

**BERKELEY-OAKLAND-SAN LEANDRO  
BUS RAPID TRANSIT  
POLICY STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC)**

**AC TRANSIT  
1600 FRANKLIN STREET  
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA**

**MEETING SUMMARY**

**August 21, 2009, 3:00 PM**

**ROLL CALL:** At 3:09 PM, Executive Administrative Assistant Kim Vazquez called the roll.

**PSC MEMBERS PRESENT:** AC Transit Director Elsa Ortiz; AC Transit Director Greg Harper; AC Transit Board President Rocky Fernandez (Committee Chair); Berkeley Councilperson Kriss Worthington; Berkeley Mayor and MTC Commissioner Tom Bates; Oakland Councilmember Rebecca Kaplan; San Leandro Councilmember Michael Gregory; San Leandro Councilmember Joyce Starosciak; Caltrans District 4 Director (Caltrans Ex Officio) Bijan Sartipi.

**PSC MEMBERS ABSENT:** Alameda County Supervisor Nate Miley; Oakland Councilmember Larry Reid.

**AC TRANSIT STAFF:** Deputy General Manager Jim Gleich; Deputy General Manager for Service Development Nancy Skowbo; BRT Project Manager Jim Cunradi; Service and Operations Planning Manager Cory LaVigne; Director of Alternative Fuels Policy and Marketing Jamie Levin; Executive Administrative Assistant Kim Vazquez.

**ITEM 1: GREETINGS AND INTRODUCTIONS**

**ITEM 2: PUBLIC COMMENT**

Comments of the public contained in the minutes are the opinion of the speakers, and there is no guarantee of their accuracy.

**Joyce Roy, Oakland Resident** thanked staff for providing links to BRT information, including agendas and meeting materials, on the AC Transit web site. She would prefer the committee sit at the dais for these meetings so it will be easier for members of the audience to hear and see the committee.

**ITEM 3: ADOPTION OF MINUTES FOR THE June 19, 2009 MEETING**

**Motion** to accept the May 15 Meeting Minutes, moved by Ortiz, seconded by Kaplan; passed unanimously (Miley, Reid not present).

**ITEM 4: CHAIR'S REPORT**

**Chair Rocky Fernandez** advised meeting attendees that AC Transit is in the process of extensive service changes and reductions in some cases. He announced that there

would be a series of public meetings over the course of the next month in each of the cities. Staff will present the changes and give citizens a chance to comment. The meetings will start on September 8<sup>th</sup> in Fremont. The schedule for the meetings is posted on the AC Transit web site. He asked that those interested attend the meetings and give staff their comments. The AC Transit Board will review all of the comments and work with staff on any adjustments to the plan. The plan is scheduled to be implemented in early 2010.

**ITEM 5: Clarifying the Membership of the Policy Steering Committee**

**Assistant General Manager Community and External Affairs Mary King** said that at the May 15<sup>th</sup> meeting Mayor Bates opened a discussion as to the composition of the PSC, specifically with regard to Supervisor Nate Miley's participation. When the BRT project first began it was thought that it would go into unincorporated areas, and so, Supervisor Miley's participation was warranted. However, since it is now clear that the project will not impact the unincorporated areas, Supervisor Miley didn't feel it was appropriate that he make recommendations for jurisdictions over which he had no authority on land use. Mayor Bates suggested that maybe Supervisor Carson would want to participate, and staff was not clear if that was what Mayor Bates really wanted, since Supervisor Carson has no authority on land use either. AGM King asked for clarification from Mayor Bates that he really did want two Supervisors with no authority on land use, on the committee.

The second suggestion from Mayor Bates was to add another City of Oakland member to the PSC (in addition to Councilmembers Reid and Kaplan), and an alternate, so that the committee would have Oakland's full participation. AGM King said this would mean that Oakland would have three votes on the committee at any given time.

**AGM King** asked that Mayor Bates clarify his legislative intent, and then have the PSC committee vote on the proposal.

**Mayor Bates** responded that the PSC serves as an advisory committee to the AC Transit Board of Directors. His concern is that Oakland's lack of attendance at the meetings (aside from Councilmember Kaplan) indicates a lack of interest in the project. The project requires Oakland's participation and buy-in on the project, or it won't work. His only intent in questioning the makeup of the committee was to ensure the attendance of at least one other representative of Oakland besides Councilmember Kaplan. He isn't concerned as much with the Supervisors, but thinks adding another voting member (in addition to Councilmembers Reid and Kaplan) and an alternate would improve City of Oakland attendance at the PSC meetings.

**Councilmember Worthington** feels that all three Cities and AC Transit should have one alternate to attend when regular members are unable to. And since we would be going to the AC Transit Board of Directors with the change to add another committee member and alternate for Oakland, we may as well add alternates for each city at that time.

**Chair Fernandez** said that Director Joel Young is the AC Transit alternate.

**Councilmember Kaplan** said that Vice Mayor De La Fuente has expressed an interest in participating on the PSC. A substantial segment of the BRT project runs through his council district. It has not been made official as the City Council is on recess and the Council President must be involved, but she is hopeful it will be worked out before the next PSC meeting. She questioned whether the committee wanted to add just an alternate, or add another seat on the committee and an alternate.

**Director Harper** agreed with Councilmember Worthington that is it up to each City whether or not to have an alternate assigned to attend in the event one of its members on the PSC is unable to attend a meeting. He said that if Oakland wants to add an alternate to attend if Councilmember Reid or Kaplan is unable to attend, they should do that.

**Chair Fernandez** clarified the motion that the committee would be comprised as follows: City of Berkeley two members, San Leandro two, Oakland three members, AC Transit three members, one Alameda County Supervisor, and one Caltrans District Director, and all jurisdictions are free to have an alternate if they so choose.

The motion passed unanimously.

From later in the proceedings, but related to this item:

**DGM Service Development Nancy Skowbo** requested clarification from Chair Fernandez on a recommendation from the May 15 meeting to add a second Alameda County Supervisor (for a total of 2) and make both Supervisors ex-officio. She wanted to confirm that this is "off".

**Chair Fernandez** affirmed that this is "off".

#### **ITEM 6: AC Transit Emission Reduction Program**

**Director of Alternative Fuels Policy and Marketing Jaimie Levin** distributed the AC Transit Sustainability Report to the members of the committee and explained that the Summary Report and the Full Report are both available online. His presentation focused on AC Transit's long term goal of zero emissions, and outlined several of the technologies that AC Transit is testing and working with to reduce its environmental impact and carbon footprint.

He began by showing data on AC Transit's fleet NOx emissions. The California Air Resources Board standard is 4.8 grams per brake horsepower hour. AC Transit's fleet average for this year is 2.6 grams, which is a significant improvement over last year. This was accomplished by buying better, more efficient, cleaner engines, and by aggressively pursuing funding to buy and install after treatment particulate traps to the bus engines. Regarding particulates, AC Transit's fleet average is 13 grams of particulates per brake horsepower hour, while the CARB standard is 22. Particulate traps tend to reduce fuel economy, resulting in more diesel fuel being used, which can then result in higher Co2 emissions.

AC transit is the first member of the California Climate Registry. As such the District goes through a rigorous annual process to inventory its carbon emissions. This inventory is certified by the Climate Registry. The inventory shows that 91% of AC Transit's Co2 emissions come from burning diesel fuel. When fleet gasoline consumption is added, the number goes up to 93%. Certainly AC Transit could reduce its Co2 emissions by reducing its fuel consumption, but a more effective way of reducing Co2 emissions in the community is getting people out of private cars and onto public transport.

Some methods the District is using or testing to reduce its own footprint are:

**Biodiesel Fuel** – Initial testing shows no adverse impact either on local criteria emissions or vehicle performance. However, in testing B100 (100% biodiesel fuel) there was an increase in NOx emissions over B20 and over the standard CARB fuel which is 20 parts per million. For AC Transit there are three issues that must be addressed with using Biodiesel Fuel; 1) cost, 2) limited sources of Biodiesel, and 3) quality of fuel must be comparable to what the District uses now.

**Hybrids** – This technology can lead to a 20% reduction in fuel consumption from the efficiencies of batteries and regenerative braking. AC Transit has a gasoline hybrid bus ready to put on the road for testing, but has been having some challenges with the battery technology. In the next three to five years as AC Transit makes new bus purchases for the fleet, they will probably be hybrid vehicles.

**Hydrogen** – This technology has zero emissions. The District's HyRoad program currently includes 3 of the hydrogen fuel cell hybrid buses which use regenerative braking. They've been in service for nearly 200,000 miles. These buses provide about 72% better fuel economy than a diesel bus. Even though the first generation Hyroad buses are 8,000 pounds heavier than a diesel bus, they still get better fuel economy. The newer Hyroad buses have been designed to be 6000 pounds lighter than the current Hyroad buses we've been using. They have been well received by the public for performance. AC Transit should be receiving the first of 12 new buses of this type in the next 90 days. The expectation is that we will see even better fuel economy. In order for Hydrogen buses to be a feasible option, they must be reliable and durable. AC Transit has built a major hydrogen fuel station in Oakland that has produced over 40,000 kilograms of hydrogen (1kilogram is equivalent to a gallon of gasoline). This station will be expanded, and the District is building a new station in Emeryville that will have solar electrolysis capability, which is zero emission. In terms of Co2 emissions, the District is reducing its carbon emissions 43% over a diesel bus. With solar electrolysis the District will be able to achieve zero emissions.

Finally, the District is getting over 600 kilowatts from rooftop solar panels, and will be expanding that close to one and a half megawatts. This will further reduce carbon emissions.

**Councilmember Worthington** raised the concern about arts and crafts street vendors on Telegraph being subjected to the fumes from the diesel buses.

**Chair Fernandez**, in response to Councilmember Worthington's concern about the diesel fumes and their impact on the street vendors on Telegraph, noted that the newer Van Hool artics, used primarily on the 1R currently, are outfitted with particulate traps that significantly reduce the NOx emissions as compared to the older diesel buses.

**Councilmember Kaplan** agreed that it would be beneficial to have some sort of dedicated fleet of environmentally friendly buses on the BRT route as it will not only have high ridership, but will be highly visible and will help AC Transit's efforts towards getting the reduced emissions message out to the public. She also mentioned another alternative fuel; Algae Based Bio Diesel, which is not in competition with food-stocks. It is a net plus fuel because not only does the algae get "fattened up" by eating pollution, but then the algae is used to make the bio diesel fuel. Although the technology is not at market scale, it is something to watch for in the future as it can be used in existing diesel buses. She asked, what is the fueling capacity of the East Oakland Hydrogen fueling facility?

**Director of Alternative Fuels Policy and Marketing Jamie Levin** said the fueling capacity is presently 150 kilograms per day (about five buses), but the system is being completely overhauled and upgraded, and it can be scaled up relatively easily and cheaply. There are also the 20,000 gallon tanks that were used for the Bio Diesel GTL test that give the District some flexibility to apply alternative fuels to some of the existing diesel fleet. He also said that the 1R route would be a good test route for a portion of the additional 12 Hyroad buses the District will be receiving.

**Councilmember Worthington** requested an estimate of the cost to change buses in the BRT proposal to zero emission or some other type of hybrid bus, as well as how many buses would be needed, including reserves, before the next CMA committee meeting.

<b>ITEM 6: AC Transit Emission Reduction Program – Public Comment</b>
---

**Joyce Roy, Oakland Resident** commented that if the District wants to have zero emission buses on BRT and have a distinctive bus, it should go with electric trolley buses, which really are zero emission. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) has been questioning the fuel cell program because it is so costly and is not reliable. For example, AC Transit's three buses are only up and running 61% of the time. On July 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2009, there was a CARB meeting questioning whether or not the fuel cell program should be continued. A lot of the bus agencies wrote in complaining that it was too costly and that they are already having to cut service and getting less funding. It just doesn't seem like a viable option.

**Chair Fernandez** replied that he was at the CARB meeting on the 23<sup>rd</sup> and that they spoke of the AC Transit program as being one of the most advanced programs. In addition, Director Peeples attended a meeting in San Diego where they said quite a few positive things about the AC Transit hydrogen program.

**Berkeley Resident Merrilie Mitchell:** The fuel cell buses are so expensive and you have so few, so it just seems that even though they're good, you're not going to have many. So in ten years you're going to have ten of them, and you have 800 or 1000 buses, so it's not really for real if it costs that much money. I'm hoping you're not going

to do BRT. One more last thing, you can turn your regular buses into shuttles by just calling them shuttles. The 18 comes down Shattuck, comes back, call it a shuttle. Let people get on and off and shop. You'll get extra Measure B money.

#### **ITEM 7: BRT Experiences in Other Cities**

**Chair Fernandez** made a presentation of the King County Washington Metro Rapid Ride, the Swift Line in Everett, Washington, and the Quickline in Houston, Texas. The key points of each are:

##### Rapid Ride

- Will Launch in 2010
- 5 Lines with ten minute headways at peak times
- Possible bus-only lanes and queue jumps for several segments throughout the five lines
- Stations will have Nextbus and prepaid boarding using Orca Cards (Seattle's version of Translink)
- Stops will be identified with tall signs and have map kiosks
- Stops on the street will have buttons that can be used to signal the bus that there is a passenger waiting
- Buses are well branded and distinct

##### Swift Line

- Started in December 2005, is currently under construction and is scheduled to launch November 30th of 2009.
- It is 17 miles long and travels through 5 different townships and cities.
- It has 12 stops in each direction, situated near featured destinations along the line
- 7 miles of the line will be transit-only lanes
- Stations will have a tall tower for easy visibility
- They will have machines for adding money to the Orca Card
- Prepaid boarding
- Kiosks with maps and estimated station to station travel times
- The platform is clearly marked for boarding similar to a BART platform
- Community participation in design of stops
- Buses and stations are well branded
- Buses have maps of stops on them
- Bi-weekly on-line construction update newsletter on their website

##### Quickline

- Q Card is their version of Translink
  - Can be bought virtually everywhere
  - Customers can decide how much money they want to load on the cards
  - Ready to use within minutes of purchase
- Quickline is the 402 Bellaire Line and is 9 miles long
- It runs every 15 minutes and will have 8 stops along the route when it initially launches, with a couple more added down the road

- Preliminary construction started for possible expansion for transit only lanes
- Texas Medical Center is a sprawling campus and it is where the line launches from
- Line is well branded with a rabbit logo
- Stations have Nextbus, and Queue Card readers, newspapers, potted plants
- Buses have Queue Card machines near the back of the bus so you can add money to your Queue Card while on the bus
- Stops have tall towers for easy visibility and also are well branded
- Community participated in the naming of the stations
- Blue line along the entire length of the line in the street next to the sidewalk, with breaks for intersections
- Blinking lights for when bus arrives
- Buses have stop maps – audio and signs announcing stops

These are great examples of BRT Lines, and as this BRT project moves forward, the question is how to include as many nice amenities as these and other BRT projects have.

**Director Harper** noted that the Everett and Houston lines averaged about a mile between stops and asked how they interweaved with local service.

**Chair Fernandez** said that the Everett system has a local service as well, with stops about a quarter mile apart.

**Councilmember Worthington** asked, with regard to the Swift Line what the differences are between the sections of the line that are bus only lanes as compared to the mixed traffic sections, and how did they make the decision.

**Chair Fernandez** said that since the line isn't finished he couldn't see the different areas, but would be happy to follow up with the individuals who facilitated his tour.

**Councilmember Kaplan** said that with this BRT project, the determination whether to have bus only or mixed traffic areas along the route will be determined by the requirement to have at least 50% dedicated lanes, and by things such as width of the road or local politics. So why these other projects decided to go with bus only or mixed traffic lanes isn't the issue. The issue is that it is possible to have BRT and still have both mixed traffic and dedicated bus lanes.

<b>ITEM 7: BRT Experiences in Other Cities – Public Comment</b>
---

**Oakland Resident Joyce Roy** stated that it is nice to see that BRT can be implemented without dedicated bus lanes. In the case of this BRT project, she doesn't feel there is any place along the route that can accommodate it because there are only four lanes plus parking. She suggested Curbside BRT, which is one of the options that San Francisco is looking at for Geary even though Geary can accommodate bus only lanes down the middle of the street. She provided the committee with copies of a drawing she had done, showing what BRT would look like as proposed with dedicated lanes on Telegraph in Temescal. She also drew what it would look like with curbside BRT.

**ITEM 8: Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) Adoption and Final Environmental Impact Statement/Report (FEIS/R) Schedule**

**BRT Project Manager Cunradi** said at the June 30<sup>th</sup> PSC meeting that staff had been looking at ways to accelerate the project schedule, including combining work, or working on parallel Tracks. Consequently, the schedule has been revised so that environmental studies are being done at the same time as the cities go through the LPA decision making process. Eventually the two processes will “rejoin” in the spring when the cities have made their LPA decisions and the administrative draft of the FEIS/R is submitted to FTA.

Some of the technical work for the project, such as studying historical resources and water quality issues, has been done. But work needs to begin on what we think the project should be, or at least study a range of what it should be. AC Transit and city staffs will be studying the maximum project (the maximum number of bus stops and stations), which for environmental purposes is the safest option. This will serve as one end of the project spectrum. At the other end would be the no-build option of keeping the 1 and 1R system as it is. In addition to studying the maximum and minimum options for the project, staffs will study the different variations that each city is putting forward. Each city will then take their recommendation to their councils and transportation commissions or back to city staff so it can be evaluated from the City’s perspective, rather than the AC Transit perspective. In the fall it is hoped that each city’s proposal will then go out for public comment at a series of approximately 12 public meetings in all three cities with stakeholder groups, community neighborhood based groups and general public meetings, and meetings with City councils and commissions.

According to the schedule, AC Transit staff will do all the technical analysis, and staff from each of the cities will do their own internal analysis in order to come to an agreement on a recommendation. The sequence begins with the staff recommendation, followed by public discussion and discourse, and then City Council action. The schedule anticipates the following timeline for each city to take an LPA to City Council:

- San Leandro – February
- Oakland – March
- Berkeley – April

Once the decisions are made, the FEIS/R is written on the LPA that the cities have selected. The final environmental document will only be on what the cities say they would like to see studied. There will be one month to create a coherent document that integrates each city’s LPA and the technical analysis appropriate for each of them. This will become the administrative draft of the FEIS/R, to go to the FTA in May of 2010. It is hoped the FTA will review the document by September of 2010, and that there will be a Record of Decision (ROD) on what the project should be by the fall of 2010.

**Councilmember Kaplan** asked when the PSC would talk about station design and function.

**BRT Project Manager Cunradi** replied that it is independent of the environmental



review, and so would be discussed after the environmental assessment. Once it is determined where the stations will be located and what portions of the route will have dedicated lanes, then the design and branding discussions can take place and another round of public meetings will be held.

**Councilmember Kaplan** is concerned that from an advocacy standpoint it might make it easier to get funding from congress if we were able to show them pictures including an attractive infrastructure that attracts more passengers to ride that includes NextBus, all door boarding, branding, etc. She also mentioned that AC Transit has already begun this process.

**BRT Project Manager Cunradi** replied that the design process begins right after the ROD, so we're only about a year away from considering design and aesthetics.

**DGM External Affairs Jim Gleich** said that AC Transit has issued an RFP for design and branding, that the bids are in and it is being evaluated.

**Councilmember Kaplan** also mentioned that the committee might want to consider some sort of phased implementation. Maybe start from the southern end, with the International Boulevard/East 14<sup>th</sup> segment, which will be ready to go a lot quicker and easier. There may be some benefit to getting something going. She asked if staff should at least be discussing it internally.

**DGM, Service Development Skowbo** commented that construction can certainly be phased, but also noted that the schedule is very aggressive and adhering to it is a major staff objective.

**Director Harper** added that accessibility studies done by AC Transit indicate a notable increase in additional wheeled items being brought onto Line 1/1R on International Boulevard. This creates a different capacity problem, and the spatial characteristics change along the route. The District may find that it wants a turnaround in downtown Oakland, going back to San Leandro, just to provide the spatial capacity for riders on that segment. That would work with what Rebecca is suggesting about doing that segment early.

**Councilmember Kaplan** asked that staff talk internally and get back to the PSC.

**BRT Project Manager Cunradi** said the FEIS/R needs to be written on the entire length of the project as it is a legal requirement. In addition, the only way to analyze the project is to see the benefits and the impacts of the whole project, not just a portion. He also said the decision about whether to phase the implementation isn't one that should be made by staff, but by the cities.

**Councilmember Kaplan** expressed concern with the City of Oakland having their recommended LPA by September 9, 2009, and that there has been nothing agendaized for a vote by the Council.

**BRT Project Manager Cunradi** clarified that the staff recommended LPA due by September 9<sup>th</sup>, wouldn't be voted on until March of next year. And that there is still a lot

of time for her to talk with Oakland staff about design.

**Councilmember Kaplan** asked whether or not the cities could have more than one option for their LPA at the time it goes to the public for comment.

**DGM, Service Development Skowbo** replied that it is possible, but that it is staff's hope there will be only one LPA up for discussion at the public meetings.

**Councilmember Gregory** agreed with the aggressive schedule and asked if staff felt it was possible.

**BRT Project Manager Cunradi** agreed that it is possible as long as AC Transit staff provides city staffs with enough information to be able to do their work. AC Transit is helping city staffs with resources to hire consultants to evaluate technical information and do outreach and advise them. There are points where the schedule can slip during public outreach in the fall, and then as the LPAs go through city council and commission approval process. Each City's process is different. Berkeley and Oakland hired consultants. San Leandro requested reimbursement for staff time to work on the project, and they will be using AC Transit's consultants.

**Director Harper** asked if there might be variations or changes that one or more of the cities might want that could negatively affect the entire system?

**BRT Project Manager Cunradi** replied that it is possible, but it doesn't look like the cities have radically different ideas for their plans. He pointed out that while not on the schedule, the PSC and AC Transit Board will likely evaluate the LPA as the sum of its parts.

<b>ITEM 8: Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) Adoption and Final Environmental Impact Statement/Report (FEIS/R) Schedule – Public Comment</b>
--

**Berkeley Resident Alan Tobey, Friends of BRT** and co-chair of the campaign committee that helped to defeat Measure K in 2008, is optimistic about the accelerated process and thinks it's very doable, but he expressed concern that changing the schedule so that the FEIR/S studies and the LPA discussions happen in parallel rather than sequentially will result in people making choices about option A or B, rather than discussing impacts and mitigations. He hopes that the public meetings are not just PR meetings, but that they address the significant perception of BRT opponents that there are negative impacts that haven't been addressed yet.

**Berkeley Resident Steve Geller, Friends of BRT**, feels the bottom line of the project should be to attract people out of cars and into buses. Regarding the pollution from the buses negatively affecting the street vendors on Telegraph avenue, he said that not all of the pollution is coming from the buses. He has seen plenty of cars, trucks and vans all spewing exhaust.

**Berkeley Resident Len Conly, Friends of BRT**, is glad the project is moving along and as far as he is concerned, the more aggressive the better. Friends of BRT believes that the more dedicated lanes there are, the better, because you will obtain better reliability.

Although sacrifices may be required to have dedicated bus lanes, he encourages residents to see the value of them. With regard to global warming, on average drivers drive 160 million miles per day in the Bay Area. That is about 60,000 tons of Co2 per day and equal to the largest coal fired power plant in the United States. According to the chart presented earlier by Jaime Levin, AC Transit puts out 60,000 tons of Co2 per year for the entire fleet.

**Joyce Roy** commented that the BRT process has been going on for almost 10 years and that it seems a bit late in the process to her to be requesting public comment. She said the City of San Francisco put out information in 2007 to residents so that they would know what they were getting. San Francisco also had a CAC since the beginning of 2009, and although this project is different from the one in San Francisco because it involves more than one City, she believes we should still have a CAC that is made up of representatives from each of the involved cities. She believes the project is being handled in a "top down" manner, and believes that design charrettes held by city staffs are very secretive. She suggested that Caltrans may want to have a say in reducing the number of car lanes on International Boulevard (since it's a state highway). She feels that curbside BRT should be considered rather than taking away lanes.

**Oakland Resident Jane Kramer** expressed concern that there has been no survey of city residents as to what they would want so she doesn't know how city staffs can plan without that information, much less speed up the process.

**Joel Ramos, Transform**, expressed his appreciation of the efforts of the PSC to keep the project moving along. Transform continues with its outreach efforts to help the community become more informed about the project, including a presentation to the East Oakland Youth Development Center on International Boulevard. The 50 youth at the meeting were very excited to hear about more dependable, reliable, faster transportation to and from school and work. As a resident of San Francisco he sits on the CAC that Joyce Roy mentioned earlier, and would definitely recommend a CAC in the future, as this BRT project moves more into the design phase and implementation of the project.

**Oakland Resident, Karen Kunze**, one time MTC Commissioner representing Marin County. She believes it is important to move forward with BRT. The technology is being successfully implemented around the world. Ms. Kunze lives on the BRT corridor and feels it will improve her life and make it that much easier for her to give up her car and believes it can have the same impact on others like herself. She encouraged the committee to remember that it can't predict everything in a major project such as this, and that there will be changes. She feels the process for this BRT project is appropriate to everyone.

**Representing Oakland BPAC Jonathan Bair**, thanked the committee for their work on the BRT project. He wanted to address Joyce Roy's opinion that there has not been adequate public process with regard to the design charrettes in Oakland. He said that the charrettes were held at the staff level, and not discussed at the City Council level. However, as the Chairman of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), they have held two public discussions with staff over the process of doing the charrettes and creating the LPA. Both of those meetings were publicly noticed at

[oaklandbikes.info](http://oaklandbikes.info), as well as by other means. The committee hopes to continue to be a part of this public process. He asked that the committee work hard to make this the best possible form of BRT because people want a reliable system.

**Next Two Meeting Dates**

September 18 at 3:00pm and October 16 at 3:00pm

The group agreed to sit on the formal dais for the next meeting, to see how it works.

**The meeting adjourned at 4:52 PM.**

**KV**