

**VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEE
Annual Program Compliance Report
Reporting Fiscal Year 2016-2017**

AGENCY CONTACT INFORMATION

Agency Name: **City of Piedmont**

Date: 12/4/2017

Primary Point of Contact

Name: Chester Nakahara

Title: Public Works Director

Phone: 510-430-3061

Email: cnakahara@ci.piedmont.ca.us

Agency's Certification of True and Accurate Reporting by Submission

By submitting this Compliance Report to the Alameda County Transportation Commission, the submitting agency certifies the compliance information reported is true and complete to the best of their knowledge, and the dollar figures in the agency's Audited Financial Statement matches exactly to the revenues and expenditures reported herein.

Program Compliance Report Structure

This Reporting Form is broken into the following sections for the Vehicle Registration Fee Direct Local Distribution Programs applicable to the recipient agency.

- * **Cover - Agency Contact**
- * **General Compliance Reporting for all programs**
- * **Table 1 - Summary of Revenue, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance**
- * **Table 2 - Detailed Summary of Expenditures and Accomplishments**

VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEE
Annual Program Compliance Report Fiscal Year 2016-2017

TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF REVENUE, EXPENDITURES, AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCE

DIRECTIONS: Complete the sections below based on the VRF Audited Financial Statements. Values must match financial statements and total reported expenditures.

A. VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEE Direct Local Distribution Program

	Local Streets and Roads	Notes
Beginning of Year Fund Balance	\$ 3,185	
Revenue	\$ 47,632	
Interest	\$ 12	
Expenditures	\$ 45,897	
<small>Expenditures Matches Table 2?</small>	<small>TRUE</small>	
End of Year Fund Balance	\$ 4,931	

**Local Streets and Roads (LSR) Direct Local Distribution Program
Reporting Period - Fiscal Year 2016-17**

GENERAL COMPLIANCE REPORTING

1. What is agency's current Pavement Condition Index (PCI)?

PCI =

Use PCI from the most recent MTC's VitalSigns linked here:

<http://www.vitalsigns.mtc.ca.gov/street-pavement-condition>

If your PCI falls below a score of 60 (fair condition), specify what actions are being implemented to increase the PCI.

Indicate N/A, if not applicable.

N/A
Note that the above PCI is from the MTC Street Saver program, Network Summary Statistics report generated on 5/12/2017. This is higher than the PCI shown in the above listed hyperlink for Piedmont (by 2 points)

2. Were any DLD LSR funded improvements this year provided exemptions from the locally adopted complete street's policy? If so, which projects and why?

N/A

3. Specify any large planned uses of fund balances within this program and their status i.e. planned or underway.

Project Title	Brief Project Description	Anticipated DLD Expenditure	Project Status
2017 Paving Project	Paving/microsealing of various streets	\$ 4,931	Underway

4. Confirm the completion of the publicity requirements in the table below (Yes/No).

	VRF (yes/no)	Copy of Article, website, signage Attached?	If applicable, briefly explain why the publicity requirement wasn't completed.
Article	Yes	Yes	Article did not mention specific funding
Website	Yes	Yes	
Signage	Yes	Yes	

**Local Streets and Roads Direct Local Distribution Program
Reporting Period - Fiscal Year 2016-17**

TABLE 2: DETAILED SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Provide a detailed summary of VRF Expenditures for the reporting fiscal year.

- Expenditure total must correspond to your Audited Financial Statements and Table 1 values

No.	Project Category <i>(Drop-down Menu)</i>	Project Phase <i>(Drop-down Menu)</i>	Project Type <i>(Drop-down Menu)</i>	Primarily Capital or Administrative Expenditure?	Project Name	Project Description/Benefits	Quantity Completed in FY 16-17	Units for Quantity <i>(Drop-down Menu)</i>	Additional description on units or expanded detail on expenditures, performance, accomplishments	VRF DLD Expenditures	Governing Board Approved?
1	Streets/Rds	Operations	Other (describe in Column H)	Administrative	Annual Compliance Reporting Requirements	Generation of annual compliance reports and audit to conform to requirements	1	Other (describe in Column K)	Compliance reporting requirements completed for FY 2016-17	\$ 500	Yes
2	Streets/Rds	Project Completion/Closeout	Street Resurfacing/Maintenance	Capital	Moraga-Highland Avenue Pavement Project	Pavement rehabilitation of Highland Ave between Highland Way and Sierra Ave., along with improvements to non-compliant curb ramps.	1	Other (describe in Column J)	Closeout of project	\$ 1,225	Yes
3	Streets/Rds	Construction	Street Resurfacing/Maintenance	Capital	2015 Pavement Project	Pavement and intersection improvements from 2015 plans.	0.2	Lane Miles	Improvements included 70 LF curb, gutter, sidewalk and pavement markings, bike lanes, signs and crosswalks, project completion & closeout. See also MBB/LSR	\$ 26,284	Yes
4	Streets/Rds	PS&E	Street Resurfacing/Maintenance	Capital	2017 Pavement Project	Pavement and intersection improvements.	1	Other (describe in Column J)	Advertising for project bids	\$ 560	Yes
5	Streets/Rds	Scoping, Feasibility, Planning	Other (describe in Column J)	Administrative	Kingston and Piedmont Court Parking Studies	Parking studies in 2 areas of the City for implementation of parking zones	80%	Other (describe in Column J)	Study	\$ 5,848	Yes
6	Streets/Rds	Scoping, Feasibility, Planning	Other (describe in Column J)	Capital	Citywide pavement Marking in GIS	Inventory of Citywide pavement markings	20%	Other (describe in Column J)	Begin field inventory of all pavement markings and input into City's GIS	\$ 2,192	Yes
7	Streets/Rds	PS&E	Pedestrian Crossing Improvements	Capital	Linda Ave. Crosswalk Improvements	Bulbouts and street lighting at midblock crosswalk locations along Linda Avenue	1	Other (describe in Column J)	Blueprint shop expenditures for project plan copies	\$ 559	Yes
8	Streets/Rds	Maintenance	Street Resurfacing/Maintenance	Capital	Failed Pavement Repair	Remove failed existing asphalt pavement, remove wet soil, backfill existing utilities, compact and repave roadway	270	Square Feet	2 locations	\$ 8,728	Yes
Percentage of Capital vs Administrative Costs				86%							
a. Total Capital				\$ 39,549							
b. Total Administrative				\$ 6,348							
									TOTAL	\$ 45,897	
									Match to Table 1?	TRUE	

If your agency did not expend greater than 50% of total costs on Capital Investments, explain how capital investments will increase in the future over Program Administration (outreach, staffing, administrative support). Indicate N/A if not applicable.

N/A