

Commission Chair Supervisor Scott Haggerty, District 1

Commission Vice Chair Councilmember Rebecca Kaplan, City of Oakland

AC Transit Director Elsa Ortiz

Alameda County Supervisor Richard Valle, District 2 Supervisor Wilma Chan, District 3 Supervisor Nate Miley, District 4

Supervisor Keith Carson, District 5

BART Director Thomas Blalock

City of Alameda Mayor Trish Spencer

City of Albany Vice Mayor Peter Maass

City of Berkeley Councilmember Laurie Capitelli

City of Dublin Mayor David Haubert

City of Emeryville Mayor Ruth Atkin

City of Fremont Mayor Bill Harrison

City of Hayward Mayor Barbara Halliday

City of Livermore Mayor John Marchand

City of Newark Councilmember Luis Freitas

City of Oakland Vice Mayor Larry Reid

City of Piedmont Mayor Margaret Fujioka

City of Pleasanton Mayor Jerry Thorne

City of San Leandro TBD

City of Union City Mayor Carol Dutra-Vernaci

Executive Director Arthur L. Dao

Meeting Notice

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• 510.208.7400

www.AlamedaCTC.org

Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee

Thursday, February 5, 2015, 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 <u>www.AlamedaCTC.org/app_pages/view/8081</u>.

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 <u>www.511.org</u>.

Accessibility

Public meetings at Alameda CTC are wheelchair accessible under the Americans with Disabilities Act. Guide and assistance dogs are welcome. Call 510-893-3347 (Voice) or 510-834-6754 (TTD) 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 <u>www.AlamedaCTC.org/events/upcoming/now</u>.

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



Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda Thursday, February 5, 2015, 1:30 p.m.

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607 • PH: (510) 208-7400

•

www.AlamedaCTC.org

***NOTE: THE MULTIMODAL ATERIAL PLAN TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE** MEETS FROM 11:30 A.M. TO 1:00 P.M.

The Multimodal Arterial Plan Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda is available on the Alameda CTC website.

1.	Introductions/Roll Call	Chair: Arthur L. Dao, Alameda CTC Exec	utive Dire	ctor
2	Public Comment	Staff Liaisons: Stewart Ng		
		Public Meeting Coordinator: Angle Ayers		
3.	Administration		Page	A/I
	3.1. January 8, 2015 ACTAC Meeting Minut Recommendation: Approve the Ja meeting minutes.	es anuary 8, 2015	1	A
4.	Transportation Planning			
	 4.1. Countywide Multimodal Plans Update 4.1.1. Countywide Multimodal Arterial Performance Measures Recommendation: Approve Measures and provide input of approach 	Plan – Vision, Goals and Vision, Goals and Performance on the performance evaluation	5	A
	4.1.2. Countywide Multimodal Arterial Selection Criteria	Plan Draft Arterial Network	37	I
	4.2. 2016 Alameda Countywide Transporta Bay Area updates	tion Plan (CTP) and 2016 Plan	47	I
5.	Programs/Projects/Monitoring			
	5.1. Alameda County Three Year Project In Recommendation: Approve Three Document (PID) Work Plan for Alar	itiation Document Work Plan -Year Project Initiation meda County.	55	A
	5.2. Draft Master Programs Funding Agreen Distribution Funds	nent for Measure BB Direct Local	61	I
	5.3. California Transportation Commission J Meeting Summary	anuary 2015	77	I

	5.4. Alameda County Federal Inactive Projects List: January 2015 Update	81	Ι
6.	Member Reports		
	 6.1. Metropolitan Transportation Commission Local Streets and Roads Working Group Update 	89	Ι
	6.2. Other Reports		I
7.	Adjournment/Next Meeting		
	Thursday, March 5, 2015		

All items on the agenda are subject to action and/or change by the committee.

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607



Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee Fiscal Year 2014-2015

Member Agencies

AC Transit BART City of Alameda City of Albany City of Berkeley City of Dublin City of Emeryville City of Fremont City of Hayward City of Livermore City of Newark City of Oakland **City of Piedmont** City of Pleasanton City of San Leandro City of Union City County of Alameda

Other Agencies

Chair, Alameda CTC ABAG ACE BAAQMD Caltrans CHP LAVTA MTC Port of Oakland Union City Transit WETA 510.208.7400 .

www.AlamedaCTC.org

This page intentionally left blank



1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• 510.208.7400

.7400 •

www.AlamedaCIC.ora

1. Introductions/Roll Call

Arthur L. Dao called the meeting to order. The meeting began with introductions, and the chair confirmed a quorum. Representatives from all cities and agencies were present, except from the following: Altamont Corridor Express (ACE), Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Air District), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), California Highway Patrol (CHP), City of Alameda, Union City Transit, and San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA).

2. Public Comment

There were no public comments.

3. Administration

3.1. Approval of November 6, 2014 Minutes

Matt Nichols (Berkeley) moved to approve the November 6, 2014 meeting minutes. Bruce Williams (Oakland) seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (ACE, ABAG, Air District, Caltrans, CHP, City of Alameda, Union City Transit, and WETA were absent).

4. Policies and Legislation

4.1. Measure BB Election Results and Analysis

Tess Lengyel presented the 2014 Measure BB Election Results and Analysis. She stated that the sale tax will be collected beginning April 1, 2015 and will have a 30-year horizon. Tess provided information on the vote outcome by precinct, and she provided a comparison of voter outcomes for 2000, 2012, and 2014 election years. Tess covered upcoming efforts to implement Measure BB including investments and innovative solutions, leveraging local funding, and the comprehensive investment plan (CIP).

4.2. 2014 Transportation Expenditure Plan Draft Revenue and Commitment Projections

Art Dao informed the committee that before Alameda CTC can receive the Measure BB funds, an agreement must be in place with the Board of Equalization, and the Commission will approve the agreement in January. He noted that we promised the voters that policies and procedures will be adopted before Alameda CTC embarks on spending the funds. Art suggested the cities not accumulate funds for preservation, but to put the funds to use to see immediate benefits.

James O'Brien provided an update on the 2014 Transportation Expenditure Plan (2014 Plan) Draft Revenue and Commitment Projections. He stated that in July 2014, a baseline revenue projection was prepared to support the commitments of \$7.785 billion included in the 2014 Plan. James stated that with passage of



Measure BB and the start of transaction and use tax revenue collections on April 1, 2015, Alameda CTC updated the revenue projection. The updated 30-year revenue total is \$8.157 billion with direct local distribution funds accounting for \$4.368 billion. He concluded by stating that the remaining \$3.789 billion will fund specifically named capital projects and other discretionary programs and projects in the 2014 Plan.

The committee discussed updating the Master Program Funding Agreements prior to the release of funds. The committee was informed that seven years are remaining on the current Measure B, and the compliance and audit reporting may be separate for Measure B and Measure BB.

4.3. Alameda CTC's Comprehensive Investment Plan Update and Draft Project Selection Criteria

Tess Lengyel recommended that the committee approve Alameda CTC's CIP Draft Project Selection Criteria. She provided a recap on the actions taken by the Commission including approval of the principals, fund estimate, and methodology. Tess stated that the CIP's Project Selection Criteria will guide programming and allocation decisions for funds administered by Alameda CTC and will identify transportation funding over a five-year period. The CIP will consist of a two-year allocation plan that will be consistent with Alameda CTC's budget. Tess reviewed the three funding categories for funding programs, projects, and planning, and provided information on the three phases of the selection methodology. The following is a summary of ACTAC comments:

- Selection criteria are comprehensive and very similar to past programming practices.
- Readiness criteria favor construction phases.
 - Consider criteria that advance and support funding planning, scoping, design, and environmental phases.
- Recommend a greater focus on needs/benefits.
 - Consider moving five points from "Readiness Delivery Criteria" to "Needs/Benefits Criteria."
- Continue to examine geographic equity and define its components.

Tom Ruark (Union City) moved to approve the CIP draft project selection criteria with the amendment to move five points from the readiness category to the needs benefits category. Keith Cooke (San Leandro) seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (ACE, ABAG, Air District, Caltrans, CHP, City of Alameda, Union City Transit, and WETA were absent).

5. Transportation Planning

5.1. Countywide Multimodal Plans Status Update

5.1.1 Countywide Goods Movement Needs Assessment

Michael Fischer provided a report from the Goods Movement Technical Team meeting prior to the ACTAC meeting. Tess Lengyel informed the committee of the third Goods Movement Roundtable on January 21 and suggested the committee RSVP due to limited capacity.

5.2. Alameda County Land Use Approval Database

Matt Bomberg stated that an action item in the 2013 Congestion Management Program was for Alameda CTC to develop a land use approval database. He said that Alameda CTC is ready to start collecting data from the jurisdictions. Matt requested the committee review the data collection template, provide input, and designate a staff person to assist Alameda CTC in gathering the information by January 16, 2015.

5.3. Alameda CTC Bicycle Master Plan Guidelines

Matt Bomberg stated that ACTAC reviewed the guidelines in November 2014, and the jurisdictions will use them in preparing their Bicycle Master Plans.

Bruce Williams (Oakland) moved to approve the Bicycle Master Plan Guidelines. Mike Tassano (Pleasanton) seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (ACE, ABAG, Air District, Caltrans, CHP, City of Alameda, Union City Transit, and WETA were absent).

6. Programs/Projects/Monitoring

6.1. I-580 Express Lanes Education and Outreach Presentation

Kanda Raj and Heather Barber provided an update on Alameda CTC I-580 Express Lanes in the Tri-Valley. It was noted that a planned 550-mile network of Bay Area Express Lanes will be complete in 2035, and various agencies and operators are working together on messages and communications.

6.2. Cycle 4 Lifeline Transportation Program - Summary of Applications

Vivek Bhat gave an update on the applications received for the Cycle 4 Lifeline Transportation Program funding.

6.3. Metropolitan Transportation Commission One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Program Funding Status Update

Art Dao informed the committee that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is facing a shortfall on the OBAG program. He noted that MTC has included a fifth year to address that issue. Alameda CTC will work with project sponsors to assess any impacts to project delivery and will assist in finding solutions.

7. Member Reports

7.1. Metropolitan Transportation Commission Local Streets and Roads

Vivek Bhat said that the Local Streets and Roads Working Group did not meet in December.

7.2. Other Reports

There were no other reports.

8. Adjournment and Next Meeting

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m. The next meeting is:

Date/Time:Thursday, February 5, 2015 at 1:30 p.m.Location:Alameda CTC Offices, 1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

Attested by:

Angie Ayers, Public Meeting Coordinator





Memorandum

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

510.208.7400

www.AlamedaCTC.org

DATE:	February 2, 2015
SUBJECT:	Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan – Vision, Goals and Performance Measures
RECOMMENDATION:	Approve Vision, Goals and Performance Measures and provide input on the performance evaluation approach

Summary

The arterial roadways are the core of the transportation system in Alameda County moving people and goods within the county and the region. These roadways provide regional and local mobility with multiple transportation modes, access to surrounding land uses, and connectivity between employment and activity centers that is essential for Alameda County's economy and quality of life. Alameda CTC is developing a Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan that will provide a framework for designing, prioritizing, and implementing projects and programs on the arterial network. The plan development is being closely coordinated with local jurisdictions, Caltrans and bus transit operators.

Alameda CTC is in the process of finalizing the vision, goals, and performance measures for the Arterial Plan. Attachment A presents the Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan vision, goals and performance measures in detail along with the draft performance evaluation approach. Upon approval of the Commission, the Project Team will progress to assess the existing and future conditions by applying the approved performance measures.

Discussion

The draft vision, goals and performance measures for the Multimodal Arterial Plan were presented to stakeholders at the Planning Area meetings in October and November 2014 and at ACTAC in November 2014. Based on the comments received the vision and goals were finalized and distributed to the stakeholders on November 26, 2014. The updated performance measures along with a draft performance evaluation approach to provide additional context were distributed to the stakeholders on January 12, 2015, and comments received until January 21, 2015 are incorporated and provided in Attachment A.

Vision and Goals:

The proposed vision and goals are in line with the adopted vision and goals of the 2012 Countywide Transportation Plan.

R:\AlaCTC_Meetings\Community_TACs\ACTAC\20150205\4.1_MM_Plans\4.1.1_ArterialPlan_Vision_Goals\4.1.1_ArterialsPlan_Vision_Goals s_Perf_Measures.docx

<u>Vision</u>

Alameda County will have a network of efficient, safe and equitably accessible arterials that facilitate the multimodal movement of people and goods, and help create a strong economy, healthy environment and vibrant communities, while maintaining local contexts.

Goals

This vision is supported by five goals and two supportive principles:

- 1. **Multimodal**: Based on local context and modal priorities, the arterial network will provide high-quality, well maintained and reliable facilities.
- 2. Accessible and Equitable: The arterial network will provide access for people of all ages, abilities, incomes and geographies.
- 3. **Connected across the County and Region:** Using typologies that are supportive of local land use, the arterial network will provide connections for all modes within the county and across the County and Region's network of streets, highways and transit, bicycle and pedestrian routes.
- 4. Efficient Use of Resources: Investment in the arterial network will make efficient and effective use of resources.
- 5. **Safe, Healthy and Vibrant:** The arterial network will be designed, built, and managed to reduce the incidence and severity of collisions, promote public health and help create vibrant local communities.

The following supportive principles are expected outcomes of the vision and goals. They are less quantifiable but the Multimodal Arterial Plan will include strategies and programs to address them:

- **Support Strong Economy:** Development of the arterial network will support existing land uses and encourage planned land uses.
- Adaptable and Resilient: The arterial network will be designed to adapt to changes in travel patterns, travel modes and technology improvements. Investments in the arterial network will enhance its ability to withstand and recover from potentially disruptive events.

Performance Measures:

The Alameda Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan's performance measures are derived from the Plan's vision and goals. These performance measures will be utilized to identify existing and future year multimodal transportation conditions across the county for the Plan's Study Network (larger network of arterials and collectors for which data is being collected).

	Table 1 – Multimodal Arterial Plan I	Performance Measures
Goal	Category	Performance Measure
	11 Auto	1.1A – Congested Speed
	1.1 – Auto	1.1B – Reliability
		1.2A – Transit Travel Speed
	1.2 – Transit	1.2B – Transit Reliability
1. Multimodal (High Quality, Well		1.2C – Transit Infrastructure Index
Maintained and Reliable)	1.3 – Pedestrian	1.3 – Pedestrian Comfort Index
,	1.4 – Bicycle	1.4 – Bicycle Comfort Index
	1.5 - Trucks/ Goods Movement	1.5 – Truck Route Accommodation Index
	1.6 – Enhanced Mobility	1.6 – Non-Auto Transportation Mode Share
	1.7 State of Good Repair	1.7 Pavement Condition Index (PCI)
2. Accessible and Equitable ¹	2.1 – Social Equity	2.1 – Benefit to Communities of Concern
	3.1 – Transit	3.1 – Transit Connectivity
3. Connected Across	3.2 – Pedestrian	3.2 – Pedestrian Connectivity
Region	3.3 – Bicycle	3.3 – Bicycle Connectivity
	3.4 – Trucks	3.4 – Network Connectivity
	4.1 – Efficient Use of Infrastructure Operations Funding	4.1 – Infrastructure Operating Cost Effectiveness
4. Efficient Use of	4.2 – Implementation Feasibility	4.2 – Implementation Feasibility Score
Resources	4.3- ITS Infrastructure	4.3 - Coordinated Technology
	4.4 – Economic Benefits	4.4 – Property Value Index
	5.1 – Safety	5.1 - Collision Rates
5. Safe, Healthy and	5.2 – Active Transportation Mode Share	5.2 – Demand for Active Transportation
viorant	5.3 - VMT	5.3 - VMT per Capita
	5.4 - GHG	5.4 - GHG per Capita

Table 1 below provides the list of performance measures identified for each goal. Detailed description and supportive evaluation approach framework is provided in Attachment A.

R:\AlaCTC_Meetings\Community_TACs\ACTAC\20150205\4.1_MM_Plans\4.1.1_ArterialPlan_Vision_Goals\4.1.1_ArterialsPlan_Vision_Goals_Perf_Measures.docx

Upon approval of the Commission, the approved performance measures will be applied to assess the existing and future conditions of the Study Network. The evaluation approach will be updated based on input received from ACTAC.

Fiscal Impact: There is no fiscal impact.

Attachments:

A. Alameda Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan – Performance Measures and Evaluation Approach

Staff Contact

Tess Lengyel, Deputy Director of Planning and Policy

<u>Saravana Suthanthira</u>, Senior Transportation Planner

Daniel Wu, Assistant Transportation Planner

4.1.1A

MEMORANDUM

Subject:	Alameda Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan – Performance Measures and Evaluation Approach
From:	Francisco Martin and Matthew Ridgway, Fehr & Peers
То:	Saravana Suthanthira, Alameda CTC
Date:	January 22, 2015

OK14-0023

The Alameda Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan's performance measures are derived from the Plan's vision and goals. These performance measures will be utilized to identify existing and future year multimodal transportation conditions across the county for the Plan's Study Network. Performance objectives¹ or thresholds for these performance measures will be developed after performance measures are approved. These performance objectives will be applied to existing and future year conditions to identify Study Network needs and will also provide guidance in identifying short-term (year 2020) and long-term (year 2040) improvements to adequately address those needs. Performance measures in combination with the performance objectives will ensure that the proposed short-term and long-term improvements meet the Plan's vision and goals. The initial list of performance measures was presented and comments received during each of the following jurisdictional outreach meetings:

- North County Planning Area meeting October 29, 2014
- Central County Planning Area meeting October 29, 2014
- East County Planning Area meeting October 30, 2014
- Plan TAC/ACTAC meeting November 6, 2014
- South County Planning Area meeting November 13, 2014
- AC Transit focused meeting November 14, 2014

¹ Draft performance objectives will be derived from modal priorities and presented to stakeholders in the coming months. Stakeholders will also have an opportunity to review modal priorities and performance objectives during the second set of Planning Area meetings in April.

Saravana Suthanthira January 22, 2015 Page 2 of 28



Comments provided at each of the Planning Area meetings listed above were summarized in a memo titled *Summary of Milestone 1 Planning Area Comments* (November 14, 2014) prepared by Eisen | Letunic. Final Vison and Goals developed based on comments received were shared with the stakeholders on November 26, 2014.

The project team updated the performance measures to incorporate stakeholders' recommended initial revisions. In addition, the project team developed an evaluation approach for each performance measure, as detailed in this memo. Data collection for these performance measures is currently underway. This memo summarizes the Multimodal Arterial Plan's final vision and goals, the updated performance measures, performance measure evaluation approach and planning framework. Comments on the draft performance measures evaluation approach memorandum dated January 12, 2015 received until January 21, 2015 from stakeholders are incorporated into this updated memorandum.

FINAL MULTIMODAL ARTERIAL PLAN VISION AND GOALS

The final Vision and Goals were previously presented and distributed to the local jurisdictions in a memo titled *Alameda Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan – Final Vision and Goals* (November 26, 2014) and are also included below.

VISION

Transportation and mobility are not goals: the movement of people and goods support economic activity and development.

Vision: Alameda County will have a network of efficient, safe and equitable arterials that facilitate the multimodal movement of people and goods, and help create a strong economy, healthy environment and vibrant communities, while maintaining local contexts.

GOALS

This vision is supported by five goals and two supportive principles:

1. **Multimodal**: Based on local context and modal priorities, the arterial network will provide high-quality, well maintained and reliable facilities.

Saravana Suthanthira January 22, 2015 Page 3 of 28



- 2. **Accessible and Equitable:** The arterial network will provide access for people of all ages, abilities, incomes and geographies.
- 3. **Connected across the County and Region:** Using typologies that are supportive of local land use, the arterial network will provide connections for all modes within the county and across the County and Region's network of streets, highways and transit, bicycle and pedestrian routes.
- 4. **Efficient Use of Resources**: Investment in the arterial network will make efficient and effective use of resources.
- 5. **Safe, Healthy and Vibrant:** The arterial network will be designed, built, and managed to reduce the incidence and severity of collisions, promote public health and help create vibrant local communities.

In addition to the above five goals, there are two supportive principles. Supportive principles are expected outcomes of the vision and goals. They are less quantifiable but the Multimodal Arterial Plan will include strategies and programs to address them:

- **Support Strong Economy:** Development of the arterial network will support existing land uses and encourage planned land uses.
- **Adaptable and Resilient:** The arterial network will be designed to adapt to changes in travel patterns, travel modes and technology improvements. Investments in the arterial network will enhance its ability to withstand and recover from potentially disruptive events.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND PLANNING FRAMEWORK

Figure 1 presents a streamlined flow chart of the Multimodal Arterial Plan planning framework and illustrates how performance measures in combination with performance objectives will be used to identify short and long-term improvements. The process is also described below:

- 1. Performance Measures are derived from the Plan's goals, which are in turn derived from the Plan's vision.
- 2. Identify the larger level "Study Network" including parallel "layered network" of other modal facilities to support data collection and typology development.
- 3. Develop criteria to identify Arterials of Countywide Significance (Arterial Network) that will be used towards the end of the Plan development process to develop the list of

Saravana Suthanthira January 22, 2015 Page 4 of 28



preferred improvements for the Plan. The draft criteria are summarized in a memorandum titled Alameda Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan – Draft Criteria for Selecting Arterials of Countywide Significance (January 21, 2015). The criteria will be discussed and approved by the Alameda CTC Committees and Commission.

- 4. Roadway typologies² will be developed for the Study Network. Typologies will be descriptive of the transportation function, land use context, modal emphasis and the relative scale of local or longer distance travel. The roadway typologies will provide the basis for identifying modal priorities along each Study Network segment/corridor. Modal priority for transit and trucks will be coordinated with the Countywide Transit and Goods Movement Plans that are currently underway. Modal priorities will be vetted and confirmed during the second set of Planning Area meetings.
- 5. Modal priorities will inform the performance objectives by segment/corridor as different modal priorities can potentially result in different performance objectives. For example, the Bicycle Comfort Index described later in this memo identifies four different ratings, ranging from LTS1 to LTS4 (LTS1 being the highest performance level). If a Study Network segment is identified as having a bicycle modal priority, the performance measure objective would be to achieve an LTS2 or better rating. If the segment is not identified as having a bicycle modal priority, the performance would be to achieve an LTS2 or better rating. If the segment is not identified as having a bicycle modal priority, the performance measure objective would be to achieve an LTS4 or better rating. The draft performance objectives are not provided in this memorandum as they will be presented to stakeholders in the coming months.
- 6. The performance objectives will be applied to the performance measure assessment of existing and future year transportation conditions to determine network gaps, deficiencies and needs. This step will occur using a GIS based automated macro analysis tool.
- 7. Recommended multi-modal transportation improvements will be identified to adequately address short and long-term Study Network multimodal needs.
- 8. The Consultant team will meet with each Alameda County jurisdiction individually to review the recommended set of multi-modal transportation improvements; each jurisdiction will have the opportunity to review and refine the set of recommended improvements which will lead to identifying the preferred set of improvements for the Arterials of Countywide Significance.

² The roadway typology framework is being developed. It will be presented to stakeholders in April.

Saravana Suthanthira January 22, 2015 Page 5 of 28



- 9. After preferred improvements are identified, the project team will utilize the equity and active transportation mode performance measures to ensure that the list of improvements achieve the Plan's vision and goals. Equity checks ensure that a set of equitable improvements are proposed throughout the County. The potential mode shift to active transportation modes will also be assessed; preferred improvements will be revised as necessary.
- 10. Prioritization criteria³ will be developed in coordination with stakeholders to prioritize the list of preferred short and long-term improvements to be included in the Final Multimodal Arterial Plan. The project team will also develop a set of ITS, climate action, and TDM strategies that are complimentary to the list of preferred short and long-term improvements.

As shown in **Figure 1** and described above, performance measures play a critical role in developing the Plan and identifying the preferred set of short and long-term improvements.

³ Short and long-term improvement prioritization criteria will be developed and presented to stakeholders later in the Plan development process. All stakeholders will have an opportunity to review and provide feedback on the prioritization criteria before the criteria are finalized.



OK14-0023_1_PlanFramework



PROPOSED PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND EVALUATION APPROACH

The proposed performance measures to be utilized as part of the Alameda Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan development are listed in **Table 1** and described in the sections below. Performance measures will be applied to assess existing and/or future year transportation conditions; These measures also include a few 'Performance Indicators' (non-auto mode share, active transportation mode share, implementation feasibility, VMT and GHG) as these indicators by themselves do not evaluate an existing or future conditions to identify a gap or deficiency, but provide a measurement of the network or facility for a comparative assessment of the proposed improvements against the existing conditions. Therefore, these indicators will be generally applied after preferred short and long term improvements are identified to evaluate and to ensure that the preferred improvements achieve the Plan's vision and goals.

Table 1 also lists the goal that each measure addresses, if the measure is a facility-specific or area-wide application, and whether the measure applies to either existing conditions, future year conditions or both. Arterial corridor performance measure results will be derived from the study segment results along the corridor; for example, automobile congested speed at the corridor level will be estimated by calculating the average (weighted by volume) congested speed from all the individual study segments that are within the corridor limits.

As previously mentioned, modal priorities will inform the performance objectives as different modal priorities can potentially result in different objectives to determine if an arterial study segment is performing adequately to suit the multimodal needs. Modal priorities will also address potential modal conflicts that may arise along arterial segments as short and long term improvements will be prioritized for the identified priority modes. All stakeholders will have an opportunity to review and refine the modal priorities along the Study Network. Jurisdictions will also be given the opportunity to coordinate with neighboring jurisdictions on modal priorities along multi-jurisdictional routes during the second set of Planning Area meetings in April and May of 2015. Because modal priorities are not yet identified, performance objectives will be identified at a later date and therefore are not described in this memo.

Saravana Suthanthira January 22, 2015 Page 8 of 28



TABLE 1 MULTIMODAL ARTERIAL PLAN PERFORMANCE MEASURES

		Performance		
Goal	Category	Measure	Evaluation Approach	Application
	<	1.1A – Congested Speed	Based on average PM peak hour congested speed.	Facility-Specific Measure, Existing and Future Conditions
	OJNY – TT	1.18 - Reliability	Based on PM peak hour volume-to-capacity ratio	Facility-Specific Measure, Existing and Future Conditions
		1.2A – Transit Travel Speed	Based on average PM peak hour transit travel speed provided by transit agencies that operate in the County.	Facility-Specific Measure, Existing and Future Conditions
ligh Quality, ell Maintained d Reliable)	1.2 – Transit	1.2B – Transit Reliability	Based on average PM peak hour transit travel speed to non-peak hour travel speed ratio. Measure with supportive data to be provided by transit agencies that operate in the County.	Facility-Specific Measure, Existing and Future Conditions
		1.2C – Transit Infrastructure Index	Based on the following factors:Provided bus stop amenitiesBus stop locationBus stop design	Facility-Specific Measure, Existing and Future Conditions
	1.3 – Pedestrian	1.3 – Pedestrian Comfort Index	 Based on the following factors: Sidewalk width Presence of buffer between sidewalk and roadway Average crosswalk spacing Roadway classification, average daily vehicle volume, number of travel lanes and speed limit Percent heavy vehicle traffic 	Facility-Specific Measure, Existing and Future Conditions



TABLE 1 MULTIMODAL ARTERIAL PLAN PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Goal	Category	Performance Measure	Evaluation Approach	Application
	1.4 – Bicycle	1.4 – Bicycle Comfort Index	Application of the Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) methodology, which is based on the type of bicycle facility provided and separation from vehicle travel lanes. LTS methodology classifies roadway segments into one of four levels of traffic stress, which are termed as LTS1 through LTS4. Groups of cyclists are categorized by how much stress they will tolerate in different environments.	Facility-Specific Measure, Existing and Future Conditions
	1.5 – Trucks/ Goods Movement	1.5 – Truck Route Accommodation Index	Based on curb-lane width. Additional consideration for on-street parking; on-street parking will be considered only in urban contexts where many businesses are expected to load from the street.	Facility-Specific Measure, Existing and Future Conditions
	1.6 – Enhanced Mobility	1.6 – Non-Auto Transportation Mode Share	Qualitative assessment of cross-sectional improvements on likelihood of changes to transit, pedestrian, and bicycle travel (proxy for person throughput).	Area-Wide Indicator ³ , Existing, Future Conditions
	1.7 State of Good Repair	1.7 Pavement Condition Index (PCI)	Based on the PCI data obtained from the MTC StreetSaver database	Facility-Specific Measure, Existing Conditions
			-	
2. Accessible and Equitable ¹	2.1 – Social Equity	2.1 – Benefit to Communities of Concern	After the preferred list of short and long-term improvements is identified, a ratio will be estimated by dividing the number of arterial miles of identified improvements within Communities of Concern (COC) by the number arterial miles of all identified improvements benefiting each jurisdiction. For Transit, number of population benefitted within COC versus overall population benefitted in the County will be used.	Area-Wide Indicator ³ , Future Conditions
3. Connected Across the County and Region	3.1 – Transit	3.1 – Transit Connectivity	Connectivity measures will be assessed through a mapping exercise. The transit, pedestrian, bicycle and truck networks will be mapped to identify gaps or inconsistencies in the networks. The pedestrian and bicycle assessment will include consideration of relative comfort.	Area-Wide Measure, Existing and Future Conditions

Page 17



TABLE 1 MULTIMODAL ARTERIAL PLAN PERFORMANCE MEASURES

leng	Catadony	Performance	Evaluation Annuach	Annlication
000	caregory	Measure		
	3.2 – Pedestrian	3.2 – Pedestrian Connectivity		Area-Wide Measure, Existing and Future Conditions
	3.3 – Bicycle	3.3 – Bicycle Connectivity		Area-Wide Measure, Existing and Future Conditions
	3.4 – Trucks	3.4 – Network Connectivity		Area-Wide Measure, Existing and Future Conditions
	4.1 – Efficient Use of Infrastructure Operations Funding	4.1 – Infrastructure Operating Cost Effectiveness	 Based on the ratio of improvement costs to existing facility costs: Develop unit operating costs for cross-sectional elements, including maintenance costs Estimate operating costs to maintain existing cross-section (O_E) Estimate operating costs to maintain preferred cross-section sectional improvements (O_P) Operating Cost Effectiveness = O_P/O_E 	Facility-Specific Measure, Future Conditions
ficient Use esources ^{2,3}	4.2 – Implementation Feasibility	4.2 – Implementation Feasibility Score	Based on a zero to four point scale, zero being most feasible and four being the least feasible	Facility-Specific Indicator ³ , Future Conditions
	4.3 ITS Infrastructure	4.3 Coordinated Technology	Four-point scale (0 – 4) based on the level of ITS investment defined by built infrastructure. Consideration for coordination with adjacent jurisdictions and/or Caltrans, as applicable	Facility-Specific Measure, Existing and Future Conditions

aravana Suthanthira	nuary 22, 2015	age 11 of 28
Sar	Janı	Pag



MULTIMODAL ARTERIAL PLAN PERFORMANCE MEASURES TABLE 1

Goal	Category	Performance Measure	Evaluation Approach	Application
	4.4 – Economic Benefits	4.4 – Property Value Index	Based on the change in residential and commercial property values influenced by transportation infrastructure improvements within the built environment.	Facility-Specific Indicator ³ , Future Conditions
	5.1 - Safety	5.1 – Collision Rates	Collision rates based on the SWITRS database.	Facility-Specific Measure, Existing Conditions
5. Safe, Healthy and Vibrant	5.2 – Active Transportation Mode Share	5.2 – Demand for Active Transportation	Potential for mode shift (low, medium, high) based on demand for active transportation.	Area-Wide Indicator ³ , Future Conditions
	5.3 VMT	5.3 - VMT per Capita	Using the Countywide Travel Demand Model	Area-wide Indicator ³ , Existing
	5.4 GHG	5.4 - GHG per Capita	Using the Countywide Travel Demand Model	and Future Conditions
Motor.				

NOLES.

Accessibility is a component of the Transit Infrastructure Index, Pedestrian Comfort Index and Bicycle Comfort Index.
 Capital Cost Effectiveness is not considered further based on additional evaluation that showed that there is not much utility for this measure and is accounted for

in the Operating Cost Effectiveness measure already included.

3. Performance measures are generally applied to assess existing and/or future year transportation conditions, performance indicators will generally be evaluated after improvements are identified to ensure that the improvements meet the Plan's goals.



GOAL 1 – MULTIMODAL (HIGH QUALITY, WELL MAINTAINED AND RELIABLE)

1.1A – AUTOMOBILE CONGESTED SPEED

Overview

Automobile congested travel speed relates directly to the automobile traveler experience and provides a good indication of vehicular operations along an arterial study segment. This measure is facility-specific and will be applied to existing and future year conditions.

Approach

Automobile congested travel speed will be estimated for Existing and Future Year PM peak hour conditions, consistent with the Alameda County Congestion Management Program. Existing travel speeds will be obtained from either of the following data sources:

- Speed data obtained from the INRIX database, or
- Speed survey data provided by jurisdictions, or
- Speed data obtained from the base year (2010) Alameda Countywide Travel Demand Model

Speed data from the INRIX database will be prioritized, followed by speed data provided by jurisdictions, and if neither INRIX nor survey data is available for an arterial segment then speed data from the Travel Demand Model will be used. Future year 2020 and 2040 PM peak hour travel speeds will be estimated using the Alameda Countywide Travel Demand Model. Adjustment factors comparing observed PM peak hour speed data to base year (2010) modeled speed data will be estimated. This adjustment factors will be applied to modeled speed data for future years 2020 and 2040 to estimate future years 2020 and 2040 PM peak hour travel speeds for the Study Network.

1.1B – AUTOMOBILE RELIABILITY

Overview

Automobile reliability is an assessment of the vehicular volume-to-capacity (V/C) along an arterial segment. Arterial segments that operate below capacity generally provide greater travel reliability

Saravana Suthanthira January 22, 2015 Page 13 of 28



compared to segments that operate at or near capacity. This measure is facility-specific and will be applied to existing and future year conditions.

Approach

Automobile reliability will be estimated for existing and future year PM peak hour conditions. Existing PM peak hour volumes will be obtained from existing count data provided by jurisdictions or base year (2010) volume data from the Alameda Countywide Travel Demand Model. Future year 2020 and 2040 volume forecasts will also be estimated using the Travel Demand Model, the process for estimating forecasts is described in a separate memo titled *Alameda Countywide Arterial Plan Travel Demand Forecasting Methods White Paper (December 31, 2014*), which is under review at Alameda CTC . Arterial segment capacity is based on the capacity rates assumed in the Travel Demand Model applied to the number of existing and future year travel lanes along an arterial segment. For example, the volume-to-capacity ratio will be calculated and reliability will be based on the following thresholds:

- Reliable (V/C between 0 0.8)
- Less Reliable (V/C between 0.8 1.0)
- Unreliable (V/C greater than 1.0)

1.2A – TRANSIT TRAVEL SPEED

Overview

At the request of Alameda County transit agencies, transit travel speed will be included in the performance measure assessment for existing and future year conditions. Transit travel speed influences transit operating costs along an arterial corridor. This measure is facility-specific and will be applied to existing and future year conditions. In addition, the measure will only be applied to Study Network segments that currently provide transit service. Study Network segments that serve as designated transit routes will be prioritized for transit, as such, the performance measure objectives will reflect this modal priority.

Approach

Existing PM peak hour average transit travel speed will be summarized by transit agencies operating transit routes along the Study Network. Existing transit speeds will be estimated using data obtained from on board GPS tracking devices. The data accounts for bus boarding and

Saravana Suthanthira January 22, 2015 Page 14 of 28



alighting movements made by patrons at bus stops along a study segment. Future year 2020 and 2040 transit travel speeds will be estimated by applying the existing transit travel speed-to-vehicle congested speed ratio to the estimated future year vehicle congested speed. Where transit improvements are recommended such as signal priority, queue jump lanes or dedicated transit lanes, transit travel speeds will reflect these improvements.

1.2B – TRANSIT RELIABILITY

Overview

Transit reliability provides a general indication of attractiveness of transit for riders along an arterial corridor. This measure is facility-specific and will be applied to existing and future year conditions. In addition, the measure will only be applied to Study Network segments that currently provide transit service. Study Network segments that serve as designated transit routes will be prioritized for transit, as such, the performance measure objectives will reflect this modal priority.

Approach

Existing PM peak hour transit reliability will be summarized by transit agencies operating transit routes along the Study Network. The transit reliability metric is estimated by comparing peak hour transit travel speed to non-peak hour speed.

1.2C – TRANSIT INFRASTRUCTURE INDEX

Overview

The built environment has a substantial effect on the transit user comfort and peoples' willingness to use transit. The Transit Infrastructure Index performance measure draws on research and existing evaluation tools to assess how well arterials serve transit users. The Transit Infrastructure Index is a facility-specific measure that will be applied to existing and future year conditions. The measure will only be applied to Study Network segments that currently provide transit service. Study Network segments that serve as designated transit routes will be prioritized for transit, as such, the performance objectives will reflect this modal priority. Saravana Suthanthira January 22, 2015 Page 15 of 28



Approach

Transit Infrastructure Index is rated as poor, good or best on an 12-point rating system based on bus stop design and provided amenities. The point rating system for the Transit Infrastructure Index can be amended if necessary; the consultant team will coordinate with Alameda County transit agencies to modify the methodology as necessary. A customized spreadsheet built into the GIS Tool will be used to calculate the Transit Infrastructure Index for any study segment that provides transit service. The measure will be applied for representative bus stops along a Study Network segment as oppose to each block within a study segment. **Exhibit 1** shows an example of the Transit Infrastructure Index calculation. Curb lane width will also be considered in addition to the bus stop amenities listed in **Exhibit 1**. A point will be scored if the curb lane width is 12 feet or greater. If available, lane width data will be obtained from local jurisdictions; if not, lane width data will be obtained from aerial imagery. Saravana Suthanthira January 22, 2015 Page 16 of 28



	6	Bus Stop Amenities	Score
		Shelter and Bench	2
		Bench Only, No Shelter	1
2		Bus Bulb	1
		Wayfinding/Routing Information	1
	A	Bicycle Parking	1
j i	8	Total	
Enter sco	re from #1 above and sc	ore one point for each of items 2-6 that	it annly
Enter sco Field	re from #1 above and sc Category	ore one point for each of items 2-6 tha	it apply. Score
Enter sco Field	re from #1 above and sc Category Bus Stop Amenities	ore one point for each of items 2-6 tha	it apply. Score
Enter sco Field	re from #1 above and sc Category Bus Stop Amenities Minimum Bus Stop Leng	ore one point for each of items 2-6 that th & Red Curb Provided (80')	it apply. Score
Enter sco Field 2 3	re from #1 above and sc Category Bus Stop Amenities Minimum Bus Stop Leng Minimum Pedestrian Pat	ore one point for each of items 2-6 tha th & Red Curb Provided (80') th of Travel (4')	t apply. Score
Enter sco Field 2 3 4	re from #1 above and sc Category Bus Stop Amenities Minimum Bus Stop Leng Minimum Pedestrian Pat ADA Compliant Bus Stop	ore one point for each of items 2-6 tha th & Red Curb Provided (80') th of Travel (4') Area (8'x 5' landing)	t apply. Score
Enter sco Field 2 3 4 5	re from #1 above and sc Category Bus Stop Amenities Minimum Bus Stop Leng Minimum Pedestrian Pat ADA Compliant Bus Stop Pedestrian-scale Lighting	ore one point for each of items 2-6 tha th & Red Curb Provided (80') th of Travel (4') Area (8'x 5' landing)	t apply. Score

EXHIBIT 1: EXAMPLE TRANSIT INFRASTRUCTURE INDEX CALCULATION

Score one point for each bus stop amenity unless otherwise noted.

Notes:

1. The Transit Infrastructure Index calculation methodology will be customized on data availability and evaluation needs while ensuring reasonable results.

2. Consultant team will coordinate with Alameda County transit agencies to modify the Transit Infrastructure Index scoring methodology as necessary. Saravana Suthanthira January 22, 2015 Page 17 of 28



1.3 – PEDESTRIAN COMFORT INDEX

Overview

The built environment has a substantial effect on the pedestrian comfort and peoples' willingness to walk. The Pedestrian Comfort Index performance measure draws on research and existing evaluation tools to assess how well arterials serve pedestrians. The Pedestrian Comfort Index will be a facility specific performance measure applied to existing and future year conditions.

Approach

The Pedestrian Comfort Index is assessed along street segments and crossing frequency is also considered.

Level of comfort is rated as poor, good or best on an assigned point system based on pedestrian facilities and automobile traffic characteristics; pedestrian infrastructure characteristics are generally weighted higher than automobile traffic characteristics when applying the methodology. A customized spreadsheet tool **StreetScore+** developed by Fehr and Peers can be used to calculate level of comfort for any facility.

The street segment calculation assigns point values (from -3 to 3) to the following variables within the built environment:

- Sidewalk width and presence
- Presence of a buffer (landscaped or hardscaped) between sidewalk and roadway
- Roadway classification, average daily vehicle volume, number of travel lanes and speed limit
- Percent heavy vehicle traffic
- Distance between crosswalks

An example of the Pedestrian Comfort Index calculation in **StreetScore+** tool is shown in **Exhibit 2** below. In regards to the **StreetScore+** tool, we will program these functions into the GIS Tool rather than use as a separate Excel process. For the Pedestrian Comfort Index evaluation, a representative location along a Study Network segment will be selected for each segment rather than assessing every block within a study segment.



EXHIBIT 2: EXAMPLE PEDESTRIAN COMFORT INDEX BASED ON STREETSCORE+

Ct					
	reebcore				
1	Enter the name of the roadway segment below.				
2	All input Fields 1-10 (marked in blue) are required.				
3	The Segment LTS output is provided below the input fields.				
4	Refer to "Streetscore+ Tool Overview" and "About" tab inputs and calculations.	s detailed descriptions of			
Segment	(Two-Way Roadway) Pedestrian Score	14			
Segment	Segment: Main Street between Oak and Elm				
Field	Category	Input			
1	Location	Commercial Corridor			
2	Sidewalk Present	Yes			
3	Sidewalk or Clear Walkway Width (feet)	6			
4	Buffer Present	Landscaped			
5	Roadway Classification	Collector			
6	Roadway Volume (2-way) (AADT)	32500			
7	Posted Speed Limit	25			
8	% Heavy Vehicle Traffic	1.5			
9	Number of travel lanes (total for both directions)	4			
10	Crosswalk spacing (ft)	200			
	Segment (Non-Directional) Comfort Level	Medium Level of Comfort			
	Segment score (0-16)	3			

Notes:

1. The Pedestrian Comfort Index calculation methodology will be customized on data availability and evaluation needs while ensuring reasonable results.

Saravana Suthanthira January 22, 2015 Page 19 of 28



1.4 – BICYCLE COMFORT INDEX

Overview

Fehr & Peers created the **StreetScore+** tool: an easy-to-use Microsoft Excel spreadsheet that calculates Levels of Traffic Stress (LTS) scores from a user's unique input. LTS is a methodology developed by Mekuria, Furth and Nixon (2012) that examines the characteristics of city streets and how various aspects can cause stress on bicyclists and affect where they are likely to ride. The Bicycle Comfort Index is a facility-specific measure based on the LTS methodology and will be applied to existing and future year conditions.

Approach

LTS methodology classifies roadway segments into one of four levels of traffic stress, which are termed as LTS1 through LTS4. Groups of cyclists are categorized by how much stress they will tolerate in different environments:

- LTS1: most children can tolerate and feel safe while bicycling.
- LTS2: the mainstream adult population will tolerate and feel safe while bicycling.
- LTS3: cyclists who are considered "enthused and confident" but still prefer having their own dedicated space for riding will tolerate and feel safe while bicycling.
- LTS4: a level tolerated only by those characterized as "strong and fearless", which comprises just 0.5 percent of the population. The high-stress streets that LTS4 groups will ride are those with high speed limits, multiple travel lanes, limited or non-existent bike lanes and signage, and large distances to cross at intersections.

LTS works on the "weakest link" principle, where the traffic stress for a given arterial corridor is dictated by the most stressful portion. This means a full segment receives the score of its lowest-scored portion. For example, a cross-town ride could have large portions of LTS1 and LTS2, but just one section of LTS3 would present a barrier. Only cyclists that could tolerate LTS3 would ride the entire route. So, LTS3 becomes the score for that route. According to the LTS methodology, Study Network segments with posted speed limits of 40 MPH or greater cannot achieve better than an LTS4 rating unless a barrier separated bicycle lane facility is provided with the exception of the "strong and fearless", typical bicyclists experience a low level of comfort riding on high speed arterials that do not provide a barrier between the cyclists and the automobile travel lanes, hence the LTS 4 rating.



An example of the **StreetScore+** tool is shown in **Exhibit 3** below. Pavement Condition Index will also be considered in addition to the built environment attributes shown in **Exhibit 3**; the recurrence of bike lane blockages will not be considered.

EXHIBIT 3: BICYCLE COMFORT INDEX BASED ON STREETSCORE+

St	reetScore ⁺					
Input inst	nuctions:					
1	Enter the name of the roadway segment below.					
2	All input Fields 1-8 (marked in green) are required. Fields 9 and 10 will activate when the bicycle lane is selected for the mode separation in Field 2.					
3	The Segment LTS output is provided below the input fields.					
4	Refer to "Streetscore+ Tool Overview" and "About LTS" to inputs and calculations.	tabs detailed de	scriptions of			
Segment	t (Two-Way Roadway) LTS					
Segment						
Field	Category	Direction 1	Direction 2			
		Input	Input			
1	Direction	NB	SB			
2	Mode separation	Bicycle Lane	Bicycle Lane			
3	Is this a residential street?	Yes				
4	Adjacent parking	No	No			
5	Lanes in analysis direction	1	1			
6	Is there a median?	None or Striped				
7	Is there a center line?	No				
8	What is the prevailing speed? (Use speed limit if prevailing speed not available)	25	25			
9	Bike Lane + Parking Width (if bike lane present)	15	15			
10	How often do bike lane blockages occur?	Rare	Rare			
2.049						

Notes:

1. The Bicycle Comfort Index calculation methodology will be customized on data availability and evaluation needs while ensuring reasonable results.

Saravana Suthanthira January 22, 2015 Page 21 of 28



1.5 – TRUCK ROUTE ACCOMODATION INDEX

Overview

The Truck Route Accommodation Index was identified to assess the general built environment of the Study Network in regards to accommodating trucks and goods movement. The Truck Route Accommodation Index is a facility-specific measure that will be applied to existing and future year conditions. Study Network segments that serve as designated truck routes will be prioritized for truck and goods movement, as such, the performance measure objectives will reflect this modal priority. This will be coordinated with the Goods Movement Plan.

Approach

For most contexts, truck route accommodation is based on the effective curb lane width, which is a function of lane width. The Truck Route Accommodation Index generates a score total ranging from zero to 10 points (higher point indicates better rating)

An effective curb lane width 12 feet or greater will score 9 points, compared to 5 points if the curb lane width is 11 feet, or 2 points if the curb lane width is 10 feet or less. In urban contexts, a second consideration is on-street parking. On-street parking would only be considered in urban contexts where many businesses are expected to load from the street; as such, one-point will be scored if an urban arterial provides on-street parking or loading/unloading areas.

1.6 – NON-AUTO TRANSPORTATION MODE SHARE

Overview

The Non-Auto Transportation Mode Share indicator was identified to assess existing and future year non-auto transportation (walking, biking, and transit) mode share for each jurisdiction within Alameda County. It is a proxy for increased person-carrying capacity under the assumption that there are few arterials in Alameda County where more travel lanes could be added. So, moving more people in non-auto modes is the primary basis for adding more system capacity. Similarly, it is assumed that increasing the non-auto transportation mode share correlates with lower vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and emissions (e.g., greenhouse gases, particulate matter) per capita. This measure is an area-wide application.

Saravana Suthanthira January 22, 2015 Page 22 of 28



Approach

Non-Auto Transportation Mode Share is a qualitative indicator of proposed improvements. It assesses, based on transit, bike and pedestrian performance measure changes, whether the proposed improvements support increases in these modes. The order of magnitude of changes in Non-Auto Transportation Mode Share will be described in a low, medium or high rating. The indicator will be assessed after preferred short and long-term improvements are identified to ensure that preferred improvements achieve the Plan's vision and goals.

1.7 – PAVEMENT CONDITION INDEX

Overview

The Pavement Condition Index (PCI) is a standard performance measure that assesses the state of good repair for pavement along an arterial segment. PCI is generally monitored by public works staff at each Alameda County jurisdiction. PCI is a facility-specific measure that will be estimated for existing conditions only, but is considered in the context of future year conditions. PCI relates to the efficient use of resources because street overlays, reconstruction or other maintenance tasks are often opportune times to reconfigure street designs. On this basis, streets in poor states of repair are considered opportunities for achieving more cost-effective redesigns. PCI can also be used to assess bicycling conditions along an arterial segment. PCI is a facility-specific performance measure that will be assessed pm the future conditions.

Approach

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) StreetSaver database will be used to obtain existing conditions PCI estimates for Study Network segments within each jurisdiction. Permission to access the PCI data within the StreetSaver database is requested from each local jurisdiction.

GOAL 2 – ACCESSIBLE AND EQUITABLE

The performance measures for "Connectivity" included under Goal 3 also address 'Accessibility'. Therefore, measures identified for this goal focus on Equitability.
Saravana Suthanthira January 22, 2015 Page 23 of 28



2.1 – BENEFIT TO COMMUNITIES OF CONCERN

Overview

The Benefit to Communities of Concern (CoC) indicator was derived to address social equity and ensure that preferred short and long-term Study Network improvements are adequately identified for Communities of Concern. This measure will be applied area-wide by jurisdiction for future year conditions only.

Approach

Communities of Concern as defined by MTC will be the basis for estimating the performance measure. Each proposed improvement will be assessed for whether it produces benefits to CoCs. After the preferred list of short and long-term improvements is identified, a CoC ratio will be estimated by dividing the number of arterial miles of identified improvements within Communities of Concern by the number arterial miles of all identified improvements benefiting each jurisdiction. For Transit improvements, number of population benefitted within COC versus overall population benefitted will be used. The indicator will be assessed after preferred short and long-term improvements are identified to ensure that preferred improvements achieve the Plan's vision and goals.

GOAL 3 – CONNECTED ACROSS THE COUNTY AND REGION

3.1-3.4 – TRANSIT, PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE AND TRUCK NETWORK CONNECTIVITY

Overview

Transit, pedestrian, bicycle and truck network connectivity measures were derived to ensure modal network connectivity and continuity across the countywide Study Network. Each measure will be applied at an area-wide level by Planning Area for existing and future year conditions. Connections at the county lines for Planning Areas, north, south, and east will also be reviewed.

Approach

Connectivity measures will be assessed through a mapping exercise. The transit, pedestrian, bicycle and truck networks will be mapped to identify gaps or inconsistencies in the networks based on the performance results by mode. The pedestrian and bicycle assessment will include



consideration of relative comfort. Where inconsistencies are identified, alternative cross-section improvements to close modal gaps and provide complete networks by mode will be presented to jurisdictions for consideration.

GOAL 4 EFFICIENCT USE OF RESOURCES

4.1 – INFRASTRUCTURE OPERATING COST EFFECTIVENESS

Overview

The Operating Cost Effectiveness performance measure was derived to assess the relative maintenance and operating costs of proposed cross-sectional improvements along a Study Network segment compared to the maintenance and operating costs of the existing cross-section along the same segment. This is a facility-specific measure applied to future year conditions only.

Approach

The methodology to estimate the Operating Cost Effectiveness is based on the ratio of maintenance and operating costs of proposed improvements to existing facility costs:

- Develop unit operating costs for cross-sectional elements, including maintenance costs
- Estimate operating costs to maintain existing cross-section (O_E)
- Estimate operating costs to maintain recommended cross-sectional improvements (O_P)
- Operating Cost Effectiveness = O_P/O_E

The Operating Cost Effectiveness measure will be used to identify short and long-term Study Network improvements that minimize relative operating costs. Since this measure focuses on physical infrastructure maintenance and operations, it will not account for transit operating costs.

4.2 – IMPLEMENTATION FEASIBILITY SCORE

Overview

The Implementation Feasibility Score indicator was identified to gauge the general feasibility of implementing recommended short and long-term Study Network improvements. The Implementation Feasibility Score is a facility-specific indicator applied to future year conditions only.

Saravana Suthanthira January 22, 2015 Page 25 of 28



Approach

The methodology is based on a zero to four point scale, zero being most feasible and four being the least feasible based on the following variables:

- Travel lane removal required (yes = 1 pt, no = 0 pts)
- Multi-jurisdictional Coordination Required (yes = 1 pt, no = 0 pts)
- Parking removal required (yes = 1 pt, no = 0 pts)
- Curb changes required (yes = 1 pt, no = 0 pts)

The higher the Implementation Feasibility Score, the more challenging it will be to implement recommended Study Network improvements. Although the intent of the Plan is to promote and support multi-jurisdictional coordination, considering the complexity in the implementation process for multi-jurisdictional improvements compared to the one within a single jurisdiction, multi-jurisdictional coordination aspect is added to the criteria as way to acknowledge the complexity.

4.3 - COORDINATED TECHONOLOGY

Overview

The Coordinated Technology indicator was identified to assess level of ITS infrastructure along the Study Network as it will improve the performance of the network at a relatively low cost. The indicator is facility-specific and will be applied to existing and future year conditions.

Approach

The methodology is based on a zero to four point scale based on the level of ITS investment defined by the built infrastructure. Existing and planned future levels of ITS infrastructure are identified based on the following general categories:

- 0: no ITS infrastructure
- 1: basic investment ITS network
- 2: medium investment ITS network
- 4: high investment ITS network

The level of ITS infrastructure pertaining to each category listed above will be defined later during the Plan development process with the help of Iteris, who is developing traffic management Saravana Suthanthira January 22, 2015 Page 26 of 28



strategies and recommendations for inclusion in the Plan. The ITS infrastructure assessment will also include coordination between jurisdictions and/or Caltrans and different operators, as appropriate.

4.4 – PROPERTY VALUE INDEX

Overview

The Property Value Index was identified to assess benefits/disbenefits to adjacent property of transportation infrastructure improvements within the built environment. This indicator is facility-specific and will be applied to future year conditions only.

Approach

The Property Value Index will assess general changes in residential and commercial property values along a Study Network segment based on recommended short and long-term improvements. The methodology to assess general changes in property values is in the process of being developed by Strategic Economics in coordination with Fehr & Peers and Alameda CTC staff. The indicator will be assessed after preferred short and long-term improvements are identified to ensure that preferred improvements achieve the Plan's vision and goals.

GOAL 5 – SAFE, HEALTHY AND VIBRANT

5.1 - COLLISION RATES

Overview

The collision history will be assessed for each Study Network segment under existing conditions only, but will be considered in the context of improvement recommendations as arterial segments with high collision rates will be more likely to be included in the preferred improvement list.

Approach

The collision history for the latest three-year period will be obtained for each Study Network segment using the California Highway Patrol's Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS). Collision rates and severity (fatality rates) will be calculated and summarized for each Study Network segment. Using the number of total collisions and fatalities reported and existing

Saravana Suthanthira January 22, 2015 Page 27 of 28



average daily traffic (ADT), collision rates will be calculated based on the number of collisions per million vehicle miles.

5.2 – DEMAND FOR ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION

Overview

The Demand for Active Transportation indicator was identified to assess the potential for shifting people from driving vehicles to active transportation modes such as walking, biking and transit. The measure will be applied at an area-wide level by jurisdiction for future year conditions only.

Approach

The Demand for Active Transportation indicator will qualitatively assess the potential of shifting from driving to active transportation modes on a low, medium or high scale. Proposed short and long-term Study Network active transportation improvements will be assessed at an area wide scale and the Demand for Active Transportation mode shift will be estimated for each Alameda County jurisdiction. The indicator will be assessed after preferred short and long-term improvements are identified to ensure that preferred improvements achieve the Plan's vision and goals.

5.3-5.4 – VMT PER CAPITA AND GHG PER CAPITA

Overview

The Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita and Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) per capita indicators were identified to assess the effectiveness of the Arterial Plan's proposed short and long term improvements on the Study Network in reducing VMT and GHG to protect the environment and respond to SB 375. These indicators will be applied at an area-wide level for the county for existing and future year conditions.

Approach

VMT will be assessed using the Alameda Countywide Travel Demand Model. GHG will be estimated using the GHG Estimator, a tool based on Emissions Factors (EMFAC) model developed by California Air Resources Board, added to the Alameda Countywide Travel Demand Model. These indicators will be assessed after preferred short and long-term improvements are identified Saravana Suthanthira January 22, 2015 Page 28 of 28



to ensure that preferred improvements achieve the Plan's vision and goals in reducing VMT and GHG.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Performance measures or indicators specifically relating to parking management or transportation demand management (TDM) policies are not proposed as part of the Multimodal Arterial Plan. Parking management and TDM strategies will however be recommended for each Alameda County jurisdiction as part of the Plan development. Although specific parking performance measures are not proposed, on-street parking will be assessed by various other performance measures listed above, such as the Pedestrian Comfort Index, Bicycle Comfort Index and Truck Route Accommodation Index. Similarly, existing TDM policies and strategies adopted by Alameda County jurisdictions will be inventoried. The consultant team will review existing TDM practices by jurisdiction and recommend additional strategies that build upon existing ones.

NEXT STEPS

The consultant team and Alameda CTC staff will present the final vision, goals and performance measures for approval at the February 5th ACTAC and February Planning Policy and Legislation Committee and Commission meetings. After receiving approval on the performance measures, the consultant team will move forward with assessing Study Network existing conditions.



Memorandum

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

510.208.7400

www.AlamedaCTC.org

DATE:	February 2, 2015
SUBJECT:	Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan Draft Arterial Network Selection Criteria
RECOMMENDATION:	Provide input on the Draft Arterial Network Selection Criteria

Summary

The arterial roadways are the core of the transportation system in Alameda County moving people and goods within the county and the region. Alameda CTC is developing a Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan that will provide a framework for designing, prioritizing, and implementing projects and programs on the arterial network.

Defining the extent of the road network for focused study and identifying and prioritizing multimodal transportation improvements is a key aspect of the Multimodal Arterial Plan. The Alameda Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan uses two types of network - a broad network, called "Study Network" for general study purposes and a subset of the broad network, called "Arterial Network" for focused identification and prioritization of long and short terms improvements. The Study Network (included in Attachment A) includes arterial and collector streets, and was developed following the California Road System classification. The project team distributed this Study Network to the jurisdictions and transit agencies to support the data collection effort in December 2014. Data collection, analysis and typology development will occur on the Study network to provide a good understanding of the large network of roads in the county.

Since the Arterial Plan's long and short term improvements should be meaningful and manageable, the project team will identify and prioritize improvements on the Arterial Network, which is a sub-set of the Study Network. The Arterial Network is deemed to be of countywide significance.

The project team has developed a draft set of criteria for identifying roads and other modal facilities that will be part of the Arterial Network or Arterials of Countywide Significance. Table 1 summarizes the criteria by mode for identifying the Arterial Network. Attachment A presents the background information about both networks used in the Arterial Plan and details about the draft network selection criteria for developing the Arterial Network and includes a map of the Study Network.

R:\AlaCTC_Meetings\Community_TACs\ACTAC\20150205\4.1_MM_Plans\4.1.2_ArterialPlan_NetworkCriteria\4.1.2_ArterialPlan_Network_ Selection_Criteria.docx

TABLE 1
ARTERIALS OF COUNTYWIDE SIGNIFICANCE – SUMMARY DRAFT NETWORK CRITERIA

Mode	Arterial Network Selection Criteria
Auto	 Congestion Management Program (CMP) Network Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS) Network State Route Network (Non-Freeway) Roads that provide access to freeway interchanges Other considerations: Rural roads with an appropriate average daily traffic (ADT) volume threshold County connectors with an appropriate ADT volume threshold
Transit	 AC Transit, LAVTA and Union City Transit major corridors Cross-Town Routes as identified by AC Transit
Bicycle	Countywide Bicycle Plan – Vision Network
Pedestrian	 Countywide Pedestrian Plan – Vision Network Other considerations: PDAs not included in the Vision Network Communities of Concern areas not included in the Vision Network
Truck	 Tier 1 Truck Routes, as applicable Tier 2 Truck Routes Other considerations: Tier 3 Truck Routes (Case by case)

Note: Attachment B illustrates CMP and MTS Network

The draft criteria for selecting Arterials of Countywide Significance will be presented in February to the Committees and the Commission. Upon approval, the criteria will be applied and the Arterial Network will be mapped and presented for information in the following months.

Fiscal Impact: There is no fiscal impact.

Attachments:

- A. Alameda Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan Draft Criteria for Selecting Arterials of Countywide Significance
- B. Congestion Management Program Network

Staff Contact

Tess Lengyel, Deputy Director of Planning and Policy

Saravana Suthanthira, Senior Transportation Planner

Daniel Wu, Assistant Transportation Planner

R:\AlaCTC_Meetings\Community_TACs\ACTAC\20150205\4.1_MM_Plans\4.1.2_ArterialPlan_NetworkCriteria\4.1.2_ArterialPlan_Network_S election_Criteria.docx

4.1.2A

MEMORANDUM

Subject:	Alameda Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan – Draft Criteria for Selecting Arterials of Countywide Significance
From:	Francisco Martin and Matthew Ridgway, Fehr & Peers
То:	Saravana Suthanthria and Daniel Wu, Alameda CTC
Date:	January 26, 2015

OK14-0023

The Alameda Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan uses two types of networks - a broad network, called "Study Network" for general study purposes and a subset of the broad network, called "Arterial Network" for focused identification and prioritization of long and short terms improvements. The Study Network, as shown in the map attached to the end of this memo, includes arterial and collector streets, and was developed following the California Road System classification. The project team distributed this Study Network to the jurisdictions and transit agencies to support the data collection effort in December 2014. Data collection, analysis and typology development will occur on the Study Network to provide a good understanding of the large network of roads in the county.

The Arterial Network is deemed to be of countywide significance based on the criteria detailed in this memo. Since the Arterial Plan's long and short term improvements should be meaningful and manageable, the project team will identify and prioritize improvements on the Arterial Network. Traditionally, from the countywide significance perspective, Alameda CTC's Congestion Management Program (CMP) includes the routes designated as part of the Congestion Management Plan (CMP) network, and MTC's Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS) network. However, the CMP and MTS networks include Caltrans state routes and freeways that will not be part of the Study Network or the Arterial Network. To reflect a multimodal perspective, the Arterial Network will expand on the CMP and MTS networks to include transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and truck routes of countywide significance.

Alameda CTC January 26, 2015 Page 2 of 4



This memo presents draft criteria for selecting the Arterials of Countywide Significance, also known as the Arterial Network. Consistent with the multimodal nature of this study, this would be done by looking at each mode. The draft summary criteria for each mode are presented in **Table 1** and described in the sections below.

TABLE 1
ARTERIALS OF COUNTYWIDE SIGNIFICANCE – SUMMARY DRAFT NETWORK CRITERIA

Mode	Arterial Network Selection Criteria
Auto	 CMP Network MTS Network State Route Network (Non-Freeway) Roads that provide access to freeway interchanges Other considerations: Rural roads with an appropriate average daily traffic (ADT) volume threshold County connectors with an appropriate ADT volume threshold
Transit	 AC Transit, LAVTA and Union City Transit major corridors Cross-Town Routes as identified by AC Transit
Bicycle	Countywide Bicycle Plan – Vision Network
Pedestrian	 Countywide Pedestrian Plan – Vision Network Other considerations: PDAs not included in the Vision Network Communities of Concern areas not included in the Vision Network
Truck	 Tier 1 Truck Routes Tier 2 Truck Routes Other considerations: Tier 3 Truck Routes

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2015.

<u>Auto</u>

The higher order facilities such as CMP, MTS and state route networks will continue to support auto travel in Alameda County. These are historical systems that will be included in the Arterials of Countywide Significance network. Beyond the CMP, MTS and state routes, considering the diverse nature of the county and its central geographic location in the region, three other roadway types will be considered for inclusion in the Arterial Network: Alameda CTC January 26, 2015 Page 3 of 4



- Rural roads in the East County will be reviewed for inclusion using an appropriate average daily traffic (ADT) volume threshold.
- County connectors (roads connecting to adjacent counties) will be reviewed for inclusion using an appropriate ADT volume threshold.
- Regardless of volume, roads connecting to freeways interchanges will be included.

<u>Transit</u>

Transit priority facilities will be derived from the on-going Countywide Transit Plan, which includes AC Transit's Major Corridors and Cross-Town Routes and high ridership LAVTA and Union City Transit routes. Also, roadways that provide access to major transit centers as defined in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) will be considered.

<u>Bicycle</u>

Bicycle facilities that are designated as part of the Countywide Bicycle Plan – Bicycle Vision Network (including both on- and off-street facilities) will be designated as part of the Arterials of Countywide Significance. The Countywide Bicycle Plan identified the Bicycle Vision Network based on five categories of regional significance, including inter-jurisdictional network (on- and off-street), access to transit routes, access to central business districts, inter-jurisdictional trails, and routes providing access to "communities of concern." Since the Countywide Bicycle Plan was adopted in the Fall of 2013, these routes will be cross-checked for jurisdictions such as Berkeley, Dublin, Oakland and Newark that have their bicycle master plan updates completed after the Countywide Bicycle Plan was adopted.

<u>Pedestrian</u>

Pedestrian priority facilities that are designated as part of the Countywide Pedestrian Plan – Pedestrian Vision Network (on- and off-street) will also be considered as part of the Arterials of Countywide Significance. The Pedestrian Vision Network includes a combination of streets within transit accessible districts, streets within Central Business Districts (CBDs), streets that provide access to major activity centers or communities of concern, and inter-jurisdictional trails. Other considerations will be made related to pedestrian-priority Routes of Countywide Significance:

• ABAG Priority Development Areas (PDAs) - includes central business districts and activity centers), which were used in developing the Pedestrian Vision Network but do not have complete correspondence with the Pedestrian Vision Network, will be reviewed for inclusion in the Routes of Countywide Significance.

Alameda CTC January 26, 2015 Page 4 of 4



• Pedestrian access within "communities of concern" as defined in the County's Community-Based Transportation Plans will be considered.

Truck

Non-freeway truck routes will be derived from the on-going Countywide Goods Movement Plan. The Goods Movement Plan summarizes the current truck route designations and sorts truck routes into three tiers:

- Tier 1 truck routes refer to the state highways that are designated to handle a majority of the through truck traffic.
- Tier 2 truck routes refer to other state highways and designated arterials that provide intracounty and intercity connectivity and last-mile connection to the Port of Oakland and Oakland International Airport.
- Tier 3 truck routes refer designated arterials and collectors that are used in a majority of local pickup and delivery.

The criteria for selecting truck routes for the Arterial Network will be:

- Tier 1 (non-freeways) and Tier 2 will be designated as Arterials of Countywide Significance.
- Tier 3 routes will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
- The truck route network will be reviewed for connectivity with missing links added pending approval of affected jurisdictions.

Please contact Francisco Martin at 510-57-9422 if you have any questions or comments.

Attachments:

Draft Study Network and Context Map



This page intentionally left blank



This page intentionally left blank



Memorandum

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

DATE:	February 2, 2015
SUBJECT:	2016 Alameda Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) and 2016 Plan Bay Area updates
RECOMMENDATION:	Receive information on the 2016 CTP and Plan Bay Area updates

Summary

Alameda CTC prepares and updates the Alameda Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP), a long-range planning and policy document that guides future transportation investments for all transportation modes and users in Alameda County. It is updated every four years, and the existing CTP was adopted in 2012 and is due for an update in 2016. The 2016 CTP Update process will begin with a Request for Proposal (RFP) release in January 2015 and is expected to be completed with the CTP adoption in the Fall of 2016 (Attachment A). Also, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) began the update to the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, called Plan Bay Area for the Bay Area Region, and is scheduled to be adopted in the Spring of 2017 (Attachment B). Since the CTP is the basis for and informs the Plan Bay Area regarding long term transportation improvements for Alameda County, Alameda CTC will actively participate in the Plan Bay Area update process and coordinate the CTP development with the Plan Bay Area update.

Discussion

Alameda CTC develops and updates the Countywide Transportation Plan, the long range transportation planning and policy document for the County. This document establishes a vision for Alameda County's multimodal transportation system to support the transportation needs of all users, develops a list of projects, programs and strategies to support the vision, inventories available funding and identifies gaps where funding and needs do not match and where additional sources of funding need to be secured. The existing CTP was adopted in 2012, and it was developed in conjunction with the development of the 2012 and 2014 Transportation Expenditure Plans.

State legislation mandates that the CTPs form the basis for the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy and that the CTPs should consider the most recent RTP/SCS. Alameda CTC coordinated the 2012 CTP update with and provided input into the Plan Bay Area (RTP/SCS) development by MTC and ABAG that occurred during the same time. Both MTC and ABAG began the update process to the Plan Bay Area recently. Additionally, MTC has updated the Guidelines for the Countywide Transportation Plans in September 2014 to reflect the new legislative requirements that connects the CTPs with the Plan Bay Area since the last update to the guidelines in 2000. As with the previous processes, the Alameda CTC will coordinate the 2016 CTP update process with the Plan Bay Area update and will ensure that the updated CTP conforms to the recently adopted guidelines for the CTP.

The 2016 CTP Update:

The 2016 CTP update will build on the work that was done for the 2012 CTP update, focusing on addressing the changes in the regulatory and financial environment to develop a strategy to guide the long term multimodal transportation improvements for all users in Alameda County. The update will coordinate with all internal planning efforts and existing resources. In that regard, to the extent possible, it will use the work from all the three ongoing Alameda CTC's modal planning efforts, the Countywide Transit Plan, Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan and Countywide Goods Movement Plan, including the adopted Countywide Bicycle Plan and Countywide Pedestrian Plan, and the Congestion Management Program.

The update will also include components to address climate change responding to the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act (SB 375), land use and transportation integration with emphasis on update to implementing the Priority Development Areas (PDA) and Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs), and Complete Streets policies. Equity analysis and outreach will be important elements of the Plan development. The proposed investment plan for the CTP will include performance based evaluation of projects and programs that will again build off of, to the extent possible, the performance evaluation work from the three modal plans. A strategy to update the existing Community Based Transportation Plans will be included, and an attempt will be made to assess the economic impact or returns from the proposed CTP investment plan investments on the community.

CTP development process and schedule

Similar to the 2012 CTP development, the 2016 CTP update will be a transparent process, with Alameda CTC closely working with the jurisdictions, transit agencies, and key stakeholders including advocacy groups. Public outreach for the Plan will be held at strategic points throughput the Plan development process for easy and effective public participation and to provide input.

The Request for Proposals for the 2016 CTP Update will be released in late January or early February. Attachment A illustrates the CTP update schedule with scheduled adoption of the 2016 CTP in the Fall of 2016.

Plan Bay Area Update

MTC and ABAG began the Plan Bay Area update at the end of 2014 with the release of the Public Participation Plan. The update was formally kicked off at the Regional Advisory

Working Group meeting held on January 6, 2015, where the outline and schedule (Attachment B) for the update were presented. The 2017 Plan Bay Area update will be a focused update using the overall framework of the Plan Bay Area adopted in 2013. It will include emphasis on state of good repair and maintaining performance framework, focus on new initiatives and projects, and greater integration of other regional initiatives, including goods movement.

Fiscal Impact: There is no fiscal impact.

Attachments

- A. 2016 Countywide Transportation Plan Update Schedule Handout at meeting
- B. Plan Bay Area Update Schedule

Staff Contact

Tess Lengyel, Deputy Director of Planning and Policy

Saravana Suthanthira, Senior Transportation Planner

This page intentionally left blank

Attachment A Approach & Tasks: 2017 RTP/SCS

Proposed Approach	
Proposed Approach Overall	 focused update in 2017 no RHNA use overall Plan Bay Area framework local input on PDA and PCA revisions emphasis on state of good repair and maintaining performance framework focus on new initiatives and projects transit core capacity/connectivity goods movement inner bay corridors greater integration of other regional agency initiatives such as sea level rise adaptation planning healthy infill economic development requirements per settlement agreement(s) including PDA assessment Freight Emissions Reduction Action Plan FIB disclosures regarding Express Lapes
	 Healthy Infill Guidelines
Specific Tasks:	
a) Public Outreach	 Develop Public Participation Plan 2 rounds of telephone polls 3 rounds of open houses (kick-off, scenarios, draft plan) CBO-hosted focus groups briefings of elected officials
b) Call For Projects	 update of Plan Bay Area project info new regional projects largely based on new initiatives incorporate new county projects per county plans and new funding sources/sales tax measures
c) Project Performance Evaluation	 preserve strongest performance evaluation elements from Plan Bay Area integrate state of good repair analysis
d) Job, Population & Housing Forecasts	 update job, population & housing forecasts keep planning horizon at 2040
e) Transportation revenue Forecast	 update revenue forecasts with new base year and growth rates keep planning horizon at 2040
f) Scenario Analysis	 one round of scenario analysis scenarios designed to inform the selection of a preferred scenario same scenario alternatives revised and carried over into EIR



Attachment B –

Responsibilities & Roles: 2017 Plan Bay Area

Major Tasks	Advisory				Decision-Making		
	А	В	E	F	G	Н	Ι
	DIM Partnership Board	or Regional Advisory ti Working Group	A Policy Advisory Council	B Regional Planning D Committee	MTC Planning Committee B ABAG Administrative Committee	Executive Board	Commission MTC
1. Policy Element		<u>.</u>		<u>.</u>			
Goals			•		\checkmark		\checkmark
Performance Targets		•	•		\checkmark		\checkmark
2. Regional Forecasts							
Population/Employment/Housing Forecasts					\checkmark	\checkmark	
Transportation Revenue Forecast		•	•		•		
3. Project Performance							
Call For Projects		•	•		•		
Project Performance Assessment			•		\checkmark		\checkmark
Operations & Maintenance Needs Assessment		•	•		•		
4. Scenario Analysis							
Define & Evaluate Scenarios		•	•	•	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark
Adopt Preferred Scenario [Land Use Distribution+ Transportation Investment Strategy]		•	•	•	V		\checkmark
5 Draft and Final Plan							
Draft FIR							$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$
Draft Plan			•	•			
Air Quality Conformity Analysis	l	•	•				
Final FIR	l	•	•	•			
Final Plan		•	•	•	$\overline{\checkmark}$	$\overline{\checkmark}$	\checkmark

• Input/Information

Action/Decision

<u>NOTE</u>: Information provided is tentative and subject to change.

Action items presented jointly to MTC's Planning Committee and ABAG's Administrative Committee may seek a recommendation from one or both committees.

This page intentionally left blank



Memorandum

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607 •

DATE:	February 2, 2015
SUBJECT:	Alameda County Three Year Project Initiation Document Work Plan
RECOMMENDATION:	Approve Three-Year Project Initiation Document (PID) Work Plan for Alameda County.

Summary

Caltrans has requested the Alameda CTC to update the Three-Year PID Work Plan for Alameda County (FY 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18).

Background

A Project Study Report / Project Initiation Document (PSR/PID) is a document that details a scope, cost, and schedule of a proposed project and is required to be completed prior to receiving programming in the STIP. Caltrans may act as the lead agency or provide quality assurance / oversight services for projects wherein local agencies act as the lead agency.

Caltrans has requested the Alameda CTC to update the Three-Year PID Work Plan for Alameda County (FY 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18) (Attachment A). Per Caltrans' Non-SHOPP Workload Guidance, any PSR/PID work that needs Caltrans oversight must be listed in this three-year Work Plan.

Similar to prior years, local agencies that wish to complete a PSR/PID document would need to execute a cooperative agreement and reimburse Caltrans for their oversight services. The only exception is if the proposed project is entirely funded using state resources.

In addition to new projects, the FY 2015-16 list also includes projects carried over from FY 2014-15. Project sponsors would be provided an opportunity to re-prioritize projects when this list is revisited in the upcoming fiscal years.

A final list will be transmitted to Caltrans upon approval by the Commission.

Fiscal Impact: There is no fiscal impact at this time.



Attachments:

A. Draft Alameda County Three-Year PID Work Plan

Staff Contact

<u>Stewart Ng</u>, Deputy Director of Programming and Projects <u>Vivek Bhat</u>, Senior Transportation Engineer



$\widehat{}$
18
2
÷.
2
1
9
–
EQ.
5
12
20
7
Ľ
Ē
<u><u></u></u>
L C
ž
5
H
5
ea
ž
ė
Ĩ.
臣
`≻
5
5
ō
0
AC
Ш
Σ
Z
A
.'
E
₹ Z
Ľ

		pue					pue
γշոցԶ Α ვոi żn əməlqml		City of Oakl	BART	ACTC	ACTC	ACTC	City of Oakl
Project Sponsor		City of Oakland	BART	ACTC	ACTC	ACTC	City of Oakland
Type of PID		PEER	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS
(M\$) tso2 tropport		4.0	360.0	10.0	10.0	20.0	0.6
(M¢) teo2 letiqe2		18.0	1200.0	35.0	80.0	150.0	3.6
Estimated PID Completion Date (MM/YYYY)		06/2014	06/2016	06/2016	06/2016	06/2017	06/2016
Initiation Date (MM/DD/YYYY)		TBD	TBD	7/1/2015	TBD	TBD	TBD
RTP Project Number		240227	240196	240347	240062	22765	240381
roitsoo		In Oakland, below 1880 between the San Francisco Bay Trail and Laney College	From Dublin BART Station to Isabel I/C in Livermore	BART alignment from Fruitvale BART to Hayward BART	in Sunol SR-84 at I-680	Tri Valley	MacArthur Blvd. from High street to Richards Road, undercrossing I-580 freeway.
noiłqinzed fnemevorqni		Lake Merritt Channel Bicycle Pedestrian Bridge	BART to Livermore	15-mile Class I bicycle/pedestrian facility generally in BART alignment that crosses various state route facilities	Improve Interchange for better operations	I580 /680 Interchange Improvements	Laurel, Mills, Maxwell Park and Seminary (LAMMPS) Active Transportation Project - reconf/signal alt. @ freeway off ramp
Peed & Need		Bike Ped	lmprove traffic operations	Improve bicycle and pedestrian safety and mobility	lmprove traffic operations	lmprove traffic operations	Bike Ped
elimtso9 bn3	or Years	31.5	19.9	Var	19.0	21.0	39.8
Begin Postmile	udes Pri	30.9	13.5	Var	18.0	20.0	39.8
Route	AN (incl	880	580	SR-61 SR-77 238 SR-92	84 680	580	580
ΑΟΙ\Α Ο\ bsəJ	/ORK PL	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA
Agreement Number	15/16 M	04- 2516	04- 2465	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Executed Reimbursement Agreement (Y/N)	0 FY 20:	>	z	z	z	z	z
(fright or R (Reimbursement)	DOSEL	Rein	Rein	Rein	Rein	Rein	Rein
# xəpul	PRC	1	2	ñ	4	ъ	9

Note: Projects NOT Listed in order of Priority

				i				
yɔnəgA gnitnəməlqml		Alameda County Public Works Agency	Alameda County Public Works Agency	ACTC	Alameda County Public Works Agency	ACTC	ACTC MTC CCTA	
Project Sponsor		Alameda County Public Works Agency	Alameda County Public Works Agency	ACTC	Alameda County Public Works Agency	ACTC	ACTC MTC CCTA	
Type of PID		PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	
(M\$) foot Cost (\$M)		1.5	1.5	2.0	1.5	3.0	19.7	
(M\$) fzoJ lefiqeD		7.5	6.5	10.0	3.5	12.0	70.2	
stimated PID Completion Date (MM/۲۲۲۷)		06/2017	06/2017	06/2017	06/2017	06/2017	01/2018	
Initiation Date (MM/DD/YYYY)		TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	01/2016	
RTP Project Number		TBD	TBD	230110	TBD	230091	230656 230657 240741	
Location		East 14th St from 162nd Ave to SR- 238 O/C	Mission Blvd SR-238 O/C to Hayward City Limits	Rte 262 (Mission Blvd)	Strobridge/Castro Valley	Various	SFOBB approach on I-80, I-880 & I- 580; SFOBB Direct Connector in Oakland to SR-4;	
Improvement Description		Streetscape improvement (Phase	Streetscape improvement (Phase III)	1-680 I/C Improvement. Rt 262 roadway iprovement, and Rt 262/Warm Sprongs Blvd Intersection Improvement	Castro Valley Local Area Traffic Circulation Imps	Integrated Corridor Mobility (ICM) Program and adaptive ramp metering	Conversion of HOV lanes to Express Lanes	
PeeA & Need		Streetscape	Streetscape	Improve traffic operations	lmprove traffic operations	Improve traffic operations	Improve traffic operations	
elimtsoq bn∃		2.9	3.7	1.1	Var	Var	Var	
əlimtzo9 nigə8		0.0	1.2	0.0	Var	Var	Var	
goute	N	185	185	262	580	238 580 880	80	
AOI\AD\b655	/ORK PLA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	
Agreement Number	6/17 W	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	
Executed Reimbursement Agreement (Y/N)	FY 201	z	z	z	z	z	z	
tnəmərındmiəЯ) אר ארא ארא ארא און א ארא ארא און און א ארא ארא און א ארא ארא און א א א א ארא און א איז א איז א	OSED	Reim	Reim Reim Reim		Reim	Reim		
# xəpul	PROF	7	∞	6	10	11	12	

DRAFT - ALAMEDA COUNTY Three-Year PID Work Plan(FY2015/16, 16/17, 17/18)

yɔnəŋA gnitnəməlqml		City of Emeryville	City of Emeryville	City of Hayward	City of Hayward	ACTC	ACTC	City of Oakland	City of Oakland	City of Livermore	Alameda County Public Works Agency	ACTC	City of Hayward ACTC
Project Sponsor		City of Emeryville	City of Emeryville	City of Hayward	City of Hayward	ACTC	ACTC	City of Oakland	City of Oakland	City of Livermore	Alameda County Public Works Agency	ACTC	City of Hayward ACTC
Type of PID		PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	NBSSR	NBSSR	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS
(M\$) foort Cost (\$M)		1.0	5.6	1.5	7.0	3.0	22.0	2.0	2.0	5.0	2.0	50.0	5.0
(M\$) teo2 letiqeD		3.0	46.3	4.5	45.0	12.0	100.0	10.0	10.0	27.5	20.0	310.0	36.0
Estimated PID Completion Date (MM/YYYY)		06/2018	01/2018	06/2018	06/2018	06/2018	06/2018	06/2018	06/2017	06/2018	06/2018	06/2018	06/2018
Initiation Date (۱۳۸۸/DD/۷۷۷)		TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
RTP Project Number		230108	240318	TBD	21093	94506	TBD	230094	230094	21100	TBD	230683	230053
Location		Emeryville	Emeryville	Hayward	Hayward	SR-238(Mission Blvd Improvements in the vicinity of the East West Connector Project)	San Leandro	Along I-580 Between 106th Ave. and Peralta Oaks Ct Westbound traffic side	Along I-580 between MacArthur Blvd. and Kingsland Place in Oakland	Vasco Rd I/C in Livermore	Strobridge/Castro Valley	I-680 between SR-84 Contra Costa County Line	Hayward
noitqirəsəd tnəməvorqml		Widen I-80 Eastbound Powell Street Off-ramp	Reconstruct Ashby Avenue Interchange on I-80	Industrial Blvd I/C reconstruction	Clawiter I/C modification	Operational Improvements & Safety	Widen connector to NB 880	Construct Noise Barrier	Construct Noise Barrier	I/C modification	Ramp modifications Strobridge/Castro Valley I/C	NB and SB HOV/HOT lane from Alcosta Blvd. to SR-84	Industrial Parkway West I/C
Purpose & Need		Improve traffic operations	Improve multi- modal traffic operations	Improve traffic operations	Improve traffic operations	Improve traffic operations	Improve traffic operations	Noise Mitigation	Noise Mitigation	Improve traffic operations	Improve traffic operations	Improve traffic operations	Improve traffic operations
End Postmile		4.0	4.6	R5.3	R4.9	11.1	16.7	36.34	40.1	10.2	R31.4	R21.8	14.8
Begin Postmile		3.5	4.6	R4.9	R4.1	10.5	16.3	30.9	39.8	9.2	R29.4	R11.0	14.1
Route	AN	80	80	92	92	238	238	580	580	580	580	680	880
ΑΟΙ\ΑΟ\δε91	/ORK PL	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA
Agreement Number	17/18 W	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Executed Reimbursement Agreement (Y/N)) FY 20:	z	z	z	z	z	z	z	z	z	z	z	z
אר סר א (Reimbursement) אר ארצ	POSED	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim
# xəpul	PRO	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24

DRAFT - ALAMEDA COUNTY Three-Year PID Work Plan(FY2015/16, 16/17, 17/18)

γวnອgA gnitnəməlqml		ACTC	ACTC	City of Hayward	Union City/ Hayward	ACTC MTC	ACTC	ACTC	ACTC Caltrans	City of Berkeley ACTC	City of Pleasanton
Project Sponsor		ACTC	ACTC	City of Hayward	Union City/ Hayward	ACTC MTC	ACTC	ACTC	ACTC Caltrans	City of Berkeley ACTC	City of Pleasanton
Type of PID		PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS
(M\$) tsoว troqqu2		5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	45.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	2.2	1.5
(M\$) teoS letiqeS		27.5	15.0	34.0	34.0	170.0	34.0	22.0	20.0	8.0	4.5
Estimated PID Completion Date (MM/YYYY)		06/2018	06/2018	06/2018	06/2018	06/2017	06/2018	06/2018	06/2018	06/2018	05/2018
Initiation Date (MM/DD/YYYY)		TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	07/2016	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
RTP Project Number		230052	230054	230052	TBD	230088 240741	TBD	230047	TBD	21144	TBD
Locațion		From West A St. I/C to Winton I/C in Hayward	From Whipple Road to Industrial Pkwy West, Hayward	Winton Ave. Hayward	Union City	From Hacienda to north of Washington and north of Washington to Hegenberger in San Leandro & Ala Countv	San Leandro	West A Street, Hayward	Fremont, Newark, Union City	Gilman St I/C in Berkeley -Pedestrian Bridge	Sunol Boulevard I/C in Pleasanton
Improvement Description		Add I-880 NB & SB auxiliary lanes Paseo Grande St. I/C to Winton I/C	Add I-880 NB & SB auxiliary lanes Whipple Road to Industrial Pkwy West	Winton I/C reconstruction	I-880 / Whipple Road Interchange	Extend NB HOV /HOT lanes	Washington to Lewelling I/C reconstruction	West A St. I/C reconstruction	I-880 auxiliary lanes, Dixon Landing to Alvarado-Niles	I/C reconfiguration	I/C reconfiguration
Peed & Need		lmprove traffic operations	lmprove traffic operations	Improve traffic operations	lmprove traffic operations	Improve traffic operations	Improve traffic operations	lmprove traffic operations	lmprove traffic operations	lmprove traffic operations	Improve traffic operations
elimtso9 bn3		18.3	14.5	18.2	14.2	25.5	20.8	18.6	13.0	6.8	15.3
Begin Postmile	tinued)	17.6	13.7	16.7	13.0	20.3	20.2	18.0	10.4	6.3	15.3
Soute	AN (con	880	880	880	880	880	880	880	880	80	680
ΑΟΙ\ΑΟ\bεə1	ORK PL	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA
Agreement Number	7/18 W	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Executed Reimbursement Agreement (Y/N)	FY 201	z	z	z	z	z	z	z	z	z	z
(friamszndmisß) אר AHS or R	DPOSED	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim	SHA	Reim
# xəpul	PRC	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34

DRAFT - ALAMEDA COUNTY Three-Year PID Work Plan(FY2015/16, 16/17, 17/18)

Note: Projects NOT Listed in order of Priority



Memorandum

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

PH: (510) 208-7400

DATE:	February 2, 2015
SUBJECT:	Draft Master Programs Funding Agreement for Measure BB Direct Local Distribution Funds
RECOMMENDATION:	Review of Draft Master Programs Funding Agreement

Summary

On November 4, 2014, Measure BB was approved, authorizing the extension of the existing transportation sales tax and augmenting it by a half percent to fund projects and programs included in the 2014 Transportation Expenditure Plan (2014 TEP). With the passage of Measure BB, revenue collection will begin April 1, 2015 and it is anticipated funds will be available for distribution by July 2015.

The 2014 TEP includes two types of distributions: direct allocations to recipients as a percentage of net revenues and on a reimbursement basis after work is performed. The draft Master Programs Funding Agreement (MPFA), included as attachment A, delineates only the requirements of the direct allocations. These direct allocations, or Direct Local Distribution (DLD) funds, account for 53.55% of the total net revenues. Projects and Programs managed on a reimbursement basis will be addressed in a separate agreement for those funds.

It is requested that the Commission review and provide input on the draft MPFA which will serve as the contract document to distribute DLD funds authorized by Measure BB. The final MPFA will be presented to the Commission for adoption in May 2015 to enable contract execution and flow of funds as soon as funds are received from the State Board of Equalization.

Background

On November 4, 2014, Alameda County voters approved Measure BB, authorizing the extension of the existing transportation sales tax and augmenting it by a half percent to fund projects and programs included in the 2014 Transportation Expenditure Plan (2014 TEP). With the passage of Measure BB, revenue collection will begin April 1, 2015 and it is anticipated the first distribution from the BOE will begin in the first quarter of the 2015-16 fiscal year. The 2014 TEP, which guides the expenditures of Measure BB, requires that each fund recipient enter into a Master Funding Agreement with the Alameda CTC to define the roles and responsibilities in spending Measure BB sales tax revenues.

The 2014 TEP includes two types of distributions: direct allocations to recipients as a percentage of net revenues, and payments made on a reimbursement basis after work is performed. The draft Master Programs Funding Agreement (MPFA), included as attachment A, delineates only the requirements of the direct allocations. Projects and Programs managed on a reimbursement basis will be addressed in a separate master agreement for those funds.

The direct allocations, or Direct Local Distribution (DLD) funds, account for 53.55% of the total net revenues and will fund the four investment categories summarized in Table A.

TABLE A: MEASURE BB DLD INVESTMENT SUMMARY					
Investment Category	Program				
Transit: Operations, Maintenance and Safety Program (OMSP)	AC Transit OMSP (18.8%)				
	Altamont Commuter Express (ACE) OMSP (1.0%)				
	San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Maintenance OMSP (0.5%)				
	San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA) OMSP(0.5%)				
	Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority (LAVTA) OMSP(0.5%)				
	Union City Transit OMSP (0.25%)				
Affordable Transit for Seniors	City-based and Locally Mandated (3.0%)				
and People with Disabilities	East Bay Paratransit Consortium- AC Transit (4.5%)				
(Paratransit)	East Bay Paratransit Consortium – BART (1.5%)				
Direct Allocation to Cities and	Local streets maintenance and safety program				
County (Local Streets and	(20.0%)				
Roads)					
Bicycle and Pedestrian	Bicycle and pedestrian direct allocation to cities				
Infrastructure & Safety	and Alameda County (3.0%)				
Note: Percentages shown represe	ent percentage of the total net revenues.				

The draft MPFA was developed with the following considerations:

1. The 2014 TEP identifies criteria that will require the development of specific policies and procedures to implement. Examples of these criteria include local contracting, performance based measurements, distribution formulas, and geographical equity formulas. To allow for time to develop the necessary policies and procedures, the MPFA will authorize distributions of DLD funding collected from April 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016, unless amended or a new MPFA is executed.

- 2. The implementation guidelines governing the use of Measure B Direct Local Distribution funds were initially approved by the Commission in December 2011. The current Alameda CTC Implementation Guidelines, which have been subjected to periodic reviews, are generally adequate to address the four investment categories of Measure BB DLD funds until refinements required by Measure BB are incorporated. The specific implementation guidelines relevant to Measure BB and exceptions noted are as follows:
 - a. Bicycle and Pedestrian Implementation Guidelines
 - b. Local Streets and Roads Implementation Guidelines- A minimum of 15% of all funds received for this investment category will be spent on project elements directly benefitting bicyclists and pedestrians.
 - c. Mass Transit Implementation Guidelines
 - d. Special Transportation for Seniors and Disabled Implementation Guidelines
- 3. Policies the following policies are currently in place for Measure B DLD and are applicable to Measure BB DLD funds:
 - a. Timely Use of Funds/Reserve Fund Policy: Funds may be reserved for specified periods of time, as defined in each reserve program and will be monitored through the annual compliance audit and reporting process.
 - b. Rescission of Funds Policy: If the requirements of the Timely Use of Funds/Reserve Fund Policy are not met, Alameda CTC may determine that these funds are not needed by the jurisdiction and request the funds be returned, including interest. Unless a request for extension of use is submitted and approved, unallocated funds would be returned to the Alameda CTC and placed into an account out of which funding allocations could be made based upon countywide needs.
 - c. Transportation Purposes Only Policy: Funds are required to be used solely for transportation purposes as defined by the authorizing ballot measures. Any jurisdiction that violates this provision must fully reimburse all misspent net revenues, including interest.
 - Non-Substitution of Fund Policy: Recipient shall not use Measure BB funds to replace funds previously provided by general funds for transportation purposes. Measure BB funds must be used to supplement existing revenues used for transportation purposes.
 - e. Fund Exchange Policy: Any fund exchanges made using the Measure BB funds must be made for transportation purposes. Exchange proposals will be considered on a case by case basis.
 - f. Staff Cost Limitations Policy: Direct costs associated with the delivery of programs and projects associated with Measure BB programs, including direct staff and consultant costs, are eligible uses of Measure BB. Indirect costs, including general administrative staff costs, are not allowed to be funded with

Measure BB, unless a jurisdiction has an independently audited/approved Indirect Cost Allocation Plan.

It is requested that the Commission review and provide input on the draft MPFA which will serve as the contract document to distribute DLD funds authorized by Measure BB. The final MPFA will be presented for adoption in May 2015 to enable contract execution and flow of funds as soon as funds are received from the California Board of Equalization.

Fiscal Impact: There is no fiscal impact at this time.

Attachments

A. Draft Master Programs Funding Agreement

Staff Contacts

Stewart Ng, Deputy Director of Programming and Projects

Trinity Nguyen, Sr. Transportation Engineer



MASTER PROGRAMS FUNDING AGREEMENT between the ALAMEDA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION and the [insert RECIPIENT]

This Master Programs Funding Agreement ("AGREEMENT"), effective the 1st of April 2015, is entered into by and between the Alameda County Transportation Commission ("ALAMEDA CTC") and the **[insert RECIPIENT]** ("RECIPIENT").

RECITALS

A. On November 4, 2014, the voters of Alameda County, pursuant to the provisions of the Local Transportation Authority and Improvement Act, California Public Utilities Code Section 180000 et seq., approved Measure BB, thereby authorizing ALAMEDA CTC to administer the proceeds from the extension of an existing one-half of one percent transaction and use tax scheduled to terminate on March 31, 2022, and the augmentation of the tax by one-half of one percent.

B. The duration of the tax will be 30 years from the initial year of collection, which begins April 1, 2015, with said tax to terminate/expire on March 31, 2045. The tax proceeds will be used to pay for the investments outlined in the 2014 Alameda County Transportation Expenditure Plan ("2014 TEP"), as it may be amended.

C. This AGREEMENT delineates the requirements of the Direct Local Distribution (DLD) funds; funds which are directly allocated to local jurisdictions and transit operators, as authorized by Measure BB and detailed in the 2014 TEP. Discretionary funds identified in the 2014 TEP are not the subject of this AGREEMENT and RECIPIENT will be required to enter into a separate agreement for those funds.

D. The DLD funds will be available for distribution once an agreement is executed with the State Board of Equalization (BOE) and the first revenue payment is received from the BOE.

E. This AGREEMENT was originally approved by the governing body of the ALAMEDA CTC on May 28, 2015.

NOW, THEREFORE, it is mutually agreed by and between the parties as follows:

ARTICLE I: FUNDING ALLOCATIONS

This AGREEMENT authorizes the ALAMEDA CTC to allocate the DLD funds derived from Measure BB as described in the 2014 TEP and summarized in Table A: Measure BB DLD Investment Summary. DLD funds shall be allocated from net revenues after BOE and administration expenses.

TABLE A: MEASURE BB DLD INVESTMENT SUMMARY					
Investment Category	Program				
Transit: Operations, Maintenance and	AC Transit OMSP				
Safety Program (OMSP)	Altamont Commuter Express (ACE) OMSP				
	San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART)				
	Maintenance				
	San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation				
	Authority (WETA) OMSP				
	Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority (LAVTA) OMSP				
	Union City Transit OMSP				
Affordable Transit for Seniors and People	City-based and Locally Mandated				
with Disabilities (Paratransit)	East Bay Paratransit Consortium– AC Transit				
	East Bay Paratransit Consortium - BART				
Direct Allocation to Cities and County	Local streets maintenance and safety program				
(Local Streets and Roads)					
Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure &	Bicycle and pedestrian direct allocation to cities and Alameda				
Safety	County				

A. **Transit (OMSP) -** ALAMEDA CTC will distribute funds based on set percentages detailed in the 2014 TEP. RECIPIENT's percentage fund distribution, if applicable, is detailed in EXHIBIT A - MEASURE BB DIRECT LOCAL DISTRIBUTION SUMMARY, attached hereto and by this reference made a part of this AGREEMENT.

1. RECIPIENT shall use such funds for maintenance and operations of transit services and may include maintenance of transit services, restoration of service cuts, expansion of transit services, and passenger safety and security.

2. The Transit OMSP funds shall be subject to the requirements for "Measure B Mass Transit Pass-through Funds," as detailed in the ALAMEDA CTC Mass Transit Program Implementation Guidelines, and said guidelines are hereby incorporated into this AGREEMENT by reference.

B. Affordable Transit for Seniors and People with Disabilities (Paratransit)

1. City and Local Transit Operator
a. ALAMEDA CTC will distribute funds based on the percentage of the population over age 70 in each of four planning areas for city-based and mandated paratransit services of local bus transit providers. Funds may be further distributed to individual cities within each planning area based on a formula refined by ALAMEDA CTC's Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee ("PAPCO"). RECIPIENT's initial percentage fund distribution, if applicable, is detailed in Exhibit A subject to change based on changes in annual population.

b. Each planning area is defined in Exhibit B attached hereto and by this reference made a part of this AGREEMENT.

c. RECIPIENT shall use such funds for implementation of locally developed solutions to address the mobility challenges of older adults and people with disabilities.

2. East Bay Paratransit Consortium

a. ALAMEDA CTC will distribute funds based on set percentages detailed in the 2014 TEP. RECIPIENT's percentage fund distribution, if applicable, is detailed in Exhibit A.

b. RECIPIENT shall use such funds towards meeting RECIPIENT's responsibilities under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

3. The ALAMEDA CTC Paratransit Program Implementation Guidelines provide program eligibility and fund usage guidelines, definitions, additional requirements, and guideline adoption details. Said guidelines are hereby incorporated into this AGREEMENT by reference.

C. Local Streets and Roads

1. ALAMEDA CTC will distribute funds pursuant to a formula weighted 50 percent by the population of the jurisdiction within the subarea and 50 percent by the number of road miles within the subarea. RECIPIENT's initial percentage fund distribution, if applicable, is detailed in Exhibit A subject to change based on changes in annual population and road mile projections.

2. RECIPIENT shall spend a minimum of 15% of all funds received on project elements directly benefitting bicyclists and pedestrians.

3. RECIPIENT shall use such funds for any local transportation need based on local priorities, including street maintenance, bicycle and pedestrian projects, bus stops, and traffic calming.

4. Local Streets and Roads funds are subject to the requirements for "Measure B Local Streets and Roads Pass-through Funds" as detailed in the ALAMEDA CTC Local Streets and Roads Program Implementation Guidelines, and said guidelines are hereby incorporated into this AGREEMENT by reference.

D. Bicycle and Pedestrian Paths and Safety

1. ALAMEDA CTC will distribute funds pursuant to a formula weighted 100 percent by the jurisdiction's share of the population. RECIPIENT's initial percentage fund distribution, if applicable, is detailed in Exhibit A subject to change based on changes in annual population.

2. RECIPIENT shall use such funds for planning, construction and maintenance of bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs, with focus on high-priority projects described in RECIPIENT's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plans.

3. Bicycle and Pedestrian Paths and Safety funds are subject to the requirements for "Measure B Bicycle and Pedestrian Pass-through Funds" as detailed in the ALAMEDA CTC Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Program Implementation Guidelines, and said guidelines are hereby incorporated into this

AGREEMENT by reference.

ARTICLE II: PAYMENTS AND EXPENDITURES

A. ALAMEDA CTC's Duties and Obligations

1. Within five working days of actual receipt of the monthly Measure BB sales tax revenues from the BOE, ALAMEDA CTC shall remit to the RECIPIENT its designated amount of DLD funds disbursed on a monthly basis by a set formula for distribution.

2. ALAMEDA CTC shall annually update the Measure BB sales tax revenue projections and the resulting funds allocation formulas to reflect the most current population using the California Department of Finance's annual population estimates (Report E-1 published in May) and maintained road mileage from the Department of Transportation as it is made available. ALAMEDA CTC shall use the updated Measure BB program allocation formulas in the allocations beginning July 1 of each new fiscal year, which is from July 1 to June 30 in the State of California. ALAMEDA CTC shall provide an annual projection of Measure BB DLD estimated to be distributed to each RECIPIENT for each investment category RECIPIENT is eligible to receive before the beginning of each new fiscal year.

3. ALAMEDA CTC shall report monthly the amount of Measure BB revenues distributed to RECIPIENT by each investment category for the fiscal year and for the total program to date.

4. ALAMEDA CTC shall provide for an independent annual audit of its financial statements including revenues and expenditures and also the calculation of the allocation formula for distributing Measure BB DLD funds to various recipients and render an annual report to the ALAMEDA CTC Commission within 180 days following the close of the fiscal year. ALAMEDA CTC shall render an annual report on Measure BB funds to the Citizens Watchdog Committee (Independent Watchdog Committee) as soon thereafter as practical.

5. ALAMEDA CTC shall provide timely notice to RECIPIENT prior to conducting an audit of any expenditure made by RECIPIENT to determine whether such expenditures are in compliance with this AGREEMENT and the 2014 TEP.

B. **RECIPIENT's Duties and Obligations**

1. RECIPIENT shall expend all Measure BB funds distributed to the RECIPIENT in compliance with the 2014 TEP guidelines, including the ALAMEDA CTC Implementation Guidelines, as they may be adopted or amended by ALAMEDA CTC from time to time.

2. RECIPIENT shall set up and maintain an appropriate system of accounts to report on Measure BB funds received. RECIPIENT must account for Measure BB funds, including any interest accrued, separately from any other funds it receives from ALAMEDA CTC. The accounting system shall provide adequate internal controls and audit trails to facilitate an annual compliance audit for the Measure BB funds and the respective usage and application of said funds. ALAMEDA CTC and its representatives, agents and nominees shall have the absolute right at any reasonable time to inspect and copy any accounting records related to such funds, except to the extent specifically prohibited by applicable law.

3. RECIPIENT hereby agrees to and accepts the formulas used in the allocation of Measure BB revenues as reflected in the ballot measure and the 2014 TEP, and agrees to accept and utilize the California Department of Finance Estimates of Population figures (Report E-1, updated each May) and

the maintained road mileage from the Department of Transportation as it is made available for the annual update of the allocation formulas to begin in each new fiscal year.

ARTICLE III: POLICIES ON USE OF FUNDS

A. Timely Use of Funds Policy

1. Except for those funds properly placed into a reserve fund pursuant to **Section B** below, all Measure BB funds received by RECIPIENT shall be spent expeditiously, and no unexpended funds are allowed, unless a written request is submitted to the ALAMEDA CTC and approved by the Commission through the annual compliance audit and reporting process.

B. **Reserve Fund Policy:** RECIPIENT may reserve funds for specified periods of time, as defined in each reserve program, which ALAMEDA CTC will monitor through the annual compliance audit and reporting process described in **Article 4**. RECIPIENT may establish the following separate types of reserve funds:

1. **Capital Fund Reserve:** RECIPIENT may establish a specific capital fund reserve to fund specific large capital project(s) that could not otherwise be funded with a single year's worth of Measure BB DLD funds. If a capital fund reserve is established by RECIPIENT, it must be done as part of the Annual Program Compliance Reporting process as defined in Article IV.B.

a. RECIPIENT may collect capital funds during not more than three fiscal years, and shall expend all reserve funds prior to the end of the third fiscal year immediately following the fiscal year during which the reserve was established (e.g., if a reserve is established at any time during fiscal year 2015-2016 (FY 15-16), RECIPIENT may collect reserve funds during some or all of FY 15-16, FY 16-17 and FY 17-18, and must spend the reserve funds prior to the end of FY 18-19).

b. RECIPIENT shall report implementation schedules and funding plans for each proposed project to be funded from the reserve in RECIPIENT's annual program compliance report.

c. RECIPIENT may seek a single one-year extension for a given reserve fund if RECIPIENT demonstrates that unforeseen and extraordinary circumstances have occurred that would justify the extension. RECIPIENT shall submit a request for such an extension in writing to ALAMEDA CTC's executive director. The ALAMEDA CTC Commission, in its sole discretion, will make a determination as to whether to approve or deny the extension request and will notify RECIPIENT of its action in writing.

2. **Operations Fund Reserve:** RECIPIENT may establish and maintain a specific reserve to address operational issues, including fluctuations in revenues, and to help maintain transportation operations. This fund may not contain more than 50 percent of annual DLD revenues, unless an exception is requested in writing and approved by the ALAMEDA CTC Commission. This fund may be a revolving fund and is not subject to an expenditure timeframe. If an operations fund reserve is established by RECIPIENT, it must be done as part of the Annual Program Compliance Reporting process as defined in Article IV.B.

3. **Undesignated Fund Reserve:** RECIPIENT may establish and maintain a specific reserve for transportation needs over a fiscal year, such as matching funds for grants, project development work, studies for transportation purposes, or contingency funds for a project or program. This fund may not contain more than 10 percent of annual DLD revenues, unless an exception is requested in writing and

approved by the ALAMEDA CTC Commission. If an undesignated fund reserve is established by RECIPIENT, it must be done as part of the Annual Program Compliance Reporting process as defined in Article IV.A.3.
 a. RECIPIENT shall report the range of potential uses for the reserve funds in its annual compliance report.

C. **Rescission of Funds Policy:** If RECIPIENT does not meet the timeliness requirements set forth in Section A and B, ALAMEDA CTC may determine the RECIPIENT does not need the unspent funds. In such case, unless the RECIPIENT requests and ALAMEDA CTC approves an extension to the applicable deadline for the Capital Fund Reserve as described in Article III.B.1, RECIPIENT must return unspent funds and all interest earned thereon to ALAMEDA CTC. All such funds returned to ALAMEDA CTC shall be placed into an account for reallocation to the same programmatic type for transportation improvements in the county.

D. Other Expenditure Restrictions:

1. **Transportation Purposes Only:** RECIPIENT shall use all Measure BB funds solely for transportation purposes as defined by the authorizing ballot measure. Any jurisdiction that violates this provision must fully reimburse all misspent funds, including all interest that would have been earned thereon.

2. **Non-Substitution of Funds:** RECIPIENT shall use Measure BB funds, pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section180000 *et seq.*, to supplement and not replace existing property taxes used for transportation purposes.

3. **Fund Exchange:** Any fund exchanges made using Measure BB must be made for transportation purposes. ALAMEDA CTC will consider exchange proposals on a case-by-case basis.

4. **Staff Cost Limitations:** Direct costs associated with the delivery of programs and projects associated with Measure BB programs, including direct staff costs and consultant costs, are eligible uses of Measure BB funds. ALAMEDA CTC does not allow indirect costs, unless the RECIPIENT submits an independently audited/approved Indirect Cost Allocation Plan.

ARTICLE IV: REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

RECIPIENT shall comply with each of the reporting requirements set forth below. If RECIPIENT fails to comply with one or more of these requirements, ALAMEDA CTC may withhold payment of further Measure BB funds to RECIPIENT until full compliance is achieved.

A. RECIPIENT shall submit to ALAMEDA CTC, on an annual basis and at the RECIPIENT's expense, an independently audited Measure BB financial statements and a compliance opinion of the funds received and used, including plans and reports of expenditures. RECIPIENT shall complete, certify, and provide the annual audited financial statements and compliance opinion to ALAMEDA CTC within 180 days following the close of each fiscal year.

B. RECIPIENT shall, by December 31 of each year, submit to ALAMEDA CTC, at the RECIPIENT's expense, a compliance report on programs and projects on which RECIPIENT expended Measure BB funds. In such report, RECIPIENT shall state how the funds were used and the benefits derived from the funded programs and projects, and establish fund reserves and amounts remaining in reserves and anticipated program and project expenditures. If RECIPIENT's expenditures in a fiscal year are less than the amount received during such year, RECIPIENT shall explain why revenues exceeded expenditures and

RECIPIENT's provide an implementation plan for the unexpended fund balances.

C. To be eligible for receipt of Local Streets and Roads funds, RECIPIENT shall provide ALAMEDA CTC with the certified number of maintained road miles within RECIPIENT's jurisdiction, which shall be consistent with the miles reported to state and federal agencies. RECIPIENT shall provide ALAMEDA CTC with the annual certified number of maintained road miles each fiscal year even if the number of miles for the fiscal year did not change. Road miles reported through the Department of Transportation shall be used in the updated Measure BB sales tax revenue allocation formula for distributing Measure BB funds and the new mileage shall be reflected in the distributions that start on July 1 of each new fiscal year.

D. RECIPIENT shall install or mount signage, such as those identified on the ALAMEDA CTC website (http://www.alamedactc.org/app_pages/view/5269), adjacent to Measure BB funded construction projects and on vehicles funded with Measure BB funds (e.g., RECIPIENT and ALAMEDA CTC logos; "Your Transportation Tax Dollars Help Fund the Operation of This Vehicle!") where practical, so Alameda County taxpayers are informed as to how RECIPIENT is using Measure BB funds. RECIPIENT shall include a description of signage and number of signs posted in the annual compliance report submitted to ALAMEDA CTC.

E. RECIPIENT shall provide current and accurate information on RECIPIENT's website, to inform the public on how RECIPIENT is using Measure BB funds, and shall also provide a link to ALAMEDA CTC's website.

F. RECIPIENT shall, at least annually, publish an article highlighting a project or program in which RECIPIENT has used Measure BB funds.

G. RECIPIENT shall actively participate in a Public Awareness Program, in partnership with ALAMEDA CTC and/or its community advisory committees, as a means of ensuring that the public has access to and has the ability to know which projects and programs are funded through Measure BB.

H. RECIPIENT shall make its administrative officer or designated staff available on request from ALAMEDA CTC to render a report or answer any and all inquiries in regards to RECIPIENT's receipt, usage, and compliance audit findings of its funds before ALAMEDA CTC's governing board and/or the Citizens Watchdog Committee (Independent Watchdog Committee) or community advisory committees, as applicable.

I. RECIPIENT agrees that ALAMEDA CTC may review and/or evaluate the project(s) or program(s) funded pursuant to this AGREEMENT. This may include visits by representatives, agents or nominees of ALAMEDA CTC to observe RECIPIENT's project or program operations, to review project or program data and financial records, and to discuss the project with RECIPIENT's staff or governing board.

ARTICLE V: OTHER PROVISIONS

A. **Indemnity by RECIPIENT.** Neither ALAMEDA CTC, nor its governing body, elected officials, any officer, consultant, agent, or employee thereof, shall be responsible for any damage or liability occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by RECIPIENT in connection with Measure BB funds distributed to RECIPIENT pursuant to this AGREEMENT. It is also understood and agreed, pursuant to Government Code Section 895.4, RECIPIENT shall fully defend, indemnify and hold harmless ALAMEDA CTC, its governing body, and all its officers, agents, and employees, from any liability imposed on ALAMEDA CTC for injury (as defined in Government Code Section 810.8) occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by RECIPIENT in connection with Measure BB funds distributed to RECIPIENT pursuant to this AGREEMENT.

B. **Indemnity by ALAMEDA CTC**. Neither RECIPIENT, nor its governing body, elected officials, any officer, consultant, agent, or employee thereof shall be responsible for any damage or liability occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by ALAMEDA CTC under or in connection with any work, authority or jurisdiction delegated to ALAMEDA CTC under this AGREEMENT. It is also understood and agreed, pursuant to Government Code Section 895.4, ALAMEDA CTC shall fully defend, indemnify, and hold harmless RECIPIENT, and its governing body, elected officials, all its officers, agents, and employees from any liability imposed on RECIPIENT for injury (as defined in Government Code Section 810.8) occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by ALAMEDA CTC under or in connection with any work, authority or jurisdiction delegated to ALAMEDA CTC under this AGREEMENT.

C. **Jurisdiction and Venue:** The laws of the State of California will govern the validity of this AGREEMENT, its interpretation and performance, and any other claims related to it. All legal actions arising out of this AGREEMENT shall be brought in a court of competent jurisdiction in Alameda County, California and the parties hereto hereby waive inconvenience of forum as an objection or defense to such venue.

D. **Attorneys' Fees:** Should it become necessary to enforce the terms of this AGREEMENT, the prevailing party shall be entitled to recover reasonable expenses and attorneys' fees from the other party.

E. **Term:** The term of this AGREEMENT shall be from April 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016, unless amended or a new Master Programs Funding Agreement is executed with RECIPIENT, whichever date is earlier.

F. **Severability**: If any provision of this AGREEMENT is found by a court of competent jurisdiction or, if applicable, an arbitrator, to be unenforceable, such provision shall not affect the other provisions of the AGREEMENT, but such unenforceable provisions shall be deemed modified to the extent necessary to render it enforceable, preserving to the fullest extent permissible the intent of the parties set forth in this AGREEMENT.

G. **Modification:** This AGREEMENT, and its Exhibits, as well as the referenced ALAMEDA CTC Implementation Guidelines, constitutes the entire AGREEMENT. This AGREEMENT may only be changed by a written amendment executed by both parties. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Implementation Guidelines may be changed from time to time by ALAMEDA CTC.

[Signatures on next page]

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this AGREEMENT by their duly authorized officers as of the date first written below.

	(RECIPIENT)	ALAMEDA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (ALAMEDA CTC)
By:		By:
Name	Date	Arthur L. Dao Date
Title		Executive Director
		Recommended
By:		By:
Name Title	Date	Stewart D. Ng Date Deputy Director of Programming and Projects
		Reviewed as to Budget/Financial Controls:
		By:
		Patricia Reavey Date Director of Finance and Administration
		Approved as to Legal Form:
		By:
		Wendel, Rosen, Black & Dean LLP Date Legal Counsel to ALAMEDA CTC

EXHIBIT A

MEASURE BB DIRECT LOCAL DISTRIBUTION SUMMARY

Recipient	Investment Category - Program	Recipient's Percentage of Measure BB Total ¹
AC Transit	Paratransit - East Bay Paratransit Consortium	4.50 %
AC Transit	Transit: Operations, Maintenance and Safety Program	18.80 %
ACE	Transit: Operations, Maintenance and Safety Program	1.00 %
Alameda	Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure & Safety	*
Alameda	Paratransit	*
Alameda	Local Streets and Roads	*
Albany	Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure & Safety	*
Albany	Paratransit	*
Albany	Local Streets and Roads	*
BART	Paratransit - East Bay Paratransit Consortium	1.50 %
BART	Transit: Operations, Maintenance and Safety Program	0.50 %
Berkeley	Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure & Safety	*
Berkeley	Paratransit	*
Berkeley	Local Streets and Roads	*
County of Alameda	Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure & Safety	*
County of Alameda	Local Streets and Roads	*
Dublin	Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure & Safety	*
Dublin	Local Streets and Roads	*
Emervville	Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure & Safety	*
Emeryville	Paratransit	*
Emeryville	Local Streets and Roads	*
Fremont	Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure & Safety	*
Fremont	Paratransit	*
Fremont	Local Streets and Roads	*
Hayward	Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure & Safety	*
Hayward	Paratransit	*
Hayward	Local Streets and Roads	*
LAVTA	Paratransit	*
LAVTA	Transit: Operations, Maintenance and Safety Program	0.50 %
Livermore	Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure & Safety	*
Livermore	Local Streets and Roads	*
Newark	Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure & Safety	*
Newark	Paratransit	*
Newark	Local Streets and Roads	*
Oakland	Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure & Safety	*
Oakland	Paratransit	*
Oakland	Local Streets and Roads	*
Piedmont	Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure & Safety	*
Piedmont	Local Streets and Roads	*
Pleasanton	Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure & Safety	*
Pleasanton	Paratransit	*
Pleasanton	Local Streets and Roads	*
San Leandro	Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure & Safety	*
San Leandro	Paratransit	*
San Leandro	Local Streets and Roads	*
Union City	Transit: Operations, Maintenance and Safety Program	0.25 %
Union City	Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure & Safety	*
Union City	Paratransit	*
Union City	Local Streets and Roads	*
WEIA	Transit: Operations, Maintenance and Safety Program	0.50 %

Note:

1. Pursuant to Article II.A.2, RECIPIENT's percentage may change based upon current annual population and/or road mile projections.

EXHIBIT B

PLANNING AREAS FOR CITY AND LOCAL TRANSIT OPERATOR FUNDING (PARATRANSIT)

Planning Area	Description						
North County	Cities of Alameda, Albany, Berkeley, Emeryville, Oakland, and Piedmont						
Central County ¹	Cities of Hayward and San Leandro, and the unincorporated area of Castro Valley, as						
	well as other unincorporated lands governed by Alameda County in the Central Area.						
South County	Cities of Fremont, Newark, Union City, as well as Union City Transit.						
East County ²	Cities of Livermore, Dublin, and Pleasanton, and all unincorporated lands governed by						
	Alameda County in the East Area, and LAVTA.						
1. Funding for Li	vermore and Dublin will be assigned to LAVTA for their ADA-mandated paratransit						
program.							
2. Funding will be assigned to Hayward to serve the unincorporated areas.							
-							

This page intentionally left blank



Memorandum

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607 •

DATE:February 2, 2015SUBJECT:California Transportation Commission January 2015 Meeting SummaryRECOMMENDATION:Receive an update on the January 2015 CTC Meeting.

Summary

The January 2015 California Transportation Commission (CTC) meeting was held in Sacramento, CA. Detailed below is a summary of the four agenda items of significance pertaining to Projects/Programs within Alameda County that were considered at the January 2015 CTC meeting.

Background

The CTC is responsible for programming and allocating funds for the construction of highway, passenger rail, and transit improvements throughout California. The CTC consists of eleven voting members and two non-voting ex-officio members. The San Francisco Bay Area has three CTC members residing in its geographic area: Bob Alvarado, Jim Ghielmetti, and Carl Guardino.

Detailed below is a summary of the four agenda items of significance pertaining to Projects / Programs within Alameda County that were considered at the January 2015 CTC meeting (Attachment A).

1. 2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Fund Estimate Overview

CTC staff presented an overview of the 2016 STIP Fund Estimate. Over the next several months, the Department of Transportation (Caltrans) will work closely with CTC staff to identify key issues and assumptions, and prepare the 2016 STIP Fund Estimate for adoption in August 2015. The key milestones for the development of the 2016 STIP Fund Estimate are:

- January 2015 Overview
- March 2015 Present Draft Assumptions and Key Issues
- May 2015 Approve Assumptions (pending changes to the May Revision of the 2015-16 Governor's Budget)
- June 2015 Present Draft STIP Fund Estimate
- August 2015 Adopt STIP Fund Estimate

2. Draft 2015 Active Transportation Program (ATP) Fund Estimate

Caltrans requested the CTC to review and comment on the Draft 2015 Active Transportation Program (ATP) Fund Estimate. The Department will work with Commission staff to implement any changes prior to the scheduled adoption of the ATP Fund Estimate on March 25, 2015.

The ATP, as articulated in SB 99 and AB 101, was signed into law on September 26, 2013. It replaced the existing system of small-dedicated grant programs, which funded Safe Routes to Schools, bicycle programs, and Recreational Trails. The ATP Cycle 2 divides approximately \$120 million for active transportation projects between the state and regions, subject to 2015 guidelines. The intent of combining this funding is to improve flexibility and reduce the administrative burden of having several small independent grant programs.

Outcome: Approximately \$10 million ATP funds are estimated to be available for MTC Region; Alameda County share will be determined through MTC's Regional process.

3. Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Assessment for I-680 NB HOV / Express Lane Project

CTC approved staff recommendation and made no comments relative to the alternatives or environmental impacts addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report Environmental Assessment (DEIR/EA) for the I-680 NB HOV/ Express Lane project.

Outcome: Final project and environmental approval is expected in fall 2015.

4. Active Transportation Program / East Bay Greenway Project

CTC approved allocation of \$2.6 million ATP funds for the preliminary engineering phase of the East Bay Greenway project.

Outcome: Allocation will fund the Preliminary Engineering phase activities for 15-mile East Bay Greenway.

Fiscal Impact: There is no significant fiscal impact to the Alameda CTC budget due to this item. This is information only.

Attachments

A. January 2015 CTC Meeting summary for Alameda County Project / Programs

Staff Contact

Stewart Ng, Deputy Director of Programming and Projects

Vivek Bhat, Senior Transportation Engineer

R:\AlaCTC_Meetings\Community_TACs\ACTAC\20150205\5.3_CTC_Meeting\5.3_CTC_Meeting_Summary.docx

CTC Action / Discussion	ions. Information	Information	nents Approved NB	ie iway Approved
Item Description	Overview of the 2016 STIP Fund Estimate Assumpt	Review and comment on the Draft 2015 Active Transportation Program (ATP) Fund Estimate.	Approve staff recommendation and provide no comrelative to the alternatives or environmental impacts addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report Environmental Assessment (DEIR/EA) for the I-680 HOV/ Express Lane project.	Approve allocation of \$2.6 Million ATP funds for th preliminary engineering phase of the East Bay Greer project
Program / Project	2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)	2015 Active Transportation Program (ATP)	Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Assessment for I-680 NB HOV / Express Lane Project	2014 Active Transportation Program / East Bay Greenway Project
Sponsor	Caltrans	Caltrans	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC

http://www.catc.ca.gov/meetings/agenda/2015Agenda/2015_01/00_ETA.pdf

January 2015 CTC Summary for Alameda County Projects/ Programs

This page intentionally left blank



Memorandum

1111	Broadway,	Suite	800,	Oakland,	CA	94607	

PH:	(510)	208-740

DATE:	February 2, 2015
SUBJECT:	Alameda County Federal Inactive Projects List: January 2015 Update
RECOMMENDATION:	Receive an update on the January 2015 Alameda County Federal Inactive Projects

Summary

Federal regulations require that agencies receiving federal funds invoice against their obligations at least once every six months. Projects that do not have invoicing activity over a six month period are placed on the Inactive Obligation list, and those projects are at risk of deobligation of the project's federal funds unless Caltrans and the Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) receive either an invoice or a valid justification for inactivity. Caltrans is tracking inactive obligations, and updating a list of inactive projects every week. If Caltrans and FHWA do not receive adequate invoicing or justification for the project's inactivity, the project may be deobligated.

Background

In response to FHWA's new guidance for processing Inactive Obligations, Caltrans developed new guidelines for managing federal inactive obligations. The new guidelines treat all federal-aid as well as the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) inactive projects equally. In order to manage changes more proactively Caltrans changed the management of "inactive projects" as follows:

- If the Department does not receive an invoice for more than six months, the • project will be deemed "inactive" and posted on the Department's website. Local Agencies will be notified the first time projects are posted.
- If the Department does not receive an invoice within the following six months (12) months without invoicing), the Department will deobligate the unexpended balances.
- It is the responsibility of the local agencies to work in collaboration with their respective District Local Assistance Engineer's to ensure their projects are removed from the list to avoid deobligation.
- The Inactive project listing is posted at the following website and will be updated weekly: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hg/LocalPrograms/Inactiveprojects.htm

Fiscal Impact: There is no significant fiscal impact to the Alameda CTC budget due to this item. This is information only.

Attachments

- A. Alameda County List of Federal Inactive Projects Report dated 01/06/15
- B. Justification Form

Staff Contact

Stewart Ng, Deputy Director of Programming and Projects

Vivek Bhat, Senior Transportation Engineer

- CO
-
0
N
~
9
0
~
- E
0
-
5
0
ŝ
Ë
—
2
Ŧ
F
čĭ
\mathbf{U}
>
ίΩ.
=
σ
e
벋
<u></u>
-0
d
_

Unexpended Bal	556,522.03	432,316.17	1,053,000.00	23,579.10	291,254.79	880,340.02	45,784.90	1,853,626.39
Expenditure Amt	112,048.97	52,783.83	0	1,408,420.90	1,410,745.21	103,587.98	154,215.10	11,147,300.61
Federal Funds	668,571.00	485,100.00	1,053,000.00	1,432,000.00	1,702,000.00	983,928.00	200,000.00	13,000,927.00
Total Cost	742,858.00	564,062.00	1,387,000.00	2,851,178.00	2,484,942.00	983,928.00	234,502.00	55,284,014.00
Last Action Date	2/28/2014	3/6/2014	9/4/2014	3/26/2014	3/6/2014	3/19/2014	3/19/2014	3/13/2014
Last Expenditure Date	2/28/2014	3/6/2014		3/26/2014	3/6/2014	3/19/2014	3/19/2014	3/13/2014
Authorization Date	1/25/2012	1/23/2012	3/4/2014	4/1/2000	6/1/2012	11/13/2012	6/14/2011	12/19/2008
Latest Date	2/28/2014	3/6/2014	3/4/2014	3/26/2014	3/6/2014	3/19/2014	3/19/2014	3/13/2014
Description	HEGENBERGER ROAD @ EDES AVE, BALDWIN ST, HAMILTON ST, 73RD AVE, UPGRADE TRAFFIC SIGNALS & INSTALL FLASHING BEACONS	BANCROFT AVE. / 94TH AVE., INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNALS, CONSTRUCT CURB RAMPS	CITYWIDE STREETS, ROAD REHABILITATION	SAN PABLO AVE. CORRIDOR IN CITY OF BERKELEY , BICYCLE RELATED - OTHER	BUCHANAN/MARIN STREET FROM PIERCE ST. TO SAN PABLO, BIKE LANE & PED. WALKWAY	MARITIME ST. TO THE WEST AND UNION PACIFIC RR TO THE EAST, INTERMODAL STUDY	LIVERMORE, BUS RESTORATION	I-580-AL.COUNTY GREENVILLE RD TO HACIENDA DR. , WIDEN FRW TO CONSTRUCT HOV LANE .
Agency	Oakland	Oakland	Livermore	Berkeley	Albany	Port Of Oakland	Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority	Caltrans
Prefix	HSIPL	HSIPL	STPL	CML	CML	DEMOSL	RPSTPLE	HPLUL
Agency/District Action Required	Submit invoice to District by 02/20/2015	Submit invoice to District by 02/20/2015	Submit invoice to District by 02/20/2015	Records indicate project is in Final Voucher. District to verify.	Invoice under review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.	Submit invoice to District by 02/20/2015	Final Invoice under review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.	Records indicate project is in Final Voucher. District to verify.
Status	Inactive	Inactive	Inactive	Inactive	Inactive	Inactive	Inactive	Inactive
Project No (newly added projects highlight ed in GREEN)	5012113	5012114	5053027	5057019	5178012	6057014	6193009	6204071

ALAMEDA COUNTY LIST OF INACTIVE OBLIGATIONS

UPDATED BY CALTRANS ON 01/06/15

Updated By Caltrans on 01/06/2015

Unexpended Bal	167,336.81	104,878.87	355,252.16	116,843.76	344,520.00	663,975.00	467,000.00	348,630.00	342,920.53	152,866.80	348,700.00
Expenditure Amt	2,452,663.19	3,525,121.13	204,257.84	1,583,156.24	71,280.00	0	0	67,770.00	30,379.47	32,133.20	42,700.00
Federal Funds	2,620,000.00	3,630,000.00	559,510.00	1,700,000.00	415,800.00	663,975.00	467,000.00	416,400.00	373,300.00	185,000.00	391,400.00
Total Cost	3,406,270.00	4,070,044.00	632,000.00	4,918,054.00	489,326.00	750,000.00	833,000.00	831,454.00	414,832.00	200,000.00	451,270.00
Last Action Date	6/18/2014	6/19/2014	6/19/2014	4/8/2014	4/10/2014	4/27/2014	6/8/2014	5/19/2014	4/14/2014	5/19/2014	5/19/2014
Last Expenditure Date	6/18/2014	6/19/2014	6/19/2014	4/8/2014	4/10/2014			5/19/2014	4/10/2014	5/19/2014	5/19/2014
Authorization Date	3/9/2009	8/4/2009	5/4/2011	4/27/2011	1/23/2012	4/27/2014	6/8/2014	1/18/2012	12/15/2011	8/16/2012	11/8/2011
Latest Date	6/18/2014	6/19/2014	6/19/2014	4/8/2014	4/10/2014	4/27/2014	6/8/2014	5/19/2014	4/10/2014	5/19/2014	5/19/2014
Description	FRUITVALE AVE. STREETSCAPE	7TH STREET FROM UNION TO PERALTA STREETS, PEDESTRAIN STREETSCAPE IMPROVE	ADELINE STREET BRIDGE OVER UPRR AMTRAK, BRIDGE# 33C0028, SEISMIC RETROFIT	MACARTHUR BLVD. IMPROVEMENT PROJECT, PED. CROSSWALK, AC OVERLAY	SAN PABLO @ WEST GRAND AVE. AND @ WEST STREET, UPGRADE SIGNALS/MODIFY INTERSECTIONS	LEIMERT BLVD. BRIDGE OVER SAUSAL CREEK. BR. # 33C0215, SEISMIC RETROFIT.	CITYWIDE STREETS - SEE STATE COMMENT SCREEN FOR ELIGIBLE LOCATIONS, STREET RESURFACING	SHORELINE DRIVE, WESTLINE DR, AND BROADWAY, REDUCE TRAVEL LANES FROM 4 TO 2; INSTALL BIKE	WASHINGTON AVE @ MONTEREY BLVD./BRADRICK DR., SIGNAL IMPROVEMENT	ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN CITY OF ALBANY, SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PROGRAM	INTERSECTION OF FREMONT BLVD. AND ALDER AVE., INTERSECTION IMPROVMENT
Agency	Oakland	Oakland	Oakland	Oakland	Oakland	Oakland	Oakland	Alameda	San Leandro	Albany	Fremont
Prefix	CML	ESPLE	внго	CML	HSIPL	STPLZ	STPL	HSIPL	HSIPL	SRTSLNI	HSIPL
Agency/District Action Required	Submit invoice to District by 05/20/2015	Submit invoice to District by 05/20/2015	Submit invoice to District by 05/20/2015	Final Invoice under review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.	Submit invoice to District by 05/20/2015	Submit invoice to District by 05/20/2015	Submit invoice to District by 05/20/2015	Submit invoice to District by 05/20/2015	Submit invoice to District by 05/20/2015	Submit invoice to District by 05/20/2015	Invoice returned to agency. Resubmit to District by 05/20/2015
Status	Future	Future	Future	Future	Future	Future	Future	Future	Future	Future	Future
Project No (newly added projects highlight ed in GREEN)	5012088	5012100	5012103	5012106	5012115	5012124	5012125	5014037	5041041	5178013	5322048

ALAMEDA COUNTY LIST OF INACTIVE OBLIGATIONS

UPDATED BY CALTRANS ON 01/06/15

Updated By Caltrans on 01/06/2015

Unexpended Bal	2,105,000.00	366,239.29	539,940.00	443,425.83	5,229,537.57	439,188.39	46,085.91	726,402.21	761,006.44
Expenditure Amt	0	133,760.71	0	22,857,701.17	19,526,476.43	2,560,811.61	1,740,914.09	353,477.79	2,427,993.56
Federal Funds	2,105,000.00	500,000.00	539,940.00	23,301,127.00	24,756,014.00	3,000,000.00	1,787,000.00	1,079,880.00	3,189,000.00
Total Cost	2,838,000.00	500,000.00	674,940.00	27,566,009.00	30,242,133.00	7,473,725.00	2,249,750.00	1,395,000.00	3,604,000.00
Last Action Date	4/16/2014	6/2/2014	4/9/2014	5/28/2014	5/28/2014	1/5/2015	6/2/2014	4/10/2014	6/2/2014
Last Expenditure Date		6/2/2014		5/28/2014	5/28/2014	4/8/2014	6/2/2014	4/10/2014	6/2/2014
Authorization Date	4/16/2014	8/3/2012	4/9/2014	6/12/2001	8/3/2005	2/16/2012	5/8/2009	6/2/2010	3/29/2011
Latest Date	4/16/2014	6/2/2014	4/9/2014	5/28/2014	5/28/2014	4/8/2014	6/2/2014	4/10/2014	6/2/2014
Description	CITYWIDE- VARIOUS LOCATIONS, REHABILITATE PAVEMENT	MULTIPLE SCHOOLS IN EAST AND WEST OAKLAND, IMPLEMENT GOLDEN SNEAKERS PROGRAM, SAEFTV PARROIS	EAST 14TH ST/MISSION BLVD FROM 162ND AVE TO RUFUS CT, CONSTRUCT BULB OUTS WITH STREETSCAPE	VARIOUS BART AERIAL STRUCTURES IN OAKLAND , SEISMIC RETROFIT SEISMIC RETROFIT	VARIOUS BART AERIAL STRUCTURES IN 4 COUNTIES. , RETROFIT OF BART AERIAL STRUCTURES	PORT OF OAKLAND, BERTHS 30 & 32, SHOREPOWER AT BERTHS 30&32.	1-880- 23RD. AVE. TO 29TH. AVE. INTERCHANGES, REPLACE INTERCHANGES-OVERCROSS	GILMAN AVE AT I-80 INTERCHANGE, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING	COUNTY WIDE, IMPLEMENT A COUNTYWIDE SR2S PROGRAM
Agency	Fremont	Alameda County	Alameda County	San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District	San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District	Port Of Oakland	Alameda County Congestion Management Agency	Alameda County Congestion Management Agency	Alameda County Congestion Management Agency
Prefix	STPL	SRTSL	HPLUL	RPSTPL	STPLZ	CML	HPLUN	HPLUL	STPCML
Agency/District Action Required	Submit invoice to District by 05/20/2015	Submit invoice to District by 05/20/2015	Invoice under review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.	Records indicate project is in Final Voucher. District to verify.	Submit invoice to District by 05/20/2015	Final Invoice under review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.	Submit invoice to District by 05/20/2015	Submit invoice to District by 05/20/2015	Submit invoice to District by 05/20/2015
Status	Future	Future	Future	Future	Future	Future	Future	Future	Future
Project No (newly added projects highlight ed in GREEN)	5322054	5933119	5933126	600014	6000025	6057013	6273053	6273060	6273065

This page intentionally left blank



QUARTERLY REVIEW OF INACTIVE PROJECTS JUSTIFICATION FORM SUMMARY



1. CT DIST - FEDERA PROJECT NO.	AL AID	2. STATE PROJECT NUMBER		3. RESPONSIBLE AGENCY 4. DATE							
5. GENERAL LOCATIO	N										
6. GENERAL DESCRIP	TION OF	WORK (INCLUDE PROJECT	PHASES WITH OBLI	GATED FUNDS	S)						
7. AUTHORIZATION DATE	8.	FEDERAL-AID FUNDS AUTHORIZED	9. PGM CODE	10. PHASE (from E-76)	11. FEDE	RAL FUNDS EXPENDED TO DATE	12. UNEXPENDED FEDERAL FUNDS				
TOTAL:											
13. LAST ACTIVITY (BILLING DATE)											
Important	t note:	Caltrans and/or FHWA	reserve the righ	nt to reject a	a Justifica	ition and deobligate the	e Federal Funds.				
14. JUSTIFICATION (C	снеск о	NE OR MORE IF APPLICABLE	E)								
Litiga	ation Fi	led 🗌	Environmental	Delays		Right of way, Utility Re	elocation Delays				
Justificat	tion Fo	rms without proper su	oporting docum	ents will be	rejected	and returned to Agenci	es by Caltrans.				
Decision			ON OR FROM LAST		EIY ON THIS	PROJECT STATUS/REASON R	IOCUMENTATION.				
INACTIVE. PROVIDE E	BACKUP	DOCUMENTATION.			r oonnen r		OKTROSEOT BEING				
16 ACTIONS TAKEN T	O RESOL	VE EXISTING ISSUE(S)									
17. DATE ACTIVITIES	TO BE RI	ESUMED	18. DATE BI	LLINGS OR O	THER CORR	ECTIVE ACTION TO BE TAKE	N (e.g. closure, withdrawal, et				
19. CURRENT COST ES	STIMATE	NEEDED TO COMPLETE PRO	JECT 20. IF ESTIN	MATE IS LESS	THAN UNEX	PENDED BALANCE, AMOUNT	TO BE DEOBLIGATED				
			(Attach cop)	or E-76 reque	esting deobl	ligation)					
21. CONSEQUENCES IF FUNDS ARE DEOBLIGATED											
22. ADDITIONAL DOC	UMENTA	TTON (LIST ATTACHMENTS)	TO SUPPORT VALU	DATION OF TH	ITS OBLIGA	TION					
23. AGENCY CONTACT		EMAIL		SIGNATURE		PHONE NUMBER	DATE				
24. FORM REVIEWED	AN <u>D RE</u> C	COMMENDED FOR APPROVA	L BY:								
CT DISTR	ICT CONTA	CT NAME/TITLE	SI	IGNATURE		PHONE NUMBER	DATE				



QUARTERLY REVIEW OF INACTIVE PROJECTS JUSTIFICATION FORM SUMMARY



Please go through the check list before submitting your justification form (DO NOT leave anything blank)								
#	Information Required	Additional Information	Check					
1	Enter the District number and federal project number (including the project prefix, e.g. STPL)							
2	Enter State Project Number, if applicable							
3	Enter Responsible Agency							
4	Enter date you've completed the form							
5	Enter route information and location description							
6	Enter work description including project phases with obligated funds							
7	Enter date when funds were authorized. Use a separate line for each phase with authorized federal funds	Refer to the current inactive list/file posted in the web						
8	Enter authorized federal funds	http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPro grams/InactiveProjects/OuarterlyRe						
9	Enter all program code(s)	viewofInactiveProjects.htm						
10	Enter project phase (e.g. PE, RW, CON, etc.)	Use E-76 for this item						
11	Enter accumulated expenditure by program code	Refer to the current inactive list/file posted in the web						
12	Enter unexpended funds	http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPro grams/InactiveProjects/QuarterlyRe						
13	Enter last billing date	viewofInactiveProjects.htm						
14	Select the appropriate reason(s) for justification; for litigation filed, submit copy (with stamp) of the documents filed	http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPro grams/Inactiveprojects.htm						
15	List project history	Include project timeline from the time of authorization or last financial transaction to present. e.g. original bid rejected - costs exceeded engineer estimate by XX%						
16	Action(s) taken to resolve the issue	Explain why previous commitment has not been met. e.g. to be re-advertised after additional funding determinations						
17	Enter date activities to be resumed	e.g. Revised date for contract award						
18	Enter billing dates or other corrective action to be taken							
19	Enter current cost estimate needed to complete							
20	Enter amount to be deobligated for unneeded funds							
21	Enter reason/consequences if funds are deobligated							
22	Additional back-up documentation	Copy of environmental approval; litigation; r/w acquisition; copy of invoice; proof that they have been working on a project since initial authorization; project timeline and funding plan; PSA; etc.						
23	Enter contact person from local agency	Person prepared the justification must sign the form						
24	DLAE approving official	Person reviewing and approving the justification must sign the form						
	ANY INCOMPLETE JUSTIFICATION FORM	WILL BE SENT BACK TO	DLAE					



METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION 6. 1 JOINT PARTNERSHIP LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS/ PROGRAMMING AND DELIVERY WORKING GROUP MEETING 101 - 8th St., 1st Floor, CR-171 Thursday, January 8, 2015 9:30 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.

<u>AGENDA</u>

<u>To</u>	<u>pic</u>	Es	stimated <u>Time</u>	
1.	Int	roductions (Seana Gause, PDWG Chair)	5 min	
2.	Re	Review of Working Group Minutes*		
	A.	Partnership Local Streets and Roads Working Group – October 9, 2014* (Nancy Adams, LSRWG Chain	<i>.</i>)	
	B.	Partnership Programming and Delivery Working Group – December 15, 2014* (Seana Gause, PDWG Chair)		
	C.	LSRWG Nomination and Election 2015 2 nd Vice Chair from a Local City		
	D.	LSRWG: PTAC Recommendation for 2015 Vice Chair from a Local City		
3.	Inf	Formational Items: ("Memo Only" unless otherwise noted)	10 min	
	A.	TIP Update* (Adam Crenshaw; <u>acrenshaw@mtc.ca.gov</u>) (View the Final 2015 TIP at <u>http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/tip/index.htm</u>)		
	B.	PTAP Update** (Christina Hohorst, <u>chohorst@mtc.ca.gov</u>)	5 min	
	C.	PMP Certification Status* (Current PMP Certification status is available online at: <u>http://mtc.ca.gov/services/pmp/</u>).		
4.	4. Discussion Items:			
	A.	Vital Signs Performance Monitoring Initiative – Update on PCI Interactive Map (Dave Vautin; <u>dvautin@mtc.ca.gov</u>) (MTC staff will provide a brief update on the Vital Signs performance monitoring initiative including a preview of the online PCI interactive map.)	10 min	
	B.	FHWA Published NPRM on NHS Pavement and Bridge Performance Measures* (Dave Vautin; dvautin@mtc.ca.gov) FHWA released the long awaited NPRM (Notice of Proposed Rule Making) on NHS Pavement and Bridg Performance Measures as required by MAP21. https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2015/01/05/2014-30085/national-performance- management-measures-assessing-pavement-condition-for-the-national-highway	10 min ge	
		i. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) will hold two free webinars to provide information on the NPRM. Each webinar will provide the same content. <i>Thursday, 1/8/2015, 3:00-5:00 EST; Thursday, 1/22/2015, 2:00-4:00 EST</i>		
	C.	 2015 LSRWG Work Plan Update (<i>Nancy Adams, LSRWG Chair</i>) i. 2014 Pothole Report Update^{**} (<i>Nicholas Richter, <u>nrichter@mtc.ca.gov</u></i>) 	20 min	
	D.	Active Transportation Program Update (Kenneth Kao, <u>kkao@mtc.ca.gov</u>)	10 min	
	E.	Federal Efficiencies Subcommittee Update(Seana Gause, PDWG Chair)	15 min	
	F.	2015 PDWG Work Plan Update (Seana Gause, PDWG Chair)	15 min	



G. Other Discussion Items (All)

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

Partnership TAC and Working Groups									
2015 Tentative Meeting Calendar									
January 5, 2015									
Month	Transit Finance (TFWG) 3rd Floor, Fishbowl (10:00a - 12:00 Noon)	Local Streets & Roads (LSRWG) 1st Floor, Room 171, (9:30a - 11:30a)	Programming & Delivery (PDWG) 1st Floor, Room 171, (9:30a - 11:30a)	Joint Partnership (LSRPDWG) 1st Floor, Room 171, (9:30a - 12:00p)	Partnership Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC) 1st Floor, Auditorium, (1:30p – 3:30p)				
January	Wednesday, Jan 7			Thursday, Jan 8	Monday, Jan 26 *				
February	Wednesday, Feb 4	Thursday, Feb 12							
March	Wednesday, Feb 4	Thursday, Mar 12	Monday, Mar 16		Monday, Mar 16				
April	Wednesday, Apr 1	Thursday, Apr 9	Monday, Apr 20		Monday, Apr 20				
May	Wednesday, May 6			Thursday, May 14	Monday, May 18				
June	Wednesday, Jun 3	Thursday, Jun 11	Monday, Jun 15		Monday, Jun 15				
July	Wednesday, Jul 1	Thursday, Jul 9	Monday, Jul 20 **		Monday, July 20				
August	Wednesday, Aug 5								
September	Wednesday, Sep 2			Thursday, Sep 10	Monday, Sep 21				
October	Wednesday, Oct 7	Thursday, Oct 8	Monday, Oct 19		Monday, Oct 19				
November	Wednesday, Nov 4	Thursday, Nov 12	Monday, Nov 16		Monday, Nov 16				
December	Wednesday, Dec 2			Thursday, Dec 10	Monday, Dec 21				
J:\COMMITTE\Partnership\[2015 Meeting Calendar_LSR-PD_LSRPD_PTAC.xlsx]2015									
* Monday January 26 PTAC meeting held in Room 171									
** Monday July 20 PDWG meeting held in Auditorium									
TFWG Meeting Manager: Theresa Hannon, thannon@mtc.ca.gov									
LSRWG/PDWG/PTAC Meeting Manager: Marcella Aranda , marand@mtc.ca.gov									

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

Contact Marcella Aranda at <u>maranda@mtc.ca.gov</u> if you have questions regarding this agenda.

Public Comment: The public is encouraged to comment on agenda items at committee meetings by completing a request-to-speak card (available from staff) and passing it to the committee secretary. Public comment may be limited by any of the procedures set forth in Section 3.09 of MTC's Procedures Manual (Resolution No. 1058, Revised) if, in the chair's judgment, it is necessary to maintain the orderly flow of business.

Record of Meeting: MTC meetings are recorded. Copies of recordings are available at nominal charge, or recordings may be listened to at MTC offices by appointment. Audiocasts are maintained on MTC's Web site for public review for at least one year.

Transit Access to the MetroCenter: BART to Lake Merritt Station. AC Transit buses: #11 from Piedmont and Montclair; #26 from MacArthur BART; #62 from East or West Oakland; #88 from Berkeley. For transit information from other Bay Area destinations, call 511 or use the 511 Transit Trip Planner at www.511.org to plan your trip.

Parking at the MetroCenter: Metered parking is available on the street. No public parking is provided at the MetroCenter. Spaces reserved for Commissioners are for the use of their stickered vehicles only; all other vehicles will be towed away.

Accessibility and Title VI: MTC provides services/accommodations upon request to persons with disabilities and individuals who are limited-English proficient who wish to address Commission matters. For accommodations or translations assistance, please call 510.817.5757 or 510.817.5769 for TDD/TTY. We require three working days' notice to accommodate your request.

5 min 5 min

