Rules for Public Comment:
Speakers wishing to address the Committee should complete a Speaker’s Form and submit it to the District Secretary. Speakers wishing to address subjects not listed on this agenda will be invited to speak under the "PUBLIC COMMENTS" section of the agenda. Speakers wishing to address a specific agenda item will be invited to address the Committee at the time the item is being considered. All speakers should limit their comments to two (2) minutes.

Individuals who wish to present more detailed information are encouraged to submit comments in writing. Written comments are made part of the written record for meetings and, as such, are available for public inspection.

Availability of Agenda Related Materials: Written agenda related materials for all regular meetings are available to the public 72 hours prior to the meeting or at the time the materials are distributed to a majority of the Committee.

Written materials presented at a meeting by staff or a member of the Committee will be available to the public at that time, or after the meeting if supplied by an outside party. Agenda related materials are available on the District’s website or by contacting the District Secretary.

Order of Agenda Items:
The Committee may discuss any item on the agenda and in any order.

Electronic Devices:
Use of electronic devices (cellular phones, pagers and/or walkie-talkies) during meetings is prohibited.

Scented Products: Please refrain from wearing scented products as there may be attendees susceptible to environmental illnesses.

Accessible Public Meetings:
Meetings of the Committee are accessible to individuals in wheelchairs. The Board room is equipped with assistive listening devices for individuals with a hearing impairment. Written materials in appropriate alternative formats or disability related modification/accommodation must be made three business days in advance of the meeting to help ensure availability. Subject to availability, sign language and foreign language interpreters will be provided upon request with 72-hour notice.

Contact Information:
Please direct requests for disability-related modification or accommodation and/or interpreter services to Linda A. Nemeroff, District Secretary, 1600 Franklin Street, Oakland, California, 94612 or call (510) 891-7201.
Meeting of the East Bay Bus Rapid Transit
Policy Steering Committee

AGENDA

Thursday, March 10, 2016
2:00 p.m.
2nd Floor Board Room
1600 Franklin Street
Oakland, CA 94612

PSC Members:

AC Transit:
Vice President Elsa Ortiz, Chair
Director Greg Harper
Director Joel Young

Alameda County (Ex Officio):
Supervisor Nate Miley

Metropolitan Transportation Commission/Caltrans:
District Director Bijan Sartipi

City of Oakland:
Vice Mayor Rebecca Kaplan
Council Member Noel Gallo

City of San Leandro:
Mayor Pauline Cutter
Council Member Corina Lopez

1. Roll Call

2. Public Comment For Items Not on the Agenda (two minutes are allowed for each speaker)


4. Chair’s Report on pertinent actions of the AC Transit Board of Directors.

5. BRT Project Update:
   A. Bid Package 3 – Contract Award Funding Plan and Contingency Sustainment Plan
   B. Overview of Station Location Changes [Requested by Mayor Cutter – 11/12/15]
   D. Update on Sponsorships and Naming Rights [Requested by Committee – 1/14/16]

6. Schedule date and time of next meeting.

7. Future Agenda Items/Review List of Pending Items.

8. Adjournment
Pending List of Future Agenda Items:

- Discussion at the staff level and at the Policy Steering Committee of the trade-offs associated with the next level of engineering in the event there is not enough money in the budget to do everything that the cities want, i.e. mitigations, access issues, streetscape improvements, bulb-outs, etc. Decisions on trade-offs can be prioritized based on available funding. [Requested by Vice Mayor Kaplan]

- Update on the buses selected for the BRT service with pictures. [Requested by Vice Mayor Kaplan – 9/3/15, 11/12/15]

- Enforcement of the bus only lane and an update on legislative solutions. [Requested by Vice Mayor Kaplan – 1/14/16]

- Discussion concerning the development of a transit pass incentive program and outreach to senior facilities regarding a bulk pass similar to the Easy Pass, but for the senior community. [Requested by Vice Mayor Kaplan]

- A broader discussion of fare payment, including a plan that was discussed years ago for the expansion of Clipper card availability throughout the neighborhoods as well as outreach to major employers along the corridor to participate in the EasyPass Program with the roll out of the service. [Requested by Vice Mayor Kaplan – 9/3/15, 11/12/15.]

- Plans for signage to avoid confusion in the construction areas, particularly in areas where stations have been constructed, but are not yet in use. [Requested by Vice Mayor Kaplan – 9/3/15]

- Updated maps reflecting the stations that had been moved. [Requested by Mayor Cutter – 11/12/15]
Meeting of the East Bay Bus Rapid Transit Policy Steering Committee

MINUTES

Thursday, January 14, 2016
2:00 p.m.
2nd Floor Board Room
1600 Franklin Street
Oakland, CA 94612

PSC Members:

AC Transit:
Vice President Elsa Ortiz, Chair
Director Greg Harper
Director Joel Young

Alameda County (Ex Officio):
Supervisor Nate Miley

Metropolitan Transportation Commission/Caltrans:
District Director Bijan Sartipi

City of Oakland:
Vice Mayor Rebecca Kaplan
Council Member Noel Gallo

City of San Leandro:
Mayor Pauline Cutter
Council Member Corina Lopez

The East Bay Bus Rapid Transit Policy Steering Committee held a special meeting on Thursday, January 14, 2016. The meeting was called to order at 2:07 p.m. with Chair Ortiz presiding.

1. Roll Call
Committee Members Present:
Vice President Elsa Ortiz, Chair
Director Greg Harper
Director Mark Williams (Alternate)
Mayor Pauline Cutter
Councilmember Corina Lopez
Vice Mayor Rebecca Kaplan
Councilmember Noel Gallo

Committee Members Absent:
Supervisor Nate Miley
Caltrans District Director Bijan Sartipi
Director Joel Young

AC Transit Staff Present:
General Manager Michael Hursh
General Counsel Denise Standridge
District Secretary Linda Nemeroff
Director of BRT David Wilkins

2. Public Comment
There was no public comment offered.
3. Chair’s Report on pertinent actions of the AC Transit Board of Directors.

Chair Ortiz reported on the upcoming bid opening for Bid Package 3, noting that the contract award was scheduled for late February with construction slated to begin in April. She also introduced the items on the agenda regarding branding and station sponsorships and told the Committee that their input was being sought on logo designs for the “Tempo” brand name.

4. Consider approving Policy Steering Committee minutes of November 12, 2015.

MOTION: GALLO/KAPLAN to approve the minutes as presented. The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES:6: Gallo, Kaplan, Harper, Cutter, Lopez, Ortiz
ABSTAIN:1: Williams
ABSENT:2: Miley, Sartipi

5. Consideration of information on BRT service and station sponsorships.

[The PowerPoint presentation on the BRT Sponsorship update is incorporated into the file by reference.]

John Gobis of Gobis & Co. LLC presented an overview of the station sponsorship strategy and explained the difference between sponsorships and naming rights. He further detailed revenue development scenarios for each and discussed policy issues and implications. He felt that station sponsorships were more relevant to the public and had proven to reduce operating and capital costs either through cash payments, in-kind contributions or capital contributions. He also outlined the next steps in the process, which included meetings with potential sponsors, policy direction and development, and consideration of any offers.

Chair Ortiz asked how sponsorships and naming rights should be calibrated given the impact on potential sponsorships of waiting a year to secure naming rights. Mr. Gobis recommended that AC Transit take the path of Cleveland and San Diego and seek sponsorships, and to formulate those sponsorships against policies that are in the interest of the agency and the project. He added that we could have a service sponsorship similar to Cleveland and allow people to sponsor specific stations along the alignment to maximize revenue. He added that he thinks of naming rights in terms of events and facilities, and cautioned against structuring naming rights in such a way that would confuse the public as to who’s operating the service.

Councilmember Gallo commended Mr. Gobis on the presentation and for its clarity and specificity, and wanted to know what staff was asking of the Committee in terms of a recommendation. Mr. Gobis explained that policy direction (what is acceptable and not acceptable) was needed, that the branding activities needed to be completed and the policy developed in order to secure a sponsor or multiple sponsors for the service. Chair Ortiz clarified that it was the role of the AC Transit Board to draft policy.

Director Harper was concerned about timing. He felt that there would be more interest and possibly more funding from potential sponsors later and suggested that the branding activities
wait for a year or when the service becomes operational. Mr. Gobis disagreed, noting that the project was far enough along with the plans and renderings to develop the branding and seek sponsorships. He felt that the service did not have to be operational to prove its value.

Vice Mayor Kaplan thanked AC Transit staff for answering her questions. She commented that her main concern was funding for ongoing maintenance needs and that it was essential to have sponsorships to bring in money to cover costs.

She recommended that staff work through the tasks to seek sponsorships, develop the Tempo visual brand identity and develop sponsorship policies concurrently while remaining flexible and open to naming rights for the appropriate sponsorship commitment level. She further clarified her understanding that staff would focus on sponsorships, but if in the course of marketing the opportunity, money was offered for naming rights, staff would remain open to it depending on the price and proposal. She encouraged the AC Transit Board to adopt this recommendation. Mr. Gobis assured the Committee that the door would remain open to naming rights.

Vice Mayor Kaplan wanted staff to verify that AC Transit’s existing advertising contract doesn’t preclude or interfere with sponsorships. She felt that it was fine to focus on sponsorships, but wanted to hear back on progress that has been made. With regard to advertising space, she wanted to see the layout of the stations; what space was dedicated to advertising and where the NextBus signs will be, noting that they needed to be large enough to be seen across the street like the 20th Street transit hub. She also did not object to large signs on the station if it brought in additional revenue.

In addition, Vice Mayor Kaplan wanted to make sure that there was a policy in place restrict advertising for alcohol, tobacco, marijuana, offensive language and things young children should not be exposed to. With regard to marketing the service, she felt it was important to take into account not just BRT passengers, but the fact that the service will operates in a densely populated corridor. AC Transit’s Director of Marketing and Communications Ms. Joseph noted that the latter will be sold to potential sponsors.

Chair Ortiz commented that AC Transit already had an advertising policy in place. Ms. Joseph added that staff had already consulted the advertising policy to see that there are no advertising conflicts, noting that it was staff’s intent to formulate a sponsorship policy that will work in conjunction with the advertising policy.

Mayor Cutter wanted to make sure that station names would continue to reflect the geographical location of the station. General Manager Michael Hursh advised that this principle had already been adopted.

**Consensus** to recommend to the AC Transit Board of Directors that staff work through the tasks to seek sponsorships, develop the Tempo visual brand identity and develop sponsorship policies concurrently while remaining flexible and open to naming rights for the appropriate sponsorship commitment level. (7-0)
6. Consideration of BRT branding update and logo options.

[The PowerPoint presentation on the BRT Sponsorship update is incorporated into the file by reference.]

AC Transit Director of Marketing and Communications Michele Joseph gave the branding update and solicited feedback from the Committee on the logo concepts under development.

Members of the Committee offered the following reactions to each logo design:

Logos:

- **Logo A:**
  - The letter “M” looks like it is related to a phone company or a tech company.
  - The letter “M” looks broken and may be confusing to people who may not understand that the bars represent the letter “M” and may think the word is “Telipop”.
  - Cool looking, but may be difficult for people to understand.

- **Logo B:**
  - Awkward to have a lower case “t”.
  - Liked the font, but not the underline.
  - The letter “o” should be tilted forward.
  - Appears old fashioned.

- **Logo C:**
  - Depicts movement, motion, and connectivity (like a route) which is what the project is about.
  - Suggested that the letter “E” be connected to “MPO” or just have the “PO” connected.
  - Looks more forward thinking, futuristic and would appeal to younger generation.
  - The words “AC Transit” need to be more prominent.

The general consensus of the Committee was that Logo C was the best, but that it needed more flow/movement/connectivity.

7. Consider receiving an informational update on utility coordination efforts and emerging issues related EBMUD utilities.

General Manager Michael Hursh advised that an informational report was being provided to inform the Committee of an emerging issue involving some of the older utilities along the corridor that staff from AC Transit, the City of Oakland and EBMUD were working together to address.

No action was taken.

8. Schedule date and time of next meeting.

The next meeting is scheduled for March 10, 2016 at 2:00 p.m.

Vice Mayor Kaplan requested the following:
- Enforcement of the bus only lane and the opportunity to seek a legislative fix to make enforcement cheaper and easier.

10. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting adjourned at 3:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Linda A. Nemeroff
District Secretary
East Bay Bus Rapid Transit Project Update

Policy Steering Committee Meeting No. 18

March 10, 2016

Downtown Oakland to San Leandro
International Blvd to East 14th St
Agenda

- Bid Package 3 – Contract Award Funding Plan and Contingency Sustainment Plan
- Overview of Station Location Changes
- Overview of Best Practices for Motorist and Pedestrian Construction Signage
- Update on Sponsorships and Naming Rights
March 9, 2016 - Anticipated award of a $108,112,200 contract to O.C. Jones & Sons, Inc. for construction of the Infrastructure and Station Platforms project in support of the East Bay Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project.
### Contract Award vs Existing Funds

The District allocated $97,058,771 to fund this contract, which is $11,053,429 less than O.C. Jones & Sons Inc. bid as shown in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>Existing Funding / Budget Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>REQUESTED BOARD AWARD TOTAL</td>
<td>$108,112,200.00</td>
<td>= Base Bid + Allowances + Add Alt 4 + Add Alt 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>San Leandro Transit Center Project Funds</td>
<td>$3,200,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Existing Program Funds for BP3</td>
<td>$93,776,771.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>City of Oakland Funds for Driveway Removals</td>
<td>$82,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td><strong>EXISTING FUNDS TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$97,058,771.00</td>
<td>= (2) + (3) + (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td><strong>FUNDING DEFICIT</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,053,429.00</strong></td>
<td>= (5) - (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Contract Award Funding Plan

Staff has developed a Contract Award Funding Plan as shown in Table 2 below to secure the additional funding necessary to mitigate the $11,053,429 deficit in order to award the contract at the total low-bid amount.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Funding / Budget Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce &quot;Startup and Testing&quot; Budget Estimate</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>Reduced from $3M to $2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate Cap &amp; Trade</td>
<td>$2,000,000.00</td>
<td>Actual amount to be confirmed Sep 2016; available Jun 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reallocate Operational Bus Cost from &quot;BRT Bus&quot; Budget</td>
<td>$1,879,000.00</td>
<td>Use PMI/SEA on project, replace with District for buses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oakland - In-Kind Contributions</td>
<td>$660,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate Available Contingency from Program Budget</td>
<td>$5,574,429.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADDITIONAL FUNDS TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,053,429.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REMAINING AVAILABLE CONTINGENCY @ BOARD AWARD</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,232,571.00</strong></td>
<td>Professional Services + Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to fund the contract, the available contingency was reduced to a level of only 4.04% which is below conventional norms.
The District has developed a contingency funding plan, which will be implemented post award, to increase the program contingency. This plan calls for considering economical and reasonable scope modifications with both the Contractor and inter-agency partners to increase the funding in the contingency budget to a minimally acceptable level of 10%.

### POST-AWARD NEGOTIATIONS - CONTINGENCY SUSTAINMENT PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACTOR BID SCOPE NEGOTIATIONS</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization exceeding 10% CAP</td>
<td>$475,568.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Fence (Segment B)</td>
<td>$367,200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Fence (Segment A)</td>
<td>$147,900.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Deterrent Dome (Small)</td>
<td>$357,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Deterrent Dome (Medium)</td>
<td>$68,850.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Deterrent Dome (Large)</td>
<td>$3,675.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48&quot; Bench</td>
<td>$64,800.00</td>
<td>Reduce 64 benches to 46 benches (one bench per platform)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72&quot; Bench</td>
<td>$98,900.00</td>
<td>Remove all of 26 - 72&quot; benches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTV System</td>
<td>$510,000.00</td>
<td>Install 2 cameras instead of 4 per platform. Estimated savings based on assumption that 50% cost is camera related.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST-AWARD BID SCOPE NEGOTIATIONS SUBTOTAL:</td>
<td>$2,093,793.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMAINING AVAILABLE CONTINGENCY AFTER BID SCOPE NEGOTIATIONS</td>
<td>$6,326,364.00</td>
<td>Professional Services + Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.03% percentage BRT construction cost excluding (2) & (4)
### Contingency Sustainment Plan (Cont....)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTER-AGENCY PROJECT SCOPE NEGOTIATIONS</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bid Items to Defer or Modify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticket Vending Machines</td>
<td>$2,700,000.00</td>
<td>Platforms built in TVM Ready; TVM purchase likely to defer until Post-operations study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape / Hardscape</td>
<td>$1,320,000.00</td>
<td>Project will build $2.3MM scope and only defer overestimated portion if necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map Case (Freestanding)</td>
<td>$46,200.00</td>
<td>Likely to defer until Post-operations study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map Case (Windscreen Mounted)</td>
<td>$86,800.00</td>
<td>Likely to defer until Post-operations study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTER-AGENCY SCOPE NEGOTIATIONS SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>$4,153,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMAINING AVAILABLE CONTINGENCY AFTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERAGENCY SCOPE NEGOTIATIONS</td>
<td>$10,479,364.00</td>
<td>Professional Services + Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>10.00%</strong></td>
<td>percentage BRT construction cost excluding (2) &amp; (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Station Location Changes for BP3

The following station locations were changed during the final design development process and included in the Board approved environmental review process on January 27, 2016.
Downtown Oakland to San Leandro
International Blvd to East 14th St

Figure II-1: Harrison Street Station- Relocation of Southbound Curb Extension Platform: Comparison of FEIS Location and 2015 Final Location

- Northbound Platform Location on 12th Street Was Relocated to Nearside of Webster in 2014 Environmental Review: No Further Change
- Southbound Platform on 11 Street Farside of Harrison Street in FEIS to Shift to Nearside of Alice Street; Proposed 2014 Location

LEGEND:
- ★ 2015: Final Station Location (2015)
- 2014: Station Location Proposed in 2014 Reevaluation
- FEIS/R Station Location
- BRT Lanes
Figure II-2: 5th Avenue Station – Relocation of Southbound Curb Extension Platform: Comparison of FEIS Location and 2015 Final Location

- No Change in Northbound Platform Location from FEIS Location
- Southbound Platform on E. 12 Street at 5th Avenue in FEIS to Shift Just Under Two Blocks South to Nearside of 7th Avenue
**Figure II-3: Avenue Station – Relocation of Southbound Curb Extension Platform: Comparison of FEIS Location and 2015 Final Location**

- **Northbound Platform on International Boulevard Was Relocated to Nearside of 10th Avenue in 2014; No Further Change**
- **Southbound Platform on E. 12 Street Shifts One Block South of FEIS Location to Farside of 11th Avenue; 2014 Proposed Location Abandoned**
Figure II-4: Georgia Way Station – Relocation of Both Southbound and Northbound Curb Extension Platforms: Comparison of FEIS Locations and 2015 Final Locations.

- **Location for Northbound Platform Proposed in 2014 Environmental Review Abandoned; Northbound Platform Shifted from Farside to Nearside of Euclid Avenue**
- **Southbound Platform Shifted Less than 100 Feet North from FEIS Location**
Best Practices for Construction Signage

The Board approved Construction Impact Mitigation Plan (CIMP) is the guiding document for the deployment of signage during BP3 construction and includes the following specific elements:

- Public Information Plan
- Motorist Information Plan
- Portable Changeable Message Signs
- Ground Mounted Construction Area Signs
- “Open for Business” Signs
- Wayfinding Signs
Ground Mounted Construction Area Signage (BP2)

Pedestrian Sign  Wayfinding Sign  Motorist Sign
Ground Mounted Construction Area Signage (BP2)

Portable Changeable Message Sign with Traffic Control Markings and Signs
Update on Sponsorships and Naming Rights

- Consultant Gobis & Co. is continuing to identify and meet with potential sponsors.
- Staff is drafting a District-wide sponsorship and naming rights policy to be presented to the Board on March 30
Recap and Adjourn

Final Thoughts?
Date for next PSC Meeting