Presentations for March 21, 2024 Board of Directors Meeting
Item 8: Website Redesign Project Award
WEBSITE REDESIGN
March 2024
San Francisco Bay Ferry
EXEMPLIFI

ABOUT
• Established in 2018
• Based in Palo Alto, Ca.

KEY QUALIFICATIONS
• Deep public transit experience
• Beautiful, user-friendly designs
• Mobile-first approach
• Responsive and proactive solutions
LA METRO
Metro.net

- Service maps
- Trip planner
- Service alerts
ACE RAIL
Acerail.com

- Trip planner
- Rider guides
- Interactive timetables
SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT
sacrt.com

- Project news and featured initiatives
- Mobile performance
- Application integration
WEBSITE REDESIGN PROJECT TIMELINE

- March 2024 – Award Contract, Project Kickoff
- April-May 2024 – Content Audit and Strategy
- May-June 2024 – Project Design
- July-Aug. 2024 – Project Development
- Aug-Sept. 2024 – Quality Assurance, Testing and Integrations
- Oct. 2024 – Training and Launch
QUESTIONS?
Item 10: APTA Peer Review
Organizing Capital Planning & Delivery

Peer Review
American Public Transportation Association
2024
Peer Review Methodology

APTA Peer Reviews enable experienced transit professionals to voluntarily provide expert advice, industry best practices, and recommendations to transit agencies seeking to address specific issues.

The peer review panel conducted this peer review virtually during the Fall of 2023 and early 2024. The review consisted of a series of discussions and interviews with WETA staff and leadership, as well as review of relevant documents.

This review is not intended as a comprehensive assessment of WETA’s staffing needs. It leverages industry best practices and experience to recommend approaches to organizing an effective and accountable capital planning and delivery function at the agency.
Peer Review Panel Members

Tim McKay  
VP – Senior Transportation Program Manager  
Jacobs  
Los Angeles CA

David Sowers  
Director, Terminal Engineering  
Washington State DOT Ferries  
Seattle WA

Marian Lee  
Partner  
Lighthouse Public Affairs  
San Francisco CA

Carrie Rocha  
Chief Capital Officer  
Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority  
Atlanta GA
Background

The Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA) operates the San Francisco Bay Ferry service. Formed in 2011 through a consolidation of existing operations, WETA has expanded over the next 10 years to become a critical component of the Bay Area transportation system. WETA functions with a small staff of 17 and a system that is operated by contracted crew and maintenance staff.

In February, the California Supreme Court issued a decision that makes $300 million in capital funds and up to $35 million in annual operating revenue available to WETA to fund the expansion of ferry service throughout the region. Some of these funds will also be used to maintain and enhance existing services and to complete the agency’s transition to zero-emission vessels. This transition, required to comply with California air emissions targets, requires significant investment in new vessels and electrification infrastructure.

The organization must be positioned to receive significant capital funding, make commitments and deliver projects on time and on budget. Organization restructure and expansion is necessary to ensure successful delivery and transition.
With new funding and the upcoming transition to electrified vessels, WETA requested the Peer Review Team to review two basic issues:

- What are the elements of an effective, accountable capital program?
- Benchmarked against other successful transit agencies – MARTA (Atlanta), Washington State Ferries, Port of San Francisco, and other agencies – how should WETA be organized to deliver a long-term capital upgrade and expansion program?
Effective Capital Planning & Delivery

An effective capital planning and delivery program depends on key overriding principles:

- **Credibility/Accountability/Consistency**: Availability of continued funding requires credibility and accountability. A competent, holistic project control function is essential to building public and regulatory oversight confidence in the ability of the agency to manage funding.

- **Avoid Eggs in One Basket**: In today’s environment of frequent change, project success cannot be dependent on a single person tasked with the entire project. Project planning and delivery should be institutionalized so that projects can advance regardless of personnel changes.

- **No One Size Fits All**: The complexity of project delivery today requires specialized expertise and smooth handover. Project planning, project delivery, public relations, grants management, project controls, safety, and operations all demand unique expertise. A mature capital program leverages this expertise to ensure project readiness as it advances from planning to construction to operations.
WETA’s Capital Program

- WETA’s staff has effectively delivered projects to date:
  - The Planning & Development group focuses on landside/terminal improvements. It also is responsible for service planning and fare structure.
  - The Operations group manages waterside capital projects (e.g., new ferries).
  - Each group manages projects vertically and horizontally through all project stages.
  - Projects often are assigned to a single person tasked with all project elements from planning through delivery. WETA’s small and nimble team depend heavily on consultants to augment the staff.
  - Project controls, grants management, and regulatory oversight interface are handled as needed, typically by the assigned project manager and their consultants.
Recommended Approach – Principles

A Larger, long-term capital program requires greater capacity, vertical integration and accountability.

• **Capacity**: Current staff levels are inadequate to support a large, complex capital and electrification program. Additional organizational capacity is required, relying on new employees and the strategic use of consultants to support both on-going needs and the short-term spikes during different capital project phases.

• **Separate Operations and Capital**: Separate the capital and operations functions – let each specialize in what it does best – but include responsibilities for Intra-group communications and hand-off management as projects move from conception to development to implementation and operations.

• **Dedicated Planning & Delivery**: The capital program group should include dedicated capital projects planning and project management/delivery functions that covers both landside and waterside projects.

• **Dedicated Project Controls**: Dedicated project control expertise, closely aligned with the CFO, is critical.
Recommendations – Organization

1. Expand Organizational Capacity, relying of mix of permanent staff and consultant resources that can be ramped-up/ramped-down as needed

2. Create Dedicated Planning & Project Delivery Function:
   - **Chief Capital Program Officer**: Create a new Chief Capital Program Officer position overseeing project planning and project management/delivery
   - **Project Planning & Delivery**: Separate the project planning and project management/delivery groups, but keep within one department to ease the “handoff” from planning to delivery
   - **Project Controls**: Create a dedicated project control function (scheduling; costs; reporting) either under the Project Management/Delivery or the CFO
3. **Executive Director**: Consolidate functions with fewer direct reports to the Executive Director. The ED should be focused on the larger vision with accountability for the capital program centralized in one department.

4. **Emergency Response**: Operations should include an emergency response function/safety function that works closely with executive staff from WETA and its contract operator.

5. **Hand-Off Management**: Intra-group communications and hand-off management is critical as projects move from conception to development to implementation and operations.
Final Comments

WETA has been remarkable to date in implementing capital upgrades, new fleet, and expansion. However, with significant expansion of the capital program underway, a larger, more institutionalized program is both appropriate and required. This will build internal expertise, build credibility with funding partners and the public, and help ensure accountability in the management of public funds.
Thank you

Sincere thanks to Seamus, Erin and the WETA Team!

Sincere thanks as well to the peers, without whom there would be no peer review.

APTA and the Peers remain available to support WETA as it moves forward with its historic new service.
Item 11: Parking and Access Study
Parking and Access Study

Noelani Fixler
San Francisco Bay Ferry Transportation Planning Internship Capstone
WETA Board of Directors Meeting
March 21, 2024
Background and Purpose

- Need for updated Parking Study
- Waterside/landside split, challenges
- Terminal access policy development and implementation
- Informing current and future terminal planning
Methodology

- Three weeks of manually collected parking and access data
- Comparisons between:
  - Three ferry terminals: Alameda Seaplane, Oakland, Richmond
  - On-board survey results
- Ferry terminal access topologies
TERMINALS AND TRIPS STUDIED

ALAMEDA SEAPLANE
9/18-10/2
Monday
7am trip
Seaplane → San Francisco Ferry Building

OAKLAND
9/18-10/2
Monday
7:30am trip
Oakland → San Francisco Ferry Building

RICHMOND
9/27-10/11
Wednesday
7:30am trip
Richmond → San Francisco Ferry Building
Study Limitations

- Parking data not available for Oakland parking lots
- Limited time, scope, staff capacity
Results and Discussion
Alameda Bike Infrastructure and Access Modes

- Drive Alone: 52%
- Bike: 25%
- Kiss-and-Ride/Carpool: 8%
- Transit*: 7%
- Walk: 7%
- Other: 7%

n=114

*Transit includes employer shuttles
Data from 2022 on board survey
Data from 2022 on board survey

*Transit includes employer shuttles

Drive Alone 45%

Kiss-and Ride/Carpool 18%

Bike 17%

Walk 12%

Transit* 2%

Other 5%

n=133
**Richmond Bike Infrastructure and Access Modes**

- Drive Alone: 57%
- Kiss-and-Ride/Carpool: 17%
- Walk: 5%
- Bike: 11%
- Transit*: 1%
- TNC: 1%
- Other: 7%

Data from 2022 on board survey

*Transit includes employer shuttles
Ferry Terminal Access Topologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminal Topology</th>
<th>Modeshare Topology Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>&lt; 40% access by car modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermodal</td>
<td>40-60% access by car modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermodal: car reliant</td>
<td>60-70% access by car modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car dependent</td>
<td>&gt; 70% access by car modes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Terminal Access Equity

Modeshare Distribution by Percentage of Income Bracket

- Under $15,000
- $15,000 - $24,999
- $25,000 - $49,999
- $50,000 - $74,999
- $75,000 - $99,999
- $100,000 - $149,999
- $150,000 - $199,999
- $200,000 or more

Data from 2022 On Board Survey
Terminal Access Equity

Percentage of Passengers

- < $50K
- $50K - $100K
- $100K - $150K
- $150K - $200K
- > $200K

Geographic Areas:
- Oakland & Alameda
- Vallejo
- Richmond
- Overall
PARKING AND ACCESS STUDY RESULTS

**ALAMEDA SEAPLANE AVERAGE MODESHARE PERCENTAGE 9/18-10/23**
- **Park:** 67%
- **Drop off:** 12%
- **Bike:** 19%

**OAKLAND NON-CAR ACCESS MODE AVERAGES 9/18-10/23**
- **Park:** 80%
- **Drop off:** 11%
- **Bike:** 9%
- **Scooter:** 2%

Parking data not available. Findings include an average of:
- 12 bikes
- 1 scooter

**RICHMOND AVERAGE MODESHARE PERCENTAGE 9/27-10/11**
- **Park:** 80%
- **Drop off:** 11%
- **Bike:** 9%
- **Scooter:** 2%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminal</th>
<th>Alameda Seaplane</th>
<th></th>
<th>Oakland</th>
<th></th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modeshare average</td>
<td>On board survey</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>On board survey</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>On board survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scooter</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop off</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive alone</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future work

- Recommendation #1: Prioritize Safe Bike Infrastructure and Bike Parking to Promote Sustainable Terminal Access
- Recommendation #2: Pursue Ferry Oriented Development
- Recommendation #3: Parking Management Strategies
- Recommendation #4: Install Electric Vehicle Chargers at Terminals
- Recommendation #5: Pursue Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Strategies
Thank you!