From: Tony Daysog
To: Weisiger, Lara
CC: Russo, John; Spencer, Trish; Kern, Janet
Date: 12/22/2014 11:23 PM
Subject: Council Referral Item: January 6, 2015 Meeting

Date: December 22, 2014

To: Lara Weisiger, City Clerk

CC: Trish Spencer, Mayor of Alameda
        John Russo, City Manager
        Janet Kern, City Attorney

SUBJECT: Council Referral Item: January 6, 2015: "Comprehensive Transit\Traffic Strategic Planning and Implementation Tool"

During the Council referral portion of the January 6, 2015 meeting, I would like the City Council to discuss directing city staff to put together a report on putting together a comprehensive transit\traffic strategic plan and implementation tool. For purposes of the Council referral agenda title, please refer to this this to as "Comprehensive Transit\Traffic Strategic Planning and Implementation Tool". Please include this e-mail in its entirety as part of the agenda item.

Among other things, I anticipate staff would return to Council by an appointed time with an assessment of the scope of work involved, community input, time frame required, and budget needed to put together such a comprehensive report. As part of the discussion of the scope of work, I anticipate Council will provide an initial set of items -- or raise a series of questions so that staff to assist Council in formulating an initial set of items -- for possible inclusion in the "Comprehensive Transit\Traffic Strategic Planning and Implementation Tool". Through community input, including via relevant legislative bodies such as the Planning Board and the Transportation Commission, I anticipate further input.

With Alameda Point "Parcel A", Alameda Point in general, Alameda Landing, and the Del Monte projects, I am seeing a need for a comprehensive transit\traffic strategic plan and implementation tool, in which in a single document a series of City's traffic\transit problems are defined ("statement of problem"), with each "statement of problem" having their own series of goals that are empirically-arrived at, with each goal then having their respective implementation steps, and finally with each goal and implementation steps also having their own set of benchmarks with which to measure progress toward achieving goals and objectives.   The comprehensive transit\traffic strategic plan and implementation tool with serve as the basis for which all applicable TDMs in target areas of Alameda Point generally, Alameda Point Parcels "A" and "B", the Northern Waterfront Area, and Park Street North of Lincoln Avenue would be discussed and crafted.

I am driven to request Council to lead this discussion because, with the Alameda Point discussion of November 2014 and Del Monte matter of December 2015, the TDMs I am seeing TDMs that are too vague in terms of how problems, solutions, goals, benchmarks, and penalties relate to one another, and are unclear as to how one TDM for one area relates to another TDM for another area. As it is, our TDMs reference on a cafeteria-plan basis a menu of transit\traffic solutions but offer no over-arching, Council driven framework for indicating which transit plan is associated with what goal and outcome and how specifically items on the menu are associated with problems. There needs to be an organized basis for

decision-making and adjustment-making where necessary, with over-arching accountability that clearly lies with City Council when it comes to meeting traffic\transit goals and outcomes.

Below is a schematic of an outline of what I see as an end-result portion of the transportation\traffic strategic planning and implementation tool document. The example below is provided SOLELY for ILLUSTRATIVE purposes, and identifies only one transit\traffic "problem" stemming from new residential development in total, for which only two solution are illustratively discussed. I present the examples below in an effort to assist readers in tracking what I mean by (1) defining a specific transit\traffic problem; (2) crafting a set of empirically arrived-at goals with respect to each problem statement; (3) clearly showing how each goal will be implemented; and (4) indicating what rewards and penalties might be contemplated with respect to goal attainment or non-attainment.

Thank you. /s/ Tony

ILLUSTRATIVE SCHEMATIC

1.0 PROBLEM STATEMENT: Example of a Specific Problem: "The morning peak commute hours through the Posey Tube will worsen (to be defined in terms of capacity of LOS) as a result of cumuluative number of NEW residential units planned for Alameda Point, Alameda Landing, the Northern Waterfront, and Park Street North of Lincoln Avenue"

. . . . 1.1 SOLUTION: Example of a transit\traffic solution 1.1: new BUS SHUTTLE

. . . . . . 1.1.1 GOAL: Example of specific goal that intimately connects
          "PROBLEM STATEMENT 1.0" and "SOLUTION 1.1" : Example of a
           specific goal: "25 percent of new resident workers leaving
           their respective new units at Alameda Point, Alameda Landing,
           Northern Waterfront, or Park Street North of Lincoln will
           use new Bus Shuttles" (note: the "25 percent" number is, for
           now, a number used for purposes of illustration: the strategic
           plan and implementation tool will discuss how "25 percent" [or
           any goal number for that matter] was arrived at)

. . . . 1.1.1.1 IMPLEMENTATION: Examples of specific implementation steps
           to operationalize "GOAL 1.1.1": Example: Examples of specific
           implementation with regard to provision of Bus Shuttle SERVICE (the final
           document would discuss the empirical basis for how each implementation
           step helps achieve the related goal)

. . . . Implementation 1A: Bus Shuttles in the direction of
                Posey Tube will run every 7 to 10 minutes during AM
                Peak commute hours (numbers are for illustrative purposes)
. . . . Implementation 1B: To facilitate 7-to-10 minute headways,
                there will be a fleet of 4 to 6 shuttles (numbers are
                for illustrative purposes)
. . . . Implementation 1C: there will be a central corporation
                yard to accommodate fleet of 4 to 6 shuttles
. . . . Implementation 1D: to accommodate fleet of 6 shuttles,

there will be a need for 9 workers (numbers are for
illustrative purposes)

. . . . Implementation 1E: Annual budget of "Z" is needed for A-E

. . . . 1.1.1.1.1 IMPLEMENTATION BENCHMARKS: Example of benchmarks
for tracking performance with respect to achieving
Implementation Steps 1A through 1E: Examples: percentage
of bus shuttle runs meeting 7-to-10 minute headways;
percentage of days in month all bus shuttles in fleet
available for use; percentage of days management staff
available to monitor hourly bus shuttle routes

. . . . 1.1.1.2 IMPLEMENTATION: Examples of specific implementation steps
to operationalize "GOAL 1.1.1": Example: Examples of specific
implementation with regard to target residents in target areas using
bus shuttles (the final document would discuss the empirical basis for
how each implementation step helps achieve the related goal)

. . . . Implementation 2A: target residents sign commitment to take
alternative transit
. . . . Implementation 2B: shuttle riders get FastTRAK passes that can
be monitored in real-time on a daily, weekly, and mos. basis
. . . . Implementation 2C: shuttle riders receive weekly or monthly
e-mail reports summarizing how riders as individuals and as
a group are meeting "Goal 1.1.1" (i.e. 25 percent goal).

. . . . 1.1.1.2.1 IMPLEMENTATION BENCHMARKS: Example of benchmarks
for shuttle riders might include: how many residents have
signed commitment to help reach 25 percent goal; how many
shuttle riders are using FastTRAK pass each day; how many
shuttle riders are reading their Constant Contact weekly
or monthly e-mail reports; how often is the 25 percent goal
exceeded in terms of number of days, weeks, month, and year
(the "25" figure is used only for illustrative purposes)

. . . . . . 1.1.X REWARDS AND PENALTIES FOR 1.1 GOAL ATTAINMENT

. . . . 1.2 SOLUTION: Example of a transit\traffic solution 1.2: CAR SHARE

. . . . . . 1.2.1 GOAL: Example of specific goal that intimately connects
"PROBLEM STATEMENT 1.0" and "SOLUTION 1.2" : Example of a
specific goal: "7 percent of new resident workers leaving
their respective new units at Alameda Point, Alameda Landing,
Northern Waterfront, or Park Street North of Lincoln will
car share" (note: the "7 percent" number is, for
now, a number used for purposes of illustration: the strategic
plan and implementation tool will discuss how "7 percent" [or
any goal number for that matter] was arrived at))

. . . . 1.2.1.1 IMPLEMENTATION: Examples of specific implementation steps
to operationalize "GOAL 1.2.1": Example: Examples of specific
implementation with regard to car sharing as a service

. . . . Implementation 1A: " "
. . . . Implementation 1B: " "
. . . . Implementation 1C: " "
. . . . Implementation 1D: " "
. . . . Implementation 1E: " "

. . . . 1.2.1.1.1 IMPLEMENTATION BENCHMARKS: Example of benchmarks
for tracking performance with respect to car sharing

. . . . 1.2.1.2 IMPLEMENTATION: Examples of specific implementation steps
to operationalize "GOAL 1.2.1": Example: Examples of specific
implementation with regard to target residents in target areas car sharing

. . . . Implementation 2A: " "
. . . . Implementation 2B: " "
. . . . Implementation 2C: " "

. . . . 1.2.1.2.2 IMPLEMENTATION BENCHMARKS: Example of benchmarks
for tracking extent to which target residents car share,
and how extent to which they meet goals

. . . . . . 1.2.X REWARDS AND PENALTIES FOR 1.2 GOAL ATTAINMENT

Tony Daysog, Alameda City Council
http://www.daysog.com
https://twitter.com/tonydaysog
510.747.4726