Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
General - Right to Post and Disseminate Transit Information					
1	BART	Post Transit Info, Att. B, Sec. A.3	The terms "unconditional ability" and "unrestricted" are too broad and undefined. Also, the requirement needs to be modified to ensure that it doesn't jeopardize advertising franchise contractual rights or adversely impact advertising franchise revenues. BART has a 'no public service announcement' policy in order to maintain the legal status of BART facilities as non-public forums. The following alternate language is proposed: "Preserve Ability to Post Transit Information - MTC expects transit operators to preserve rights to post and disseminate connecting transit information for free within their facilities (including but not limited to route, schedule, fare, real-time transit information, and regional transit projects (e.g. 511 and TransLink®). For any transit agency that already entered into a third-party agreement that compromises these rights, MTC expects the transit agency to make good faith efforts to reinstate these rights in their agreement at the earliest opportunity and, at a minimum, to reinstate such rights in future agreements or renewals entered into after adoption of this Resolution. Nothing herein shall be interpreted as requiring transit agencies to display advertising. Rather, the objective is to provide transit customers with pertinent information that improves their transit experience."	MTC will eliminate the words "unconditional" and "unrestricted". MTC accepts BART's suggested language with the exception of 1) removing the reference that the right is for "MTC and connecting transit operators" and 2) removing the right to "disseminate" information, and with the addition of wording to make it clear the requirement includes the ability to inform customers about regional transit projects like TransLink and 511.	Yes
2	Golden Gate	Post Transit Info, Att. B, Sec. A.3	It is not practical for transit operators to preserve "unrestricted" rights for MTC and connecting transit operators to post, disseminate and promote transit information for free within their facilities. District staff proposes the word "unrestricted" be deleted.	See response to #1.	Yes

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
General - Cost-Sharing					
3	AC Transit	Cost-Sharing, Att. B, Sec. C	The cost sharing proposal appears to eliminate all aspects of the soft costs that each agency is required to absorb. We request that MTC take a full accounting of all costs associated with transit coordination projects, including transit agency operational costs (staff time, maintenance costs, and other residuals costs associated with project implementation), so that if additional revenues become available, there is an understanding of this demand.	MTC's approach to funding regional projects in Res. 3866 is meant to acknowledge that 'soft costs' exist, but also that there is a shared responsibility to implement regional projects.	No
4	SFMTA	Cost-Sharing, Att. B, Sec. C	The SFMTA requests that MTC be as clear as possible in this resolution about the process for determining funding and human resource commitments requested of transit operators, including the methodology and assumptions used to develop cost estimates as well as determination of cost allocations to individual operators. This would enable transit agencies to budget and project for these activities and analyze the ability of agencies to absorb these costs. Likewise, it would assist agencies in identifying the need for additional resources to help fulfill the mandated activities and staffing levels required. Further, this would help to inform a transparent discussion of project priorities, expectations, responsibilities, and incentives and disincentives for meeting project completion targets. It is imperative that these be clearly articulated to ensure that agencies understand cost impacts as well as funding requirements and availability.	Transit operators are best positioned to accurately estimate the amount of effort to implement coordination requirements at their own agencies. Res. 3866 attempts to be more specific with roles, responsibilities and requirements so that agencies can estimate their required level of effort and budget accordingly. Regarding transparency, MTC proposes to convene quarterly PTCC meetings, if this is of interest.	No
5	AC Transit	Cost-Sharing, Att. B, Sec. C	MTC should commit to prepare quarterly budget updates to its partnering transit agencies with detailed project expenses and revenues.	MTC will make available annual project budgets for TransLink, 511 Transit and the Hub Signage Program to the TFWG beginning FY 10/11.	No

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
General - Consultation Process					
6	Santa Rosa, SCT, Petaluma, MCTD, WCCTA, ECCTA, CCCTA, Fairfield, NCTPA	Consultation Process, Att. B, Sec. B	The PTCC met on November 23, 2009 for the first time since 2002, and with relatively short notice, to review and comment on proposed amendments to the Transit Coordination Implementation Plan (TCIP). Prior to the release of the meeting agenda, MTC staff did not share a copy of the proposed amendments with the full membership of the PTCC. Per SB 1474, the Commission must work in coordination with the PTCC on rules and regulations, such as those being proposed for amendment into the TCIP. However, this was not the case, and we request that the Commission delay adoption of Resolution 3866, and require that MTC staff work in coordination with the full PTCC membership on refining the new requirements of the TCIP, such as those that govern Translink and informational materials in transit facilities, to reflect the best interests of the region.	Staff does not recommend delaying adoption. MTC's approach was to solicit written feedback from transit operators on a draft policy that was largely developed with transit agency input on much of the contents through TACs. Transit operators were given several weeks notice about the PTCC meeting. MTC staff sent the draft Res. 3866 to all TAC members and visited several staff-level committees. Transit operators had 4 weeks to provide comments and MTC accepted late comments. MTC is responding to all transit agency comments in writing to maintain transparency and making reasonable changes. Lastly, MTC has scheduled a second PTCC meeting on February 8, 2010. In general, MTC's consultation process will be to consult with TACs when developing draft policy (or other advisory groups when there is no relevant TAC). Once drafted, MTC will solicit feedback from the PTCC. At its discretion, MTC may also solicit feedback from other committees during the review process. Lastly, MTC will forward staff's recommendation to the Operations Committee and full Commission for approval.	Yes

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
7	Santa Rosa, SCT, Petaluma, MCTD, WCCTA, ECCTA, CCCTA, Fairfield, NCTPA	Consultation Process, Att. B, Sec. B	Implores the Commission to direct MTC staff through Res. 3866 to work closely with the PTCC and the existing Partnership structure which has a broad awareness of how coordination requirements impact their agencies in the development of future amendments to the TCIP. MTC staff should not work solely with TACs that are narrowly focused on specific programs and may not include all operators in the region. SB 1474 requires that the Commission do this by working "in consultation with the regional transit coordinating council" (e.g. PTCC) in efforts to improve the efficiency and coordination of regional transit service. It was the intent of SB 1474 to allow for full transparency in the development of "rules and regulations" to promote improved regional coordination. By working through the PTCC and the Partnership structure, we can most effectively ensure this.	See response to #6.	Yes
8	BART	Consultation Process, Att. B, Sec. B	There was inadequate time to review the packet prior to the November 23, 2009 PTCC meeting. We would like to see increased communication with PTCC to better comply with the roles and responsibilities specified in SB1474 and to develop a more inclusive, cooperative approach to agency partnership.	See response to #6.	No
9	Santa Rosa, SCT, Petaluma, MCTD, WCCTA, ECCTA, CCCTA, Fairfield, NCTPA	Consultation Process, Att. B, Sec. B	To ensure fair and equal opportunity for all operators, we ask that Resolution 3866 require that future amendments be subject to approval by the full Commission and not just the Operations Committee, which may not reflect the full diversity of the region.	MTC staff agrees.	Yes
10	Advisory Council	Consultation Process, Att. B, Sec. B	Seems to set up a two-tier review process where MTC's Policy Advisory Council reviews changes after all other groups give input. Is this MTC's intent?	No, MTC's intent is that all committees, whether comprised of transit operator staff or advisors to MTC, have equal opportunity to weigh in on proposed changes, if warranted. The language in Res. 3866 will be clarified.	Yes

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
11	BART	Consultation Process, Att. B, Sec. B	It has been BART's perception that TACs have been utilized as a venue by which MTC has presented decisions without adequate opportunities for discussion and development of concurrence. BART would like to see the TACs have more authority to make recommendations to the PTCC, formally vote on items before them, and keep minutes. This would foster buy-in at all levels, which would help regional initiatives proceed more expeditiously. It would also be advantageous for there to be greater transparency around input from the transit agencies, with a uniform process for collecting, considering and responding openly to their comments.	The purpose of MTC's TACs is for transit operators to provide project-specific expertise and advice to MTC regarding its programs and policies, not the PTCC. MTC typically keeps minutes for the TACs. While TAC members don't officially vote on issues raised at the TAC, we do seriously consider consensus opinions and even minority opinions. It is in MTC's interest to accommodate transit agencies where practical.	No
General - Sanctions					
12	EDAC	Sanctions, Att. B, Sec. D	Add 'within 60 days, if no action is taken by an operator, MTC will withhold money for that year and if inaction continues, reprogram future year's funds'.	Existing draft language provides enough flexibility to address coordination problems should they arise without locking MTC into a specific course of action.	No
13	VTA	Sanctions, Att. B, Sec. D	MTC's inclusion of the threat to withhold funds for failing to meet deadlines is unnecessary. MTC holds certain rights as called for in SB 1474, and VTA believes it is sufficient to include those powers by reference.	MTC prefers to be explicit about its authority.	No
14	BART	Sanctions, Att. B, Sec. D	Pursuant to review by BART's Legal Department, please add the following new paragraph: "MTC shall not apply sanctions to a transit agency if noncompliance with the requirements of this Resolution and its Attachments is a result of a conflict between such requirements and that agency's existing contractual obligations or grant conditions, or a conflict with governing laws, regulations or court orders. Also, MTC shall not apply sanctions to a transit agency if the reason for noncompliance is beyond the control of that agency, including, but not limited to, an act or failure to act of another transit agency or any other party."	MTC will maintain existing sanctions language to preserve our ability to deliver on coordination objectives. However, MTC will certainly consider these factors when making a decision about good faith compliance efforts.	No

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
15	Santa Rosa, SCT, Petaluma, MCTD, WCCTA, ECCTA, CCCTA, Fairfield, NCTPA	General, Cost-Sharing, Sanctions	Asks that the Commission be sensitive to the financial challenges facing transit operators as it considers the elements of Resolution 3866 and proceeds in the future with expanding the list of special programs and related requirements that may detract from our basic mission of providing transit service in the region. Funding that is redirected, withheld, or reprogrammed away from transit operations to "coordination" programs may only serve to hurt the region and the patrons who rely on basic transit service to meet their daily needs for survival.	MTC staff appreciate the challenging financial circumstances many transit agencies and MTC face. It is not MTC staff's objective to unreasonably withhold, restrict or reprogram funds. Any such staff recommendation will be carefully considered.	No
General - Miscellaneous					
16	Advisory Council	General	Instead of actual transit agency consolidation which may be too difficult, what if all buses looked the same? What would be the impact to the customer?	This suggestion is beyond the scope of the current update of the Transit Coordination Implementation Plan and could be considered in the Transit Sustainability Project.	No
17	Advisory Council	General	Supports the idea of a common look for all bus systems and transit information.	See response to #16.	No
18	Advisory Council	General	Supports the idea of a common look for all bus systems and transit information. Also, consider color-coding routes/services.	See response to #16.	No
19	Advisory Council	General/ TransLink	Does not support the idea of a common look for all bus systems. Focus on functional consolidation instead, such as aligning discount programs across all transit operators. Build the TransLink brand, and use it to everywhere to unify the transit system.	MTC supports the alignment of discount programs across all transit operators and will explore this idea as part of the Transit Sustainability Project.	No

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
20	Emeryville TMA	General	The TransLink component applies to our operation indirectly. Because we are already "fare-free", we have no revenue to share with connecting services. However, we would be very interested in being able to offer customers whose trips originate in Emeryville on our free shuttle, the ability to transfer at no or low cost, to AC Transit services along the San Pablo corridor to reach destinations within Emeryville. This fare-free zone would result in efficiencies for both systems.	The Transit Sustainability Project is expected to include an evaluation of current fare policies, including shuttle services and connections with other services.	No
21	Emeryville TMA	General	The proposed route configuration changes planned for AC Transit's Route 57 in Emeryville will cause one of our routes to exceed capacity. We are interested in conversations about how costs might be shared to implement the necessary service increases so the financial burden created by one system's cutback doesn't fall solely on another provider's shoulders.	Service cuts throughout the region are having a negative impact on the system and transit users. The Transit Sustainability Project is expected to include an analysis of service design and delivery in the inner East Bay.	No
22	EDAC	General	If/when MTC addresses timed transfers in coordination requirements, be wary not to lower service levels of high-volume operators/transit lines. Requirement should be on smaller volume carriers to time transfer with larger volume carriers. In these hard economic times where service is being cut back, providing more service is more important than providing timed transfers.	Transit Connectivity Plan (2006) addresses timed transfers by recommending that once sufficient real-time information is available, transit operators monitor schedule adherence and coordination at regional hubs and provide performance data for MTC's State of the System report. At this time, this capability does not exist and MTC is not proposing detailed timed transfer requirements.	No

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
511 Transit Information - Appendix B-1					
23	Tri-Delta Transit	511, App. B-1 Transit General #3	Is it mandatory for agencies to post 511 information at bus stops/on signs (resource/space issues)?	The resolution's goal is to ensure that transit riders are aware of the full range of resources available to them. Therefore, it calls for links to 511.org on agency websites and for 511 references on new printed materials for traveler information, especially those that include connecting services. MTC acknowledges there is limited space on bus stop signs and will not mandate that 511 be included on them unless the sign includes a real-time transit stop identification number used on 511. Real-time stop ID numbers at bus stops must include reference to 511.	No
24	WestCAT	511, App. B-1 Transit General #3	Concerned that MTC could require placement of 511 stickers/logos/other marketing and contact info at more locations than agencies can manage or have resources to undertake. MTC should further define how many and to which types of locations this requirement applies.	See response to #23.	No

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
25	Golden Gate	511, App. B-1 Transit General #3	The District is concerned about some requirements and related costs including 1) expanded notification of availability of 511.org website and 2) quality control for 511 input/output as 511 functionality expands.	MTC expects transit agencies to provide clear and easy to find links to 511.org on their websites and in various places within their systems to increase awareness of regional transit information tools. Quality data from transit operators is required to provide ensure accuracy of regional information tools. Transit agencies are responsible for quality control of their data. Expectations for data quality control are defined in a draft of *511 Transit Program Roles and Responsibilities* . A draft version of this document was reviewed by the 511 Transit TAC. We have added one item under Transit Agency Responsibilities: "Agencies will share their data quality control review plan/process with MTC, as needed. The *511 Transit Program Roles and Responsibilities* document will be reviewed and updated annually, or on an as-needed basis, with input from the TAC. The current document will be posted on the MTC website at :http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/tcip/. Res 3866 Appendix B-1 will be changed to reference this document.	No

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
26	BART	511, App. B-1 Transit Real-time #7	For Real Time Transit Information, MTC is investing in a centralized, 'command and control' system to collect and manage real time transit information. BART and Muni have demonstrated that when agencies share real time data directly, a centralized system is not necessary to deploy the regional information services outlined in the 511 Strategic Plan and elsewhere. The BART and Muni open strategy has led to a number of third party products/services in areas that 511 is still planning to enter (e.g. mobile web sites and mobile applications, location-based services, SMS and IVR services). MTC has already used BART's open data services for the Embarcadero Kiosk. MTC does not need to control or intermediate real time data in order to use it and deliver on 511's stated objectives. An alternate approach could bring considerable cost savings to the region.	We disagree. The Commission has asserted the value of providing coordinated, regional real-time transit information. We require a regional data clearinghouse with a common data format to disseminate the real-time transit information from multiple transit operators on 511 and signs at transit hubs. BART's proposed use of "open" data feeds suggests that MTC build and maintain different interfaces for each operator's data feed. Having multiple interfaces is not efficient or cost-effective. The current regional data transfer standards ensure that we receive usable, consistent real-time information from all participating agencies and maintain cost efficiencies.	No

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
27	BART	511, App. B-1 Transit Real-time #8	For Real-Time Transit Information, all agencies, large and small, must build and maintain a real time interface application. Agencies should not be forced to adopt MTC's uncommon, customized Java Messaging Service (JMS) interface requirements. Instead, agencies should be incentivized (e.g. with capital assistance for building interface systems) to provide an open, public real time web service as BART and Muni have. MTC could use these open, distributed systems for 511 and third parties could have direct access to real time information without the added cost, overhead, and potential issues created by the intermediation of an additional, complex MTC system. It would bring more real time data to market faster, and in more ways, than any other public agency could manage under current regional plans. MTC has been exploring the release of real time data to third parties in TAC, and at the very least the PTCC should be advised of the current direction and an objective assessment of options going forward.	As stipulated in the *Regional Real-time Transit System Requirements*, agencies are not forced to adopt the JMS data interface. MTC provides exceptions to use Web Services where it makes sense. Both BART and MUNI are using the Web Services interface. MTC does not have funds, other than the RM2 real-time transit funds already programmed, to incentivize operators. MTC's use of the Technical Advisory Committees is explained in the response to #11.	No
28	AC Transit	511, App. B-1 MTC Real-time #5	For Real-Time Transit Information, restore deletion on page 3: "Jointly assess the value of making data feed available to third party ISPs. If industry evolves to suggest a new or different market demand for real-time data, MTC will develop, in consultation with transit agencies, a policy recommendation to the Commission".	It was agreed at the Real-time Transit TAC that the regional real-time transit data housed in 511 should be shared for free with third-party developers. This text was deleted accordingly. Similary, language in the *Real-Time Transit System Roles and Responsiblities* document (which will now be called, *511 Transit Program Roles and Responsibilities.*) was updated to reflect this change. We also added the wording cited in our response to #29.	No

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
29	SamTrans	511, App. B-1 MTC Real-time #5	Further discussions on data ownership and access are needed. It will be important to define these relationships. Real-time information has value and revenues could potentially be generated to data owners and providers.	The current trend in the industry is for open sharing of real-time data to software developers. We will add to the *Regional Real-time Transit System Roles and Responsibilities document (*which will now be called, *511 Transit Program Roles and Responsibilities) the following: "*If the real-time transit information industry evolves to suggest potential revenue for real-time transit data, MTC will develop, in consultation with transit agencies, a policy recommendation to the Commission."	No.
30	AC Transit	511, App. B-1 Real-time Roles & Responsibilites Document	For Real-Time Transit Information, configuration data should be archived for at least 6 months instead of the proposed 90 days. This will better support operators' sign-up and delays or changes to those in the future.	The requirement of 90 days was at the request of an agency with security concerns. We can revisit this requirement at the TAC if AC Transit desires.	No
31	Golden Gate	511, App. B-1 Transit Real-time #10	Regarding new real time transit data created by other transit operators and fed to District's information signs, MTC prohibits District from storing or sharing other systems' data with 3rd parties . Although staff appreciates MTC concern for privacy and 511 exclusive use of regional data, separating data by operator could be problematic - especially if Marin Transit is considered another operator, since service and data are so tightly integrated.	Due to a 2009 court case (County of Santa Clara v. Superior Court, 170 Cal.App. 4 1301), MTC is deleting from Appendix B-1 the transit agency real-time transit requirement prohibiting agencies from sharing partner agency data received from the 511 data system with third parties. The court in that case concluded that end user restrictions on public data are incompatible with the purposes and operation of the California Public Records Act. Also, it seems GGT has a misunderstanding of how data from multiple transit agencies will appear on transit hub signage. To clarify, MTC has the responsibility to display multiple transit agencies' data on transit hub signage. See "Sign Technical Req and Specifications v 1 1.doc" located at http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/tcip for more information.	Yes

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
32	AC Transit	511, App. B-1 Transit Real-time #12	For Static Transit Information, MTC should define the length and types of service disruptions that warrant reporting to 511.	The 511 Traveler Information Center's (TIC) Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) defines the service disruption information that TIC operators will post on 511. You can find the specific SOP definition at http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/tcip. Transit agencies are expected to deliver service disruption information to the 511 TIC.	No
33	EDAC	511, App. B-1 MTC General	Incorporate major destinations outside Bay Area such as Davis and Sacramento, especially when lines originate inside Bay Area (e.g. Capital Corridor) .	MTC will explore this option, though the current trip planner license is limited to base maps and address matching within the nine Bay Area counties only.	No
34	AC Transit	511, App. B-1 MTC General	Prefer the earlier draft document's higher level of specificity regarding MTC and transit agency responsibilities for the 511 Transit Information data exchange requirements. The new version doesn't seem to make specifics of these requirements clear enough to be actionable.	The roles and responsibilities in the earlier draft of Res. 3866, as reviewed by the 511 Transit TAC, continue to be valid. They are now available in "511 Transit Program Roles and Responsibilities,"available on MTC's website. Appendix B-1 in Res 3866 will reference the *511 Transit Program Roles and Responsibilities* document.	No
35	AC Transit	511, App. B-1 MTC General #2	Identify funding for the 511 Transit program in the resolution to ensure that it stays technologically current and adds features as needed.	Res. 3866 is not intended to document fund sources for any coordination project.	No
36	AC Transit	511, App. B-1 MTC General #2	Res. 3866 should be explicit that MTC will fund and support the development of software and data exchange practices which improve data exchange capability.	MTC anticipates development and O&M costs for software and data exchange tools during the planning and budgeting processes, and provides for system improvements, to the extent possible.	No
37	SFMTA	511, App. B-1 MTC General #2	Clarify whether the intention is for 511 to include paratransit information. Both SF Paratransit and East Bay Paratransit have stand-alone websites, and it may be helpful to make clear whether the ultimate intention is to also consolidate regional paratransit trip planning.	MTC continues to provide direct phone connections and website links to the region's paratransit operators. We do not plan on providing regional paratransit trip planning services through the transit trip planner.	No

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
38	AC Transit	511, App. B-1 MTC General #3	In coordination with its transit agency partners, MTC should conduct a review and comparison of industry best practices as part of its 511 performance monitoring/system enhancements.	As resources allow, MTC and its contractor, with regular input from TAC members, review developments and stay in contact with peers in the transit website information field to keep pace with industry best practices.	No
Hub Signage Program (HSP) - Appendix B-2					
39	AC Transit	HSP, App. B-2 #4	From time to time, AC Transit has successfully assigned this cost to the host property. We would rather that MTC act as an arbitrator when an agreement cannot be reached than assigning these responsibilities explicitly in Resolution 3866.	It is important to provide guidance on which transit agency is responsible for sign O&M, replacement and ownership at each hub so there is a regional approach to implementing the program and to minimize confusion or disagreement between transit agencies. That said, MTC is not opposed to transit agencies negotiating alternative approaches as long as the responsibilities are clear and sustained over time; however, if agreement cannot be reached, the default approach would be enforced.	No
40	AC Transit	HSP, App. B-2	Require that costs associated with moving signs on transit host properties required as a result of the host transit agency be borne by MTC or by the agency requiring the relocation of the sign.	Further discussion is needed at the Transit Connectivity TAC; no change is recommended at this time.	No
41	AC Transit	HSP, App. B-2	Investigate what authority MTC might have over the Ports to reduce or eliminate costs associated with the location of real-time signage on their property.	MTC knows of no authority it has over the Port of Oakland with respect to signs. We will continue to explore options.	No

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
42	SFMTA	HSP, App. B-2	How do hub signage requirements apply to SF Paratransit at regional transit connections, and have these services been addressed in discussions to date? For example, how will paratransit information be communicated at the Transbay Terminal, San Francisco and Daly City BART stations, or wherever regional transfers occur?	Regional sign standards do not address paratransit information. MTC will work with operators to identify regional paratransit transfer locations on regional maps where applicable. The HSP has limited real-estate to display information within hubs and is focused on fixed-route bus/rail/ferry services which do not require pre-planning/reservation for use. As it is, we are forced to condense and eliminate important information, and have almost no ability to provide information in multiple languages. Paratransit is usually more of a door-to-door service that requires advance planning/reservation.	No
43	EDAC	HSP, App. B-2	Conduct a focus group with disabled individuals to make sure sign design and information meets needs of cognitively impaired, etc.	MTC staff reviewed the draft signage design with MTC's EDAC in May 2008 and members of BART's accessibility task force participated in the Embarcadero Pilot review in June 2009. All signs have been designed to meet ADA requirements. While sign design is largely final, MTC will conduct a focus group with persons with disabilities including cognitive disabilities.	No
44	Golden Gate	HSP, App. B-2 #2	MTC requires operators of regional transit hubs to conform to their sign standards. Any deviation from the standards must be pre-approved by MTC. The District is concerned that this process is too limiting. Also, since operators become responsible for sign installation, maintenance and replacement, MTC's decisions can affect operator cost. It would be more reasonable to limit MTC authority to signs that it funds and to allow operators to deviate from MTC standards for economic reasons (or conform to standards "as resources permit"). It is notable that MTC reserves the right to provide assistance to operators on a "as resources permit" basis.	In general, MTC is limiting the requirements to the 24 regional transit hubs (including 3 airports). In the future, MTC could designate additional regional hubs. See MTC comment in #45.	Yes

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
45	MTC	HSP, App. B-2 #6	MTC is adding a requirement that as transit agencies plan new facilities or prepare for major remodels of existing facilities, they consult with MTC early in the planning process for applicability of the Standards to the project.		
46	AC Transit	HSP, App. B-2	What approach will be used to formalize sign ownership? (e.g. agreement, letter, resolution)	MTC will incorporate by reference in Res. 3866 a new table to document sign ownership. Sign ownership will be determined through the planning process prior to sign installation at each hub. The sign ownership table will be periodically shared with the TAC and maintained on MTC's website. MTC has not yet determined how ownership transfer will be formalized.	Yes
47	SamTrans	HSP, App. B-2, Att. 1	Given the financial state of transit agencies, we urge MTC to provide funding for lifecycle replacement and annual operations and maintenance costs.	MTC will provide funds for lifecycle replacement of real-time signs and assume some O&M responsibilities for transit information displays, wayfinding kiosks and real-time signs. Beyond this, transit operators have ownership, replacement and some O&M responsibilities depending on the sign type. While the transit industry is suffering financially right now, replacement costs are long term. MTC staff is open to reviewing O&M cost data collected by transit operators for regional signs once implemented. However, MTC staff believe that O&M cost will be incremental and modest, especially since many new signs replace existing signs (especially in BART stations) and MTC is paying some O&M costs.	No
48	BART	HSP, App. B-2, Att. 1	BART's operating budget is under extreme pressure and the agency is challenged to meet the demands of the riding public. BART would like to work cooperatively with MTC to monitor the issue of O&M cost (digital and other signage) going forward and find ways to fund O&M costs at the hubs to properly sustain the improvements.	See response to #47.	No

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
49	Advisory Council	HSP, App. B-2, Att. 1	MTC should earmark new funds for transit operators to cover maintenance costs associated with signs.	See response to #47.	No
TransLink - Appendix B-3					
TransLink - Participation Requirements					
50	BART	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. I #8 and Sec. II	This new requirement states that operators shall not establish other fare payment systems/policies that undermine TransLink without approval from MTC, while paragraph three in the subsequent section states that no new non-TransLink pre-paid fare media shall be created by any operator. These statements are somewhat inconsistent, but indicate that severe restrictions could exist for special fare instruments even though they do not compete with TransLink (e.g. New Year's Eve passes, group passes, special event fares and passes, and promotional fare products). These requirements could preclude BART from working with the region to develop options for limited use smart cards and to develop cell phone technology for fare payment use. We want to ensure that regulations position the region to take advantage of new technologies, and feel that we can assist in this regard.	The Resolution does not prohibit transit operators from making any decisions regarding their fare policies. As the Resolution makes clear, however, they do so at risk of their transit funding, if they approve a fare policy, fare payment system, or fare product which is detrimental to the TransLink program. MTC has made some revisions to the Resolution provisions referred to in this comment to clarify our intent. As a specific response to this comment by BART, MTC does not want to limit the development or implementation of better or alternative technology to smart cards. However, any such technology development should be made with the goal and policy to support and advance the region's investment in TransLink.	Yes
51	Golden Gate	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. II	MTC proposes a new requirement that infringes upon the operators' rights to set fare policy by prohibiting competing fare payment systems or policies without prior approval from MTC. The language MTC uses to define a competitive system is too broad. Our contemplated future reduction in the current frequent rider discount available to ferry riders using TransLink could be subject to this prohibition.	See response to #50.	Yes

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
52	VTA	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. I #8	The new TransLink participation requirements state that operators must receive MTC's approval prior to establishing new fare policies. As an independent agency under state law, VTA reserves the right to establish its fare policies and control fare revenues. The new requirement would be an infringement of the VTA Board's authority. At a minimum, the proposed changes in the participation requirement would be subject to VTA Board approval to continue to be part of the program.	See response to #50.	Yes
53	LAVTA	TransLink, App. B-3	As a small operator whose place in the TransLink implementation queue is undetermined, there has been virtually no contact with LAVTA about the scope, schedule, budget, and associated operator requirements. Of particular concern is the requirement to phase out pre-paid fare media within a year of TransLink readiness, and how the requirement will work with respect to some of LAVTA's business partners in our Commuter Club program. LAVTA requests that MTC staff brief us on TransLink, so we may more fully understand its impacts and benefits, and mutual expectations of each other as TransLink is implemented.	MTC looks forward to meeting with LAVTA staff, but this is unlikely to occur prior to Res. 3866 adoption.	No

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
54	Santa Rosa	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. II	Santa Rosa CityBus will have a problem with providing top priority to Translink for marketing purposes and may not be able to adhere to the clause "no new non-TransLink prepaid fare media shall be created by any transit operator", if the SMART system does not have Translink as its primary prepaid fare media. At this time, implementation of Translink on SMART is not part of the Translink budget. If SMART proceeds without implementing Translink and Golden Gate Transit reduces its corridor bus service to Santa Rosa (as expected), CityBus will not have a viable Translink-using transit connection to Marin and San Francisco (Marin Transit is also not currently on the Translink list). In addition, we would like to reserve the right to sell Day Passes in the form of fare media purchased off of buses (at stations and sales points). This fare media targets a different audience than Translink clientele and shouldn't be viewed as competition for Translink.	MTC established the TransLink budget prior to the establishment of SMART; at present, the budget does not include the system's implementation on SMART. MTC expects that any transit agencies beginning revenue service in the future will implement TransLink as a fare payment option, and the transit agency will fund costs associated with implementing the regional fare payment system. The TransLink Implementation Requirements require operators to "implement, operate and promote TransLink as the primary non-cash fare payment system." This is different than "providing top priority to TransLink for marketing purposes." MTC will work with all transit operators not yet operating TransLink to establish common fare payment options--i.e., passes, transfers, single-journey fares, etc. During this effort, MTC will work with Santa Rosa CityBus and other operators concerning implementing Santa Rosa CityBus's day pass as a TransLink fare	No
55	MTC	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. I	Clarify roles and responsibilities for the end-of-lifecycle replacement of TransLink® equipment and replacement of equipment due to damage following transfer of ownership. Appendix B-3 already includes text concerning transfer of ownership of equipment to transit agencies.		Yes
56	MTC	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. I	Add explicit requirements that operators perform responsibilities related to maintenance, card issuance, customer service, and financial reconciliation, and take steps to adequately train and keep informed their front-line personnel re TransLink		Yes

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
TransLink - Marketing and Communications					
57	MTC	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. II	Add as a new participation requirement for operators their assistance and cooperation in the change of the TransLink name to Clipper.		Yes
58	Golden Gate	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. II	Staff is concerned about requirements to incorporate TransLink in existing communications media. An "as resources permit" clause is needed to assure that operator costs are not significantly affected.	Regarding marketing materials and operator costs, MTC believes that the Resolution is clear that the incorporation of TransLink into existing communications media is required only "whenever the operator next updates the content of these items," making an "as resources permit" clause unnecessary.	
TransLink - Senior and Youth Card Distribution					
59	EDAC	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. III	Idea of eliminating senior/youth passes could result in abuse because there will no longer be a process to confirm eligibility for the discount. Why do we want to get rid of paper discount passes?	In approving the TransLink Phase II Operating Rules, the transit agencies have adopted verification standards to prevent distribution of discount-enabled cards to ineligible individuals. Transit agencies remain responsible for enforcement of discount policies at the point of fare payment, i.e. on a bus or in a station. See what is now Section III. of Appendix B-3 for a senior and youth card distribution process that may be	No
60	SamTrans	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. III	MTC should clarify that transit agencies will process the application for a TransLink card, but will not actually issue the card.	MTC is currently in discussions with transit agencies and the TransLink Contractor about the details of the TransLink senior and youth distribution program. As stated in the section on senior and youth card distribution, transit operators and MTC may agree upon a different approach for a senior and youth card distribution program than the approach described in the Resolution. As a specific response to this comment by SamTrans, MTC believes it is clear enough that transit agencies will not be issuing cards under the approach described in the Resolution.	No
61	SamTrans	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. III	The TransLink Card Distribution Program should also address, either in that section or elsewhere, an approach for users with disabilities.	MTC believes the existing distribution channels of the RTC program are meeting the needs of users with disabilities.	No

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
TransLink - Fare Media Transitions					
62	AC Transit	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	Remove Bear Pass since it has been on TransLink since February.	Agreed.	Yes
63	AC Transit	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	At the time this transition schedule was determined, AC Transit was not aware of the pending decision to rebrand the TransLink program. AC Transit sees significant problems and disadvantages in starting a transition campaign for adult 10-ride and 31-day ticket users in early 2010, as planned. AC Transit would like to explore moving the transition deadline for this population.	After further discussion with AC Transit, no change is being made to the Resolution regarding the transition dates for these AC Transit fare products.	No
64	BART	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	The student ticket is not an HVD product. BART will work with MTC to identify options for a scope expansion to offer student tickets on TransLink. For BART Plus, it is BART's understanding that this product was created as a temporary means to promote interoperator ridership until TransLink. AC Transit has already withdrawn from the BART Plus program, and SFMTA intends to withdraw at the end of 2010. BART requests MTC clarify its intent and convene a multi-agency discussion of potential future transition requirements for BART Plus.	MTC will correct the HVD reference. The Resolution does not set transition dates for either the student fare magnetic stripe ticket or the BART Plus ticket. The continuation or discontinuation of the BART Plus ticket is not a matter addressed by the Resolution. MTC has adopted language proposed by BART re the orange student ticket and BART Plus product, with some revisions. At BART's suggestion, MTC has added the BART Plus product to the fare media transition table for SFMTA, since SFMTA is one of the transit agencies which accepts it.	Yes

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
65	BART	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	Senior (green) and Youth and Disabled (red) magnetic tickets are not HVD products as indicated in the table. Implementation is contingent on timely establishment of a regional program to verify eligibility and distribute cards to youth and senior customers (disabled are mostly addressed by the RTC program card being converted to TransLink). Contingencies also include completion of a legal evaluation of the implications of restricting the availability of categorical discounts to only TransLink cardholders, and completion of the TransLink Ticket Vending Machine integration project. An additional constraint to be addressed is meeting the extraordinary education and support needs of these customers as they are transitioned to TransLink from magnetic stripe tickets, which is currently proposed to be occurring at the same time magnetic ticket HVD sales are ending. This indicates that the date for ending red and green magnetic ticket sales should be revised from March, 2011 to May, 2011.	MTC will correct the HVD reference. In MTC's view, sufficient time exists for the matters identified in the Comment to be worked out so that sales of red and green tickets can be in TransLink-only form in 2011 as desired. MTC believes the language in different sections of the Resolution regarding "good faith" and "reasonable effort" by transit agencies to implement the requirements the Resolution imposes upon them is sufficient. MTC is agreeable to a change in the date for ending red and green magnetic tickets to May 2011.	Yes
66	BART	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	The date for ending EZRider acceptance (September 1, 2010) is contingent upon a successful BART TransLink hard launch in January 2010, and mutually developing and implementing a practical plan to close EZRider accounts and transfer customers to TransLink. BART and MTC staff is currently working cooperatively on both of these issues; the date should be indicated as subject to change accordingly.	BART and MTC staff are working cooperatively toward development and implementation of "a practical plan to close EZRider accounts and transfer customers to TransLink." MTC believes the language in different sections of the Resolution regarding "good faith" and "reasonable effort" by transit agencies to implement the requirements the Resolution imposes upon them is sufficient. Due to the anticipated launch of 'Clipper' in mid-2010 as a new name for TransLink, however, MTC and BART have agreed to move the date for ending acceptance of EZ Rider as a method to pay for transit rides to October 1, 2010.	Yes

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
67	BART	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	The SFMTA fare media transition plan includes elimination of the paper BART-Muni two-way transfer and the paper BART-Muni Daly City two-way transfer effective March 30, 2010, at which time these transfers will be available only to riders using TransLink. BART recommends that the transition date for the two types of transfers be June 1, 2010 instead, because the additional 3 months will be key to the two agencies' jointly informing riders of this change and to achieving wider distribution of TransLink cards.	MTC agrees with the recommendation that a delay in the transition of these paper passes to TransLink-only is appropriate, but does so primarily for the reason that a change of the TransLink name to Clipper is planned to occur in mid-2010. The transition date for these fare products is set as August 1, 2010.	Yes
68	BART	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	Constraints and contingencies on ending magnetic High Value Discount (HVD) sales and offering a TransLink version include identifying alternatives, with determination of the scope, schedule, budget and funding to develop and implement a non-autoload HVD product. In addition, an issue to be discussed and resolved is the need to determine a means for BART to reconcile funds collected by third parties for this BART-only product, to ensure that payments are correctly credited to BART in a timely manner.	BART and MTC staff are working cooperatively toward development and implementation of the necessary steps to "ending magnetic High Value Discount (HVD) sales and offering a TransLink version." MTC believes the language in different sections of the Resolution regarding "good faith" and "reasonable effort" by transit agencies to implement the requirements the Resolution imposes upon them is sufficient.	No
69	MTC	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	MTC has decided to delete the provision that BART must alter its Autoload-only policy for the TransLink HVD product.		Yes
70	Caltrain	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	Caltrain is concerned about its ability to meet fare media transition dates as the TransLink system is not yet fully reliable. For example, handheld card readers used by train conductors are not operating in a reliable manner; TransLink Service Bureau response time is slow; and there are only limited numbers of retail and sales locations for Caltrain users.	Issues raised in comment are either currently being addressed, or will be addressed, so they are not grounds for any change in transition dates.	No

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
71	Caltrain	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	Transition of Caltrain's full fare monthly pass to TransLink will be challenging since we have had limited experience with monthly pass riders during soft launch. As MTC is well aware, Genentech was delayed in getting into the program due to issues with Cubic, the TransLink contractor. The first month that Genentech employees will be able to load the full fare monthly pass will be in February 2010, more than four months behind the anticipated schedule. We are concerned this slippage will ripple through the rest of the schedule.	MTC believes there are sufficient monthly pass holders currently using the system to allow immediate feedback. The addition of Genentech customers will allow even greater insight into the Caltrain pass holder experience. For this reason the assertions made in this comment are not grounds for any change to the Resolution.	No
72	Caltrain	TransLink, App. B-3	MTC has indicated it has removed Caltrain's participation in the ticket vending matching (TVM) integration project led by VTA, and has offered up to 32 add-value machines (AVM) to Caltrain instead. In addition to unresolved issues over cost of installation and maintenance of AVMs, Caltrain is quite concerned that AVMs may not be installed until after the transition date established by MTC.	MTC will work with Caltrain to make sure adequate add value distribution channels exist to support the planned transition. No change in transition dates is currently necessary due to this issue.	No
73	Caltrain	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	A monthly parking permit is not available for Caltrain riders. We are waiting to hear from Cubic via MTC on a possible interim solution.	MTC acknowledges this comment by Caltrain. No change in transition dates is currently necessary due to this issue.	No
74	Caltrain	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	Caltrain recommends waiting to establish a date for the integration of our Go Pass until we have more experience with the initial fare media, or at least until VTA has undertaken the Eco Pass change so that Caltrain can learn from VTA.	MTC intends to engage Caltrain in discussions regarding a Go Pass strategy. Until then, the resolution remains unchanged.	No
75	Caltrain	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	The proposed ramp-up numbers, or minimum sales per month, in the implementation plan seem arbitrary and Caltrain is concerned that actual numbers will fall short by a significant level.	MTC agrees to lower the ramp-up numbers because we will be discouraging significant marketing efforts prior to the launch of the Clipper brand in mid-2010.	Yes
76	Caltrain	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	The proposed auto-load number in the implementation plan is not realistic; Caltrain's cash users and paper Commuter Check users cannot use auto-load.	The overall TransLink autoload percentage is running at about 50. This is not a difficult requirement given the type of customers using Caltrain. No change to the resolution is necessary.	No

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
77	Caltrain	TransLink, App. B-3	There are limited purchasing options for Caltrain users - online, via phone, SF & SJ Caltrain stations, at SamTrans HQ office, and limited Walgreens locations (where Walgreens staff have limited knowledge of the system). Caltrain believes the issue of limited purchasing options could be resolved with the TVM integration project.	MTC disagrees with the assertion in this Comment that there are only "limited" purchasing options. No change in transition dates is necessary due to this issue.	No
78	SamTrans	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	SamTrans tokens are unique and popular, and do not lend themselves to integration in the TransLink system.	Although tokens are popular, MTC believes there would be a savings to SamTrans in handling if they were to be phased out in preference to TransLink.	No
79	SamTrans	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	SamTrans is to begin accepting TransLink two months following MTC's declaring it "revenue ready". Our prior experience with Caltrain indicates that "revenue ready" does not mean operationally ready, so we would recommend extending the deadline.	MTC expects the TransLink system will be operationally ready two months following MTC's determination that the TransLink Contractor has met all revenue ready requirements for the system's implementation on SamTrans.	No
80	SamTrans	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	MTC wants all prepaid fare media to be phased out one year after "revenue ready". Based on the experiences of other agencies that have reached this milestone, it is appropriate to extend that phase out for SamTrans an additional year to two years.	In general, MTC believes a one-year transition time will be sufficient in the future for all operators who have not yet reached Revenue Ready status. MTC has made revisions to the Resolution related specifically to SamTrans' and VTA's situations, however.	Yes
81	SFMTA	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	School/Youth Ticket Book - Revise comment to read, "Pending development of limited use card." No plan to discontinue this item.	Revision has been made as requested.	Yes
82	SFMTA	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	Class Pass - Recommend 6/1/11 transition given other priority transition areas. Requires significant coordination and resources to implement and results in very small increase in usage.	Draft Resolution says transition of Class Pass to be completed by June 30, 2010. This was in error. June 30, 2010 was intended to be date by which SFMTA determines a distribution strategy for the TransLink version of the Class Pass. MTC has revised the language regarding transition of the Class Pass to reflect that product development work still needs to be performed by the TransLink Contractor.	Yes

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
83	SFMTA	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	BART Two-Way Transfer - SFMTA and BART recommend transition date of 6/1/10 to ensure proper outreach and marketing.	MTC agrees with the recommendation that a delay in the transition of these paper passes to TransLink-only is appropriate, but does so primarily for the reason that a change of the TransLink name to Clipper is planned to occur in mid-2010. The transition date for this fare product is set as August 1, 2010.	Yes
84	SFMTA	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	BART/Daly City Two-City - SFMTA and BART recommend transition date of 6/1/10 to ensure proper outreach and marketing.	See response to #83.	Yes
85	SFMTA	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	Golden Gate Ferry Two-Way Transfer - Transition confirmed for 3/1/10	To allow the TransLink Contractor sufficient time to finish development work arising out of the new fare rules for this product, the last date on which these transfers will be accepted in paper form will now be March 30, 2010.	Yes
86	SFMTA	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	Senior Monthly Pass - Propose 2/1/11 as date. Not recommended to make fare changes during month of December due to holidays.	MTC agrees to this proposed change.	Yes
87	SFMTA	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	Youth Monthly Pass - Propose 2/1/11. Not recommended to make fare changes during month of December due to holidays.	See response to #86.	Yes
88	SFMTA	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	RTC/Disabled Monthly Pass - Date of 9/30/10 is dependent on adequate outreach and marketing to RTC members, in addition to concurrent availability of Senior/Disabled BART/Muni pass on TransLink.	MTC agrees to clarify that the transition date for this fare product will, if possible, be concurrent with the availability of the Senior/Disabled BART/Muni pass on TransLink, but regardless no later than February 1, 2011.	Yes

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
89	SFMTA	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	It may not be possible or prudent to transition RTC card holders to TransLink and eliminate the RTC sticker until the Senior/Disabled Pilot Muni/BART Pass is accommodated on TransLink. o Senior and Disabled RTC customers should be prioritized for transition to TransLink because they are most likely to utilize electronic fare media and are the same customers who will be participating in the Senior/Disabled Pass pilot program. o First priority is to get clarity from Cubic regarding what it will take to add this Senior/Disabled Pilot Muni/BART pass to TransLink. o Full RTC migration to TransLink should be a prerequisite for eliminating the RTC sticker. o TransLink add fare machine may be needed at the SFMTA RTC Card office and the Paratransit office.	MTC appreciates these comments by SFMTA. See responses to #86 and #88.	Yes
90	SFMTA	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	Plans for SFMTA to transition 30,000 seniors to TransLink in one year may be overly ambitious given current resource constraints. With staffing reductions and increased focus on core service delivery, funding for the one staff person who has been working on pilot distribution to seniors and disabled customers has been cut. An outreach and distribution campaign will be required to ensure that seniors are educated and informed about this dramatic change.	MTC appreciates these comments by SFMTA. See responses to #86 and #88.	Yes
91	SFMTA	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	SFMTA requests one-month delays in (a) the date by which it is to submit an implementation strategy and proposed transition date for the Lifeline fare product, and (b) the transition date for the Adult Single Ride Ticket Book.	MTC agrees to these requests.	Yes

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
92	MTC	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	While SFMTA is willing to confirm a transition date for the Adult BART/Muni Monthly Pass of June 30, 2010, MTC believes an adjustment, making the transition date for this fare product later, is appropriate, due to the anticipated launch of 'Clipper' in mid-2010 as a new name for TransLink. Thus, the transition date for this fare product is set as August 1, 2010.		Yes
93	VTA	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	The requirements provide that an operator would be excused from fare media transition requirements if the TransLink Contractor fails to meet at least 75 percent of cardholder support service levels as specified in the contract. VTA believes the 75 percent performance standard is unacceptable and that the TransLink Contractor should be held to at least a 90 percent service level. At 75 percent, potentially 1 in 4 customers could experience inadequate service, and VTA would not support transition of fare media to a program with inadequate customer support.	MTC shares VTA's concern about TransLink® users receiving a high level of customer service, which is why MTC is making any operator's full transition of fare media to TransLink® conditional upon adequate cardholder support performance by the TransLink® Contractor. On most of the cardholder support service level standards, the minimum acceptable level of performance is 90% or higher. In the Resolution, MTC has decided to increase the performance requirement that the Contractor must meet.	Yes
94	EDAC	TransLink, App. B-3, Sec. IV	Why does SFMTA fare media transition schedule have different date for senior and RTC/Disabled monthly passes?	Since 2007, all customers qualifying for RTC Discount Cards and receiving new, renewal or replacement cards already have received TransLink-compatible cards; thus, since nearly all qualifying RTC Discount Card customers already have TransLink-compatible cards, the plan calls for the elimination of non-TransLink alternatives for this market segment at an earlier date than for other market segments.	No

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
95	Advisory Council	TransLink App. B-3	Concerned TransLink could slow boarding compared to SFMTA proof-of-payment (POP) system. Tag on-off requirement on Caltrain undermines POP system. Agencies with POP system in place should not be held to same adoption rates as non-POP agencies. TransLink should be targeted at riders who would otherwise pay cash fares. Also, confused about how discounts are calculated via TransLink; concerns discounts will only be available if one loads discounted passes on the card.	MTC does not support modifying fare media transition requirements for agencies that operate proof-of-payment enforcement systems. TransLink is fully compatible with all fare collection and enforcement systems used by Bay Area transit agencies.	No
TransLink - Miscellaneous					
96	MTC	TransLink, App. B-3	Major subject headings of Appendix B-3 reordered		Yes
97	SFMTA	TransLink, App. B-3	SFMTA requests that the proposed resolution address when/if there will be specific plans and estimated timelines for implementing TransLink for use on Paratransit vans. This was delayed in the past to prioritize fixed route service, but should be revisited in the near future given the focus on regional connectivity and ease of payment.	In 2000, MTC and the transit agencies studied the possibility of implementing TransLink as a regional paratransit fare payment system. The effort concluded that TransLink is not appropriate for this purpose because of the diversity in approaches for paratransit fare collection.	No
98	Advisory Council	TransLink, App. B-3	TransLink does not work reliably on SFMTA for a variety of reasons. Concerned that users will have a bad experience and not support the system. There should be a feedback/evaluation process included in the plan to make sure projects meet expectations.	Performance evaluation is addressed at the project level, not in Resolution 3866 which focuses on regional coordination requirements. For TransLink, the Contractor's performance is measured by standards and KPI's in the contract between MTC and Contractor. The operation of TransLink devices in the field is the joint responsibility of the operators and Contractor.	No
99	Advisory Council	TransLink. App. B-3, Sec. II	What if the customer does not like, want or trust the TransLink system? If this makes it difficult to meet the 20 million transaction goal, can MTC change the goal? Transit agencies should not be responsible for not meeting these goals.	Following the transition of fare products to smart card-only availability, customers who choose not to use TransLink may still pay fares in cash. 20 million TransLink transactions per month is a benchmark established in the TransLink Contract between MTC and Cubic Transportation Systems; it is not a benchmark mentioned in Resolution 3866.	No

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
100	SamTrans	TransLink, App. B-3	The Business Rules have yet to be fully vetted, so there are likely to be other issues that also need to be addressed to assure effective implementation and least disruption for customers and operators. For example, further discussion should be undertaken concerning requiring bus operators to get out of the seat to change the fare (out of SF) and the need to be able to accommodate the Needy Family Youth Pass.	Discussion and collaboration between MTC, SamTrans, and the TransLink Contractor can and should continue to achieve our mutual goals of "effective implementation." No change to the Resolution as currently drafted is necessary to do so.	No
101	Caltrain	TransLink, App. B-3	The maximum fare to be deducted from TransLink for Caltrain users needs to be adjusted. For example it should be possible to exclude a 6-zone fare deduction during those times when trains do not run to Gilroy.	The TransLink system reflects the business rules approved by Caltrain. The comment proposes a new requirement beyond the business rules already approved by Caltrain. The comment does not relate to any provision in the Resolution.	No
102	EDAC	TransLink, App. B-3	AC Transit vehicles don't have TransLink reader at 2nd door, so a person in wheelchair can't use TransLink independently. When one surrenders card to bus operator, you don't know what happens with your card. Also, can discount/disabled fare value be added to TransLink card?	The draft resolution does not require the transition of AC Transit's senior/disabled fare products to smart card-only availability. Qualifying senior/disabled AC Transit customers will continue to have the option of all existing fare payment options unless AC Transit decides to modify those options. Regarding the availability of discount fares for qualifying senior/disabled customers, eligible customers may acquire specially-encoded TransLink cards that automatically grant discounts in accordance with transit operator fare policies.	No
Existing Coordinated Services (Appendix B-4)					
103	ACTIA	Existing Coordinated Services, App. B-4 #2	The Regional Eligibility Database is out of date. Please include stronger language requiring operators to update their information on a regular basis, perhaps every 6 months.	MTC will refer this issue to the Partnership's Paratransit/Accessibility Committee for consideration.	No

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
104	BART	Existing Coordinated Services, App. B-4 #5	The last sentence of that paragraph should read: "Express feeder bus services to/from BART stations during peak periods are maintained through direct allocation of BART STA funds to transit agencies as specified in the annual Fund Estimate." An additional sentence should be added: "Future funding for feeder services shall be evaluated as part of MTC's Transit Sustainability Project."	MTC will make the first change and is adding language in Res. 3866 to further clarify the arrangement. Express bus and feeder service is expected to be evaluated as part of the Transit Sustainability Project.	Yes
105	SamTrans	Existing Coordinated Services, App. B-4 #5	Given resource limitations, it is important to weigh the importance of providing regional links and express bus and feeder bus services in the context of the entire rubber-tire route structure (including local fixed-route bus services) and efficiency consideration.	Express and feeder bus services are expected to be evaluated as part of MTC's Transit Sustainability Project.	No
106	ACTIA	Existing Coordinated Services, App. B-4, Att. 1 #5	Regarding interagency paratransit passenger transfers, passengers overwhelmingly prefer a "hand-off" (where the first transit vehicle waits for the second vehicle) to the "drop and roll". The Plan should include much stronger language stating who has the authority on a regional basis to decide and enforce that policy. The "drop and roll" approach provokes more outrage, fear for safety, and general concern than many other issues.	MTC will refer this issue to the Partnership's Paratransit/Accessibility Committee for consideration.	No
107	SamTrans	Existing Coordinated Services, App. B-4, Att. 1 #6	To reach the goal of providing ADA services and end users with a one-step process for coordinating their entire trip, significant efforts are necessary to change and coordinate the business practices of multiple operators.	MTC staff's understanding is that transit operators have been in compliance with the Requirements for Interagency ADA Paratransit Services since this policy was developed in close cooperation with transit agencies. Since this comment suggests otherwise, MTC will refer this issue to the Partnership's Paratransit/Accessibility Committee for review.	No
108	SamTrans	Existing Coordinated Services, App. B-4, Att. 1 #8	When setting a regional fare payment method/policy for paratransit services, the policy must support pricing strategies that help transit agencies manage the demand for paratransit services which has the highest unfunded mandate of any rubber tire services.	Paratransit service and external cost drivers are expected to be considered in the Transit Sustainability Project.	No

Disposition Matrix: Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)

No.	Agency/Comm.	Res. 3866 Section	Comment	MTC Response	Change Res 3866?
109	ACTIA	Existing Coordinated Services, App. B-4, Att.1 #8	Many Paratransit Riders would prefer easier fare-pay for Regional Trips. Many riders purchase coupons from their own service, being able to pay their full fare at once at the beginning of the trip would be easiest. Riders would also prefer not to have to open up a payment account with an entirely different service (e.g. Outreach in Santa Clara).	Paratransit and regional fare policies will be evaluated as part of the Transit Sustainability Project. MTC will also refer this issue to the Partnership's Paratransit/Accessibility Committee for consideration.	No