

<b>Board Member Comments (5/10/23)</b>			<b>Response</b>
1	Director Shaw	The outreach plan notes a technical working group consisting of city partners and “other groups to be identified”. What groups do you see as participating in that?	Staff also presented to and gathered feedback from BPACs and various city commissions (e.g., mobility commissions, commissions on persons with disabilities).
2	Director Peeples	How are you going to schedule workshops so you can get maximum participation from the technical working groups and community groups?	Staff scheduled the TAC meetings (consisting of jurisdiction staff) by sending out polls to identify the most suitable times. Staff also had follow-up meetings for any jurisdictions who were unable to attend the TAC meetings (ex: Berkeley staff was unable to attend TAC meeting #1 so District staff had a separate meeting with just Berkeley staff to share the presentation content and the feedback that other jurisdictions shared during TAC #1).  All other outreach was conducted at the BPACs and city commissions’ regularly scheduled meetings.
3	Director Walsh	How will NACTO guidelines be incorporated into the TSDG?	We mention NACTO resources in Chapter 2, among a listing of other resources to reference in conjunction with the TSDG. The recommendations in the TSDG are largely consistent with NACTO guidelines, but the TSDG also addresses additional topics such as bus layover spaces, the passenger waiting experience, and East Bay Paratransit operational needs.
4	Director Walsh	Come back to the Board with data on bus speed impacts due to complete streets projects	Attachment 2 contains a bus speed analysis before and after complete streets projects along Telegraph Avenue (Oakland) and Park Street (Alameda). For both corridors analyzed, recent bus speeds along the route segments with complete streets treatments are either similar to or slower than pre-COVID bus speeds. There doesn’t appear to be a clear correlation between complete streets projects and bus speeds in this analysis, since in most cases along Telegraph Ave and Park St the trends are consistent between segments with complete streets treatment versus without treatments. Bus speeds in general have been trending downward compared to pre-COVID bus speeds.

<b>Board Member Comments (5/10/23)</b>			<b>Response</b>
5	Director Walsh	Outreach should also include BPACs, senior groups, and disability groups	Outreach was conducted at various BPACs, mobility commissions, and commissions on persons with disabilities throughout the District.
6	Director Syed	There is a statement in the report that the 2018 Multimodal Design Guidelines resulted in projects that increased transit delay, but we have not established that causality.	Not all complete streets projects are created equal and there are many different factors that can contribute to transit delay (ex: delivery trucks, traffic congestion, the type of complete street projects) so the causation is difficult to pinpoint. As noted in the response to comment #4, the story remains the same that bus speeds in general have been trending downward for some time. The goal of the TSDG is to lay out conditions that would be safe and compatible for all users of the street, including transit and paratransit, and design that is supportive of efficient and reliable transit service.
7	Director Walsh	Concerns about renaming from “Multimodal Design Guidelines” to “Transit-Supportive Design Guidelines”. Removal of “multimodal” sounds like a retreat and we are in an ecosystem where we want to be supportive of multiple modes.	Much of the 2018 Multimodal Corridor Guidelines is still contained in this 2025 Transit-Supportive Design Guidelines document. We have just incorporated additional content, such as paratransit operational needs, layover needs, and considerations for the passenger experience. The goal remains the same that AC Transit is supportive of the development of pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure while also ensuring that those street improvements also facilitate safe access to transit and reliable transit operations.

<b>Board Member Comments (5/8/24)</b>			<b>Response</b>
8	Director Peebles	Once the TSDG is approved, schedule short presentations in front of city planning commissions (not just city staff) to give the commissioners an idea of what we’re doing	Noted.

<b>Board Member Comments (5/8/24)</b>			<b>Response</b>
9	Director Shaw	Does it matter if the sidewalk-level bikeway is in front of the bus shelter or behind the bus shelter?	We have both layouts shown as sample designs in the TSDG document, but we do not specify preference for one over the other. Throughout the document we have tried to make it clear that it is necessary to have clear delineation (ex: railings, bus stop furniture, planters, etc.) between pedestrian areas and the bikeway to avoid potential conflicts, and that visibility of the waiting passenger is also a critical design consideration to minimize instances of pass-ups.
10	Director Walsh	Questions about what outreach was conducted and what was heard	<p>The staff report and presentation includes a listing of the outreach that was conducted, and a summary of the comments received.</p> <p>City/jurisdiction staff were the only external group that formally received the full TSDG document for review and comment. Other meeting bodies only received presentation slides of varying detail depending on meeting context (e.g., ILCs received a condensed, high-level presentation, whereas BPACs and transportation commissions received more detailed presentations discussing the TSDG contents chapter by chapter). However, following some requests from Board members and the public to provide the full draft document for public review, staff provided commission members and attendees of several meeting bodies (i.e., Berkeley Commission on Disability, Berkeley Transportation and Infrastructure Commission) with the full draft document for review and comment.</p>
11	Director Walsh	Conduct more outreach, particularly with BPACs and City commissions	Staff conducted additional outreach at ILCs, Berkeley Commission on Disability, and the Berkeley Transportation & Infrastructure Commission. Staff made attempts to present to other groups (e.g., Oakland Mayor's Commission on Aging, Berkeley Commission on Aging) but were unable to do so, either because commission agendas were already too full or because of lack of interest in the topic.

Board Member Comments (5/8/24)			Response
12	Director Walsh	We should partner with cities to strive for road safety. The document should have more mention of Vision Zero and safety (safe and secure operations)	<p>The TSDG does not specifically use the term “Vision Zero”, but the document includes much discussion of safety for people walking, biking, and taking transit. For example, we state that the overarching goal of the TSDG is to facilitate high-quality transit service through improved street and bus stop design that helps minimize passenger travel time and ensures a reliable, convenient, safe, and comfortable transit experience. Chapter 1 also notes these safety-related goals and priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creation of safe pedestrian environments around bus stops and bikeways that complement AC Transit bus operations</li> <li>• Universal Design, the importance of creating a transit environment that is safe and fully accessible to all</li> <li>• Having bus stop designs that maximize rider comfort and minimize risk of collisions</li> </ul>
13	Director Walsh	What data do we have on bus speeds on streets where cities have done complete streets treatments?	<p>Attachment 2 contains a bus speed analysis before and after complete streets projects along Telegraph Avenue (Oakland) and Park Street (Alameda).</p> <p>The TSDG is a living document, and the vertical deflection section of the TSDG can be updated after we have more findings from the Speed Cushion study that is currently underway in partnership with the City of Oakland.</p>