

# County Connection

2477 Arnold Industrial Way    Concord, CA 94520-5326    (925) 676-7500    countyconnection.com

## MARKETING, PLANNING, & LEGISLATIVE MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, August 6th, 2015  
8:30 a.m.

City of Pleasant Hill Community Room  
100 Gregory Ln  
Pleasant Hill, CA

1. Approval of Agenda
2. Public Communication
3. Approval of Minutes of June 4th, 2015\*
4. State Legislation: Support ABX1 7, SBX1 8, ABX1 8, SBX1 7\*
5. Federal Legislative Update: Status of T-21 Re authorization
6. Clipper Marketing\*
7. Lamorinda Transit Study – Public Input on Options\*
8. Marketing Reports:
  - a. Website User Report
  - b. Social Media Statistics
  - c. Community Events\*
9. Next Meeting – September 3, 2015
10. Adjournment

---

\*Enclosure

FY2014/2015 MP&L Committee

Amy Worth – Orinda, Rob Schroder – Martinez, Sue Noack – Pleasant Hill

Clayton • Concord • Contra Costa County • Danville • Lafayette • Martinez  
Moraga • Orinda • Pleasant Hill • San Ramon • Walnut Creek

CENTRAL CONTRA COSTA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

## General Information

**Public Comment:** Each person wishing to address the committee is requested to complete a Speakers Card for submittal to the Committee Chair before the meeting convenes or the applicable agenda item is discussed. Persons who address the Committee are also asked to furnish a copy of any written statement to the Committee Chair. Persons who wish to speak on matters set for Public Hearings will be heard when the Chair calls for comments from the public. After individuals have spoken, the Public Hearing is closed and the matter is subject to discussion and action by the Committee.

A period of thirty (30) minutes has been allocated for public comments concerning items of interest within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee. Each individual will be allotted three minutes, which may be extended at the discretion of the Committee Chair.

**Consent Items:** All matters listed under the Consent Calendar are considered by the committee to be routine and will be enacted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless requested by a committee member or a member of the public prior to when the committee votes on the motion to adopt.

**Availability of Public Records:** All public records relating to an open session item on this agenda, which are not exempt from disclosure pursuant to the California Public Records Act, that are distributed to a majority of the legislative body, will be available for public inspection at 2477 Arnold Industrial Way, Concord, California, at the same time that the public records are distributed or made available to the legislative body. The agenda and enclosures for this meeting are posted also on our website at [www.countyconnection.com](http://www.countyconnection.com).

**Accessible Public Meetings:** Upon request, County Connection will provide written agenda materials in appropriate alternative formats, or disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to enable individuals with disabilities to participate in public meetings. Please send a written request, including your name, mailing address, phone number and brief description of the requested materials and preferred alternative format or auxiliary aid or service so that it is received by County Connection at least 48 hours before the meeting convenes. Requests should be sent to the Assistant to the General Manager, Lathina Hill, at 2477 Arnold Industrial Way, Concord, CA 94520 or [hill@countyconnection.com](mailto:hill@countyconnection.com).

**Shuttle Service:** With 24-hour notice, a County Connection LINK shuttle can be available at the BART station nearest the meeting location for individuals who want to attend the meeting. To arrange for the shuttle service, please call Robert Greenwood – 925/680 2072, no later than 24 hours prior to the start of the meeting.

### Currently Scheduled Board and Committee Meetings

Board of Directors:	Thursday, August 20, 9:00 a.m., County Connection Board Room
Administration & Finance:	Wednesday, August 5, 9:00 a.m. 1676 N. California Blvd., S620, Walnut Creek
Advisory Committee:	Tuesday, September 8, 2:00 p.m., County Connection Board Room
Marketing, Planning & Legislative:	Thursday, August 6, 8:30 a.m., 100 Gregory Ln, Pleasant Hill
Operations & Scheduling:	Tuesday, August 4, 8:00 a.m., 309 Diablo Rd, Danville

**The above meeting schedules are subject to change. Please check the County Connection Website ([www.countyconnection.com](http://www.countyconnection.com)) or contact County Connection staff at 925/676-1976 to verify date, time and location prior to attending a meeting.**

**This agenda is posted on County Connection's Website ([www.countyconnection.com](http://www.countyconnection.com)) and at the County Connection Administrative Offices, 2477 Arnold Industrial Way, Concord, California**

**Summary Minutes**  
**Marketing, Planning, and Legislative Committee**  
County Connection Administration Offices  
2477 Arnold Industrial Way, Concord  
**May 7th, 2015, 8:30 a.m.**

**Directors:** Directors Worth, Noack

**Staff:** Rick Ramacier, Anne Muzzini, Laramie Bowron **Public:** None

**Call to Order:** Meeting called to order at 8:35 a.m. by Director Worth

1. **Approval of Agenda Items:** Agenda was approved.
2. **Public Comment and/or Communication:** None
3. **Approval of MP&L Summary Minutes for May 7, 2015:** Minutes were approved.
4. **Title VI Analysis for Martinez Shuttle:** Mr. Bowron presented the Title VI analysis for the Martinez Shuttle. The analysis showed that there were no disparate impacts on minority or low income riders. The Committee recommended approval by the Board.
5. **Performance Indicators – Short Range Transit Plan:** Mr. Bowron presented the chapter of the SRTTP on performance and recommended that an adjustment be made to the standard for fixed route performance to better measure different types of routes and the fact that we measure 100% of the timepoints. The Committee discussed indicators related to cost and recommended increased the cost per passenger to \$8.50 per passenger and modifying the on time performance measurement in accordance with staff recommendation.
6. **Marketing Reports** – The Committee reviewed the marketing reports was happy to see an increase in the use of the mobile transit app in response to the recent marketing campaign.
7. **Next Scheduled Meeting** – The next meeting was scheduled for July 2nd
8. **Adjournment** – The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 a.m.

Minutes prepared and submitted by: Anne Muzzini, Director of Planning & Marketing

# County Connection

## INTER OFFICE MEMO

To: MP&L Committee

Date: July 28, 2015

From: Kristina Martinez, Civil Rights Administrator

Reviewed by:

---

**SUBJECT:** State Legislation: Support ABX1 7, SBX1 8, ABX1 8, SBX1 7

---

### Staff Recommendation:

Staff requests that the MP&L committee discuss and forward to the Board of Directors recommendations to:

- Support ABX1 7, SBX1 8 (Cap and Trade)
- Support ABX1 8, SBX1 7 (Sales and Use Tax)

### Background:

The Governor has called an extraordinary session on transportation. Below are four bills that have been introduced in the extraordinary session that address transportation funding.

#### ABX1 7, SBX1 8 (Cap and Trade) – Nazarian, Hill

As provided through previous updates, the ultimate goal of the Cap and Trade Program is to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions through mechanisms that allow for clean technology investments. Within its allocation plan, the program currently appropriates 10% of funding proceeds to the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program and 5% to the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP). Instead, this bill would increase funding allocations from 10% to 20% in the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program. Similarly, it would increase funding allocations from 5% to 10% in the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program.

An identical bill, SBX1 8, has been introduced and provides for the same increases in annual proceeds through the Cap and Trade Program. Introduced by Hill, this bill is also supported by its co-authors, which includes Senator Loni Hancock. Both bills would benefit County Connection by doubling the level of operating assistance received through the Cap and Trade Program. Additionally, it would provide an increase in the opportunities available which County Connection can compete for through capital programs.

#### ABX1 8, SBX1 7 (Sales and Use Tax) – Chiu & Bloom, Allen

Current law, which has established general sales and use tax, also enforces an additional tax on diesel fuel. The existing rate of additional diesel sales and use tax is 1.75%, which becomes available through formula allocation for public transportation use. ABX1 8 proposes to increase the diesel sales and use tax from 1.75% to 5.25%, effective July 1, 2016. An identical bill, SBX1 7, was also introduced by Senator Allen in support of the increase.

County Connection's FY2016 budget projects STA allocations of just over \$3.3 million in funding. This contrasts with its previous projected funding levels in FY2010 of \$3.8 million, which was expected to increase at higher levels as the years progressed. Such funding levels were projected prior to the gas tax swap, which occurred in 2010. Six years later, County Connection is at 87% of its previous projection due to the severe loss of funding allocations as a result of the gas tax swap. During this time, it was implied by Legislature and the Governor that once the economy improved and stabilized, it would address the significant transit operation revenue issue that the gas tax swap caused.

Staff has yet to determine the impact of this bill to County Connection. Therefore, it is difficult to project the level of revenue this would bring to the Authority. However, it is reasonable to assume based on existing regional policies that if enacted, this legislation could provide County Connection with a minimum of at least \$2 million annually in additional operating funding.

#### Additional Information

For the committee's reference and interest, attached are all legislative bills that have been brought forward during the extraordinary session on transportation.

#### **Updates on Significant Legislation Previously Brought to MP&L Committee:**

##### AB 1250 – Bloom

AB 1250, which would have originally exempted agencies through January 1, 2016 to procure buses while legislators addressed the bus axle weight limit, has been amended to put forward a more permanent solution. This bill has moved out of the Assembly and through the Senate Transportation Committee. It is set to be heard by the Senate Appropriations Committee in August.

At this time, a compromise has been reached between the California Transit Association (CTA) and League of Cities which will put this bus axle weight limit issue behind. Any transit bus procurements issued between January 1, 2016 and December 31, 2017 must meet the bus axle weight limit of 25,000 pounds on any one axle. Procurements issued after 2017 must meet the bus axle weight limit, which will decrease by 1,000 pounds on any one axle every two years up until December 31, 2021. As a result, any procurement which is issued after January 1, 2022 must meet the set bus axle weight limit of 22,000 pounds on any one axle. County Connection is currently on record to support this bill.

##### SB 231 – Gaines

County Connection took an oppose position on SB 231 which would cause STA formula changes statewide based upon population. The bill referenced allocation amendments with regard to the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, whose population was based upon the number of visitors rather than actual residents. County Connection viewed this as setting an unfair precedence for formula abuse of STA funds. Since then, the bill has been amended to exclude this piece from its proposed legislation.

##### SB 391 – Huff

SB 391 proposed an increase to public transportation safety and protection, including assault and battery committed against transit employees. This has become a two year bill.



July 21, 2015

Transportation Special Session Legislation

Bills	Subject	Status	Client - Position
<b><u>ABX1 1</u></b> <b>(Alejo D)</b> Transportation funding.	<p>ABX 1 is the reintroduction of AB 227, which was held in the Assembly Budget Committee due to the impact the bill would have on the general fund. ABX 1 includes the following provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Halt the use of truck weight fees for debt service payments,</li> <li>• Require all loans made to the general fund from transportation accounts to be repaid by December 31, 2018,</li> <li>• Halt the diversion of "Non-Article 19" funds to transportation debt service,</li> <li>• Specify that all swap excise tax revenue would be allocated 44% to the STIP, 12% to the SHOPP, and 44% to cities and counties for local streets and roads.</li> </ul> <p>While ABX 1 halts the transfer of weight fees to the general fund, it does not provided a backfill to the general fund.</p>	ASSEMBLY PRINT	
<b><u>ABX1 2</u></b> <b>(Perea D)</b> Transportation projects: comprehensive development lease agreements.	<p>ABX 2 is the reintroduction of AB 1265, which was held on the Assembly Appropriations Committee's Suspense File. This bill would repeal the sunset date on the CTC's authority to approve public-private partnership projects.</p> <p>Current law authorizes a regional transportation agency to seek approval from the CTC to enter into public-private partnership to build toll facilities. ABX 2 would repeal the existing January 1, 2017 sunset date on this authority.</p>	ASSEMBLY PRINT	
<b><u>ABX1 3</u></b> <b>(Frazier D)</b> Transportation funding.	<p>ABX 3 is a spot bill that contains legislative intent language to enact permanent and sustainable sources of funding to repair state and local roadways.</p>	ASSEMBLY PRINT	



<b><u>ABX1 4</u></b> <b>(Frazier D)</b> Transportation funding.	ABX 4 is another spot bill that includes intent language to enact sustainable funding sources to improve the state's key trade corridors and support local efforts to repair and improve local transportation infrastructure.	ASSEMBLY PRINT	
<b><u>ABX1 5</u></b> <b>(Hernández, Roger D)</b> Income taxes: credits: low-income housing: farmworker housing assistance.	ABX 5 makes several changes that would increase the amount of tax credits that could be allocated by the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee to farmworker housing projects. The bill would increase the amount of tax credits allocated to farmworker housing from \$500,000 to \$25 million annually. The bill would also state that qualified projects can include not less than 50% farmworker residents.	ASSEMBLY PRINT	
<b><u>ABX1 6</u></b> <b>(Hernández, Roger D)</b> Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program.	ABX 6 would dedicated 20% of the funds allocated to the Affordable Housing & Sustainable Communities Program to projects located in rural areas, and requires 50% of the rural set aside must be used for affordable housing projects.	ASSEMBLY PRINT	
<b><u>ABX1 7</u></b> <b>(Nazarian D)</b> Public transit: funding.	ABX 7 would increase the share of cap & trade funds dedicated to transit. The bill would increase the amount allocated to the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program from 5% to 10%, and increase the amount allocated to the Transit & Intercity Rail Capital Program from 10% to 20%.	ASSEMBLY PRINT	
<b><u>ABX1 8</u></b> <b>(Chiu D)</b> Diesel sales and use tax.	Starting on July 1, 2016, ABX 8 would impose a sales tax on diesel fuel sales of 5.25%. This revenue would be deposited into the Public Transportation Account and allocated to operators through the State Transit Assistance formula.  The bill would also sunset the existing 1.75% gas tax swap add-on sales tax imposed on diesel fuel sales on July 1, 2016. Thus replacing the existing 1.75% rate with the 5.25% rate.	ASSEMBLY PRINT	
<b><u>SBX1 1</u></b> <b>(Beall D)</b> Transportation funding.	Like SB 16, SBX 1 is the Senate Democrat's transportation funding proposal that would generate up to \$3.6 billion annually over the next 5 years. The funds would primarily be used to fund state highway and local and street and road maintenance needs.	SENATE T. & I.D.	

	<p>SBX 1 was amended on July 14<sup>th</sup> to make the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gasoline excise tax increased to 12 cents from 10 cents.</li> <li>• Diesel excise tax increases to 22 cents from 12 cent. The amount dedicated to trade corridors was increased from 2 cents to 12 cents.</li> <li>• Eliminates the BOE's annual true-up of the gas tax swap and replaces it with a fixed swap excise tax of 17 cents that would be adjusted for inflation by the BOE every three years.</li> <li>• Expands the allowable use of these funds by cities and counties to include maintenance and rehabilitation, safety projects, grade separation projects, and <i>active transportation projects associated with any other allowable project.</i></li> <li>• If a city or county has a pavement condition index of 85 or higher then it could use the funds any transportation purpose.</li> <li>• Deletes the proposed VLF increase and replaces it with a \$35 "Road Access Charge". This is in addition to the vehicle registration fee increase of \$100 on alternative fueled vehicles and \$35 on all other vehicles.</li> <li>• Transferring weight fee revenues currently used for bond debt to the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account is deleted. The \$35 Road Access Charge would be deposited into the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account, and the weight fee revenue would continue to be used for debt payments in order to eliminate any general fund impact.</li> <li>• 5% dedicated to the SLPP remains unchanged.</li> <li>• The sunset date is deleted.</li> </ul> <p>SBX 1 and SB 16 would dedicate 5% of the funds toward an incentive program to encourage new local transportation sales tax programs – counties with an existing sales tax program are not eligible for</p>		
--	--	--	--



	these funds. The remaining funds are equally split between Caltrans maintenance projects and local street and road projects.		
<b><u>SBX1 2</u></b> <b>(Huff R)</b> Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund.	<p>SBX 2 is part of the Senate Republican Caucuses proposal to direct cap &amp; trade auction revenue to transportation projects. It is estimated that this would direct \$1.9 billion to transportation projects.</p> <p>SBX 2 would that all auction proceeds that are derived from including transportation fuels in the cap &amp; trade program shall be appropriated by the Legislature for transportation infrastructure, including public streets and highways, but not high speed rail.</p>	SENATE T. & I.D.	
<b><u>SBX1 3</u></b> <b>(Vidak R)</b> Transportation bonds: highway, street, and road projects.	<p>SBX 3 would halt the use of existing bonds for construction of the high speed rail system, and redirect the use of unsold bonds to state and local transportation projects. The bill would make the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use any outstanding bond proceeds to pay off the debt of those bonds.</li> <li>• Use any unissued bonds for transportation projects whereby 50% is appropriated to Caltrans for highway maintenance and new construction, and 50% to a new program in Caltrans to fund the repair and new construction of local streets and roads.</li> </ul>	SENATE T. & I.D.	
<b><u>SBX1 4</u></b> <b>(Beall D)</b> Transportation funding.	<p>SBX 4 is spot bill that includes legislative intent language to establish a permanent and sustainable funding source to maintain and repair state highways, local roads, bridges and other critical infrastructure.</p> <p>SBX 4 has procedurally been moved to the Third Reading File without being heard in a policy committee.</p>	SENATE THIRD READING	
<b><u>SBX1 5</u></b> <b>(Beall D)</b>	SBX 5 is a spot bill with legislative intent language to establish a sustainable funding source to improve the state key trade corridors and support efforts by	SENATE THIRD READING	

Transportation funding.	<p>local governments to repair and improve local transportation infrastructure.</p> <p>SBX 5 has also been moved to the Senate Third Reading File without a policy committee hearing.</p>		
<p><b>SBX1 6</b> <b>(Runner R)</b> Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund: transportation expenditures.</p>	<p>SBX 6 makes two significant changes. First, it would delete the continuous appropriation of 25% of cap &amp; trade funds to the High Speed Rail Authority.</p> <p>Second, after the allocations are made to the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program, Transit &amp; Intercity Rail Program, and the Affordable Housing &amp; Sustainable Communities Program, the remaining 65% would be continuously appropriated to the CTC. The CTC would allocate the funds to high-priority transportation projects with 40% to state highway projects, 40% to local street and road projects, and 20% to public transit projects.</p>	SENATE T. & I.D.	
<p><b>SBX1 7</b> <b>(Allen D)</b> Diesel sales and use tax.</p>	<p>Identical to ABX 8, SBX 7 would replace the existing 1.75% diesel fuel sales tax that was imposed as part of the gas tax swap with a 5.25% sales tax rate.</p> <p>Starting on July 1, 2016, SBX 7 would impose a sales tax on diesel fuel sales of 5.25%, and sunset the existing 1.75% sales tax rate imposed on diesel fuel sales. This revenue would be deposited into the Public Transportation Account and allocated to operators through the State Transit Assistance formula.</p>	SENATE PRINT	
<p><b>SBX1 8</b> <b>(Hill D)</b> Public transit: funding.</p>	<p>SBX 8 is identical to ABX 7.</p> <p>SBX 8 would the amount allocated to the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program from 5% to 10%, and increase the amount allocated to the Transit &amp; Intercity Rail Capital Program from 10% to 20%.</p>	SENATE PRINT	
<p><b>SBX1 9</b> <b>(Moorlach R)</b> Department of Transportation.</p>	<p>SBX 9 would prohibit Caltrans from using any "one-time" revenue to pay for staff costs, and it would phase in a requirement to contract out for architectural and engineering services.</p> <p>The bill would require starting on July 1, 2016 for Caltrans to contract out 15% of all architectural and</p>	SENATE PRINT	

	engineering services. That amount would ratchet up each year for 7 years to ultimately require 50% of architectural and engineering services be contracted out.		
<b><u>SBX1 10</u></b> <b>(Bates R)</b> Regional transportation capital improvement funds.	<p>SBX 10 would substantially alter how the county share of STIP funds are allocated and programmed.</p> <p>The bill would essentially allocate the 75% share of state and federal funds to the regional transportation planning agencies as a block grant as determined by the existing formula. The regional agencies would then program these funds to projects identified in the regional transportation improvement program. The regional agencies would then notify the CTC of which projects will be funded and then the CTC would simply incorporate these projects into the STIP. Thus, eliminating the CTC's role in programming these funds.</p>	SENATE PRINT	
<b><u>SBX1 11</u></b> <b>(Berryhill R)</b> California Environmental Quality Act: exemption: roadway improvement.	<p>Existing law provides an exemption from CEQA for local road repair projects undertaken in a county of less than 100,000, and does not cross a waterway or affect any riparian areas, wetlands, or wildlife areas.</p> <p>SBX 11 would expand this CEQA exemption to apply to any state or local roadway repairs undertaken in any county.</p>	SENATE PRINT	
<b><u>SBX1 12</u></b> <b>(Runner R)</b> California Transportation Commission.	<p>SBX 12 would make the California Transportation Commission (CTC) an independent entity outside the oversight of the California State Transportation Agency.</p> <p>This bill would also authorize the CTC to adopt and make changes to the projects listed in the SHOPP as submitted by Caltrans. Any changes made to a project included in the SHOPP, such as cost increases, scope, or schedule, must first be approved by the CTC before being implemented by Caltrans.</p>	SENATE PRINT	
<b><u>SBX1 13</u></b> <b>(Vidak R)</b> Office of the	SBX 13 would create an independent Office of the Transportation Inspector General. The office would be charged with reviewing policies, practices and	SENATE PRINT	



Transportation Inspector General.	procedures, as well as conducting audits of activities involving state transportation funds. The Inspector General would be appointed by the Governor to a 6 year term.		
<b>SBX1 14</b> <b>(Cannella R)</b> Transportation projects: comprehensive development lease agreements.	Identical to ABX 2, SBX 14 would delete the sunset date on the CTC's ability to approve public-private-partnerships.  Current law authorizes a regional transportation agency to seek approval from the CTC to enter into public-private partnership to build toll facilities. ABX 2 would repeal the existing January 1, 2017 sunset date on this authority.	SENATE PRINT	





## INTER OFFICE MEMO

To: MP&L Committee

Date: July 30, 2015

From: Kristina Martinez, Civil Rights Administrator

Reviewed by:

---

**SUBJECT:** Federal Legislative Update: Status of T-21 Re authorization

---

### **Action Required:**

The following update is for informational purposes only. No action is required by the MP&L Committee.

### **Background:**

On July 30, 2015, the Senate passed a six-year surface transportation bill, increasing the amount of funding authorizations for bus capital programs and investments. In addition to this, the Senate also passed a short-term extension bill, which extends the authorization of transit and highway programs through October 29, 2015. This was passed to further allow the House to address a long-term bill.

For the committee's reference, attached is the most recent legislative update provided by APTA on the surface transportation bill and short-term extension.

To ensure delivery of Legislative Alert, please add 'LegislativeAlert@apta.com' to your email address book.  
If you are still having problems receiving our newsletter, see our whitelisting page for more details:  
<http://www.commpartners.com/website/white-listing.htm>



## LEGISLATIVE Alert

AMERICAN PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION



July 29, 2015

### House Passes Three-Month Authorization Extension

On Wednesday, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 3236, the Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015, by a vote of 385-34-1. This bill is similar to the short-term extension passed earlier this month by the House, extending the authorizations of federal transit and highway programs instead for three months through October 29, 2015 at the current funding levels. The bill transfers \$6.068 from the General Fund to the Highway Trust Fund's (HTF) Highway Account, and \$2 billion to the Mass Transit Account. The source of revenue for this extension was the same combination of tax compliance measures (roughly \$5 billion) and the extension of aviation security fees (roughly \$3 billion) as House included in its previously-passed five month extension bill.

Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) stated on Wednesday morning, "We'll take up that bill once the House sends it to us, and we'll continue working in the interim to finish our own multiyear highway bill, a bill that's fiscally responsible and won't raise taxes by a penny."

### Senate Continues Work on Long-Term Surface Transportation Legislation

Meanwhile, the Senate passed several procedural hurdles to move forward with the chamber's long-term surface transportation bill referenced in detail in our [previous Legislative Alert](#). The Senate agreed to the text of the legislation by a vote of 62-38, and to limit debate by a vote of 65-35. The final text, adopted through an amendment by Majority Leader McConnell, incorporated several additional changes agreed to by key negotiators on the bill. Among those changes were an amendment to the Commerce Committee title of the bill authorizing \$199 million in funding that can be used by public commuter railroads for grants, or to leverage financing, for the implementation of positive train control (PTC) systems. APTA worked closely with the Commerce Committee as this PTC amendment developed. The changes agreed to as part of the McConnell managers' amendment also removed language included in the Public Transportation Title that would have protected from disclosure sensitive safety data collected under the under the Safety Management System regime of the Public Transportation Safety Program.

Unless the Senate reaches a unanimous consent agreement sooner, this clears the path for a vote on final passage of the bill around noon on Thursday, when the legislation would be sent to the House of Representatives for consideration. The House has indicated, however, that they will be adjourning Wednesday night for their August recess, planning to craft their own long-term solution once they return in September. Leader McConnell has stated, "We'll conference the legislation we pass with what the House passes and then send a unified bill to President Obama." Also on Wednesday, a spokesperson for the White House stated that the President would sign another short-term extension, despite previous intimations that he would not.

### APTA Position

APTA supports passage of the Senate bill. The bill is a good start in the process and ultimately moves Congress forward on enactment of a multi-year bill.

While it does not authorize funding at the full levels APTA has recommended, it does increase the

authorizations for Federal Transit Programs by 25 percent over six years, and does so in a manner fairly consistent with APTA's recommendations. It provides added emphasis for bus and bus facility funding and restores a discretionary or competitive bus capital grant program, while also providing for increases to fixed-guideway state of good repair investments, and capital investment grants (New Starts). Public transportation's share of the bill's total revenues are substantial.

The Commerce Committee (Rail) title of the bill includes increased funding for passenger rail, including authorizations of funding for state grants, and significant improvements to the Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing (RRIF) program. The bill also authorizes additional funding for PTC implementation grants and RRIF loans, and provides the Secretary of DOT with the authority to oversee implementation of PTC systems by the end of 2018, thereby ensuring that PTC is safely installed as quickly as possible.

The last three years of the bill are not fully funded, and therefore Congress has work remaining to address that issue. Also, APTA also continues to recommend to Congress that a better, more sustainable, long-term financing solution is needed for the Highway Trust Fund to prevent the need for repeated returns to miscellaneous unrelated funding offsets and perpetual Trust Fund crises.

The bill also retains language that increases the Buy America content requirement for transit rolling stock from the current level of 60 percent to 70 percent by FY2020. APTA and transit vehicle manufacturers and major component suppliers have expressed concerns about both the domestic content changes and provisions on iron and steel.

Ultimately, passage of the Senate bill is a necessary step and attention will now turn to the House of Representatives for action on their version of the legislation.



**American Public Transportation Association**  
[Unsubscribe here](#)

1666 K St., NW. Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-4800 | [www.apta.com](http://www.apta.com)

To: Marketing, Planning, & Legislative Committee

Date: July 30, 2015

From: Anne Muzzini

Reviewed by:

---

### **SUBJECT: Clipper Marketing Update**

---

#### **Summary of Issues:**

County Connection staff has been meeting with the MTC Clipper marketing team in anticipation of the launch of Clipper on the East Bay bus systems. Following is a description of the activities planned.

#### **Soft Launch Activities/Materials:** Revenue ready through mid-January 2016

##### Outreach

- MTC marketing teams will assist agency staff in outreach and education activities that include in-person presence at key transit stops and hub locations such as BART stations, Park 'n Ride lots, and transit centers to educate existing riders that Clipper is now available on their buses
- MTC will distribute regional news releases and PR stories
- Clipper launch will be promoted on social media by MTC and agencies
- Agency micro-sites on clippercard.com will go live, with links to each agency's website
- Each agency will be provided with 500 adult Clipper Cards for promotional use

##### Print Materials

- "Clipper in the East Bay" brochures provided to agencies for distribution
- "Getting Started with Clipper" take-ones provided to agencies for distribution
- Clipper card sleeves provided to agencies for distribution with promotional cards as well as cards sold through ticket offices

##### Signage

- Interior Bus Cards will be produced and provided to all agencies
- Decals for bus windows and ticket offices
- Transit Information Displays at BART stations will be updated to include participation of East Bay operators in the Clipper program

#### **Hard Launch Activities/Materials:** Mid-January through mid-March 2016

##### Paid Advertising

- Radio Campaign (broadcast and digital)
- Social Media Campaign – Facebook, Twitter, Instagram

- Other channels to be determined
- BART Advertising – number of ads is yet to be determined

**Co-Op Advertising:**

- Exterior Bus Advertising – Projected available space on the four agency fleets committed by Lamar Transit Advertising include: 6 King ads, 21 Queen ads, and 12 tail ads. MTC will possibly supplement with paid advertising
- BART Advertising – MTC will negotiate with BART to have some free station advertising in conjunction with a planned media contract. The numbers are yet to be determined.

**Customer Service Training**

MTC will conduct training sessions with each agency's customer service staff in two phases. The first phase will include basic training on the different Clipper cards, how they work, and account management. The second phase will include training for ticket sales staff to include how to properly register the cards, add value, check the status of account values, and when to refer cardholders or callers to the Clipper customer service staff.

**Recommendation:**

For information only

**Financial Implications:**

Most of the above costs will be covered by MTC. Any other activities that County Connection chooses to employ will be taken from the Promotions budget.



# Using Your Clipper Card

## Tag Your Card

1. When you board the bus, find the Clipper card reader.
2. Hold your card flat against the Clipper logo on the reader.
3. Wait for the beep and green light. Then continue to your seat.

You must tag your Clipper card every time you board, even if you have a 31-Day Pass—your tag is your proof of payment.

**If you use your card on transit systems that charge by the distance you travel—** BART, San Francisco Bay Ferry, Golden Gate Transit and Caltrain—you'll need to tag at the beginning of your ride and again at the end of your ride. This ensures Clipper only charges you for the distance you actually traveled.

## Maintain a Balance

To use Clipper on County Connection, Tri Delta Transit, WestCAT and Wheels, you must have a 31-Day Pass or a minimum cash value balance of \$1.75 on an adult or Youth Clipper card, or 75 cents on a Senior or RTC Clipper card. If you don't, the card reader will beep three times and display a red light when you tag it. You'll then have to pay your fare with cash.

Visit [clippercard.com](http://clippercard.com) for minimum balance requirements on other services.



## Autoload Your Card

Never run out of value! Set up Autoload at [clippercard.com](http://clippercard.com) to automatically add cash value or a 31-Day Pass to your Clipper card through your credit card or bank account when your cash balance falls below \$10 or your pass expires.

## Check Your Balance

Card readers will display your cash value balance or pass expiration date when you tag. You can also check your balance online or through Clipper Customer Service.

## Transfer to Other Systems

Clipper automatically calculates transfers—you don't need a paper transfer if you transfer to another route or another transit agency that accepts Clipper. Just tag your Clipper card each time you transfer.

If you are transferring to an agency that does not accept Clipper, please ask the driver for a paper transfer when you board your first vehicle.

Visit [511.org](http://511.org) for detailed information about fares, passes and transfer policies.

## Participating Transit Agencies and Clipper Passes Accepted

To determine the best value for you, visit your transit agency's website for detailed fare information.

### County Connection



- East Bay Regional Local 31-Day Pass\*
- East Bay Regional Express 31-Day Pass

\*If you buy the local pass but also ride express buses, you must either have enough cash value on your card to cover express route upgrade fees or pay cash.

### Tri Delta Transit



- Tri Delta Transit 31-Day Pass (only available for adult and youth customers)
- East Bay Regional Local 31-Day Pass
- East Bay Regional Express 31-Day Pass

### WestCAT



- WestCAT 31-Day Pass (not accepted on Lynx Transbay service)
- East Bay Regional Local 31-Day Pass
- East Bay Regional Express 31-Day Pass

### Wheels



- Wheels 31-Day Pass
- East Bay Regional Local 31-Day Pass
- East Bay Regional Express 31-Day Pass

#### • The East Bay Regional Local 31-Day Pass

is accepted on County Connection, Tri Delta Transit, WestCAT (except Lynx Transbay service) and Wheels local bus services.

#### • The East Bay Regional Express 31-Day Pass

is accepted on local and express bus services offered by County Connection, Tri Delta Transit, WestCAT (except Lynx Transbay service) and Wheels.

- East Bay Regional Express and Local 31-Day Passes are each offered at a single price for adult, youth, senior and RTC customers.

#### Earn Day Passes for Unlimited Rides

If you pay with cash value, you can automatically earn a Day Pass for unlimited rides in a single day on most County Connection, Tri Delta Transit, WestCAT and Wheels routes. Once you pay \$3.75 in fares in a day (\$1.75 for senior and RTC customers) on any combination of these transit services, your rides will be free of charge for the rest of that day. Free rides and fares paid on WestCAT Lynx Transbay service do not apply toward a Day Pass.

## Protect Your Card and Its Value

- Register your card for free. Visit [clippercard.com](http://clippercard.com) or call 877.878.8883.
- Clipper can replace a registered card and restore its balance for a small fee.
- Don't punch a hole in your card, bend it or alter it in any way. Doing so can prevent your card from working properly.

## Discount Cards

Youth, seniors and people with disabilities can get Clipper cards for discounted rides. Learn more:

- [clippercard.com/discounts](http://clippercard.com/discounts)
- 877.878.8883
- TTY/TDD: 711 or 800.735.2929 (and type "Clipper")

For more information about Clipper, visit [clippercard.com](http://clippercard.com).



# New to Clipper?



Clipper automatically figures out the cost of your ride, including all discounts and transfers. Just **tag** and **go!**

You can add any combination of cash value —accepted on all participating Bay Area transit systems—or 31-Day passes. You can also earn a Day Pass for unlimited rides on most County Connection, Tri Delta Transit, WestCAT and Wheels routes once you pay \$3.75 in cash value fares in a single day (\$1.75 for seniors and RTC customers).

LOCATION	GET CARD*	ADD VALUE TO CARD
clippercard.com	✓	✓
Walgreens, Whole Foods and other retailers	✓	✓
Participating transit agency ticket offices	✓	✓
BART and VTA ticket machines (cash value only at BART machines)	—	✓
Muni and Golden Gate Ferry ticket machines	✓	✓
Clipper Customer Service Centers	✓	✓
Clipper Customer Service 877.878.8883	✓	✓
Your workplace transit benefit program	✓	✓

\*Adult Clipper cards cost \$3.

Visit [clippercard.com](http://clippercard.com) for a full list of retail, customer service center, ticket machine and Add Value machine locations.

# Fast. Easy. Secure. Reusable.

Your Clipper card is all you need to travel on these Contra Costa County and Tri-Valley area transit services:

County Connection  
Tri Delta Transit  
WestCAT  
Wheels

You can also use Clipper on these Bay Area transit services:

AC Transit • BART • Caltrain  
City Coach • FAST  
Golden Gate Transit and Ferry  
Marin Transit • Muni • SamTrans  
San Francisco Bay Ferry  
SolTrans • The VINE • VTA

## Why Clipper?

Clipper offers benefits like balance protection for lost cards, automatic reloading of your pass or cash value, and easy transfers between systems.



CLIPPER

Clipper is the all-in-one transit card accepted on most Bay Area transit systems.

## Contact Us

Need help or have a question?  
Get in touch with us.

Phone: 877.878.8883

Fax: 925.686.8221

TTY/TDD: 711 or 800.735.2929  
(and type "Clipper")

Web: [clippercard.com](http://clippercard.com)

Email: [custserv@clippercard.com](mailto:custserv@clippercard.com)

Mail: P.O. Box 318  
Concord, CA 94522-0318

Follow:



Bay Area Clipper

County  
Connection

TRI DELTA TRANSIT

WESTCAT

Wheels

# Clipper

Your All-in-One Transit Card

County Connection  
Tri Delta Transit  
WestCAT  
Wheels



[clippercard.com](http://clippercard.com)



# USING CLIPPER



## Get a Card and Add Value

Get your card and add value at:

- Walgreens, Whole Foods and other retailers
- Participating transit agency ticket offices
- Call 877.878.8883
- Visit [clippercard.com](http://clippercard.com)

Visit [clippercard.com](http://clippercard.com) for more retail and ticket machine locations. Make sure you have a valid pass or a minimum of \$1.75 (75 cents on a Senior or RTC Clipper card) before you board.

## Tag Your Card

1. When boarding the bus, locate the Clipper card reader.
2. Hold your card flat against the Clipper logo on the reader.
3. Wait for the beep and green light.  
Then continue to your seat.

## For More Information

- Using Clipper on your bus: Visit [clippercard.com](http://clippercard.com) and click on your transit agency logo
- Applying for a Youth, Senior or RTC Clipper card: Visit [clippercard.com/discounts](http://clippercard.com/discounts)
- Detailed fare information: Visit your transit agency's website

# CÓMO UTILIZAR CLIPPER



## Obtenga una tarjeta y agréguele valor

Obtenga su tarjeta y agréguele valor en:

- Walgreens, Whole Foods y otras tiendas
- Taquillas expendedoras de boletos de la agencia de transporte público participantes
- Llame al 877.878.8883
- Visite [clippercard.com](http://clippercard.com)

Visite [clippercard.com](http://clippercard.com) para conocer la ubicación de más tiendas y máquinas expendedoras de boletos. Asegúrese de tener un pase válido o un mínimo de \$1.75 (75 centavos en una tarjeta Clipper para adulto mayor o RTC) antes de abordar.

## Pase su tarjeta

1. Al abordar el autobús, localice el lector de la tarjeta Clipper.
2. Sostenga su tarjeta recta contra el logotipo de Clipper del lector.
3. Espere al pitido y a la luz verde.  
Luego pase a su asiento.

## Para obtener más información

- Cómo usar Clipper en el autobús: visite [clippercard.com](http://clippercard.com) y haga clic en el logotipo de la agencia de transporte público
- Cómo solicitar una tarjeta para jóvenes, adultos mayores o RTC: visite [clippercard.com/discounts](http://clippercard.com/discounts)
- Información detallada sobre tarifas: visite el sitio web de su agencia de transporte público

### Your All-In-One Transit Card

- ▶ **REGISTER IT.** Protect your balance in case of loss or damage.
- ▶ **REUSE IT.** Reload your card with cash value or passes.
- ▶ **PROTECT IT.** Don't punch holes in, bend or break your card.

Proteja su tarjeta. Regístrela hoy.

[clippercard.com](http://clippercard.com) | 877.878.8883

Now on  
your bus!

# Clipper.®

County Connection • Tri Delta Transit  
WestCAT • Wheels



## INTER OFFICE MEMO

To: Marketing Planning and Legislative Committee

Date: July 30, 2015

From: Anne Muzzini, Director of Planning & Marketing

Reviewed by:

---

**Subject: Lamorinda Transit Study**

---

Nelson Nygaard has completed the public input phase of the Lamorinda Transit Study and has presented the feedback and recommended a selection of options to the LPMC TAC. They will be presenting public input and option selection at the next LPMC meeting. If the LPMC is OK with the recommendations, the consultant will move on to and implementation and finance plan.

Attached are the comments from the TAC on the document and the executive summary. The full draft is lengthy and is not a part of the packet. If you would like a copy please let me know and I will provide it to you.

There is no need for action at this time. Once the final report is complete, I will present it and move to get Board receipt and acceptance.





## **LPMCTAC FEEDBACK ON ALTERNATIVES MEMO**

To: Anne Muzzini (CCCTA), Charles Swanson (City of Orinda), Ellen Clark (City of Moraga), Tony Coe (City of Lafayette)

From: Richard Weiner and Terra Curtis

Date: July 27, 2015

Subject: Feedback from LPMC Technical Advisory Committee on Lamorinda Service Alternatives Memo

---

On Wednesday July 22nd, the Project Team presented the revised version of the Lamorinda Service Alternatives Memo. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the feedback received from a range of public outreach efforts, and the refinements that were made to the proposed strategies based on this feedback.

While the committee agreed in principal with most of the alternatives described in the memorandum, there were a number of items that the committee indicated should be changed in the version that is presented to the LPMC. Following are the key changes that were agreed upon in the meeting and that will be incorporated in the Implementation Plan and Final Report, pending feedback from the LPMC:

- Explore the option of increasing Route 6 frequency by reducing headways to 15 or 20 minutes (as an alternative to a BART Shuttle)
- Provide greater clarification of the pros and cons of a taxi voucher (pre-pay) versus taxi reimbursement (post trip) program for seniors and people with disabilities
- Clarify the "Increased school transportation program coordination" option by specifying: increased coordination between County Connection and Lamorinda School Bus Program service planners; increased communication between schools and County Connection to improve service for altered school schedules and promotion of the student ticket program
- Clarify the alternative prioritization scheme by indicating that "Priority 2" projects should serve as backups to higher priority options if they prove infeasible or ineffective in implementation, and are not simply based on years to implement



## MEMORANDUM

To: Anne Muzzini, County Connection  
From: Richard Weiner, Terra Curtis  
Date: July 22, 2015  
Subject: Lamorinda Service Alternatives Refinements – Executive Summary

---

## BACKGROUND

This memo updates the Lamorinda Service Alternatives Executive Summary dated March 27, 2015 by summarizing public feedback received on the original service alternatives and providing initial thoughts of service refinements and recommendations.

The Lamorinda Service Plan is aimed at improving transit ridership, service quality, and cost effectiveness by developing alternative service options in the Lamorinda Area. While the focus of the plan is public transportation options, other alternatives have also been considered.

Based on initial conversations with the Lamorinda Program Management Committee Technical Advisory Committee (LPMC TAC), the LPMC, local transportation providers, and community members, key challenges for transit in the area include the following:

- Current transit service works for some, but is not a viable option for most residents within the Lamorinda area
- Vehicle access is limited due to parking constraints at both local BART stations and in downtown Lafayette

To initiate the process of finding transit service alternatives that address these challenges, three key transportation markets were identified: **commute trips**, **school trips**, and **midday trips** (with a focus on seniors). Preliminary alternatives were developed and the feasibility of each was determined based on discussion with TAC members. Several were carried forward for further development. This Executive Summary describes the public feedback received on prioritized alternatives and poses initial recommendations for refining those alternatives.

## SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK

Between May 21 and June 12, 2015, several channels were used to gather public feedback on the draft service alternatives—a process used to refine the prioritized service alternatives described in the next section. Figure 1 summarizes the surveying methods, dates, and responses received.

**Figure 1 Alternatives Refinement Public Outreach Summary**

Survey Method	Dates	Responses
Online survey of BART passengers, disseminated by handing out postcards at Lafayette and Orinda BART stations	Disseminated May 27 and 28 Survey open through June 12	500
Online survey of the general public disseminated through Nextdoor, the Lamorinda Weekly, and via flyers posted in the Lamorinda Spirit Van and several senior centers and housing facilities	May 25 - June 12	591
Online survey of parents of schoolchildren, disseminated through the Lafayette, Orinda, and Acalanes school districts' superintendents	May 21 - June 12	653
Textizen text-based survey advertised on County Connection buses	May 28 - June 12	39
Interviews with several individuals who work closely with Lamorinda's senior population	Early June	3

Like in the first round of outreach, the number of responses received indicates a high level of engagement with transportation issues in Lamorinda; unlike the first round, we saw a high level of engagement through channels other than Nextdoor. As seen in Figure 2, school bus expansion, a taxi subsidy program for seniors and people with disabilities, and BART shuttles garner the most support from respondents.

It should be noted that while respondents were not asked directly about their interest in using on-demand transit services—which could be thought of as a third version of the BART shuttle concept—many indicated support through free form comments and the vast majority (80.9%) support a model that prioritizes response time over service area (offered by many on-demand models).

**Figure 2 Summary of Support for each Proposed Alternative**

Alternative	% of Respondents Interested in Using the Service	Total Responses
BART Vanpools	32.3%	464
BART Shuttles - Moraga Way - Mt. Diablo Boulevard - On-demand model	56.0%	430
Taxi Scrip/Voucher program for seniors or people with disabilities	79.6%	103*
Taxi Scrip/Voucher program for the general public	42.2%	102*
School Bus Program Expansion	81.4% - 89.2%**	518
*This question was added to the survey on June 1, 2015 after many responses had been received		
**Respondents were asked about each expansion proposal separately		

## **LAMORINDA SERVICE ALTERNATIVES**

Lamorinda Program Management Committee Technical Advisory Committee

One final overarching point is the relatively frequent suggestion by respondents to many of the surveys that bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements are needed, particularly to encourage and facilitate more walking and biking to school. Many people stressed these options as complements to existing and proposed transit service alternatives.

The following section describes the benefits and drawbacks of each service alternative, including feedback received in the second round of public outreach and initial recommendations. Prioritization of these recommendations is provided in a table at the conclusion of this Executive Summary.

## RECOMMENDED SERVICE REVISIONS

Figure 3 Summary of Alternative Benefits and Drawbacks

Service Alternative	Benefits	Drawbacks	Public Feedback	Initial Recommendations
<b>Vanpool to BART</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rideshare operation handled primarily by individuals; public entity does not have to be involved on a day-to-day basis</li> <li>BART and/or other public entities may be able to subsidize the service to reduce costs to participants</li> <li>Concept is simple; easy to communicate the operations to potential rideshare subscribers</li> <li>Designed specifically for commuters to points west of Lamorinda (Oakland and San Francisco)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Subscribers must commit to both morning and evening departure times</li> <li>Some subscribers must commit to be drivers</li> <li>Vehicle rental agreement holders (the driver and/or backup driver) may have to front all or part of the cost of the vehicle rental</li> <li>Requires a high number of subscribers to enable participants to be picked up from their homes</li> <li>Limited cost savings to users (but guaranteed access to BART)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less than 25% of BART riders would use this option, but Moraga residents most likely</li> <li>Respondents report the most common reason they would support such an option is its link to guaranteed BART parking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given its relatively low level of support and other alternatives' ability to achieve similar outcomes, this alternative is not recommended at this time.</li> </ul>



**LAMORINDA SERVICE ALTERNATIVES**  
Lamorinda Program Management Committee Technical Advisory Committee

Service Alternative	Benefits	Drawbacks	Public Feedback	Initial Recommendations
<b>Moraga/ Orinda BART Shuttle</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Passengers pay only for their fare; no vehicle rental, fuel, insurance, or maintenance costs to split</li> <li>Highest level of flexibility for passengers; morning and evening trip times could be flexible due to shuttle frequency</li> <li>Supplements less frequent County Connection Route 6 service</li> <li>Expands transit service options to BART system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited service area (presuming that many would still drive to access transit)</li> <li>Service is geared to residents of Moraga and Orinda, though Lafayette may benefit from reduced traffic congestion</li> <li>Requires additional operational and capital funding</li> <li>Park-and-ride are conceptual and require further investigation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supported by a majority of general public responses, 38% of surveyed BART riders</li> <li>Mostly looking for a more frequent option, potentially could be served by a new option or increased Route 6 frequency</li> <li>Lots of complaints about Route 6 headway (both for riders and non-riders)</li> <li>People think some kind of incentive/marketing campaign to get people using the shuttle will help</li> <li>Note: BART is very frequent in the 7 a.m. hour (every 5 minutes) and decreases to every 10-15 minutes closer to 9 a.m.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This service option is recommended to continue into the Implementation Plan.</li> <li>Route 6's existing low frequency has decreased the public's confidence in using County Connection for timely connections; as such, it may be best to develop this as a standalone service through branding and service characteristics, rather than simply increasing the frequency of Route 6.</li> <li>BART frequency at the time most people use it suggests this feeder service would not have to be incredibly reliable at arriving at BART at a particular time; rather, shuttle frequency is the most important factor.</li> </ul>
<b>Lafayette Shuttle</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports increased development along Mount Diablo Boulevard and existing businesses/employers</li> <li>Enables additional transit options for those living along Mount Diablo Boulevard (and near intersection with Pleasant Hill Road)</li> <li>Supplements less frequent County Connection service (Route 25)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited service area along Mount Diablo Boulevard</li> <li>Currently, only proposed to operate during peak commute hours (give focus of study)</li> <li>Shuttle access is still contingent on safe pedestrian access and connections across Mount Diablo Boulevard</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for lunchtime shuttle along Mt. Diablo Blvd., but it does not solve an priority need for most respondents</li> <li>Desire to provide transportation for seniors along the corridor, but senior stakeholders indicate a taxi subsidy program would be more effective for their clientele</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This service alternative is recommended to continue into the Implementation Plan as a low priority.</li> </ul>

## LAMORINDA SERVICE ALTERNATIVES

Lamorinda Program Management Committee Technical Advisory Committee

Service Alternative	Benefits	Drawbacks	Public Feedback	Initial Recommendations
<b>Zone Service</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides basic level of access to the transit system across a wide service area</li> <li>Effectively serves as a community general public Dial-a-Ride (with specific time-points)</li> <li>Increases transit access to BART and other community services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Service quality (speed) is limited based on the wide service area and deviations</li> <li>Unlikely to be a productive (passengers per hour) service</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall, preference to prioritize service response time over service area, but this is more common among younger respondents</li> <li>Respondents over age 55 prioritize door-to-door nature of flex services over response time</li> <li>Worried about the costs of such a service (\$5 on top of BART fare); may be more relevant for an occasional need (seniors) than recurring commute trips</li> <li>Lack of proximity to home of existing County Connection services doesn't seem to be the most concerning issue (among current riders)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given preference for response time among commuters and senior stakeholders' preference for the taxi subsidy solution, zone service is not recommended at this time.</li> </ul>
<b>Deviated Fixed-Route</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opportunity to provide transit service to residents north of CA-24</li> <li>Likely to be more productive than zone services</li> <li>Increases transit access to BART and other community services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Service quality (speed) is limited based on deviations</li> <li>Unlikely to be a productive (passengers per hour) service, but more so than zone service alternatives</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given preference for response time among commuters and senior stakeholders' preference for the taxi subsidy solution, zone service is not recommended at this time.</li> </ul>

**LAMORINDA SERVICE ALTERNATIVES**  
Lamorinda Program Management Committee Technical Advisory Committee

Service Alternative	Benefits	Drawbacks	Public Feedback	Initial Recommendations
<b>Taxi Subsidy Program</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ New mobility option for seniors and people with disabilities</li> <li>▪ Offers same-day transportation for people who otherwise have to schedule a day in advance</li> <li>▪ Can offer lower cost per trip than ADA paratransit</li> <li>▪ Opportunity to serve connecting trip to BART at discounted price for occasional need</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Requires administration costs</li> <li>▪ Opportunity for fraud through re-sale of vouchers</li> <li>▪ Due to cost constraints, could only serve occasional-need trips for the general public</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ About 2/3 of respondents support program for seniors and people with disabilities; only 42% for the general public</li> <li>▪ Lafayette residents most likely to support specialized program, but at least 50% of residents in Orinda and Moraga also support</li> <li>▪ The older the respondent, the more likely to support (85% of people over age 65 support it)</li> <li>▪ General public subsidy program gets most support from Moraga residents (54% of whom support it)—75% of respondents would use this type of program to get to/from BART</li> <li>▪ Respondents hold a belief that such a program could attract new private transportation providers to Lamorinda.</li> <li>▪ Strong level of support from key stakeholders; recommend to prioritize taxis over TNCs for the service.</li> <li>▪ There is concern about finding continuous funding source.</li> <li>▪ The demand for a general public subsidy program from residents of Moraga highlights the effect of BART parking constraints on residents' desire for additional mobility options.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ This alternative is recommended to continue into the Implementation Plan.</li> <li>▪ It is clear that there is public support for a taxi subsidy program to supplement trips currently provided by County Connection's LINK paratransit and Lamorinda Spirit Van services. Also, it supports the goals of this study in providing enhanced midday service to the community.</li> <li>▪ Because this option would serve a similar market to some of the other alternatives—which also garner significant support—and due to the costliness of opening a subsidy program to the general public, it is recommended to treat a general public taxi subsidy program as a secondary priority to one focused on seniors and people with disabilities at this time.</li> </ul>

**LAMORINDA SERVICE ALTERNATIVES**  
Lamorinda Program Management Committee Technical Advisory Committee

Service Alternative	Benefits	Drawbacks	Public Feedback	Initial Recommendations
<b>School Transportation Services Expansion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased school bus ridership</li> <li>Potential to reduce school trip-related congestion</li> <li>Addresses increasing school-aged population in Lamorinda</li> <li>Easy to implement from an operations standpoint through existing service provider</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional cost for expanded service</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High level of engagement with school transportation topic</li> <li>Widespread belief that school transportation plays a role in local traffic congestion, but some (~30% of respondents) lack confidence in school bus program's effectiveness at solving the issue</li> <li>About 66% of students that are currently dropped off by parents attend schools where new service is proposed (high potential for mode shift)</li> <li>High level of support for all the expansion options, but most support won for increasing existing capacity to Orinda Intermediate and Stanley Middle School <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parents of Orinda Intermediate students also among the most likely to use new service</li> <li>New service (to Happy Valley, Del Rey, and Lafayette Elementary) is least supported, but parents of students at Happy Valley would be overwhelmingly likely to use it</li> <li>Parents of students at Lafayette are least likely to take advantage of the new option; most currently walk or bike to school</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recommended that this service option continue into the Implementation Plan</li> <li>Prioritize expansion of capacity to Orinda Intermediate and Stanley Middle and new service to Happy Valley Elementary</li> <li>Initial considerations may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Creating a ballot measure to fund the expansion</li> <li>Decreasing the cost of the program by creating more bulk pass options</li> <li>Charging for permits to access school drop-off/pick-up zones</li> <li>Charging for high school parking</li> <li>Incentivizing taking the bus through monthly drawings/prizes</li> <li>Supplementing investment with developing better biking and walking facilities and programs<sup>1</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> Recent research suggests that school districts can save money by improving bicycling and walking conditions to shift current bus users to those modes; such a shift opens up bus services to students that live farther from school than reasonable walking or bicycling distance. See UNC Center for Urban and Regional Studies, "Economic Benefits of Safe Routes to School." Available online at <https://curs.unc.edu/files/2013/05/SRTS-McDonald-FINAL-6.23.15.pdf>.

**LAMORINDA SERVICE ALTERNATIVES**  
Lamorinda Program Management Committee Technical Advisory Committee

Service Alternative	Benefits	Drawbacks	Public Feedback	Initial Recommendations
<b>Increased School Transportation Program Coordination</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased awareness of program changes and offerings among program administrators and parents</li> <li>Coordination benefits—program changes can leverage other resources, outreach efforts, and strategically coordinate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires in-person meetings</li> <li>Additional administrative burden to organize and attend quarterly or bi-annual meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In free form comments, many respondents indicated an increased focus on bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements and programs to encourage more biking, walking, and carpooling to school</li> <li>Incentives and marketing programs were suggested</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recommended that this service option continue into the Implementation Plan, given the potentially low costs of implementing coordination. Possible implementation steps include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinate/convene meetings between the Southwest Area Transportation Committee (SWAT), Lamorinda School District Superintendents, Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Oversight Committee, 511 Contra Costa/Safe Routes to School, and Sustainable Lafayette Green Schools Committee to facilitate conversation around bike/ped issues at schools.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Technology-based Transportation<sup>2</sup></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Offer supporting services that address the gaps unfilled by traditional transit</li> <li>New services range from providing on-demand, point-to-point options (also known as “transportation network companies” or “ridesourcing” apps) to private fixed-route services that rely on 15-passenger vans or buses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Companies launching new businesses could choose not to respond in particular markets for factors outside the public entity’s control</li> <li>Using public funds for private operational support is unlikely, due both to the public sector’s need to tie funding to requirements for serving the public at large and private companies’ need for operational flexibility</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Almost 81% of respondents indicated that the primary focus of an on-demand type service should be faster response times with smaller service areas, rather than larger service areas at the expense of longer response times.</li> <li>Desire for the more frequent and convenient service that TNCs could provide, but caution that price makes the private solutions inaccessible for more than just occasional trips.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recommended that this service concept continue to the Implementation Plan as a concept only; the Implementation Plan will further specify strategies for public options to incorporate elements of new private tech-enabled transportation models and policy implications.</li> </ul>

<sup>2</sup> Note: to date, this topic has not been described as a standalone option. A full description of the challenges and opportunities are described in the following section.

## INITIAL PRIORITIZATION

Figure 4 Summary of Alternatives

Alternatives	Service Approach	Market Focus	Initial Priority*
BART Feeder Services	Vanpool to BART	Commuters	--
	Moraga/Orinda BART Shuttle	Commuters	1
	Downtown Lafayette BART Shuttle	Commuters	2
Flexible Transit Services	Zone Service	Commuters, Senior Mobility	3
	Deviated Fixed Route Service	Commuters, Senior Mobility	3
	Taxi Subsidy Program	Senior Mobility, Commuters	1
	Technology-based Transportation Solutions	Commuters, Senior Mobility, School Trips	2
School Services	Expansion of School Bus Program	School Trips	1
	Increased School Transportation Program Coordination	School Trips	1
* 1 = next year; 2 = next 2-3 years; 3 = reconsider at a later date			



To: Marketing, Planning, & Legislative Committee

Date: July 30, 2015

From: Mary Burdick

Reviewed by:

---

### **SUBJECT: Community Events**

---

#### **Summary of Issues:**

County Connection participates in select community and business events, and coordinates Class Pass field trips for schools with service along fixed-routes.

#### **School & Community Events:**

July 15 – Concord Child Care Center, Concord 35 students/10adults  
July 28 – Cal State East Bay – New student orientation  
August 1 – CA Council For The Blind – Quarterly presentation  
August 19 – Walnut Creek Intermediate, Walnut Creek Tri-S Day  
August 25 – Ygnacio Valley High – Student Week of Welcome  
August 27 – Saint Mary's College – New student move-in/orientation

#### **Recommendation:**

For information only

#### **Financial Implications:**

Any costs associated with events are included in the Promotions budget.