



ALAMEDA-CONTRA COSTA TRANSIT DISTRICT

Master Minute Order

File Number: 21-470

Report ID: 21-470

Type: Regular - Planning

Status: Received

**Agenda
Section:**

Meeting Body: Board of Directors -
Regular Meeting

Report Created: 09/22/2021

Final Action: 11/10/2021

ded Action: Consider receiving a report on the Rockridge BART Station Transfer Point - Alternatives Analysis and Feasibility Study. [Requested by Director Peeples 11/11/2015, 10/23/2019 and Director Walsh 6/9/2021]

Moved to 11/10 per Rama. LN 10.5

Sponsors:

Enactment Date:

Attachments: STAFF REPORT, Att.1. Rockridge BART Transfer
Alternatives Study

Enactment Number:

Hearing Date:

Effective Date:

History of Legislative File

Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
Board of Directors - Regular Meeting	11/10/2021	Received				Pass
Action Text: MOTION: WALSH/BECKLES to receive report on the Rockridge BART Station Transfer Point - Alternatives Analysis and Feasibility Study. The motion carried by the following vote:						
Notes: <i>[Written comment received prior to the meeting is incorporated into the file by reference.]</i>						

Senior Transportation Planner Sean Diest Lorgion presented the staff report.

Public Comment:

John Minot, EBTRU, commented on the staff presentation and offered suggestions and further considerations to improve passenger transfers.

Sheela Gunn-Cushman commented on the impracticality of bus rider transfers from a disabled rider perspective and noted that additional reporting about driver communication that aids riders with disabilities with transfers is required.

Steven Jefferson, Bus Operator, offered comments from a bus operator's perspective, noting that after a bus leaves the curb, it cannot stop. Jefferson added that a transfer station would create more convenience and provide safety for

operators and riders.

Board Discussion:

Director Beckles asked that staff take into account the lived experiences of riders, especially those who are visually impaired or have another type of disability and to consider feedback from operators as well.

Director Shaw asked if staff thought of different/cheaper ways to address the transfer problem that wouldn't cost so much and asked if staff had conducted an origin/destination study. Mr. Diest Lorgion advised that an origin/destination study had not been conducted, but staff did look at different alternatives within the surrounding Rockridge area in order to make it passenger transfers easier, while staying close to BART, especially on the east side of BART where the disability access is better.

Director Walsh commented favorably on the excellent report and asked if staff has information on the number of people that transfer at this location. Mr. Diest Lorgion commented that prior to 2011, the route was a single line and when it was studied in 2006, there were rough estimates that 2,400 riders would be impacted by splitting the line at Rockridge BART. Director Walsh noted her desire to eliminate transfers due to the impact of having the change buses, not only on Line 51, but all other lines as well. She hoped the Board would consider this down the road.

Director Walsh commented on the benefits to riders of using a connection protection feature which would let the bus operator know when another connecting bus was arriving, and asked why it wasn't being used. Mr. Diest Lorgion reported that staff piloted the use of connection protection within the District Computer Aided Dispatch System, but there were many issues with it that staff is still working to resolve. Chief Operating Office Salvador Llamas added that staff is working with the software vendor to figure out how best to maximize use of the connection protection system, how much interaction with the system is required by the bus operators and also to address on-time service issues that could result from holding a bus at every stop to wait for a connecting bus. Chief Information Officer Ahsan Baig provided additional information about programming the feature in the CAD/AVL system.

Director Peeples commented on the Line 51 report which was produced by staff more than a decade ago and involved transportation engineers from Alameda, Oakland and Berkeley. He added that there were 2,400 that would be affected, but many of them were traveling from Alameda to Berkeley, saying that many people figured out that they could transfer to Line 6 in downtown Oakland and get to Berkeley faster. He strongly supported the use of technology to ensure that passengers did not miss their connection and felt that having the 51A and 51B operate out of the same division to use the technology was a good idea. He further believed that interlining the 51A and 51B was a bad idea because the conditions of the original Line 51 study have not changed primarily because of traffic problems in

Berkeley.

Director Peebles wanted to know why the cost to do an east side stop on College Avenue for the 51A and 51B was so expensive. Staff explained there was a lot of work and capital costs associated with an east side stop on College and in order for the 51A buses make a right turn on Shafter to loop around and get back onto College Avenue. Director Peebles asked if the City of Oakland or the Rockridge Merchants Association had weighed in on the proposal, to which staff advised that it had not yet discussed the plan with businesses or the city as of yet. Director Peebles encouraged staff to have a dialogue with the city and neighboring merchants.

Ayes: 7 President Ortiz, Vice President Young, Director Walsh, Director Beckles,
Director Williams, Director Shaw, Director Peebles
