DRAFT
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MINUTES
January 31, 2007

Chair Knox White called the Transportation Commission to order at 7:30 p.m.

1. **ROLL CALL –** Roll was called and the following recorded.

Members Present:
John Knox White
Michael Krueger
Robert McFarland
Eric Schatmeier
Srikat Subramaniam

Absent:
Jeff Knoth
Robb Ratto

Staff Present:
Obaid Khan, Supervising Civil Engineer
Barry Bergman, Program Specialist II

3. AGENDA CHANGES

There were none.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chair Knox White advised that there was not a quorum to vote on the minutes of October 25, 2006, and November 15, 2006.

Chair Knox White invited a motion to approve the minutes of December 13, 2006.
Commissioner Schatmeier moved approval of the minutes. Commissioner Krueger seconded the motion. Motion passed (4-0 McFarland abstained).

4. COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

6A. REVIEW AND PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS ON FINAL DRAFT FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM CONCEPTS – FINAL.

Staff Khan presented the staff report and noted that two previous presentations had been made. The first recommendation from the Multimodal Circulation Subcommittee was to divide the arterials into two categories: regional arterials and island arterials. The regional arterials would carry regionally significant traffic in and out of the City, and island arterials would carry traffic across the City and within City limits. The second recommendation would be to examine those roadways that would be reduced in their current classification. They are currently classified as transitional arterials or collectors. The Subcommittee recommended that Bayview Drive be classified as a local street, however, staff recommended that it be classified as transitional collector, like Buena Vista Avenue or Gibbons Drive because of traffic volumes, connectivity and land use. Staff had previously recommended that an implementation policy be developed to examine the design guidelines development as part of the transportation master plan. It would address some conflicts and concerns raised by the consultant, and would remove the conflicts in the future during implementation.

Mark Spencer of DKS Consultants, displayed a PowerPoint presentation and summarized the points covered in previous meetings. The defined objective was to meet the needs of all street users and the surrounding community while promoting the multimodal transportation system in Alameda. Concerns raised included how street classifications could help guide the City towards its future goals in terms of where and how the streets would operate, as well as whether it could be achieved in conjunction with other transportation policies. Modal priority streets, bike priority streets and transit priority streets were discussed, as well as truck routes. He noted that the land use and modal classification overlays needed to be balanced with the auto needs. The street types were defined according to the types of trips served and network connectivity. The street function would be defined by the existing uses; those design and operational needs would need to be addressed. The terms arterial, collector and local were retained, which would provide consistency with FHWA terminology and CalTrans definitions, and would facilitate applying for funding and dealing with other regional programs. He described the characteristics of each type of street and their functionality in detail, especially in relation to transit, bicycles and pedestrians.

Mr. Spencer described the implementation strategy as a firm and flexible application, and noted that the modal priorities must be followed to ensure connectivity of the bike, transit and truck networks. He believed it was important to be firm on what was a bike street, emphasizing the bike amenities, and the same with the transit streets, etc. He noted that it was important to be flexible in balancing what happens within the limited right of way. He noted that most of Alameda has a built-out network. He noted that they recommended integrating the street classification system and an implementation policy into the TMP. He noted that design standards, block lengths, cross-sections, and congestion standards all affected and counterbalanced each other.

Public Comment

Jim Strehlow complimented the consultant on the PowerPoint presentation and requested a copy. He was satisfied with the designation of Gibbons Drive as a transitional collector. He inquired how new development would be added to the plan in the future, and how traffic volumes would be measured and updated.

Bill Smith expressed concern about traffic in the Tube, and noted that as a frequent bicyclist, he was concerned about the condition of the roads. He believed new technology would help the efficiency and safety of auto/bicycle traffic. He would like to see new signage that would enhance traffic safety.

Scott Brady asked the Commission to remember that every street in Alameda was residential when considering the street designations. He noted that people backing out of their driveways severely limited the traffic flow. He noted that traffic on those streets will not be able to go faster because of the designation change.

Closed Public Comment

Chair Knox White noted that the specific planning issues would be dealt with during the planning of the specific sites. He noted that with respect to traffic counts, the guiding policies of the Transportation Master Plan, traffic counts and volume counts were part of monitoring. He inquired whether the types of streets had been specifically stated.

Staff Khan replied that under the County Congestion Management Agency, regular traffic volumes were collected on the streets in the system on either a two- or five-year cycle. He would report that information to the Commission at a future date. He noted that trend counts would be collected to show how the traffic volumes change in certain areas of the City. Staff would be amenable to that being either a policy or guideline.

Commissioner Schatmeier objected to the characterization of the modal overlay governing transit as a "transit priority." He noted that he was a member of the Subcommittee, and recalled that they were defining <u>candidates</u> for transit service, not priorities. He stated that there were three main purposes in identifying these streets: 1) to identify streets that are candidates for physical improvements, 2) assist the policymakers, and 3) predictability about possible locations for transit. The last two were the factors given the greatest consideration by the Subcommittee.

Commissioner Krueger inquired whether it would help to add language stating whether the street currently carries transit. He noted that if there are existing or planned transit services on any particular street, the associated physical improvements could be included in the design of any project.

Chair Knox White suggested replacing "can assist in prioritizing" with "prioritized."

Commissioner Schatmeier noted that they had shied away once from addressing transit streets as anything more than candidates because of the potential uproar it would create by defining them as priority transit streets. He noted that was something they had tried to avoid before. He suggested that the wording be changed to acknowledge that many streets labeled as transit streets that either don't have transit, and probably won't in the foreseeable future without changes in budget realities. He did not believe there was a reason to create an uproar by changing what they had intended by classifying those streets as transit streets in the first place. He suggested labeling them as transit candidates.

Commissioner Krueger noted that he would not want to water the language down to the point where it downplayed the physical improvements. He indicated that it is important to say that the modal overlay will determine the priority, not just suggest it.

Chair Knox White suggested changing the language under "Modal Overlays" to read, "The modal overlay classifications prioritize operational elements within the constraints of the right of way." *Commission Schatmeier* noted that would be acceptable.

Commissioner Krueger asked why the exclusive transit right-of-way along Clement Ave. does not extend all the way to the Fruitvale Bridge. This would mean that there would be a shared right-of-way at the most congested point in the corridor.

Staff Khan noted that both High Street and Park Street currently function almost at capacity, and as a result, staff was examining Fruitvale Bridge to absorb additional capacity. Also, lower level of transit priorities intersect at Tilden, so this could serve as a transfer point.

Commissioner Krueger noted that future plans depended on whether the City was serious about the mode shift and emissions reductions or not. He inquired whether the language on page 27 could be strengthened, stating that the modal overlays will be used to establish the priorities, not just that they can assist. He also asked that on page 30, the language referring to "enhanced bus stops" be changed to "enhanced bus stops/stations" because that could go beyond a mere bus stop, and might involve a different mode.

Commissioner Krueger noted that the reference to a commercial main street on page 20 seemed somewhat weak in stating that bike racks might not be feasible on some streets. He noted that in his submitted comments, he inquired about the language about sidewalks on both sides of the street, which had been originally mentioned in the matrix beginning on page 34. It appeared that that language was dropped, but he could not find any language addressing it. He inquired whether it was delegated to the pedestrian plan.

Mr. Spencer noted that the pedestrian aspects had been taken out in several places, because they anticipated it would be included in the pedestrian planning activity; there was a certain amount of redundancy assumption built in to it. He noted that sidewalks on both sides of the street was not necessarily a given, and there could be right of way tradeoff decisions could be made as well.

Commissioner Krueger felt that the strong emphasis on pedestrian access in the General Plan, as related to the strong support for walkability in the community, that he believed that having sidewalks on both sides of the streets would be very important. *Chair Knox White* suggested deferring this discussion to the pedestrian plan. *Commissioner Krueger* agreed.

Chair Knox White also noted that on page 2, under "Objectives of the Alameda Classification System," a key issue to address is cut-through traffic. He believed the wording should be changed to "residential traffic impacts." On page 7, under "Numbers of Lanes," it read, "This should be determined through operational evaluation; it should be tied to threshold LOS, which are being developed as part of the TMP, and should also be weighed against neighborhood

livability issues." He observed that throughout the text, a lot of decisions made seemed to be based on LOS. Also, under "Congestion Tolerance – Congestion Should Be Reduced," it was also determined through threshold LOS for different modes of transportation and balanced against livability issues.

Chair Knox White noted that with respect to Bayview, the subcommittee had suggested that it be a local street; it is currently in the plan as a transitional collector. He invited the Commissioners' feelings on that issue.

Commissioner Schatmeier believed that was reasonable, and believed it should be a local street.

Commissioner Krueger stated that the transitional designation seems appropriate, as it acknowledges the street's current volumes.

Commissioner McFarland agreed with *Commissioner Krueger's* assessment.

In response to an inquiry by *Commissioner Krueger* whether the traffic counts had been affected by the traffic calming measures, *Staff Khan* believed that 30% of traffic volume on Bayview Drive had been reduced. Staff supports the transitional designation, as it would give the City the power to make changes in the future to reduce traffic volumes.

Chair Knox White noted that under Land Use Overlays (General section), it read, "All unmarked local streets are designated residential corridor streets," but a map indicated highlighted residential corridor streets. He noted that the markings should be consistent. He believed it was odd to highlight a few key streets.

Chair Knox White noted that page 19, under Residential Corridor Streets (Adequate Travel Lanes), read, "Provide sufficient lanes for adequate capacity to minimize queuing impacts at residential driveways…" but this did not seem to be a residential-oriented goal. He stated that livability issues should be more of a goal than ensuring that traffic proceeded so that there was no queuing.

Chair Knox White invited Commission comment under Commercial, with respect to keeping building frontages at a common setback to maintain a pedestrian-friendly environment. Also, building entrances should face the street. Also, he suggested that would be a design feature of the streets under Commercial Main Street. *Commissioner Krueger* supported that view, and believed it was very important for the pedestrian environment.

Chair Knox White wished to add to the language, "Marked pedestrian crosswalks are to be frequent and should be based upon pedestrian activity *and activity generators."* He noted that sometimes there was no pedestrian activity because people were scared to cross the street. He concurred with *Commissioner Krueger* about the bike racks; if operationally and physically feasible, he believed there should be bike racks on each block, and if there was no place to fit them, the Commission could address the issue in that event.

Chair Knox White noted that on page 22, he was reluctant to reduce the parking requirements in the City. He noted that the language "if sufficient off-street parking is provided" indicated that on one hand, the City planned to reduce that need, and on the other hand, a plan was being put together that requires additional parking capacity. He noted that while "sufficient" was not defined there, but that it could be worded, "off-street provided as called out in the parking plan."

Staff Khan suggested referencing the General Plan, since the parking plan will probably modify the General Plan. *Chair Knox White* agreed.

Chair Knox White made several additional comments:

- that under "Sidewalks" under Commercial Street, wished to add the language "can be narrower than residential corridor, *an exception for designated corridors like the Cross Alameda Trail."*
- the language under "Regional Arterial" read, "Three to four lanes as determined by capacity needs *and modal constraints"* or "*modal priority maps."*
- On page 38, "Island Arterial Overlays" (Bicycle, School Zone and Recreation), read, "…ideal for bicycle network, bike lanes, wind safety network, connectivity are provided, provide intersection amenities . . . pedestrian comfort and access are highest priorities in conjunction with other street functions, appropriate lighting and suggested route signs, prioritize amenities against lane width and on-street parking." He believed that the language under the pedestrian aspect should appear under the bicycle aspects as well.
- on page 40, "Number of Lanes" (Island Arterial), it should read, "two to three lanes," removing "typical, but may have four lanes."
- under "Island Collector," the grid under Number of Lanes did not agree with the text, which read "two to three lanes"; the grid read "no more than two lanes." He was agreeable with either one.
- On page 44, under "Local Street Overlays" (Bicycles), read, "Local streets will likely not require bicycle treatments"; he believed that the bike overlay and the determination of the bike plan should decided whether or not there were bicycle treatments.
- under "Recommendations for the City of Alameda Implementation Plan," there did not appear to be an actual recommendation. He inquired whether DKS had a recommendation for an implementation plan that they believed would be a good fit for Alameda. *Mr. Spencer* noted that they tried to create a unique presentation for Alameda, and that an individual implementation plan must be created to work for the City.
- on all of the maps, particularly the bike map, the Clement Extension was drawn incorrectly; it was drawn to indicate that it connected directly into Eagle. He noted that it should connect further up into Atlantic. He would like to add the connection of the bike path through the Beltline.
- *Chair Knox White suggested adding a path connection between the end of Portola and Ninth Street. This may be possible in the future.*

Commissioner Krueger would like to see a dedicated right of way off the Island, and believed the Clement Extension and Fernside acted as alternate routes to the other bridges.

Chair Knox White stated that Fernside is okay as an island arterial, but that Clement should be classified as a regional arterial. *Commissioner Krueger* noted that this would be predicated on the completion of the Clement extension.

Staff Khan stated that once the Clement extension is completed, and it becomes an arterial, that the hope is to downgrade the classification of Blanding.

Commissioner Krueger moved that the designation for Clement from Tilden to Ohlone Street should be Regional Arterial. *Commissioner Schatmeier* seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

Commissioner Krueger moved that the entire length of Tilden from Park Street to the Miller-Sweeney Bridge be classified as a potential exclusive transit right-of-way. *Commissioner McFarland* seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

Chair Knox White suggested that Encinal at Sherman should be considered a commercial main street. He also asked why Oak Street was classified as a collector, and did not understand what it collected, as it was only two blocks long. *Staff Khan* noted that it collected traffic from side streets, as represented by traffic volumes, and that provided connectivity between two arterials. *Mr. Spencer* noted that it acted as a bypass for Park Street in the area.

Commissioner Krueger asked that the school and recreation map be modified to reflect the relocation of Island High School.

Commissioner Schatmeier moved to accept the consultant's report with the comments made by the Commissioners. *Commissioner Krueger* seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

Chair Knox White complimented the consultant on a job well done.

Commissioner Schatmeier moved to continue the meeting after a five minute break. *Commissioner Krueger* seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

7A. ALAMEDA LANDING TDM GOALS AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT – 1ST OF 2 PRESENTATIONS.

Bruce Knopf, of Catellus, noted that his presentation was intended to engender Commission feedback and comments, and will be brought before the Commission again in February. Their objective was operate a successful Transportation Demand Management program, and reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips, as well as to produce a draft TDM plan that will go to the Planning Board in March. The program would be operational on "day one" – defined as occupation of 100,000 square feet of the commercial development, or 150 housing units. He noted that in the project's EIR, they did not take credit for any anticipated benefits from a TDM program. The use was intended to be pedestrian-friendly and bike-friendly, as well as transit-oriented.

The program's financing mechanism will be permanent, with resources to be provided by the tenants and residents of the development. He stated that the primary feature of the program would be a supplementary ground shuttle system that, when viewed in conjunction with AC Transit, can provide 15-minute headways, based on their hope that AC Transit will provide service to and within the site.

Mr. Knopf noted that the program also included a water shuttle, operating for a minimum of one year, and providing service between the project and Jack London Square. The water shuttle feasibility study would be completed by day one. ProLogis has been working with Bike Alameda to identify a window when that shuttle would begin operation, and they are proposing to start no later than completion of the second phase of development.

Mr. Knopf invited Commission feedback on a process for monitoring the elements of the TDM program, and what criteria should be used to evaluate the program. He noted that the working draft has not been reviewed by Public Works or the Planning staff. He noted that the parking pricing and parking cashing out options had been removed from the TDM draft, because they would not be viable given the demand for parking in Alameda.

Mr. Knopf noted that the next steps would be to received the Commission's feedback and comments, and return with a draft plan in late February. They planned to present that to the Planning Board at their March 12, 2007, meeting. He introduced the TDM plan manager, John Atkinson, who had been active in this area for almost 20 years. He had previously run the systems in Santa Clara, Berkeley and Downtown Walnut Creek.

Staff Bergman noted that he received a communication from Nathan Landau at AC Transit earlier in the day, and wished to present it. He believed Mr. Knopf covered the major points involved in the program, and wished to ensure there was a clear understanding about the baseline for measuring the trip reductions. He noted that he received the letter from AC Transit too late to circulate to the Commission, and read it into the record:

> AC Transit has concerns about the way the Draft Alameda Landing Transportation Demand Management agreement is structured. Unfortunately, I am unable to attend the Commission meeting tonight to address the issue. AC Transit is pleased that a commitment to TDM policies and implementation measures is being made for this important project. We have not yet had an opportunity to discuss the proposed agreement with City staff, or to review it fully, having seen it for the first time yesterday. The

agreement is structured around rerouting of an AC Transit line and addition of a supplemental shuttle. We are concerned that this combination is not necessarily the best approach to providing transit service to the site. This divided duplicative service nay undercut the use of AC Transit service to the site, particularly if the shuttle is free to the passenger. Divided service does not necessarily advance the goal of encouraging the residents and employees of Alameda Landing to use the regular transit system.

AC Transit would also appreciate the opportunity to consider routes in this area in the context of our evolving plans for West Alameda and Alameda Point. We recognize the importance of providing frequent service, especially in the peak hour, to encourage ridership.

AC Transit is developing ecopass programs, which provide systemwide bus passes to employees and residents of a given development. We would like to discuss ecopass opportunities, which in some cases can raise funds for additional service in this context. Therefore, we would request the opportunity to meet with Planning and Public Works staff, and with the developer to discuss this TDM plan before it is finalized. I would stress that AC Transit does not have a preconceived plan at this time, but instead wishes to explore and resolve the issues involved in a timely manner."

Mr. Knopf noted that they had not begun to consider pricing, and added that they want to work with AC Transit as much as possible. They would entertain contracts with them, and did not wish to duplicate service.

Commissioner Schatmeier requested further information from staff regarding dropping the two most effective strategies. *Mr. Knopf* noted that one of the staff reports reported that 71% of the Alameda residents who commuted to San Francisco took transit. He noted that reflected the cost for parking in San Francisco, and that because that was not a reality in San Francisco, it did not seem to be a feasible strategy to put on the table as an effective tool.

Commissioner Krueger inquired whether transit passes had been considered. *Mr. Knopf* noted that it was included in the conceptual plan a year before, and noted that its omission was unintentional, and that they would explore it.

Public Comment

Bill Smith noted that Mr. Knopf had previously been a City employee, and that Don Parker had helped develop Marina Village. He understood that Marina Village was an assessment district, and that this property was next to Marina Village with respect to impacts. He inquired whether there should be an assessment district on this property.

Mr. Knopf noted that there were districts for both the residential and the commercial retail that would pay for the TDM program on an ongoing basis.

Jon Spangler noted that he had long been interested in improving the Estuary crossing, and noted that he had served on the Estuary Water Shuttle Task Force with *Mr. Knopf* and other Catellus

staff. He commended Catellus for being on the leading edge with a TDM, which he viewed as an unfolding work in progress. He believed it was important to integrate AC Transit's views as expressed in the memo, and that best practices should be implemented with other organizations. He believed the City should be careful in evaluating the TDM plan and the impact of Catellus at Alameda Landing overall, not just in terms of shoppers, workers and business owners, but also the potential costs and benefits realized by the entire community from the TDM options that would be funded by residents of Alameda and Oakland. He hoped that as the City evaluates the TDM, that it will be able to examine tourism funding, funding through the Port of Oakland and Chamber of Commerce, or other economic development sources normally used in Alameda. He was encouraged by this progressive approach.

Jeff Cambra, Board member of Bike Alameda, spoke on behalf of the Estuary Crossing Coalition, agreed with Mr. Spangler's comments. He noted that the Coalition's interests include:

1) Establishing criteria for the earliest possible initiation of the Estuary water shuttle service, taking into account that there is sufficient project improvements and occupancy to create ridership;
2) Such criteria should include
    a. extra Alameda Landing west end demand, as determined by non-developer-funded surveys and City-sponsored feasibility studies;
    b. operational effectiveness as determined by the use of Estuary water shuttle ridership surveys and other TDM surveys proposed by Catellus to determine regional impact;
    c. any disagreement regarding initiation of the Estuary water shuttle should be addressed as part of the TDM annual report submitted to the Council.

Mr. Cambra noted that it was the Coalition's understanding that the Coalition and Catellus agree in principle on these interests, and that the Coalition supports this draft document as it relates to the Estuary water shuttle. Due to the short time between the release of the draft TDM document and this meeting, the Coalition will continue to meet with Catellus to provide additional comments for the next TC meeting in February.

Closed Public Comment

Commissioner Schatmeier noted that he was interested in the shuttle service, and that Commission as a whole was interested in reducing single-occupant automobile trips, rather than trips in general. He wished to echo the AC Transit comments and concerns about how a shuttle service can be overlaid with AC Transit service. He understood that the details had not been worked out yet. He believed that 30-minute headways are not sufficient. He added that pricing needs to be further investigated, and that the AC Transit fare from the development into downtown Oakland of $1.75, plus $0.25 for a transfer, when piggybacked on top of a BART fare would be a deterrent to ridership. He stated that free shuttles such as those operated MacArthur BART to the Kaiser facility also detracts from AC Transit ridership. He suggested subsidizing the AC Transit fare on the 19 line in coordination with a free shuttle.

Commissioner Krueger stated that the utility of transit increases when integrated into a larger network. For this reason, that he was not generally a fan of small, limited shuttle services, and

that there was more benefit being part of a larger system. In lieu of a shuttle, he suggested providing an Ecopass, or a combination of an Ecopass and contracting with AC Transit for additional service to get people onto regular AC Transit buses.

John Atkinson, consultant to Catellus, noted that the shuttle was the cornerstone of the program, and added that they intended to apply a systemic approach to reduce SOV traffic. He noted that they were exploring ride-matching systems with carpools and possibly van pools. He stated that AC Transit has indicated that not all of their buses are equipped for handling an Ecopass program. Also, in trying to price services, AC Transit was $130-140 an hour to run shuttles, approximately double the cost of a private operator; an economically feasible situation should be found. Catellus' goal is to coordinate not just with AC Transit, but also with BART and the ferry, and that they want to work with AC Transit as much as possible.

Staff Bergman noted that the Interagency Liaison Committee had addressed the possibility of using an Ecopass. AC Transit had not been ready to implement that concept yet, and that they had three programs that had been individually negotiated. They are currently trying to standardize that process, and would will an update at the next ILC meeting within the next month.

A discussion of integrating the service into the Island grid followed.

Commissioner Krueger was surprised to see that the monitoring would be done only through surveys.

Mr. Knopf noted that Catellus has proposed taking the ITE trip generation rates that such a development was expected to generate in the outlying and surrounding area, and to take those numbers and examine the level of reduction in SOV trips expected to accomplish. Through direct surveys, the level of usage would be compared against the survey results.

Commissioner Schatmeier suggested measuring at the key access points of the actual car trips, and running the numbers from that.

Andrew Thomas, Planning Department, noted that *Mr. Knopf* and staff had done a good job in introducing the major issues. He noted that the Planning Department saw this as the beginning of a much larger West End TDM program. He believed that although he was very happy that Catellus had stepped forward in committing the $425,000 per year at buildout, it would take a lot more money to run an effective transportation program. The Planning Department believed that Catellus should create an organization so that future projects may be built in the West End. He noted that Alameda Point could have 1400-1500 market-rate units, which could potentially provide a major financial contribution to this program. The Planning Department believed that a major source of annual operating funding should be generated which should be turned over to AC Transit when it became big enough so they could provide the levels of services needed in the West End. If an Ecopass program is initiated, everyone who pays the annual fee may participate. He believed it was important to get this organization started now. He noted that they needed to be able to adjust to changing system requirements.

Commissioner Krueger believed the most significant goal was the reduction of the total number of SOV trips generated by the project. He noted that while emissions were important, the trips had the most impact on the neighborhoods.

Chair Knox White believed there could be benefits of a TDM program that reduced West End trips that did not come out of carbon trading for commute trading, and there could be a benefit for the rides that the project could get credit for. He felt he did not have enough information to make a determination about whether an 8-10% trip reduction is appropriate. He noted that the goal was to mitigate traffic, and that the Commission's EIR policy is not to expand roadways to mitigate the traffic, and to mitigate traffic aggressively through TDM. He stated that the TDM program should be as aggressive as possible within the project budget, and that the TDM program should not take credit for ridership on AC Transit's 19 bus line. He suggested using a biennial survey of the HOAs to get trip information. He noted that he supports the development of a TMA, but he believes it should be connected to the City, rather than be an independent agency. He believed the TMA should focus on the West End, not just the project participants. He would like the use of AC Transit to be the preferred agency when possible, but understood that AC Transit recognized the use of private shuttles when needed.

Chair Knox White noted that

- the first bullet point under Administration (Key Administration Goals, page 9), read "represent Alameda Landing"; he believed the TMA should represent a broader scope and should represent the City.
- He was surprised to see costs associated with a guaranteed ride home and ride matching, since those were both regional project programs that were free to appropriately sized businesses.
- Under "Evaluation of Success," the language talked about "participation rate of Alameda Landing employees in the program." He was concerned that a private shuttle and AC Transit, it would be beneficial to the TDM program to draw riders away from some other form so they could get credit for success. For that reason, he believed it was important to count cars and use surveys, as opposed to asking whether they were using the services.
- Page 12 discussed "During Phase A, trip reduction target is 2 to 3 percent"; the original memo said "5%." He understood there would be a ramp-up, but 2 to 3% seemed very low to him. He believed that if there would be a lower percentage goal for the first five years, he believed the project should be re-evaluated when the real goal was met.
- He recommended evaluating the TDM program based on cost per rider, and nothing else, due to the limited funding for this program.
- He noted that RIDES no longer exists, and that the program is currently called 511 Rideshare.
- He said that he would email his comments on the surveys.

Staff Bergman noted that traffic congestion in the tubes is primarily an issue heading out of Alameda during the AM peak hour, and heading into Alameda during the PM peak hour. However, TDM programs are generally more successful when applied to employment sites, so the potential for the TDM program proposed by ProLogis to reduce traffic congestion is greater in the direction opposite that of the major congestion problems. He requested feedback from the Commission regarding how this issue should relate to the program's goals.

Chair Knox White suggested that those trips causing the congestion should be targeted, such as the City-outbound trips. He noted that while the specific percentage could not be determined now, both an overall trip reduction goal and a peak-hour trans-Island trip reduction goal should be identified.

Staff Khan noted that the Congestion Management Agencies created goals for the County, and assigned trips in a mode split, which could be looked as a base trip generation.

Chair Knox White did not wish to penalize the developer with a baseline, but believed they should be aggressive in their goals to mitigate the traffic to as high a level as possible.

Commissioner Krueger wished to raise the issue of parking fees and parking cashout, and there may be a fear that would reduce the attractiveness of the development to businesses.

Chair Knox White noted that most of Alameda had free parking, compared to San Francisco, and that companies may decide to locate across the Estuary where there would be free parking.

Mr. Knopf noted that they wished to be treated equally as compared to other property owners.

No action was taken.

8. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 PM.

G:\pubworks\LT\TRANSPORTATION\COMMITTEES\TC\2007\022807\January 31 TC Minutes - Final-rev.doc