

November 13, 2022

Re: Nov. 14 Network Management Business Case Advisory Group Meeting  
**Item 4A: Regional Network Management (RNM) Progress Update**, Functional Areas  
& Preliminary Draft RNM Framework Review

Chair Mulligan,

Our groups view effective transportation network management as critical to the future - indeed, the very survival - of Bay Area transit. It will determine our ability to deliver an equitable, high ridership system that can rise to the challenge of our region's ambitious climate and livability goals. We welcome today's presentation and the opportunity to provide feedback on a preliminary network management structure.

While we recognize this proposal is only an initial framework and is yet to reflect input from the Advisory Group, we wish to submit some initial shared comments and questions based on the presentation materials already shared.

### **Composition of Proposed RNM Executive Board**

The materials include a proposal for an "RNM Executive Board" that would function as the primary "Steering element" of the RNM structure, beneath the "Regional Visioning Element" identified as MTC. Under such a structure, the RNM Executive Board would have a different relationship to MTC than the current Clipper Executive Board - which we are interested in learning more about at Monday's meeting. However, we are concerned that the body would be composed entirely of transit agency General Managers and the Executive Director of MTC, and wouldn't formally include rider, professional expert, or policymaker representatives.

We are concerned that the RNM Executive Board as outlined wouldn't have sufficient accountability to riders - especially considering this is likely to be the main forum where policy details around the delivery of customer-facing changes to the transit system would occur.

The proposal suggests that customers have been relegated to an "Advisory Function" off to the side, rather than incorporated directly into the Steering Function. In our experience, having customer advisory committees that meet separately from decision-making bodies has not led to customers being centered in decision-making. One way to address this would be to have multiple members of the Advisory Function participate directly in the Steering Function.

### **Role of Policymakers**

As we understand this proposal, the primary policymakers participating in the RNM framework are MTC Commissioners, and they do so as part of the "Regional Visioning Element" - setting the strategic vision and direction that the Steering Element and Administrative/Operational Elements are intended to execute on.

One practical challenge of this is the bandwidth of MTC. Commissioners already have many responsibilities, so it's unclear how much real oversight it would be reasonable to expect MTC can provide over the RNM Board.

It may be worth considering adding some policymakers from communities and transportation agencies directly to the RNM Board. This will increase collaboration and engagement throughout the process and not just when decisions come before MTC.

### **Setting Limits on Purview and Duration of Preliminary RNM Framework**

Our groups believe strongly that the region must prioritize developing a permanent, stable network management structure as soon as possible. In order to support that we wish to see this preliminary RNM Framework be limited in its duration. We suggest limiting the RNM Framework for a period of two years. This will provide a time limit for MTC and other stakeholders to identify a permanent network management structure, including the legislative and funding roadmap.

### **RNM Mission & Vision Statement**

Finally, it is unclear whether the "Proposed RNM Mission & Vision Statements" provided on page 13 of the materials are proposed to apply to this specific Preliminary Short/Near Term RNM structure, or the Regional Network Management more generally.

The BRTF and MTC already adopted a significantly more ambitious and outcome-oriented vision for transit transformation:

*"Design, adequately invest in, and effectively manage a public transit system that is equitable, inclusive, frequent, affordable, accessible and reliable; is integrated with unified service, fares, schedules, customer information and identity; and serves all Bay Area populations, resulting in increased transit ridership and reduced growth in vehicle miles traveled."*

Comments from Advisory Group members and members of the public at the September meeting supported the BRTF-adopted vision. A vision statement intended to apply to Regional Network Management generally should be of a similar level of ambition as the vision previously adopted.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit these early comments, and we look forward to the discussion on Monday, as well as opportunities to improve the preliminary RNM framework to put our region on a much stronger path toward transforming Bay Area transit.

Sincerely,

Ian Griffiths  
Policy Director, Seamless Bay Area

Russ Hancock  
President & CEO, Joint Venture Silicon Valley

Jason Baker  
SVP, Infrastructure and Regional Partnerships  
Silicon Valley Leadership Group

Zack Deutsch-Gross  
Policy Director, TransForm