Meeting Notice

Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee

Thursday, October 5, 2017, 1:30 p.m.
1111 Broadway, Suite 800
Oakland, CA 94607

Mission Statement

The mission of the Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) is to plan, fund, and deliver transportation programs and projects that expand access and improve mobility to foster a vibrant and livable Alameda County.

Public Comments

Public comments are limited to 3 minutes. Items not on the agenda are covered during the Public Comment section of the meeting, and items specific to an agenda item are covered during that agenda item discussion. If you wish to make a comment, fill out a speaker card, hand it to the clerk of the Commission, and wait until the chair calls your name. When you are summoned, come to the microphone and give your name and comment.

Recording of Public Meetings

The executive director or designee may designate one or more locations from which members of the public may broadcast, photograph, video record, or tape record open and public meetings without causing a distraction. If the Commission or any committee reasonably finds that noise, illumination, or obstruction of view related to these activities would persistently disrupt the proceedings, these activities must be discontinued or restricted as determined by the Commission or such committee (CA Government Code Sections 54953.5-54953.6).

Reminder

Please turn off your cell phones during the meeting. Please do not wear scented products so individuals with environmental sensitivities may attend the meeting.

Glossary of Acronyms

A glossary that includes frequently used acronyms is available on the Alameda CTC website at www.AlamedaCTC.org/app_pages/view/8081.
Location Map

Alameda CTC
1111 Broadway, Suite 800
Oakland, CA 94607

Alameda CTC is accessible by multiple transportation modes. The office is conveniently located near the 12th Street/City Center BART station and many AC Transit bus lines. Bicycle parking is available on the street and in the BART station as well as in electronic lockers at 14th Street and Broadway near Frank Ogawa Plaza (requires purchase of key card from bikelink.org).

Garage parking is located beneath City Center, accessible via entrances on 14th Street between 1300 Clay Street and 505 14th Street buildings, or via 11th Street just past Clay Street.

To plan your trip to Alameda CTC visit www.511.org.

Accessibility

Public meetings at Alameda CTC are wheelchair accessible under the Americans with Disabilities Act. Guide and assistance dogs are welcome. Call 510-208-7450 (Voice) or 1-800-855-7100 (TTY) five days in advance to request a sign-language interpreter.

Meeting Schedule

The Alameda CTC meeting calendar lists all public meetings and is available at www.AlamedaCTC.org/events/upcoming/now.

Paperless Policy

On March 28, 2013, the Alameda CTC Commission approved the implementation of paperless meeting packet distribution. Hard copies are available by request only. Agendas and all accompanying staff reports are available electronically on the Alameda CTC website at www.AlamedaCTC.org/events/month/now.

Connect with Alameda CTC

www.AlamedaCTC.org
facebook.com/AlamedaCTC
@AlamedaCTC
youtube.com/user/AlamedaCTC
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1. **Introductions/Roll Call**

2. **Public Comment**

3. **Administration**
   3.1. Approve the September 7, 2017 ACTAC Meeting Minutes.

4. **Programs/Projects/Monitoring**
   4.1. Approve Resolution 17-004, regarding the approval of the Alameda County 2018 STIP Project List; and approve Resolution 17-005, the project-specific resolution of local support for recommended STIP projects implemented by the Alameda CTC.
   4.2. Alameda County Federal Programming Update.

5. **Policy and Transportation Planning**
   5.1. Rail Strategy Study Update.

6. **Information Exchange Forum**
   6.1. Bay Area Regional Advanced Mitigation Planning and East Bay Pilot.

7. **Member Reports**

8. **Adjournment/Next Meeting**
   Thursday, November 9, 2017

---

All items on the agenda are subject to action and/or change by the committee.
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1. **Introductions/Roll Call**
   Arthur L. Dao called the meeting to order. A roll call was conducted. All members were present with the exception of Aleida Andrino-Chavez, Miriam Chion, Sergeant Ed Clarke, Kevin Connolly, Matt Davis, Amber Evans, Anthony Fournier, Jayson Imai and John Xu.

   **Subsequent to the Roll Call**
   Aleida Andrino-Chavez and Jayson Imai arrived after the vote on item 3.1. Amber Evans arrived during item 4.1 Christy Wegener left during item 4.1

2. **Public Comment**
   There were no public comments.

3. **Administration**
   **3.1 Approval of April 6, 2017 ACTAC Meeting Minutes**
   Obaid Khan moved to approve this item. Donna Lee seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following votes:

   - **Yes:** Bell, Brown, Dao, Hahn, Izon, Javandel, Kelley, Khan, Larsen, Lee, Payne, Ruark, Wegener, Williams
   - **No:** None
   - **Abstain:** Horvath
   - **Absent:** Andrino-Chavez, Chion, Clarke, Connolly, Davis, Evans, Fournier, Imai, Xu

4. **Programs/Projects/Monitoring**
   **4.1 Senate Bill 1 Programs Update and approve the 2018 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Principles and Programming Schedule for the development of the Alameda County 2018 STIP project list.**
   Vivek Bhat provided an overview of funding programs under the purview of Senate Bill 1 (SB 1) and recommended that ACTAC approve the 2018 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Principles and Programming Schedule for the development of the Alameda County 2018 STIP project list. He noted that the California Transportation Commission (CTC) adopted the final STIP program guidelines in August. He informed the committee that the STIP project list is due to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) on October 16, 2017. Mr. Bhat reviewed the 2018 draft STIP principles, stating that the principles are similar to what have been approved in prior STIP cycles. Mr. Bhat noted that the principles are intended to be consistent with the goals and objectives of the Countywide Transportation Plan and the Alameda CTC’s Comprehensive Investment Plan. He reviewed the existing STIP commitments and provided information on the 2018
STIP schedule. Mr. Bhat noted that a list of projects will be brought before the committee next month.

Donna Lee asked if BART would need to submit documentation regarding the Station Modernization project that was deprogrammed in a prior STIP cycle. Mr. Bhat confirmed that BART will need to submit documentation.

Obaid Khan asked will the CIP be updated with the STIP project list. Mr. Bhat affirmed that the STIP projects will be included in the 2018 CIP update in spring 2018.

Ruben Izon asked if new applications may be submitted for STIP projects. Mr. Bhat responded that at this point new applications cannot be submitted. He stated applications submitted for the 2018 CIP would be considered.

Hans Larsen expressed concern about several outstanding projects components left out as a part of the BART Warm Springs Extension. He requested considering the West Access Bridge, which is a BART facility, and the Irvington BART Station as candidate projects for the STIP program.

Obaid Khan moved to approve this item. Farid Javandel seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following votes:

Yes: Andrino-Chavez, Bell, Brown, Dao, Evans, Hahn, Horvath, Imai, Izon, Javandel, Kelley, Khan, Larsen, Lee, Payne, Ruark, Williams
No: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Chion, Clarke, Connolly, Davis, Fournier, Wegener, Xu

Jacki Taylor recommended that ACTAC approve the proposed 2017 Federal Earmark Repurposing Strategy. She reviewed the projects that are eligible for repurposing and she reviewed the benefits of repurposing funds for these projects. Ms. Taylor concluded her report by reviewing the approval schedule and process.

Thom Ruark moved to approve this item. Bruce Williams seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following votes:

Yes: Andrino-Chavez, Bell, Brown, Dao, Evans, Hahn, Horvath, Imai, Izon, Javandel, Kelley, Khan, Larsen, Lee, Payne, Ruark, Williams
No: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Chion, Clarke, Connolly, Davis, Fournier, Wegener, Xu

4.3. Alameda County Federal Inactive Projects Update
Jacki Taylor provided an update on the August 2017 Federal Inactive List. She requested that the committee review the Caltrans inactive list in the packet. Ms. Taylor encouraged ACTAC members to stay current with their federal invoicing and to provide her with project status updates for any inactive projects. Mr. Bhat noted that the state’s goal is to maintain the list of inactive obligations under two percent and that currently the Inactive obligations were at eight percent. He encouraged local jurisdictions to submit their invoices diligently to help the state achieve the two percent target.

This item is for information only.

5. Policy and Transportation Planning
   5.1. Approve Alameda CTC’s Transportation Technology Initiative and Matching Opportunity.

Saravana Suthanthira recommended that ACTAC approve Alameda CTC’s Transportation Technology Initiative and Matching Opportunity. She noted that approval of this item allows Alameda CTC to embark on a feasible and practical approach to leveraging funds for transportation technology and to develop an approach on how the Alameda CTC will in the future address technology in Alameda County. Ms. Suthanthira reviewed Alameda CTC’s transportation technology initiative, which is a three pronged approach to advance technology solutions that will 1) provide matching funds to successful IDEA grant applications through MTC’s technology grant program for Alameda County member agencies, 2) seek information from local jurisdictions on technology needs through a letter of interest and 3) seek information from technology companies, universities and other organizations to help investigate and validate new data collection methods through a letter of interest.

Farid Javandel moved to approve this item. Obaid Khan seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following votes:

Yes: Andrino-Chavez, Bell, Brown, Dao, Evans, Hahn, Horvath, Imai, Izon, Javandel, Kelley, Khan, Larsen, Lee, Payne, Ruark, Williams
No: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Chion, Clarke, Connolly, Davis, Fournier, Wegener, Xu

5.2. Alameda County Safe Routes to Schools Program Update.

Cathleen Sullivan provided an update on the Safe Routes to Schools Program (SR2S). She reiterated that it is a countywide program that encourages walking, bicycling, carpooling and riding transit to school safely. Ms. Sullivan gave an overview of the new implementation structure and discussed the role of local jurisdictions in Alameda County with the SR2S program. She noted that Alameda CTC sees this as a partnership with local jurisdictions and would like to engage with ACTAC on a regular basis. She also discussed City and County involvement in site assessments and informed the committee that Advisory Committees will be formed within each area of the county that will allow agency partners to have an opportunity for strategic input.
5.3. **Congestion Management Program Conformity Findings**
Tess Lengyel introduced Chris G. Marks and noted that he is a new addition to the Planning Team as an Associate Transportation Planner. Mr. Marks provided an update on the Congestion management Program (CMP) Conformity Findings. He noted that the Conformity Findings will go before the Commission for adoption in November 2017.

This item is for information only.

5.4. **Share Your Ride Week Update**
Tess Lengyel noted that there are several types of promotional programs across the state and Alameda CTC is in coordination with Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), Contra Costa Transportation Authority and other regional partners to launch Share your Ride Week from October 2-6, 2017 during Rideshare Week. She noted that one of the objectives of this campaign was to raise awareness of opportunities available to solo-driver commuters and encourage them to try modes like carpool, vanpool and public transit. Another objective was to promote technologies that make sharing rides easier. Ms. Lengyel stated the campaign was also a part of Alameda CTC’s Travel Demand Management efforts.

This item is for information only.

6. **Information Forum**
6.1. **Transportation Technology efforts in cities of Fremont, San Jose and Joint Venture Silicon Valley**
Saravana Suthanthira informed the committee that the information exchange forum provides an opportunity to share experience and information on innovative transportation efforts occurring in the county and in the Bay Area region. The topics for the September ACTAC included city-focused and region wide transportation technology efforts, including presentations from the City of Fremont, San Jose and the Joint Venture Silicon Valley.

Hans Larsen, City of Fremont Public Works Director, presented Fremont’s Smart Mobility Solutions. He discussed Fremont’s adoption of Vision Zero (in 2015), participation in the USDOT Smart City Challenge (in 2016), and its current preparation of a Smart City Strategic Plan and a Mobility Action Plan, that defined a bold vision for modern multimodal mobility for the Bay Area’s fourth largest city. Mr. Larsen noted that key transportation innovation and technology efforts include: 1) managing extreme commute traffic impacts through a partnership with Waze, using data science and drones, and real-time text alerts; 2) supporting electric vehicle use by the public and for city fleet vehicles, including a proposed partnership with Tesla to develop an Electric Vehicle police patrol vehicle; and 3) implementing the Fremont Boulevard Safe and Smart Corridor project (funded by Measure BB).
Ho Nguyen, City of San Jose ITS Manager, presented their ITS Plan that is part of the San Jose’s Innovation Roadmap for Improved Traffic Management. His presentation focused on the infrastructure and system management components that aim to translate the Vision identified in the Innovation Roadmap for this element. Some of the efforts include: enhanced operational capabilities with a recently completed, state of the art traffic management center coupled with a $20M investment in traffic field infrastructure, large scale system-wide emergency vehicle preemption technologies to better support public safety, LED streetlight conversion through public-private partnerships, Facebook Terragraph trial deployment for improved public WiFi experience, and Automated Traffic Signal Performance Measures (ATSPM) implementations to provide real-time performance data for improved signal operations and maintenance.

Steve Raney, Executive Director for Joint Venture Silicon Valley’s Mobility, presented the Fair Value Commuting Project. The Bay Area Fair Value Commuting (FVC) Demonstration Project by Joint Venture Silicon Valley won the Federal Transit Administration’s Mobility on Demand Sandbox Program Grant in 2016. This project is modeled after a next generation effort of Stanford University’s sophisticated commute program that reduced Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) commuting from 75 to 50 percent, by charging SOV fees and offering incentives toward taking alternative commute modes. The FVC system components include enterprise & smartphone apps, incentives/fees, electric scooter/bike, microtransit, and advanced ridesharing.

7. Member Reports
There were no member reports.

8. Adjournment and Next Meeting
The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m. The next meeting is:

    Date/Time:    Thursday, October 5, 2017 at 1:30 p.m.
    Location:    Alameda CTC Offices, 1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA  94607

Attested by:

Vanessa Lee,
Clerk of the Commission
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DATE: September 28, 2017

SUBJECT: 2018 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP): Alameda County 2018 STIP Project List

RECOMMENDATION:
1. Approve Resolution 17-004, regarding the approval of the Alameda County 2018 STIP Project List; and
2. Approve Resolution 17-005, the project-specific resolution of local support for recommended STIP projects implemented by the Alameda CTC.

Summary

The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is a multi-year capital improvement program of transportation projects on and off the State Highway System, funded with revenues from the State Highway Account and other funding sources administered by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). The 2018 STIP will include programming capacity resulting from the passage of the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 (Senate Bill 1) and covers Fiscal Years (FYs) 2018-19 through 2022-23. Alameda County’s share of the State’s 2018 STIP Fund Estimate is $48.8 million and represents the amount of new STIP funding made available in the last two years of the 2018 STIP period. Staff is recommending Commission approval of the Alameda County 2018 Project List (Attachment A) which is consistent with the 2018 STIP Principles approved by the Commission in September 2017 (Attachment B).

The recommendation for the Alameda County 2018 STIP Project List includes an exchange component between STIP and Alameda CTC-administered local funds (Attachment C). The exchange proposal includes reprogramming $12 million of existing STIP funding from the East West Connector project to the I-80 Gilman Interchange project for a like amount of local funds and reprogramming $2 million of 2018 STIP funds proposed for the Caldecott Settlement project to the SR-84 Widening from south of Ruby Hill Drive to I-680 and SR-84/680 Interchange Improvements project for a like amount of local funds.

Background

The STIP is a multi-year capital improvement program of transportation projects on and off the State Highway System, funded with revenues from the State Highway Account and other funding sources. Senate Bill 45 (SB 45) was signed into law in 1996 and had
significant impacts on the regional transportation planning and programming processes. The statute delegated major funding decisions to a local level and allows the Alameda CTC to have a more active role in selecting and programming transportation projects to be funded through the STIP. SB 45 changed the transportation funding structure and modified the transportation programming cycle, program components, and expenditure priorities. The STIP is composed of two sub-elements: 75% of the STIP funds goes toward the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and 25% goes to the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP).

The Alameda CTC is to adopt and forward a county program of STIP projects to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) each biennial STIP cycle. As the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the nine-county Bay Area, MTC is responsible for developing the regional priorities for the STIP. MTC approves the region’s RTIP and submits it to the CTC for inclusion in the Statewide STIP. The MTC region’s RTIP is due to the CTC in December 2017.

2018 STIP Fund Estimate

The CTC approved the Fund Estimate for the 2018 STIP at its August 2017 meeting. The 2018 STIP Fund Estimate identifies a total of approximately $48.8 million for Alameda County. Based on anticipated regional policy (and existing regional commitments), the Alameda CTC will have about $24.9 million available to program to projects. The MTC Region 2018 STIP Policy is scheduled to be approved on October 25, 2017.

$ 48.813 M  2018 Fund Estimate for Alameda County
$ 23.914 M  Fulfillment of previous STIP commitments *
$ 0.466 M  Less STIP Administration funds for MTC
$ 1.535 M  Less STIP Administration funds for Alameda CTC
$ 24.899 M  2018 STIP Funds Available to Program to Projects

* Due to limited STIP funding in past STIP cycles, the Alameda CTC (and the Alameda County CMA prior to the Alameda CTC) periodically approved commitments for future STIP funding starting with the 2008 STIP cycle. With each subsequent cycle, the Alameda CTC has prioritized the programming of available STIP funding, to the extent practicable, to the approved STIP commitments.

2018 STIP Project List

Staff is recommending Commission approval of the 2018 STIP Project List (Attachment A) consistent with the Principles for the 2018 STIP Project List, approved by the Commission in September 2017 (Attachment B). The Principles prioritize consideration of previously approved STIP commitments related to the programming of future Alameda County STIP shares. These commitments included MTC Resolution 3434 projects and funds to payback Measure B advances for project development work on Proposition 1B Infrastructure Bond projects. In some cases, previous STIP commitments have since been delivered using
other funding or have been delivered with less funding than originally anticipated due to significant project savings. The recommendation for the 2018 STIP Project List includes programming to fulfill the STIP commitments from previous cycles to projects with remaining funding needs.

The projects recommended for 2018 STIP funding are based on the project applications submitted for the Alameda CTC’s 2018 Comprehensive Investment Plan (CIP). The CIP process involves extensive outreach and consideration of a wide range of investments for the various funding programmed and allocated by the Alameda CTC, including the Alameda County share of STIP funding.

**2018 STIP Exchange Proposal**

The 2018 STIP recommendation includes an exchange between STIP and Alameda CTC-administered local funds. The proposal includes reprogramming $12 million of existing STIP funds from the East West Connector project to the I-80 Gilman Interchange project for a like amount of local funds and exchanging $2 million of proposed 2018 STIP funds from the Caldecott Settlement project with the SR-84 Widening from south of Ruby Hill Drive to I-680 and SR-84/I-680 Interchange Improvements project for a like amount of local funds.

The 2014 STIP included $12 million for the East West Connector project which is currently programmed in FY 2020-21. The I-80 Gilman Interchange project is proposed as a new project in the 2018 STIP with the STIP funds proposed for FY 2020-21 to align with the current construction schedule. Additionally, moving the STIP funds onto the I-80 Gilman Interchange project would result in less administration costs for the East West Connector project and increasing the local funding programmed to the project will add flexibility to its project delivery strategy.

The $2 million balance remaining from the Alameda CTC’s existing funding commitment to the Caldecott Settlement project is also proposed through the 2018 STIP. In order for the City of Oakland to access these funds earlier than the 2018 STIP schedule, staff is proposing exchanging a like amount of local funds from the SR-84 Widening, South of Ruby Hill Drive to I-680, and SR-84/I-680 Interchange Improvements project.

The I-80 Gilman and SR84/I-680 Interchange projects are both being implemented by the Alameda CTC. Thus, the Commission is also requested to approve Resolution 17-005, the MTC-required 2018 STIP project-specific resolution of local support (Attachment E).

**Next Steps**

The Alameda CTC must forward a draft 2018 STIP Project List to MTC by October 13, 2017. Final governing body approval and all supporting documentation is due to MTC by November 1, 2017. MTC will consolidate the RTIP proposals from the nine Bay Area counties into a 2018 Regional STIP program (2018 RTIP), which is due to the CTC in December 2017. The final 2018 STIP is scheduled to be approved by the CTC in March 2018.
**Fiscal Impact:** There is no fiscal impact.

**Attachments**

- A. 2018 STIP Draft Project List
- B. Approved 2018 STIP Principles
- C. 2018 STIP Exchange Proposal
- D. Resolution 17-004, Approval of Alameda County 2018 STIP Program
- E. Resolution 17-005, Alameda CTC’s 2018 STIP Resolution of Local Support

**Staff Contacts**

- Vivek Bhat, Director of Programming and Project Controls
- Jacki Taylor, Senior Program Analyst
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index #</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount Proposed for 2018 STIP ($ x 1,000)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
• $23.125 remaining per Revised Resolution 14-007.  
• $10M fulfilled through Measure BB Allocation.  
• $13.125M proposed for 2018 STIP will fulfill Alameda CTC’s existing funding commitment to BRT. |
| 2      | Route 24 Corridor – Caldecott Settlement Projects                        | 2,000                                    | • $8M included with Resolution 08-018, Dec. 2008.  
• $2M fulfilled in STIP 2008.  
• $2M fulfilled in STIP 2010.  
• $2M fulfilled in STIP 2014.  
• $2M proposed for 2018 STIP will fulfill Alameda CTC’s existing funding commitment to project. |
| 3      | BART Station Modernization                                                | 3,726                                    | • $3.726 represents Alameda County portion of multi-county STIP project.  
• Project was moved out of the 2016 STIP period due to a negative fund estimate. |
| 4      | Improved Bike/Ped Connectivity to East Span SFOBB (BATA)                 | 3,063                                    | • $3.063 represents Alameda County portion of regional STIP project.  
• Project was moved out of the 2016 STIP period due to a negative fund estimate. |
| 5      | Caldecott ARRA Payback                                                   | 2,000                                    | • Project was moved out of the 2016 STIP period due to a negative fund estimate.                                                  |
| 6      | STIP Administration                                                       | 2,001                                    | • Alameda CTC STIP Administration $1.5 M  
• MTC STIP Administration $0.5 M                                                                                                   |
| 7      | I-80 Gilman Interchange Improvements                                     | 13,784                                   | • New project proposed through 2018 STIP                                                                                         |
| 8      | SR-84 Widening from south of Ruby Hill Drive to I-680 and SR-84/680 Interchange Improvements | 9,114                                    | • New project proposed through 2018 STIP                                                                                         |
|        | **Total**                                                                | **48,813**                               |                                                                                                                                      |
Principles for the Development of the Alameda County 2018 STIP Project List

- It is anticipated that any new funding programmed in the 2018 STIP will be made available in FYs 2021/22 and 2022/23.
- Previously-approved commitments for STIP programming, included in the attached list, will be considered during the development of the 2018 STIP project list.
- Sponsors of currently programmed projects will be required to provide updated project scope, status, schedule, cost and funding information.
- Any project considered for funding must be consistent with the Countywide Transportation Plan and satisfy all STIP programming requirements.
- Projects recommended for STIP funding must demonstrate readiness to meet applicable STIP programming, allocation and delivery requirements and deadlines.
- Consideration of the following are proposed for the required project prioritization for the development of the 2018 STIP project list:
  - The principles and objectives set forth in the Alameda CTC Comprehensive Investment Plan;
  - Previous commitments for STIP programming approved by the Alameda CTC;
  - Projects that can leverage funds from other SB1 programs
  - The degree to which a proposed project, or other activity intended to be funded by transportation funding programmed by the Alameda CTC, achieves or advances the goals and objectives included in the Countywide Transportation Plan;
  - The degree to which a proposed project has viable project implementation strategies that are based on current project-specific project delivery information provided by applicants, including:
    - Readiness for the current/requested project delivery phase;
    - The status of environmental clearance;
    - The project cost/funding plan by phase;
    - The potential for phasing of initial segment(s) which are fully-funded and provide independent benefit; and
    - Potential impediments, i.e. risks, to successful project implementation in accordance with the proposed project delivery schedule.
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## Exchange 1

### Current Programming (w/ Proposed 2018 STIP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Phase</th>
<th>$ x 1,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-West Connector Project</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80 Gilman Interchange Reconfiguration</td>
<td>13,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,784</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposed Programming (Attt Exchange)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Phase</th>
<th>$ x 1,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-West Connector Project</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80 Gilman Interchange Reconfiguration</td>
<td>25,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,784</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Exchange 2

### Current Programming (w/ Proposed 2018 STIP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Phase</th>
<th>$ x 1,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldecott Settlement Projects</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 84/I-680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>9,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,114</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposed Programming (After Exchange)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Phase</th>
<th>$ x 1,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldecott Settlement Projects</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 84/I-680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>11,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,114</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ALAMEDA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION 17-004

Approval of the Alameda County 2018
State Transportation Improvement (STIP) Program

WHEREAS, SB 45 (Chapter 622, Statutes 1997) substantially revised
the process for estimating the amount of state and federal funds
available for transportation projects in the state and for appropriating
and allocating the available funds to these projects; and

WHEREAS, as part of this process, the Alameda County
Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) is responsible for
programming projects eligible for Regional Improvement Program funds,
pursuant to Government Code Section 14527 (a), for inclusion in the
Regional Transportation Improvement Program, and submission to the
Metropolitan Transportation Commission and then to the California
Transportation Commission (CTC), for inclusion in the State Transportation
Improvement Program (STIP); and

WHEREAS, projects recommended for inclusion in the 2018 STIP
must be consistent with the goals and objectives of the Alameda CTC
Comprehensive Investment Plan and the Countywide Transportation
Plan and satisfy all STIP programming, allocation and delivery
requirements; and

WHEREAS, the Alameda CTC 2018 STIP Principles placed a
programming priority on projects that have received a commitment of
future STIP programming and projects that can leverage funds from
other Senate Bill 1 programs; and

WHEREAS, the funding identified in the 2018 STIP Fund Estimate for
Alameda County includes approximately $2 million of STIP capacity for
Planning, Programming and Monitoring (PPM) and $ 46.8 million of
Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) for a total of $ 48.8
million.
NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Alameda CTC approves the 2018 STIP program detailed in Exhibit A.

DULY PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Alameda County Transportation Commission at the regular Alameda CTC Board meeting held on Thursday, October 26, 2017 in Oakland, California, by the following vote:

AYES: NOES: ABSTAIN: ABSENT:

SIGNED: Attest:

_________________________  _____________________________
Rebecca Kaplan, Chair    Vanessa Lee, Commission Clerk
### EXHIBIT A

**Alameda County 2018 STIP Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index #</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount Proposed for 2018 STIP ($ x 1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AC Transit Bus Rapid Transit Project</td>
<td>13,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Route 24 Corridor – Caldecott Settlement Projects</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BART Station Modernization</td>
<td>3,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Improved Bike/Ped Connectivity to East Span SFOBB (BATA)</td>
<td>3,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Caldecott ARRA Payback</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>STIP Administration</td>
<td>2,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I-80 Gilman Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>13,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SR-84 Widening from south of Ruby Hill Drive to I-680 and SR-84/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>9,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>48,813</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Resolution of Local Support

Resolution No. 17-005

Authorizing the filing of an application for funding assigned to MTC and committing any necessary matching funds and stating assurance to complete the project

WHEREAS, the Alameda County Transportation Commission (herein referred to as APPLICANT) is submitting an application to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for $36,898,000 in funding assigned to MTC for programming discretion, which includes federal funding administered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and federal or state funding administered by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) such as Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STP) funding, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funding, Transportation Alternatives (TA) set-aside/Active Transportation Program (ATP) funding, and Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) funding (herein collectively referred to as REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING) for the I-80 Gilman Interchange Reconfiguration and SR-84 Widening from south of Ruby Hill Drive to I-680 and SR-84/ I-680 Interchange Improvements projects (herein referred to as PROJECT) for the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) (herein referred to as PROGRAM); and

WHEREAS, the United States Congress from time to time enacts and amends legislation to provide funding for various transportation needs and programs, (collectively, the FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION ACT) including, but not limited to the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STP) (23 U.S.C. § 133), the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) (23 U.S.C. § 149) and the Transportation Alternatives (TA) set-aside (23 U.S.C. § 133); and

WHEREAS, state statutes, including California Streets and Highways Code §182.6, §182.7, and §2381(a)(1), and California Government Code §14527, provide various funding programs for the programming discretion of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA); and
WHEREAS, pursuant to the FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION ACT, and any regulations promulgated thereunder, eligible project sponsors wishing to receive federal or state funds for a regionally-significant project shall submit an application first with the appropriate MPO, or RTPA, as applicable, for review and inclusion in the federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and

WHEREAS, MTC is the MPO and RTPA for the nine counties of the San Francisco Bay region; and

WHEREAS, MTC has adopted a Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606, revised) that sets out procedures governing the application and use of REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING; and

WHEREAS, APPLICANT is an eligible sponsor for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING; and

WHEREAS, as part of the application for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING, MTC requires a resolution adopted by the responsible implementing agency stating the following:

- the commitment of any required matching funds; and
- that the sponsor understands that the REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING is fixed at the programmed amount, and therefore any cost increase cannot be expected to be funded with additional REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING; and
- that the PROJECT will comply with the procedures, delivery milestones and funding deadlines specified in the Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606, revised); and
- the assurance of the sponsor to complete the PROJECT as described in the application, subject to environmental clearance, and if approved, as included in MTC’s federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and
- that the PROJECT will have adequate staffing resources to deliver and complete the PROJECT within the schedule submitted with the project application; and
- that the PROJECT will comply with all project-specific requirements as set forth in the PROGRAM; and
- that APPLICANT has assigned, and will maintain a single point of contact for all FHWA- and CTC-funded transportation projects to coordinate within the agency and with the respective Congestion Management Agency (CMA), MTC, Caltrans, FHWA, and CTC on all communications, inquiries or issues that may arise during the federal programming and delivery process for all FHWA- and CTC-funded transportation and transit projects implemented by APPLICANT; and
- in the case of a transit project, the PROJECT will comply with MTC Resolution No. 3866, revised, which sets forth the requirements of MTC’s Transit Coordination Implementation Plan to more efficiently deliver transit projects in the region; and
- in the case of a highway project, the PROJECT will comply with MTC Resolution No. 4104, which sets forth MTC’s Traffic Operations System (TOS) Policy to install and activate TOS elements on new major freeway projects; and
• in the case of an RTIP project, state law requires PROJECT be included in a local congestion management plan, or be consistent with the capital improvement program adopted pursuant to MTC’s funding agreement with the countywide transportation agency; and

WHEREAS, that APPLICANT is authorized to submit an application for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING for the PROJECT; and

WHEREAS, there is no legal impediment to APPLICANT making applications for the funds; and

WHEREAS, there is no pending or threatened litigation that might in any way adversely affect the proposed PROJECT, or the ability of APPLICANT to deliver such PROJECT; and

WHEREAS, APPLICANT authorizes its Executive Director, General Manager, or designee to execute and file an application with MTC for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING for the PROJECT as referenced in this resolution; and

WHEREAS, MTC requires that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the MTC in conjunction with the filing of the application.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the APPLICANT is authorized to execute and file an application for funding for the PROJECT for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING under the FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION ACT or continued funding; and be it further

RESOLVED that APPLICANT will provide any required matching funds; and be it further

RESOLVED that APPLICANT understands that the REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING for the project is fixed at the MTC approved programmed amount, and that any cost increases must be funded by the APPLICANT from other funds, and that APPLICANT does not expect any cost increases to be funded with additional REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING; and be it further

RESOLVED that APPLICANT understands the funding deadlines associated with these funds and will comply with the provisions and requirements of the Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606, revised) and APPLICANT has, and will retain the expertise, knowledge and resources necessary to deliver federally-funded transportation and transit projects, and has assigned, and will maintain a single point of contact for all FHWA- and CTC-funded transportation projects to coordinate within the agency and with the respective Congestion Management Agency (CMA), MTC, Caltrans, FHWA, and CTC on all communications, inquiries or issues that may arise during the federal programming and delivery process for all FHWA- and CTC-funded transportation and transit projects implemented by APPLICANT; and be it further
RESOLVED that PROJECT will be implemented as described in the complete application and in this resolution, subject to environmental clearance, and, if approved, for the amount approved by MTC and programmed in the federal TIP; and be it further

RESOLVED that APPLICANT has reviewed the PROJECT and has adequate staffing resources to deliver and complete the PROJECT within the schedule submitted with the project application; and be it further

RESOLVED that PROJECT will comply with the requirements as set forth in MTC programming guidelines and project selection procedures for the PROGRAM; and be it further

RESOLVED that, in the case of a transit project, APPLICANT agrees to comply with the requirements of MTC’s Transit Coordination Implementation Plan as set forth in MTC Resolution No. 3866, revised; and be it further

RESOLVED that, in the case of a highway project, APPLICANT agrees to comply with the requirements of MTC’s Traffic Operations System (TOS) Policy as set forth in MTC Resolution No. 4104; and be it further

RESOLVED that, in the case of an RTIP project, PROJECT is included in a local congestion management plan, or is consistent with the capital improvement program adopted pursuant to MTC’s funding agreement with the countywide transportation agency; and be it further

RESOLVED that APPLICANT is an eligible sponsor of REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING funded projects; and be it further

RESOLVED that APPLICANT is authorized to submit an application for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING for the PROJECT; and be it further

RESOLVED that there is no legal impediment to APPLICANT making applications for the funds; and be it further

RESOLVED that there is no pending or threatened litigation that might in any way adversely affect the proposed PROJECT, or the ability of APPLICANT to deliver such PROJECT; and be it further

RESOLVED that APPLICANT authorizes its Executive Director, General Manager, City Manager, or designee to execute and file an application with MTC for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING for the PROJECT as referenced in this resolution; and be it further

RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution will be transmitted to the MTC in conjunction with the filing of the application; and be it further

RESOLVED that the MTC is requested to support the application for the PROJECT described in the resolution, and if approved, to include the PROJECT in MTC’s federal TIP upon submittal by the project sponsor for TIP programming.
DULY PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Alameda County Transportation Commission at the regular Alameda CTC Board meeting held on Thursday, October 26, 2017 in Oakland, California, by the following vote:

AYES:  NOES:  ABSTAIN:  ABSENT:

SIGNED:  Attest:

_________________________  _____________________________
Rebecca Kaplan, Chair  Vanessa Lee, Commission Clerk
DATE: September 28, 2017

SUBJECT: Alameda County Federal Programming Update

RECOMMENDATION: Receive an update on status of Federal Programming in Alameda County.

Summary

Leading up to the start of the new Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) on October 1st and in anticipation of the approval of the One Bay Area Grant Cycle 2 (OBAG 2) program of projects by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) later this fall, MTC staff have been closely monitoring the delivery of projects currently programmed with federal funds, including developing the FFY Annual Obligation Plan, identifying Local Agency Single Point of Contact (SPOC) and monitoring inactive projects. ACTAC Representatives are requested to review the attached material related to federal programming and project delivery, including the final Draft FFY 2017-18 Obligation Plan (Attachment A), Local Agency SPOC inventory (Attachment B), SPOC Checklist (Attachment C) and Caltrans’ Federal Inactive project List, dated 9/21/17 (Attachment D).

Background

**FFY 2017-18 Draft Obligation Plan**

MTC’s Regional Project Delivery Policy, Resolution 3606, requires MTC to develop an Annual Obligation Plan by October 1st of each year, in coordination with Local Agencies and Caltrans. Projects included on this annual plan are subject to the delivery deadlines identified in Resolution 3606, including submitting a complete Request for Authorization (RFA) by November 1, 2017 and receiving an FHWA authorization (E-76) by January 31, 2018. Attached is the proposed FFY2017-18 Annual Obligation Plan, dated 09/19/17 (Attachment A). Final comments were due to MTC by Friday, September 22, 2017. Any projects with unobligated OBAG 1 funds must remain programmed in FFY 2017-18 and meet the Resolution 3606 delivery deadlines.
Local Agency SPOC Checklist

An agency’s designated Single Point of Contact (SPOC) is the point person for all FHWA and State-funded transportation projects for their agency and is to coordinate with their own agency staff as well as with Congestion Management Agency (CMA), MTC and Caltrans staff on various actions related to a project’s federal and state funding. MTC requires Local Agencies to comply with certain requirements in order to qualify for the various regional discretionary funding sources awarded by MTC, including:

- Assign and maintain a single point of contact for all FHWA-administered projects implemented by the agency
- Track the status of major delivery milestones for all programmed and active FHWA-administered projects implemented by the agency and provide quarterly status updates to your CMA
- Maintain all active FHWA-administered projects in good standing with respect to regional, state and federal delivery deadlines, and federal-aid requirements. This includes ensuring timely invoices for all projects.
- Maintain consultant and/or staff resources with the knowledge and expertise to deliver federal-aid projects within the funding timeframe and meet all federal-aid project requirements
- Attend a minimum of 50% of MTC’s Partnership Working Group meetings annually, i.e., the Transit Finance (TFWG), Local Streets and Roads (LSRWG) and/or Programming and Delivery (PDWG) meetings

The current agency SPOCs for Alameda County are listed in Attachment B. Signed SPOC Checklists for FFY 2017-18 were due to MTC by October 2nd. Moving forward, MTC will require a signed SPOC Checklist (Attachment C) to be submitted annually. Additional information regarding a SPOC’s role and responsibilities can be found on the MTC website at: [http://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/fund-invest/federal-funding/project-delivery](http://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/fund-invest/federal-funding/project-delivery)

Inactive Projects

Federal regulations require agencies receiving federal funds to invoice against each federal obligation at least once every six months. Caltrans maintains a list of inactive obligations and projects are added to the list when there has been no invoice activity for six months. If Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) do not receive an invoice during the subsequent six-month period the project’s federal funds will be at risk for deobligation. ACTAC is requested to review the latest inactive projects list (Attachment A), which identifies the federal funds at risk and the actions required to avoid deobligation. In response to FHWA’s requirements for processing inactive obligations, Caltrans Local Assistance proactively manages federal obligations, as follows:
• Projects without invoice activity for more than six months will be deemed "inactive" and added to the list of Federal Inactive Obligations. The list is posted on the Caltrans website and updated weekly: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/Inactiveprojects.htm.

• Caltrans will notify local agencies the first time projects are posted.

• If Caltrans does not receive an invoice within the following six months (12 months without invoicing), Caltrans will deobligate the unexpended balances. The deobligation process is further detailed in FHWA's Obligation Funds Management Guide, which states that project costs incurred after deobligation are not considered allowable costs for federal participation and will therefore remain ineligible for future federal reimbursement.

It is the responsibility of local agencies to submit timely invoices. In the event a project becomes inactive, local agencies are to coordinate with their respective District Local Assistance Engineers to remedy the deficiency, ensure the project is removed from the inactive list promptly, and to avoid deobligation of funds. Additionally, per MTC Resolution 3606, agencies with inactive projects may be subject to restrictions on future federal funds.

Next Steps

Agency SPOCs are to comply with MTC's SPOC requirements, as identified and affirmed in the completed SPOC Checklists. Projects included in the FFY 2017-18 Obligation Plan are to submit a request for authorization (RFA) to Caltrans Local Assistance by November 1, 2017. Agencies with inactive projects identified in the attached report are to submit timely invoices to Caltrans and are requested to provide periodic status updates to Alameda CTC programming staff until the inactive status is cleared and the project is removed from the Caltrans report. Email invoice status updates to Jacki Taylor, jtaylor@alamedactc.org.

Fiscal Impact: There is no fiscal impact.

Attachments

A. Draft FFY 2017-18 Obligation Plan
B. Alameda County Local Agency SPOC Inventory
C. Local Agency SPOC Checklist
D. Alameda County List of Federal Inactive Projects, dated September 21, 2017

Staff Contacts

Vivek Bhat, Director of Programming and Project Controls

Jacki Taylor, Senior Program Analyst
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## Alameda County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
<th>Phone No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda (City)</td>
<td>Virendra Patel</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vpatel@alamedaca.gov">vpatel@alamedaca.gov</a></td>
<td>(510) 747-7947</td>
<td>Supervising Civil Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit)</td>
<td>Peter Brown</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pbrown@actransit.org">pbrown@actransit.org</a></td>
<td>510-891-7164</td>
<td>Manager, Capital Planning &amp; Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>James Chu</td>
<td><a href="mailto:james@acpwa.org">james@acpwa.org</a></td>
<td>(510) 670-5566</td>
<td>Supervising Civil Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC)</td>
<td>Vivek Bhat</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vbhat@alamedactc.org">vbhat@alamedactc.org</a></td>
<td>510-208-7430</td>
<td>Senior Trans Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>Aleida Andino-Chavez</td>
<td><a href="mailto:achavez@albanyca.org">achavez@albanyca.org</a></td>
<td>(510) 528-5759</td>
<td>Transportation Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altamont Corridor Express (ACE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART)</td>
<td>Michael Tanner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mtanner@bart.gov">mtanner@bart.gov</a></td>
<td>(510) 464-6433</td>
<td>Manager, Cap. Dev't and Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Beth Thomas</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bathomas@cityofberkeley.info">bathomas@cityofberkeley.info</a></td>
<td>510-981-7068</td>
<td>Principal Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Obaid Khan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:obaid.khan@dublin.ca.gov">obaid.khan@dublin.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>(925) 833-6634</td>
<td>Transportation and Operations Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD)</td>
<td>Tiffany Margulici</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tmargulici@ebparks.org">tmargulici@ebparks.org</a></td>
<td>510-544-2204</td>
<td>Grants Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeryville</td>
<td>Amber Evans</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aevans@emeryville.org">aevans@emeryville.org</a></td>
<td>(510) 596-4382</td>
<td>Community Development Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>Connie Wong</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cwong@fremont.gov">cwong@fremont.gov</a></td>
<td>(510) 494-4782</td>
<td>Senior Civil Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>Morad Fakhrai</td>
<td><a href="mailto:morad.fakhrai@hayward-ca.gov">morad.fakhrai@hayward-ca.gov</a></td>
<td>(510) 583-4740</td>
<td>Director of Public Works - Engineering &amp; Tran.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority (LAVTA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>Roberto Escobar</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rjescobar@cityoflivemore.net">rjescobar@cityoflivemore.net</a></td>
<td>925-960-4532</td>
<td>Associate Civil Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>Jayson Imai</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jayson.imai@newark.org">jayson.imai@newark.org</a></td>
<td>510-578-4671</td>
<td>Assistant City Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Bruce Williams</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bwilliams@oaklandnet.com">bwilliams@oaklandnet.com</a></td>
<td>(510) 238-7229</td>
<td>Senior Transportation Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont</td>
<td>John Wanger</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wanger@coastlandcivil.com">wanger@coastlandcivil.com</a></td>
<td>(707) 571-8005</td>
<td>City Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>Mike Tassano</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mtassano@cityofpleasantonca.org">mtassano@cityofpleasantonca.org</a></td>
<td>925) 931-5670</td>
<td>Traffic Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Oakland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro</td>
<td>Kirsten Foley</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kfoley@sanleandro.org">kfoley@sanleandro.org</a></td>
<td>(510) 577-3432</td>
<td>Administrative Services Manager, Engineering &amp; Tran.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union City</td>
<td>Thomas Ruark</td>
<td><a href="mailto:thomasruark@unioncity.org">thomasruark@unioncity.org</a></td>
<td>(510) 675-5301</td>
<td>City Engineer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This page intentionally left blank
Single Point of Contact (SPOC) Checklist

For agencies accessing federal transportation funds through the FHWA federal-aid process

To be completed and renewed annually or whenever a new Single Point of Contact is assigned

Email completed form to your CMA and MTC at SPOC-FES@bayareametro.gov

Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>SPOC Name:</th>
<th>SPOC Email:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPOC Title:</th>
<th>SPOC Phone:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CMA Representative:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Public Agency Certification Review

SPOC acknowledges awareness of the following items adopted by the agency governing body in the Resolution of Local Support:

- Agency will comply with the provisions and requirements of the Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606, revised)
- Agency has, and will retain the expertise, knowledge and resources necessary to deliver the FHWA-funded transportation projects
- Agency has assigned, and will maintain a SPOC for all FHWA and CTC-funded transportation projects to coordinate within and outside the agency
- Agency has reviewed its FHWA-funded projects and has adequate staffing resources to deliver and complete the PROJECT(s) within the schedule

Acknowledgement

SPOC acknowledges awareness of the following Agency requirements from the Regional Project-Funding Delivery Policy, MTC Resolution 3606:

- To be ‘regionally qualified’ for regional discretionary funds, and for programming federal funds in the federal TIP, the local agency must comply with the following, in addition to any other regional, state and federal requirements:
  - Assign and maintain a single point of contact for all FHWA-administered projects implemented by the agency.
  - Maintain a project tracking status of major delivery milestones for all programmed and active FHWA-administered projects implemented by the agency.
  - Maintain all active FHWA-administered projects in good standing with respect to regional, state and federal delivery deadlines, and federal-aid requirements.
  - Maintain the expertise and staff resources necessary to deliver federal-aid projects within the funding timeframe, and meet all federal-aid project requirements.
  - Has demonstrated a good delivery record and delivery practices with past and current projects.
  - Have staff and/or consultant(s) on board who have delivered FHWA-administered projects within the past five years and/or attended the federal-aid process training class held by Caltrans Local Assistance within the past 5 years, and have the knowledge and expertise to deliver federal-aid projects.

SPOC Certification

SPOC self-certifies the following:

- SPOC has sufficient knowledge to navigate, or assist others to navigate the FHWA federal-aid process
- SPOC has basic understanding of relationship between FMS/TIP/RTP
- SPOC has a Fund Management System (FMS) account
- SPOC has read and understands the provisions of the Regional Project-Funding Delivery Policy, MTC Resolution 3606
- SPOC will maintain and keep up to date, a spreadsheet of delivery milestones for all active FHWA-funded projects administered by the agency
- SPOC will communicate FHWA and CTC-funded project delivery status, through construction award, to CMA contact at least on a quarterly basis
- SPOC has ensured that current active listings in the federal TIP as of this date are correct with regards to cost, scope and schedule
- SPOC will participate in at least ½ the Partnership WG meetings on an annual basis, if agency has projects remaining for delivery
- SPOC will maintain the Unanticipated Delays Worksheet (Link in development)
- SPOC is aware of the November 1 RFA submittal deadline and January 31 federal obligation of funds (E-76/Authorization) delivery deadline.
- SPOC has attended training or reviewed the SPOC training materials
- SPOC has confirmed that the respective Project Manager(s) are aware of delivery milestone deadlines for FHWA-funded and/or CTC-funded projects scheduled for delivery (obligation/allocation of funds) within the current and following federal fiscal years.

I certify to the best of my knowledge the above is true:

Signature, Agency Single Point of Contact (SPOC) Date

Signature, Agency Department Director Date

MTC Resolution 3606 and SPOC information is located at:  http://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/fund-invest/federal-funding/project-delivery
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Agency Action Required</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Reason for Delay</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Potential Disposition Date</th>
<th>Latest Action Date</th>
<th>Last Action Date</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>Unexpended Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5178012</td>
<td>inactive</td>
<td>Invoice under review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>Close-out documents have been submitted.</td>
<td>BUCHANAN/MARIN STREET FROM FIERCE ST. TO SAN PABLO, BIKE LANE &amp; PED. WALKWAY</td>
<td>7/6/2017</td>
<td>7/6/2016</td>
<td>7/6/2016</td>
<td>$2,484,942.00</td>
<td>$1,702,000.00</td>
<td>$773,942.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501207</td>
<td>inactive</td>
<td>Records indicate project is in Final Voucher. District to contact Final Voucher Unit to check status of project closure.</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td></td>
<td>HEGENBERGER ROAD OH (WPR) BR NO 33C-1502, SEISMIC Retrofit</td>
<td>5/13/2016</td>
<td>5/14/2015</td>
<td>5/14/2015</td>
<td>$7,511,271.00</td>
<td>$6,640,876.00</td>
<td>$870,435.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502115</td>
<td>inactive</td>
<td>Carry over project. Invoice under review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td></td>
<td>CITYWIDE, OAKLAND CASHARE AND OUTREACH PROGRAM</td>
<td>9/7/2016</td>
<td>9/8/2015</td>
<td>9/8/2015</td>
<td>$384,631.00</td>
<td>$320,526.00</td>
<td>$64,105.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502121</td>
<td>inactive</td>
<td>Carry over project. Project is in final voucher process.</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td></td>
<td>HEGENBERGER RD. OVER SAN LEANDRO STREET - BRIDGE # 33C0020, BRIDGE PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>8/10/2016</td>
<td>8/11/2015</td>
<td>8/11/2015</td>
<td>$761,250.00</td>
<td>$673,935.00</td>
<td>$87,315.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502100</td>
<td>inactive</td>
<td>Carry over project. Invoice under review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td></td>
<td>7TH STREET FROM UNION TO PEMALTA STREET, PEDESTRIAN STREETCARE IMPROVE</td>
<td>5/25/2016</td>
<td>5/26/2015</td>
<td>5/26/2015</td>
<td>$4,070,044.00</td>
<td>$3,830,000.00</td>
<td>$240,044.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507300</td>
<td>inactive</td>
<td>Carry over project. Princed status update to DLAE immediately.</td>
<td>University Of California</td>
<td></td>
<td>WITHIN CITY OF BERKELEY, STUDY ON-CAMPUS PARKING PRICING</td>
<td>9/8/2016</td>
<td>9/10/2015</td>
<td>9/10/2015</td>
<td>$211,585.00</td>
<td>$169,185.00</td>
<td>$42,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507308</td>
<td>inactive</td>
<td>Carry over project. Princed status update to DLAE immediately.</td>
<td>University Of California</td>
<td></td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER CENTER, LOCAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM</td>
<td>4/30/2016</td>
<td>5/1/2015</td>
<td>5/1/2015</td>
<td>$199,726.00</td>
<td>$99,883.00</td>
<td>$99,843.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502400</td>
<td>future</td>
<td>Invoice under review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.</td>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td></td>
<td>PACIFIC AVE. MAIN ST. TO FOURTH ST &amp; OTIS DR: PARK ST TO BROADWAY, ROADWAY REHAB.</td>
<td>12/15/2017</td>
<td>1/30/2018</td>
<td>12/15/2018</td>
<td>$829,000.00</td>
<td>$634,900.00</td>
<td>$194,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505004</td>
<td>future</td>
<td>Submit invoice to District by 11/20/2017</td>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td></td>
<td>DOWNTOWN NAYVARD AND POSSIBLE ADDITIONAL LOCATIONS CAR SHARING SERVICES</td>
<td>12/2/2017</td>
<td>12/2/2016</td>
<td>12/2/2016</td>
<td>$245,880.00</td>
<td>$200,480.00</td>
<td>$45,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517105</td>
<td>future</td>
<td>Submit invoice to District by 11/20/2017</td>
<td>Newark</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enterprise drive: Fillbert street to approximately 350 west of wells avenue</td>
<td>12/23/2017</td>
<td>12/23/2016</td>
<td>12/23/2016</td>
<td>$734,328.00</td>
<td>$454,000.00</td>
<td>$280,328.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502142</td>
<td>future</td>
<td>Submit invoice to District by 11/20/2017</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>9/8/17: Plan to submit next invoice in Sept.</td>
<td>TELEGRAPH AVENUE BETWEEN 29TH AND 4TH ST. STRIPING AND SIGN ROAD DIET WITH BUFFERED BIKE LANE, SIGNAL MODIFICATION, CROSSWALK ENHANCEMENTS, LADDER STRIPPING AND BLUES-OUT</td>
<td>10/14/2017</td>
<td>10/14/2016</td>
<td>10/14/2016</td>
<td>$221,400.00</td>
<td>$199,260.00</td>
<td>$22,140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502139</td>
<td>future</td>
<td>Submit invoice to District by 11/20/2017</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>9/8/17: Plan to submit next invoice in Sept.</td>
<td>IN OAKLAND, AT THE INTERSECTIONS OF: 10TH/DAK, 10TH/JACKSON, 10TH/HARRISON, 11TH/JACKSON, 11TH/HARRISON, 12TH/FRANKLIN, 12TH/FRANKLIN, 17TH/FRANKLIN, 19TH/FRANKLIN, UPGRADE SIGNS FOR PEDESTRIAN SAFETY TO INCLUDE COUNTER CLOUATION</td>
<td>10/14/2017</td>
<td>10/14/2016</td>
<td>10/14/2016</td>
<td>$73,000.00</td>
<td>$65,700.00</td>
<td>$7,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510108</td>
<td>future</td>
<td>Invoice under review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.</td>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td></td>
<td>BRIDGE NO. 33C0032 BERMAL AVE OVER ARROYO DE LA LAGUNA CLEAN BRIDGE AND APPLY PROTECTIVE COATING</td>
<td>11/30/2017</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
<td>$1,729,111.00</td>
<td>$1,330,782.00</td>
<td>$398,329.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510109</td>
<td>future</td>
<td>Invoice under review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.</td>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td></td>
<td>CITY OF PLEASANTON: 5 BRIDGES, 33C0045, 33C0009, 33C0045, 33C0046, 33C0046, BRIDGE PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE PROJECT</td>
<td>12/5/2017</td>
<td>12/5/2016</td>
<td>12/5/2016</td>
<td>$90,000.00</td>
<td>$79,677.00</td>
<td>$3,323.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535409</td>
<td>future</td>
<td>Invoice under review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.</td>
<td>Union City</td>
<td></td>
<td>WHIPLE ROAD/CENTRAL AVENUE AND DECOTO ROAD/PERRY ROAD UPGRADE TRAFFIC SIGNALS; INSTALL LIGHTING</td>
<td>10/21/2017</td>
<td>10/21/2016</td>
<td>10/21/2016</td>
<td>$57,500.00</td>
<td>$57,500.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DATE: September 28, 2017

SUBJECT: Update on Alameda CTC Rail Strategy Study

RECOMMENDATION: Receive update on the Rail Strategy Study

Summary

This memo provides an update on the Alameda CTC’s Rail Strategy Study. The Study is an outgrowth of recommendations included in the Countywide Goods Movement Plan and the Countywide Transit Plan, which both identified significant growth potential for rail in the county. The Study is a one-year technical effort to examine possible future freight and passenger rail growth scenarios and the implications for Alameda County, and to identify potential improvements that support more efficient freight and passenger rail operations while reducing impacts on communities adjacent to rail infrastructure.

This update focuses on the initial results of high-level capacity and operations analysis of the rail system in Alameda County that identifies current and future system constraints and provides an indication of the types of improvements that could improve operational efficiency of the system and/or reduce local impacts. In addition, this update describes the initial work underway to develop a strategic framework for advancing grade crossing improvements. This includes a methodology being developed to evaluate and prioritize railroad grade crossing improvements in order to establish an ongoing framework to advance grade crossing improvements, which focuses on improving safety and reducing impacts such as vehicle delay, emissions, and noise.

Background

The rail system in Alameda County is a critical transportation link serving a unique role for both people and goods movement. Alameda County contains the core of the Bay Area/Northern California freight and passenger rail system. Two Class 1 freight railroads (the Union Pacific Railroad (UP) and the BNSF Railway), two intercity regional railroads (Capitol Corridor and Altamont Corridor Express), and two longer distance intercity rail services (Amtrak Coast Starlight and the San Joaquin’s intercity rail service) operate on this system. The system is owned by UP, with the passenger rail providers operating on
UP-owned right of way. The intercity rail services provide an alternative to autos for intercity and longer distance commuter trips. Figure 1 presents a map of the existing rail infrastructure and identification of some critical rail junctions in Alameda County.

Figure 1. Existing Rail Infrastructure in Alameda County

The rail system is currently under pressure from multiple growth patterns. With new rail services and economic development at the Port of Oakland, and local and regional populations that continue to grow and consume goods and services, freight rail demand is anticipated to grow in the future. Efficient freight rail service is critical to the success of the Port of Oakland as well as providing the most cost-effective long haul transportation option for certain commodities produced or used by Bay Area industries. While moving goods by rail rather than truck can reduce highway and local road congestion and emissions from trucks, increased rail activity can also result in local-level community impacts as trains travel through the county where rail infrastructure and operations abut communities. In addition, there are multiple planning efforts for
increased passenger rail services, both locally and in the larger Northern California
mega-region, all of which pass through and serve Alameda County.

The Countywide Goods Movement Plan identified significant economic, congestion,
safety, and potential air quality benefits of a program that would create improved rail
connections between the Port of Oakland and the state and national rail network.
Such a program, if properly implemented, could complement efforts of regional
intercity rail providers to expand and improve their services while also supporting rail
mode share growth at the Port. Another key element of the Study is a robust analysis of
grade crossings in the county and the establishment, based on quantitative and
qualitative metrics, of a prioritized grade crossing program to support ongoing
advocacy for funding and provide jurisdictions with tools to assist in grade crossing
analysis.

Work Completed To Date

In April, staff and consultants provided an introduction to the study that included an
overview of the rail infrastructure in Alameda County, current train volumes, rail network
and infrastructure issues, and an overview of rail grade crossings in the County. Since
April, the consultant team completed and distributed an existing conditions analysis,
developed a range of potential growth scenarios based on existing planning efforts
(State Rail Plan, Port of Oakland planning documents, Capitol Corridor Vision Plan, and
ACEForward), and prepared an initial analysis of capacity and operational constraints
in the system based on the potential growth scenarios. The capacity analysis also
considered potential changes in operations and infrastructure improvements in order to
gain insight into the types of investment packages that could improve the overall
performance of the system. The next step in the analysis process will be to examine
impacts of the best-performing packages, develop cost estimates, and recommend
potential packages that could form the basis for partnership discussions with UP,
tercity passenger rail operators, and regional and state partners.

Rail Network and Infrastructure Issues

In the existing conditions analysis, a number of issues and constraints were identified
and their impacts on system performance were subsequently evaluated in the
capacity analysis. Three major categories of infrastructure issues that were identified:

- **Single track segments** – South of the Port of Oakland, much of the rail system
  consists of single track subdivisions running in parallel with some rail-rail crossings
  (junctions). As train volumes grow and freight and passenger trains share these
  single track segments, operations will begin to break down and capacity will limit
  potential for growth.

- **Speed restrictions** – Many segments in the system have significant speed
  constraints that have the effect of limiting capacity. These constraints are often
due to the track geometry, the level of maintenance, or the presence of at-grade crossings and safety concerns.

- **Poor connectivity** – The rail system in Alameda County is a legacy system which reflects the fact that in the past, different subdivisions had different operators. As a result, there are missing connections between subdivisions at key locations. This can result in circuitous routing and a lack of system redundancy and flexibility.

A base year capacity analysis was conducted that verified many of the known operating constraints and choke points. Additional more detailed analysis would need to be completed by UP to fully verify these observations. Key existing and developing constraints, listed from north to south, include the following:

- Martinez Subdivision through Emeryville and into the Port of Oakland has sufficient track capacity for current and projected volumes but there are access issues into the Port of Oakland that can result in rail congestion and impact grade crossings throughout Emeryville.
- The Niles Subdivision through Jack London Square is nearing the upper limit of optimal operations due to speed constraints, many closely spaced at-grade crossings and high train volumes.
- Newark Junction is at the upper limit of optimal operations. This is a location where freight and both regional rail providers converge as they move to and from the busy Centerville line (Niles Subdivision).
- Niles Junction/Niles Canyon is at the upper limit of optimal operations. This is a location with complicated movements by passenger and freight trains in a segment with track geometry that slows down trains.
- The Coast Subdivision is at the upper limit of optimal operations north of Newark Junction and above the upper limit of optimal operations south of Newark Junction (where both intercity passenger services move between Oakland and San Jose and where some freight trains continue south).

**Figure 2** summarizes the key assumptions about train volumes for the future potential growth scenarios.

---

1 The term “optimal operations” indicates that the rail segment has adequate capacity for additional train traffic and to perform routine maintenance to infrastructure. If a delay occurs to one train, it will not necessarily delay any of the following trains. All trains are able to complete their trips, most without any delays or minor delays. This roughly equates to a highway LOS C.
### 2035 Growth Scenarios and Key Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Freight Trains</th>
<th>Passenger Trains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1** Moderate | • Historical 2% growth  
• Maintain 23% rail share at Port | **None**  
• Same service as 2016 |
| **2** High | • Higher Port growth consistent with Oakland Army Base EIR  
• 40% rail share at Port | **Moderate**  
• Add 4 daily Capitol Corridor Oakland to San Jose roundtrips for a total of 11 (22 daily trains)  
• Add 2 daily ACE roundtrips for a total of 6 (12 daily trains) |
| **3** High | • Higher Port growth consistent with Oakland Army Base EIR  
• 40% rail share at Port | **High**  
• Based on Capitol Corridor Vision Plan Phase 1, add 8 daily Oakland to San Jose roundtrips for a total of 15 (30 daily trains)  
• Based on ACEforward programmatic EIR, add 6 round trips for a total of 10 (20 daily trains). |

The capacity analysis for Scenario 1 indicates that all of the constraints identified for the existing conditions become more severe with no passenger train growth and moderate freight growth. While the analysis does show partially constrained capacity in Niles Junction/Niles Canyon, there is sufficient capacity so that UP can accommodate the freight train growth assumed in this scenario. In this scenario, improvements were examined that would convert an existing drill track north of the Port of Oakland to a third main track within the existing rail right of way and would add grade crossing safety improvements in Emeryville. These projects would improve access to the Port of Oakland while reducing community impacts. A series of grade crossing improvements to address safety concerns in the Jack London Square area were also examined. These improvements would improve pedestrian and motorist safety while at the same time increase allowable speeds in Jack London Square and potentially create an opportunity to pursue a quiet zone in the area. Detailed analysis of these potential improvements by the cities, rail operators and the Public Utilities Commission would be needed before any projects could move forward.

In Scenario 2, with higher freight growth, moderate passenger growth, and current train routing, most of the rail system south of the Port of Oakland will be fully constrained and...
improvements would be needed to accommodate this growth without significant delays and congestion on the system. One operational alternative that is already being explored by the Capitol Corridor in discussion with the UP, and was articulated in the Capitol Corridor Vision Plan, is to shift Capitol Corridor operations to the Coast Subdivision and freight operations largely to the Niles/Oakland Subdivisions (from Elmhurst Junction to Niles Junction). This would not change the volume of freight trains moving through Niles Junction/Niles Canyon, but would eliminate congestion at Newark Junction, significantly reduce the number of trains on the Centerville Line, and eliminate the need for a third main track on the Niles Subdivision from Jack London Square to Elmhurst Junction. This would require a new connection to allow freight trains to move from the Niles Subdivision to the Oakland Subdivision. One option that was analyzed would create a new connection at Industrial Parkway in Hayward. Additionally, a new rail junction between the Centerville Line and the Oakland Subdivision, a project known as the Shinn Connection, could provide system redundancy, improve fluidity and operational flexibility through Niles Junction and potentially serve future passenger rail services (i.e. Dumbarton Rail plans).

Scenario 2 did indicate that with or without the changes in routing already discussed, there would not be sufficient capacity in Niles Canyon to accommodate the growth in freight and ACE passenger trains without double tracking through Niles Canyon. Since this may not be feasible for environmental, community impact, and engineering reasons, another routing alternative was examined. In this case, some of the freight trains that would otherwise be routed through Niles Canyon are assumed to be routed north along the Martinez Subdivision to UP’s Tracy Subdivision, which connects with the Martinez Subdivision in Richmond and runs east-west through Contra Costa County. It is assumed that most of these freight trains would eventually connect to a southern route (to markets in the Southwest and Southeast) in Stockton. At the present time, the Tracy Subdivision is inactive and would require track upgrades if UP were to use it more regularly. In addition, the Martinez Subdivision would require extension of the third main track, which would be a conversion of an existing track within the rail right of way as described for Scenario 1, to North of Richmond and an additional segment of third main track in Hercules. This routing option would reduce the number of freight trains on the Niles/Oakland Subdivisions as compared to the previous alternative routing and could potentially encourage UP to allow ACE to increase passenger service while still significantly reducing train volumes on the Centerville Line. Additional coordination with Contra Costa County would need to be done if this is a routing option UP would take.

Scenario 3, with high freight growth and high passenger growth produces similar results as Scenario 2 with similar impacts on operations and capacity from changes in routing and improvements previously discussed. In this scenario, analysis was conducted to determine what the needs would be for high Capitol Corridor train volumes from Oakland to San Jose. The analysis confirmed that for Capitol Corridor to achieve the service levels outlined in the Capitol Corridor Vision Plan Phase 1, they would need to
operate on dedicated passenger tracks, rather than continuing to operate on shared infrastructure with UP. Given the difficulties in accommodating moderate levels of passenger growth through the Niles Canyon as described in Scenario 2, the higher levels of growth for the ACE services were not analyzed further in Scenario 3.

**Grade Crossings and Community Impacts**

The density of the rail network and land use patterns in Alameda County results in a large number of locations where roadways and the rail system cross each other at-grade. Collisions, congestion, noise, and emissions at crossings are major concerns for communities located along the rail infrastructure. With significant growth being concentrated along the existing rail infrastructure, these conflicts are expected to increase in the future.

The Rail Strategy Study is developing a methodology to prioritize grade crossings based on the social cost (collisions, noise, emissions, fuel consumption, etc.) of impacts at the crossings. The methodology will also include an approach to identify the types of safety and impact reduction improvements (improved signals and warning devices, grade separations, crossing closures, quiet zones) that are most cost-effective in different types of locations and typical situations around the County.

The study team has compiled data for 136 individual public crossings on railroad mainlines and is in the process of monetizing the social costs of the impacts at these crossings. Data have been collected on train and vehicle volumes (current and projected), collisions (10-year accident history and predictions), vehicle delay, potential noise impacts, emissions from idling vehicles, and proximity to sensitive land uses (including residential uses) and Communities of Concern. **Figure 3** shows some of the crossings that rank among the top 10 in the County for safety costs, delay costs, and potential noise impacts. The ranking based on social costs of impacts will provide a first cut at high priority crossings that may need improvements.
Figure 3. Crossings with High Safety, Delay, and Noise Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Location</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Rail Subdivision</th>
<th>Top Ten in Incurred Safety Costs</th>
<th>Top Ten in Delay Costs</th>
<th>Top Ten in Residential Noise Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29th Ave</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Niles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37th Ave</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Niles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65th St.</td>
<td>Emeryville</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th St</td>
<td>Emeryville</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67th S.</td>
<td>Emeryville</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98th Ave</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Niles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar St.</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis St.</td>
<td>San Leandro</td>
<td>Niles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyer St</td>
<td>Union City</td>
<td>Coast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont Blvd.</td>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>Niles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruitvale Ave.</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Niles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilman St.</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesperian Blvd.</td>
<td>San Leandro</td>
<td>Niles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High St</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Niles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Pkwy.</td>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>Niles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rita Rd.</td>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennyson Rd.</td>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>Niles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union City Blvd.</td>
<td>Union City</td>
<td>Coast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Avenue</td>
<td>San Leandro</td>
<td>Niles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to analyzing crossings individually, the methodology is looking at corridors that contain multiple crossings that are generally placed relatively close to each other. By looking at corridors and the roadway circulation patterns for vehicles that use the crossings, it should be possible to identify more cost-effective solutions and to take into consideration the interaction of crossings in a corridor in terms of operations and safety. This may also create new opportunities for quiet zones. The social costs for each of the individual crossings in a corridor will be aggregated so that the corridors can be compared to each other. This may elevate the importance of certain groups of crossings that might not rank as highly when considered individually. Another potential advantage of considering corridors is that it can set the stage for more effective funding advocacy by bringing groups of stakeholders together rather than having them...
compete with one another for limited funding. A plan for the whole corridor can then be pursued over time. This approach has proved very effective in funding improvements in the Puget Sound region (the FAST Corridor), Southern California (the Alameda Corridor East), and in the Chicago area (the CREATE program).

Next Steps

The results of the capacity analysis are being compiled in a tech memo that will be shared with staff from the Capitol Corridor, ACE, and UP for technical review as well as with ACTAC. Additional analysis is also being conducted to compare impacts and benefits of different improvements and their relationship to surrounding communities. Preliminary cost analyses of potential improvements have been developed and are under review. This analysis will form the basis for detailed discussions with our state and regional partners and UP. It is anticipated that discussion with UP will also include discussions of the East Bay Greenway and the 7th Street Grade Crossing projects at the Port of Oakland, two complex projects being led by Alameda CTC’s Project Delivery team. Both projects require significant partnership with UP.

Improvement concepts for grade crossings are being identified in parallel with completing the initial evaluation of the social costs associated with crossing impacts. An initial analysis of social costs for individual crossings has been completed in draft and a similar analysis is underway for corridors. The prioritization methodology will be completed by the end of the year with an initial assessment of high priority crossing improvements and strategies for pursuing funding. In order to advance this work and secure input from the jurisdictions, Alameda CTC is forming a Working Group for interested ACTAC members. The Working Group will meet on November 9th and December 11th to review initial methodology and data analysis and provide input on the prioritization framework.

Fiscal Impact: There is no fiscal impact.

Staff Contacts

Tess Lengyel, Deputy Executive Director of Planning and Policy
Carolyn Clevenger, Director of Planning
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A new law, AB 2087\(^1\), establishes a conservation planning tool called a Regional Conservation Investment Strategy (RCIS) to promote the conservation of species, habitats, and other natural resources. An RCIS provides a non-regulatory assessment and analysis of conservation needs in a region and enables Regional Advance Mitigation Planning (RAMP). The Bay Area RAMP (see schematic) consists of a conservation assessment and transportation assessment that will help inform regional mitigation planning. There are currently two RAMP pilot projects to develop RCISs, one in Santa Clara County and one in the East Bay (Alameda and Contra Counties). Once developed and approved, the East Bay RCIS could be used to inform conservation planning, including the development of mitigation credit agreements.

East Bay Regional Conservation Investment Strategy Overview:

- Voluntary, non-binding assessment of conservation needs
- Improves regional conservation planning and implementation
- The East Bay RCIS is one of four pilots being developed statewide
- Developed for approval by California Department of Fish and Wildlife and potentially other regulatory agencies
- Consistent and compatible with HCP/NCCPs
- Considers focal species, natural communities, working lands, and proposed infrastructure development projects
- Used to inform conservation investment, including investment for mitigation
- Conservation actions may be for protection, restoration, or enhancement
- May expedite project delivery when used for identifying mitigation

---
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# Joint Partnership Local Streets and Roads / Programming and Delivery Working Group Meeting

**Bay Area MetroCenter, 1st Floor, Yerba Buena**

**Monday, September 18, 2017**

**9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.**

## Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Estimated Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introductions</strong> <em>(Danielle Schmitz, NVTA, PDWG Chair)</em></td>
<td><strong>9:30 a.m.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## LSRWG - Focused Items

**9:40 a.m.**

**1. Discussion Items:**

- **A. 2017 Work Plan** *(Theresa Romell, tromell@mtc.ca.gov)*
  - 10 min

- **B. P-TAP Update:** P-TAP 18 *(Christina Hohorst, chohorst@mtc.ca.gov)*
  - 5 min

- **C. 2016 Regional Pavement Condition Report and PCI Impact** *(Sui Tan, stan@mtc.ca.gov)*
  - 5 min

  *(The 2016 Regional Pavement Condition Report and PCI Impact is available online on Vital Signs, [http://www.vitalsigns.mtc.ca.gov/](http://www.vitalsigns.mtc.ca.gov).)*

## Joint LSRPDWG Items

**10:05 a.m.**

**1. Review of LSRPDWG Minutes – May 22, 2017** *(Danielle Schmitz, PDWG Chair)*

**2. Informational Items:** *(“Memo Only” unless otherwise noted)*

- **A. PMP Certification Status**
  - (Current PMP Certification status is available online at [http://mtc.ca.gov/sites/default/files/PMP_Certification_Status_Listing.xlsx](http://mtc.ca.gov/sites/default/files/PMP_Certification_Status_Listing.xlsx))

- **B. TIP Update** *(Adam Crenshaw; acrenshaw@mtc.ca.gov)*
  - 5 min

  *(The current TIP can be found online at [http://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/fund-invest/transportation-improvement-program](http://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/fund-invest/transportation-improvement-program)).*

- **C. Legislative Update** *(Rebecca Long; rlong@mtc.ca.gov)*
  - 5 min

  *(Updates on current legislation is available online at [https://mtc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=AO&ID=52102&GUID=f32be645-fe44-4df0-8357-fef58aa33366&N=M1kMDg1MjAxNyBMBWdpc2xhdGlvdBiB21taXR0ZWUgUGFja2V0IFJldmlzZQ%3d](https://mtc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=AO&ID=52102&GUID=f32be645-fe44-4df0-8357-fef58aa33366&N=M1kMDg1MjAxNyBMBWdpc2xhdGlvdBiB21taXR0ZWUgUGFja2V0IFJldmlzZQ%3d)).*

- **D. Caltrans Updates:**
  - **i. Office of Local Assistance Training**
    - ([http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/training.html](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/training.html))
  - **ii. Architectural & Engineering (A&E) Consultant Contract Review**
    - (A completed Exhibit 10-C, A&E Consultant Contract Review Checklist, for new or amended federal and/or state funded consultant contracts must be accepted by Caltrans prior to contract award effective October 1, 2017. A&E Training - [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/AE/index.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/AE/index.htm); [http://www.localassistanceblog.com/ae-training/](http://www.localassistanceblog.com/ae-training/) )
  - **iii. Safe Harbor Rate Test and Evaluation Period Extended**
    - (Notice to Local Agencies and A&E Consulting Firms with Federal Aid Highway Funded Projects, FHWA has informed participating states that the program has been extended again to run through December 31, 2017, [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/BLA_OB/2013/ob13-07r.pdf](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/BLA_OB/2013/ob13-07r.pdf))

- **E. Other Information Items:**
3. Discussion Items:
   A. Other Discussion Items (All) 5 min

PDWG - Focused Items 11:00 a.m.

1. Discussion Items:
   A. State Programming/CTC Actions: 20 min
      • Active Transportation Program Update* (Karl Anderson, kanderson@mtc.ca.gov)
      • STIP Update (Karl Anderson, kanderson@mtc.ca.gov)
      • SB 1 Update (Ross McKeown; rmckeown@mtc.ca.gov)
   B. Federal Delivery Monitoring Updates* (Ross McKeown; rmckeown@mtc.ca.gov/ Marcella Aranda; maranda@mtc.ca.gov) 20 min
      i. Final Draft FFY2017-18 Annual Obligation Plan*
      ii. Inactive Obligations Update
         (FHWA has announced an immediate and significant focused effort on inactive obligations. As of September 1, California is at 3.2% inactive, the target is 2%. The current Inactive Obligation listing can be found online at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/InactiveProjects/2017/Webposting_Inactive.xlsx)
   C. Federal Efficiencies Subgroup Update (Marcella Aranda; maranda@mtc.ca.gov) 20 min
      i. SPOC Checklist
      ii. Unanticipated Delays Worksheet
   D. Other Discussion Items

Recommended Agenda Items for Next Meeting: (All) 5 min

Join WebEx meeting
Meeting number (access code): 923 585 645
Join by phone
+1-415-655-0002 US Toll

* = Attachment in Packet  ** = Handouts Available at Meeting

Contact Marcella Aranda at maranda@mtc.ca.gov if you have questions regarding this agenda.
### Partnership Board, TAC and Working Groups

#### 2017 Tentative Meeting Calendar

**September 1, 2017**

(Subject to change. See agendas for final meeting date, time and location)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yerba Buena, Room 109 (9:30a - 11:35a)</td>
<td>Yerba Buena, Room 109 (10:00a - 12:00p)</td>
<td>Ohlone Room 109, (9:30a - 11:30a)</td>
<td>Ohlone Room 109, (9:30a - 11:30a)</td>
<td>Yerba Buena, Room 109, (9:30a - 12:00p)</td>
<td>Yerba Buena, Room 109, (1:30p – 3:30p)</td>
<td>Location TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Wed, Jan 4</td>
<td>Thu, Feb 9</td>
<td>Mon, Mar 20</td>
<td>Mon, Apr 17</td>
<td>Mon, May 22</td>
<td>5/11/2017 (Mon, May 22)</td>
<td>Time TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Tue, Feb 7</td>
<td>Wed, Feb 1</td>
<td>Thu, Feb 9</td>
<td>Mon, Mar 20</td>
<td>Mon, May 22</td>
<td>Mon, May 22</td>
<td>Time TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Tue, Mar 7</td>
<td>Wed, Mar 1</td>
<td>Mon, Mar 20</td>
<td>Mon, Apr 17</td>
<td>Mon, May 22</td>
<td>Mon, May 22</td>
<td>Time TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Tue, Apr 4</td>
<td>Wed, Apr 5</td>
<td>Thu, Apr 13</td>
<td>Mon, Apr 17</td>
<td>Mon, May 22</td>
<td>Mon, May 22</td>
<td>Time TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Tue, May 2</td>
<td>Wed, May 3</td>
<td>Thu, Jun 8</td>
<td>Mon, Jun 19</td>
<td>Mon, Jun 19</td>
<td>Mon, Jun 19</td>
<td>Time TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Tue, Jun 6</td>
<td>Wed, Jun 7</td>
<td>Thu, Jul 13</td>
<td>7/17/2017 (Mon, Jul 17)</td>
<td>Mon, Jul 17</td>
<td>Mon, Jul 17</td>
<td>Time TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Tue, Jul 11</td>
<td>Wed, Jul 5</td>
<td>Thu, Jul 13</td>
<td>7/17/2017 (Mon, Jul 17)</td>
<td>Mon, Jul 17</td>
<td>Mon, Jul 17</td>
<td>Time TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Wed, Aug 2</td>
<td>NO AUGUST PARTNERSHIP MEETINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Location TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Tue, Sep 5</td>
<td>Wed, Sep 6</td>
<td>Mon, Sep 18</td>
<td>Mon, Sep 18</td>
<td>Mon, Sep 18</td>
<td>Mon, Sep 18</td>
<td>Time TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Tue, Oct 3</td>
<td>Wed, Oct 4</td>
<td>Thu, Oct 12</td>
<td>Mon, Oct 16</td>
<td>Mon, Oct 16</td>
<td>Mon, Oct 16</td>
<td>Time TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Tue, Nov 7</td>
<td>Wed, Nov 1</td>
<td>Thu, Nov 9</td>
<td>Mon, Nov 20</td>
<td>Mon, Nov 20</td>
<td>Mon, Nov 20</td>
<td>Time TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Tue, Dec 5</td>
<td>Wed, Dec 6</td>
<td>Thu, Dec 14</td>
<td>Mon, Dec 18</td>
<td>Mon, Dec 18</td>
<td>Mon, Dec 18</td>
<td>Time TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes are highlighted.

Please email the appropriate meeting manager if you would like to be added or removed from the distribution list

RAWG Meeting Manager: Martha Silver, msilver@bayareametro.gov
TFWG Meeting Manager: Theresa Hannon, thannon@bayareametro.gov
LSRWG/PDWG/PTAC Meeting Manager: Marcella Aranda, maranda@bayareametro.gov
PARTNERSHIP BOARD: Meeting Manager: Beba Sanchez, bsanchez@bayareametro.gov
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