

Attention!!!

Please note that the March 28, 2011 PAPCO meeting will be from 1 to 3:30 p.m. at Hayward City Hall in Conference Room 2D. Please plan your transportation accordingly. The agenda packet is enclosed.

Hayward City Hall is located in downtown Hayward at 777 B Street, just one-fifth of a mile (approximately a three-minute walk) from the Hayward BART station. Visit the BART website (<http://www.bart.gov>) or (transit.511.org/) to plan your trip. For more information about Hayward City Hall, visit the City of Hayward website (<http://user.govoutreach.com/hayward/faq.php?cid=10773>)

If you have any additional questions, please contact Naomi at (510) 208-7469.

This page intentionally left blank



Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee Meeting Agenda

Monday, March 28, 2011, 1 to 3:30 p.m.

at Conference Room 2D, Hayward City Hall, 777 B Street, Hayward, CA 94541

Meeting Outcomes:

- Make a recommendation on supplemental funding for continuing Gap Grants
- Establish membership on the Finance Subcommittee
- Establish membership on the Program Plan Review Subcommittee
- Receive an update from the 5310 Subcommittee
- Receive Gap Grant reports on miscellaneous trip provision
- Receive a staff update on the 2011 Annual Mobility Workshop

1:00 – 1:12 p.m. 1. Welcome and Introductions

Sylvia Stadmire

1:12 – 1:15 p.m. 2. Public Comment

Public

1:15 – 1:20 p.m. 3. Approval of February 28, 2011 Minutes

Sylvia Stadmire

[03A PAPCO Meeting Minutes 022811.pdf](#) – Page 1

[03B Joint Meeting Minutes 022811.pdf](#) – Page 7

1:20 – 1:35 p.m. 4. Recommendation on Supplemental Funding for PAPCO Continuing Gap Grants

[Memo Supplemental Funding Continuing Gap Grants.pdf](#)

(handout at meeting)

PAPCO members will discuss and make a recommendation on options for grant continuation.

1:35 – 1:45 p.m. **5. Finance Subcommittee Membership** |
 PAPCO *PAPCO will convene a Finance Subcommittee that will meet on Thursday, April 21 from 1 to 4 p.m.*
05 Finance Subcommittee Information.pdf – Page 13

1:45 – 1:55 p.m. **6. Program Plan Review Subcommittee Membership** |
 PAPCO *PAPCO will convene a Program Plan Review Subcommittee that will meet on Friday, April 29 and Monday, May 2 from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.*
06 Program Plan Review Subcommittee Information.pdf – Page 15

1:55 – 2:05 p.m. **7. Receive an update from the 5310 Subcommittee** |
 PAPCO *The 5310 Subcommittee met on March 15. A representative from the subcommittee will report on the outcomes.*

2:05 – 2:50 p.m. **8. Gap Grant Reports –Varied Trip Provision Programs** |
 Grant Recipients *PAPCO will receive Gap Grant reports on Alzheimer's Services of the East Bay – Driving Growth through Transportation Services for Individuals with Dementia; BORP's – BORP North County Youth/Adults with Disabilities Group Trip Project; City of Oakland's – GRIP - Grocery Return Improvement Program / TAXI UP & GO Project!; and the South County Taxi Pilot Program.*

2:50 – 3:00 p.m. **9. Member Reports on PAPCO Mission, Roles, and Responsibilities Implementation** |
 PAPCO *09 PAPCO Calendar of Events.pdf – Page 19*
09A PAPCO Workplan.pdf – Page 21
09B PAPCO Vacancies.pdf – Page 25

3:00 – 3:10 p.m. **10. Committee Reports** |
 Sharon Powers and Harriette Saunders A. East Bay Paratransit Service Review Advisory Committee (SRAC)
 B. Citizens Watchdog Committee (CWC)

3:10 – 3:30 11. Staff Updatesp.m.
Staff

- A. Mobility Management
[11A Mobility Management article.pdf](#) – Page 27
- B. 2011 Annual Mobility Workshop Update
- C. **Countywide Transportation Plan Transportation Expenditure Plan Update**
[11C Memo Regional SCS-RTP CWTP-TEP Process.pdf](#) – Page 31
[11C1 Summary CW Regional Planning Activities.pdf](#) – Page 35
[11C2 CWTP-TEP-SCS Dev Impl schedule.pdf](#) – Page 37
[11C3 Memo AlamedaCTC Approved Call for Projects.pdf](#) – Page 41
[11C4 Preliminary List of Projects and Programs.pdf](#) – Page 49
[11C5 Memo MTC Call for Projects.pdf](#) – Page 69
[11C6 Comments on RTP/SCS Goals&Perf Targets.pdf](#) – Page 83
[11C7 Memo Polling Results.pdf](#) – Page 85
[11C8 Final Polling Questions.pdf](#) – Page 87
- D. Outreach Update
- E. Other Staff Updates

12. Mandated Program and Policy Reports

- [12A SRAC Minutes 030111.pdf](#) – Page 97
- [12B WAAC Minutes 110310.pdf](#) – Page 105

13. Draft Agenda Items for April 25, 2011 PAPCO

- A. Fiscal Year 10/11 Coordination Evaluation
- B. Fiscal Year 11/12 Coordination Contract Recommendation
- C. Confirm Program Plan Review Subcommittee
- D. Report from East Bay Paratransit
- E. Quarterly Reports from the City of Alameda and the City of Hayward
- F. TAC report

3:30 p.m. 14. Adjournment

Next Meeting (Joint PAPCO/TAC):

Date: April 25, 2011

Time: 1 to 4 p.m.

Location: Alameda CTC Offices, 1333 Broadway, Suite 300, Oakland, CA 94612

Staff Liaisons:

Tess Lengyel, Programs and Public
Affairs Manager
(510) 208-7428
tlengyel@alamedactc.org

Naomi Armenta, Paratransit Coordinator
(510) 208-7469
narmenta@alamedactc.org

Location Information: Hayward City Hall is located in downtown Hayward at 777 B Street, just one-fifth of a mile (approximately a three-minute walk) from the Hayward BART station. Visit the BART website (<http://www.bart.gov>) or (transit.511.org/) to plan your trip. For more information about Hayward City Hall, visit the City of Hayward website (<http://user.govoutreach.com/hayward/faq.php?cid=10773>).

Public Comment: Members of the public may address the committee regarding any item, including an item not on the agenda. All items on the agenda are subject to action and/or change by the committee. The chair may change the order of items.

Accommodations/Accessibility: Meetings are wheelchair accessible. Please do not wear scented products so that individuals with environmental sensitivities may attend. Call (510) 893-3347 (voice) or (510) 834-6754 (TTD) five days in advance to request a sign-language interpreter.



Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee Meeting Minutes Monday, February 28, 2011, 1 p.m., 1333 Broadway, Suite 300, Oakland

Attendance Key (A = Absent, P = Present)

Members:

<u>P</u> Sylvia Stadmire, Chair	<u>P</u> Sandra Johnson Simon	<u>P</u> Clara Sample <u>P</u> Harriette Saunders
<u>A</u> Carolyn Orr, Vice-Chair	<u>P</u> Jane Lewis <u>P</u> Jonah Markowitz	<u>P</u> Will Scott
<u>P</u> Aydan Aysoy	<u>P</u> Betty Mulholland	<u>P</u> Maryanne Tracy- Baker
<u>P</u> Larry Bunn	<u>P</u> Sharon Powers	<u>P</u> Esther Waltz
<u>A</u> Herb Clayton	<u>P</u> Vanessa Proee	<u>P</u> Renee Wittmeier
<u>P</u> Shawn Costello	<u>P</u> Carmen Rivera- Hendrickson	<u>P</u> Hale Zukas
<u>P</u> Herb Hastings	<u>P</u> Michelle Rousey	
<u>A</u> Joyce Jacobson		

Staff:

<u>P</u> Tess Lengyel, Programs and Public Affairs Manager	<u>P</u> Angie Ayers, Acumen Building Enterprise, Inc.
<u>P</u> Naomi Armenta, Paratransit Coordinator	<u>P</u> Krystle Pasco, Paratransit Coordination Team
<u>A</u> Rachel Ede, Nelson\Nygaard	

1. Welcome and Introductions

Herb Hastings volunteered to chair the PAPCO meeting until the arrival of the Chair person. Herb Hastings called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m. The meeting began with introductions and a review of the meeting outcomes. Naomi Armenta welcomed the new member, Esther Waltz.

Guests Present: Jennifer Cullen, Senior Support; Pam Deaton, City of Pleasanton; Kim Huffman, AC Transit; Kadri Klm, LAVTA; Wilson Lee, City of Union City; Gail Payne, City of Alameda; Laura Timothy, BART; Ashley VanMaanen, Alzheimers Service of the East Bay; Mary Steiner

2. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

3. Approval of January 24, 2011 Minutes

Sandra Johnson-Simon moved that PAPCO approve the minutes as written. Esther Waltz seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously (16-0).

4. Make a Recommendation on Gap Funding

Naomi reviewed the Gap Funding memo and asked PAPCO to approve staff's recommendations. Staff recommended the following:

- AC Transit and BART (in support of East Bay Paratransit) be eligible to apply for any unclaimed remaining stabilization funding allocated for FY 09/10 and 10/11. Staff does not recommend funding stabilization for FY 11/12.
- Designating up to \$500,000 of Gap funding for Coordination and Mobility Management Planning (CMMP) pilot programs.
- Designating up to \$1,000,000 of Gap funding for programs that meet new criteria to continue for one year.
- Allowing any remaining funding designated for CMMP pilots to be eligible for jurisdictions to apply for technical assistance to implement Mobility Management.

Harriette Saunders moved to approve staff recommendations. Shawn Costello seconded the motion. The motion carried (16-2). Betty Mulholland and Clara Sample abstained.

5. City of Hayward Quarterly Report

Anne Culver from the City of Hayward gave a presentation on the City of Hayward Paratransit Program and gave PAPCO an update on its new planned fixed-route shuttle service. The shuttle rides would be free for East Bay Paratransit-eligible riders. The paratransit program provides low-cost, "door-to-door" transportation service to persons unable to use other forms of transportation independently. The City of Hayward also has two subcontracts with nonprofit agencies: Meals on Wheels and Alzheimer's Services of the East Bay.

6. City of Alameda Quarterly Report

Gail Payne from the City of Alameda gave a presentation on the City of Alameda Paratransit Program and gave PAPCO an update on the shuttle service, Medical Return Trip Improvement Program (MRTIP), premium taxi service, group trips,

and the scholarship program. The City of Alameda City Council will review the following recommended changes for the Paratransit Program at the March 15, 2011 meeting:

- Shuttle Service – Operate the west loop only on Tuesdays; create a central loop for Thursdays; and expand coverage of the west and east loops to cover a larger area.
- Taxi Services – Operate taxi-metered lift-equipped vans; restrict the taxi service to within Alameda County; limit MRTIP vouchers to five per month; place an expiration date on travel vouchers; and terminate free trips.
- The route changes are scheduled to be effective on April 1, 2011.

7. Establish a Subcommittee for 5310 Scoring

Naomi reviewed the 5310 Review Subcommittee handout and asked PAPCO members to sign up to participate on the subcommittee. The following PAPCO members volunteered:

- Aydan Aysoy
- Herb Hastings
- Sandra Johnson-Simon
- Betty Mulholland
- Sharon Powers
- Michelle Rousey
- Clara Sample
- Harriette Saunders
- Will Scott
- Sylvia Stadmire
- Maryanne Tracy-Baker
- Renee Wittmeier

8. Member Reports on PAPCO Mission, Roles, and Responsibilities Implementation

Sylvia stated that she completed the Countywide Transportation Plan and Transportation Expenditure Plan (CWTP-TEP) Outreach Toolkit Training on February 3, 2011.

Jonah Markowitz discussed the complaint process in dealing with transportation when things go wrong. He stated that In Home Support Services (IHSS) is challenging the validity of their clients.

Herb Hastings stated that the bus service for the County Fair is still being worked on at Wheels.

Betty Mulholland stated that she is facilitating the Outreach Toolkit at many of the senior centers in Alameda County.

Many of the PAPCO members stated that a need exists to advocate for programs in the State of California for funding, and to contact our elected officials and request that they stop cutting our vital services.

9. Committee Reports

A. East Bay Paratransit Service Review Advisory Committee (SRAC)

Sharon Powers stated that at the January meeting, SRAC discussed raising the base fare for East Bay Paratransit to \$4.

B. Citizens Watchdog Committee (CWC)

There were no updates on CWC.

10. Staff Updates

A. Mobility Management

There were no updates. Please review the attachment in your packet.

B. Outreach Update

Krystle Pasco reported on the Union City 2nd Annual Senior Health and Resource Fair held at the Tropics Mobile Home Park Clubhouse. She mentioned that approximately 300 seniors attended. Krystle reviewed the March events with the committee.

C. Other Staff Updates

Naomi informed the committee that the next meeting may be held at either Hayward City Hall or the Ed Roberts Campus.

11. Mandated Program and Policy Reports

There were no program and policy reports. Please review the attachment in your packet.

12. Draft Agenda Items for March 28, 2011 PAPCO

- A. Input on Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans Priority Projects/Programs Chapter
- B. Establishment of Finance Subcommittee Membership
- C. Establishment of Program Plan Review Subcommittee Membership
- D. Discussion on Gap Grant Extensions
- E. Stabilization Update
- F. Annual Mobility Workshop Update
- G. Gap Grant Reports – Miscellaneous Trip Provision

13. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m. The next meeting will be held at Hayward City Hall, 777 B Street, Room 2D, Hayward, CA.

This page intentionally left blank.



**Paratransit Planning and Advisory Committee (PAPCO) and
Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting Minutes
Monday, February 28, 2011, 1 p.m., 1333 Broadway, Suite 300, Oakland**

Attendance Key (A = Absent, P = Present)

TAC Members:

<u> A </u> Beverly Bolden	<u> A </u> Drew King	<u> P </u> Gail Payne
<u> P </u> Anne Culver	<u> A </u> Jackie Krause	<u> A </u> Mary Rowlands
<u> P </u> Pam Deaton	<u> P </u> Kadri Kulm	<u> A </u> Mia Thibeaux
<u> A </u> Louie Despeaux	<u> A </u> Kevin Laven	<u> P </u> Laura Timothy
<u> A </u> Jeff Flynn	<u> A </u> Isabelle Leduc	<u> A </u> Kelly Wallace
<u> A </u> Shawn Fong	<u> P </u> Wilson Lee	<u> A </u> Mark Weinstein
<u> A </u> Brendalynn Goodall	<u> P </u> Hakeim McGee	<u> A </u> Victoria Williams
<u> A </u> Karen Hemphill	<u> A </u> Cindy Montero	<u> P </u> David Zehnder
<u> P </u> Kim Huffman	<u> A </u> Mallory Nestor	
	<u> A </u> Joann Oliver	

PAPCO members and staff on Attachment 03 attended the Joint meeting along with the above TAC members.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Naomi Armenta, Paratransit Coordinator, called the meeting to order at 2:45 p.m.

Guest Present: Jennifer Cullen, Senior Support; Mary Steiner; Ashley VanMaanen, Alzheimer’s Services of the East Bay

2. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

3. Technical Advisory Committee Report

Hakeim McGee shared with the Joint Committee some of the TAC activities that took place during October 2010 through January 2011, particularly in the area of coordination and mobility management.

In terms of coordination efforts, TAC understands that PAPCO members want seniors and people with disabilities to have the ability to use services throughout Alameda County if they are eligible for ADA Paratransit. They want people to be able to ride a shuttle in communities outside where they live; some cities have coordinated on this effort.

Hakeim mentioned that the City of Fremont has a transit adventures program for seniors. This program allows seniors that participated in the travel training program to take part in outings to fun destination points. The City of Fremont is meeting with the City of Union City to expand this program.

4. Clipper Presentation

Lysa Hale could not attend the meeting. Naomi mentioned that she will be at the Pleasanton Fair on March 17, 2011. Members also agreed they want her to make a presentation at the next joint meeting on April 25, 2011.

5. Quarterly Education and Training – Countywide Transportation Plan Update and Legislative Program

Tess Lengyel led the discussion on the Countywide Transportation Plan and the Transportation Expenditure Plan (CWTP-TEP); and the Legislative Program.

Countywide Transportation Plan and Transportation Expenditure Plan:

Tess stated that one of the roles of the Alameda CTC is to perform planning efforts in Alameda County. She said the CWTP is a 25-year plan that feeds into the Regional Transportation Plan, which the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is responsible for. Alameda CTC is in the process of updating the CWTP and developing a new Transportation Expenditure Plan concurrently with the regional efforts. She said the goal is to update the CWTP first then develop the supporting expenditure plan, which will be placed on the ballot in November 2012.

Tess also provided information on the advisory committees involved in the process. The CWTP-TEP Steering Committee is made up of elected officials; the Technical Advisory Working Group (TAWG) consists of staff from the jurisdictions, transit agencies, and representatives from the Port of Oakland; and the Community Advisory Working Group (CAWG) consists of businesses, educators, and people from the community. In an effort to keep PAPCO and

TAC up to date on the regional, countywide, and sales tax planning processes, the CWTP-TEP will be an agenda item for every meeting.

Tess gave an overview of the CWTP-TEP outreach approach. She mentioned that five community workshops in different areas of the county will take place to seek feedback from the community on projects and programs they are interested in.

Outreach Workshops have been scheduled on the following dates at these locations:

- February 24, Oakland City Hall
- February 28, Fremont Public Library
- March 9, Hayward City Hall
- March 16, San Leandro Library
- March 24, Dublin Public Library

Questions/feedback from members:

- Does each city need to submit for the call for projects? If cities have projects they would like to include in the RTP, CWTP or TEP, they will need to submit them on line. Alameda CTC is in the process of developing a list of programs and projects that have been received through outreach processes as well as feedback from the Commission and advisory committees, and from the 2008 adopted CWTP.
- Is there an unmet need to hear from seniors and people with disabilities, since the meetings are in the evenings and folks attending will not be speaking about specialized transportation? Tess mentioned that both workshops Outreach Toolkits are being used to reach a broad spectrum of people in the County. Thus far, many senior organizations have been involved in the outreach efforts. The public can also complete an online questionnaire.

A TAC member encouraged Alameda CTC to keep the survey simple. The survey was used today in the City of Pleasanton, and it was too complicated for the 75 attendees. Their answers were very basic.

Legislative Program:

Tess informed the group that in January, Alameda CTC adopted the Legislative Program for the calendar year. She stated that the 2011 Legislative Program is divided into six sections:

- Federal Transportation Bill Reauthorization
- Transportation Funding
- Project Delivery
- Multi-modal and Transit Oriented Development
- Transportation and Social Equity
- Climate Change

Tess said that Alameda CTC is advocating at the federal level for rewards for states like California that put a significant amounts of funding in transportation. She said that Alameda County spends about \$100 million a year on transportation. Tess said that in November 2010, the Bay Area passed the Vehicle Registration Fee to help fund transportation improvements.

She also mentioned that representatives from Alameda CTC and the Commission will go to Washington D.C. the week of March 28 to meet with the legislators developing the transportation bill. She stated that the countywide planning effort will encompass more than we can fund in 25 years. She said acknowledging the needs of the county will help Alameda CTC in Washington D.C.

6. Planning for 2011 Annual Mobility Workshop

Naomi informed the committee that the room is reserved at MTC for July 11, for the Annual Mobility Workshop. She said this meeting is in lieu of the July PAPCO meeting.

Input from members:

- Have Clipper as a theme.
- Receive information on the American Disability Act as related to private services.
- Have the Alameda County elected officials and Tess provide direct answers for specific questions and concerns.
- Have group tables with integrated seating.
- If we have a working session, have it mixed instead of separated by planning area.

- A larger room is need; the members feel they have outgrown the MTC space.
- Have emergency awareness and preparedness as a theme.
- Regarding new technologies (Braille maps, etc.), find a resource to speak at the workshop.
- Have different transit agencies from other states speak.
- Include an East Bay Regional Park table displaying its programs.

7. Discussion of Items Not on the Agenda

Pam Deaton said the City of Pleasanton sent a postcard to ask people to try the downtown services for free and to tell the City what they think.

Wilson Lee inquired when Alameda CTC will stop using the old logo. Staff informed the group that the website is in the process of being updated now.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.

This page intentionally left blank.

Finance Subcommittee

At the PAPCO meeting on March 28, 2011, PAPCO members will be asked to sign up to participate in the Finance Subcommittee. Below is background information to assist you in determining whether this is a subcommittee you are interested in signing up for.

Background

Throughout each fiscal year, the thirteen paratransit providers in Alameda County have to submit three reports; their Base Program Plan (early April), a Mid Year Report (mid March), and a Compliance Report/Year End Report (December). On March 18, 2011, Mid Year Reports were due to the Alameda CTC from the paratransit providers. The Finance Subcommittee was originally set up to address guidelines for fund balances. Now the Finance Subcommittee reviews these submitted reports and addresses a number of issues including fiduciary responsibilities, unspent fund balances, and notable trends in revenues and expenditures. The primary focus of the April Finance Subcommittee is to review staff summary reports and identify issues for correction or clarification during Program Plan Review.

Subcommittee Process

The subcommittee will meet on April 21, 2011, at the Alameda CTC to go over summary reports prepared by staff. Any issues identified through this Subcommittee will either be forwarded to the program manager through the coordinator with a request to correct and resubmit their report, or will be identified as questions to be included on the reviewer forms for the programs in questions. The subcommittee will also select a spokesperson to report on the subcommittee outcomes at the Joint PAPCO/TAC meeting on April 25, 2011.

Responsibilities

All PAPCO members that volunteer for this subcommittee are asked to review the materials provided prior to the meeting. Accessible materials can be arranged for any member by request.

PAPCO Meeting Date

- Thursday, April 21, 2011, from 1 – 4 pm at Alameda CTC (1333 Broadway, Suite 300). Lunch will be provided.

Per Diem

Since this is a standing subcommittee (as listed in the Bylaws), PAPCO members will receive a per diem.

Program Plan Review Subcommittee

At the PAPCO meeting on March 28, 2011, PAPCO members will be asked to sign up to participate in the Program Plan Review Subcommittee. Below is background information to assist you in determining whether this is a subcommittee you are interested in signing up for.

Background

Program Plan Review is a primary PAPCO responsibility assigned by the ACTIA Board (now Alameda County Transportation Commission) and stated in the Bylaws Article III.C.1. as: "*Review of mandated and non-mandated services for cost effectiveness and adequacy of service levels and to make recommendations to the ACTIA Board regarding the approval of requests for funding.*" This year, PAPCO will be responsible for reviewing and recommending funding for Measure B funded paratransit programs totaling over **\$8.95 million dollars**.

Overview of Paratransit Programs in Alameda County

There are 13 different paratransit programs in Alameda County. Broadly speaking, these programs can be categorized into "Mandated" programs and "Non-Mandated" programs.

Mandated programs are a federal mandate by the Americans with Disabilities Act, which was passed in 1990, and required that public transit systems make their services fully accessible, including providing services for people who, because of their disability, cannot ride regular buses and trains. In Alameda County, AC Transit and BART have partnered to form the East Bay Paratransit Consortium which provides the mandated service in our region.

In addition, Livermore Amador Valley Transit (LAVTA) in Livermore, and Union City Transit in the City of Union City also provide mandated services. However, LAVTA and Union City do not receive funding under the "mandated paratransit" portion of Measure B. They receive funding through the cities they serve, and offer both mandated and non-mandated services. Only AC Transit and BART receive funding from the "mandated services" portion of Measure B.

Mandated services are required by federal law to provide paratransit services to individuals who live within a $\frac{3}{4}$ mile radius of a regular bus or rail route during the days and hours that the regular services are offered. Other requirements of the mandated services are that they provide next day service; charge fares no more than twice the undiscounted fixed route fare; accept requests for all types of trips without prioritization; operate during the same hours as regular transit services; and allow no pattern or practice of denials. Individuals who wish to use mandated paratransit in their area are required to complete an application to determine their eligibility.

Non-mandated programs, on the other hand, have much more flexibility in how they design their programs. Each City in the County has designed their paratransit programs to meet the needs of their local jurisdiction. The major difference between the mandated and non-mandated or “City-based” programs, aside from the absence of federal regulations, are that they provide paratransit services for seniors and offer a range of different types of paratransit services, including taxi, van service, and shuttle service.

Subcommittee Process

Two meetings have been scheduled on April 29 and May 2, 2011. Committee members are welcome to sign up for one or both days, or attend part of one day, as the meetings will be quite long. In the past, programs have been grouped by different types of service: City-Based Same Day Service, City-Based Advance Reservation Service, and ADA Service – or by MSL application or by geographic area. More details on the schedule will be provided in April.

Each program will be scheduled for at least a 45-minute time slot on one of the review dates. During that slot, program managers will provide a 10 minute presentation of their program, followed by a brief staff report on programmatic issues, financials (including questions identified through the Finance Subcommittee), program compliance and dramatic changes to any operating statistics. You will then have an opportunity to ask questions of each of the program managers before making your recommendation.

As part of your recommendation, you will have the opportunity to make comments or suggest ideas to the program managers regarding their programs. Once you make your comments or suggestions, you may simply

send a program plan on to the Commission for approval without comment, or you may attach comments or questions that you believe should be pursued by staff.

Your final recommendations will go before the full PAPCO in May for final approval before going to the Commission.

Responsibilities

All PAPCO members that volunteer for this subcommittee will be responsible for carefully reviewing the somewhat extensive materials provided prior to the meeting(s) and coming prepared with comments and questions. For each program, you will receive the following materials:

- Annual Submittal Staff Summary Form – contains summary information about each program and questions raised by the Finance Subcommittee
- Program Plan Application PDF
- Program Plan Application Table 1 & 2

Accessible materials can be arranged for any member by request.

PAPCO Meeting Date

Committee members are welcome to sign up for one or both meetings.

- Friday, April 29, 2011 from approximately 10 – 4 at the Alameda CTC (1333 Broadway, Suite 300). Lunch will be provided.
- Monday, May 2, 2011 from approximately 10 – 4 at the Alameda CTC (1333 Broadway, Suite 300). Lunch will be provided.

Per Diem

Since this is a standing subcommittee, PAPCO members will receive a per diem for each meeting attended.

This page intentionally left blank.

PAPCO Calendar of Events for March 2011 to April 2011

Full Committee Meetings

- Monday, March 28, 2011, 1 to 3:30 p.m., Alameda CTC, **Regular PAPCO Monthly meeting**
- Tuesday, April 12, 2011, 9:30 to 11:30 a.m., Alameda CTC, **Regular TAC Monthly meeting**
- Monday, April 25, 2011, 1 to 4 p.m., Alameda CTC, **Regular PAPCO Monthly meeting/Joint meeting with TAC**

Subcommittee Meetings

- Tuesday, March 15, 2011, 10 a.m. to 4 p.m., **5310 Orientation and Scoring Subcommittee**
- Thursday, April 21, 2011 1 to 4 p.m., **Finance Subcommittee**
- Friday, April 29, 2011, 10 a.m. to 4 p.m., **Program Plan Subcommittee 1**
- Monday May 2, 2011, 10 a.m. to 4 p.m., **Program Plan Subcommittee 2**

Outreach

Meeting Date	Event Name	Meeting Location	Time
3/17/11	Annual Pleasanton Transit Fair	Pleasanton Senior Center 5333 Sunol Blvd Pleasanton, CA	10 a.m. – 1 p.m.
3/19/11	Transition Information Faire	Developmental Disabilities Council College of Alameda Alameda, CA	9:30 a.m. – 3 p.m.
3/23/11	Oakland Running Festival Expo	Oakland Marriott	9 a.m. – 8 p.m.
4/21/11	East County Transportation Forum	Dublin City Hall 100 Civic Plaza Dublin, CA 94468-2658	6:30 – 8:30 p.m.

You will be notified of other events as they are scheduled.

For more information about Outreach events or to sign up to attend, please call (510) 208-7467.

PAPCO Work Plan FY 2010/11

PAPCO Work Plan

PAPCO activities throughout the year will be guided by PAPCO Goals and Bylaws. The PAPCO Chair or Vice Chair will report to the ACTIA Board every month.

Topic: PAPCO Development and Outreach		
Goal: Continue PAPCO's development as an informed and effective community advisory committee; accomplish outreach in a variety of ways in all areas of the County		
Actions	Completed	In-Progress
Participate in Committee Leadership Training at September Meeting	x	
Participate in Legislative Training at Joint Meeting (February)	x	
Participate in Emergency Preparedness update/drill at January Meeting	x	
Assist in distributing new materials – Access Alameda in different languages (Spanish, Chinese, Tagalog, Vietnamese, Farsi)		
Assist in distributing new materials – Fact Sheets on Aging, etc		
Assist in outreach to community members regarding Clipper fare payment system		x
Fill every vacant seat on PAPCO Targeted PAPCO recruitment		x
Staff will continue to be available to help draft talking points or articles for members		ongoing
All members to participate in at least one Outreach activity – write an article, speak at another meeting, visit Senior Centers, and/or attend an event		ongoing

Topic: Policy Engagement and Input

Goal: Stay informed on and take advantage of opportunities to provide input on a variety of topics

Actions	Completed	In-Progress
Beginning in October 2010 research accessible transportation to County Fair		x
Complete survey regarding other committees/activities participation in November 2010 to be shared with Committee		x
Staff will continue to forward opportunities for comments and participation via email		x
Receive regular summaries of Transit Access Reports		x

Topic: Coordination and Mobility Management Planning Process

Goal: Learn about and contribute to Alameda County's Mobility Management Process

Actions	Completed	In-Progress
Review materials regarding Mobility Management provided in new section in meeting packet		x
Receive a report from TAC at Joint meetings on efforts	x	
October	x	
February		
April		
Contribute to Countywide transportation inventory by completing survey regarding other transportation options/sources in community in November 2010		x

Topic: Planning Efforts

Goal: Stay informed on and contribute to Alameda County/Regional planning efforts; expand focus to “complete community”

Actions	Completed	In-Progress
Provide input on Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan Update		
October Joint Meeting	x	
November Meeting	x	
March Meeting		
Receive presentation on Countywide Transportation Plan and Transportation Expenditure Plan Development at February Joint Meeting; and also regular updates	x	
Receive reports from MTC and Regional issues/events		x

Topic: Fiduciary Oversight

Goal: Continue fiduciary oversight over pass-through and grant funding

Actions	Completed	In-Progress
Received update on new pass-through reporting format at November Meeting	x	
Receive reports from extended Gap grants at Meetings		
November	x	
March		x
April		
June		
Hold a fiduciary training as part of Finance Subcommittee in April		
Continue to evaluate pass-through and grant programs and expenditures		x

Topic: Sustainability

Goal: Identify ongoing funding needs for paratransit and future Call Cycles

Actions	Completed	In-Progress
Discuss possible extension of Gap funding in January		x
Make recommendation on Gap Grant Call at January/February Meeting		x
Receive an update on pass-through stabilization funding at May Meeting		

Topic: Customer Service

Goal: Participate in driver training and serve as a resource to providers; and facilitate communication and resolution of consumer complaints

Actions	Completed	In-Progress
Continue to be available to assist in East Bay Paratransit Driver Training		
Continue to be available to assist in East Bay Paratransit Secret Rider Program and Complaints Board		
Continue to be available to assist in LAVTA with Driver Training and related items		
Ensure that taxi providers have access to resources such as pocket guides from Easter Seals Project ACTION		

Members' Other Committees/Activities

PAPCO members appointed to SRAC		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be completed after survey
PAPCO members appointed to WAAC		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be completed after survey
Other Committees/Activities to be completed after survey		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be completed after survey

CURRENT APPOINTMENTS

Appointer

- A. C. Transit
- BART
- LAVTA
- Union City Transit
- City of Berkeley
- City of Emeryville
- City of Dublin
- City of Fremont
- City of Hayward
- City of Livermore
- City of Oakland; Councilmember Rebecca Kaplan
- City of Pleasanton
- City of Union City
- Supervisor Alice Lai-Bitker

- Supervisor Gail Steele

- Supervisor Keith Carson

- Supervisor Nate Miley

- Supervisor Scott Haggerty

Member

- Hale Zukas
- Harriette Saunders
- Esther Waltz
- Larry Bunn
- Aydan Aysoy
- Joyce Jacobson
- Shawn Costello
- Sharon Powers
- Vanessa Proee
- Jane Lewis
- Rev. Carolyn M. Orr

- Carmen Rivera-Hendrickson
- Clara Sample
- Sylvia Stadmire
- Renee Wittmeier
- Herb Clayton
- Michelle Rousey
- Jonah Markowitz
- Will Scott
- Betty Mulholland
- Sandra Johnson Simon
- Herb Hastings
- Maryanne Tracy-Baker

VACANCIES

Appointer

- City of Alameda
- City of Albany
- City of Newark
- City of Piedmont
- City of San Leandro

Current PAPCO Appointments and Vacancies

Please keep these vacancies in mind when you speak with community members. If you know of an interested candidate, please have them contact Naomi at (510) 208-7469 and we will put them in contact with the Appointer.

pressdemocrat.com

How do you solve transportation problems for seniors who don't drive?

By MARY CALLAHAN
THE PRESS DEMOCRAT

Published: Tuesday, March 1, 2011 at 4:06 p.m.

Rural Sebastopol resident Della Miller already was in her 80s when she fell asleep at the wheel of her car, totaled the vehicle and ended her driving career four years ago.

Widowed and living alone with her fox terrier, Skippy, Miller still needed to get around, especially for treatment of a chronic, acute respiratory condition requiring multiple medical appointments each month.

After paying \$27 for a cab ride from her Mill Station Road home to her doctor in town soon after losing her car, Miller discovered the free, Volunteer Driver Transportation Program at the Sebastopol Area Senior Center, which last year alone got her to 30 appointments.

"That's what's been my life saver," said Miller, 87.

Without it, "I don't know what I would do," she said.

What indeed. That's the quandary to be tackled Wednesday by Sonoma County policymakers, senior citizen advocates, service providers and others at what's been dubbed a Senior Mobility Summit in Santa Rosa.

Part of a two-year effort to grapple with the needs of an aging population in a far-flung county, summit participants will try to find ways to expand and coordinate transportation services for the senior population.

"It's not a very sexy issue, but it's sure going to emerge as an increasingly important topic as the aging population just mushrooms and we are outliving our driving years," said Cynthia Scarborough, executive director of the Vintage House senior center in Sonoma, which provides a volunteer car service similar to Sebastopol's.

“There has been an increasing recognition that there's health outcomes that are positive if you keep people active and not isolated,” Ginny Doyle, a planner with the Adult and Aging Division of Sonoma County Health and Human Services Department, which organized the event. “And so that's what we're looking at: the group of aging seniors who will stay healthier longer and be able to stay at home longer if they can get out to regular services often.”

Sonoma County's senior population is expected to increase 20 percent by 2020, with its 85-and-older crowd growing to more than 26,000 people, county Supervisor Efren Carrillo said.

There will be thousands of Dellas among them — folks who no longer drive and need help getting to and from medical appointments, and to grocery stores, pharmacies, hairdressers and the myriad other activities that enrich lives.

“For seniors to stay healthy, for any of us to stay healthy, we have to be able to get around,” Doyle said.

The volunteer car service, through the Sebastopol senior center, has provided 9,100 rides to 1,983 West County residents aged 60 and older since its January 2008 start, coordinator Dean Brittingham said.

Except for Brittingham's grant-funded, part-time position, it is an all volunteer service staffed by 35 people who use their own vehicles and fuel to help others get around.

The people they serve “have given up their keys, and for a long time had no options about how to get anywhere,” Brittingham said. “...A lot of people have been isolated. Their health has gone down. They feel unvalued/devalued as a community member.”

Like those before them, the 35 volunteer drivers on the roster filled out long applications, passed background and reference checks, got fingerprinted, and were trained, she said.

Fifty-five drivers volunteer through the Vintage House program, averaging 105 one-way trips each week, Scarborough said.

Friends in Sonoma Helping, or FISH, another non-profit, provides travel for medical appointments to seniors, while both the Council on Aging in Santa Rosa, with 95 registered riders, and Jewish Family and Children's Services provide volunteer rides at low cost to cover coordination.

It's gratifying work, and it's easy to become attached, said Council on Aging volunteer driver JoAnn Clayton, who takes an 83-year-old widow to dialysis on Saturdays. “They become your family.”

“It's more than a ride,” Doyle said.

Those who are disabled can also utilize county door-to-door paratransit services. But those in the various programs said there is unmet demand for the services in the county and a need for collaboration among private and public agencies.

“Our transportation in this area is fairly fragmented,” Doyle said.

The summit runs from 8:30 a.m. to noon Wednesday at 3725 Westwind Blvd., Suite 101, in Santa Rosa.

Speakers include Mobility Management's David Cyra, the Federal Transit Administration's United We Ride Ambassador to California; and Paul Branson, the community mobility manager for Marin Transit, which has created a coordinated and integrated model for senior transportation.

Those attending may RSVP with Joanne De Alejandro at jdealeja@schsd.org or 565-5950.

Copyright © 2011 PressDemocrat.com — All rights reserved. Restricted use only.

This page intentionally left blank.



MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 15, 2011

TO: CWTP-TEP Steering Committee

FROM: Beth Walukas, Manager of Planning
Tess Lengyel, Manager of Programs and Public Affairs

SUBJECT: **Review of Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS)/Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Countywide Transportation Plan (CWTP)/ Transportation Expenditure Plan Information**

Recommendation

This item is for information only. No action is requested.

Summary

This item provides information on regional and countywide transportation planning efforts related to the updates of the Countywide Transportation Plan and Sales Tax Transportation Expenditure Plan (CWTP-TEP) as well as the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the development of the Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS).

Discussion

Staff will be submitting monthly reports to ACTAC; the Planning, Policy and Legislation Committee (PPLC); the Alameda CTC Board; the Citizen's Watchdog Committee; the Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee; the Citizen's Advisory Committee; and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee. The purpose of these reports is to keep various Committee and Working Groups updated on regional and countywide planning activities, alert Committee members about issues and opportunities requiring input in the near term, and provide an opportunity for Committee feedback in a timely manner. CWTP-TEP Committee agendas and related documents are available on the Alameda CTC website.

March 2011 Update:

This report focuses on the month of March 2011. A summary of countywide and regional planning activities for the next three months is found in Attachment A and a three year schedule is found in Attachment B. Highlights include MTC/Alameda CTC Call for Projects, MTC Committed Funding and Projects Policy, an approach to developing financial forecast assumptions, ABAG's release of the Initial Vision Scenario, Update on SCS presentations to Councils, and Upcoming Meetings on Countywide and Regional Planning Efforts, as described below:

1) RTP/SCS Work Element Proposals and Release of Initial Vision Scenario

MTC continues to refine their proposals and guidance for the following work elements of the RTP/SCS:

- 25-year financial forecast assumptions:
- preliminary draft committed funds and projects policy scheduled to be reviewed by MTC Committees in March as a draft and adopted as final in April,
- guidance for the call for projects,
- draft projects performance assessment approach, and
- transit capital, local streets and roads maintenance needs, and transit operation needs approach.

The supporting documentation can be found at
<http://apps.mtc.ca.gov/events/agendaView.akt?p=1617>.

Also, ABAG and MTC released the Initial Vision Scenario on March 11. An update will be provided at the meeting under Item 7B.

2) Update on SCS Presentations to City Councils and Boards of Directors on Initial Vision Scenario

Jurisdiction	Date to Council/Board	Type of item	Completed?
Alameda County	February 8		Yes
Alameda	February 1		Yes
Albany	January 18	Presentation	Yes
Berkeley	January 25	Information to Council	Yes
	January 19	Presentation to Planning Commission	Yes
Dublin	January 25	Information to Council	Yes
	January 29	District 1 Workshop	
Emeryville	January 18	Working Session	Yes
Fremont	January 29	District 1 Workshop	Yes
Hayward	January 18	Working Session	Yes
Livermore	February 28	Information to Council	Yes
	January 29	District 1 Workshop	Yes
Newark	February 24		Yes
Oakland	February 15	Presentation to Council	Yes
	February 2	Presentation to Planning Commission	Yes
Piedmont	February 7		Yes
Pleasanton	February 1 (tentative)		Yes
	January 29	District 1 Workshop	Yes

Jurisdiction	Date to Council/Board	Type of item	Completed?
San Leandro	February 22	Working Session	Yes
Union City	January 25	Presentation	Yes
AC Transit	March 23	Presentation	Yes
BART	January 27		Yes

All presentations have been completed.

3) *Upcoming Meetings Related to Countywide and Regional Planning Efforts:*

Committee	Regular Meeting Date and Time	Next Meeting
CWTP-TEP Steering Committee	4 th Thursday of the month, noon Location: Alameda CTC	March 24, 2011 April 28, 2011
CWTP-TEP Technical Advisory Working Group	2 nd Thursday of the month, 1:30 p.m. Location: Alameda CTC	March 10, 2011 April 14, 2011
CWTP-TEP Community Advisory Working Group	1 st Thursday of the month, 3:00 p.m. Location: Alameda CTC	March 3, 2011 April 7, 2011
SCS/RTP Regional Advisory Working Group	1 st Tuesday of the month, 9:30 a.m. Location: MetroCenter, Oakland	March 1, 2011 April 5, 2011
SCS/RTP Performance Target Ad Hoc Committee	Varies Location: MetroCenter, Oakland	No additional meetings scheduled
SCS/RTP Equity Ad Hoc Committee	Location: MetroCenter, Oakland	March 9, 2011 April 13, 2011
SCS/RTP Housing Methodology Committee	10 a.m. Location: BCDC, 50 California St., 26th Floor, San Francisco	March 24, 2011 April 28, 2011
CWTP-TEP Public Workshops and Initial Vision Scenario Outreach	Location and times vary	CWTP-TEP: February 24, 2011 (Oakland) February 28, 2011 (Fremont) March 9, 2011 (Hayward) March 16, 2011 (San Leandro) March 24, 2011 (Dublin) IVS: March 16, 2011 (San Leandro) March 24, 2011 (Commission mtg)

Committee	Regular Meeting Date and Time	Next Meeting
		March 24, 2011 (Dublin) Other TBD

Fiscal Impact

None.

Attachments

Attachment 11C1: Summary of Next Quarter Countywide and Regional Planning Activities

Attachment 11C2: CWTP-TEP-RTP-SCS Development Implementation Schedule

**Attachment A: Summary of Next Quarter Countywide and Regional Planning Activities
(March through May)**

Countywide Planning Efforts

The three year CWTP-TEP schedule showing countywide and regional planning milestone schedules is found in Attachment B. Major milestone dates are presented at the end of this memo. In the March to May time period, the CWTP-TEP Committees will be focusing on:

- Finalizing the Briefing Book, available on the Alameda CTC's website, that is intended to be an information and reference document and a point of departure for the discussion on transportation needs;
- Identifying performance measures and a methodology for prioritizing transportation improvements in the CWTP;
- Coordinating with ABAG and local jurisdictions on defining the Vision Scenarios for the Sustainable Communities Strategy and establishing how land use and the SCS will be addressed in the CWTP;
- Identifying transportation needs and issues including presentation of best practices and strategies for achieving Alameda County's vision beyond this CWTP update;
- Developing and implementing a Call for Projects and Committed Funding and Project Policy that is consistent and concurrent with MTC's call for projects and guidance and identifying supplemental information needed for Transportation Expenditure Plan projects and programs;
- Developing financial projections;
- Identifying transportation investment packages for evaluation;
- Conducting polling and reviewing polling results for an initial read on voter perceptions;
- Conducting public outreach on transportation needs and the Initial Vision Scenario.

Regional Planning Efforts

Staff continues to coordinate the CWTP-TEP with planning efforts at the regional level including the Regional Transportation Plan (MTC), the Sustainable Communities Strategy (ABAG), Climate Change Bay Plan and amendments (San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)) and CEQA Guidelines (Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)).

In the three month period for which this report covers, MTC and ABAG are focusing on developing an Initial SCS Vision Scenario (released March 11, 2011), assisting in presenting the Initial Vision Scenario to the public and City Councils and Boards of Directors; developing draft financial projections, adopting a committed transportation funding and project policy, releasing and implementing a call for projects, completing the work on targets and indicators for assessing performance of the projects and beginning the performance assessment.

Staff will be coordinating with the regional agencies and providing feedback on these issues, including:

- Participating on the MTC/ABAG Regional Advisory Working Group (RAWG),
- Participating on regional Sub-committees: on-going performance targets and indicators and the equity sub-committee;

These activities will feed into our discussion on revenue and financial projections and availability and the discussion of transportation investment both new and existing that will begin around the early spring timeframe.

Key Dates and Opportunities for Input

The key dates shown below are indications of where input and comment are desired. The major activities and dates are highlighted below by activity:

Sustainable Communities Strategy:

Presentation of SCS information to local jurisdictions: Completed

Initial Vision Scenario Released: March 11, 2011: Completed

Detailed SCS Scenarios Released: July 2011

Preferred SCS Scenario Released/Approved: December 2011/January 2012

RHNA

RHNA Process Begins: January 2011

Draft RHNA Methodology Released: September 2011

Draft RHNA Plan released: February 2012

Final RHNA Plan released/Adopted: July 2012/October 2012

RTP

Develop Financial Forecasts and Committed Funding Policy: March/April 2011

Call for RTP Transportation Projects: March 1 through April 29, 2011

Conduct Performance Assessment: March 2011 - September 2011

Transportation Policy Investment Dialogue: October 2011 – February 2012

Prepare SCS/RTP Plan: April 2012 – October 2012

Draft RTP/SCS for Released: November 2012

Prepare EIR: December 2012 – March 2013

Adopt SCS/RTP: April 2013

CWTP-TEP

Develop Land Use Scenarios: May 2011

Call for Projects: Concurrent with MTC

Outreach: January 2011 - June 2011

Draft List of CWTP screened Projects and Programs: July 2011

First Draft CWTP: September 2011

TEP Program and Project Packages: September 2011

Draft CWTP and TEP Released: January 2012

Outreach: January 2012 – June 2012

Adopt CWTP and TEP: July 2012

TEP Submitted for Ballot: August 2012

Calendar Year 2010

Task	2010						Meeting FY2010-2011	2010				
	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Alameda CTC Committee/Public Process												
Steering Committee			Establish Steering Committee	Working meeting to establish roles/responsibilities, community working group	RFP feedback, tech working group	Update on Transportation/ Finance Issues	Approval of Community working group and steering committee next steps	No Meetings		Feedback from Tech, comm working groups	No Meetings	Expand vision and goals for County ?
Technical Advisory Working Group								No Meetings		Roles, resp, schedule, vision discussion/ feedback	No Meetings	Education: Trans statistics, issues, financials overview
Community Advisory Working Group								No Meetings		Roles, resp, schedule, vision discussion/ feedback	No Meetings	Education: Transportation statistics, issues, financials overview
Public Participation								No Meetings			Stakeholder outreach	
Agency Public Education and Outreach	Information about upcoming CWTP Update and reauthorization											
Alameda CTC Technical Work												
Technical Studies/RFP/Work timelines: All this work will be done in relation to SCS work at the regional level						Board authorization for release of RFPs	Pre-Bid meetings	Proposals reviewed	ALF/ALC approves shortlist and interview; Board approves top ranked, auth. to negotiate or NTP	Technical Work		
Polling												
Sustainable Communities Strategy/Regional Transportation Plan												
Regional Sustainable Community Strategy Development Process - Final RTP in April 2013			Local Land Use Update P2009 begins & PDA Assessment begins						Green House Gas Target approved by CARB.	Start Vision Scenario Discussions		
											Adopt methodology for Jobs/Housing Forecast (Statutory Target)	Projections 2011 Base Case
												Adopt Voluntary Performance Targets

Task	2011						FY2011-2012	2011				
	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Alameda CTC Committee/Public Process												
Steering Committee	Adopt vision and goals; begin discussion on performance measures, key needs	Performance measures, costs guidelines, call for projects and prioritization process, approve polling questions, initial vision scenario discussion	Review workshop outcomes, transportation issue papers, programs, finalize performance measures, land use discussion, call for projects update	Outreach and call for projects update (draft list approval), project and program packaging, county land use, financials, committed projects	Outreach update, project and program screening outcomes, call for projects final list to MTC, TEP strategic parameters, land use rcmmnd	No Meetings.	Project evaluation outcomes; outline of CWTP; TEP Strategies for project and program selection	No Meetings	1st Draft CWTP, TEP potential project and program packages, outreach and polling discussion		Meeting moved to December due to holiday conflict	Review 2nd draft CWTP; 1st draft TEP
Technical Advisory Working Group	Comment on vision and goals; begin discussion on performance measures, key needs	Continue discussion on performance measures, costs guidelines, call for projects, briefing book, outreach	Review workshop outcomes, transportation issue papers, programs, finalize performance measures, land use discussion, call for projects update	Outreach and call for projects update, project and program packaging, county land use, financials, committed projects	Outreach update, project and program screening outcomes, call for projects update, TEP strategic parameters, land use	No Meetings.	Project evaluation outcomes; outline of CWTP; TEP Strategies for project and program selection	No Meetings	1st Draft CWTP, TEP potential project and program packages, outreach and polling discussion		Review 2nd draft CWTP, 1st draft TEP, poll results update	No Meetings
Community Advisory Working Group	Comment on vision and goals; begin discussion on performance measures, key needs	Continue discussion on performance measures, costs guidelines, call for projects, briefing book, outreach	Review workshop outcomes, transportation issue papers, programs, finalize performance measures, land use discussion, call for projects update	Outreach and call for projects update, project and program packaging, county land use, financials, committed projects	Outreach update, project and program screening outcomes, call for projects update, TEP strategic parameters, land use	No Meetings.	Project evaluation outcomes; outline of CWTP; TEP Strategies for project and program selection	No Meetings	1st Draft CWTP, TEP potential project and program packages, outreach and polling discussion		Review 2nd draft CWTP, 1st draft TEP, poll results update	No Meetings
Public Participation	Public Workshops in two areas of County: vision and needs; Central County Transportation Forum	Public Workshops in all areas of County: vision and needs		East County Transportation Forum			South County Transportation Forum	No Meetings			2nd round of public workshops in County: feedback on CWTP,TEP; North County Transportation Forum	No Meetings
Agency Public Education and Outreach	Ongoing Education and Outreach through November 2012						Ongoing Education and Outreach through November 2012					
Alameda CTC Technical Work												
Technical Studies/RFP/Work timelines: All this work will be done in relation to SCS work at the regional level	Feedback on Technical Work, Modified Vision, Preliminary projects lists					Work with feedback on CWTP and financial scenarios	Technical work refinement and development of Expenditure plan, 2nd draft CWTP					
Polling	Conduct baseline poll									Polling on possible Expenditure Plan projects & programs		
Sustainable Communities Strategy/Regional Tra												
Regional Sustainable Community Strategy Development Process - Final RTP in April 2013			Release Initial Vision Scenario	Detailed SCS Scenario Development			Release Detailed SCS Scenarios	Technical Analysis of SCS Scenarios; Adoption of Regional Housing Needs Allocation Methodology		SCS Scenario Results/and funding discussions		Release Preferred SCS Scenario
	Discuss Call for Projects		Call for Transportation Projects and Project Performance Assessment		Project Evaluation		Draft Regional Housing Needs Allocation Methodology					
	Develop Draft 25-year Transportation Financial Forecasts and Committed Transportation Funding Policy											

Countywide Transportation Plan and Transportation Expenditure Plan
 Preliminary Development Implementation Schedule - Updated 12/22/10

Calendar Year 2012

Task	2012					FY2011-2012						
	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Oct	November	
Alameda CTC Committee/Public Process												
Steering Committee	Full Draft TEP, Outcomes of outreach meetings	Finalize Plans	Meetings to be determined as needed			Adopt Draft Plans	Adopt Final Plans	Expenditure Plan on Ballot				VOTE: November 6, 2012
Technical Advisory Working Group	Full Draft TEP, Outcomes of outreach meetings	Finalize Plans	Meetings to be determined as needed									VOTE: November 6, 2012
Community Advisory Working Group	Full Draft TEP, Outcomes of outreach meetings	Finalize Plans	Meetings to be determined as needed									VOTE: November 6, 2012
Public Participation			Expenditure Plan City Council/BOS Adoption									VOTE: November 6, 2012
Agency Public Education and Outreach	Ongoing Education and Outreach Through November 2012 on this process and final plans					Ongoing Education and Outreach through November 2012 on this process and final plans						
Alameda CTC Technical Work												
Technical Studies/RFP/Work timelines: All this work will be done in relation to SCS work at the regional level	Finalize Plans											
Polling					Potential Go/No Go Poll for Expenditure Plan							
Sustainable Communities Strategy/Regional Tra												
Regional Sustainable Community Strategy Development Process - Final RTP in April 2013	Approval of Preferred SCS, Release of Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan		Begin RTP Technical Analysis & Document Preparation		Prepare SCS/RTP Plan					Release Draft SCS/RTP for review		

This page is intentionally left blank.



MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 17, 2011

TO: CWTP-TEP Steering Committee

FROM: Tess Lengyel, Programs and Public Affairs Manager
Beth Walukas, Planning Manager

SUBJECT: **Review of the Call for Projects and Programs for the Countywide and Regional Transportation Plans**

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission review and provide feedback on potential projects and programs for inclusion in the countywide and regional transportation plans. A preliminary list of potential projects and programs is found in Attachment A. This list will serve as preliminary guide to understand the realm of potential projects and programs that may be submitted in response to the Call for Projects and Programs for both Plans, as well as to help identify those that should be submitted by Alameda CTC for inclusion in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Information about project and program suggestions that have been provided at the Commission retreat in December, through the CAWG and TAWG meetings, outreach efforts throughout the County as of March 9, 2011, and the 2008 Countywide Transportation Plan are summarized in Attachment A. ACTAC and TAWG were informed at their March 2011 meetings of the preliminary list and were asked to review and submit comments to Alameda CTC by March 18, 2011 about which projects they intend to sponsor. The preliminary list of projects and programs was also sent to the Community Advisory Working Group for their review and input.

Summary

The Alameda CTC is concurrently working on the update of the CWTP and development of a new TEP, both of which will inform the RTP and Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS). The county-level plans development is in sync with the regional efforts and this memo details the process for administering the MTC-directed call for projects in Alameda County, which has been delegated to the CMAs to implement. The MTC-directed Call for Projects for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and development of the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) was released to Bay Area Congestion Management Agencies (CMA) on February 14, 2011 and delegated significant outreach, review and evaluation requirements to the CMAs (Attachment B). The Alameda CTC process for implementing the call for projects and programs was approved by the Commission on February 24, 2011, and the Call was released in Alameda County

immediately thereafter. MTC's on-line application for project and program submissions became available on March 1, 2011, and the Alameda CTC issued access codes for the on-line application to all jurisdictions.

This call for projects and programs will also be used to support the update of the Countywide Transportation Plan (CWTP) and development of a new Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP), which may be placed on the November 2012 ballot.

The remainder of this memo summarizes how Alameda CTC will meet the requirements of MTC's Call for Projects and details how project and program submissions will be sought, evaluated, approved and submitted to MTC by the April 29, 2011 deadline. It also presents supporting information in terms of programs and projects for consideration in the submittal of countywide and regional applications and seeks early feedback from the jurisdictions about which projects and programs they intend to submit applications for.

The Alameda CTC schedule is included in Table 1 and requires that Alameda County jurisdictions submit projects and programs to the Alameda CTC, using the MTC web-based application, by no later than April 12, 2011. This due date is necessary to allow the Alameda CTC to perform the required evaluations and to package a draft list for submission to MTC by April 29, 2011. The submittal will occur in two steps. The Alameda CTC will submit a draft list that meets the \$11.76 Billion county-share allocation by the April deadline followed by a final list in May. This is to ensure that the proposed list of projects and programs is presented for comment to all Alameda CTC committees, including the Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee (ACTAC), the CWTP-TEP Community and Technical Advisory Working Groups, the CWTP-TEP Steering Committee, the Planning, Policy and Legislation Committee, a public hearing, and adoption of a final list by the full Commission on May 26, 2011.

Discussion

The update of the RTP and development of the SCS includes a series of efforts and evaluation processes for integrating the first Bay Area SCS in accordance with SB 375 with the proposed transportation system. This effort includes the following:

- Development of performance goals and targets (*adopted January 2011*)
- Development of an Initial Vision Scenario, which takes the currently planned land use in the nine-county region adds housing and employment to address the projected population that must be accommodated in the region as required by SB 375 and overlays the Transportation 2035 RTP transportation system with some augmented services (*to be released March 11, 2011*)
- A call for projects (*released February 14, 2011 to the CMAs and a web based application available March 1, 2011*) for potential projects and programs.
- A performance assessment of projects and programs submitted during the Call for Projects from which projects for the Detailed SCS Scenarios will be selected (*May through July 2011*)

- Development and evaluation of Detailed SCS scenarios using information from the Initial Vision Scenario and the selected projects resulting from the performance assessment (*July through September 2011*).
- After further evaluation and repackaging on how detailed scenarios are meeting goals, a Preferred SCS will be developed and adopted and will be included in the environmental impact report review with the RTP (*adoption expected January/February 2012*)
- Adoption of a Final SCS/RTP (*April 2013*)

Call for Projects

MTC delegated the implementation of the call for projects and programs to each of the Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) for county-level coordination, packaging and submission to MTC (Attachment B). This effort is being done on a tight schedule to meet the developmental deadlines of the SCS/RTP, and for CWTP-TEP in Alameda County.

Draft guidance for the Call for Projects was issued by MTC at the end of January and final guidance submitted to the CMAs on February 14, 2011. Implementation of the call and evaluation of the project and program submittals will also be guided by several sets of policies and procedures, some of which are still going through the approval processes by MTC, ABAG and Alameda CTC in March and April.

In January, MTC adopted the RTP/SCS goals and performance targets, which will be used to evaluate projects and programs in meeting both statutory and voluntary performance targets. In addition, draft policies regarding committed funds and projects, as well as project performance assessments are currently in circulation for review and are expected to be adopted in April 2011. Meanwhile, MTC's schedule for the call for projects is as follows:

- Issue Call for Projects Letter to CMAs February 14, 2011
- Open Online Project Application Form for Use by CMAs/ Project Sponsors: March 1, 2011
- Close of Project Submittal Period April 29, 2011 (See Table 1 for Alameda CTC's submission deadline of April 12, 2011)
- MTC Conducts Project-Level Performance Assessment and Selection Process for Projects for Detailed SCS Scenarios: May through July 2011

According to MTC's guidance for implementation of the call for projects, there are seven specific efforts the CMAs must do as part of the call. MTC's requirements are shown below in bold, and Alameda CTC's approach is detailed in italics:

1. Public Involvement and Outreach:

- a) **Conduct countywide outreach to stakeholders and the public to solicit project ideas.**
The Alameda CTC has adopted a public involvement strategy for the development of the CWTP-TEP, which includes informing stakeholders and the public about the call for projects and seeking public comment on project and program ideas. This effort will be done through its technical and community advisory working groups, as well as through targeted countywide outreach that seeks feedback on potential projects and programs

using a specifically designed Toolkit and questionnaire, which will be used at meetings and will also be placed on the Alameda CTC webpage. This outreach effort is broad-based, addresses language and access needs, and will be conducted throughout the county. Information about the call, submission processes and decision-making timelines are included on the agency website. Five public meetings are being held in each area of the County to also share information and solicit project and program feedback. These include the following 2011 dates, times and locations:

Thursday, February 24th — Oakland, 5:30-7:30pm

City of Oakland City Hall—Hearing Room 3 (1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza)
5:30–6:00 pm—Informational Open House
6:00–7:30 pm—Workshop

Monday February 28th — Fremont, 6:30-8:30pm

Fremont Public Library—Fukaya Room A (2400 Stevenson Blvd.)
6:30–7:00 pm—Informational Open House
7:00–8:30 pm—Workshop

Wednesday March 9th — Hayward, 6:30-8:30pm

Hayward City Hall—Conference Room 2A (777 B Street)
6:30–7:00 pm—Informational Open House
7:00–8:30 pm—Workshop

Wednesday March 16th — San Leandro, 6:30-8:30pm

San Leandro Library—Karp Room (300 Estudillo Avenue)
6:30–7:00 pm—Informational Open House
7:00–8:30 pm—Workshop

Thursday, March 24th — Dublin, 6:30-8:30pm

Dublin Public Library—Community Meeting Room (200 Civic Plaza)

- b) **Document the outreach effort undertaken for the local call for projects.** *Alameda CTC will provide an overall description of the outreach process including how project and program submissions were solicited, evaluated and recommended to MTC. Table 1 below describes the Alameda CTC timeline, public hearings and opportunities for public comment on the draft and recommended project and program lists that will be submitted to MTC. A fully documented summary of outreach, how the outreach followed MTC's Public Participation Plan, as well as comments received and responses to comments addressing project/program inclusion will be submitted to MTC.*

2. Agency Coordination: Work closely with local jurisdictions, transit agencies, MTC, Caltrans, and stakeholders to identify projects for consideration in the RTP/SCS. *Alameda CTC has begun and will continue to inform elected officials, the public, stakeholders, local jurisdictions, transit operators and other partners of the call for projects, submission timelines and public commentary periods, and will be responsible for assigning passwords to local jurisdiction staffs, fielding questions about the project application form, reviewing and verifying project information, and submitting projects to MTC.*

3. Title VI Responsibilities: Ensure the public involvement process provides underserved communities access to the project submittal process as in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. *Alameda CTC has developed a public participation approach specifically designed for broad engagement, which will also address the Title VI requirements. The CWTP is subject to Title VI and therefore, all work associated with the update of the CWTP has been planned to meet these requirements and will be documented as described above.*

4. County Target Budgets: Ensure that the County project list fits within the target budget defined by MTC for the county. *Alameda CTC will use the targeted budget of \$11.76 Billion supplied by MTC as a starting point to guide the County's recommended project list with the understanding that additional work will be conducted after the call for projects to hone in on a more financially constrained list of projects and programs that fit within the RTP/SCS financially constrained envelope. The final list of projects and programs included in the CWTP and TEP will not necessarily be as constrained as the list submitted to MTC for inclusion in the RTP.*

5. Cost Estimation Review: Establish guidelines for estimating project costs. *Alameda CTC has developed a cost estimating guide specifically for use with this call for projects and which may also be used for a second more refined effort related to projects that could be included in the TEP. The Alameda County cost estimating guidelines has been finalized and placed on the Alameda CTC website. All project submittals will be evaluated prior to submission to MTC to ensure that appropriate cost estimates were used.*

6. General Project Criteria: Identify whether projects meet basic project parameters and criteria as outlined by MTC. *Alameda CTC will communicate MTC's criteria to project sponsors, encouraging submission of projects that support the goals and performance targets adopted by MTC in January 2011. These basic project criteria, which have been articulated in MTC's Call for Projects Guidance, are as follows:*

- Support the goals and performance targets of the RTP/SCS (adopted by MTC)
- Serves as a regionally significant component of the regional transportation network. A regionally significant transportation project serves regional transportation needs (such as access to and from the area outside of the region, major activity centers in the region, major planned development such as new retail malls, sports complexes, etc., or major transportation terminals as well as most terminals themselves.)
- Support focused growth by serving existing housing and employment centers – FOCUS Priority Development Areas

- o Derives from an adopted plan, corridor study, or project study report (e.g., countywide transportation plan, regional bicycle plan, climate action plans, etc.)

Based on information that will be presented to the Committees and the Commission, there may be additional screening criteria proposed that reflect the goals and targets from the CWTP-TEP process. This process will build on on-going programs and information gathered from the Working Groups, Committees and the public participation process.

7. Programmatic Categories. *As directed in MTC’s call for projects, Alameda CTC will group similar types of projects and programs that are exempt from regional air quality conformity and do not add capacity or expand the transportation network into broader programmatic categories. This process will build on on-going programs and information gathered from the Working Groups, Committees and the public participation process.*

Alameda CTC Timeline for the Call for Projects

Table 1 describes the timeline for the countywide and regional transportation plan project and program solicitation, submission, evaluation, approvals and delivery to MTC.

Table 1: 2011 Call for Projects Timeline

Alameda CTC: CWTP-TEP Process Timeline		MTC/ABAG: SCS-RTP Process Timeline	
Activity	Date	Activity	Date
Update on Call for Projects	ACTAC: 2/1 CAWG: 2/3 TAWG: 2/10 SC: 2/24	Official Call for Projects Release to CMAs	February 14
Alameda CTC Issues Call for Projects Guidance and Schedule	February 25		
Alameda CTC issues access codes to Alameda County jurisdictions	March 1	MTC Web Based Application Available	March 1
MTC Training on on-line Application	March	Define Project Performance Assessment Methodology	Through April
Update on Call for Projects	ACTAC: 3/1 CAWG: 3/3 TAWG: 3/10 PPLC/PPC: 3/14 SC: 3/24	Release Initial Vision Scenario	March 11. Seek stakeholder feedback through end of April
Sponsor Submittals to Alameda CTC	April 12, 5 p.m.		
Alameda CTC preliminary evaluations	April 12-21		

Mailout of Draft list to Steering Committee	April 21			
Steering Committee Meeting/Approval of DRAFT project/program list	April 28			
Submission of draft list to MTC	Friday, April 29			
Mailout of draft list to Alameda CTC Committees and Working Groups: ACTAC, CAWG, TAWG, PPLC and PPC	May 2			
Advisory Committee meetings discussion of draft list	ACTAC: 5/3 CAWG: 5/5 TAWG: 5/12		Adopt Project Performance Methodology	April 27
Revised list submitted to PPLC, PPC	May 6 (via email)			
PPLC/PPC Review final draft list	May 9			
Alameda CTC additional evaluation	May 10-19			
Steering Committee Mailout	May 19			
Steering Committee Meeting/Public Hearing/ Recommendation of final list to full Alameda CTC Commission for approval of project/program list	May 26			
Alameda CTC Commission Approval of Final project/program list	May 26			
Submission of list to MTC	Friday, May 27		MTC Project Performance Evaluation and Selection Process for Projects for Detailed SCS Scenarios	May – July

Fiscal Impact

There is no fiscal impact at this time.

Attachments

- Attachment 11C4: Preliminary list of potential programs and a summary of currently adopted 2008 CWTP projects
- Attachment 11C5: MTC Call for Projects
- Attachment 11C6: Letter to MTC - Comments on RTP/SCS Goals and Performance Targets

This page intentionally left blank.



MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 15, 2011

TO: CWTP-TEP Steering Committee

FROM: Tess Lengyel, Manager of Programs and Public Affairs
Beth Walukas, Manager of Planning

SUBJECT: **Call for Projects: Supporting Information for the Project and Programs Call For Project Application Process**

In order to facilitate the Call for Projects process, Alameda CTC staff has assembled supporting information to help in the submittal of applications. Attached you will find:

- Attachment A1 List of Projects and Programs identified through the CWTP-TEP process to date including through the Board Retreat, CAWG, TAWG, Steering Committee, Public Outreach, Alameda CTC Committees and Commission.
- Attachment A2 Preliminary Programmatic Categories identified for the 2012 CWTP-TEP development compared to 2008 CWTP Programmatic Categories and MTC's Program Categories for the RTP.
- Attachment A3. Status update of the projects and programs in the 2008 Countywide Transportation Plan including identifying the completed projects.

This item was presented to TAWG on March 10, 2011 and they were requested to identify by March 18th and inform Alameda CTC regarding the projects and programs for which the sponsors will be submitting applications.

Alameda CTC will be reviewing the information and identifying if additional project sponsorship should be considered. The deadline for submitting application is April 12.

Table 1. Projects and Programs Identified Through the CWTP-TEP Process To Date*

#	PROJECTS/PROGRAMS	MTC Program Category
	PROGRAMS	
1	Bike trails	1,2
2	Bike access impvmt Fremont Blvd and I-680 @ Automall	2,3
3	Electric trolley buses	26,27,29
4	Bay Trail gap closures	1,2,3
5	East Bay Greenway/ Iron Horse and Bay Trail Completion	1
6	Alameda Creek (trail?) ped/bike bridge UC - Coyote Hills	1
7	Alameda Creeek Trail improvements	2,3
8	Ped/bike local network gap closures	1,2
9	Union City Blvd bikes lanes	1,2
10	Bike lanes	1,2
11	Improve pedestrian/walking infrastructure	2,3
12	Bike lane to San Francisco	1,2
13	Bike/ped overcrossing of I-880 in South County	1,2
14	AC Transit GPS	5
15	NextBus real time info	5
16	Bus stop enhancements (esp low income areas)	4,5
17	Restoration of cancelled bus routes	11,27,28,29
18	Bus enhancements: wifi and cupholders	5
19	Express bus service -extended hrs of service for later work schedules	11
20	Bathrooms on BART	5
21	More BART parking	29,30
22	BART station enhancement - amenities/cleanliness	5
23	ITS	5,13,20,24
24	Complete Streets	13,15
25	Maintenance programs	11,13,24
26	TDM	26,27,28,29
27	511 (improve user-friendliness)	28,29
28	Seniors Transportation (edu/access)	4,5,28
29	Healthy living, walking, bike promotion	2,3,4,28, 29
30	Multi-lingual access/education	4,28,29
31	Bike/walk to transit	2,3,4,5,13,20,28
32	Info for transit transfers	28,29
33	Walk to school promotion	26,27,28, 29
34	Public awareness of transit	26,27,28, 29
35	Free /reduced cost student bus passes	26,27,29
36	Paratransit - tie funding to efficiency	4,5
37	Pre-paid transit supporting TOD/employers	26,27,28, 29
38	Pricing - programs to induce behavior change	26,27,28, 29
39	Parking programs (demand mgmt, pricing, unbundling)	28,29,30
40	Port of Oak - change to 24 hr facility	26,27
41	Address truck impacts on local streets	13,15,24,26,27
42	Safe Routes to School - expansion	26,27,28, 29
43	Traffic calming near schools	13,15,20
44	Crossing guard program	29
45	Freeway Service Patrol	19
46	Bus stop safety/security improvements	2,4,5

#	PROJECTS/PROGRAMS	MTC Program Category
47	School buses	11
48	Shuttles - employer, TOD, local (i.e. Union City FLEA)	11,26,27,29
49	Bikeshare program	26,27,28, 29
50	Bike access on transit	2,5,29
51	Secure funding for transit operations	11
52	Transit ops - reliable/on-time buses	5, 29
53	24 hr operations for BART	11
54	eliminate time of day restrictions for Bikes on BART	29
55	Bus driver training (wheelchair securing)	5
56	Bus driver training - customer service skills	5
57	Transit civility education program	5
58	Increase bus service frequency in South County (1/2 hr)	5, 11, 29
59	Transit connectivity -first and last mile	5, 11, 29
60	Transit connectivity - transfers btw systems	5, 11, 29
61	Support urban growth boundaries	TBD
62	Employer- alternative work shifts	26,27,28, 29
63	Transit agency mergers for efficiency	TBD
64	Guaranteed Ride Home Program	
65	Safe Routs to School	
66	I-880 Operations Improvements	
67	CBTP Projects	
68	Travel Training	
69	Bike Education Training Program	
70	Rehab of Major Arterials, Complete Streets, access to transit, signal synchronization, spot improvements	
71	GHG reduction programs	1,2,3,4,5,11,15,26, 27, 28,29,30
PROJECTS		
72	Dumbarton Rail	
73	Irvington BART station	
74	BART to Livermore/Connect to High Speed Rail	
75	Capitol Corridor stop at Union City	
76	HSR over Altamont	
77	BART extension to San Jose (and around the bay)	
78	BART Bay Fair "Wye"	
79	Northbound HOV Extension on I-880 between I-238 and Hegenberger	
80	Widen Ardenwood near Paseo Padre	
81	Thornton Ave, Peralta (congestion relief/safety)	
82	Niles Canyon Rd (safety improvements)	
83	Fremont @ Peralta grade separation	
84	Decoto Rd (congestion relief/safety)	
85	Grade separation of rail crossings at major roadways	
86	Integrated Corridor Mobility	
87	I-580/I-680 connector/flyover	
88	I-880 HOT lanes	
89	I-580 HOT lanes	
90	I-680 HOT lanes	
91	I-680 NB HOT lanes	
92	Completion of I-580/I-680 HOT lane network	
93	I-880/SR-84 interchange	

#	PROJECTS/PROGRAMS	MTC Program Category
94	I-880 interchange projects	
95	Whipple Rd (I-880 to Central)	
96	Industrial at I-880 NB off-ramp	
97	I-880/I-680 connector/flyover	
98	SR 84 (East County)	
99	I-80 south interchange signage	
100	I-880/Dumbarton interchange (congestion relief/safety)	
101	SR 84/Niles (congestion relief/safety)	
102	I-80 improvements for freeway efficiency	
103	I-680 south of Mission - pavement resurfacing	
104	I-680/Automall (congestion relief/safety)	
105	Goods Movement/Truck technology	
106	East-West Connector	
107	GHG reduction projects	
108	Dedicated contra flow lane on the San Francisco Bay Bridge connecting to Transbay Terminal (AC Transit's study)	
109	Grade separations in the I-880 and I-80 corridors	
110	580/680 Interchange	
111	SR 84 connector between I-580 and I-680, including SR84/I-680 interchange (potentially a toll corridor)	
112	I-880 Express Lane Conversion	
113	Oakland Subdivision rail right-of-way preservation	
114	Express bus service in Express Lane Corridors	
115	I-680 NB HOV/HOT: Alcosta to SR 84	
116	Comprehensive network of alternative fuel stations	
117	Truck Parking Facilities	
118	Second BART Transbay Tube	
119	Truck Bypass in Central County to facilitate Goods Movement	
120	Short Haul Rail improvements to reduce the number of trucks on freeways	
121	Improve 680/Mission Blvd South Interchange	

Table 2 Preliminary 2008 Existing and Proposed 2012 CWTP Program Categories		
#	Category Name	MTC Category #
1	Bicycle/Pedestrian Expansion	1
2	Bicycle/Pedestrian Enhancements	2
3	Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities Rehabilitation	3
4	Lifeline Transportation	4
5	Transit Enhancements	5
6	Transit O&M	11
7	Local Road Safety	13
	Highway Safety	14
8	Non-Capacity Increasing Local Road Intersection Modifications and Channelization	15
9	Non-Capacity Increasing State Highway Enhancements	16
10	Freeway/Expressway Performance Management	19
11	Non-Capacity Increasing Local Road Rehabilitation	20
12	Non-Capacity Increasing Local Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement/Retrofit	21
13	Local Streets and Roads O&M	24
14	Regional Air Quality and Climate Protection Strategies	26
15	Local Air Quality and	27
16	Regional Planning Outreach	28
17	Transportation Demand Management	29
18	Parking Management	30
Attachment A.1. Preliminary CWTP Program Descriptions		
Attachment A.2. MTC Programmatic Categories		

Preliminary CWTP Program Descriptions

MTC Program Category & Description	Current Alameda CTC Programs	Current Alameda CTC Specific Programs in 2008 CWTP	Proposed for CWTP 2012
<p>1) Bicycle/Pedestrian Expansion New facilities, expansion of existing bike/pedestrian network</p>	<p>Bicycle and Pedestrian Program</p>	<p>1) Bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs; 2) Iron Horse Bicycle, Pedestrian and Transit Route, Dublin, 3) Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements on Stanley Blvd, 4) Albany Bike and Pedestrian Improvements; 5) Berkeley Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements; Berkeley Bike Plan Implementation; 6) Bike/Pedestrian Improvements on Alamo Canal Trail, 7) 65th Street Bike/Pedestrian Bridge at I-80, Phase 1, 8) Addition of Bike Lanes and Congestion Relief in Highland and Magnolia Ave areas, Piedmont; 9) City of San Leandro Pedestrian and Streetscape Improvements</p>	<p>Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Subcategories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Countywide bike plan network • Countywide ped plan network • Class I Multi-use Paths • Bike/Ped bridges • Local Bike/Ped projects (from local plans)

Preliminary CWTP Program Descriptions

MTC Program Category & Description	Current Alameda CTC Programs	Current Alameda CTC Specific Programs in 2008 CWTP	Proposed for CWTP 2012
<p>2) Bicycle/Pedestrian Enhancements Enhancements, streetscapes, TODs, ADA compliance, mobility and access improvements</p>	<p>Bicycle and Pedestrian Program</p>		<p>Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Subcategories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ped access to transit • Bike access to transit • Bike Parking
<p>3) Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities Rehabilitation</p>	<p>Bicycle and Pedestrian Program</p>		<p>Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Maintenance subcategories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class I Multi-use Paths • Bikeways • Bike Support infrastructure (racks on buses, bike lockers, signage, etc) • Sidewalks • Ped support infrastructure (benches, crosswalk striping, etc)
<p>4) Lifeline Transportation Community Based Transportation Plans projects and programs such as information/outreach projects, dial-a-ride, guaranteed ride home, paratransit, non-operational transit capital enhancements (i.e., bus shelters). Does not include fixed route transit projects)</p>	<p>Lifeline Transportation Program, Special Transportation Program</p>	<p>Pedestrian and Streetscape Improvements in Cherryland/Ashland</p>	<p>Community Based Transportation Plan Implementation</p>
<p>5) Transit enhancements</p>	<p>Transportation for</p>	<p>1) Transit enhancements</p>	<p>Transportation and Land Use</p>

Preliminary CWTP Program Descriptions

MTC Program Category & Description	Current Alameda CTC Programs	Current Alameda CTC Specific Programs in 2008 CWTP	Proposed for CWTP 2012
<p>ADA compliance, mobility and access improvements, passenger shelters, informational kiosks</p>	<p>Livable Communities (TLC) Program</p>	<p>funded by transit center development funds (Measure B);</p> <p>2) Paratransit for AC Transit, BART, non-mandated city programs, service gap coordination;</p> <p>3) Ed Roberts Campus at Ashby BART Station (complete?)</p> <p>4) Union City Intermodal Station</p> <p>5) West End Transit Hub, Alameda</p> <p>6) Castro Valley BART TOD</p> <p>7) Berkeley TOD Infrastructure</p> <p>8) TOD Improvement Plan,</p> <p>9) South Hayward BART Transit Village</p> <p>10) SMART Growth/TOD – Oakland (Coliseum, MacArthur, W. Oakland), Downtown San Leandro, Bay Fair BART Transit Village,</p> <p>11) Union City Intermodal, Phase 2</p>	<p>Program (or PDA Program), includes TLC Program Bicycle and Pedestrian Program (including bike/ped access to transit)</p>
<p>6) Transit operations and</p>	<p>Mass Transit</p>	<p>Telegraph/Internation/E. 14th</p>	<p>TBD</p>

Preliminary CWTP Program Descriptions

MTC Program Category & Description	Current Alameda CTC Programs	Current Alameda CTC Specific Programs in 2008 CWTP	Proposed for CWTP 2012
maintenance On-going non-capital costs, preventive maintenance		Street BRT; AC Transit maintenance facilities improvements; Transit Priority Measures/Speed Protection	
7) Local road safety Shoulder widening, realignments, non-coordinated signals Highway safety Implementation of Highway Safety Improvement Program, Strategic Highway Safety Program, shoulder improvements, guardrails, medians, barriers, crash cushions, lighting improvements, fencing, increasing sight distance, emergency truck pullovers	Local Transportation (Local Streets and Roads)	Comprehensive City Street Upgrades, Piedmont	Bicycle and Pedestrian Program (bike/ped safety improvements) TBD
8) Non-capacity increasing local road intersection modifications and channelizations Spot improvements			TBD
9) Non-capacity increasing state highway enhancements Noise attenuation, landscaping, roadside rest areas, sign removal, directional and information signs, soundwalls			TBD

Preliminary CWTP Program Descriptions

MTC Program Category & Description	Current Alameda CTC Programs	Current Alameda CTC Specific Programs in 2008 CWTP	Proposed for CWTP 2012
10) Freeway/Expressway Performance Management Non-ITS elements, performance monitoring, corridor studies		Central Alameda County Integrated Corridor Mobility Program (includes adaptive ramp metering); I-80 Integrated Corridor Mobility Project	TBD
11) Non-capacity increasing local road rehabilitation Pavement resurfacing, skid treatments			TBD
12) Non-capacity increasing local bridge rehabilitation/replacement/retrofit		Estuary bridges seismic retrofit and repair; Fruitvale Avenue Roadway Bridge Seismic Retrofit; Fruitvale Avenue Rail Bridge Seismic Retrofit	TBD
13) Local streets and roads operations and maintenance Ongoing non-capital costs, routine maintenance	Local roads (local streets and roads)	Citywide ITS (Where does this go?)	TBD
14) Regional Air Quality and Climate Protection Strategies Outreach programs and non-capacity projects specifically targeting regional air quality and			TBD

Preliminary CWTP Program Descriptions

MTC Program Category & Description	Current Alameda CTC Programs	Current Alameda CTC Specific Programs in 2008 CWTP	Proposed for CWTP 2012
climate protection strategies 15) Local Air Quality and Climate Protection Strategies Outreach programs and non-capacity projects specifically targeting local air quality and climate protection strategies	Guaranteed Ride Home (other TFCA programs), Transportation and Land Use Program , Transit Center Development, Special Transportation, Bicycle and Pedestrian Program	Transit enhancements funded by transit center development funds (Measure B)	TBD
16) Regional Planning and Outreach Regionwide planning, marketing and outreach	Transportation and Land Use Program , Transit Center Development		
17) Transportation Demand Management	Guaranteed Ride Home , Safe Routes to School, Travel Choice Program		Transportation Demand Management Including Guaranteed Ride Home, Safe Routes to School, Travel Choice, Walk/Bike Promotions
18) Parking Management Parking cash out, variable pricing, etc.		Berkeley Parking Pricing Program	Parking Management
Potential New Categories for MTC			
Youth Bus Pass			Separate program category?

Preliminary CWTP Program Descriptions

MTC Program Category & Description	Current Alameda CTC Programs	Current Alameda CTC Specific Programs in 2008 CWTP	Proposed for CWTP 2012
			Funding available? TEP pilot program in discrete area?
Goods Movement			Program or Projects?

Attachment A.2 Programmatic Categories

Programmatic categories are groups of similar projects, programs, and strategies that are included under a single group for ease of listing in the RTP/SCS. Projects within programmatic categories must be exempt from regional transportation conformity. Many projects which address the concerns of communities, such as pedestrian bulbouts, bicycle lanes, transit passenger shelters, ridesharing, etc. are often taken into account in a programmatic category. Therefore individual projects of this nature do not need to be specified. Projects grouped in a programmatic category are viewed as a program of multiple projects. Projects that add capacity or expand the network are not included in a programmatic category. Projects that do not fit within the identified programmatic categories are listed separately in the RTP/SCS. Programmatic categories to be used include, but are not limited to the following:

1. **Bicycle/Pedestrian Expansion** (new facilities, expansion of existing bike/pedestrian network)
2. **Bicycle/Pedestrian Enhancements** (enhancements, streetscapes, TODs, ADA compliance, mobility and access improvements)
3. **Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities Rehabilitation**
4. **Lifeline Transportation** (Community Based Transportation Plans projects such as information/outreach projects, dial-a-ride, guaranteed ride home, paratransit, non-operational transit capital enhancements (i.e. bus shelters). Does not include fixed route transit projects.)
5. **Transit Enhancements** (ADA compliance, mobility and access improvements, passenger shelters, informational kiosks)
6. **Transit Management Systems** (TransLink[®], Transit GPS tracking systems (i.e. Next Bus))
7. **Transit Safety and Security Improvements** (Installation of security cameras)
8. **Transit Guideway Rehabilitation**
9. **Transit Station Rehabilitation**
10. **Transit Vehicle Rehabilitation/Replacement/Retrofit**
11. **Transit O&M** (Ongoing non-capital costs, preventive maintenance)
12. **Transit Operations Support** (purchase of operating equipment such as fareboxes, lifts, radios, office and shop equipment, support vehicles)
13. **Local Road Safety** (shoulder widening, realignment, non-coordinated signals)
14. **Highway Safety** (implementation of Highway Safety Improvement Program, Strategic Highway Safety Program, shoulder improvements, guardrails, medians, barriers, crash cushions, lighting improvements, fencing, increasing sight distance, emergency truck pullovers)
15. **Non-Capacity Increasing Local Road Intersection Modifications and Channelization**
16. **Non-Capacity Increasing State Highway Enhancements** (noise attenuation, landscaping, roadside rest areas, sign removal, directional and informational signs)
17. **Freeway/Expressway Incident Management** (freeway service patrol, call boxes)
18. **Non-Capacity Increasing Freeway/Expressway Interchange Modifications** (signal coordination, signal retiming, synchronization)
19. **Freeway/Expressway Performance Management** (Non-ITS Elements, performance monitoring, corridor studies)
20. **Non-Capacity Increasing Local Road Rehabilitation** (Pavement resurfacing, skid treatments)
21. **Non-Capacity Increasing Local Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement/Retrofit**
22. **State Highway Preservation** (Caltrans SHOPP, excluding system management)
23. **Toll Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement/Retrofit**
24. **Local Streets and Roads O&M** (Ongoing non-capital costs, routine maintenance)
25. **State Highway O&M** (Caltrans non-SHOPP maintenance, minor 'A' and 'B' programs)
26. **Regional Air Quality and Climate Protection Strategies** (outreach programs and non-capacity projects specifically targeting regional air quality and climate protection strategies)
27. **Local Air Quality and Climate Protection Strategies** (outreach programs and non-capacity projects specifically targeting local air quality and climate protection strategies)
28. **Regional Planning and Outreach** (regionwide planning, marketing, and outreach)
29. **Transportation Demand Management** (continuation of ridesharing, shuttle, or vanpooling at current levels)
30. **Parking Management** (Parking cash out, variable pricing, etc.)

Table 3. Status of 2008 CWTP Projects and Programs*

#	Sponsor	Project Title	Program Category	2008 CWTP Information			Current Project Phase					Comments/Notes
				Planning Area	Cost Estimate (\$ x Million)	Funding Request (\$ x Million)	Planning /Scoping	PE/Env	PS&E	Con	Closeout/ Complete	
PROGRAMS												
1	ACTIA	Transit enhancements funded by transit center development funds	5, 26, 27	Multi	4.8	0.0						on-going program
2	CMA	Central Alameda County Integrated Corridor Mobility Program (includes adaptive ramp metering)	19	PA2	33.5	0.0	X					LATIP (\$32.5M)
3	CMA	Soundwalls	16	Multi	10.0	0.0						STIP (\$10.0M) & LATIP (\$10.0M)
4	CMA/ACTIA	Bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs	1, 2, 3	Multi	305.0	0.0						on going program
5	Dublin	Iron Horse Bicycle, Pedestrian and Transit Route	1, 2, 3	PA4	10.9	0.0			X			MB (\$6.3M)
6	LAVTA	Livermore/Dublin Bus Rapid Transit Project	11	PA4	14.1	0.0				X		
7	Countywide	TOD Improvement Program	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 15, 26, 27, 28	Multi	30.0	30.0						
8	Countywide	Arterial Performance Initiative Program	19	Multi	15.0	15.0						
9	Hayward	South Hayward BART Transit Village	2, 5, 26, 27	PA2	50.0	5.0						
10	Oakland	Citywide ITS	5, 24	PA1	22.0	22.0						
11	Oakland	SMART Growth/TOD: Transit Villages at BART Stations including but not limited to:	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 26, 27	PA1	57.0	57.0	X	X				on going program in various stages of development
12	San Leandro	Downtown San Leandro TOD	1, 2, 3, 5, 26, 27	PA2	4.0	4.0			X			\$4.6m from TLC
13	San Leandro	Traffic Signal System Upgrade	13	PA2	2.0	2.0				X		\$200K CMAQ- \$300K TLSP
14	San Leandro	Bay Fair BART Transit Village	1, 2, 3, 5, 26, 27	PA2	4.0	4.0	X					
15	AC Transit	Maintenance Facilities Improvements	11	Multi	16.1	16.1						
16	AC Transit	Transit Priority Measures/Speed Protection (includes Bay Bridge Related Improvements)	5, 19	Multi	120.0	14.8						
17	Alameda County	Pedestrian and Streetscape Improvements in Cherryland/Ashland	1, 2, 3, 4	PA2	17.6	15.0						
18	Alameda County	Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements on Stanley Blvd	1, 2, 3	PA4	6.0	2.0					X	
19	Alameda/Alameda County	Estuary Bridges Seismic Retrofit and Repair	21	PA1	4.0	1.0		X				
20	Alameda/Alameda County	Fruitvale Avenue Roadway Bridge Seismic Retrofit	21	PA1	8.0	5.0		X				
21	Alameda/Alameda County	Fruitvale Avenue Rail Bridge Seismic Retrofit	21	PA1	2.6	1.0		X				
22	Albany	Bike and Pedestrian Improvements	1, 2, 3, 26, 27, 29	PA1	2.3	2.3						\$1.7M CMAQ in 2010 Black Grant for Buchanan Path
23	Berkeley	Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements	1, 2, 3, 26, 27, 29	PA1	6.0	6.0						

* - completed projects are shown in *strikeout and shaded*.

#	Sponsor	Project Title	Program Category	2008 CWTP Information			Current Project Phase					Comments/Notes
				Planning Area	Cost Estimate (\$ x Million)	Funding Request (\$ x Million)	Planning /Scoping	PE/Env	PS&E	Con	Closeout/ Complete	
24	Berkeley	Bicycle Plan Implementation	1,2,3,27,27,29	PA1	11.0	3.0					X	
25	Berkeley	Berkeley Parking Pricing Program	29,30	PA1	5.0	3.0	X					
26	CMA	Sound Wall Program	16	Multi	10.0	10.0						
27	Piedmont	Addition of Bike Lanes and Congestion Relief in Highland and Magnolia Ave. areas	1,2,3,2,6,27,29	PA1	1.2	1.2						
28	Piedmont	Comprehensive City Street Upgrades	13, 24	PA1	0.5	0.5						
29	San Leandro	City of San Leandro Pedestrian and Streetscape Improvements	1,2,3, 13, 15	PA2	13.3	13.3						Same as San Leandro Downtown TOD
30	Union City	Union City Intermodal, Phase I	1,2,3, 5, 26, 27	PA3	21.0	14.0			X			
31	CMA	I-80 Integrated Corridor Mobility (ICM) Project	19						X			CMA (\$55.3M) TLSP (\$21.4M)
32	Piedmont	Traffic signal on Grand Avenue at Rose Avenue/Atroyo Avenue intersection in Piedmont		PA1	0.3	0.0						Note - is it completed?
33	Alameda	West End Transit Hub		PA1	1.4	1.4	X					
34	Alameda County	Castro Valley BART TOD		PA2	44.0	5.2						
35	Dublin	Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements on Alamo Canal Trail		PA4	2.6	2.0			X			STIP-TE
36	ACTIA	Paratransit for AC Transit, BART, non-mandated city programs, service gap coordination		Multi	154.6	0.0						on-going program
PROJECTS												
37	ACTHA	I-580 on-ramp improvements in Castro Valley		PA2	34.9	0.0						X
38	ACTHA	I-580 auxiliary lanes between Santa Rita Road/Tassajara Road and Airway Boulevard interchanges		PA4	5.5	0.0			X		X	X
39	Alameda	Stargel (formerly Finley) Avenue from Webster Street (SR 260) to 5th Avenue		PA1	48.6	0.0						X
40	BART	New West Dublin Presentation-BART Station		PA4	80.0	0.0					X	Design-Build contract nearly complete.
41	BART	BART-Oakland International Airport Connector		PA1	459.0	0.0					X	Contact awarded and NTP issued Funding Plan includes un-secured sources
42	Berkeley	Ed Roberts Campus at Ashby BART Station		PA1	43.5	0.0					X	
43	Caltrans	I-880/SR-92 Interchange Improvements		PA2	245.0	0.0					X	

* - completed projects are shown in *strikeout and shaded*.

#	Sponsor	Project Title	Program Category	2008 CWTP Information			Current Project Phase					Comments/Notes		
				Planning Area	Cost Estimate (\$ x Million)	Funding Request (\$ x Million)	Planning /Scoping	PE/Env	PS&E	Con	Closeout/ Complete			
44	Caltrans	Reconstruct I-880/SR-262 interchange and widen I-880 from SR-262 (Mission Boulevard) to the Santa Clara County line from 8 lanes to 10 lanes (8 mixed flow and 2 HOV lanes)		PA3	486.8	0.0							X	I-880 Mission Blvd. Interchange Phase 2 deferred into Interchange Completion Project sponsored by Fremont.
45	Caltrans	Widen I-880 for SB HOV lane from Heggenberger Road to Marina Boulevard (reconstruct bridges at Davis Street and Marina Boulevard)		PA1	119.4	0.0			X					Project Development by CMA. CMA (\$94.6M)
46	Caltrans	I-880 Oak Street On ramp reconstruction		PA1	26.7	0.0								
47	Caltrans	Extend HOV lane on I-880 NB from existing HOV terminus at Bay Bridge approach to Maritime on-ramp		PA1	19.0	0.0								
48	Caltrans	Widen I-238 between I-580 and I-880 from 4 lanes to 6 lanes; auxiliary lanes on I-880 between I-238 and "A" Street		PA2	422.6	0.0							X	
49	Caltrans	SR-84 WB HOV on-ramp from Newark Boulevard		PA3	12.5	0.0	X							Funding moved to another project.
50	Caltrans	SR-84 WB HOV lane extension from Newark Boulevard to I-880		PA3	44.4	0.0							X	
51	Caltrans/CMA	I-580 Eastbound Truck Climbing Lane		PA4	64.2	0.0			X					TCIF (\$64M)
52	CMA	Widen I-680 for southbound HOV/HOT lane from SR-237 to SR-84 (includes ramp metering and auxiliary lane)		PA3/PA4	230.9	0.0					X			
53	CMA	Widen I-580 for EB and WB HOV and auxiliary lanes from Tassajara Road to Greenville Road		PA4	272.2	0.0				X	X			Note - Separate HOV complete 2/EB AUX/HOT completed 3/580 WB HOT/HOV completed EB HOV under construction.
54	CMA	Extend NB I-880 HOV lanes north from Hacienda		PA2	167.5	0.0	X							LATIP (\$155.5M)
55	CMA	I-580 right-of-way preservation for transit in the I-580 corridor		PA4	123.5	0.0			X					
56	Fremont	SR-262/Warren Avenue/I-880 interchange improvements (including Union Pacific Railroad grade separation)		PA3	56.0	0.0				X				Includes Phase 1B work from I-880 Mission Blvd. interchange project sponsored by Caltrans (ACTA MB project). Construction phase includes un-secured funding
57	Fremont	Infrastructure for future Irvington BART Station		PA3	2.4	0.0			X					
58	Fremont	Kato Road from Warren Avenue to Milmont Drive		PA3	5.4	0.0			X					
59	Fremont	Fremont Boulevard to connect to I-880/Dixon Landing Road		PA3	8.9	0.0	X							
60	Fremont	Washington/Bassett Parkway/Grade Separation		PA3	408.6	0.0							X	
64	Hayward	SR-238 Corridor Improvements between Foothill Boulevard/I-580 and Industrial		PA2	116.0	0.0							X	
62	Hayward	I-880 auxiliary lane West A to Winton		PA2	36.5	0.0								LATIP (\$32.5M)
63	Hayward	I-880 auxiliary lane from Whipple Road to Industrial Parkway		PA2	21.9	0.0	X							LATIP (\$19.5M)

* - completed projects are shown in *strikeout and shaded*.

#	Sponsor	Project Title	Program Category	2008 CWTP Information			Current Project Phase						Comments/Notes
				Planning Area	Cost Estimate (\$ x Million)	Funding Request (\$ x Million)	Planning /Scoping	PE/Env	PS&E	Con	Closeout/ Complete		
64	Hayward	I-880/SR-92 Reliever, Clawiter/Whitesell/SR-92 interchange Phase 2		PA2	58.3	0.0		X					Phase 1 moving, Phase 2 delayed for funding. LATIP (\$52.0M)
65	Hayward	I-880 Industrial Parkway West interchange, Phase 2		PA2	29.2	0.0	X						
66	Hayward	Construct street extension in Hayward near Clawiter and Whitesell Streets		PA2	26.9	0.0		X					Same as Phase 1 of Reliever Route
67	LA VTA	Satellite Operations and Maintenance Facility		PA4	7.8	0.0							
68	Livermore	Las Positas Road Connection, Phase 2		PA4	7.3	0.0							
69	Livermore	West Jack London Boulevard Extension		PA4	18.7	0.0							
70	Livermore	4-lane major arterial connecting Dublin Boulevard and North Canyons Parkway		PA4	11.1	0.0							
71	Livermore	I-580/Isabel interchange improvements, Phase 1		PA4	155.9	0.0				X			MB, CMAA, Federal & Local funds
72	Newark	Dumbarton Rail Corridor Project		PA3	301.0	0.0		X					Current cost estimate \$700M
73	Pleasanton	I-580/San Ramon Road/Foothill Road Interchange Improvements		PA4	2.1	0.0			X				
74	Pleasanton	I-680/Bernal Avenue Interchange Improvements		PA4	17.0	0.0			X				Note - is it completed?
75	Port	7th Street Grade Separation		PA1	427.0	0.0							TCIF (\$110.0M)
76	Port	Outer Harbor Intermodal Terminal (OHIT)		PA1	220.0	0.0	X						TCIF (\$132.0M)
77	Port	Martinez Subdivision		PA1	215.0	0.0	X						TCIF (\$17.5M)
78	San Leandro	Washington Avenue/Benitez-Street Interchange Improvements		PA2	26.5	0.0					X		
79	San Leandro	I-880/Marina Boulevard Interchange		PA1	36.1	0.0			X				Partially included with I-880 SB HOV project LATIP (\$24.4M)
80	San Leandro	I-880/Davis Street I interchange		PA1	24.4	0.0			X				Partially included with I-880 SB HOV project LATIP (\$11.1M)
81	Union City	Union City Intermodal Station (Phase 1)	2, 5, 26, 27	PA3	40.0	0.0					X		Show 02 as committed
82	WETA	Berkeley/Albany to San Francisco ferry service		PA1	56.6	0.0	X						
83	WETA	Alameda/Oakland to San Francisco ferry service and Harbor Bay to San Francisco ferry service		PA1	21.5	0.0							
84	AC Transit	Telegraph/International/E. 14th Street BRT		Multi	250.0	74.0		X					
85	BART	Warm Springs Extension		PA3	890.0	144.0					X		Project split into Subway and LTSS contracts. Subway more than 50% complete - fully funded LTSS proposals/bids due late January
86	Berkeley	TOD Infrastructure		PA1	5.2	5.0							NOTE - Add HOV per #50
87	CMA	I-580 Corridor Improvements; I-580 HOT Lanes from Greenville Road west to I-680		PA4	35.0	29.0							

* - completed projects are shown in *strikeout and shaded*.

#	Sponsor	Project Title	Program Category	2008 CWTP Information			Current Project Phase							
				Planning Area	Cost Estimate (\$ x Million)	Funding Request (\$ x Million)	Planning /Scoping	PE/Env	PS&E	Con	Closeout/ Complete	Comments/Notes		
88	CMA	I-580 Corridor Improvements; I-580 WB Auxiliary Lane from 1st St to Isabel		PA4	10.0	10.0								
89	AC Transit	Additional buses for Frequent Service Transit Network		Multi	22.0	22.0								
90	AC Transit	Grand/MacArthur BRT		PA1	41.0	30.0	X							
94	AC Transit	Transfer Center at or near Chabot College		PA2	2.0	2.0								
92	ACTIA	SR-84 Expressway widening, Jack London to Vallecitos		PA4	129.6	15.0								
93	Alameda County	Crow Canyon Road Safety Improvements		PA2	14.5	11.0	X							
94	Alameda County	East Levee/Boulevard Roadway Improvements		PA2	11.7	9.9				X				
95	Alameda County	Vasco Road Safety Improvements Phase II		PA4	13.2	10.0								
96	Alameda/Caltrans	I-880 Broadway/Jackson Phase I		PA1	26.0	17.2	X							No R/W or Con funding identified
97	BART	Station Capacity Projects		Multi	32.5	32.5	X							
98	BART	Station Access Projects		Multi	26.5	26.5	X							
99	Berkeley	Gilman I-80 interchange improvements		PA1	7.0	5.5			X					
100	Berkeley	Ashby I-80 interchange/Aquatic Park Access Improvements		PA1	2.0	2.0								
101	Berkeley	Railroad Crossing Improvements, Phase I		PA1	2.0	2.0			X					
102	Caltrans	Truck Parking facilities in North County		PA1	5.0	5.0								
103	Caltrans	I-880 North Improvements; I-880 SB and 66th/Hegenberger auxiliary Lanes		PA1	5.0	5.0								
104	Dublin	Dublin interchange improvements, (Hacienda & Fallon Road) Ph II		PA4	37.6	16.0	X							
105	Dublin/Livermore/Pleasanton	Project Development for I-580/680 Connector		PA4	15.0	15.0				X				
106	Emeryville	65th Street Bike / Pedestrian Bridge at I-80, Phase I		PA1	3.7	3.5								
107	Emeryville	I-80 Eastbound off-ramp at Powell Street		PA1	1.8	1.5								
108	Fremont	SR-262 Mission Blvd Improvements		PA3	10.0	10.0								Includes ACTIA No. 22 - Cross-Connector Study
109	Fremont	Autumn Parkway Intersection Improvements between I-880 and I-680		PA3	42.0	9.0								
110	Hayward	I-880 West A Street interchange		PA2	27.0	27.0								LATIP (\$27.0M)
111	Hayward	I-880 Industrial Parkway interchange, Phase 1		PA2	14.7	14.7								LATIP (\$41.0M)
112	Livermore	I-580/First St. interchange Improve to ultimate configuration		PA4	37.0	4.0								
113	Livermore	I-580/Vasco interchange Improve to ultimate configuration		PA4	55.0	4.0								

* - completed projects are shown in *strikeout and shaded*.

#	Sponsor	Project Title	Program Category	2008 CWTP Information			Current Project Phase					Comments/Notes	
				Planning Area	Cost Estimate (\$ x Million)	Funding Request (\$ x Million)	Planning /Scoping	PE/Env	PS&E	Con	Closeout/ Complete		
114	Livermore	Isabel Avenue/I-580 interchange Phase II		PA4	28.0	4.0					X		
115	Livermore	I-580/Greenville Road interchange improvements		PA4	43.0	4.0							
116	Newark	Central Avenue Railroad Overpass		PA3	18.3	12.6							
117	Oakland	I-880 improvement program including 42nd and High Access Improvements		PA1	24.9	19.0					X		
118	Oakland	SR-24 /Caldecott Tunnel Enhancements		PA1	8.0	6.0							
119	Pleasanton	PSR Development for SR-84 Widening-Pigeon Pass to I-680		PA4	2.3	2.3	X						
120	Port	North Airport Air Cargo Access Road Improvements, Phase 1		PA1	10.0	5.0							Note - is it completed?
121	San Leandro	E. 14th St at the Hesperian Blvd/I50th Avenue.		PA2	3.4	2.0				X			
122	Union City	ACTA East West Connector (formerly SR84) between Mission Boulevard in Union City and I-880 in Fremont		PA3	160.2	9.6				X			Current cost estimate more than \$200M
123	CMAA Caltrans	I-880/23rd/29th Interchange		PA1						X			TCIF (\$73.0M)
124		NB 238/880 Connector		PA2									LATIP (\$31.0M)
125		I-880/Washington Interchange		PA2									LATIP (\$31.0M)
126		I-880/Whipple Interchange		PA2									LATIP (\$13.5M)
127		I-880/West Winton Interchange		PA2									LATIP (\$25.0M)
128		SR 92/Industrial Interchange		PA2									LATIP (\$6.0M)
129		I-580/Strobridge Interchange.		PA2									LATIP (\$21.0M)

This page intentionally left blank



PAPCO Meeting 03/28/11
METROPOLITAN Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
TRANSPORTATION Attachment 11C5
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700
COMMISSION TEL 510.817.5700
TTY/TDD 510.817.5769
FAX 510.817.5848
E-MAIL info@mtc.ca.gov
WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

February 14, 2011

Scott Haggerty, Chair
Alameda County

Adrienne J. Tissier, Vice Chair
San Mateo County

Tom Azumbrado
U.S. Department of Housing
and Urban Development

Tom Bates
Cities of Alameda County

Dave Cortese
Santa Clara County

Bill Dodd
Napa County and Cities

Dorene M. Giacomini
U.S. Department of Transportation

Federal D. Glover
Contra Costa County

Mark Green
Association of Bay Area Governments

Anne W. Halsted
San Francisco Bay Conservation
and Development Commission

Steve Kinsey
Marin County and Cities

Sam Liccardo
Cities of Santa Clara County

Jake Mackenzie
Sonoma County and Cities

Kevin Mullin
Cities of San Mateo County

Jon Rubin
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

Bijan Sartipi
State Business, Transportation
and Housing Agency

James P. Sperling
Solano County and Cities

Amy Rein Worth
Cities of Contra Costa County

Vacancy
City and County of San Francisco

Steve Heminger
Executive Director

Ann Flemer
Deputy Executive Director, Policy

Andrew B. Fremier
Deputy Executive Director, Operations

RE: Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy – Call for Projects

To: Caltrans, Congestion Management Agencies, and Multi-County Transit Operators

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is issuing an open “call for projects” for consideration in the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). MTC requests the assistance of each of the nine Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) to coordinate project submittals for their county. Caltrans and multi-county transit operators may submit directly to MTC, but coordination with the CMAs are encouraged. Attached is the Call for Projects Guidance that lays out required elements to be carried out in the local call for projects.

Project submittals are due to MTC on April 29, 2011. Projects/programs will undergo a project-level performance evaluation, which MTC will initiate starting in May 2011. MTC requests all partner agencies to adhere to this deadline. The results of the project performance assessment will inform the upcoming detailed alternatives analysis and investment trade-off discussions, ultimately leading to a preferred RTP/SCS early next year with adoption occurring a year later. As such, there will be ongoing opportunities for these discussions to occur.

The SCS legislation requires closer integration between land use and transportation planning. With this in mind, MTC and ABAG have adopted goals that direct local agencies to consider how their projects support SCS principals as promulgated by SB 375.

MTC is developing a web-based application form for sponsors to fill out and submit their projects. Sponsors will be able to (a) remove projects in the current plan (Transportation 2035) that are either now complete and open for service or no longer being pursued, (b) update projects in the current plan that should be carried forward in the RTP/SCS, and (c) add new projects. The web-based project application will be available

on March 1, 2011. At that time, MTC will provide instructions to CMAs on how to access and use the web-based form. Upon request, MTC staff will also provide a brief tutorial to the CMAs and its technical advisory committee.

MTC looks forward to receiving your project submittals. If you have any questions about the submittal process, please contact Grace Cho of my staff at (510) 817-5826 or gcho@mtc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



Ann Flemer
Deputy Executive Director, Policy

AF: GC

J:\PROJECT\2013 RTP_SCS\Call for Projects\Final Version\Call for Projects Letters\Call for Projects Letter.doc

Attachments:

- Attachment A: Call for Projects Guidance
- Attachment A.1: Goals and Performance Targets
- Attachment A.2: Programmatic Categories
- Attachment A.3: MTC's Draft Transportation Project Performance Assessment Methodology
- Attachment A.4: MTC Policy Advisory Council Members

Attachment A Call for Projects Guidance

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) requests the assistance of the nine Bay Area Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) to help with the Call for Projects within their counties. CMAs are best suited for this role because of their existing relationships with local jurisdictions, elected officials, transit agencies, community organizations and stakeholders, and members of the public within their counties. MTC expects the CMAs to plan and execute an effective public outreach and local engagement process to solicit candidate projects to be submitted to MTC for consideration in the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS).

Project sponsors with projects vying for future state or federal funding must have their project identified in the financially constrained RTP/SCS. CMAs will be the main point of contact for local sponsoring agencies and members of the public submitting projects for consideration for inclusion in the 2013 SCS/RTP. Sponsors of multi-county projects (i.e. Caltrans, BART, Caltrain, etc.) may submit directly to MTC, but communication and coordination with CMAs is encouraged. Members of the public are eligible to submit projects, but must secure a public agency sponsor and coordinate the project submittal with their CMA.

CMAs will assist MTC with the Call for Projects by carrying out the following activities:

1. Public Involvement and Outreach

- ***Conduct countywide outreach to stakeholders and the public to solicit project ideas.*** CMAs, as well as multi-county transit operators and Caltrans, will be expected to implement their public outreach efforts in a manner consistent with MTC's Public Participation Plan (MTC Resolution No. 3821), which can be found at http://www.onebayarea.org/get_involved.htm. CMAs are expected, at a minimum, to:
 - Execute effective and meaningful local engagement efforts during the Call for Projects by working closely with local jurisdictions, elected officials, transit agencies, community-based organizations, and the public through the project solicitation process. In addition to the CMAs' citizen advisors, MTC's Policy Advisory Council members are a good resource to the CMAs to help plan community outreach events, engage members of the public, and identify candidate projects. Please see **Attachment A.4** for a list of MTC's Policy Advisory Council members.
 - Explain the local Call for Projects process, informing stakeholders and the public about the opportunities for public comments on project ideas and when decisions are to be made on the list of projects to be submitted to MTC;
 - Hold public meetings and/or workshops at times which are conducive to public participation to solicit public input on project ideas to submit;
 - Hold at least one public hearing providing opportunity for public comment on the list of potential projects prior to submittal to MTC;
 - Post notices of public meetings and hearing(s) on their agency website; include information on how to request language translation for individuals with limited English proficiency. If agency protocol has not been established, please refer to MTC's Plan for Assisting Limited English Proficient Populations.
 - CMA staff will be expected to provide MTC with a link so the information can also be viewed on the website OneBayArea.org;
 - Hold public meetings in central locations that are accessible for people with people with disabilities and by public transit;

- Offer language translations and accommodations for people with disabilities, if requested at least three days in advance of the meeting.
- ***Document the outreach effort undertaken for the local call for projects.*** CMAs, as well as multi-county transit operators and Caltrans, are to provide MTC with:
 - A description of how the public was involved in the process for nominating and/or commenting on projects for inclusion in the RTP/SCS. Specify whether public input was gathered at forums held specifically for the RTP/SCS or as part of an outreach effort associated with, for example, an update to a countywide plan;
 - A description of how the public engagement process met the outreach requirements of MTC's Public Participation Plan, including how the CMA ensured full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the project submittal process.
 - A summary of comments received from the public and a description of how public comments informed the recommended list of projects submitted by the CMA. Conversely, rationale must be provided if comments or projects from the public were not able to be accommodated in the list of candidate projects and a description of how the CMA, in future project nomination processes, plans to address the comments or projects suggested by the public.

2. Agency Coordination

- ***Work closely with local jurisdictions, transit agencies, MTC, Caltrans, and stakeholders to identify projects for consideration in the RTP/SCS.*** CMAs will assist with agency coordination by:
 - Communicating this Call for Projects guidance to local jurisdictions, transit agencies, Caltrans, and stakeholders and coordinate with them on the online project application form by assigning passwords, fielding questions about the project application form, reviewing and verifying project information, and submitting projects as ready for review by MTC
 - Working with members of the public interested in advancing a project idea to find a public agency project sponsor, and assisting them with submitting the project to MTC;
 - Developing freeway operations and capacity enhancement projects in coordination with MTC and Caltrans staff.
 - Developing transit improvements in coordination with MTC and transit agency staff.

3. Title VI Responsibilities

- ***Ensure the public involvement process provides underserved communities access to the project submittal process as in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.***
 - Assist community-based organizations, communities of concern, and any other underserved community interested in submitting projects;
 - Remove barriers for persons with limited English proficiency to have access to the project submittal process;
 - For additional Title IV outreach strategies, please refer to MTC's Public Participation Plan found at: http://www.onebayarea.org/get_involved.htm

4. County Target Budgets

- ***Ensure that the County project list fits within the target budget defined by MTC for the county.***
 - To establish the county target budgets, MTC used the discretionary funding amount (\$32 billion) from the Transportation 2035 Plan and assigned counties a target budget based on a population share formula with an additional 75% mark up. County target budgets can be seen below. This formula approach is consistent with the formula used in Transportation 2035 Plan.
 - County target budgets are intended as a starting point to guide each CMA in recommending a project list to MTC by providing an upper financial limit.
 - County target budgets are not intended as the financially constrained RTP/SCS budget. CMAs and MTC will continue to discuss further and select projects later in the process that fit the RTP/SCS financially constrained envelope.

County Target Budgets (in billions)

Alameda: \$11.76

Contra Costa: \$7.84

Marin: \$2.24

Napa: \$1.12

San Francisco: \$6.16

San Mateo: \$5.60

Santa Clara: \$14.0

Solano: \$3.36

Sonoma: \$3.92

5. Cost Estimation Review

- ***Establish guidelines for estimating project costs.*** CMAs are to establish cost estimation guidelines for use by project sponsors. The guidelines may be developed by the CMAs or CMAs can elect to use other accepted guidelines produced by local, state or federal agencies. MTC has identified the following cost estimation guidelines available for use:
 - Federal: National Cooperative Highway Research Program's Guidance for Cost Estimation and Management for Highway Projects During Planning, Programming, and Preconstruction (http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/nchrp/nchrp_w98.pdf)
 - State: Caltrans' Project Development Procedures Manual Chapter 20, Project Development Cost Estimates (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd/pdpm/chap_pdf/chapt20.pdf)
 - Local: Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) Cost Estimation Guide (http://ccta.net/assets/documents/Cost_Est_Guide_Documentation.pdf)
- ***Review and verify with MTC that each project has developed an appropriate cost estimate prior to submittal.***

6. General Project Criteria

- ***Identify whether projects meet basic project parameters as outlined by MTC.*** CMAs will encourage project sponsors to submit projects which meet one or more of the general criteria listed below, keeping in consideration that projects should support SCS principals promulgated by SB 375:
 - Supports the goals and performance targets of the RTP/SCS (see **Attachment A.1**).
 - Serves as a regionally significant component of the regional transportation network. A regionally significant transportation project serves regional transportation needs (such as access to and from the area outside of the region, major activity centers in the region,

major planned developments such as new retail malls, sports complexes, etc., or transportation terminals as well as most terminals themselves).

- Supports focused growth by serving existing housing and employment centers FOCUS Priority Development Areas.
- Derives from an adopted plan, corridor study, or project study report (e.g., community-based transportation plans, countywide transportation plan, regional bicycle plan, climate action plans, etc.).

- **Assess how well the project meets basic criteria**

Project sponsors are welcome to use MTC’s qualitative/quantitative approach or some hybrid thereof to develop and evaluate project priorities (See **Attachment A.3**). Sponsors may include qualitative discussion and/or quantitative data to demonstrate how proposed projects meet the RTP/SCS goals and targets, the magnitude of project impacts and cost effectiveness. MTC will provide a function in the on-line application for this information and may use it to inform the Goals Assessment portion of MTC's evaluation.

7. Programmatic Categories

- CMAs should group similar projects, which are exempt from regional air quality conformity that do not add capacity or expand the transportation network, into broader programmatic categories rather than submitting them as individual projects for consideration in the RTP/SCS. These individual projects may address a concern of the community (e.g., improved pedestrian ways to transit, curb bulb-outs to calm traffic, etc.), but do not have to be individually specified for the purposes of air quality conformity. See **Attachment A.2** for guidance on the programmatic categories.

Timeline

Task	Date
Issue Call for Projects Letter to CMAs, Caltrans, and Multi-County Transit Operators	February 10, 2011
Open Online Project Application Form for Use by CMAs/ Project Sponsors	March 1, 2011
Close of Project Submittal Period	April 29, 2011
MTC Conducts Project-Level Performance Assessment and Selection Process for Projects for Detailed SCS Scenarios	May – July 2011

J:\PROJECT\2013 RTP_SCS\Call for Projects\Final Version\Attachment A - Guidance.doc

Attachment A.1 RTP/SCS Goals and Performance Targets

Goal	Performance Target (from 2005 levels unless noted)
<p><u>Climate Protection</u> Dealing effectively with the challenge of climate change involves communities far beyond the shores of San Francisco Bay. Indeed, Senate Bill 375 requires metropolitan areas throughout California to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from cars and trucks. Furthermore, our region must safeguard the shoreline due to sea-level rise through adaption strategies. By combining aggressive policies with innovative technologies, the Bay Area can act as a model for other regions around the state and nationwide.</p>	Reduce per-capita CO ₂ emissions from cars and light-duty trucks by 15%
<p><u>Adequate Housing</u> A diverse and sufficient housing supply is essential to maximize livability for all Bay Area residents. The region aspires not only to ensure affordability and supply of housing for peoples of all income levels and in all nine counties, but also to reduce the concentration of poverty in low-income communities of concern.</p>	House 100% of the region's projected 25-year growth by income level (very-low, low, moderate, above-moderate) without displacing current low-income resident
<p><u>Healthy & Safe Communities</u> Promoting healthy and safe communities includes improving air quality, reducing collisions and encouraging more bicycle and pedestrian travel. While policy choices by regional agencies can help influence land-use decisions and the operation and design of transportation infrastructure, local governments have the biggest role to play. Cities' and counties' land-use authority directly shapes the development patterns that guide individuals' travel choices.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reduce premature deaths from exposure to particular emissions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reduce premature deaths from exposure to fine particulates (PM2.5) by 10% ● Reduce coarse particulate emissions (PM10) by 30% ● Achieve greater reductions in highly impacted areas <p style="margin-left: 20px;">Associated Indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Incidence of asthma attributable to particulate emissions ● Diesel particulate emissions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reduce by 50% the number of injuries and fatalities from all collisions (including bike and pedestrian) ○ Increase the average time walking or biking per person per day for transportation by 60% (for an average of 15 minutes per person per day)
<p><u>Open Space & Agricultural Preservation</u> Limiting urban sprawl will help preserve productive agricultural lands and prime natural habitat, in addition to maintaining public access to shorelines, mountains, lakes and rivers. As open space and farmlands are essential to the Bay Area's quality of life, the region</p>	<p>Direct all non-agricultural development within the urban footprint (existing urban development and urban growth boundaries)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Scenarios will be compared to 2010 urban footprint

Goal	Performance Target (from 2005 levels unless noted)
<p>should focus growth in existing urban areas rather than pursue additional development in outlying areas.</p>	<p>for analytical purposes only</p>
<p><u>Equitable Access</u> A high quality of life is not a privilege reserved only for the wealthy. Regional agencies must work to ensure that high-quality housing is available for people of all incomes; that essential destinations may be reached at a minimal cost of time or money; that mobility options are available not only to those who can transport themselves but also to our growing populations of senior and disabled residents; that the benefits and burdens alike of transportation investment are evenly distributed; and that air pollution, water pollution or noise pollution are not disproportionately concentrated in low-income neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Decrease by 10% the share of low-income and lower-middle income residents' household income consumed by transportation and housing</p>
<p><u>Economic Vitality</u> A strong economy is imperative to ensure continued quality of life for all Bay Area residents. This includes a healthy climate for business and growth, and plentiful employment opportunities for individuals of all skill levels and industries. Savvy transportation and land-use policies in pursuit of this goal will not only reduce travel times but also expand choices, cut total costs, improve accessibility, and boost reliability.</p>	<p>Increase gross regional product (GRP) by 87% – an average of 2.1% per year (in current dollars)</p>
<p><u>Transportation System Effectiveness</u> Maximizing the efficiency of the transportation system requires preserving existing assets in a state of good repair as well as leveraging assets that are not fully utilized and making targeted, cost-effective improvements. Continued maintenance is necessary to protect safety, minimize vehicle damage, support infill development in existing urban areas and promote economic growth regionwide.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Decrease average per-trip travel time by 10% for non-auto modes ○ Decrease automobile vehicle miles traveled per capita by 10% ○ Maintain the transportation system in a state of good repair: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase local road pavement condition index (PCI) to 75 or better • Decrease distressed lane-miles of state highways to less than 10% of total lane-miles • Reduce average transit asset age to 50% of useful life
<p><u>Infrastructure Security</u> The potential for damage from natural or manmade disasters is a threat to the security of Bay Area infrastructure. To preserve the region's economic vitality and quality of life, Bay Area government officials — in cooperation with federal and state agencies — must work to prevent damage to infrastructure systems and to minimize the potential impacts of any future disasters. Funding priorities must reflect the need to ensure infrastructure security and to avoid any preventable loss of life.</p>	

Attachment A.2 Programmatic Categories

Programmatic categories are groups of similar projects, programs, and strategies that are included under a single group for ease of listing in the RTP/SCS. Projects within programmatic categories must be exempt from regional transportation conformity. Many projects which address the concerns of communities, such as pedestrian bulbouts, bicycle lanes, transit passenger shelters, ridesharing, etc. are often taken into account in a programmatic category. Therefore individual projects of this nature do not need to be specified. Projects grouped in a programmatic category are viewed as a program of multiple projects. Projects that add capacity or expand the network are not included in a programmatic category. Projects that do not fit within the identified programmatic categories are listed separately in the RTP/SCS. Programmatic categories to be used include, but are not limited to the following:

1. **Bicycle/Pedestrian Expansion** (new facilities, expansion of existing bike/pedestrian network)
2. **Bicycle/Pedestrian Enhancements** (enhancements, streetscapes, TODs, ADA compliance, mobility and access improvements)
3. **Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities Rehabilitation**
4. **Lifeline Transportation** (Community Based Transportation Plans projects such as information/outreach projects, dial-a-ride, guaranteed ride home, paratransit, non-operational transit capital enhancements (i.e. bus shelters). Does not include fixed route transit projects.)
5. **Transit Enhancements** (ADA compliance, mobility and access improvements, passenger shelters, informational kiosks)
6. **Transit Management Systems** (TransLink[®], Transit GPS tracking systems (i.e. Next Bus))
7. **Transit Safety and Security Improvements** (Installation of security cameras)
8. **Transit Guideway Rehabilitation**
9. **Transit Station Rehabilitation**
10. **Transit Vehicle Rehabilitation/Replacement/Retrofit**
11. **Transit O&M** (Ongoing non-capital costs, preventive maintenance)
12. **Transit Operations Support** (purchase of operating equipment such as fareboxes, lifts, radios, office and shop equipment, support vehicles)
13. **Local Road Safety** (shoulder widening, realignment, non-coordinated signals)
14. **Highway Safety** (implementation of Highway Safety Improvement Program, Strategic Highway Safety Program, shoulder improvements, guardrails, medians, barriers, crash cushions, lighting improvements, fencing, increasing sight distance, emergency truck pullovers)
15. **Non-Capacity Increasing Local Road Intersection Modifications and Channelization**
16. **Non-Capacity Increasing State Highway Enhancements** (noise attenuation, landscaping, roadside rest areas, sign removal, directional and informational signs)
17. **Freeway/Expressway Incident Management** (freeway service patrol, call boxes)
18. **Non-Capacity Increasing Freeway/Expressway Interchange Modifications** (signal coordination, signal retiming, synchronization)
19. **Freeway/Expressway Performance Management** (Non-ITS Elements, performance monitoring, corridor studies)
20. **Non-Capacity Increasing Local Road Rehabilitation** (Pavement resurfacing, skid treatments)
21. **Non-Capacity Increasing Local Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement/Retrofit**
22. **State Highway Preservation** (Caltrans SHOPP, excluding system management)
23. **Toll Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement/Retrofit**
24. **Local Streets and Roads O&M** (Ongoing non-capital costs, routine maintenance)
25. **State Highway O&M** (Caltrans non-SHOPP maintenance, minor 'A' and 'B' programs)
26. **Regional Air Quality and Climate Protection Strategies** (outreach programs and non-capacity projects specifically targeting regional air quality and climate protection strategies)
27. **Local Air Quality and Climate Protection Strategies** (outreach programs and non-capacity projects specifically targeting local air quality and climate protection strategies)
28. **Regional Planning and Outreach** (regionwide planning, marketing, and outreach)
29. **Transportation Demand Management** (continuation of ridesharing, shuttle, or vanpooling at current levels)
30. **Parking Management** (Parking cash out, variable pricing, etc.)

This page intentionally left blank.

Attachment A.3 – MTC’s Draft Transportation Project Performance Assessment Methodology

	Transportation 2035	SCS/RTP Approach – Initial Thoughts
Goals Assessment (largely qualitative)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All projects (700+) assessed, grouped into 13 project type How well projects address each goal/number of goals addressed Conducted by panel of MTC staff and stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as for Transportation 2035 – but reflecting new goals/targets and with added emphasis on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> support for focused growth statutory goals to reduce carbon dioxide and accommodate future housing demand For larger projects, use quantitative information where available, such as projected CO2 and particulate emissions reduction
Benefit-Cost Assessment (quantitative)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 60 large-scale uncommitted projects as well as uncommitted regional programs MTC model analysis <ol style="list-style-type: none"> B/C ratio in 2035 including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delay CO2 PM10 and PM2.5 Injuries & fatalities Direct user costs (vehicle operating/ownership) Cost savings for on-time maintenance Cost per reduction on CO2 Cost per reduction in VMT Cost per low-income household served by new transit <p>Goals not reflected in B/C are captured through the qualitative assessment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same types of projects but potentially more (perhaps 100) - subject to final policy on committed projects MTC model analysis <ol style="list-style-type: none"> B/C ratio - over 25 yrs instead of horizon year (if time allows) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Travel time (see notes below) CO2 PM10 and PM2.5 Health costs associated with changes in active transportation levels Injuries & fatalities Direct user costs (vehicle operating/ownership) Cost savings for on-time maintenance <p>Goals not reflected in B/C are captured through the goals assessment in a qualitative fashion</p>
Synthesis & Use of Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bubble chart mapping B/C and number of goals addressed Sponsors “justify” projects with low-B/C before inclusion in the draft plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bubble chart mapping B/C and number of goals addressed Sponsors must “justify” projects with <ol style="list-style-type: none"> low B/C or meeting few goals increase in CO2 emissions that do not support draft land use
Considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Four quantitative measures was information overload for the decision makers; prefer to have a single quantitative result 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider approaches to address to concern that current B/C model is dominated by travel time <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sensitivity tests of impact of travel time on relative ratings of projects Review emerging practices for travel time valuation (e.g., discounting small time savings, different values of time based on trip purpose, value of reliability) Assess significance of B/C results for each project

This page intentionally left blank.

Attachment A.4
MTC Policy Advisory Council Members

Naomi Armenta
Representing the Disabled Community of
Alameda County
narmenta@actia2022.com

Cathleen Baker
Representing the Low-Income Community of
San Mateo County
cabaker@co.sanmateo.ca.us

Paul S. Branson
Representing the Senior Community of Marin
County
kayak707@gmail.com

Richard L. Burnett
Representing the Disabled Community of
Solano County
burnett.richardl@gmail.com

Joanne Busenbark
Representing the Senior Community of Napa
County
joannbusenbark@sbcglobal.net

Carlos Castellanos
Economy Representative
carlosc@ebaldc.com

Bena Chang
Economy Representative
bchang@svlg.net

Wilbert Din
Representing the Minority Community of San
Francisco
wil_din@yahoo.com

Richard Hedges
Economy Representative
hedghogg@ix.netcom.com

Allison Hughes
Representing the Disabled Community of San
Francisco

allisonh@rdtsi.com

Dolores Jaquez
Representing the Senior Community of
Sonoma
doloresjaquez@yahoo.com

Randi Kinman
Representing the Low-Income Community of
Santa Clara County
randikinman@yahoo.com

Federico Lopez
Representing the Disabled Community of
Contra Costa County
fwlopez@comcast.net

Marshall Loring
Representing the Senior Community of San
Mateo County
cmarsh.L@att.net

Evelina Molina
Representing the Low-Income Community of
Sonoma County
youthgreenjobs@gmail.com

Cheryl O'Connor
Economy Representative
coconnor@hbanc.org

Kendal Oku
Representing the Minority Community of
Marin County
kandpoku@gmail.com

Lori Reese-Brown
Representing the Minority Community of
Solano County
Bro7L@aol.com

Gerald Rico
Representing the Minority Community of
Napa County
ricochip@sbcglobal.net

Frank Robertson
Representing the Minority Community of
Contra Costa County
bostonlegacy@comcast.net

Linda Jeffery Sailors
Economy Representative
madammayor@comcast.net

Dolly Sandoval
Representing the Senior Community of Santa
Clara County
dolly@dollysandoval.com

Egon Terplan
Environment Representative
eterplan@spur.org



Commission Chair
Mark Green, Mayor - Union City

March 17, 2011

Commission Vice Chair
Scott Haggerty, Supervisor - District 1

Mr. Steve Heminger
Executive Director

AC Transit
Greg Harper, Director

Metropolitan Transportation Commission
101 Eighth Street,
Oakland, California 94607

Alameda County
Supervisors
Nadia Lockyer - District 2
Wilma Chan - District 3
Nate Miley - District 4
Keith Carson - District 5

Dear Mr. Heminger,

BART
Thomas Blalock, Director

Subject: Comments on RTP/SCS Goals and Performance Targets

City of Alameda
Rob Bonta, Vice Mayor

The Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) received a presentation at its February 24th CWTP-TEP Steering Committee meeting about the RTP/SCS Goals and Performance Targets adopted by MTC Commission in January. Based on our review of the adopted performance targets, we submit the following comments and a request for information about how congestion relief will be accounted for in the performance assessment process.

City of Albany
Farid Javandel, Mayor

City of Berkeley
Laurie Capitelli, Councilmember

City of Dublin
Tim Sbranti, Mayor

City of Emeryville
Ruth Atkin, Councilmember

City of Fremont
Suzanne Chan, Vice Mayor

City of Hayward
Olden Henson, Councilmember

City of Livermore
Marshall Kamena, Mayor

City of Newark
Luis Freitas, Vice Mayor

City of Oakland
Councilmembers
Larry Reid
Rebecca Kaplan

City of Piedmont
John Chiang, Vice Mayor

City of Pleasanton
Jennifer Hosterman, Mayor

City of San Leandro
Joyce R. Starosciak, Councilmember

At the January 14, 2011 Joint MTC Planning Committee/ABAG Administrative Committee meeting, certain modifications were made to staff's recommendations that we believe will limit the ability to evaluate certain goals that are important to the Congestion Management Agencies. The Committee revised the Transportation System Effectiveness goal of the Performance Targets from:

Decrease average per-trip travel time for auto and transit modes by 10%

To:

*Decrease average per-trip travel time by 10% for non-auto modes and
Decrease automobile vehicle miles traveled per capita by 10%*

The revised and now adopted measure results in two effects that we do not believe the Commission intended. First, it does not recognize that congestion relief is a mandate of the congestion management plans and one that we are required to measure and monitor. Second, by decreasing average trip travel time for all modes instead of just transit and auto, it contradicts the Health and Safe Communities goal of *Increase average time walking or biking per person per day for transportation by 60% (for an average of 15 minutes per day).*

Executive Director
Arthur L. Dao

Mr. Steve Heminger
March 17, 2011
Page 2

The Alameda CTC supports SB 375 and its goals. In Alameda County, our jurisdictions have begun implementing development patterns that reduce drive alone trips and promote transit, which result in reduced greenhouse gas emissions. However, we are concerned that by defining certain goals so specifically, we lose sight of other important needs and projects, such as high occupancy vehicle and toll lanes, that affect transportation and relieve congestion and reduce greenhouse gases by allowing traffic to flow more smoothly.

We appreciate your consideration of the above and request clarification on how the performance assessment will also inform project performance with respect to congestion relief. Please contact Arthur L. Dao, Executive Director of the Alameda CTC, with any questions. Mr. Dao can be reached at 510/208-7402 via telephone or adao@alamedactc.org via email.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mark Green". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Mark" being more prominent than the last name "Green".

MARK GREEN, Chair
Alameda County Transportation Commission
Mayor of Union City

Cc: Alameda County Transportation Commission
Arthur L. Dao, Alameda CTC
Beth Walukas, Alameda CTC
Tess Lengyel, Alameda CTC
Doug Kimsey, MTC
Ashley Nguyen, MTC



MARKET
& OPINION
RESEARCH
SERVICES

811 First Avenue
Suite 451
Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 652-2454 TEL
(206) 652-5022 FAX

**PAPCO Meeting 03/28/11
Attachment 11C7**

436 14th Street
Suite 820
Oakland, CA 94612
(510) 844-0680 TEL
(510) 844-0690 FAX

4041 North High Street
Suite 300M
Columbus, OH 43214
(614) 268-1660 TEL
EMCresearch.com

MEMORANDUM

TO: Tess Lengyel
FROM: Sara LaBatt
DATE: March 17, 2011
RE: Project Progress Report
TEP Update Survey #1

This memorandum serves to update Alameda CTC on the progress of the first survey on the Transportation Expenditure Plan Update as of March 17, 2011.

Current Project Status

The survey questionnaire was drafted and reviewed by Alameda CTC staff, as well as the Steering Committee, CAWG, and TAWG. Survey comments from all parties were incorporated into the final draft, and a pretest of the survey was conducted with 29 randomly selected Alameda County voters on March 3, 2011. No survey changes were recommended as a result of the pretest.

Following the successful pretest, the main survey fielding period was March 6 through 14, 2011. Eight hundred thirteen (813) interviews were completed with a representative sample of likely voters in Alameda County, with an average interview length of seventeen (17) minutes. Interviews were regularly monitored by EMC staff, and data was checked every day to ensure everything was proceeding appropriately.

The data is currently being cleaned, coded, and analyzed. EMC will review the initial findings with Alameda CTC staff, and be prepared to present initial findings to the Steering Committee on March 24, 2011, with presentations following for both CAWG and TAWG in April 2011.

This page intentionally left blank.

Telephone Survey of Alameda County Voters
Conducted for: Alameda County Transportation Commission
n=800

FINAL MARCH 2, 2011

Hello, my name is _____, may I speak with **(NAME ON LIST)**. **(SPEAK TO NAME ON LIST ONLY)**

Hello, my name is _____, and I'm conducting a survey for EMC Research to find out how people in your area feel about some of the different issues facing them. We are not trying to sell anything, and are collecting this information on a scientific and completely confidential basis.

AGE FROM SAMPLE

1. 18-29
2. 30-39
3. 40-49
4. 50-64
5. 65+
6. BLANK

SUPERVISOR DISTRICT FROM SAMPLE

1. 1
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5

1. **SEX (Record from observation)**

1. Male
2. Female

2. Are you registered to vote in Alameda County?

1. Yes → CONTINUE
2. No → **TERMINATE**

3. Do you think things in Alameda County are generally going in the right direction, or do you feel that things are pretty seriously off on the wrong track?

1. Right Direction
2. Wrong Track
3. (Don't Know)

4. What is the most important problem facing Alameda County today? **(OPEN END, 1 response)**

5. And what would you say is the most important transportation problem facing Alameda County today? **(OPEN END, 1 response)**

6. As you may know, voters in Alameda County approved Measure B in 2000, a half cent sales tax that funds road and transit projects and programs all across Alameda County. In general, would you say Measure B has been a good thing for Alameda County, or a bad thing for Alameda County?
 1. Good thing
 2. Bad thing
 3. (Don't know)

7. There may be a measure on the ballot next year in Alameda County that would extend the existing half cent transportation sales tax to address an updated plan for the county's current and future transportation needs. The money from this measure could only be spent on the voter-approved expenditure plan, and all money from this measure would stay in Alameda County and could not be taken by the state. If this measure were on the ballot today, are you likely to vote yes to approve it, or no to reject it?
(IF UNDECIDED/DON'T KNOW: Which way do you lean — toward voting "Yes" to approve, or toward voting "No" to reject?)
 1. Yes, approve
 2. (Lean yes)
 3. No, reject
 4. (Lean no)
 5. (Undecided/Don't know)

Now I'd like to read you a list of projects and programs that could be funded by this ballot measure. For each one, please tell me how a high a priority it should be. Please use a scale from one to five, where one means it should not be a priority at all and five means it should be a very high priority;

SCALE: 1 2 3 4 5 | 6
 Not a priority at all Very high priority | (DK)

(RANDOMIZE Qx-Qx)

BEFORE EACH QUESTION: The (first/next) one is...

AFTER EACH QUESTION AS NECESSARY: How a high a priority should that be for this ballot measure? Use a scale from one to five, where one means it should not be a priority at all and five means it should be a very high priority.

8. Maintaining streets, roads, and highways;
9. Expanding transit services and reliability, including express bus services;
10. Expanding road and highway capacity and efficiency;
11. Providing and supporting alternatives to driving, like walking, biking, and public transit;
12. Improving the movement of goods, freight, and cargo;
13. Maintaining and operating existing transit services;
14. Improving transportation services for seniors and people with disabilities;
15. Expanding bicycle and pedestrian improvements;
16. Improving local streets to make them safer and more efficient for all, including cars, transit vehicles and riders, bicyclists, and pedestrians;
17. Making it easier to get to work and school using public transportation;
18. Restoring public transit service cuts;
19. Providing a free bus transit pass to all junior and senior high school students in the county;
20. Reducing air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions from the county's cars, trucks, buses, and trains;
21. Keeping public transit service affordable for those who depend on it, including seniors, youth, and people with disabilities;
22. Expanding the Safe Routes to Schools program;
23. Extending BART to Livermore;
24. Extending commuter trains over the Dumbarton Bridge to improve the commute to Silicon Valley;
25. Improving and expanding ACE Train service, which runs from Stockton through Livermore, Pleasanton, and Fremont, and ends in San Jose;
26. Improving and expanding ferry service from Oakland and Alameda to San Francisco;
27. Widening Route 84 between I-580 and I-680 near Livermore and Pleasanton;
28. Completing bicycle commuting corridors, like the Bay Trail and the East Bay Greenway;
29. Reducing traffic on I-880 by extending carpool lanes and using technologies that improve traffic flow;

(END RANDOMIZE)

And now, thinking about the ballot measure itself, I will read you some pairs of options, and ask which you would prefer.

30. **(ROTATE 1 & 2; Read "OR" between first and second statement)**

1. A measure that extends the existing transportation sales tax for another 20 years (or)
2. A measure that makes the existing transportation sales tax permanent, but allows the public to vote on how that money is spent now, and again in 20 years;
3. (Both)
4. (Neither)
5. (Don't Know)

31. **(ROTATE 1 & 2; Read "OR" between first and second statement)**

1. A measure that extends the existing half cent transportation sales tax at the same rate, with a smaller set of funded projects and programs (or)
2. A measure that increases the existing half cent transportation sales tax by one quarter of a cent, with a larger set of funded projects and programs;
3. (Both)
4. (Neither)
5. (Don't Know)

32. Which of the following is closer to your opinion: **(ROTATE 1 & 2; Read "OR" between first and second statement)**

1. Taxes are already high enough; I'll vote against any increase in taxes. (or)
2. It is crucial to have high quality roads and public transit, even if it means raising taxes;
3. (Both)
4. (Neither)
5. (Don't Know)

Please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with each of the following statements about Alameda County.

- Scale:**
- | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Strongly agree | 2. Somewhat agree |
| 3. Somewhat disagree | 4. Strongly disagree |
| 5. (Don't Know/Refused) | |

(RANDOMIZE LIST)

33. Improving our streets, roads and public transit will create jobs and improve the local economy.
34. Our streets and roads have gotten worse over the last few years.
35. Our public transportation system has gotten worse over the last few years.
36. Improving public transportation can have a significant impact on reducing greenhouse gas emissions and slowing down climate change.
37. Improving public transportation can have a significant impact on local air quality and public health.
38. Improving public transportation can have a significant impact on reducing traffic.
39. Making it easier and safer to walk and bicycle can have a significant impact on reducing traffic.
40. We spend too much taxpayer money on public transportation systems that few people really use.
41. I would take public transportation more often if it were faster and more reliable.
42. Improving the use of technology on our roads and public transit systems can have a significant impact on reducing traffic.
43. Transporting more cargo by train instead of by truck can reduce congestion and improve air quality.
44. Making it easier to move cargo from the Port of Oakland through and out of Alameda County can improve our local economy and reduce the cost of the goods we buy

(END RANDOMIZE)

And now, thinking about a different topic, I'd like to ask you just a few questions about a different ballot measure that voters might decide in a future election. This is a different measure than the sales tax we have been discussing.

45. There may be a measure on the ballot in a future election that would increase the tax on gasoline in the Bay Area by 10 cents per gallon. This measure would pay for maintenance of local streets and roads as well as improvements to public transportation, such as BART. If this measure were on the ballot today, are you likely to vote yes to approve it, or no to oppose it?
(IF UNDECIDED/DON'T KNOW: Which way do you lean — toward voting "Yes" to approve, or toward voting "No" to reject?)
 1. Yes, approve
 2. (Lean yes)
 3. No, reject
 4. (Lean no)
 5. (Undecided/Don't know)

46. Supporters of this measure say that it makes sense to tax gasoline because it would pay for improvements that benefit everyone throughout the region, like better roads and more reliable public transit. Opponents of this measure say it will place an unfair burden on people with long commutes to work or school, and local governments should make better use of existing taxes before asking for more.

Now that you've heard more about it, if the measure to increase the tax on gasoline by 10 cents per gallon for road and transit improvements were on the ballot today, are you likely to vote yes to approve it, or no to oppose it?

(IF UNDECIDED/DON'T KNOW: Which way do you lean — toward voting "Yes" to approve, or toward voting "No" to reject?)

1. Yes, approve
2. (Lean yes)
3. No, reject
4. (Lean no)
5. (Undecided/Don't know)

Now I'd like to ask you a few questions for statistical purposes only.

47. In terms of your job status, are you employed, unemployed but looking for work, retired, a student, or a homemaker?
1. Employed → **ASK Qx**
 2. Unemployed → **SKIP TO Qx**
 3. Retired → **SKIP TO Qx**
 4. Student → **SKIP TO Qx**
 5. Homemaker → **SKIP TO Qx**
 6. (Other) → **SKIP TO Qx**
 7. (Don't know) → **SKIP TO Qx**

(ASK Q61 IF Q60=1-“Employed”)48. In what city do you work? **(OPEN-ENDED, ONE RESPONSE)**

1. (Berkeley)
2. (Castro Valley)
3. (Dublin)
4. (Emeryville)
5. (Fremont)
6. (Hayward)
7. (Livermore)
8. (Milpitas)
9. (Newark)
10. (Oakland)
11. (Pleasanton)
12. (Richmond)
13. (Sacramento)
14. (San Francisco)
15. (San Jose)
16. (San Leandro)
17. (San Lorenzo)
18. (Union City)
19. (Walnut Creek)
20. (Other (specify _____))
21. (Refused/Don't know)

(RESUME ASKING EVERYONE)

For each of the following, please answer Yes or No.

SCALE:

1. Yes
2. No
3. (Don't Know/Refused)

Do you or does anyone in your household...

49. Ride a bicycle to school or work?
50. Ride a bus to school or work?
51. Ride BART to school or work?
52. Carpool to school or work?
53. Drive alone to school or work?
54. Walk to school or work?

55. Do you rent or own your home or apartment?

1. Rent/other
2. Own/buying
3. (Don't know/Refused)

56. Thinking about a political scale where 1 is very liberal and 7 is very conservative, where would you place yourself on that scale? **(Code 1-7, 8=Don't know)**

57. What is the last grade you completed in school?
1. Some grade school
 2. Some high school
 3. Graduated high school
 4. Technical/Vocational
 5. Some college
 6. Graduated college [including Bachelors, BA]
 7. Graduate/Professional [including Masters, PhD, etc]
 8. (Don't know/Refused)
58. Would you consider yourself to be Hispanic or Latino, Black or African American, White, Asian or Pacific Islander, or something else?
1. Hispanic/Latino
 2. Black/African-American
 3. White
 4. Asian or Pacific Islander
 5. (Bi-racial/ Multi-racial)
 6. Something else/ other
 7. (Refused)
59. In what year were you born? **(Do not read categories, code as appropriate)**
1. 1936 or earlier (75+)
 2. 1937-1941 (70-74)
 3. 1942-1946 (65-69)
 4. 1947-1951 (60-64)
 5. 1952-1956 (55-59)
 6. 1957-1961 (50-54)
 7. 1962-1966 (45-49)
 8. 1967-1971 (40-44)
 9. 1972-1976 (35-39)
 10. 1977-1981 (30-34)
 11. 1982-1986 (25-29)
 12. 1987-1993 (18-24)
 13. (Refused)

THANK YOU!

PARTY REGISTRATION FROM SAMPLE

Democrat
Republican
DTS

CITY CODE FROM SAMPLE

Alameda
Albany
Berkeley
Dublin
Emeryville
Fremont
Hayward
Livermore
Newark
Oakland
Piedmont
Pleasanton
San Leandro
Union City
Other/Unincorporated

ZIP CODE FROM SAMPLE

This page intentionally left blank.

**SERVICE REVIEW ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 4, 2011 MINUTES**

**1) SRAC ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTION OF INDIVIDUALS
PRESENT**

SRAC members present: Don Queen, Janet Abelson, Patricia Affonso, Sharon Powers, Ann Varni, Chris Mullin, Harriet Saunders, Marvin Dyson, Peter Crockwell, Robert L. Kearney.

Staff present: Mallory Nestor-Brush, AC Transit; Laura Timothy, BART; Mary Rowlands; Myisha Grant, Program Coordinator's Office; Mark Weinstein, Veolia/Paratransit Broker.

Members of the public present: Myralyn Grant, Earl Perkins, Mary Steiner, Bettye Lou Wright, Vicki Riffin, Gary Brown, Laura Corona, Lonnie Brown, Sherri Brooks, Marian McNary, Mary Lawrence, Vanessa Proee, Magenta Cook, and Naomi Armenta.

2) APPROVAL OF SRAC MINUTES FROM NOVEMBER 4TH, 2010

MOTION: Dyson/Crockwell to approve the minutes. Unanimous.

3) PUBLIC COMMENTS

Bettye Lou Wright asked why EBP drivers do not all carry receipts. She mentioned she had called in with this complaint.

Gary Brown said on a recent trip to the warm pool in Berkeley, the manifest showed his pick-up time changed and he arrived late to the pool. He has not received a postcard acknowledging his complaint was received.

Myralyn Grant asked that drivers be reminded to close the vehicle doors if someone is smoking on the sidewalk nearby.

Mary Lawrence noted her driver today was very good and waited until she had safely crossed the street. On a trip November 16th however, the driver was lost in San Francisco and had to obtain instructions from a stranger. There was no GPS in the vehicle. She called in the complaint and was told

she would receive a written response, but she has not. Mary said the staff at the Broker's office was unhelpful when the driver called for instructions.

Earl Perkins said he has to applaud the drivers. He feels the issues with service are with reservations and scheduling and hopes it is better this year.

Mary Steiner said she had several comments:

- She said she did not receive the packet for the November 2nd SRAC meeting or today's meeting.
- She has received notice of a no-show suspension because she refused to accept lift van rides.
- Someone called and inquired about her medical conditions, which she considers a violation of her privacy.
- Drivers are overbooked and schedules too tight in her opinion
- She understands funds have been spent on to improve the computer system used by EBP, but she does not see the value. For example, her trips were delayed today and yesterday.
- She cannot afford the \$4.00 fare. She uses EBP to travel to her medical appointments.
- She feels her request for sedan or subsidized taxi service is necessary and a reasonable accommodation.

4) INFORMATION ABOUT EAST BAY PARATRANSIT TICKET VENDORS

Laura Timothy explained BART is responsible for EBP fare tickets and the vendors that sell the tickets. The new \$4.00 ticket is now available. It is blue with a clipped corner for individuals with sight impairments. A supply has been provided to the Broker's office. By the end of January the new tickets will be available at all vendors who sell EBP tickets. The \$3.00 tickets will be phased out.

Timothy said the bulk of tickets – or 90% - are sold through the Broker's office. There are about 11 other vendors in the service area. Vendors typically contact BART if they are interested in selling tickets. If individuals want a local store to carry EBP fare tickets, the best thing to do is for the individual to contact the store and lobby the manager to carry them. All vendors make a 1% profit. Laura noted EBP tickets can be ordered off the BART website.

5) DRIVER TRAINING DISCUSSION

Rashida Kamara, the Veolia Operations Manager gave a presentation on driver training requirements.

The four providers had to have their training program approved by the Broker in advance of starting the new contract in 2007.

A Veolia Compliance supervisor must sign off before any new driver is released to the road. Veolia road supervisors and occasionally SRAC members audit the driver training. All drivers are background checked.

Last year a new training element was added which is conducted by Veolia staff for both new and veteran drivers. It includes practical training on: collecting fares; uniforms and name tags; finding and transporting the ADA riders; comment cards; drivers not taking cancellation or reservation requests; and other real life scenarios.

There is scheduled re-training of experienced drivers and those experiencing problems or complaints are also brought back for re-training.

Comments about driver training follow:

- Taxi drivers don't know the rules, particularly about fare payment, required assistance, or that riders do not have to board early unless the rider chooses.
- Drivers do not get out of the vehicle and identify themselves at Chabot College.
- Many drivers do not know how to assist a blind rider or one with visual impairments. Drivers should never ask a rider personal questions about their vision issues.
- East Bay Center for the Blind would be happy to participate in driver training.

Rashida Kamara explained taxis are only used occasionally, on an exception basis, primarily in an emergency when no other EBP vehicle can reach the rider.

6) DISCUSSION ABOUT REGIONAL TRIP RESERVATIONS

Mark Weinstein explained Regional Trips involve two ADA programs and can be hard to coordinate, due to differences in policies and procedures between EBP and the connecting ADA program. These trips, however, do allow riders to travel throughout the Bay Area. Regional Transfers most commonly take place at BART stations except for Pinole. Many adjacent operators will no longer wait for the connecting vehicle; they practice a “drop and toll” procedure. EBP still waits.

Scheduling the trip can be problematic as other operators are smaller than EBP and don't have full staff available to work on the reservations all the time. Also other operators may not have customer service agents in place at all times, leaving no one to call if something goes wrong.

In response to a question about EBP traveling all the way to the San Francisco airport, eliminating the transfer at the Daly City BART station, Laura Timothy explained that East Bay Paratransit travels only where AC Transit and BART overlap. The San Francisco airport is in San Mateo County and BART has an agreement with Sam Trans for travel there.

7) DISCUSSION ON THE IMPACT OF AC TRANSIT ROUTE CHANGES ON EAST BAY PARATRANSIT SERVICE

Mallory Nestor-Brush said the second half of the planned AC Transit service reductions went into effect October 31, 2010. The first half of the planned route changes were implemented March 2010. No service has been restored from these two reductions.

Cuts that were considered for implementation in December 2010 have been delayed, but are still on the table. They involve weekend service and could affect 2,400 paratransit riders. Mallory went on to say riders who are affected will still be eligible for service but will be unable to book a trip that's not within $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile of active fixed route service on weekends. But if there is no operating fixed route service in an area, there is no East Bay Paratransit service either.

Comments included:

- If AC Transit passes increase to \$38.00 from \$20.00, more bus riders will leave AC Transit, decreasing revenue further and possibly triggering more cuts.
- There have to be more public hearings at AC Transit before any future cuts are considered.

8) REPORT FROM THE EAST BAY PARATRANSIT BROKER

Mark Weinstein provided the Broker's Report.

- Ridership far exceeded expectations in the first five months; 28,000 more riders were transported this fiscal year, compared to the same time last year. Over 2,600 trips were provided per day on average.
- Productivity is a high 1.85, against a budgeted 1.76. Analysis shows a 0.1% increase in productivity over one year results in \$100K savings.
- On-time performance this fiscal year to date is the same as last year. Total complaints increased but the ratio of complaints to passengers carried decreased. Complaints against drivers also decreased.
- Average time on hold for the first five months increased this year to 2.3 minutes over last year's 1.3, but we expect it to return to normal now that the seven day advance reservation period was re-instituted
- Two new call center agents are being trained. More agents will be hired in the next 4-6 weeks.
- The fare increase went into effect on January 1st. The call center reports few complaints; most riders are accepting of the increase, which is the first in six years.
- MDC's were installed in the last two providers in November and December.

9) REPORT FROM SRAC MEMBERS

Mallory Nestor Brush said she wanted to respond to the three main issues brought up by Mary Steiner, noting that the meeting was being recorded by Ms. Steiner.

1. In the future, correspondence will be sent certified mail to Ms. Steiner.
2. All EBP vehicles now have mobile data computers (MDC's) including a GPS system for way finding. The MDC's help dispatchers locate the position of a vehicle and will contribute to improved communication with drivers and better reporting statistics. They are needed for the next step which is IVR or interactive voice recording. This will allow calling of

riders to let them know when the vehicle will arrive. Grant money was provided to EBP for installation of these MDC's.

3. There have been court cases in the past years supporting the ADA operator's right to assign vehicles at their discretion.

10) NEXT SRAC MEETING AND ADJOURNMENT: The next SRAC meeting will be March 1st, 2011.

**EAST BAY PARATRANSIT
Performance Report for the SRAC
Systemwide**

Attachment 4

	July-January FY 09/10	July-January FY 10/11
Ridership Statistics		
Total Passengers	402,947	439,431
ADA Passengers	344,496	374,265
% Companions	1.2%	1.4%
% of Personal Care Assistants	13%	13%
Average Passengers/ Weekday	2,373	2,586
Average Pass/ Weekend & Holidays	842	896
Scheduling Statistics		
% Rider Fault No Shows & Late Cancels	2.2%	2.6%
% of Cancellations	22.5%	22.6%
Go Backs/ Re-scheduled	7,483	7,095
Effectiveness Indicators		
Revenue Hours	230,037	239,479
Passengers/Revenue Vehicle Hour	1.75	1.83
ADA Passengers per RVHr.	1.50	1.56
Average Trip Length (miles)	10.47	9.93
Average Ride Duration (minutes)	40.1	38.4
Total Cost	\$18,177,572	\$19,365,168
Revenue Miles	3,606,435	3,716,211
Total Cost per Passenger	\$45.11	\$44.07
Total Cost per ADA Passenger	\$52.77	\$51.74
Total Cost per Revenue Hour	\$79.02	\$80.86
On Time Performance		
Percent on-time	94.1%	93.7%
Percent 1-20 minutes past window	4.8%	5.0%
% of trips 21-59 minutes past window	1.0%	1.2%
% of trips 60 minutes past window	0.05%	0.08%
Customer Service		
Total Complaints	1,444	1,477
Timeliness	343	464
Driver Complaints	686	585
Equipment / Vehicle	14	36
Scheduling and Other Provider Complaints	117	154
Broker Complaints	284	238
Commendations	1,085	816
Ave. wait time in Queue for reservation	1.3	2.2
Safety & Maintenance		
Total accidents per 100,000 miles	2.72	3.85
Roadcalls per 100,000 miles	3.12	5.33
Eligibility Statistics		
Total ADA Riders on Data Base	20,531	19,352
Total Certification Determinations	3,198	2,915
Initial Denials	70	93
Denials Reversed	14	7

This page intentionally left blank.

LIVERMORE AMADOR VALLEY TRANSIT AUTHORITY
1362 Rutan Court, Suite 100
Livermore, CA 94551

WHEELS Accessible Advisory Committee

Meeting

DATE: Wednesday, November 3 2010

PLACE: Diana Lauterbach Room LAVTA Offices
1362 Rutan Court, Suite 100, Livermore, CA

TIME: 3:30 p.m.

MINUTES

1. Call to Order

Chair Herb Hastings called the meeting to order at 3:32 pm.

Members present:

Herb Hastings – Alameda County Representative

Jane Lewis – Pleasanton Representative

Russ Riley – Livermore Representative

Carmen Rivera-Hendrickson – Pleasanton Representative

Lee Serles – Livermore Representative

Sue Tuite –Dublin Alternate

Roberta Ishmael – Livermore Alternate

Joan Helen Hall – Alameda County Alternate

Pam Deaton – Social Services Representative

Jennifer Cullen – Social Services Representative

Staff Present:

Paul Matsuoka, LAVTA

Jeff Flynn, LAVTA

Kadri Kulm, LAVTA
Greg Cain, MV Transit

Members of the Audience:

Mary Hummel
Shawn Mark Ebersole

2. Citizens' Forum: An opportunity for members of the audience to comment on a subject not listed on the agenda (under state law, no action may be taken at this meeting)

Mary Hummel, Dial-A-Ride rider from Arbor Vista senior apartment complex in Livermore, thanked staff for the weekly Walmart and Target shuttles and suggested that senior housing complexes utilized sign-up sheets for the shuttles so that the correct number of vans can be sent. Staff informed Ms. Hummel that senior housing complexes are instructed to send sign-up sheets to Dial-A-Ride operations, but unfortunately they do not always do it.

3. Minutes of September 8, 2010 Meeting of the Committee

Approved: Rivera-Hendrickson/Riley

4. Para-Taxi Program Update

The committee approved the following changes to the Para-Taxi program:

- Increase the maximum reimbursement amount from the current 70% to 85%
- Increase the maximum reimbursement amount per trip from the current \$10 to \$20. (Wheelchair accessible cab surcharge, if applicable, will be reimbursed in addition to the \$20 per ride maximum.)
- Reimburse the \$10 wheelchair accessible cab surcharge
- Increase the maximum reimbursement per month from the current \$80 to \$200. (Wheelchair accessible cab surcharge, if applicable, will be reimbursed in addition to the \$200 per month maximum.)

WAAC members asked staff to mail the updated Para-Taxi materials to all WAAC members for their feedback prior to mailing the materials out to Dial-A-Ride riders.

Approved: Riley/Rivera-Hendrickson

5. WAAC Composition/Recruiting Update

The committee reviewed Shawn Mark Ebersole's application for WAAC's Pleasanton Alternate position and forwarded their recommendation to LAVTA Board of Directors.

Approved: Rivera-Hendrickson/Riley

6. LAVTA's Representative at PAPCO

Staff reminded the committee that LAVTA does not currently have a representative at PAPCO. Shawn Costello was LAVTA's representative, but is now representing the City of Dublin.

7. Alameda County Fair Shuttle Discussion

Herb Hastings informed the committee that he has been trying

to negotiate an agreement with the County Fair Association to arrange a shuttle service between the Dublin/Pleasanton BART station and the Fairgrounds during the duration of the Fair. Staff said that LAVTA as a public transportation provider receiving federal funds cannot legally provide a shuttle service due to federal regulations that were passed couple of years ago, but the Fair could pay a private contractor (such as MV) to do it. Staff reminded the committee members that all Bay Area ADA paratransit eligible riders can always use Dial-A-Ride to get from the BART station to Fairgrounds.

8. Ethics Report and ACTIA Workshop

This item was postponed to next meeting per Carmen Rivera-Hendrickson's request.

9. BART Task Force Report

Herb Hastings reported that the BART Task Force is currently in the process of organizing a tour to the new West Dublin BART station while it's still in construction to make sure the station (elevators, fair gate machines, etc.) is accessible for people with disabilities. The Task Force members have been checking other BART stations for accessibility as well. Carmen Rivera-Hendrickson stressed the importance of finding accessibility issues while the stations are still in construction as it is much more expensive to add the accessibility features later on.

10. Operational Issues

Roberta Ishmael reported a non-accessible bus stop and malfunctioning traffic light at the Route 15 stop by Target and Walmart shopping centers in Livermore. Carmen Rivera-Hendrickson said there is another committee that deals with curb cut and sidewalk issues and works with the cities. Staff said that LAVTA works closely with the cities on bus stop accessibility and safety issues and these issues should be brought to WAAC. Staff has also applied for a grant for bus stop accessibility improvements.

Sue Tuite inquired why the bus stop on Dublin Blvd at Sierra Court is backwards. Staff responded that because the right-of-way on that location in front of Custom Carpets is limited and the owner of Custom Carpets declined to give up 6 inches of their land that would be necessary to maintain the ADA clearance, the shelter had to be flipped around.

Carmen Rivera-Hendrickson reported she has heard riders expressing the need for a bus stop at Dublin Blvd and Regional. Staff said the number of bus stops LAVTA is allowed to put on Dublin Blvd is limited, but will look into it. Staff said that these riders should send a formal request to Wheels so that staff can follow up. So far LAVTA has not received such a request.

Carmen Rivera-Hendrickson reported that her chair was mis-hooked in a bus. Carmen said that she has straps, but some drivers are trying to hook it up on electronic section. Staff replied that in these kinds of situations it is important to file a formal complaint so that staff can investigate and follow up.

Staff gave an update on the bus stop by Walmart. Since the bus stop is on Walmart property, LAVTA cannot install a shelter there without Walmart's permission. Staff has contacted Walmart several times offering a free bus shelter, but so far it has been unsuccessful. It may help if riders approached Walmart about this issue.

Staff gave an update to Joan Helen Hall's request for a bus stop improvement by her church on East Avenue. Staff discovered that this location has no curb or sidewalk. Curbs and sidewalks are responsibilities of the cities. Staff said that a little further west there is a sidewalk and curb. Staff is talking with the city about possible relocation of the bus stop.

Herb Hastings was inquiring about the status of the Dublin side BART station stop. Staff said that the two Route 12 bus bays are currently ripped up and the hold-up is the furniture. BART requires very specific furniture on their property and

LAVTA can only use BART-approved vendors. There is a very long lead time. The BART-approved vendor initially told staff it would be 10 days from approval, but it has now changed to 1.5 months. The latest update is that the benches will be put in and the concrete restored on the last week of November.

Sue Tuite and Herb Hastings reported that some buses are driving too fast through the BART station and some drivers are on their cell phones. Staff responded that this is against the state law and these instances should be reported to LAVTA through customer complaints process (via web or 925-455-7500 number). There are also recordings on buses, but since these get over-recorded, it is important to notify LAVTA in a timely manner after the incident occurs.

13. Adjournment

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:14 pm