

Commission Chair Scott Haggerty, Supervisor-District 1

Commission Vice Chair Rebecca Kaplan, Councilmember, City of Oakland

AC Transit Elsa Ortiz, Director

Alameda County Supervisors

Richard Valle – District 2 Wilma Chan – District 3 Nate Miley – District 4 Keith Carson – District 5

BART Thomas Blalock, Director

City of Alameda Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft, Vice Mayor

City of Albany Peggy Thomsen, Mayor

City of Berkeley Laurie Capitelli, Councilmember

City of Dublin Tim Sbranti, Mayor

City of Emeryville Ruth Atkin, Councilmember

City of Fremont Suzanne Chan, Councilmember

City of Hayward Marvin Peixoto, Councilmember

City of Livermore John Marchand, Mayor

City of Newark Luis Freitas, Councilmember

City of Oakland Larry Reid, Vice Mayor

City of Piedmont John Chiang, Mayor

City of Pleasanton Jerry Thorne, Mayor

City of San Leandro Michael Gregory, Vice Mayor

City Of Union City Carol Dutra-Vernaci, Mayor

Executive Director Arthur L. Dao

COMMISSION MEETING NOTICE Thursday, May 23, 2013 2:00 P.M.

1333 Broadway, Suite 300 Oakland, California 94612 (see map on last page of agenda)

Scott Haggerty Rebecca Kaplan

Arthur L. Dao Vanessa Lee

Chair Vice Chair

Executive Director Clerk of the Commission

AGENDA

Copies of individual Agenda items are available online at: www.alamedactc.org

Pledge of Allegiance

2 **Roll Call**

1

Public Comment 3

Members of the public may address the Commission during "Public Comment" on any item not on the agenda. Public comment on an agenda item will be heard as part of that specific agenda item. Only matters within the Commission's jurisdictions may be addressed. If you wish to comment make your desire known by filling out a speaker card and handing it to the Clerk of the Commission. Please wait until the Chair calls your name. Walk to the microphone when called; give your name, and your comments. Please be brief and limit comments to the specific subject under discussion. Please limit your comment to three minutes.

A

Ι

Ι

Ι

Ι

4	Chair/Vice Chair Report							
5	Exect	utive Director Report						
6	Appr	oval of Consent Calendar						
	6A.	Minutes of April 25, 2013 – Page 1						
	6B.	I-580 Corridor High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lane Projects						
		Monthly Progress Report – Page 7						
	6C.	I-580 Express (HOT) Lane Projects Monthly Progress Report						
		– Page 19						
	6D.	Review of Draft Plan Bay Area and the Draft Environmental						
		Impact Report Comments- Page 33						
	6E.	Congestion Management Program (CMP): Summary of the						
		Alameda CTC's Review and Comments on Environmental						
		Documents and General Plan Amendments – Page 37						

Approval of Countywide Transportation Demand Management 6F. Α Strategy and Review of the Annual Evaluation of the Guaranteed Ride Home Program – Page 43

- 6G. <u>Approval of Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) FY 2013/14 Allocation Plan</u> A – Page 159
- 6H. <u>Approval of Measure B Special Transportation for Seniors and People with</u> A <u>Disabilities Gap Grant Cycle 5 Program</u> Page 179
- 6I. <u>Approval of Three-Year Project Initiation Document Strategic Plan for</u> A <u>Alameda County – Page 187</u>
- 6J. <u>Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program Overview and Summary</u> I of FY 2013/14 Applications Received – Page 195
- 6K. <u>Approval of the FY 2011-2012 Measure B and Vehicle Registration Fee Pass-</u> A <u>through Fund Program Compliance Reports</u> Page 219
- 6L. <u>Approval of Final FY 2013-2014 Measure B Capital Program Strategic Plan</u> A – Page 225
- 6M. <u>I-680 Southbound Express Lane (ACTIA No. 8A) Approval of Contract</u> A <u>Amendments to the Professional Services Contracts with ETC, Novani and</u> <u>CDM Smith – Page 249</u>
- 6N. <u>I-680 Northbound Express Lane (ACTIA No. 8B) Approval of a</u> A <u>Cooperative Agreement with California Department of Transportation</u> (Caltrans) – Page 255
- 60. <u>Approval of a Revised Sales Tax Revenue Projection for Fiscal Year 2012</u>- A 2013 Page 257
- 6P. <u>Approval of the Alameda CTC FY2012-13 Third Quarter Consolidated</u> A <u>Investment Report</u> – Page 259
- 6Q. <u>Approval of the Consolidated FY2012-13 Third Quarter Financial Report</u> A – Page 271

Community Advisory Committee Reports – (Time Limit: 3 minutes per speaker) 7A. <u>Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee-</u> Midori Tabata, Chair I – Page 283

- 7B. <u>Citizens Advisory Committee –</u> Barry Ferrier, Chair Page 289 I
- 7C. <u>Citizens Watchdog Committee</u> James Paxson, Chair Page 291 I
- 7D. <u>Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee</u> Sylvia Stadmire, Chair I – Page 293

8	Planni	ng, Policy and Legislation Committee Action Items	
	8A.	Approval of Legislative Positions and Update – Page 303	Α
9	Programs	s and Projects Committee Action Items	
	9A.	Approval of 2013 Capital Improvement Program and Programs Investment	Α
		Plan Revenue Assumptions and Review of the Development Methodology	
		– Page 323	
	9B.	Approval of 2014 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)	A
		Principles – Page 339	
	9C.	Approval of Draft FY 2012/13 Coordinated Funding Program – Page 351	A
10	Finance	and Administration Committee Action Items	
	10A.	Approval of the Fiscal Year 2013-2014 Draft Proposed Consolidated	Α
		Budget for the Alameda County Transportation Commission - Page 377	
11	Mombo	r Donorts (Varbal)	
11	TATCHIDE!		
12	Adjourn	nment-Next Meeting- June 27, 2013	

Key: A- Action Item; I – Information Item

- (#) All items on the agenda are subject to action and/or change by the Commission
- (*) Materials will be distributed at the meeting.

PLEASE DO NOT WEAR SCENTED PRODUCTS SO INDIVIDUALS WITH ENVIRONMENTAL SENSITIVITIES MAY ATTEND

Alameda County Transportation Commission 1333 Broadway, Suites 220 & 300, Oakland, CA 94612 (510) 208-7400 (510) 836-2185 Fax (Suite 220) (510) 893-6489 Fax (Suite 300) www.alamedactc.org

June 2013 Meeting Schedule: Some dates are tentative. Persons interested in attending should check dates with Alameda CTC staff.

Alameda County Transportation Advisory Committee (ACTAC)	1:30 pm	June 10, 2013	1333 Broadway, Suite 300
I-580 Policy Advisory Committee (PAC)	9:15 am	June 10, 2013	1333 Broadway, Suite 300
I-680 Sunol Smart Carpool Lane Joint Powers Authority Committee (JPA)	9:00 am	June 10, 2013	1333 Broadway, Suite 300
Planning, Policy and Legislation Committee (PPLC)	10:00 am	June 10, 2013	1333 Broadway, Suite 300
Programs and Projects Committee (PPC)	11:30 pm	June 10, 2013	1333 Broadway, Suite 300
Finance and Administration Committee (FAC)	1:00 pm	June 10, 2013	1333 Broadway, Suite 300
Alameda CTC Commission Meeting	2:00 pm	June 27, 2013	1333 Broadway, Suite 300

Glossary of Acronyms

ABAG	Association of Bay Area Governments					
ACCMA	Alameda County Congestion Management Agency					
ACE	Altamont Commuter Express					
ACTA	Alameda County Transportation Authority (1986 Measure B authority)					
ACTAC	Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee					
ACTC	Alameda County Transportation Commission					
ACTIA	Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority (2000 Measure B authority)					
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act					
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District					
BART	Bay Area Rapid Transit District					
BRT	Bus Rapid Transit					
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation					
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act					
CIP	Capital Investment Program					
CMAQ	Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality					
СМР	Congestion Management Program					
CTC	California Transportation Commission					
CWTP	Countywide Transportation Plan					
EIR	Environmental Impact Report					
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration					
FTA	Federal Transit Administration					
GHG	Greenhouse Gas					
НОТ	High occupancy toll					
HOV	High occupancy vehicle					
ITIP	State Interregional Transportation Improvement Program					
LATIP	Local Area Transportation Improvement Program					
LAVTA	Livermore-Amador Valley Transportation Authority					
LOS	Level of service					

MTC	Metropolitan Transportation Commission
MTS	Metropolitan Transportation System
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NOP	Notice of Preparation
PCI	Pavement Condition Index
PSR	Project Study Report
RM 2	Regional Measure 2 (Bridge toll)
RTIP	Regional Transportation Improvement Program
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan (MTC's Transportation 2035)
SAFETEA-L	LU Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act
SCS	Sustainable Community Strategy
SR	State Route
SRS	Safe Routes to Schools
STA	State Transit Assistance
STIP	State Transportation Improvement Program
STP	Federal Surface Transportation Program
ТСМ	Transportation Control Measures
TCRP	Transportation Congestion Relief Program
TDA	Transportation Development Act
TDM	Travel-Demand Management
ТЕР	Transportation Expenditure Plan
TFCA	Transportation Fund for Clean Air
TIP	Federal Transportation Improvement Program
TLC	Transportation for Livable Communities
ТМР	Traffic Management Plan
TMS	Transportation Management System
TOD	Transit-Oriented Development
TOS	Transportation Operations Systems
TVTC	Tri Valley Transportation Committee
VHD	Vehicle Hours of Delay
VMT	Vehicle miles traveled



1333 Broadway, Suites 220 & 300

Oakland, CA 94612

PH: (510) 208-7400

www.AlamedaCTC.org



Directions to the Offices of the Alameda County Transportation Commission:

1333 Broadway, Suite 220 Oakland, CA 94612

Public Transportation Access:

BART: City Center / 12th Street Station

AC Transit:

Lines 1,1R, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 40, 51, 63, 72, 72M, 72R, 314, 800, 801, 802, 805, 840

Auto Access:

- Traveling South: Take 11th Street exit from I-980 to 11th Street
- Traveling North: Take 11th Street/Convention Center Exit from I-980 to 11th Street
- Parking: City Center Garage – Underground Parking, (Parking entrances located on 11th or 14th Street)



ALAMEDA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MINUTES OF APRIL 25, 2013 OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA

1. Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Haggerty called the meeting to order at 2:05pm.

2. Roll Call

Lee conducted the roll call. A quorum was confirmed.

3. Public Comment

There were no public comments.

4. Chair/Vice Chair Report

Chair Haggerty stated that during the week of April 15 through 18, he, the Executive Director and the Deputy Director of Policy and Legislation traveled to Washington, D.C. for Alameda CTC's annual legislative visit. He stated that thirteen meetings were held with congressional representatives, professional committee staff for both the Senate and House committees responsible for transportation and agency staff at the Department of Transportation.

5. Executive Director Report

Art Dao provided an update on the development of the National Freight Strategic Plan as it relates to MAP-21. Mr. Dao stated that he was appointed to the California Department of Transportation State Frieght Advisory Committee and participated in its first meeting. He concluded by stating that Bike to Work Month will begin in May and that there was a groundbreaking event for the I-580 Westbound Carpool Lane and the Eastbound 580 Auxiliary Lane Projects scheduled for May 30, 2013.

6. Approval of Consent Calendar

6A. Minutes of March 28, 2013

6B. I-580 Corridor High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lane Projects Status Update

- 6C. I-580 Express (HOT) Lane Projects Status Update
- 6D. I-580 Express (HOT) Lanes Work Plan
- 6E. Congestion Management Program (CMP): Summary of the Alameda CTC's Review and Comments on Environmental Documents and General Plan Amendments
- 6F. Approval of 2013 Alameda CTC Retreat Outcomes for Planning Studies Prioritization, Outreach Approach and Implementation Timeline
- 6G. Approval of Strategic Planning and Programming Policy for Integration with the 2013 Congestion Management Program (CMP) Update and 2014 State Transportation Improvement

Plan (STIP) Development Process

- 6H. California Transportation Commission (CTC) March 2013 Meeting Summary
- 6I. Approval for Continuation of Countywide Bicycle Safety Education Program
- 6J. Draft Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) FY 2013/14 Allocation Plan
- 6K. Measure B Special Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities Gap Grant Cycle 5 Program Summary of Applications Received
- 6L. Approval of Draft FY 2013/14 Measure B Capital Program Allocation Plan Update and Assumptions
- 6M. Downtown Oakland Streetscape Improvements (ACTC Project No.604.0) Approval of Time Extension for Project Specific Funding Agreement No.2003-02 (Amendment No. 2) Between the Alameda CTC and the City of Oakland
- 6N. Westgate Parkway Extension Project (ACTIA 18B) Allocation of 2000 Measure B Capital Funding
- 60. I-880/Mission Boulevard (Route 262) Interchange Completion Project (ACTA MB196) -Approval of Amendment to Professional Services Agreement (A99-003) with PB Americas for Right of Way Closeout Activities and Design Service During Construction
- 6P. Approval of the Alameda CTC Investment Policy
- 6Q. Approval of the Creation of an Alameda CTC Other Postemployment Benefits Trust through the California Employers' Retiree Benefit Trust and Delegate the Authority to Request Disbursements from that Trust
- 6R. Approval of Advisory Committee Appointments

Commissioner Kaplan motioned to approve the Consent Calendar. Commission Blalock seconded the motion. Commissioner Ortiz abstained on Item 6A. The motion passed 21-0.

7. Community Advisory Committee Reports

7A. Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

Midori Tabata, BPAC Chair, stated that BPAC last met on April 11, 2013. The committee reviewed the coordinated funding program call for projects, funding for the bicycle safety education program, and TDA Article 3 guidelines. Ms. Tabata concluded by stating that BPAC has a vacancy for the League of Mayors appointment for District 2.

7B. Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)

No one was present from CAC.

7C. Citizens Watchdog Committee (CWC)

No one was present from CWC.

7D. Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee (PAPCO)

Sylvia Stadmire, PAPCO Chair, stated that PAPCO met on April 22, 2013. The committee made a recommendation on Pass-through funding and Paratransit Gap Cycle 5 awards and received a quarterly report from LAVTA. Ms. Stadmire stated that the committee will be participating in various outreach efforts as well as planning the annual Mobility Workshop. She concluded by updating the Commission on committee vacancies.

8. Planning, Policy and Legislation Committee Action Items

8A. Approval of Legislative Positions and Updates

Tess Lengyel provided an update on state and federal legislative initiatives. On the federal level, Ms. Lengyel updated the Commission on issues regarding sequestration, budget cuts and MAP-21 implementation. On the state level, Ms. Lengyel stated that staff was reviewing over 2100 newly introduced Bills and highlighted important updates regarding lowering the voter thresholds and Cap & Trade revenues. She recommended that the Commission take a support position on AB 14.

Commissioner Ashcraft asked for clarification on Labors opposition to CEQA. Ms. Lengyel stated that there were concerns expressed regarding Labor's ability to move projects forward with CEQA.

Commissioner Ashcraft requested more information on Alameda CTC's involvement with the WETA Board. Ms. Lengyel stated that staff made a recommendation to add the Alameda CTC as a representative on the WETA Board.

Commissioner Kaplan motioned to approve this Item. Commission Blalock seconded the motion. The motion passed 22-0.

8B. Plan Bay Area and Draft Environmentation Impact Report Presentation

Art Dao introduced Steve Heminger, Executive Director of MTC, and Ezra Rapport, Executive Director of ABAG, who gave a presentation on the Plan Bay Area and Draft Environmental Impact Reports. The presentation provided an overview of the draft Plan including a summary of the preferred scenario, regional growth trends, investment strategy and advocacy.

Commissioner Valle asked how many public hearings were held in Alameda County. Mr. Heminger stated that there was one hearing this cycle and four total hearings during the development of the Plan. The next Alameda County public hearing will be held on May 1st in Fremont.

Commissioner Kaplan wanted to know if there would be further additions and/or modifications made to the current version on the plan and asked for clarification on the next steps. Mr. Heminger stated that because this is a process and the next revision period will begin in about one year, he did not anticipate major changes in the Plan's recommendations.

Commissioner Kaplan asked why the current plan doesn't deal directly with freight and recommended that it be strengthened as it is a huge part of the congestion in Alameda County.

Commissioner Kaplan wanted more information on initiatives taken regarding senior housing and recommended that senior housing be included in Priority Development Areas. Mr. Heminger stated that legislation was in the works to support efforts related to senior housing and redevelopment.

Commissioner Capitelli wanted more information on how the Plan would improve local jusrisdications permitting processes. Mr. Rapport stated that improved efficiencies by being consistent with the Sustainable Communities Strategy could result in streamlining benefits per SB375, which could occur through the development of programmatic EIR's and reducing the threat of litigation.

Commissioner Dutra-Vernaci asked for more information on earthquake mitigation and recovery. Mr. Heminger stated that there is maintence funding in the Plan designated for seismic retrofitting work and that ABAG has published a policy agenda as part of their Resiliency Initiative.

Commissioner Marchand stated that there is insufficient funding for needed transportation investment and asked where the funding was for public services in Priority Development Areas.

Commissioner Gregory questioned if the number of transit agencies was addressed in the Plan and recommended that if not it should be addressed in the next update. Mr. Heninger stated that transit sustainability was a separate initiative that was being addressed by MTC.

A public comment was heard on this Item by Jane Krammer.

This Item was for information only.

9. Programs and Projects Committee Action Items

9A. FY 2012-13 Coordinated Funding Program: Summary of Applications Received

Matt Todd provided an update on the FY 2012-13 Coordinated Funding Program applications received. Mr. Todd stated that 69 total applications were received; 15 local streets & roads applications, 20 One Bay Area Grant program applications, and 34 local fund applications. He concluded by stating that the final funding recommendation would be brought to the Commission in June.

This Item was for information only.

9B. Alameda CTC Semi-Annual Programs Status Update

John Hemiup provided an update on the Alameda CTC Semi-Annual Programs Status. Mr. Hemiup provided a status of the Measure B and Vehicle Registration Fee Pass-Through Fund and Grant Programs for the first half of Fiscal Year 2012-13. He summarized disbursements made for the Measure B Pass-through Fund and Grant Distribution, VRF funding distribution and programs, the Bicycle Safety Education Project, the Express Bus Service Grant Program, the Paratransit Gap Grant Program, the Transit Center Development Grant Program and highlighted the City of Oakland West Oakland/Seventh Street Transit Village Streetscape Project.

This Item was for information only.

9C. Alameda CTC Semi-Annual Capital Projects Status Update

James O'Brien provided an update on the Alameda CTC Semi-Annual Capital Projects Status. The update included information on 44 active capital projects being implemented by the Alameda CTC, and/or being funded wholly, or in part, with Measure B Capital funds.

This Item was for information only.

10. Member Reports

There were no member reports.

10. Adjournment: Next Meeting – May 23, 2013

The next meeting will be held on May 23, 2013 at 2:00pm.

Attest by:

Vanessa Lee Clerk of the Commission

This page intentionally left blank



Memorandum

DATE: May 15, 2013

TO: Alameda County Transportation Commission

FROM: I-580 Express Lane Policy Committee

SUBJECT: I-580 Corridor High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lane Projects Monthly Progress Report

Recommendation

This item is for information only.

Summary

The Alameda CTC is the sponsor for the I-580 Corridor High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lane Projects, which will construct an HOV lane in both the Eastbound and Westbound directions along I-580 from Pleasanton to Livermore. The projects are designed to provide increased capacity, safety and efficiency for commuters and freight along the primary trade corridor connecting the Bay Area with the Central Valley.

As project sponsor, the Alameda CTC has been working in partnership with Caltrans, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), Alameda County, and the cities of Livermore, Dublin, and Pleasanton to deliver the projects. The construction contracts are being administered by Caltrans; the current status of each is as follows:

- <u>I-580 Eastbound HOV Lane Project</u> The Segment 3 construction contract for auxiliary lanes (Segment 3) was awarded on November 16, 2012. Construction activity will began in April 2013.
- <u>I-580 Westbound HOV Lane Project</u> will be constructed in two separate construction contracts: an eastern segment from Greenville Road to Isabel Avenue and a western segment from Isabel Avenue to Foothill/San Ramon Road. The construction contract for the western segment was awarded on October 29, 2012; the eastern segment was awarded on November 20, 2012. Construction activity began in March 2013. A groundbreaking ceremony is currently being planned in cooperation with Caltrans for late May 2013.

Attached for the Committee's review, are the monthly progress reports for both the I-580 Eastbound HOV Lane Project and the I-580 Westbound HOV Lane Project; each report covers activities through April 30, 2013.

Discussion

I-580 Eastbound HOV Lane

The I-580 Eastbound HOV Lane Project is comprised of three segments:

- <u>Segment 1 and 2</u> provided one HOV lane in the eastbound direction from Greenville Road to Hacienda Drive. Construction was completed in 2010.
- <u>Segment 3</u> limits span from Hacienda Drive to Greenville Road and will construct eastbound auxiliary (AUX) lanes from Isabel Avenue to First Street in Livermore. In addition, the project will widen the eastbound bridges at Arroyo-Las Positas, pave and stripe all lanes in the eastbound direction from Hacienda Drive to Greenville Road and make other improvements to accommodate conversion of the HOV lane to a double express / high occupancy toll (HOT) lane facility.

Design and right-of-way acquisition work for Segment 3 was completed in May 2012. The bids for this segment were opened on October 5, 2012. The apparent low bidder was OC Jones & Sons with a bid 6.22% below the Engineer's Estimate. The contract was awarded to OC Jones & Sons on November 16, 2012. Construction activity will begin in April 2013.

The total cost of I-580 Eastbound HOV Lane Project is \$137.1M. The project is funded from a combination of local, state and federal funds. The California Transportation Commission allocated \$21.56M CMIA and \$5M SHOPP funds for Segment 3 at their May 2012 meeting. Both CMIA and SHOPP allocations were adjusted to reflect the bid savings at contract award. See Attachment A for detailed project funding and financial status.

I-580 Westbound HOV Lane

The I-580 Westbound HOV Lane Project will provide a westbound HOV lane from the Greenville Overcrossing in Livermore to the San Ramon / Foothill Road overcrossing in Dublin / Pleasanton. The project will also provide an auxiliary lane from Vasco Road to First Street; First Street to North Livermore Avenue; North Livermore Avenue to Isabel Avenue; and from Airway Boulevard to Fallon Road and will rehabilitate the existing pavement. The widening of the Arroyo Las Positas Creek Bridges has been included in Segment 3 of Eastbound HOV Lane Project in order to avoid conflict during construction between contractors. The westbound project will be constructed in two separate construction contracts:

- An East Segment from Greenville Road to Isabel Avenue, and
- A West Segment from Isabel Avenue to San Ramon/Foothill Road.

The total cost of the I-580 Westbound HOV Project is \$145.2M. The project is funded from local, state and federal funds. California Transportation Commission allocated \$101.7M CMIA, \$29.4M SHOPP and \$10.0M TCRP funds at their April, May and September 2012 meetings. Both CMIA and SHOPP allocations were adjusted to reflect bid savings at contract award. See Attachment B for detailed project funding and financial status.

Design and right-of-way acquisition work for both segments was completed in May 2012. The bids for the western segment were opened on August 29, 2012; the apparent low bidder was DeSilva Gates Construction with a bid 23.32% below Engineer's Estimate. The bids for the eastern segment were opened on September 19, 2012; the apparent low bidder was Ghilotti Construction Company with a bid 16.33% below Engineer's Estimate. The west segment contract was awarded October 29, 2012 and the east segment contract was awarded on November 20, 2012. Construction activity began in March 2013.

Benefits

The I-580 Eastbound HOV Project has reduced peak period congestion and delay by providing a new HOV lane for carpooling motorists and transit riders. The I-580 Westbound HOV Project will complement the newly completed eastbound HOV lane and provide similar benefits. The new lane aims to encourage ridesharing and transit use and to reduce the number of single occupant vehicles on the mainline. AUX lanes are designed to improve highway operations by separating vehicle on and off movements on the mainline from the faster moving through traffic lanes. This project will support regional air quality attainment goals by reducing the numbers of automobiles in use and idling in traffic. It will also improve safety for motorists and maintenance workers by providing adequate inside and outside shoulders where possible, allowing a refuge area for disabled vehicles and improving accessibility for the California Highway Patrol (CHP) and emergency and maintenance vehicles.

Fiscal Impact

This item is for information only. There is no fiscal impact at this time.

Attachment(s)

Attachment A:	I-580 Eastbound HOV Lane Project Monthly Progress Report
Attachment B:	I-580 Westbound HOV Lane Project Monthly Progress Report
Attachment C:	I-580 Corridor HOV Lane Projects – Location Map

This page intentionally left blank

ATTACHMENT A I-580 Eastbound HOV Lane Monthly Progress Report Through April 30, 2013

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Eastbound I-580 HOV Lane Project includes three segments: Segment 1, Segment 2 and Segment 3:

- Segment 1 HOV lane construction from Greenville Road to Portola Avenue.
- Segment 2 HOV lane construction from Portola Avenue to Hacienda Drive.
- Segment 3 Auxiliary (AUX) Lane from Hacienda Drive to Greenville Road. Project scope includes:
 - o Construction of AUX lanes from Isabel Avenue to First Street;
 - Pavement width necessary for a double high occupancy toll (HOT) lane facility;
 - Final lift of asphalt concrete (AC) pavement and striping for entire eastbound project limits from Hacienda Drive to Portola Avenue;
 - The soundwall that was deleted from the I-580/Isabel Avenue Interchange Project; and,
 - The widening of two bridges at Arroyo Las Positas in the eastbound direction.

CONSTRUCTION STATUS

Segment 1 - The HOV lane from Greenville Road to Portola Avenue was opened to traffic in October 2009. The construction contract of this segment was accepted on February 2, 2010.

Segment 2 - The HOV lane from Hacienda Drive to Portola Avenue was opened to traffic in November 2010. The construction contract was accepted on September 30, 2011.

Segment 3 – The Auxiliary Lane project from Hacienda Drive to Greenville Road was advertised on July 9, 2012 and bids were opened on October 5, 2012. The apparent low bidder was OC Jones & Sons with a bid 6.33% below the Engineer's Estimate. The contract was awarded to OC Jones & Sons by Caltrans on November 16, 2012. Caltrans is reviewing initial submittals and the contractor began construction activity in April 2013.

SEGMENT 3 ANTICIPATED CONSTRUCTION STAGING & TRAFFIC HANDLING

Construction activities are expected to include both day and night work; final construction staging sequence may change based on contractor's proposed plans. Significant work is involved in rehabilitating the existing pavement which requires closing traffic lanes. Due to heavy day time traffic volumes, closing traffic lanes will create considerable traffic delays. For this reason, pavement rehabilitation work can only be done during night time hours. Night work will include setting lane closures and shifting traffic lanes (placement of k-rail and striping work), existing pavement rehabilitation work (crack and seat, slab replacement and overlay) and electrical work. According to the approved lane closure charts by Caltrans, night work will occur between 9:00 PM and 4:00 AM. Lane closures are expected, but complete freeway closure is not

anticipated. Work within the median behind k-rail is expected as the first order of work and will occur during day time hours. In addition, all bridge work is expected to occur during day time hours. In cooperation with Alameda CTC, Caltrans will lead the public outreach effort; which is expected to occur following award of the construction contract.

FUNDING AND FINANCIAL STATUS

The I-580 Eastbound HOV is funded through federal, state and local funds.

Project	Funding Source (\$ x million)								
Phase	CMIA	RM2	TVTC	FED	SHOPP	Meas. B	Total		
PA&ED		1.54	0.64				2.18		
PS&E		1.38	0.92	0.23		0.07	2.60		
ROW		0.20	0.06			0.33	0.59		
Construct Cap	17.87	2.20			4.69	6.08	30.84		
Construct Sup	2.53	1.12				1.09	4.74		
TOTAL	20.40	6.44	1.62	0.23	4.69	7.57	40.95		
Total Project Cost: \$40.95 M									

I-580 Eastbound AUX Lane Project Funding Plan at Award - Segment 3

SCHEDULE STATUS

I-580 Eastbound AUX Lane Project Schedule - Segment 3

Project Approval	December 2011 (A)
RTL	May 2012 (A)
CTC Vote	May 2012 (A)
Begin Construction (Award)	November 2012 (A)
End Construction	November 2014 (T)

RECENT ACTIVITIES

Project was awarded on November 16, 2012.

UPCOMING ACTIVITIES

Construction activities began April 2013 with temporary striping and placement of safety barrier (k-rail).

ATTACHMENT B I-580 Westbound HOV Lane Monthly Progress Report Through April 30, 2013

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Westbound I-580 HOV Lane Project includes three segments: Segment 1, Segment 2 and Segment 3:

- Segment 1 East HOV Segment; project limits are Greenville Road to Isabel Avenue.
- Segment 2 West HOV Segment; project limits are from Isabel Avenue to San Ramon Road in Dublin.
- Segment 3 Eastbound bridge widenings at Arroyo Las Positas Creek. The project scope of this segment has been combined with, and will be delivered as part of, the Segment 3 contract for the Eastbound HOV Lane Project.

CONSTRUCTION STATUS

Segment 1(East Segment) – This project was advertised on July 16, 2012 and bids were opened on September 19, 2012. The apparent low bidder was Ghilotti Construction Company, Inc. with a bid 16.33% below Engineer's Estimate. The contract was awarded to Ghilotti Construction Company, Inc. by Caltrans on November 20, 2012. Caltrans is reviewing initial submittals and anticipates the contractor starting field work in April 2013.

Segment 2 (West Segment) – This project was advertised on June 25, 2012 and bids were opened on August 29, 2012. The apparent low bidder was DeSilva Gates Construction with a bid 23.32% below Engineer's Estimate. The contract was awarded to DeSilva Gates Construction by Caltrans on October 29, 2012. Caltrans is reviewing initial submittals and the contractor started construction activity in March 2013.

ANTICIPATED CONSTRUCTION STAGING & TRAFFIC HANDLING

Even though final construction staging sequence could change based on contractor's proposed plans, construction activities are expected to include both day and night work. Significant work is involved in rehabilitating the existing pavement which requires closing traffic lanes. Due to heavy day time traffic, closing traffic lanes will create significant traffic delays. As such pavement rehabilitation work can only be done during night time. Night work will include setting lane closures and shifting traffic lanes (placement of k-rail and striping work), existing pavement rehabilitation work (crack and seat, slab replacement and paving) and electrical work. According to the approved lane closure charts by Caltrans, night work will occur between 9:00 PM and 4:00 AM. Lane closures are expected but complete freeway closure is not anticipated. Work within the median behind k-rail is expected as first order of work and will occur during day time. All bridge work is expected during day time. In cooperation with Alameda CTC, Caltrans will lead the public outreach effort; which is expected to occur following award of the construction contracts.

FUNDING AND FINANCIAL STATUS

The I-580 Westbound HOV Lane Project is funded through federal, state, and local funds available for the I-580 Corridor. The total project cost is \$145.2M. The total programmed (committed) funding from federal, state and local sources is \$45.2M.

Project	Project Funding Source (\$ x million)								
Phase	CMIA	RM2	TCRP	FED	SHOPP	Meas. B	TVTC	TCRP	Total
								LONP	
PA&ED		4.44							4.44
PS&E		3.23		0.12		0.89	0.54		4.78
ROW		1.37							1.37
Const	35.34		5.92	6.19	13.54	0.96			61.95
Сар									
Const.	6.52		1.59			2.06		0.24	10.41
Sup									
Total	41.86	9.04	7.51	6.31	13.54	3.91	0.54	0.24	82.95
Total Project Cost: \$82.95 M									

I-580 Westbound HOV Lane Project Funding Plan At Award Segment 1 (East Segment)

Segment 2 (West Segment)

Project	Funding Source (\$ x million)							
Phase	CMIA	RM2	TCRP	FED	SHOPP	Meas. B	TVTC	Total
PA&ED		3.71						3.71
PS&E		2.71		0.10		0.73	0.46	4.00
ROW		1.12						1.12
Const	33.73		2.49		9.61			45.83
Сар								
Const.	6.75					0.88		7.63
Sup								
Total	40.48	7.54	2.49	0.10	9.61	1.61	0.46	62.29
Total Project Cost: \$62.29 M								

SCHEDULE STATUS

I-580 Westbound HOV Lane Project Schedule:

Segment 1 (East Segment):

Project Approval	January 2010 (A)
RTL	May 2012 (A)
CTC Vote	May 2012 (A)
Begin Construction (Award)	November 2012 (A)
End Construction	November 2014 (T)

Segment 2 (West Segment):

Project Approval	January 2010 (A)
RTL	April 2012 (A)
CTC Vote	April 2012 (A)
Begin Construction (Award)	October 2012 (A)
End Construction	November 2014 (T)

RECENT ACTIVITIES

- East Segment: Bids opened on September 19, 2012; construction contract awarded November 20, 2012. Construction activity began in April 2013.
- West Segment: Bids opened on August 29, 2012; construction contract awarded October 29, 2012. Construction activity began in March 2013.

UPCOMING ACTIVITIES

- East Segment: Construction activities include temporary striping, placement of temporary safety barrier and clearing the work area.
- West Segment: Construction activities include temporary striping, placement of temporary safety barrier and clearing the work area.

This page intentionally left blank

Attachment C





This page intentionally left blank



Memorandum

DATE: May 15, 2013

TO: Alameda County Transportation Commission

FROM: I-580 Express Lane Policy Committee

SUBJECT: I-580 Express (HOT) Lane Projects Monthly Progress Report

Recommendation

This item is for information only.

Summary

The Eastbound I-580 Express High Occupancy Toll (HOT) Lane Project will convert the newly constructed eastbound HOV lane, from Hacienda Drive to Greenville Road, to a double express lane facility. The I-580 Westbound Express High Occupancy Toll (HOT) Lane will convert the westbound HOV lane (currently under construction) to a single express lane facility from west of Greenville Road to west of the San Ramon Road/Foothill Road Overcrossing in Dublin/Pleasanton.

Both I-580 express lane projects are currently in the environmental phase which is forecast for completion in August 2013 and are scheduled to start construction immediately after the east and west segments of the I-580 Westbound HOV Lane and I-580 Eastbound Auxiliary Lane Projects are completed in 2014. These HOV lane projects will widen the freeway to provide the width needed for the express lane projects. The I-580 Eastbound and Westbound Express Lane Projects will construct the necessary infrastructure, such as signing, sign gantries for dynamic messaging and toll reading, electrical conduit for connecting power and communication sources, and striping to accommodate the express lanes. The System Integrator contractor will install the required communication equipment and software. The express lane facility will be open for use in 2015.

For detailed information on project funding, schedule and status of the Eastbound I-580 Express (HOT) Lane, Westbound I-580 Express (HOT) Lane and System Integration, see Attachments A, B and C of this report.

Discussion

Delivery Strategy

I-580 Eastbound Express (HOT) and I-580 Westbound Express (HOT) Projects will be combined into one construction project. This will reduce bid advertising and construction support costs

and minimize potential conflicts with two contractors performing work within the same project limits and median of the highway.

Staff continues to work with Caltrans to add strategic express lane project elements to the existing I-580 Westbound HOV and I-580 Eastbound Auxiliary Lane construction contracts via contract change order, where feasible. The benefit of this approach is to avoid additional traffic disruptions to the traveling public and reduce or eliminate re-work. Items under consideration to be included as contract change order work includes:

- Electrical Conduit across and along I-580
- Striping stripe to final HOT configuration
- Install K-rail along median at sign locations

"Near Continuous" Access Configuration Status

Staff is currently moving forward with the concept of a "near continuous" access configuration in lieu of "limited" access for the express lanes on the I-580 corridor. The "near continuous" (aka "more open") access configuration would eliminate the two foot buffer between the express lane and the general purpose lanes except at "hot spots" or "safety zones" such as between Hacienda and Fallon Road (eastbound) and Hacienda and I-680 (westbound). The project team is working on refining the traffic operations analysis for a "near continuous" access configuration. This process has required more work and time than originally anticipated; which will result in a delay in completion of the environmental phase of the two projects until approximately August 2013. The construction start date will not be delayed and is scheduled to start in fall 2014.

In addition, other project revisions are underway to implement the "near continuous" access concept including revisions to the toll systems software, changes to the location of the Dynamic Message Signs (DMS) and toll gantries, updating the Concept and Operations Plan and System Engineering and Management Plan, and analyzing zone tolling requirements.

Fiscal Impact

This item is for information only. There is no fiscal impact at this time.

Attachment(s)

Attachment A: I-580 Eastbound Express (HOT) Lane Project Monthly Progress Report Attachment B: I-580 Westbound Express (HOT) Lane Project Monthly Progress Report Attachment C: I-580 Express (HOT) Lanes System Integration Monthly Progress Report Attachment D: I-580 Corridor Express Lane Projects – Location Map

ATTACHMENT A I-580 Eastbound Express (HOT) Lane Project Monthly Progress Report Through April 30, 2013

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Eastbound I-580 Express or High Occupancy Toll (HOT) Lane Project will convert the newly constructed eastbound HOV lane, from Hacienda Drive to Greenville Road, to a double express lane facility which will include standard shoulder and lane widths where feasible.

PROJECT DELIVERY STATUS

The Environmental Phase for this project is underway as follows:

- Environmental studies are complete and the Initial Study and Environmental Assessment (IS/EA) is drafted and ready to circulate pending updating for changes to address "near continuous" access alternative and Caltrans approval of the Traffic Operational Analysis Report and Draft Project Report in June 2013. The estimated date of circulation of the draft IS/EA is June 2013. A 30 day public circulation period is required in addition to a public meeting expected in July 2013.
- Staff is working to coordinate with the three I-580 HOV lane projects currently in construction (I-580 Westbound HOV West Segment, I-580 Westbound HOV East Segment, I-580 Eastbound HOV Segment 3 Auxiliary Lanes) to add some express lane elements to the civil projects via contract change order (CCO). The following is a list of work under consideration to include by CCO:
 - Electrical Conduit across and along I-580
 - Striping stripe to final HOT configuration
 - Install K-rail along median at sign locations

POTENTIAL ISSUES/RISKS

- Funding Current funding shortfall to implement "near continuous" approach. (See "Funding & Financial Status" at the end of Attachment C).
- Schedule impacts –additional project delays to the environmental phase due to refinement of traffic analysis for "near continuous" access configuration and final agreement of the Design Exceptions. Staff anticipates working on design details for "near continuous" access (location and number of toll gantries, zone tolling requirements) concurrently with completing the overall civil design to avoid delays to the start of construction which is scheduled to start in 2014.

SCHEDULE STATUS

I-580 Eastbound Express (HOT) Lane Project Schedule:

Project Approval	August 2013
RTL	June 2014
Begin Construction	September 2014
End Construction	June 2015

RECENT ACTIVITIES

- Refining traffic studies for "near continuous" access alternative
- Updating the civil work cost estimate and System Integration scope & cost
- Discussing dynamic messaging and other sign plans with Caltrans to get their approval

UPCOMING ACTIVITIES

- Finalize Traffic Study refinements Target date June 2013
- Finalize Draft Project Report Target June 2013
- Circulate the Draft IS/EA for 30 day public comment working toward June 2013 circulation of document; dependent on completion of additional work for conversion to "near continuous" access. A public meeting will be held during the 30 day comment period
- Working toward environmental clearance and project approval by Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration by August 2013
- Determine items to be added to HOV lane projects via CCO Target date May 2013

ATTACHMENT B I-580 Westbound Express (HOT) Lane Monthly Progress Report Through April 30, 2013

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The I-580 Westbound Express or High Occupancy Toll (HOT) Lane Project will convert the planned westbound HOV lane to a single express lane facility on I-580 in Alameda County from west of the Greenville Road Undercrossing in Livermore to west of the San Ramon Road/ Foothill Road Overcrossing in Dublin/Pleasanton, a distance of approximately 14 miles.

PROJECT DELIVERY STATUS

The environmental phase for this project is underway as follows:

- Traffic studies are being updated to include an evaluation of the "near continuous" access alternative.
- The environmental document, a Categorical Exemption (CE), is being prepared and environmental studies are underway.
- A Supplemental Project Report is being reviewed by Caltrans.

POTENTIAL ISSUES/RISKS

- Funding there is a current funding shortfall. (See Funding & Financial Status at the end of Attachment C)
- Schedule impacts –There are some delays associated with completing the traffic studies for the "near continuous" access approach. The target date for completion of the environmental phase is currently June 2013. At this time, staff anticipates to work on design details for "near continuous" access (location and number of toll gantries) concurrently with completing the overall civil design to avoid delays to the start of construction which is scheduled for fall 2014

SCHEDULE STATUS

I-580 Westbound Express (HOT) Lane Project Schedule:

Project Approval	June 2013
RTL	December 2013
Begin Construction	September 2014
End Construction	June 2015

RECENT ACTIVITIES

- Environmental technical studies and completion of traffic studies (including "near continuous" access configuration) are underway
- Completion of geometrics and Supplemental Project Report (including Design Exceptions) are underway
- Discussing dynamic messaging and other sign plans with Caltrans for their approval.
- Traffic Operational Analysis Report (TOAR)

UPCOMING ACTIVITIES

- Supplemental Project Report Target date May 2013
- Draft Environnemental Document (CE) Target date May 2013
- Final environmental clearance Target date June 2013

ATTACHMENT C I-580 Express (HOT) Lanes Systems Integration Monthly Progress Report Through April 30, 2013

SYSTEM INTEGRATION SCOPE DESCRIPTION

The I-580 Express Lane civil work will construct the necessary infrastructure, such as signing, sigh gantries for dynamic messaging and toll reading, electrical conduit for connecting power and communication sources, and pavement striping to accommodate express lanes. The System Integrator will include tolling hardware design and software development, factory testing of design, equipment and system installation, and road geometry and toll system integration. It will also consist of field testing of the toll equipment and all subsystems including the interfaces to the BATA Regional Customer Service Center and Caltrans prior to implementing the new express lanes.

Detailed Discussion

The systems integration focuses on the most recent technologies including software, hardware and traffic detection that will be deployed to optimize the existing corridor capacity in order to effectively manage the current and forecasted traffic in the corridor. The system integrator, however, will continue to own the software while the implementing agency will pay for the use of license to allow for the usage of the toll integrator's software.

In March 2010, the Alameda CTC retained Electronic Transaction Consultants (ETC) Corporation as its Systems Integrator for implementation of the new electronic toll collection system for the I-580 Eastbound Express Lanes facility. ETC's system design progressed based on a limited access configuration; which is comprised of a total of five access locations: three exclusive ingress/egress and two combined ingress/egress locations. As discussed at the I-580 PAC meetings since November 2012, the agency and ETC staff have been working towards revising the contract requirements to revise the express lane access configuration from "limited" to a "near continuous" operating concept and include additional tasks for implementing the electronic toll collection system for the Westbound I-580 Express Lane. The civil/roadway work described above will be removed from the systems integration work. With the revisions to the consultant services agreement, ETC would be responsible for the toll system design, development, factory testing, installation, integration, field testing and operations and maintenance, for the new I-580 express lanes in both directions of travel.

The "near continuous" concept provides additional access opportunities while reducing the footprint required for implementing a shared express/general purpose lane facility. In addition, it looks and feels almost like an HOV facility and, therefore, would expect to provide driver familiarity.

Project Status

The following is a detailed discussion of the major activities that are either progressing or planned for in 2013:

Project Geometry and Electronic Toll System Design

The civil/roadway designers have developed geometry for the "near continuous" express lanes operating concept. Geometric development is an iterative process as it requires close coordination with the operational analysis and needs to address operational, safety and enforcement issues. The latest version of the express lanes concept proposes the following:

In the eastbound I-580 direction:

- Buffer separated single-lane HOV/Express Lane will be installed from Hacienda Drive to Fallon Road
- Continuous dual-lane HOV/Express Lane will be installed from Fallon Road to west of Vasco Road
- Continuous single-lane HOV/Express Lane will be installed from west of Vasco Road to Greenville Road

In the westbound I-580 direction:

- Continuous single-lane HOV/Express Lane will be installed from Greenville Road to Hacienda Drive
- A buffer separated single-lane HOV/Express Lane will be installed from Hacienda Drive to the I-580/I-680 Interchange

Additional coordination between the designers and Caltrans is necessary prior to finalizing the project geometry.

On a regular basis, the civil and toll system designers have been coordinating their designs and have determined the preliminary locations of the toll equipment, such as the Dynamic Message Signs (DMS), the toll antennas and readers. Final location of all of the express lanes related equipment will be determined based on Caltrans/Agency approval of project geometry. ETC staff will design the toll system software and hardware based on the identified new toll equipment locations, the power and communication sources, and the revised express lanes access configuration. ETC will also define the power and communication requirements for the electronic toll collection system design and provide this information to the civil/roadway design team for their power/communication design.

Traffic and Revenue Study

The travel demand forecast and toll revenue forecasts in both directions of the I-580 express lanes facility are being updated to reflect post-recession traffic numbers. In addition, the revenue model will incorporate the post-recession socio/economic conditions that have been experienced in the east county communities and the near continuous access concept.

While the "near continuous" access could potentially generate additional revenue, it might lead to an increase in revenue leakage due to challenges associated with enforcing express lane violations in a "continuous" express lane concept. Project staff is exploring an automated violation enforcement system concept to try and deter system violations, as described in subsequent sections of this memorandum.

Concept of Operations/System Engineering Management & Enforcement Plans

CDM Smith (formerly Wilbur Smith Associates) staff will be updating a concept of operations (Con Ops) plan and a system engineering management plan (SEMP) to reflect the changes described above These plans will outline the engineering process, the testing process, QA/QC guidelines, toll maintenance and operations requirements, and communication network requirements, etc. A System Enforcement plan needs to be developed by CDM Smith, utilizing electronic equipment to deter/minimize toll evasion/violation. A final SEMP will include both the Con Ops and the System Enforcement plan as appendices; which will require FHWA review and approval.

Software and hardware design

ETC will revise the Detailed Design Document (DDD) for the software and hardware development based on deploying a "near continuous" access express lane system. The designers will also revise the communication network and electrical power needs. ETC staff will then perform a series of factory and field tests and work with the agency staff to validate its hardware and software design, prior to opening the new express lanes facility.

Toll Pricing and Rate Publishing

As discussed in previous meetings, for practical purposes and to curtail toll violation, a zonebased toll pricing scheme likely will be implemented to effectively support the "near continuous" access configuration. The zone-based toll rates will be displayed to patrons via the DMSs. However, since the "near continuous" access approach is a new concept and first of its kind to be implemented in California, additional details for pricing and messaging will have to be analyzed and determined during the system design process, prior to finalizing the electronic toll collection and price-setting systems.

Toll Antennas, Readers and Violation Enforcement Subsystem

Closely spaced toll antennas and readers will help facilitate a "near continuous" access express lane configuration since it will lead to an effective FasTrak® transponder read. It should also support more effective toll violation enforcement. Various local and regional agencies are currently studying the potential effects of placing toll reader gantries at various intervals through the corridor, for example from ½ mile or 1 mile intervals, which is expected to effectively support a "near continuous" access express lane facility. While evaluating a preliminary project geometry and electronic toll collection system design, staff situated the toll gantries at approximately ³/₄ mile intervals. Efforts were made by the project design team to combine the tolling gantry and DMS locations at the same locations, for use in both directions of travel.

Since the "near continuous" access will employ an increased number of toll gantries (for readers), it will be difficult to enforce manual toll violation enforcement. Therefore, an automated toll violation enforcement system strategy will have to be designed and deployed to effectively manage the toll violation enforcement. The issues related to customer privacy, toll dispute resolution, customer service and issuance of automated violation tickets will have to be vetted to ensure that it can be implemented within the current California vehicle code and agency requirements. In addition, to enhance system violation detection, additional CCTV cameras and violation enforcement system (VES) cameras (for license plate capture) will need to be designed, developed, integrated into the toll system and installed.

LA Metro implemented switchable transponders when it opened its express lanes on I-110 and I-10. However, the switchable transponders are new to Bay Area toll customers. Therefore, the robust public education/outreach program that the agency plans to employ, at least a year prior to opening the facility, will have to include additional information about these toll transponders (i.e. how to obtain it, who needs to use it, how it works, how to reach customer service, etc.).

The Golden Gate Bridge Authority implemented another payment option, payment through payby-plate. The user will be required to open up an account to pay via their license plate. Our initial assessment indicates that this payment option is likely to encounter challenges since it will be difficult to distinguish the HOV and SOV users in an open/shared express lane facility, unless every vehicle is required to register as either an HOV or SOV vehicle. Staff will continue to evaluate and collaborate with other toll operators and report back to the committee on whether the I-580 Express Lanes will employ such payment option.

A Work Plan for the I-580 Express Lanes; presented in April 2013 I-580 PC meeting included a timeline for the approval of all toll policies and business operating rules, financial breakeven analysis, the SEMP; development of project delivery and financing strategies, completion of electronic toll system design, and development of a public education/outreach program. In addition, the policy matters/business rules will be discussed and adopted by the I-580 PC and Commission prior to implementation of the I-580 Express Lanes.

In summary, even though the "near continuous" access concept provides additional opportunities it is a relatively new concept for implementation in the region. Additional research, education and evaluation are necessary for effective implementation of such a concept for all future Alameda County Express Lanes, including the I-580 Express Lanes. Staff is committed to working closely with other likeminded agencies/industry experts to move forward and implement an effective electronic toll collection system strategy to effectively support a "near continuous" access express lane configuration.

SYSTEM INTEGRATION STATUS

- Alameda CTC and ETC staff have been working towards revising ETC contract requirements to revise the express lane access configuration from "limited" to a "near continuous" approach and include additional tasks for implementing the electronic toll collection system for the Westbound I-580 Express Lane.
- Express Lane sign plans have been submitted to Caltrans for their review and approval. Once the sign locations and other infrastructure elements are finalized, system design requirements will be developed.

RECENT ACTIVITIES

- Alameda CTC, URS, CDM Smith and ETC continue to discuss scope of System Integration work and ETC's proposal.
- Continue to work on "zone tolling", pricing and automated violation strategies.

UPCOMING ACTIVITIES

- Finalize contract negotiations with ETC Target date May 2013
- ETC contract amendment Target date June 2013 Commission Meeting
- Prepare Draft Concept Operations Plan Target date June 2013
- Prepare Draft System Engineering Management Plan Target date July 2013

FUNDING AND FINANCIAL STATUS

Combined Eastbound & Westbound Funding Plan for "near continuous" access

Project	Funding Source (\$ x million)									
Phase	ARRA	Federal Earmark	RM2	TVTC	TCRP Deferred	Local (Meas. B)	TBD	Total		
PA&ED			1.39	2.17	0.10			3.66		
PS&E			0.14	1.53	3.07			4.74		
Sys. Int.	7.50				1.00		8.80	17.30		
ROW				0.37				0.37		
Const. Support			0.60	0.71	0.50	0.78	1.48	4.07		
Construct Cap		1.00	1.92		1.33	0.69	19.42	24.36		
O&M						0.18	0.30	0.48		
TOTAL	7.50	1.00	4.05	4.78	6.0	1.65	30.00	54.98		
Total Project Cost: \$54.98 M										

Note: An additional funding shortfall of \$3M from the previous report is due to additional lighting required by Caltrans based on the Safety Review Committee's recommendations.

This page intentionally left blank


1-580 Corridor Express Lane Projects - Location Map

Page 31

This page intentionally left blank



Alameda CTC Meeting 05/23/13 Agenda Item 6D

1333 Broadway, Suites 220 & 300

Oakland, CA 94612

PH: (510) 208-7400

www.AlamedaCTC.org

Commission Chair Scott Haggerty, Supervisor - District 1 May 15, 2013

Commission Vice Chair Rebecca Kaplan, City of Oakland Councilmember

AC Transit Elsa Ortiz, Director

Alameda County

Supervisors Richard Valle - District 2 Wilma Chan - District 3 Nate Miley - District 4 Keith Carson - District 5

BART Thomas Blalock, Director

City of Alameda Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft, Vice Mayor

City of Albany Peggy Thomsen, Mayor

City of Berkeley Laurie Capitelli, Councilmember

City of Dublin Tim Sbranti, Mayor

City of Emeryville Ruth Atkin, Councilmember

City of Fremont Suzanne Chan, Councilmember

City of Hayward Marvin Peixoto, Councilmember

City of Livermore John Marchand, Mayor

City of Newark Luis Freitas, Councilmember

City of Oakland Larry Reid, Vice Mayor

City of Piedmont John Chiang, Mayor

City of Pleasanton Jerry Thorne, Mayor

City of San Leandro Michael Gregory, Vice Mayor

City of Union City Carol Dutra-Vernaci, Mayor

Executive Director Arthur L. Dao Steve Heminger, Executive Director Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Ezra Rapport, Executive Director Association of Bay Area Governments

101 8th Street Oakland, CA 94607

steve Elva

Dear Mr. Henninger and Mr. Rapport,

The Alameda CTC appreciates the opportunity to participate in the development of Plan Bay Area over the past two years and the opportunity to offer comments at this time. This letter only represents Alameda CTC staff's comments on Plan Bay Area and the Draft Environmental Impact Report. As such, this letter does not represent the comments of Alameda CTC's member jurisdictions and agencies, many of whom will submit their comments independently.

We first want to thank MTC and ABAG for their work with numerous stakeholders, the public, local jurisdictions and the county congestion management agencies in developing the Draft Plan. The process has involved consultation with both standing and ad-hoc committees and frequent participation from the CMAs and other stakeholders. Because the CMAs are governed by elected officials, on-going, direct consultation between the regional agencies and CMAs has been and remains a critical component to developing and implementing the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in a way that best represents the Bay Area electorate.

Because the Draft Plan was developed in close coordination with elected officials, agency and jurisdiction staff, as well as other community stakeholders, Alameda CTC staff's comments on the Draft Plan focus only on the need to further define certain investment and implementation strategies. Staff supports the adoption of the Project (e.g., the Jobs-Housing Connection alternative that forms the basis of Draft Plan Bay Area), which has been developed with significant public and stakeholder input and incorporates the programs and projects from the Alameda CTC's Countywide Transportation Plan and Transportation Expenditure Plan. The Project Alternative is also consistent with Alameda CTC's current transportation policies, goals and objectives.

We want to reiterate the important role that the Express Lane Network plays in enabling the region to provide a complete high occupancy vehicle lane network that will facilitate and enable the expansion of express bus service, which may be funded with net revenues from the Express Lane Program. It will also be important to ensure that the planning and implementation of the Express Lane Program is done in coordination with other transportation plans and programs, and that a comprehensive approach be undertaken in the corridors for which Express Lanes are planned. Lastly, we have forwarded some minor corrections to the description of the Regional Express Lane Network (Chapter 4 on pages 80 and 81) to MTC staff and recommend that they be reviewed by the MTC Express Lane team and updated accordingly.

We note that the Draft Plan does not include an investment strategy specifically focused on goods movement, a major function of the region's transportation network and a critical component of the Bay Area's economy. In light of on-going planning activities and potential funding opportunities at the federal and state levels, we recommend that critical infrastructure improvements and programs that support goods movement be called out in Plan Bay Area and that as part of the next RTP a more comprehensive goods movement strategy be developed, including land use considerations related to goods storage and movement. Alameda CTC is about to initiate development of a Countywide Goods Movement Plan that will identify priority projects and programs and inform the next CWTP and RTP.

While the Plan has made significant progress in meeting new state mandates to link land use and transportation investment, reduce greenhouse gases and house the region's population, there are a number of issues we look forward to working with MTC and ABAG on improving in the next RTP as noted below:

- It is noted that the regional population, housing and jobs growth numbers and distribution used in Draft Plan Bay Area are consistent with those adopted in the Final Jobs-Housing Connections Strategy adopted in May 2012. However, for the next update of the Plan, careful comparison of actual development patterns to the projections over the next four years should be done. Alameda CTC looks forward to working with Alameda County jurisdictions and the regional agencies in updating and refining these projections as additional data is collected and evaluated over the next several years.
- We look forward to working with MTC and ABAG on further developing and implementing the policy initiatives outlined in Investment Strategy 6 beginning on page 84. It will be important to work together to define roles and responsibilities for implementation and to engage the public as programs and policies are further defined.
- We look forward to working with MTC to further define priorities and funding within the Freeway Performance Initiative (FPI), especially as it relates to the development of the Express Lane system and arterial management. We also note that the DEIR states (on page 2.1-33) that the FPI will be expanded to focus heavily on signal coordination along congested arterials; however, the discussion of the FPI within the Draft Plan did not specifically identify this. We are pleased to see that the FPI continues to include the Program for Arterial Signal Synchronization (PASS) under Arterial Management. PASS, through signal re-timing and signal prioritization, benefits all modes and reduces greenhouse gas emissions, and therefore supports both regional and local objectives addressing climate change and complete streets. However, the scope of the current PASS program is limited and covers only 500 signals across the region annually. Considering the significant number of traffic signals in the region (on the order of approximately 10,000) and the cost effectiveness of the PASS program, we recommend increased funding for this program in this RTP cycle, which will result in improved coordination in arterial management and increased benefits to all roadway users.
- There are a number of implementation issues that the local jurisdictions, CMAs and regional agencies will need to work together to further address, including:

- The provision of detailed technical guidance on best management practices for mitigating air quality impacts, climate adaptation and sea level rise, and earthquake mitigation and recovery.
- Guidance on implementation of permit/entitlement streamlining, including use of CEQA streamlining and exemptions that can facilitate infill development and the provision of infrastructure in Priority Development Areas (PDAs).
- Securing adequate funding for public services and infrastructure necessary to support housing and job growth and create complete communities in Priority Development Areas.

Regarding the alternatives analyzed in the DEIR:

- The differences between the Project and the other alternatives analyzed in the DEIR are relatively minimal. However, Alternatives 4 and 5 contain provisions that are unachievable or would be extremely difficult if not impossible to implement within the timeframe given for achieving the initial greenhouse gas reduction target (2020).
- The No Project Alternative is not a viable option due to the fact that the region is required to adopt an SCS that achieves the greenhouse gas reduction targets identified by the California Air Resources Board.
- The Project represents the one alternative that is the most vetted and understood by Bay Area residents, the most consistent with local and countywide plans, and the most comprehensive in addressing the needs of all modes and users while remaining environmentally sound and beneficial.

We appreciate the tremendous effort that MTC and ABAG have made to develop the region's first SCS, and we look forward to continuing to work closely with the regional agencies as we move forward with implementation of the SCS and RTP.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR L. DAO Executive Director

Alameda CTC Commissioners
 Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee
 Beth Walukas, Deputy Director of Planning, Alameda CTC
 Tess Lengyel, Deputy Director of Policy, Public Affairs and Legislation
 Ken Kirkey, Director of Planning, MTC
 Miriam Chion, Planning and Research Director, ABAG
 Carolyn Clevenger, MTC EIR Project Manager

This page intentionally left blank



Memorandum

DATE: May 15, 2013

TO: Alameda County Transportation Commission

FROM: Planning, Policy and Legislation Committee

SUBJECT: Congestion Management Program (CMP): Summary of the Alameda CTC's Review and Comments on Environmental Documents and General Plan Amendments

Recommendation

This item is for information only.

Summary

This item fulfills one of the requirements under the Land Use Analysis Program (LUAP) element of the Congestion Management Program (CMP). As part of the LUAP, Alameda CTC is required to review Notices of Preparations (NOPs), General Plan Amendments (GPAs), and Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) prepared by local jurisdictions and comment on them regarding the potential impact of proposed land development on the regional transportation system.

Since the last monthly update on April 8, 2013, staff reviewed one NOP. The comment letter is attached.

Attachment(s)

Attachment A:

Comment letter for City of Fremont Notice of Preparation of a Draft Program Environmental Impact Report for the Warm Springs/South Fremont Community Plan This page intentionally left blank

10



1333 Broadway, Suites 220 & 300

Oakland, CA 94612

PH: (510) 208-7400

www.AlamedaCTC.org

April 22, 2013

Kelly Diekmann Principal Planner City of Fremont Community Development Department 39550 Liberty Street, P.O. Box 5006 Fremont, CA 94537-5006

SUBJECT: Comments on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Warm Springs South Fremont Community Plan

Dear Mr. Dickmann,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Warm Springs South Fremont Community Plan.

The approximately 850 acre project area is bounded by State Route 262 (Mission Boulevard) to the south, I-880 to the west, I-680 to the east, and Auto Mall Parkway to the north. The Community Plan facilitates and employment based TOD plan around the new Warm Springs South Fremont BART station. The existing area has a substantial job base of approximately 15,000 industrial and commercial jobs and no residential development. The proposed project identifies potential new and redevelopment of property to accommodate an additional 10,000 to 20,000 jobs and 4,000 housing units. Development throughout the study area will generally be characterized as residential development between 30-70 units per acre with mixed-use retail potential and with commercial uses ranging from hotels, light industrial, R&D and Class A office nearest the BART station. The plan will include associated infrastructure improvements and public facility needs, as well as transportation and circulation network improvements.

The Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) respectfully submits the following comments:

• The City of Fremont adopted Resolution No. 8336 on July 7, 1992 establishing guidelines for reviewing the impacts of local land use decisions consistent with the Alameda County Congestion Management Program (CMP). It appears that the proposed project will generate at least 100 p.m. peak hour trips over existing conditions, and therefore the CMP Land Use Analysis Program requires the City to conduct a traffic analysis of the project using the Countywide Transportation Demand Model. The analysis should study conditions in years 2020 and 2035. Please note the following paragraph as it discusses the responsibility for modeling.

• The CMP was amended on March 26th, 1998 so that local jurisdictions are responsible for conducting travel model runs themselves or through a consultant. The Alameda CTC has a Countywide Travel Demand model that is available for this purpose. The City of Fremont and the Alameda CTC signed a Countywide Model Agreement on April 1, 2008. Before the model can be used for this project, a letter must be submitted to the Alameda CTC requesting use of the model and describing the project. A copy of a sample letter agreement is available upon request.

The most current version of the Alameda CTC Countywide Travel Demand Model is the August 2011 update, which incorporates the Association of Bay Area Government's Projections 2009 land use assumptions.

- The DEIR should address all potential impacts of the project on the Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS) roadway and transit systems. MTS roadway facilities in the project area include Interstate 880, Interstate 680, Mission Boulevard, Auto Mall Parkway, Warm Springs Boulevard, and Fremont Boulevard. MTS transit operators include BART and AC Transit.
 - Potential impacts of the project must be addressed for 2020 and 2035 conditions.
 - Please note that the Alameda CTC has *not* adopted any policy for determining a threshold of significance for Level of Service for the Land Use Analysis Program of the CMP. Professional judgment should be applied to determine the significance of project impacts (Please see chapter 6 of 2011 CMP for more information).
 - For the purposes of CMP Land Use Analysis, 2000 Highway Capacity Manual is used to study impacts on roadway segments.
- The adequacy of any project mitigation measures should be discussed. On February 25, 1993, the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (predecessor to the Alameda CTC) Board adopted three criteria for evaluating the adequacy of DEIR project mitigation measures:
 - Project mitigation measures must be adequate to sustain CMP service standards for roadways and transit;
 - Project mitigation measures must be fully funded to be considered adequate;
 - Project mitigation measures that rely on state or federal funds directed by or influenced by the CMA must be consistent with the project funding priorities established in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) section of the CMP or the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

The DEIR should include a discussion of the adequacy of proposed mitigation measure criteria discussed above. In particular, the DEIR should detail when proposed roadway or transit route improvements are expected to be completed, how they will be funded, and the effect on LOS if only the funded portions of these projects were assumed to be built prior to project completion.

• Potential impacts of the project on CMP transit levels of service must be analyzed. (See 2011 CMP, Chapter 4). Transit service standards are 15-30 minute headways for bus service and 3.75-15 minute headways for BART during peak hours. The DEIR should address the

issue of transit funding as a mitigation measure in the context of the Alameda CTC mitigation measure criteria discussed above.

- The DEIR should also consider Travel Demand Management (TDM) related strategies that are designed to reduce the need for new roadway facilities over the long term and to make the most efficient use of existing facilities (see 2011 CMP, Chapter 5). The DEIR should consider the use of TDM measures, in conjunction with roadway and transit improvements, as a means of attaining acceptable levels of service. Whenever possible, mechanisms that encourage ridesharing, flextime, transit, bicycling, telecommuting and other means of reducing peak hour traffic trips should be considered. The Site Design Guidelines Checklist may be useful during the review of the development proposal. A copy of the checklist is enclosed.
- The DEIR should consider opportunities to implement and enhance countywide bicycle and pedestrian routes identified in the Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans, which were approved in October 2012. The approved Countywide Bike Plan and Pedestrian Plan are available at http://www.alamedactc.org/app_pages/view/5275.
- For projects adjacent to state roadway facilities, the analysis should address noise impacts of the project. If the analysis finds an impact, then mitigation measures (i.e., soundwalls) should be incorporated as part of the conditions of approval of the proposed project. It should not be assumed that federal or state funding is available.
- Local jurisdictions are encouraged to consider a comprehensive Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Program, including environmentally clearing all access improvements necessary to support TOD development as part of the environmental documentation.
- Portions of the Project Area overlap with the Warm Springs Priority Development Area. As such, the zoning districts and General Plan Amendments produced from this planning effort should consider the land use assumptions being adopted by the Association of Bay Area Government/Metropolitan Transportation Commission as part of the Sustainable Communities Strategy/Regional Transportation Plan in July 2013.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this Notice of Preparation. Please do not hesitate to contact me at (510) 208-7405 or Matthew Bomberg of my staff at (510) 208-7444 if you require additional information.

Sincerely,

3 Walntas

Beth Walukas Deputy Director of Planning

Cc: Matthew Bomberg, Assistant Transportation Planner File: CMP – Environmental Review Opinions – Responses - 2013 This page intentionally left blank



Memorandum

DATE: May 15, 2013

TO: Alameda County Transportation Commission

FROM: Planning, Policy and Legislation Committee

SUBJECT: Approval of Countywide Transportation Demand Management Strategy and Review of the Annual Evaluation of the Guaranteed Ride Home Program

Recommendation

It is recommended the Commission approve the recommendations for implementing a countywide Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Strategy (Attachment A) and review the Annual Evaluation Report for the Guaranteed Ride Home (GRH) Program (Attachment B).

Summary

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs offer a cost-effective approach to reducing traffic congestion and vehicle miles traveled. Because of their significant benefits, they are a statutorily required component of the Congestion Management Program (CMP). Consequently, the Alameda CTC has a long history of promoting, supporting and providing TDM programs and activities in Alameda County in fulfillment of the CMP requirements. Although the Guaranteed Ride Home (GRH) Program has been the only officially sponsored TDM program, the Alameda CTC has conducted a number of pilot TDM programs and has provided consistent support for the countywide bicycle and pedestrian program and Safe Routes to Schools.

The 2011 CMP and the 2012 Countywide Transportation Plan (CWTP) identified the need for the Alameda CTC to develop a more comprehensive approach to TDM and parking management, as have recommendations from recent evaluations of the GRH Program. In conjunction with the GRH Program Annual Evaluation, staff, with consultant assistance from Nelson/Nygaard, have developed a proposed Countywide TDM Strategy (Attachment A) that provides an inventory of the broad range of TDM programs and activities already present in Alameda County and recommends a strategy for better integrating, supporting and building on these exiting efforts, including implementation of the regional commute benefit program and the GRH Program.

While many TDM programs are most effective when administered and implemented at a local level, some programs, such as the regional 511 Rideshare program and the GRH Program are most effective when implemented at a larger geographic scale. The Alameda County GRH Program gives commuters who rideshare, take transit, walk, or bicycle an "insurance policy" against being stranded

at work if they need to make an unscheduled return trip home. The GRH Program is an important complement to other TDM efforts because it enables employees to take alternative modes when they might not otherwise view them as viable options. In recognition of the critical support GRH programs provide, nearly every county in the Bay Area offers one.¹

Comments from PPLC and ACTAC

The following comments were received from PPLC at its May 13, 2013 meeting:

- Alameda CTC should develop a "wish list" of the various types of TDM programs that should be expanded countywide, including bike stations, bicycle sharing, car sharing, and transit pass programs (like the AC Transit EasyPass program).
- Alameda County is a hub for numerous governmental agencies. Alameda CTC should explore opportunities to expand the AC Transit EasyPass program to this set of employees and employers in particular.
- Continue to improve employer/employee outreach for the GRH program. Human resources staff in particular has the ability to inform employees about the program and other TDM options.

The following comments were received from ACTAC at its May 7, 2013 meeting:

- Alameda CTC can help local jurisdictions coordinate with transit providers in neighboring counties (Contra Costa, San Joaquin, Santa Clara).
- There are a broad range of actions/programs that qualify as TDM and that should be considered in terms of meeting any potential TDM requirements.
- Before new transportation management agencies can be formed, it will be necessary to first facilitate job growth in some jurisdictions; for these jurisdictions, economic development is a key priority and assistance is needed in realizing the level of job growth projected as part of the Draft Plan Bay Area.
- There is a need for technical and/or financial assistance with initiating or expanding certain programs such as car sharing.
- Alameda CTC can assist with disseminating information as to what other cities in Alameda County or the region are doing with regard to innovative or best practices; Alameda CTC can also provide technical assistance with implementation of new TDM programs/efforts.
- Transit passes, such as AC Transit's EasyPass program, can be an important component of TDM programs.
- TDM programs and activities may potentially be eligible for future state GHG cap and trade revenues.

Discussion

TDM programs address congestion and mobility by focusing on changing the demand for singleoccupancy vehicle travel. Research shows that TDM and parking management have had demonstrable success in influencing people's travel choices and behaviors, thereby reducing vehicle trips, congestion, and vehicle emissions, while improving mobility, accessibility, and the efficiency of local and regional transportation networks.

The most effective TDM programs include some form of financial incentive, either through pricing parking or subsidizing transit and other non-drive alone modes. Furthermore, the more robust the

¹ 511 Rideshare Commute Rewards – County Rewards, <u>http://rideshare.511.org/rewards/county_benefits.aspx</u>, accessed April 25, 2013.

offerings in a TDM program, the more likely an individual is to find an alternative mode and incentive that matches his or her unique travel needs and constraints. For example, a TDM program that includes subsidized transit passes, vanpools, bicycling incentives, and a guaranteed ride home program has greater potential to reduce vehicle trips than any one of those measures alone. TDM programs also leverage existing transportation capital, operating and programmatic investments, particularly those in high-occupancy vehicle lanes and transit, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities and programs.

Countywide TDM Strategy Recommendations

This is an opportune time to reconsider TDM in Alameda County and develop a more comprehensive Countywide TDM Strategy. The 2012 CWTP for the first time had to respond to new statewide policy mandates designed to promote sustainability and reduce carbon emissions through strengthened linkages between transportation investment decisions and land use patterns. TDM and parking management were two of the core issue areas that were called out for further investigation in the implementation steps for this CWTP.

In addition, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) are currently in the process of implementing a Regional Commute Benefit Ordinance (Senate Bill 1339) that will apply to all Bay Area employers with 50 or more employees. This provides Alameda CTC with a timely opportunity to consider how the agency's efforts can support and complement this legislation through a more comprehensive TDM strategy.

The following considerations were instrumental in developing the recommendations included in the Countywide TDM Strategy:

- Alameda CTC must ensure that it is not duplicating services already being offered. There is a broad range of existing TDM programs in Alameda County. Many cities already have TDM and parking management programs; a number of employers, transportation management associations and other institutions provide shuttles; BART provides secure bicycle parking; and AC Transit offers a discounted bulk transit pass program. In particular, many of the efforts that are commonly offered at the county level (beyond GRH), such as ride sharing and vanpool resources, are already provided by MTC.
- Alameda CTC's ability to impose TDM requirements is limited as are local resources to comply with new requirements. Consequently, countywide TDM strategies should emphasize a voluntary approach to implementation. CMAs do not have the authority to impose TDM requirements in the same way that cities or TMAs do. Alameda CTC's primary authority is the "power of the purse string" as it can impose conditions and performance objectives on projects funded through Measure B and some regional funds. The agency does have some limited leverage to impose requirements on cities and new developments through the Congestion Management Program and LOS Monitoring program. There is a limit to the number of requirements/conditions that can be attached to funding, and Alameda CTC does not want to overburden local jurisdictions when they have limited resources. These constraints are reflected in the current Alameda CTC programs which are focused on providing value-added incentives like GRH, bike promotion, and technical assistance rather than imposing new requirements.
- Many TDM programs are simply more appropriate and effective to provide at the local level. Typically, parking policies are set by individual jurisdictions under their land use authority and are tailored for each city to meet its unique needs. TDM strategies are also

commonly implemented at the local level as cities have the power to mandate TDM as part of trip reduction ordinances or conditions of approval for new development. TMAs and employers (and sometimes housing developments) are the other primary implementers of TDM as they have direct access to large groups of employees (and residents) and often are required or internally motivated to reduce trips. Alameda County is large and diverse, so it is difficult to implement countywide programs that are applicable to the entire county. The Alameda CTC's strategy should focus on sponsoring programs that are most effectively delivered at the county level and work to support and encourage cities and private organizations to provide programs that are most effectively delivered at the local level.

Considering these factors, the primary goal of an expanded Alameda CTC TDM program should be supporting and incentivizing cities and employers to implement more robust TDM and parking management strategies at the local level. There are a number of ways that this can be done, building on the agency's existing efforts:

- 1. Update the TDM Chapter of the Congestion Management Program: The current update of Alameda CTC's Congestion Management Program (CMP) should include an update of the TDM chapter to provide a comprehensive menu of TDM activities that can be used to reduce automobile trips as well as the relative trip reduction impacts of different strategies that is tailored to the different needs of jurisdictions in the county.
- 2. Encourage Formation of new TMAs and Strengthening of Existing TMAs: TMAs are an effective mechanism to reduce traffic congestion and improve use of non-drive alone modes by employees and sometimes residents. Alameda CTC should support creation of new TMAs in Alameda County and strengthening of existing TMAs. This could constitute financial support as well as resources such as a "how to" handbook.
- 3. Develop a comprehensive TDM clearinghouse and other TDM informational resources: Alameda CTC should host a user-friendly website that inventories the full range of TDM programs available in Alameda County and describes research-based best practices. This type of resource would help city staff, individual residents and employees, and other agencies and organizations to better understand the range of available programs as they pursue enhancements to their own TDM programs and would enable better coordination between programs. An enhanced information program could also be used to assist cities in developing informational and educational printed and web materials tailored to local circumstances.
- 4. **Provide technical assistance:** Alameda CTC should expand its technical assistance program to support jurisdictions in implementing parking reforms and TDM policies and programs. This is appropriate for implementation at the countywide level and is a role that the Alameda CTC is uniquely well positioned to carry out. Technical support for jurisdictions can take two primary forms:
 - a. Technical Resources: Providing informational materials, case studies and examples, model ordinance language, and other guidelines and information that can assist jurisdictions in implementing parking and TDM policies.
 - b. Planning Grants: Providing funds to cities to conduct studies and other planning efforts to overcome local parking and TDM challenges and move forward on adoption of parking management and TDM programs and policies potentially including formation of new TMAs. Alameda CTC has already expanded its TOD technical assistance program into a "Sustainable Communities Technical

Assistance Program" (SC-TAP) to support a wide range of planning and project development activities in PDAs.

- 5. **Provide a robust Guaranteed Ride Home Program:** GRH is a critical safety net to support other TDM programs in Alameda County. GRH is most appropriately funded and administered at the countywide level, thus Alameda CTC should continue to administer GRH.
- 6. Potentially adopt future TDM/parking funding requirements: For future funding cycles, Alameda CTC should consider making local adoption of parking and transportation demand management policies an important factor in prioritizing and funding projects and/or in future updates to program funding agreements. Requiring or incentivizing city TDM programs would increase the strength and coverage of TDM countywide, but would have to be carefully implemented to allow for diversity across the county and to ensure that requirements are not overly burdensome.

Findings of the 2012 GRH Program Evaluation and Implementation of Prior GRH Program Recommendations

The GRH program is one of many TDM programs in Alameda County that aim to reduce strains on existing roadway and parking capacity without engaging in expensive capacity additions. While GRH is one of many programs that seek to shift demand to alternative transportation modes, it is unique in that it is the only program that provides a vital safety net for other commute alternatives, thereby making their use possible and leveraging investments that have already been made.

The Alameda County GRH program has been in operation since April 9, 1998. Over the last 15 years, the program has matured from a demonstration program with a handful of participating employers to a robust one with 5,104 registered employees and 282 active registered employers throughout Alameda County. The Alameda County GRH program is funded entirely through grants from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA).

Alameda CTC GRH program enrollment increased from 4,800 to 5,100 in 2012. The program added 34 new employers in 2012 to reach 282 establishments. These figures both represent the highest levels in the program's 15 year history. Program enrollees live predominantly in Alameda and Contra Costa County, but a substantial number also live in San Joaquin, Stanislaus, San Francisco, and Solano Counties. Fifty-one rides were taken in 2012, a slight increase over 2011, but about half as many as in 2008. The most common reasons for taking rides were personal illness and unscheduled overtime.

The annual program evaluation included surveys of both employers and employees. The surveys are designed to elucidate how effective the GRH program is in encouraging alternative mode use, the nature of overall commuting behavior (as opposed to the commutes of those who actually need to take emergency rides), as well as the quality of program support, customer service, marketing, etc. The surveys achieved response rates of 15% and 23% of employees and employers, respectively.

Major findings from the employee survey include:

- Most (59%) respondents cite the GRH program as at least somewhat important in their decision to not drive alone to work
- A significant number of respondents indicate that in the absence of GRH they would commute using alternative modes less frequently (25%) or not at all (9%)
- Customer service including the telephone hotline and printed materials are rated highly

- Most participants find out about GRH through an employer representative (49%), an on-site posting (11%), or a co-worker (16%)
- Most participants register online (54%)

Major findings from the employer survey include:

- A very large majority of employer representatives (85%) identify participation in the GRH program as important in encouraging alternative mode commuting
- Almost all employer representatives find their workload "manageable" or claim that they "could do more work if needed."
- Almost all employers (92%) inform new employees about the GRH program during benefits enrollment; employers are slightly less likely (73%) to remind current employees about the program, and usually do so through email and word of mouth.
- Employer representatives identify internal marketing through employer contacts as the most effective marketing strategy
- The customer service and GRH website were both rated highly by employer representatives.

Results from the employee evaluation survey are used to obtain an estimate of how many solo driving trips the GRH program contributes to the reduction of. This estimation is performed by using survey data on frequency of solo driving before and after GRH enrollment and average commute distance which are then extrapolated to all program participants. The results of this estimation, which is performed according to TFCA guidelines, are that the GRH program contributes to:

- 167,961 drive alone round trips reduced
- 3,300 tons of CO2 not emitted
- \$1 million in annual savings on gas expenditures

The previous 2011 Program Evaluation Report identified four key recommendations for program improvements in 2012. GRH staff worked to implement these recommendations as detailed below.

1. Initiate new program efficiencies, such as updating website to include links to alternative travel modes, establishing online ride vouchers, and using social media.

GRH staff completely redesigned the 15 year old website to improve the look and make updating easier faster, and less costly, and include links to other transportation options in Alameda County. GRH staff performed exploratory research regarding online voucher options leading to a new recommendation below. Finally, GRH staff worked with Alameda CTC staff to develop a marketing plan that emphasizes increased engagement with other ongoing Alameda CTC marketing activities and launched social media activities in early 2013. New marketing tactics will be more cost-effective as they are less labor-intensive, and should also increase program visibility.

2. Focus new marketing on increasing awareness of the availability of the GRH Program to all employers in Alameda County, regardless of size; and continue to expand the program's reach to underserved areas, such as South and Central County. This includes using creative outreach and education strategies, such as co-marketing.

GRH staff worked with chambers of commerce and created press releases to effectively market the program throughout the county to all employers regardless of size. As a result, employer enrollment increased in both South and Central County, including new employers joining in Hayward, San Leandro, and Fremont. GRH staff employed co-marketing including working with the Alameda CTC *Ride, Stride, Arrive* campaign and with the AC Transit EasyPass program.

3. Continue to manage the existing program, provide customer support and services, and monitor and report program use and effectiveness.

GRH staff continued ongoing administrative responsibilities, including engaging a subcontractor to reduce database maintenance related costs. GRH staff responded to inquiries and monitored and reported on the program on a monthly basis.

4. Submit recommendations for next steps for the GRH program, subject to approval by Board.

GRH staff developed a series of recommendations in the context of the Alameda CTC's Comprehensive TDM Strategy, as summarized in the following section.

Recommendations for GRH Program Improvements in 2013

The 2012 GRH Program Evaluation Report identifies a series of recommendations for improving the GRH program. These recommendations are consistent with the Comprehensive TDM Strategy and aim to move GRH into a new era of increased ease of use, higher visibility, and better coordination with other TDM activities in Alameda County. Recommendations include:

1. Investigate feasibility of transitioning from the current paper voucher system to either an online voucher system or a reimbursement system and implement appropriate solution.

Moving away from the current paper vouchers holds great promise to increase ease of use for GRH participants, reduce administrative costs, and improve program tracking and security. As a first step towards a possible transition, GRH staff performed a peer review of other GRH programs and contacted vendors of software that could host online voucher or reimbursement system. It is recommended that, as a next step, GRH staff use this information to determine if transition is feasible for the Alameda CTC in light of program budget, agency legal policies pertaining to dealing with taxi and rental car vendors, and possible future regional TDM integration considerations.

2. Update the current Access Database of employers and employees to a cloud-based database.

The current Access database system is unwieldy and lacks a user-friendly interface. It is recommended that if a new system is chosen for GRH (either online voucher system or reimbursement system), the GRH program database be updated to a cloud-based database to promote improved online user interface for registration and voucher distribution. The costs of a new database would be largely shared with the costs of transitioning away from paper vouchers.

3. Investigate changing GRH employee enrollment requirements such that being part of an employer with an Employer Representative is recommended but not required, and modify program if appropriate.

Currently, employees may only enroll in the GRH program if they belong to a registered employer with a designated Employer Representative. Employer Representatives, while helpful in a variety of ways, are not essential to program operations. The Employer Representative requirement is a barrier to immediate enrollment for employer from companies that are not yet registered and may be unfair to employees of smaller establishments where it is often harder to find someone to serve as an Employer Representative. It is recommended that GRH staff explore the feasibility of changing program rules and operations such that employees can join GRH even if their employer is not enrolled with a designated representative; such a change should continue to aim to recruit Employer Representatives for internal company marketing purpose, even if they will not be required. To some extent, the

7

usefulness of Employer Representatives depends on whether paper vouchers are in use, as a current function of representatives is holding and distributing emergency vouchers; thus, this recommendation should be coordinated with Recommendation 1.

4. Continue to enhance marketing and outreach through coordination with Alameda CTC for events, print, and social media marketing to promote the GRH program to employers and employees throughout Alameda County.

An updated Marketing Plan was developed in late 2012 and submitted to the Alameda CTC in January 2013. This Marketing Plan calls for additional co-marketing with the Alameda CTC that leverages the hundreds of events that the agency attends throughout the county. GRH staff will perform direct outreach (which tends to be costly) only at high profile, employee communication with major employers and program participants in a consistent but unobtrusive manner. Social media offers the promise of more regular visibility and engaging program participants to market to each other by sharing their anecdotes, experiences, etc. with the GRH community.

5. Expand the GRH program in Alameda County to include a countywide TDM "One-stopshop" Clearinghouse Website as part of the proposed Comprehensive TDM Program Approach recommendations.

GRH is a program that makes other TDM options like transit, shuttles, vanpooling, etc. viable, but it is not in and of itself a transportation option. Good alternative transportation options and other supportive incentives to use alternative transportation must be in place before GRH can reach its maximum potential. There are a number of other TDM programs that already exist in Alameda County with a range of providers including the region, cities, and employers. Unfortunately, centralized information about the range of TDM options in Alameda County is not easily available for users. It is recommended that the GRH Program be expanded to include a TDM information "One-stop-shop" clearinghouse.

The GRH website will be expanded to include information for employers and employees about TDM programs available in different parts of Alameda County. New printed materials would be given to people enrolled in GRH that further encourage use of more sustainable modes of transportation.

Fiscal Impacts

No fiscal impact is expected at this time. Costs for implementing recommendations for both the Countywide TDM Strategy and 2012 GRH Program Evaluation are being included in the upcoming FY 2013-2014 budget process.

Attachment(s)

Attachment A:	Alameda CTC Countywide TDM Strategy
Attachment B:	2012 Alameda CTC GRH Program Evaluation

8



Countywide TDM Strategy April 2013



Attachment A

Alameda County Transportation Commission 1333 Broadway, Suites 220 and 300 Oakland, CA 94612 www.AlamedaCTC.org

With staff assistance provided by Nelson\Nygaard

Page 51

Table of Contents

Page

Introduction	1
Why Now?	2
What is TDM?	2
Benefits/Effectiveness of TDM	8
Existing Alameda CTC TDM Programs	9
Prior TDM Recommendations	15
Alameda County TDM Program Inventory	17
State and Regional Programs	
City Programs	
Transit Agency Programs	
Private and Employer TDM Programs	30
Non-Governmental Organizations	32
Expanding Alameda CTC's TDM Program	
Update the TDM Chapter of the CMP	35
Strengthen Existing and Form New TMAs in Alameda County	35
TDM Clearinghouse and Informational Resources	
Technical Assistance	38
Guaranteed Ride Home Program	41
Potential Future Funding Requirements	41
Implementation Plan	43

Table of Figures

Figure 1	Overview of Types of TDM and Parking Strategies	4
Figure 2	Schools Participating in Alameda County Safe Routes to Schools (2011-12)	11
Figure 3	Ride into Life Advertisement	12
Figure 4	MTC 511.org Rideshare Website	19
Figure 5	Express Lanes for Carpools in the Bay Area	20
Figure 6	511 Bike Mapper	21
Figure 7	City Carshare and Zipcar Pods	23
Figure 8	Peer-to-Peer Carshare Vehicles Available in Alameda County through RelayRides	24
Figure 9	Existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans and Maps in Alameda County	28
Figure 10	Alameda CTC TDM Strategy Implementation Plan	44

Page

INTRODUCTION

The Alameda CTC has a long history promoting and providing Transportation Demand Management (TDM) in Alameda County. TDM is a statutorily required component of the Congestion Management Program (Section 65089 (b)(3) of the California Government Code) and has consequently been an important component of the Alameda CTC's role as the county's congestion management agency. To date, the Guaranteed Ride Home (GRH) program has been the only program officially described as an agency sponsored TDM program, but there are several other activities that promote reducing or managing demand for automobile travel that are sponsored by the Alameda CTC, such as the bicycle and pedestrian program and Safe Routes to Schools.

The Alameda CTC has long had a vision to expand its TDM program offerings and package all the services as a comprehensive countywide TDM program. Best practices show that TDM programs are more effective when implemented as a group. Some measures enhance the incentives provided by others, such as pricing parking and simultaneously subsidizing transit. Programs like GRH are explicitly designed to accompany other programs by providing an "insurance" plan against being stranded at work. The more robust the offerings in a TDM program, the more likely an individual is to find an alternative mode and incentive that matches his or her unique travel needs and constraints. For example, a TDM program that includes subsidized transit passes, vanpools, bicycling incentives, and a guaranteed ride home program, has greater potential to reduce vehicle trips than any one of those measures implemented by itself.

The importance and role of TDM in Alameda County and the need to develop a more comprehensive program has been articulated in the agency's planning documents for several years, and the CMP statute (California Government Code Section 65089 (b)(3)) requires a travel demand element that promotes alternative transportation methods. Recent planning documents that address TDM include the:

- 2012 Countywide Transportation Plan (CWTP)
- 2011 Transportation Demand Management and Parking Management Issue Paper (TDM Issue Paper)
- 2011 Countywide Transportation Plan/Transportation Expenditure Plan Briefing Book (CWTP/TEP Briefing Book)
- 2011 Congestion Management Program (CMP)
- Climate Action Plan inventory
- Performance Evaluation of the Alameda CTC Guaranteed Ride Home Program in recent years

This paper catalogs all the recommendations from these past plans and lays out a vision for how the Alameda CTC could move forward to meet these objectives. To determine the most appropriate roles and responsibilities for the agency, the paper inventories all of the Alameda CTC's current TDM efforts and other TDM efforts currently taking place in Alameda County (sponsored by jurisdictions, transit agencies, employers, etc.). The paper concludes with a set of recommended strategies for an expanded Alameda CTC TDM program and an approach for phased implementation.

WHY NOW?

This is an opportune time to reconsider TDM in Alameda County. Alameda CTC just completed the 2012 Countywide Transportation Plan (CWTP) in June of 2012. For the first time, the CWTP had to respond to new policy mandates designed to promote sustainability and reduce carbon emissions, most notably California Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32) and Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) which mandate reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled through strengthened linkages between transportation investment decisions and land use patterns. TDM and parking management were two of the core issue areas that were called out for further investigation in the implementation steps for this CWTP.

In addition, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) are currently in the process of implementing a Regional Commute Benefit Ordinance (described later in this paper) that will apply to all Bay Area employers with 50 or more employees. This provides Alameda CTC with a timely opportunity to consider how the agency's efforts can support and complement this legislation.

WHAT IS TDM?

TDM and parking management seek to address transportation challenges, such as congestion and the need for adequate parking, with programs that manage travel demand. TDM measures seek to reduce demands on existing roadway and parking capacity using incentives and disincentives designed to influence travel choice. TDM has become more popular as supply-side solutions are increasingly criticized for creating additional congestion through "induced demand," exacerbating parking inefficiencies, and contributing to a number of other public health and social impacts related to driving.

As discussed below, research shows that TDM and parking management have had demonstrable success in influencing people's travel choices and behaviors, thereby reducing vehicle trips, congestion, and vehicle emissions while improving mobility, accessibility, and the efficiency of local and regional transportation networks. The most effective TDM programs include some form of financial incentive, either through pricing parking or subsidizing transit and other non-drive alone modes. Managing travel demand through TDM and/or parking management are also cost effective; by leveraging existing investments, these strategies complement existing investments in transit systems and other alternatives to driving.

Transportation demand management can be implemented by a wide range of organizations on multiple levels; specific strategies are appropriate for the region as a whole, the county and local jurisdictions, as well as individual employers or trip generators. Determining what TDM roles are the most appropriate for implementation at the countywide level is one of the most significant questions this paper seeks to address. Parking management, on the other hand, is generally implemented at the local level: parking codes are included in zoning ordinances, and parking

management occurs primarily on local streets and roads and in city-owned public parking garages. The range of potential TDM activities is outlined in Figure 1. These TDM strategies are discussed in much more detail in Chapter 10 of the TEP/CWTP Briefing Book, included as Appendix A.

Figure 1 Overview of Types of TDM and Parking Strategies

Categories of TDM	Specific Types of TDM Programs	Description	Primary Agency Responsible
Parking Management	Demand-responsive pricing of on- street spaces	Set on-street parking prices based on parking demand in area to achieve parking availability targets.	Cities
	"Unbundling" of parking costs from rents and leases	Separate the charge for leasing or buying a unit or square footage in residential or commercial buildings from charges for parking spaces.	Enabled or required by cities, must be brokered by private businesses or developments
	Reduced or eliminated minimum parking requirements	In areas that are well-served by transit and other alternatives to driving, allow developers to build residential and commercial buildings with fewer parking spaces or no parking.	Cities
	Use of new meter technologies to allow multiple forms of payment and dynamic pricing	Install parking meters that allow payment by credit card or phone, and that connect to a central system in real-time, allowing for remote programming and management of parking prices.	Cities
	District-based parking management	Manage parking supply in a defined area as a unified whole in order to better manage parking demand between different facilities to eliminate cruising for parking and improve the customer experience.	Cities
	Shared parking strategies	Facilitate the sharing of parking among multiple land uses that have complementary schedules (e.g. an office with greater demand during the day and restaurant with greater demand at night).	Enabled by cities, must be brokered by private businesses or developments
	Use of parking revenue to support other mobility/neighborhood programs	Dedicate meter revenue from designated area to uses such as mobility improvements, neighborhood or business improvement programs, potentially through the creation of a parking benefit district.	Cities
	Improved parking wayfinding signage	Install wayfinding signage to make parking easier to find. This can help to shift parking demand away from overfull spaces to underutilized areas and can help reduce local traffic impacts caused by searching for parking.	Cities

Categories of TDM	Specific Types of TDM Programs	Description	Primary Agency Responsible
Financial Incentives	Subsidized transit passes	Employers/developers provide discounted or free transit passes to employees/residents; transit agencies sell passes at reduced rates based on purchase of passes for all employees/residents regardless of transit use (e.g., universal pass programs).	Employers, housing developments or TMAs/Business Improvement Districts are the most common distributors of discounted transit passes; agreements are made with transit agencies. Cities sometimes include distribution of transit passes as a part of a development's conditions for approval or in zoning requirements.
	Pricing employee parking and/or parking cash-out programs	Charge employees for parking or, if parking is free, pay employees who do not drive the cash value of the parking space.	Employers are responsible, but parking cash- out can be mandated by cities, regions or states
	Commuter checks	Provide direct payment or pre-tax discounts to employees who commute to work by transit, biking, walking, carpool, or vanpool.	Employers
	Transit "fare free" zones	Transit agency provides free rides in designated zone.	Transit agencies, can be initiated/funded by cities, transportation management associations (TMAs), Business Districts
	Direct financial incentives to bike, walk, carpool or take transit	Provide a direct financial incentive to people who commute by bike, walk, carpool, vanpool, or take transit. Commute benefit programs that result in tax savings for employers and employees are the most typical.	Any organization, public or private;
Shared Vehicle Services	Ride sharing	Carpool to work instead of driving alone. Public agencies may encourage this by providing rideshare matching websites.	Any organization, public or private
	Shuttles	Operate a free or subsidized shuttle service to major employment centers or schools to reduce demand for driving and parking. Often financed wholly or in part by contributions from businesses along route.	Any organization, public or private
	Vanpools	Commute to work in a shared van with 7-15 people. Public agencies may facilitate vanpooling by providing rideshare matching websites and the van or other subsidies or incentives.	Any organization, public or private

<u>c</u>	
C)
-17	
Ċ	ر
	D
τ	2
0)
÷	
Ċ	

Categories of TDM	Specific Types of TDM Programs	Description	Primary Agency Responsible
Safety Net	Guaranteed/Emergency Ride Home program	Provide a guaranteed ride home for people who do not drive to work alone to ensure they are not stranded if they need to go home in the middle of the day due to an emergency, or stay late for work unexpectedly.	Any organization, public or private
Alternative Commute Scheduling	Telecommuting	Employers allow employees to work one or more days from home in order to reduce the number of automobile trips to work.	Employers
	Compressed work weeks	Employers allow employees to compress their work week by working fewer but longer days. For example, instead of working 5, 8-hour days, an employee may work 4, 10-hour days.	Employers
Promotional Activities	Travel marketing programs	Promote awareness of alternative travel modes through campaigns.	Any organization, public or private
	Travel training	Promote awareness of alternative travel modes through training.	Any organization, public or private
	On-site transportation coordinators	Employers hire dedicated staff member to oversee TDM programs and/or provide one-on-one employee travel education/training.	Employers, housing developments
	Bike/ped maps, education, and promotion	Maps of safe biking/walking routes, educational classes on safe biking/walking, and promotional activities such as Bike to Work Day; usually provided by public agencies or non-profit organizations.	Any organization, public or private
Urban Form and Land Use	Compact, mixed use development and "park once" districts	Encourage development of districts that allow people to park just once if they drive to reach the district, and walk to destinations within the area once they are there.	Cities are responsible for zoning, land use planning, and development permissions
Trip Reduction Mandates	Trip reduction ordinances	Require employers in designated districts to meet specific targets for how many car trips are generated.	Cities
	TDM conditions of approval for new development	Require developers to implement TDM measures, such as transit passes, shuttle systems, or unbundled parking, in order to receive approval for new developments.	Cities can mandate TDM measures for new development

Categories of TDM	Specific Types of TDM Programs	Description	Primary Agency Responsible
Multi-Modal Infrastructure	Car sharing services	Private companies offer shared vehicles that are available for short-term rental. These services reduce the need for car ownership for people who only need a vehicle occasionally.	Private car sharing companies (non-profit and for-profit)
	Bicycle sharing services	Bicycles are available to members for short-term rental and can be returned at any bike share station. Bike share may be offered in city neighborhoods, near transit hubs, or at major employment centers.	Cities or private bicycle sharing companies (usually at invitation of a city)
	Enhanced transit service	Improve transit service to better serve potential riders and shift travel from driving trips.	Transit agencies, funded by cities, counties, TMAs, BIDs, regional agencies
	Secure bicycle parking	Offer secure bike parking to encourage travel by bicycle, especially at major transit hubs and employment centers and other areas where there is demand for long-term bike parking.	Cities, employers, housing developments, TMAs, transit agencies depending on ownership of right of way; counties and regional agencies can also purchase and facilitate installation of bicycle parking
	On-site bike/ped amenities (lockers, showers, etc.)	Employers offer on-site amenities that make it easier for people to bike or walk to work, by offering a place to store extra clothes and/or bicycles, shower, etc.	Employers, housing developments
	High Occupancy Vehicle/Toll (HOV/HOT) lanes	Implement a system of express lanes for high-occupancy vehicles, transit, and/or people who pay a toll. This provides a time savings to people who commute by modes other than driving alone.	Highway districts, often led by counties or regional agencies
	Preferential parking for carpools	Provide dedicated parking spaces for carpool users. These spaces should be the most desirable spaces.	Cities, transit agencies, employers, or any entity that owns a parking lot

BENEFITS/EFFECTIVENESS OF TDM

TDM and parking management have been shown to be highly effective tools in achieving the transportation vision, goals, and objectives stated in the CWTP and are required by state law as part of CMP; specifically, TDM strategies are aimed at reducing peak vehicle trips and reducing vehicle miles travelled, with related benefits of reducing congestion and carbon emissions, improving public health, and increasing mobility. The positive impacts of a comprehensive TDM program would be consistent with the agency's need to address statewide greenhouse gas reduction regulations (AB 32 and SB 375). The TDM Issue Paper prepared for the CWTP/TEP includes a detailed study of the benefits of TDM and parking management. This Issue Paper is included as Appendix B and a summary of those findings is included here.

TDM and parking management:

- Reduce congestion and vehicle trips: Numerous studies demonstrate the effectiveness of TDM and parking management strategies in reducing vehicle trips and VMT. Specific programs proven to reduce driving include: parking pricing, subsidized transit passes, parking cash-out, ridesharing, carsharing, and guaranteed ride home.
- Increase transit use and reduce drive alone rates.
- Reduce emissions: Reduce vehicle emissions from drivers who are circling looking for a parking space.
- Produce quick results and longer-term impacts: TDM programs have been shown to have immediate effects on travel behavior and mode choice, while implementation of parking reforms, such as dynamic pricing, can result in instantaneous changes to parking availability and local congestion related to "cruising" for parking. Many of the behavioral impacts result in long-term and systemic changes, including reductions in household vehicle ownership and travel behavior.
- Are cost effective: TDM strategies can be implemented quickly, leverage existing infrastructure investments (e.g. increasing use of transit system or HOV lane infrastructure), leverage resources of the private sector, provide an additional source of revenue for local jurisdictions to use on alternative modes, like bicycle, pedestrian or transit improvements.
- Are politically viable: Many people already participate in a TDM program; many public and private employers highlight their TDM efforts and commute benefits as a means to attract employees. (Parking management can be more politically challenging and should be managed carefully.)
- **Region-wide applicability and flexibility**: Core philosophies and methodologies behind each of the strategies remain the same, and can be tweaked or refined to meet the goals and objectives of different municipalities.
- Pro-market: Parking reforms can improve the efficiency of the regional economy and reduce the cost to build new housing and commercial developments, especially in transitrich and walkable locations. Further, providing TDM incentives can be a tax break for employers, so these are mutually beneficial public-private opportunities.

EXISTING ALAMEDA CTC TDM PROGRAMS

The Alameda County Guaranteed Ride Home (GRH) Program is often thought of as the agency's sole or predominant TDM program; however, the agency supports several other TDM-related programs to meet the requirements of the CMP statue, such as bike and pedestrian safety, education, and promotional campaigns. The agency also provides critical funds to transit service and bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure throughout the county which is critical to supporting travel by alternative modes.

Guaranteed Ride Home

The Alameda County GRH program, administered by Alameda CTC with funding from BAAQMD, gives commuters an "insurance policy" against being stranded at work if they need to make an unscheduled return trip home. By providing the assurance that commuters can get home in an emergency, GRH removes one of the greatest barriers to choosing an alternative to driving alone, addressing concerns such as, "What if I need to get home because my child is sick or I have unscheduled overtime and miss my carpool ride home?" For employees, the availability of guaranteed rides home is an incentive to find an alternative to driving alone to work and thus avoid contributing to traffic.

The Alameda County GRH program has been in operation since April 1998. Over the last 15 years, the program has matured from a demonstration program with a handful of participating employers to a robust one with 5,104 registered employees and 282 active registered employers throughout Alameda County. Since it began, the GRH program has removed over 180,000 round trips per year by offering "insurance" of a ride home for registered employees when they have emergency needs that can't be met if they travel to work by an alternative mode. In 2012, registered employees in the GRH Program took 335,921 fewer trips to work in their cars in Alameda County. Of those employees, 51, less than one percent, needed to take an emergency trip home through the GRH program. By enabling commuters to feel more comfortable choosing non-drive alone modes, GRH has an impact that goes far beyond the number of trips provided. The reduced number of solo car trips to work from those registered in the program in 2012 resulted in a savings of an estimated nine million miles and a reduction of 3,300 tons of carbon dioxide emissions.

The Alameda County GRH program was developed to help reduce the number of single-occupant vehicles on the road and as a means of reducing traffic congestion and improving air quality. As such, the GRH program is designed to complement other programs that encourage individuals to travel by a means other than driving alone. The Alameda County GRH program is promoted in conjunction with the Safe Routes to Schools Program, Alameda County's *Ride, Stride, Arrive!* initiative and other bike and pedestrian promotions, described below.

Safe Routes to School

The Alameda County Safes Routes to School (SR2S) program was started by Alameda CTC in 2007 and is intended to reduce traffic congestion and promote health by working with educators,

parents and students to increase walking, biking and carpooling to school¹. The program, which is funded through a combination of Measure B and federal funds, is in place at over 100 schools (shown in Figure 2) with over 300 individual events in Alameda County. SR2S programs in Alameda County include:

- Walking schools buses and bike trains
- Monthly Walk & Roll to School Day events
- Annual International Walk and Bike to School Day events
- Annual Bike to School Day events
- Family cycling workshops
- Safety courses and educator guides on bike/pedestrian safety
- School walk audit events to identify safety issues around schools
- Carpool to school ride matching and promotional activities

The Alameda County SR2S program is currently focusing on strengthening its data collection efforts to determine whether schools participating in the program have reduced drive-to-school trips compared to other schools.

¹ Alameda County Safe Routes to Schools websites: <u>http://www.alamedacountysr2s.org/;</u> <u>http://www.alamedactc.org/app_pages/view/8070</u>



Figure 2 Schools Participating in Alameda County Safe Routes to Schools (2011-12)

Source: Alameda CTC

Walking and Biking Promotional Programs and Campaigns

Alameda CTC promotes active transportation modes through several related programs and advertising campaigns its funds. *Ride, Strive, Arrive*! is an umbrella program encompassing both the Step into Life walking campaign and the Ride into Life bike campaign. The Step into Life website provides information on walking routes, organized walks, and walking tools and tips. The Ride into Life website provides links to a wide range of existing bicycling information on the websites of Alameda County cities, 511.org's bicycle trip planner, and the East Bay Bicycle Coalition's website.

In addition to the Ride into Life website, Alameda CTC has also partnered with the East Bay Bicycle Coalition since 2008 to run Ride into Life advertisements in advance of the annual Bike to Work Day events to promote bicycling as a lifestyle. Ads appear on buses, bus shelters, street poles, and in storefronts throughout Alameda County. In 2010 and in 2011, Alameda CTC provided \$20,000 in funding for Bike to Work Day related promotions.

Alameda CTC conducted an evaluation of its Bike to Work Day advertising campaign in 2011. The evaluation included surveys of cyclists and non-cyclists, which found that 72% of Alameda County adult residents had heard of Bike to Work Day, and 2% participated in 2011.² About 16% of Bike to Work Day participants said they heard about the program through a poster or billboard. The most effective advertisements, according to those surveyed, was an image that suggests that bicycling could save money by avoiding gas costs. The evaluation found that providing support for employers to promote Bike to Work Day at the workplace was one of the most important recommendations for the future.

Figure 3 Ride into Life Advertisement

Source: Alameda CTC

² http://www.alamedactc.org/files/managed/Document/7235/BTWD_2011_Final_Report.pdf
Bike Safety and Education Classes

The East Bay Bicycle Coalition currently provides free bicycle safety classes in Alameda County with the financial support of Alameda CTC's Bicycle and Pedestrian Grant Program. Specialized classes are available with focuses on urban cycling, adults learning to ride, and families. By training cyclists to ride safely and comfortably, the program is intended to reduce vehicle trips in Alameda County. Since its inception in 2007, the program has trained over 5,300 adults and teenagers through its bicycle safety classes.³

Technical Assistance for Parking Management and TOD

The Alameda CTC, through its Transit Oriented Development Technical Assistance Program (TOD TAP), funds parking and TDM studies to assist local jurisdictions in reconsidering and improving their parking management policies. The agency has funded two parking studies, a shared parking study at MacArthur BART and a parking and stormwater study at Coliseum/Oakland Airport BART.

Other Investments

Although not technically TDM, one of the most important actions that the Alameda CTC takes to support travel by non-auto modes is investing in transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities throughout Alameda County. Alameda CTC allocates tens of millions of dollars annually to support the operation and enhancement of transit services throughout Alameda County and millions to support provision of safe, accessible bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Making transit, bicycling and walking more convenient and safer in more places enables these modes to be viable alternatives for an increasing number of people in the county.

The Alameda CTC updated their Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans in 2012. These Plans identify the capital projects, programs and planning efforts needed through the year 2040 to make bicycling and walking in Alameda County safer, more convenient and more enjoyable. The plans also identify near term implementation actions that Alameda CTC will undertake in the next five years (2013–2017) to set the stage for implementing the plan's medium- and long-term efforts. These actions include funding key portions of the priority bicycle and pedestrian networks, providing technical tools and assistance to local agencies to implement bicycle and pedestrian programs/infrastructure and continuing to staff and fund countywide initiatives such as Safe Routes to Schools and promotion campaigns. Both plans will be updated within the next 4-5 years to identify the next phase of implementation actions.

The Alameda CTC is currently beginning the process of undertaking a Countywide Transit Plan and updating the county's Community Based Transportation Plans that will help the agency optimize investments in the transit system and identify any other actions the agency can take to improve transit service throughout the county.

3

http://www.alamedactc.org/files/managed/Document/9381/A090025_CW_Bicycle_Safety_Education_Progra m_101612.pdf

PRIOR TDM RECOMMENDATIONS

Although the Alameda CTC does provide a range of TDM programs, these programs are not packaged or marketed as a unified TDM program and thus are often not seen as a comprehensive program. As a result, many existing planning documents have recommended that Alameda CTC expand and enhance their TDM offerings and/or develop a countywide TDM program. Recommendations from past plans are listed below, in chronological order by planning effort.

Key recommendations from recent Performance Evaluations of the Alameda CTC Guaranteed Ride Home Program were:

- Expand the GRH program into a comprehensive TDM program: "We recommend that the CMA expand the GRH program into a comprehensive TDM program. Of all the GRH programs we examined, the CMA program is the only one that is not operated as part of a comprehensive program that includes other TDM or commute alternative efforts. Expanding the program would allow the CMA to broaden the range of commute alternative services it provides to residents of Alameda County while fulfilling the Travel-Demand Management Element of its Congestion Management Program. It would also work toward meeting the objectives of AB 32 and SB 375, state legislative mandates to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases."
- Merge the Alameda County GRH program with other GRH programs in the Bay Area: We
 recommend that the CMA merge the Alameda County GRH program with programs in
 adjacent counties, such as the Contra Costa County program, which is operated by 511
 Contra Costa."

The Alameda CTC 2011 Congestion Management Program, Chapter 10: Conclusions and Implementation Issues, identifies the following issues related to TDM as requiring further Alameda CTC action:

- Congestion Pricing Strategies: "off-peak transit fare discounts; parking ticket surcharge by the Alameda County jurisdictions, with revenues devoted to transit; and parking pricing in Berkeley."
- Parking Standards and Policies: "Parking for automobiles is a significant but underrecognized factor in the relationship between land use and transportation. With the support of local jurisdictions, the Alameda CTC plans to explore and review parking policies and standards as a way to develop parking management strategies as a land use tool for local jurisdictions to promote alternative modes and reduce greenhouse gases."

The 2012 Countywide Transportation Plan/Transportation Expenditure Plan Briefing Book includes the following ideas for incentivizing parking reforms at the local level:

Provide planning grants to cities to assist them with the management of parking. Grants could fund any of the following: development of residential or commercial parking permit districts, reform of outdated parking requirements, data collection required to implement parking reforms, assistance establishing and/or enforcing parking cash-out requirements and other transportation demand management ordinances.

- Provide funding to local entities for new the acquisition and installation of new parking technologies (e.g. parking meters for curb parking or parking access and revenue control systems for off-street lots, license plate recognition systems, parking stall occupancy sensors, handheld enforcements).
- Provide matching funds to cities that raise parking revenues by increasing curb parking rates, off-street rates, and/or enacting parking taxes. For example, providing cities with one dollar in regional funding for every one dollar in new local parking revenue that they raise would encourage cities to reduce existing parking subsidies and/or to enact parking taxes.
- Fund training programs, technical assistance and symposia on best practices in reducing traffic and greenhouse gas emissions by reforming parking policies and practices.

The 2011 TDM Issue Paper, developed in support of the Transportation Expenditure Plan and CWTP, recommended the following (paraphrased):

- Provide dedicated funding to the Guaranteed Ride Home (GRH) program, the Alameda CTC's primary TDM program.
- Expand the Alameda County GRH program into a comprehensive countywide TDM program. A sample of potential TDM measures that the Alameda CTC could fund include additional ridematching services, subsidized transit passes, bicycle infrastructure at work places, and additional marketing and promotion.
- Develop Countywide TDM and parking management guidelines: This could be a set of
 regional advisory statements or "best practices" that local jurisdictions could refer to as
 they move forward with developing their own TDM or parking management policies and
 programs, or regional "guidelines" could also be tied to regional funding allocations to
 ensure that local jurisdictions follow them and meet certain targets.
- Create a robust technical assistance program, including an information clearinghouse and TDM and parking management grant programs.
- Initiate a TDM and/or parking certification program that could recognize communities and individual employers and developers who lead the way forward as the first to implement policy and program reforms.

The 2012 Countywide Transportation Plan, Chapter 7 on Next Steps, recommends:

• "TDM and parking management are key tactics to meet the requirements of SB 375, as they are an ideal complement to land use strategies that reduce greenhouse gases and vehicle miles traveled. The Alameda CTC could expand TDM program implementation through creation of a transportation demand management plan and/or a parking management plan for the county."

To evaluate these many recommendations and determine how Alameda CTC's TDM program should expand, the Alameda CTC must first consider what TDM programs are already offered in the County by other entities. Following is an inventory of TDM programs offered throughout Alameda County.

ALAMEDA COUNTY TDM PROGRAM INVENTORY

Taken as a whole, Alameda County has a quite robust offering of TDM programs. There are many TDM and parking management programs and policies in place provided by a range of types of organizations/agencies, including:

- State of California
- Regional agencies
- Counties
- Cities
- Transit agencies
- Employers
- Housing developments
- Transportation Management Associations (TMAs)⁴
- Non-profit organizations

Considered together, these existing programs provide a strong foundation for the Alameda CTC to build upon as it evaluates opportunities for greater coordination and new partnerships with cities and employers in the future.

STATE AND REGIONAL PROGRAMS

There are a range of existing programs at the state and regional level that impact travel demand in Alameda County. The following section details several of the most important programs.

State Parking Cash-Out Law

California state law requires that certain employers with more than 50 employees who provide subsidized parking for their employees also offer a cash allowance in lieu of a parking space.⁵ This law is intended to provide an incentive for employees to take transit, bike, walk, or carpool to work. A 2009 study by UCLA urban planning professor Donald Shoup evaluated eight case studies of employers who complied with the requirement. After providing the parking cash out, solo driving to work at these employers fell by 17 percent; carpooling increased by 64 percent;

⁴ Transportation Management Associations are usually groups of businesses that unite under a single umbrella organization (often non-profit) to cooperate with local businesses and public agencies to enhance access and mobility within and in the vicinity of certain defined geographic boundaries. Activities often include advocacy and outreach; serving as liaison between government departments, transit agencies, and employers (often their major funders); providing direct transit services in the form of shuttles; and other TDM strategies such as ride-share matching, transit subsidies, and transit information, including sales of passes. Environmental benefits and promoting and enhancing economic vitality are also often important goals, as are helping local jurisdictions and businesses comply with regulatory requirements, such as air quality standards and trip reduction goals.

⁵ State Parking Cash-out law: <u>http://www.arb.ca.gov/planning/tsaq/cashout/cashout.htm</u>

transit ridership increased by 50 percent; walking and biking increased by 33 percent; and commuter parking demand fell by 11 percent.⁶

Alameda CTC conducted its own parking cash out pilot in the late 1990s to study the effectiveness of financial incentives on use of alternative modes. Four jurisdictions participated in the program: Alameda County and the cities of Albany, Oakland and Pleasanton. Each jurisdiction offered a different type of financial incentive in lieu of providing parking, including \$1.50-\$2.00 per day, \$1.25 per trip and \$40 in commuter check benefits. In general, the pilot showed that financial incentives alone resulted in significant jumps in participation in the parking cash out program (i.e., commuting by non-drive alone modes). In cities that did not have an existing incentive, participation jumped from 3-5% of program participants to 19-23%. The introduction of a financial incentive proved to be more important than the exact amount, illustrated by the fact that introduction of a new financial incentive proved far more successful at increasing commuting by alternative modes than increasing an existing parking cash out amount (Pleasanton). The pilot also illustrated that the effectiveness of incentives was directly related to transit accessibility.

Alameda County may be able to increase the effectiveness of this law locally by promoting awareness of it among eligible employers and employees in the County.

Regional Commute Benefit Program (SB 1339)

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) are currently in the process of implementing a commuter benefits pilot program that will apply to all Bay Area employers with 50 or more employees. Once implemented, the ordinance will require employers to offer one of four commuter benefits options, each of which is intended to reduce vehicle miles traveled and employee commute costs. The options that employers may offer employees include:

- Pay for transit, vanpooling or bicycling expenses with pre-tax dollars, as allowed by federal law
- A transit or vanpool subsidy of at least \$75 per month
- A free shuttle or vanpool operated by or for the employer
- An alternate option proposed by the employer and approved by MTC or BAAQMD

According to MTC, in Bay Area cities that have already implemented a commuter benefits ordinance, such as San Francisco, most employers have chosen the pretax option due to its minimal costs.

After four years, BAAQMD and MTC will report to the state legislature on the results of the program, including its impacts on vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas reductions. Promoting awareness of the program may be an important role for Alameda County in the program's implementation.

⁶ Source: <u>http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/single-project.php?row_id=55468</u>

511 Regional Rideshare Program

MTC's 511 Regional Rideshare Program offers an online tool for commuters to find rideshare matches through its transportation information website, 511.org. Ridesharing can reduce vehicle trips and offer an affordable and flexible option to travelers in areas that are not well served by transit, or where transit service is very crowded, such as the BART Transbay Tube corridor from Alameda County into San Francisco. Ridesharing is the top alternative to driving alone both nationally and in the Bay Area, where carpooling has a mode share of 11%⁷.



Figure 4 MTC 511.org Rideshare Website

Traditionally, ridesharing occurs informally among neighbors and coworkers. MTC's website is designed to expand the range of potential carpoolers and facilitate coordination between people with similar commutes who would not otherwise be aware of each other. Commuters who are interested in finding a carpool ride match sign up through the 511.org site, providing basic information about their trip patterns, vehicle availability, and work schedule, and are then connected with potential carpools that match their needs. MTC encourages users of the site to log their commutes, offering an incentive program with prizes of up to \$500 for keeping track of carpool trips.

In addition to offering travelers assistance with carpool ride matching, MTC's rideshare program also includes a network of free park-and-ride lots where carpools can meet. Within Alameda County, MTC lists 15 park-and-ride lots, with 2,434 total spaces. The rideshare website also

⁷ http://ridesharinginstitute.org/sites/ridesharinginstitute.org/files/Susan%20Heinrich%20slides.pdf

emphasizes the travel time advantages of using the Bay Area's extensive network of carpool lanes, shown in Figure 5.





Source: MTC

511 Regional Bike and Transit Trip Planners

511 also offers a transit trip planner that provides point-to-point transit directions and real-time arrival information for all the Bay Area's transit agencies. The site also offers a regional bike mapper, illustrated in Figure 6 below. The Bike mapper provides turn-by-turn biking directions along the shortest and/or flattest route.

The 511 Bicycling page also provides information on safety, Bike to Work Day, taking bikes on transit, bicycle access on bridges and bicycle parking options. The transit pages also provide resources, important transit alerts and other critical information for transit riders.



Figure 6 511 Bike Mapper

Casual Carpool

Casual carpooling is a phenomenon that involves carpools forming in the East Bay (largely in Alameda County) between strangers to travel across the Bay Bridge to downtown San Francisco. There are 24 pick-up locations in communities throughout the East Bay⁸ where lines of riders and drivers meet for three-person carpools to share a ride across the Bay Bridge to Fremont Street and Howard Street in downtown San Francisco, at the edge of the financial district. There are two primary incentives at work for drivers: 1) carpool drivers can take advantage of a free-flowing

⁸ SF Casual Carpool locations: <u>http://www.ridenow.org/carpool/#locations</u>; Casual Carpool website (MTC): <u>http://rideshare.511.org/carpool/casual_carpool.aspx</u>; Private casual carpool website: <u>http://www.sfcasualcarpool.com/</u>. carpool lane (for vehicles with 3+ occupants) through the Bay Bridge toll plaza and metering lights that can save 20-35 minutes depending on congestion levels; and 2) carpools get a discounted toll which saves them \$3.50 (carpool toll is \$2.50 compared to the standard \$6.00 peak-hour toll). To utilize the system, a driver has to be enrolled in FasTrak electronic tolling. This is an ad hoc, self-governing activity that is not formally supported by any public agency, but facilitates carpooling by hundreds of commuters every day travelling between the East Bay and San Francisco.

Carsharing

Carshare services can help to reduce vehicle miles traveled by providing an alternative to automobile ownership for people who only need a vehicle occasionally. These services allow members to easily rent vehicles for short periods of time through a website or on a mobile app, and are unlocked using an RFID-enabled smartcard. Cars are parked in pods, most often located in off-street parking areas, where members pick the car up and return it at the end of their reservation. Carsharing is operated by private companies or non-profit organizations, but city and county governments can aid its expansion by facilitating parking spaces for carsharing in public garages, on-street, or as a requirement for new private buildings.

Because members typically access the cars on foot or by transit, carsharing services are generally most effective in denser urban areas and near college campuses, where carshare demand is highly concentrated. Zipcar and City CarShare, the two major carsharing services in Alameda County, both offer a large number of carshare pods in the denser areas of Oakland, Berkeley, and Emeryville. There are a limited number of pods at particular locations in Alameda, Albany, Fremont, and Hayward such as Cal State East Bay and Fremont BART. Carsharing has not yet been established in any communities in eastern Alameda County. The location of City Carshare and Zipcar "pods" in Alameda County are illustrated in Figure 7.

By meeting the need for occasional car access among occasional drivers, such as residents of denser neighborhoods and students, carsharing can reduce vehicle ownership. This in turn can reduce the amount of space dedicated to storing vehicles, and shift driving trips to sustainable modes.

Some cities and employers also use carsharing to replace their fleet vehicles and to alleviate employees' needs to drive their personal cars to work because they need to use them for workrelated travel. If employees are able to take transit, rideshare, bike, or walk to work on the days that they need to use a car for work-related travel (and then use a carshare vehicle for their work trip during the day), then both the need for parking at the employees' work site and vehicle miles traveled can be reduced.



Figure 7 City Carshare and Zipcar Pods

Peer-to-Peer Charsharing

In addition to traditional carsharing services, a new set of services called peer-to-peer carsharing is now emerging, which allows members to rent vehicles directly from other members of the service. Peer-to-peer carsharing has similar benefits to traditional carsharing in terms of reducing vehicle trips and vehicle ownership, but takes advantage of the existing private vehicle fleet among members, an untapped resource that sits dormant for most of the day. Services like RelayRides already have expanded into Alameda County, with dozens of cars available for rent, as shown in Figure 8.





Source: RelayRides, March 2013

BAAQMD Spare the Air Resource Program

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) established their Spare the Air Program in 1991 to improve air quality in the Bay Area. Spare the Air engages in education and promotions to encourage changes in behavior that will reduce pollution. They provide "Air Alerts" in advance when air quality is forecast to be unhealthy and encourage people to alter their behavior on these days in order to prevent unhealthy air quality. They work directly with employers by providing tools and resources to educate employees on reducing pollution. As part of this program, they have established local "resource teams" composed of local residents, civic groups, agencies, businesses, and environmental organizations that work together regularly to plan educational activities and programs that reduce air pollution in their communities. There are two resource teams in Alameda County, and the efforts of each are described below.

Southern Alameda Resource Team⁹

In 2012 the Southern Alameda Resource Team focused its efforts on shuttle systems and antiidling campaigns. These campaigns utilized banners, information packets, stickers, and competitions to educate people on idling. The Team also provided incentives to encourage participation in the Safe Routes to Schools alternative commuting competition, offering gift cards to teachers of winning classrooms to use for classroom supplies. Past efforts have included vanpool incentives, commute solutions workshops, and other activities.

Tri-Valley Resource Team¹⁰

In 2012 the Tri-Valley Resource Team focused its efforts on an employer commute campaign called "Extreme Makeover: Commute Edition." Employers in San Ramon, Dublin, Pleasanton, and Livermore were eligible to receive a review of their current commute programs, further development of a new or existing program to increase participation, and incentives to encourage program participation.

CITY PROGRAMS

Overview

Cities across Alameda County have adopted plans and programs addressing TDM and bicycle/pedestrian goals. Every city in Alameda County has adopted a Climate Action Plan, as has the County for its government operations and for unincorporated portions of the County.

TDM and Parking Programs

Nearly every city in Alameda County has some type of TDM program and/or has re-considered their parking management strategies at the city or neighborhood level. These policies generally

⁹ The main point of contact for this team is Stephanie Anderson, at (510) 763-2500 or

sanderson@communityfocus.org. Member Organizations include: AC Transit, City of Hayward, City of Fremont, City of Newark, City of Union City, Enterprise Rideshare, 511 Regional Rideshare Program, Fremont Chamber of Commerce, Fremont Unified School District, Hayward Unified School District, Kaiser Permanente, New Haven Unified School District, Newark Unified School District, Supervisor Nadia Lockyer's Office, Supervisor Scott Haggerty's Office, TransForm - Safe Routes to Schools. Website: http://sparetheair.org/Get-Involved/Your-Community/Resource-Teams/Southern-Alameda.aspx.

¹⁰ The main point of contact for this team is also Stephanie Anderson (her contact information is listed above). Member organizations include: City of Dublin, Hacienda Business Park, City of Livermore, Office of Supervisor Scott Haggerty, City of Pleasanton, 511 Contra Costa, City of San Ramon, Safeway, Enterprise Rideshare, AlternetWays Company, 511 Regional Rideshare, Wheels, Direct Energy, Office of Senator Ellen Corbett, Office of Congressman Jerry McNerney, Safe Routes to Schools/Transform. Website: <u>http://sparetheair.org/Get-Involved/Your-Community/Resource-Teams/Tri-Valley.aspx</u>

include adopting TDM policies or parking management plans, requiring TDM measures as a condition of approval for new developments, working with major employers to establish programs such as employee/shopper shuttles at major employment centers, and adopting approaches to parking that support transit-oriented development near BART stations.

A selection of examples is provided below (employer and TMA provided shuttles are described separately). There are more efforts that have been undertaken or are currently underway that are not described here. A more comprehensive TDM survey will be conducted to ensure Alameda CTC has a full understanding of the range of TDM programs offered by jurisdictions throughout the county.

- The City of Berkeley's Downtown Parking & Transportation Demand Program seeks to manage parking demand through pricing, providing better information about public and private parking facilities, development of shared parking facilities agreements between different uses, and through a policy of only paying for parking facilities using parking revenue. Berkeley also has extensive TDM programs both for city employees and for private companies in the city. The City of Berkeley Model TDM Employer program provides free AC Transit passes to city employees for trips to work, and TDM requirements are often included as conditions of approval for develop projects in downtown. The city recently updated its zoning code in conjunction with its recently adopted Downtown Area Plan to require that new development implement a number of TDM measures.
- The City of Emeryville has taken an active approach to TDM and parking management as well, adopting a Sustainable Transportation Plan in 2012 that includes many of the TDM measures described in this report. The City is also evaluating parking management approaches for the Hollis Area that are intended to increase the availability of parking spaces for short-term parkers.
- The City of Alameda is also developing a citywide TDM plan which recommends a range of TDM measures, including establishing a Transportation Management Agency in the city. Alameda already allows for optional in-lieu parking fees for developments, which are used to pay for transit and bicycling improvements. These may require employers to purchase AC Transit passes for employees or bike racks as part of entitlements.
- The City of Oakland has adopted a citywide policy framework for parking management in its commercial districts, and is in the process of developing specific parking management plans for each district. For example, the Temescal Parking Policies and Management Plan was developed pursuant to this policy in 2012, and incorporates many parking management recommendations, including variable rate pricing and better parking wayfinding signage.
- The City of Hayward is currently engaged in a TDM study to determine the most costeffective parking and transportation strategies to support transit-oriented development.
- The City of Union City has begun moving towards more urban, transit-oriented strategies for parking management around its BART station. Union City may reduce parking requirements for projects near the station, contingent on developments having a TDM program that could include transit incentives, carsharing, and bike parking. The City has

also installed its first parking meters around the Union City BART station both on-street and in municipal lots near the station.

- The City of Fremont just adopted a Downtown Community Plan that includes revised offstreet parking standards, including shared parking, and general recommendations on TDM. They are currently undertaking a City Center Precise Plan and Form Based Code for their downtown area, including the Downtown Community Plan area as well as other areas extending west and east to the Fremont BART station. This Plan will also have revised parking standards and TDM recommendations. They have a TOD overlay district that applies to all rail station areas in the city that has TOD-specific parking standards and required bike parking for all new development.
- The City of Pleasanton has implemented TDM measures both for city employees and for employers at the Hacienda Business Park. The City's parking cash-out program, "pRide," reimburses city employees \$2 a day for using travel modes other than a single-occupant vehicle. Pleasanton has also proactively managed travel demand at the Hacienda Business Park through the Hacienda Business Park Trip Reduction Ordinance (TRO). This ordinance applies to all employers in the zone, and establishes a performance standard for peak hour drive alone commute trips with a threshold of 55% or less of daytime workers driving alone. Employers must meet this target within three years using any measures they choose. At a minimum, employers must name a transportation coordinator, establish a traffic mitigation program, and conduct an annual survey of employees' commute patterns.
- The City of Dublin has included provisions for shared parking and reductions in minimum parking requirements for TOD and senior housing as well as other multi-modal enhancements in their recent Downtown Dublin and Eastern Dublin Specific Plans. They are beginning to consider other TDM strategies for Priority Development Areas around BART stations to encourage access to BART by non-auto modes, but no formal plans have been initiated to date.
- The City of Livermore Downtown Specific Plan includes provisions for shared parking in Downtown, reduced parking for multi-family residential, parking in-lieu fees when public parking is available, and other TDM programs. Trip reduction agreements have been reached with some new business park developments as well.
- The City of Newark has considered TOD friendly parking considerations in their planning for the Dumbarton TOD Priority Development Area.

Business associations at several other employment centers in Alameda County operate shuttles that are funded by businesses and local and regional agencies. These are listed in a separate section later in this report.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Programs

Recognizing that bicycle and pedestrian facilities are an important part of managing transportation demand, many cities and agencies in Alameda County already have extensive bicycle/pedestrian programs. Figure 9 summarizes the existing bicycle and pedestrian plans and maps that cities and agencies in Alameda County have developed.

City/Agency	Pedestrian Master Plan	Bike Master Plan	Maps
North County			
Albany	Yes	Yes	Bike map
Alameda	Yes	Yes	Combined walking and biking map through BikeAlameda
Berkeley	Yes	Yes	Combined walking and biking map
Emeryville	Yes	Yes	Bike map includes locations of public art
Oakland	Yes	Yes	Separate walking and biking maps
Piedmont	Under development	Under development	None
Central County			
San Leandro	Yes	Yes	Bike map
Hayward	Under development	Yes (2007)	None
South County		-	_
Fremont	Yes	Yes	Bike map
Newark	Under development	Under development	None
Union City	Yes	Yes	None
East County		-	_
Dublin	Under development	Yes	Combined bike and trails map
Livermore	No	Yes (2001)	Bike map
Pleasanton	Yes	Yes	Combined bike and trails map
Other Entities			
AC Transit	No	Yes (2009 bike parking study)	N/A
BART	No	Yes	N/A
LAVTA	No	No	N/A
Alameda County	Yes	Yes	No

Figure 9 Existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans and Maps in Alameda County

TRANSIT AGENCY PROGRAMS

Transit agencies by the nature of their mission provide a critical alternative to driving, but many transit agencies further contribute to reducing automobile trips by facilitating access to stations or bus stops by foot or bicycle or providing programs that encourage people to use transit more

often. In Alameda County, several transit agencies have programs to improve non-motorized station access and increase ridership.

AC Transit

AC Transit, which provides bus service throughout Alameda County, offers a bulk discount pass program to employers, colleges, and large residential developments called Easy Pass.¹¹ Additionally, AC Transit conducted a bike parking study in 2009 to improve integration of bikes and transit.

BART

BART, the Bay Area's largest regional rail service, released a bicycle plan in 2012 that will increase the amount of bike parking available at stations, improve biking access on streets near BART stations, and improve circulation for passengers with bicycles in BART stations. Bicycle lockers are provided at a number of BART stations and operated through BikeLink.¹² BART implemented a pilot program to increase bike access to trains in early 2013 through a pilot program to allow bikes on board during peak hours. BART has also encouraged non-motorized access to its stations through partnerships with municipalities to develop transit-oriented districts around many of its stations.

To inform the redevelopment of its station areas, BART developed an *Access Methodology* in 2005 that provides a decision making framework to determine the most cost-effective mix of TOD, access improvements, and replacement parking for each station site. This set the stage for the new approach to station parking and development by establishing a hierarchy of station access modes that clearly prioritized non-motorized options and transit ahead of auto access and parking. In addition, since 2005, BART has charged daily/monthly parking fees at all of its park-and-ride lots; demand-based criteria are used to set these rates.

ACE

Altamont Commuter Express (ACE) offers a limited Emergency Ride Home program for its riders that provides emergency rides home from a rider's destination station back to their station of origin on a case-by-case emergency-only basis (via trains, buses, shuttles or taxi). This program is available only for 20-trip and monthly ticket holders.¹³

Other Transit Agencies

The other transit agencies in Alameda County do not have specific TDM or bike parking programs, but most agencies accommodate bicycles on their vehicles.

¹¹ AC Transit Easy Pass website: <u>www.actransit.org/easypass</u>

¹² BART bike guide, including list of bike locker locations: <u>http://bart.gov/guide/bikes/index.aspx</u>; Bike Link website: <u>http://www.bikelink.org/</u>

¹³ ACE Emergency Ride Home website:

http://www.acerail.com/RidingACE/TrainSchedules/EmergencyRideProgram.aspx

PRIVATE AND EMPLOYER TDM PROGRAMS

The following employers and campuses in Alameda County provide free shuttles for their employees:¹⁴

- University of California Berkeley "Bear Transit" (UC Berkeley also participates in the AC Transit Easy Pass program for students and faculty/staff, and has its own campus TDM and parking management plan)
- Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory
- Alta Bates Summit Medical Center
- Kaiser Oakland Medical Center
- CSU East Bay
- Mills College
- Heald College

Alameda County also has a number of Transportation Management Associations/Organizations (TMAs/TMOs) or similar business associations/districts that fund shuttles and other commute programs. They include:

- **Emeryville TMA** is a non-profit organization funded through Business Improvement District fees paid by all commercial and industrial property owners in the city. The Emeryville TMA funds the **Emery Go-Round shuttle**, a free service which runs from the MacArthur BART station along two routes serving the Amtrak station, Bay Street and major employers in Emeryville. The TMA also provides: information and referral services, coordination with local and regional government and transit agencies, the Alameda CTC GRH program, and car-sharing spaces.
- Hacienda Business Park, in Pleasanton, offers a "Commute Solutions" program that
 offers a comprehensive suite of commute services to encourage commuting by non-drive
 alone modes. Their program includes:¹⁵
 - Free Wheels ECO Pass: The park provides a free bus pass to all employees that allows them to ride the local Wheels bus service (provided by LAVTA) seven days a week. This pass program is also available to residents of four residential communities located at Hacienda. In addition to their services operating throughout the Tri-Valley area, Wheels provides direct shuttle services to and from Hacienda that are timed to meet ACE and BART train arrivals during peak commute hours and an I-680 Express bus service to Pleasant Hill/Walnut Creek. Wheels also provides off-peak shuttle services to and from BART and other locations in the Tri-Valley.
 - New Rider Program: Hacienda partners with all the regional transit providers to offer free rides for new transit riders. Employees can get free rides on BART, ACE, County Connection, SJRTD and AC Transit.

¹⁵ Hacienda Business Park Commute Solutions website: <u>http://www.hacienda.org/tenants/tenants_commute.html</u>; LAVTA pass programs: <u>http://www.lavta.org/index.aspx?page=53</u>.

¹⁴ For more information, see the Transit Chapter of the CWTP Briefing Book, pages 5-12 and 5-13: <u>http://www.alamedactc.org/files/managed/Document/10616/Appendix B-Briefing Book.pdf</u>

- Carpool/Vanpool: Hacienda partners with 511 to facilitate carpooling and vanpooling and offers preferential parking for carpools and vanpools.
- Bike and Pedestrian Friendly Design and Mixed Use Development: Hacienda includes housing on-site which allows people to shorten their commutes, and their design guidelines require bike parking. The business park includes bike-friendly streets and sidewalks throughout.
- Education and Commute Planning Assistance and GRH: The Hacienda website provides information on all the transit providers that serve the Tri-Valley as well as a transit trip planner (that maps trips through the 511 transit trip planner). The website also provides links to commute assistance programs in surrounding counties, including Contra Costa, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, San Mateo, Napa and Solano, the Commuter Choice tax benefit and other regional commute assistance services. Hacienda also participates in Alameda CTC's GRH program.
- San Leandro Transportation Management Organization funds the San Leandro LINKS shuttle which is a free shuttle serving West San Leandro funded through a Business Improvement District tax and a variety of other public sources.
- **Berkeley Gateway TMA** funds the **West Berkeley shuttle** that provides free service from the Ashby BART station to major employment centers in West Berkeley. The shuttle service is operated under a partnership with the Emeryville TMA.
- The **Broadway "B Line"** is a free shuttle that operates between Jack London Square and the Uptown/Lake Merritt districts of Oakland. It is funded through a public-private partnership between City of Oakland, business associations throughout the areas that are served and a BAAQMD grant; it is operated by AC Transit.
- Bishop Ranch Office Park, located in the San Ramon valley in Contra Costa County provides 9 free shuttle routes for employees, four of which serve Dublin/Pleasanton BART and the Pleasanton ACE station, along with a variety of other commute services for employees.¹⁶

Other employer TDM programs likely exist, however a comprehensive employer TDM survey is outside the scope of this paper. A more comprehensive TDM survey will be conducted to ensure Alameda CTC has a full understanding of the range of TDM programs offered throughout the county.

Best Workplaces for Commuters (BWC)

One resource available to employers is the Best Workplaces for Commuters (BWC) program. This is a membership program that recognizes employers that meet the National Standard of Excellence in commuter benefits. This standard was created by the National Center for Transit Research (NCTR) and the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

In order to be eligible, an employer has to provide:

¹⁶ Bishop Ranch Transportation Services: <u>http://www.bishopranch.com/tenant-services/transportation</u>.

- One (1) primary benefit, such as employer-paid tax-free transit or vanpool passes, teleworking, or parking cash-out
- Three (3) secondary benefits, such as shuttles between transit stations and worksites, ridesharing or carpool matching, preferred or reduce-cost parking for carpools and vanpools, and compressed work schedules
- Access to an Emergency Ride Home, which provides participants with a ride at little/no cost if they need emergency transport home
- Commitment that within 18 months of acceptance into the program at least 14% of employees will not be driving alone to work
- Active promotion of commuter benefits to employees
- Active promotion of the BWC designation, name and logo through employer public media
- A central contact in charge of commuter benefits
- A central location for information on commuter benefits
- Annual membership fee of \$230

In return, this program provides public recognition, technical assistance, training, web-based tools, and discussion forums for participating employers. These web-based tools include recorded web conference streams and impact calculators for financial, environmental, and traffic improvements associated with commuter benefits.¹⁷

There are two workplaces in Alameda County that meet the National Standard of Excellence and are on the Best Workplaces for Commuters' list:

- Hacienda Business Park (Pleasanton)
- 511 Rideshare (Oakland)

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

The following organizations provide transportation advocacy and bike education programs in Alameda County:

- East Bay Bicycle Coalition (EBBC)
- Walk Oakland Bike Oakland (WOBO)
- BikeAlameda
- Albany Strollers and Rollers
- TransForm
- Various recreational bicycle riding, racing and touring groups

¹⁷ Best Workplaces for Commuters website: <u>http://www.bestworkplaces.org/</u>

EXPANDING ALAMEDA CTC'S TDM PROGRAM

In considering what makes most sense for an expanded TDM role for the Alameda CTC, there are few key considerations:

- Alameda CTC must ensure that it is not duplicating services already being offered. As is illustrated in the TDM inventory above, there is a broad range of existing TDM programs in Alameda County. Many cities already have TDM and parking management programs; a number of employers, TMAs and other institutions provide shuttles; BART provides secure bicycle parking; and AC Transit offers a discounted bulk transit pass program. In particular, many of the efforts that are commonly offered at the county level (beyond GRH), such as ride sharing and vanpool resources, are already provided by MTC.
- Alameda CTC's ability to impose TDM requirements is limited as are local resources to comply with new requirements. Consequently, countywide TDM strategies should emphasize a voluntary approach to implementation. CMAs do not have the authority to impose TDM requirements in the same way that cities or TMAs do. Alameda CTC's primary authority is the "power of the purse string" as it can impose conditions and performance objectives on projects funded through Measure B and some regional funds. The agency does have some limited leverage to impose requirements on cities and new developments through the Congestion Management Program and LOS monitoring program. There is a limit to the number of requirements/conditions that can be attached to funding, and Alameda CTC does not want to overburden local jurisdictions when they have limited resources. These constraints are reflected in the current Alameda CTC programs which are focused on providing value-added incentives like GRH, bike promotion, and technical assistance rather than imposing new requirements.
- Many TDM programs are simply more appropriate and effective to provide at the local level. Typically, parking policies are set by individual jurisdictions under their land use authority and are tailored for each city to meet its unique needs. TDM strategies are also commonly implemented at the local level as cities have the power to mandate TDM as part of trip reduction ordinances or conditions of approval for new development. TMAs and employers (and sometimes housing developments) are the other primary implementers TDM as they have direct access to large groups of employees (and residents) and often are required or internally motivated to reduce trips. Alameda County is large and diverse so it is difficult to implement countywide programs that are applicable to the entire county. The Alameda CTC's strategy should focus on sponsoring programs that are most effectively delivered at the county level and work to support and encourage cities and private organizations to provide programs that are most effectively delivered at the local level.

Considering these factors, the primary goal of an expanded Alameda CTC TDM program should be supporting and incentivizing cities and employers to implement more robust TDM and parking management strategies at the local level. There are a number of ways that this can be done, building on the agency's existing efforts:

- 1. **Update the TDM Chapter of the Congestion Management Program**: The current update of Alameda CTC's Congestion Management Program (CMP) should include an update of the TDM chapter to provide a more comprehensive menu of TDM activities that can be used to reduce automobile trips and is tailored to the different needs of jurisdictions throughout the county.
- 2. Encourage Formation of new TMAs and Strengthening of Existing TMAs: TMAs are an effective mechanism to reduce traffic congestion and improve use of nondrive alone modes by employees and sometimes residents. Alameda CTC should support creation of new TMAs in Alameda County and the strengthening of existing TMAs. This could constitute financial support as well as resources such as a "how to" handbook.
- 3. Develop a comprehensive TDM clearinghouse and other TDM informational resources: Alameda CTC should host a user-friendly website that inventories the full range of TDM programs available in Alameda County and describes research-based best practices. This type of resource would help city staff, individual residents and employees, and other agencies and organizations to better understand the range of available programs as they pursue enhancements to their own TDM programs and would enable better coordination between programs. An enhanced information program could also be used to assist cities in developing informational and educational printed and web materials tailored to local circumstances.
- 4. **Provide technical assistance**: Alameda CTC should expand its technical assistance program to support jurisdictions in implementing parking reforms and TDM policies and programs. This is appropriate for implementation at the countywide level and is a role that the Alameda CTC is uniquely well positioned to carry out. Technical support for jurisdictions can take two primary forms:
 - a. **Technical Resources**: Providing informational materials, case studies and examples, model ordinance language, and other guidelines and information that can assist jurisdictions in implementing parking and TDM policies.
 - b. **Planning Grants**: Providing funds to cities to conduct studies and other planning efforts to overcome local parking and TDM challenges and move forward on adoption of parking management and TDM programs and policies, potentially including formation of new TMAs. Alameda CTC has already expanded its TOD technical assistance program into a "Sustainable Communities Technical Assistance Program" (SC-TAP) to support a wide range of planning and project development activities in PDAs.
- 5. **Provide a robust Guaranteed Ride Home Program**: GRH is a critical safety net to support other TDM programs in Alameda County. GRH is most appropriately funded and administered at the countywide level, thus Alameda CTC should continue to administer GRH.
- 6. **Potentially adopt future TDM/parking funding requirements**: For future funding cycles, Alameda CTC could consider making local adoption of parking and transportation demand management policies an important factor in prioritizing and funding projects and/or in future updates to program funding agreements. Requiring or incentivizing city TDM programs would increase the strength and coverage of TDM

countywide, but would have to be carefully implemented to allow for diversity across the county and to ensure that requirements are not overly burdensome.

Together, these strategies will increase the impact of the programs that already exist, incentivize expansion of TDM offerings throughout the county, and ultimately increase the likelihood that individuals throughout the county will utilize TDM programs and travel by non-drive alone modes.

Each of these strategies is described in turn in the remainder of this paper.

UPDATE THE TDM CHAPTER OF THE CMP

The current update of Alameda CTC's Congestion Management Program (CMP) will include an update of the TDM chapter to provide a comprehensive menu of TDM activities that can be used to reduce automobile trips. The menu will be both sector-specific (e.g. strategies that are better for shift-work versus full time weekday work schedules) and location specific (e.g. more urban, transit rich environments versus more suburban, auto-oriented places). The menu will also categorize TDM measures according to their relative impact on reducing auto trips and demand for parking. For example, financial incentives, such as pricing of parking, parking cash out, and subsidized transit (or requiring these measures as part of a TDM ordinance) are considered the most effective way to reduce drive alone commuting. Meanwhile, marketing and information are effective, but less robust measures that alone will not reduce driving as significantly. Given that a "well-balanced" TDM program offering a variety of measures is more effective than a TDM program built around a single trip-reduction measure, the menu will also consider the impacts of packages of strategies implemented in concert.

The chapter will also include a discussion of potential best practices with regard to implementing TDM at the local level (i.e., ordinances, conditions of approval, incentivizing expansion of carsharing in a city, etc.¹⁸). The Land Use Analysis Program chapter will refer to this updated TDM chapter for the development of potential automobile trip reduction/mitigation strategies for new proposed developments and the TDM Checklist in Appendix E will be updated to reflect the menu.

STRENGTHEN EXISTING AND FORM NEW TMAS IN ALAMEDA COUNTY

Groups of employers can provide commute programs and benefits that would be impossible and/or unaffordable for a single employer. For example, bulk transit programs are based on economies of scale, so the larger the employee base, the better the deal the transit providers can offer. However, there are currently relatively few TMAs in Alameda County. Alameda CTC should convene cities, major employers, business parks, and/or other concentrated groups of employers to explore formation of TMAs and strengthening and expanding of existing TMAs.

¹⁸ The Emeryville TMA conducted successful pilot where they provided a partial subsidy to carshare services, to help test whether a viable market could be established. After less than a year of operation, this market had developed firmly, with some carshare pod locations no longer requiring a subsidy and others demonstrating potential to no longer need one with further outreach and adjustments to services.

TMAs yield benefits to many parties and therefore all partners would be willing to participate in discussions. Benefits include:

- Commute benefit programs can save employees significant time, money and lower their stress levels.
- Employers who provide robust employee commute programs see benefits such as improved employee recruitment and retention, improved productivity due to regained time and lower stress, and others.
- TMAs can assist cities in reducing congestion and meeting climate action goals.

To support this effort, Alameda CTC could potentially offer financial support as well as informational and technical resources like a "how to" handbook for launching and designing a TMA. In addition, resources exist to support such efforts, such as shuttle "sharing" companies like RidePal,¹⁹ that provide "last mile" shuttle service connections for multiple employers.

TDM CLEARINGHOUSE AND INFORMATIONAL RESOURCES

An expanded TDM information program is another role that makes sense for the Alameda CTC to provide at the countywide level. Alameda CTC is in the best position to understand the full range of TDM programs from the region and state down to the local level and to dedicate resources to keeping up to date on changes to these programs. This broader information program could include both a "one-stop-shop" web-based information clearinghouse as well as printed educational materials on the types of TDM programs that are available for different populations and geographies in Alameda County.

"One-Stop-Shop" Clearinghouse Website

There is a need for a place where information about all the TDM programs in Alameda County is presented together. Alameda CTC should develop a full "one-stop-shop" TDM webpage for employers, employees and residents in Alameda County to understand the full range of modes and promotional programs available to them. This would also allow city staff and other agencies and organizations to better understand the range of programs as they pursue enhancements to their own TDM programs and enable better coordination between programs.

The inventory of TDM programs presented in this paper provides a starting place for development of a "one-stop-shop" information clearinghouse website. The inventory included here is not comprehensive; it did not include a full survey of city-based parking and TDM efforts nor of employers. It is recommended that a more comprehensive survey be conducted as part of the development of the website.

The level of information that is appropriate to provide on the clearinghouse page will have to be determined. Staff time will have to be dedicated to ensuring that the website and inventory are kept up to date, therefore Alameda CTC must ensure that the level of detail provided is not too onerous and time consuming to maintain and update.

¹⁹ Ride Pal offers "collaborative consumption solutions for corporate commute shuttles.": <u>http://ridepal.com</u>.

In terms of functionality, the website could be designed to provide a "tab" for employers, employees and cities. Employees and employers could enter their zip code or their city or navigate by planning area in order to have access to a list of all the TDM programs available in their area. The site could also provide education on additional programs that could be offered, for example to increase the utilization of discounted transit pass programs. Links to the websites of other agencies who sponsor TDM programs could be provided to facilitate easy access to additional information.

Alameda CTC and MTC have already coalesced some TDM information that this website can build on and/or link to:

- The Alameda CTC Bicycle and Pedestrian program already has well developed web pages that provide education and marketing as well as a resource web page:
 <u>http://www.alamedactc.org/app_pages/view/8078</u>. This page inventories resources available in each city (e.g. bicycle and pedestrian coordinators, advisory committees (BPACs), bicycle and pedestrian plans, maps) informational/educational materials (e.g. Toolkit for Improving Walkability in Alameda County), and many other regional and national resources for bicycling and walking.
- MTC already provides a number of resources for transit trip planning, bike trip planning, ride sharing and vanpooling. The Alameda CTC does not need to re-create these pages, but can provide explanations of their utility and links to the appropriate sites. Alameda CTC should work with 511 staff to ensure optimal ease of use and understanding for those navigating between the sites.
- The Alameda County Safe Routes to Schools website provides a tremendous number of resources and information sources to support increasing the number of students who get to school by non-auto modes.

Other potential resources on the site could include:

- Maps of all the transit systems and the tools they offer such as real time arrivals and trip planners via web or mobile phone
- Links to the 511 transit trip planner and/or Google's transit trip planner
- Maps of bike locker locations and links to the bike locker application
- An easy to use web portal for connecting employers with transit agency discounted pass programs. Discounted transit passes have been proven to be one of the most effective strategies to switch people from driving to transit. Discounted pass programs are also usually a win-win as commuters benefit and transit agencies benefit because they receive a fixed revenue stream from the bulk sale of the passes. The Alameda CTC should partner with the marketing departments of transit agencies in the county to extend the reach of existing programs.

One option for the website would be to build on the Guaranteed Ride Home program website, which was redesigned in 2012 to be very customer friendly. Expanding the GRH website would improve the effectiveness of the GRH program because it would be presented in conjunction with the range of travel options for which it is designed to be a safety net.

TDM Fact Sheets and other Printed TDM Educational Materials

The Alameda CTC could develop printed and electronic materials to promote TDM and increase awareness of the range of programs available. These could be featured on the TDM clearinghouse website and distributed through the agency's regular outreach activities. Some information pieces that could be a good starting place are:

- **TDM fact sheets**: These could be developed at the planning area level. They could illustrate all the alternative modes and TDM programs available to residents and employees in those areas. These fact sheets could give an overview of transit options, bicycle maps, bicycle facilities (key routes and parking), 511 ride matching and vanpools, car sharing pods, or even casual carpool locations and also describe any discounts, financial incentives or other TDM benefits available to residents/employees in that area.
- **Countywide Bike Maps**: The Alameda CTC has previously considered, but never developed, Countywide or planning area level bicycle maps to provide bicyclists with a resource for trips beyond their city's limits. This would complement the existing city-based bicycle maps which cover only one city and the East Bay Bicycle Coalition maps (east of the hills and west of the hills) which focus on very large areas. This is an effort that the Alameda CTC is best suited to undertake due to its multi-jurisdictional nature.

All informational and promotional efforts should be closely coordinated with the recommendations in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans which identify several additional information/promotion efforts for future implementation.

Coordinated Marketing/Promotion

There are an abundance of resources available already in Alameda County which are not being fully utilized, likely due in part to lack of awareness. The information program should have a "marketing" component to ensure that all this compiled information is successfully disseminated to employers and individuals throughout the county. Alameda CTC should not be the only agency disseminating information. Alameda CTC staff should coordinate closely with cities, MTC's 511 program, transit agencies (which all do their own marketing and promotion), and potentially even carsharing companies on promotions and marketing efforts.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Technical Resources

The TDM "menu" described above is one of the first resources that could be developed as part of a set of countywide TDM and parking technical resources. This menu could also include guidance on where each measure is most effectively implemented, both in terms of sponsoring agency and geography/urban form. Additional resources could include model ordinances and policies and examples of where different TDM strategies have been successfully implemented.

In terms of parking reform, Alameda CTC benefits from the fact that MTC has done a tremendous amount of work in terms of research and education around parking regionally. MTC has already taken a number of steps to educate local jurisdictions on the benefits of parking reform and provide resources to support the adoption of reduced parking requirements, parking pricing, and parking management policies by local jurisdictions. Since 2010, MTC activities have included: a smart parking training program including a parking policy survey and an educational workshop on parking fundamentals, and a regional parking Toolbox Handbook.²⁰ Alameda CTC can build on and tailor the outcomes of these MTC efforts to specific needs in Alameda County.

Whereas MTC has already developed numerous technical materials for parking, there is more of a gap for TDM. Appropriate resources could include model TDM and trip reduction ordinances (similar to the agency's model complete streets policy), or a universal framework or "how-to guide" for TDM program development, implementation, and ongoing management. Many resources have already been compiled on TDM, parking management, and bicycle and pedestrian planning by advocacy, think tank, and other organizations that the Alameda CTC can draw from and build on. Alameda CTC should solicit input from ACTAC and jurisdictions on what resources would be most valuable.

The scope of technical resources offered by the Alameda CTC will have to be determined based on resource and staff availability, and any efforts should be evaluated to ensure that they are not duplicative of what has been developed at the regional level or elsewhere.

Technical Assistance Grants

Implementation of parking and TDM programs and policies requires significant staff time and other resources. Parking reform efforts are resource intensive; successful implementation of parking reform depends on a well-designed, highly transparent process that is supported by robust data and responsive to public input. These efforts usually require collection of new data and detailed analysis of parking supply and demand. Even for cities that already have clear policy direction and political will to address parking challenges, many lack the required data to make informed and transparent decisions and are unable to move forward due to lack of resources. Many cities have not comprehensively reviewed their parking codes in years or decades, while even fewer have conducted a recent inventory of their existing parking supply or gathered data on parking demand. Through planning grants, Alameda CTC can provide funds to move parking reform efforts along.

For TDM, there may be less general understanding of the effectiveness of TDM and what measures would be most appropriate in each city. Cities could apply to the Alameda CTC for planning grants to tailor TDM strategies to local conditions, design TDM programs, and write TDM ordinances or conditions of approval. The TDM inventory that the agency will be maintaining will assist jurisdictions and the Alameda CTC to know where programs already exist and what roles are most appropriate for cities to fill.

Alameda CTC has already expanded its TOD technical assistance program into a "Sustainable Communities Technical Assistance Program" (SC-TAP) to provide direct assistance to

²⁰ MTC, 2010, Smart Parking Study/Toolbox:

http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/smart_growth/parking/parking_seminar.htm

jurisdictions using One Bay Area Grant Program Priority Development Area (PDA) Planning and Implementation and Measure B Transit Center Development funds. These funds are intended to support a wide range of planning and project development activities in PDAs as well as to provide bicycle and pedestrian planning and engineering and complete streets technical support within PDAs. The SC-TAP program provides an existing source of funds for technical assistance with parking and TDM and is creating a list of on-call TDM and parking management consultants to assist local governments with this type of work. The program could be expanded over time as additional resources become available.

The SC-TAP program will also enhance the technical resources available at the Alameda CTC because it will require consultants to develop "best practices" design guides and fact sheets at the conclusion of each project, as a "way to share knowledge and experience and help build a local best practices resource for Alameda County jurisdictions."²¹

Grant types awarded through this program could include any of the following.

- Planning grants:
 - Development of local TDM and commute benefits ordinances.
 - Development of project-specific TDM programs.
 - Parking studies to revise local parking codes and/or develop parking ordinances for jurisdictions to adopt, develop district-based management, etc.
 - Parking impact fee studies.
 - Data collection and analysis.
- Capital grants:
 - On-site transportation coordinators for employers or institutions of a certain size.
 - Installation of on-site amenities, such as secure bicycle parking, lockers/showers, etc.
 - Acquisition and installation of parking meters (for curb parking) and parking access and revenue control systems (for off-street lots).
 - Purchase and operation of enforcement vehicles and license plate recognition systems, parking stall occupancy sensors, or handheld enforcements.
- Monitoring, enforcement, and evaluation grants:
 - Local monitoring and enforcement of TDM ordinances and project-specific TDM programs.
 - "Follow-up" evaluations of planning or capital grants to measure outcomes of studies and resulting policies, programs, and projects.
 - Travel demand surveys.
 - Data collection and analysis.

In general, for these types of technical assistance and study efforts, the Alameda CTC may want to set minimum thresholds that a jurisdiction would have to achieve as part of the process. For

²¹ SC-TAP RFQ: <u>http://www.alamedactc.org/files/managed/Document/10657/A13-0019_SC_TAP_RFQ.pdf</u>

example, if a jurisdiction reconsiders their parking policy, meeting certain minimum thresholds on the types of policies they implement based on basic characteristic of the city's or neighborhoods urban form and transit availability could be required or strongly encouraged. The TDM "menu" could inform these types of requirements.

GUARANTEED RIDE HOME PROGRAM

Guaranteed Ride Home programs are a critical component of TDM efforts. These programs provide an important safety net that assures commuters that they will be able to get home in an emergency, thereby removing one of the greatest barriers to choosing an alternative to driving alone. These types of programs are most commonly implemented and administered at the county or regional level. Therefore Alameda CTC should continue to sponsor the Guaranteed Ride Home program.

The marketing of the program should be integrated with the expanded TDM information program and other Alameda CTC outreach efforts. Marketing of the program as a stand-alone commute program has always been a challenge. It is a long-standing recommendation that GRH should be marketed as one ingredient in a broad TDM package. Integrating GRH marketing with a broader Alameda CTC TDM program will improve the effectiveness of the GRH program and make resources currently spent on GRH outreach more productive. Outreach efforts could educate employers about all the TDM programs available and relevant to them such as AC Transit's Easy Pass or other transit pass programs, the regional Commute Benefit Ordinance, and the State Parking Cash-out law, as well as local transit options and 511 programs. Employer TDM and GRH outreach could also be used to assist with Alameda CTC efforts to facilitate TMA formation.

This dovetails with the GRH 2013 Program Evaluation which recommends integrating GRH into a comprehensive Alameda CTC TDM information program and increasing the coordination of GRH marketing with other Alameda CTC outreach efforts.

POTENTIAL FUTURE FUNDING REQUIREMENTS

For future funding cycles, Alameda CTC could consider making local adoption of parking and transportation demand management policies an important factor in prioritizing and funding projects and/or in future updates to program funding agreements. This could build off of the work done for the recent One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) program that required adoption of a complete streets policy in order for a city to receive OBAG funding and incorporated parking and TDM policies into project evaluation criteria. Potential implementation mechanisms for considering local parking and TDM policies in Alameda CTC funding decisions are:

- Master Program Funding Agreements: Alameda CTC could make TDM and parking policy requirements part of the master program funding agreements. The Agreements were just updated so another update is unlikely for a number of years.
- Part of Evaluation Criteria for calls for projects: In the future, Alameda CTC could strengthen the TDM and parking policy requirements for receipt of discretionary funding. One single TDM program or parking management strategy could not be required across

the county because the contexts are too varied; therefore such a requirement would have to be flexible to allow for different types of programs in different places.

Such a requirement should be phased in over time and coordinated with the resources that the Alameda CTC is able to provide to support city efforts, including both technical resources and financial support.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Alameda CTC is committed to developing a comprehensive countywide TDM program. This aligns with recommendations of many past Alameda CTC planning efforts, and will most effectively utilize agency resources and support the GRH program in being more effective. With a few exceptions, TDM programs are best implemented at the local level by cities, TMAs or employers, therefore the primary goal of the Alameda CTC's TDM program should be to support and incentivize cities and employers to implement more robust TDM and parking management strategies at the local level. To accomplish this, it is recommended that Alameda CTC support and facilitate formation and strengthening of TMAs in the county, and expand its existing information and promotional resources and technical assistance programs to increase the resources available to cities and employers to work on TDM and parking management.

Figure 10 outlines a phased implementation plan for how the Alameda CTC can implement this expanded TDM program. A key first implementation step is to update the TDM chapter and checklist in the Congestion Management Program as part of the update that is currently underway. This update will apply the information from this memo to provide a much more robust set of TDM best practices and relative trip reduction impacts of different strategies. The requirements for local jurisdictions would not change; but much better information on additional steps that can be taken at the local level would be provided along with examples of what some Alameda County cities have already done. This type of information sharing and detailed information on best practices will be helpful for jurisdictions seeking to strengthen their automobile trip reduction programs.

<u> </u>
σ
\subseteq
0
÷È
σ
ŧ
Ð
Ã
Ð
ā
З
_

Figure 10 Alameda CTC TDM Strategy Implementation Plan

TDM Strategy Update TDM Chapter	Remainder of FY2013 Create "menu" of TDM and parking	FY2013-2014 Create "menu" of TDM and parking	FY2014-2015 Update TDM chapter as	2016-2020
of CMP	programs as part of current CMP update (2013).	programs as part of current CMP update (2013).	appropriate to respond to changing conditions in 2015 update.	
connuct a comprehensive survey of TDM activities and organizations in Alameda County.		conduct survey.		
Facilitate TMA formation and strengthening	Identify existing TMAs in Alameda County. Educate Commission and ACTAC on potential formation of new TMAs in the county.	Work with jurisdictions to determine gaps where TMAs might be appropriate. Identify candidate employers, business parks and Business Improvement Districts. Convene "working groups" of employers and cities to discuss TMA formation.	In conjunction with working groups, aim to form 1-2 new TMAs in Alameda County. Work with existing TMAs to determine possible expansions of program offerings and/or membership.	Continue efforts to convene working groups and aim to form 1-2 new TMAs in Alameda County. Continue efforts to strengthen and expand existing TMAs and their program offerings and/or membership.
TDM Information Clearinghouse and other TDM Informational Resources	Educate Commission on expansion of Alameda CTC information program. Begin discussions with AC Transit, 511 and other organizations on coordinated marketing efforts.	Determine strategy for website including where it should be hosted, organizational framework for presenting information, functionality, and relationship with GRH. Update and finalize TDM inventory and determine level of detail to present on website. Develop list of desired TDM informational resources (with input from ACTAC and other stakeholders).	Create web-based "one-stop-shop" TDM clearinghouse. Develop initial set of TDM informational and educational resources.	Maintain and update TDM clearinghouse website. Continue to develop TDM informational and educational materials as needed.

Implementation Plan

TDM Strategy	Remainder of FY2013	FY2013-2014	FY2014-2015	2016-2020
Technical Resources	Research information on best practices and innovative pilot projects employed elsewhere that may be relevant to Alameda County.	Develop a prioritized list of desired technical resources (with input from ACTAC and other stakeholders). Begin development of top priority resources.	Complete development of initial list of resources and re-assess additional resources needs.	Ongoing development of resources as needed to support jurisdiction efforts.
Technical Assistance Grants	Select on-call consultant list for SC- TAP program. Work with local jurisdictions and employers/ employer organizations to identify key needs and issues related to implementation of TDM programs. Refine the countywide TDM program based on this additional research and feedback.	Award grants as appropriate for parking and TDM as part of SC- TAP program. Work to increase funding for parking and TDM technical assistance program.	Continue awarding grants through SC-TAP program. Work to increase funding for parking and TDM technical assistance program.	Identify new/expanded source of funds for technical assistance grant program as possible.
Guaranteed Ride Home Program	Continue program as is.	Continue integration of GRH marketing with ongoing Alameda CTC outreach efforts. Coordinate with information program efforts and initiate development of more comprehensive information and marketing materials.	Continue to provide administrative support for GRH program. Roll out comprehensive TDM/GRH marketing efforts.	Continue administrative support for GRH and comprehensive TDM/GRH marketing efforts.

This page intentionally left blank

APPENDIX A: CWTP BRIEFING BOOK CHAPTER 10 PARKING AND TDM

APPENDIX A: CWTP BRIEFING BOOK CHAPTER 10 Alameda County Transportation Commission
CHAPTER 10. PARKING AND TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

Traditionally, communities have tried to meet increasing demand for roadway or parking capacity by adding more supply—either through building lanes or adding parking structures. However, that approach has become increasingly unsustainable as there is less room available to add lanes in our built up areas and as cities have discovered the negative impacts that an ever increasing supply of roadways and parking lots has on the urban fabric. In addition, ample free parking and roadway capacity expansions have both been shown to induce more driving over time. It has become clear that the capacity expansion approach, originally intended to reduce congestion, may be worsening it, and may have a host of other unintended negative impacts as well.

The primary alternative to increasing supply is managing demand; changing the ways people travel has proven to be a quite effective way to manage congestion. Transportation demand management (TDM) consists of programs and policies that seek to affect the travel choices people make—the mode, time and duration of trips.

Page 103

ALAMEDA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

A large portion of traffic on our roadways is people driving their cars alone. Therefore, most demand management programs are designed to encourage people to travel by alternatives to the "single-occupant vehicle" (SOV), especially at peak hours when traffic is worst. Transportation demand management (TDM) can include strategies such as incentivies to use transit, to bike or to carpool, or providing alternatives such as carshare services that decrease the need for every individual to have a car. A number of typical TDM strategies are described in the sidebar on the following pages.

One of the most prominent and effective demand management strategies is managing the parking supply. Effective parking management has been shown to be a particularly effective way to manage the congestion on busy downtown streets that is caused by people "cruising" in their search for on-street parking. In addition, the overall availability and price of parking affects the mode choices people make when deciding how to get places. For example, since parking is expensive and more scarce (and since there are viable alternatives) in downtown San Francisco, many people traveling from Alameda County may choose to take BART or carpool rather than drive, which decreases traffic on the Bay Bridge.

In addition to being one of the single most important tools available for affecting the quantity of traffic on city streets, parking policy has also been shown to have substantial impacts on economic vitality, safety of all street users, and quality of the streetscape. A city's parking code (most importantly the minimum number of off-street parking spaces that a city requires for a new land use) shapes the form of our buildings and influences what is financially feasible to build. The type of parking facility and its integration with street design affect vehicle circulation, the movement and safety of transit vehicles, bicyclists and pedestrians and the quality of the streetscape. A brief overview of parking management strategies is also included in the sidebar on the following pages.

Transportation demand management can occur on multiple levels, with strategies appropriate for the region, the county and local jurisdictions, as well as individual employers or trip generators. Parking management is done at the city level: parking codes are a part of local zoning codes and parking management occurs primarily on local streets and roads and in city-owned public parking garages. Given this diversity, this Chapter concludes with an overview of how parking management and demand management could be integrated into the performance measures, projects and programs in the Alameda Countywide Transportation Plan and Transportation Expenditure Plan.

Transportation Demand Management Strategies

A number of the most effective TDM and parking management strategies are listed in the sidebars on the next few pages.

Compact Mixed Use Development & "Park Once" Districts

Land use is the best demand management. Maximizing access through proximity reduces travel and the need for parking. For example, reasonably dense, mixed use development where residents can walk to meet their daily shopping needs and employees can walk to get lunch and take care of daily errands eliminates many car trips that would have otherwise been necessary. In these compact, mixed use areas, it is often effective to implement a "park once" district that allows many uses to share the same parking supply, rather than every use having its own exclusive, separate parking space. The idea of a "park once" district is illustrated in the figures below which show a "conventional" parking scenario and a "park once" scenario.



Subsidized Transit Passes

In recent years, growing numbers of transit agencies have teamed with universities, employers, or residential neighborhoods to provide "universal transit passes." These passes typically provide unlimited rides on local or regional transit providers for low monthly fees, often absorbed entirely by the employer, school, or developer. The principle of employee or residential transit passes is similar to that of group insurance plans—transit agencies can offer deep bulk discounts when selling passes to a large group, with universal enrollment, on the basis that not all those offered the pass will actually use them regularly. These "universal transit passes" have been shown to reduce traffic congestion, increase transit ridership, and reduce existing parking demand.

Pricing Employee Parking & Parking Cash-Out

A majority of American commuters who drive to work today can park for free at work, which creates a strong incentive to drive to work alone. Parking cash-out is an alternative to directly pricing employee parking. In a parking cash out program, employers offer the cash value of the parking subsidy to any employee who does not drive to work in the form of a transit, vanpool, or carpool/walk/ bike subsidy. This ensures that an equal transportation subsidy is provided to all employees who ride transit, carpool, vanpool, walk or bicycle to work. Parking pricing is one of the transportation demand measures that have the largest impact on employee drive-alone rate. Significant changes in mode split can be achieved even at suburban locations that lack transit service through incentivizing carpooling to work.



Source: Nelson/Wygaaro

Car-sharing

Car-sharing provides individuals with access to a fleet of shared vehicles, allowing them to avoid owning a car, or a second or third car. Car-sharing at the workplace allows employees to take transit, walk or cycle to work, since a car will be available for business meetings or errands during the day. Car-sharing can also be used by businesses and government organizations to replace their fleet vehicles.

Alternative Work Schedules

Alternative work schedules typically allow or force employees to start and/or leave work outside of peak hours. These strategies are often a part of a company's Trip Reduction or TDM program. These can include flextime and staggered shifts enabling or mandating employees to arrive and leave at different times or the compressed work week where employees work fewer but longer days, such as four 10-hour days each week (4/40), or 9-hour days with one day off every two weeks (9/80).



Source: Nelson Wygaard

Parking Management

Traditionally, parking policy has been based on requiring every new land use to build, at minimum, a given number of off-street parking spaces in a dedicated lot or garage to ensure that there are "enough" parking spaces for all potential users to drive and park under conditions of maximum demand for that use. On-street parking, in contrast, has been managed minimally. Despite a stated goal of congestion relief and avoidance of spillover parking on surrounding streets, traffic congestion and parking issues have gotten worse under this status quo and are projected to steadily worsen over the next 20 years. Dozens of studies have demonstrated that when there is ample free parking, people drive more. The amount of driving induced is substantial, as is the increase in parking demand.

In light of this evidence, in recent years cities are instead choosing to adopt a different parking management model. The basic tenants of this new approach to parking are:

Start by Managing Scarce, Valuable Curb Parking

Curbside parking spaces are a neighborhood's most valuable parking resource and a critical indicator and determinant of the economic health of a place. Instead of maintaining minimum parking requirements in an attempt not to have to manage on-street parking, communities can actively manage on-street parking through tools such as parking pricing and residential parking permits, and use this as a base to determine how to manage off-street parking.



Source: Nelson/Wygaard

Use Parking Price to Maintain Availability

For areas where parking demand exceeds on-street supply, rather than just building more off-street parking, cities can charge flexible, market rate prices for curbside parking spaces to ensure turnover of the most convenient curb-parking spaces for customers. Off-street parking can simultaneously be priced to incentivize its use and thereby lessen traffic caused by "cruising" in search of an on-street space. Further, the use of pricing instead of time limits can eliminate a key source of downtown parking anxiety which can counterproductively shorten the time people spend browsing for and consuming local goods and services.

New Meter Technologies

New meter technologies can be critical to enable flexible-pricing strategies to help meet on-street performance-targets. These new "smart" meters can also provide payment flexibility for customers, improving the customer experience.

Dedicate Revenue to District Where it is Collected

In order to build support for these parking policy and pricing changes, it is important to dedicate parking revenues to public improvements and services that benefit the blocks where the revenue is collected. If parking revenues seem to disappear into the General Fund, there will be little support for installing parking meters, or for raising rates. This often takes the form of a "Parking Benefit District," where meter revenue is collected and a local board determines how it is spent.

Use Revenues to Fund Transit and Demand Management

Rather than offering parking for free and allowing transit service to be user-paid, and thus comparatively expensive and relatively scarce, communities are funding transit service that is frequent and (for some users) free, investing in other modes such as bicycling, and funding incentives to take modes other than driving alone.

Reconsider Minimum Parking Requirements

Once a city is using on-street parking management techniques to avoid parking spillover and congestion, a reconsideration of minimum parking requirements becomes necessary. Reducing, creating flexibility in, or eliminating parking requirements does not mean that no parking is built, but rather that market forces would determine the appropriate level of supply, based on market demands, rather than relatively arbitrary city requirements, often set decades ago.

Unbundle Parking Prices from Leases & Rents

Rather than hiding the cost of parking in the cost of other goods and services through requiring new buildings to build ample off-street parking and offer it for free to their occupants and visitors, cities can make the costs of parking visible, so that citizens can make the choice to save money by using less parking.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Demand management strategies, in particular parking management, are an indispensible part of Alameda County's transportation system, and their importance will only grow in the future as new approaches to congestion management become ever more important. A number of cities in Alameda County have already begun to implement policy innovations, and more robust TDM programs.

Cities are also beginning to reconsider their parking requirements, especially near transit stations, and to invest in technology to have better data to enable more efficient management. A selection of these city programs are profiled in this chapter indicating the range of parking and TDM strategies present in Alameda County today.

As described earlier in this report, Alameda County is quite diverse and different communities are facing different problems with regards to parking. However, there are also many commonalities in both the challenges communities are facing and the available solutions. For example, regardless of context, parking is often the locus of developer-citizen conflicts at new projects and "getting parking right" is crucial to the success of new development throughout the County. At least one case from each planning area is described below in an attempt to capture the range of parking issues present in Alameda County today and some of the solutions that are being tried.

Urban, transit-rich North County cities, such as Berkeley, are engaged in using novel technologies to collect robust data to enable dynamic pricing to respond to demand and decrease congestion while improving economic vitality of their historic downtowns. Older suburban communities in Central and South County, such as Hayward and Union City, are implementing a new parking paradigm as they encourage TOD at their BART stations and in their urbanizing downtowns. Traditionally auto-based suburban commuting cities in East County, such as Pleasanton and Dublin, have some urbanizing nodes and are also starting to encourage TOD at their BART stations and finding that parking is becoming a major lynchpin of political and economic success in those projects.

Countywide and Regional Programs

An example of a very successful countywide TDM program is the Alameda County Guaranteed Ride Home program. This program "guarantees" a ride home for all enrolled employees who commute by modes other than driving alone up to six times per year. This is a commuter benefit designed to encourage use of alternative modes by removing the uncertainty of not having your own car at work. It is available to all Alameda County employers and employees free of charge.

The regional 511 transportation information service offers a commute benefits program that includes a number of programs to support commuting by non-auto modes and sharing rides. 511 has a carpool ridematching service called "511 RideMatch" and a bike mapping tool called "511 BikeMapper".¹

It should also be noted that, though not a regional or local change, pre-tax transit benefits nearly doubled in 2010 and pre-tax bicycle benefits were allowed for the first time on a federal level.

City of Berkeley

The parking problems in the City of Berkeley illustrate the most common parking management problems that cities in Alameda County are struggling with. The City of Berkeley has also implemented a number of parking and demand management advancements and their successes are also described below. Both Berkeley's successes and challenges give a real face to many of the parking and demand management issues and strategies that were discussed in the abstract earlier in this Chapter.

The Parking Problem in Berkeley

Berkeley's parking issues are similar to many downtowns. The general perception in downtown Berkeley is that downtown "has a parking shortage." However, photographs in Figure 10-1² reveal that, on a Saturday evening there is ample available parking in downtown, but it isn't at the curb. Nearly every curb space is full while in the open-to-the-public parking garages nearby, multiple levels of parking were entirely vacant.³

The explanation of this phenomenon lies in parking pricing and management. On Saturday evening, the standard price to park in the garages is a \$5 flat-rate fee. After 6 P.M., curb parking is free. The curb parking is more visible, easier to reach, closer to destinations, and perceived by many to be safer than parking in a garage—and it's free. Given this

¹ Source: 511 website, http://511.org

² Photographs taken by Nelson\Nygaard staff on January 30, 2010, a Saturday evening, between 10 pm and midnight.

³ Garages: publicly-owned Center Street Garage and the privately-owned Allston Way Garage, both just half a block from Shattuck Avenue, the main street through downtown Berkeley.



Figure 10-1 Parking Contrasts in Downtown Berkeley

Saturday, January 30, 2010, 10 pm - midnight: Harold Way, Shattuck Avenue, the Allston Way Garage and the Center Street Garage, Berkeley. Source: NelsonNygaard

ALAMEDA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

combination of incentives, it becomes obvious why that the curb parking is full while the garages are half-empty. Further, for evening employees at restaurants and bars working shifts starting at 5 or 6 P.M., under current rules, it makes most sense to drop a few quarters in a meter that will turn off at 6 P.M., and then remain all night. Shoppers and diners who arrive later often find the curb parking full.

These late night visitors are left with three options:

- 1. Circle the commercial blocks until a curb spot opens up.
- 2. Pay \$5 flat rate to park in a garage.
- 3. Search for parking on a nearby neighborhood residential street and park there for free.

Given that current residential parking permit area rules permit anyone to park up to two hours and after 7 P.M. for as long as they want, it is understandable that curb parking on many residential blocks near downtown is completely occupied for much of the evening, while the garages remain empty. Even during the weekday, studies have documented many nonresidents park in the residential permit parking blocks, often evading the spirit of the law by moving their cars every two hours to avoid being cited.

The combined issues of perceived parking shortages and acute neighborhood spillover parking while nearby parking garages are vacant are not unique to downtown Berkeley, but affect cities across Alameda County. There are a few key conclusions that can be drawn from this example that have broader implications for cities throughout the county:

- Perceptions of an overall parking shortage may be a case of acute spot shortages rather than an overall lack of capacity. Nonetheless this misperception can negatively affect economic vitality, leading to demands for building more parking combined with ever emptier garages impacting the city's ability to pay off construction debt.
- 2. Building more spaces cannot solve this type of perceived parking shortage.
- 3. Better parking management can solve the perceived parking shortage, without driving away customers or damaging the downtown economy.

The Solution

The City of Berkeley has recently taken a number of innovative steps in terms of parking recently and continues to attract funds to take their parking management to a whole new level. The City recently won a MTC Climate Initiatives Program Innovative Grant



Source: Nelson/Wygaard

and a U.S. DOT Federal Highways Administration Value Pricing Pilot Program to implement efficient demand responsive pricing through purchase of License Plate Recognition technology and other implementation steps.

Berkeley has a number of parking policies already in place:

- Sustainable Parking Funding: Berkeley's practice of using parking fees to cover the cost of municipal parking facilities is a sustainable way to fund parking
- **City of Berkeley Model TDM Employer:** The City of Berkeley has made considerable efforts to establish itself as a model employer with regard to transportation demand management.
 - The City's EasyPass program, established in 2002, provides free unlimited rides on all AC Transit buses to all City employees. As a result, 20% of former drive-alone employees now use AC Transit to commute to work; 59% of users reported they would reduce or stop riding the bus without the EcoPass.
 - o Other programs include: secure bike parking and showering facilities, carpool, vanpool & car-sharing programs
 - o All these programs combined have led to less driving and higher use of all non-auto modes.

- TDM as Development Condition of Approval: In downtown (as well as at other locations in the city), the city has frequently required that new developments comply with transportation demand management requirements as a condition of approval of the project.
- Mandatory Employee Commute Benefit: Berkeley (along with the cities of San Francisco and Richmond in Contra Costa County) passed an ordinance requiring all employers with 10+ employees to offer pre-tax commute benefits (TRACCC Ordinance).
- New Technologies: New technologies have also been integrated into Berkeley's parking system. Most recently, multi-space meters which accept both coin and forms of credit/debit cards have been installed throughout downtown Berkeley and the Southside. These devices ease the ability for users to pay by accepting additional forms of payment while also reducing the amount of parking fee collection infrastructure.
 - Berkeley has also investigated additional electronic wayfinding and guidance systems to complement the current parking supply to make searching for a parking space faster for consumers while enabling more efficient use of the city's existing parking supply.
- Reduced parking requirements at Transit-Oriented Development: Several award winning TOD projects in Berkeley were made possible by Berkeley's willingness to allow projects with little on-site parking. They also allow car-lift systems which enable developers to maximize efficiency in parking garages, freeing up space for ground floor commercial and housing.⁴
- UC Berkeley's TDM Program: UC Berkeley also operates a robust TDM program for students, faculty, and staff that is similar to that of the City, such as the AC Transit Class Pass Program.



Source: Nelson\Nygaard

San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART)

The Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) which provides regional heavy-rail transit services in the San Francisco Bay Area, has begun to transition towards market-based parking pricing. For selected areas, BART allows parking rates to vary by lot and has adopted occupancy-based criteria for adjusting daily and monthly reserved parking rates. In addition, BART has recently facilitated construction of TOD by eliminating the requirement that all displaced commuter parking be replaced as part of each project.

Parking at BART Stations

BART is actually one of the largest parking operators in the Bay Area. For most of the agency's history, the cost of building, operating, and maintaining commuter parking facilities has been paid for by all riders through fares and taxes, rather than through user fees (as station parking was available to commuters free of charge). Since 2005, BART has charged daily parking fees of \$1-\$5 and monthly reserved parking fees of \$30 to \$115 at all of its park-and-ride lots. Demand-based criteria are used to set monthly reserved parking fees and daily rates at selected stations and some members of the Board of Directors have proposed transitioning toward pure marketbased parking pricing systemwide.

^{4 &}quot;Developing Parking Policies to Support Smart Growth in Local Jurisdictions: Best Practices" 2006 Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC).

Currently, prices vary by station as shown in Figure 10-2.

Figure 10-2 BART Station Daily Parking Fee

Station(s)		Daily Parking Fee
West Oakland		\$5.00
Daly City Colma		\$2.00
Ashby Castro Valley Dublin/Pleasanton El Cerrito del Norte El Cerrito Plaza Fremont Fruitvale MacArthur Lafayette Lake Merritt	North Berkeley Orinda Rockridge Walnut Creek Pleasant Hill Pittsburg/Bay Point Millbrae San Bruno South San Francisco Union City	\$1.00

Facilitating Station Area Development

As it conducts station area planning, BART is focused on achieving the best combination of parking supply, parking management practices (including pricing), access facilities and services for all modes, and TOD to maximize ridership and revenue for each station and each corridor. To inform this planning work, BART commissioned development of an *Access Methodology* (2005) model that offers the most cost-effective mix of TOD, access improvements, and replacement parking for each station site. This set the stage for the new approach to station parking and development by establishing a hierarchy of station access modes that clearly prioritized non-motorized options and transit ahead of auto access and parking (see Figure 10-3).⁵



Source: Nelson/Wygaard



⁵ BART Access Guidelines (October, 2003).

Monitoring

Motivated by concerns about impacts to BART ridership and revenues, as well as potential spillover parking impacts on surrounding neighborhoods, the BART Board directed its Marketing Department to conduct detailed parking occupancy surveys for two weeks before and two weeks after the initial implementation of pricing and to analyze daily station ridership in light of the survey results. Surveys throughout the system showed no significant impact on ridership or fare revenues.

Example: MacArthur Transit Village

This example briefly illustrates how BART's approach plays out in a real project in Alameda County. The MacArthur BART Station is a heavily used transfer station in the urban Temescal neighborhood of Oakland. Planning for the MacArthur Transit Village has been in the works since 1993. Given the high density of residents and jobs in the surrounding area, the pedestrian and bicycle accessibility of the site, the density of the TOD planned for BART property, and the availability of high frequency bus and shuttle transfers for station passengers, model results indicate that BART ridership and revenues would be highest with a development plan that includes just 50% of the existing supply of 600 spaces. Instead, responding to concerns about spillover parking and fears of lost parking revenue, BART has settled on a plan to replace 85% of current parking, and is working with the City of Oakland to accommodate a limited number of commuters parking on-street in surrounding neighborhoods.

Benefits

Benefits of BART parking policies include:

- Equity benefits: Parking fees that cover the full cost of building, operating, and maintaining station parking facilities, leave scarce transit agency resources for use in fulfilling the agency's primary mission to provide high quality public transportation services in the region. BART has thus reduced the practice of utilizing fare revenue from transit dependent commuters to subsidize parking for suburban commuters.
- **Increased revenue:** With ever tightening capital and operating budgets, parking pricing represented an opportunity to generate substantial new revenue from users. As of April 2010, these parking programs generate \$13 million per year for BART. BART has allocated these revenues to the general fund, but some Directors have argued for dedication of parking revenues to station specific multimodal access improvements.
- Improving commuter choices and parking availability: Before parking fees were adopted, many lots were completely full by 8:00 A.M. Commuters from outside of the City of San Francisco could not be sure that they would find a parking space at a nearby BART station on any given day, reducing their incentive to take public transit. With BART's monthly reserved parking permits, commuters are guaranteed a parking space until 10:00 A.M. Meanwhile, proponents of dynamic, market-based daily parking pricing argue that it could be used to guarantee the availability of station parking for arriving travelers, regardless of the day or time of arrival.



Image from MacArthur Transit Community Partners, LLC

Hayward

Most of Hayward has conventional auto-oriented suburban parking standards, with minimum parking requirements. However, over the last few years they have been moving towards more transit-oriented parking and demand management polices around their BART stations. They have developed new development codes and are innovating their parking codes and development standards as well as designing comprehensive demand management policies to support their goals for these station areas.

The community's goals for these areas include creation of vibrant, livable neighborhoods with high-quality, safe, well-used public spaces; encouraging highest-intensity residential uses and essential community services within a short walking distance to the BART station; encouraging coordinated development, facilitating coordination of public and private parking resources to enhance neighborhood livability; and encouraging well-designed development that supports a high quality pedestrian realm and appropriately scaled development for the surrounding neighborhoods.

In 2006, the South Hayward BART/Mission Boulevard Concept Design Plan established new, more transitoriented parking standards for several zones within the South Hayward BART/Mission Boulevard Plan area.⁶ Within these zones, minimum parking requirements for residential land uses were eliminated and replaced by maximum parking limits.

The standards for these zones, while allowing developers of transit-oriented projects to provide whatever amount of parking they find appropriate to meet the demands of their particular target market, have not, as is sometimes feared, resulted in the provision of no parking at all. For example, the Wittek/Montana mixed-use development at the South Hayward BART Station, which proposes approximately 788 multi-family residential units, proposes to build approximately 898 parking spaces for the residential units despite no parking spaces being required. The city is taking the same approach in the Mission Boulevard Specific Plan, also under development currently, covering all portions of Mission Boulevard lying outside of the Plan area mentioned above.

Hayward has also developed a Form-based Code for this area which establishes a clear vision for the future of the area and they are currently engaged in a TDM study to figure out the most cost-effective parking and transportation strategies to support and advance that vision. They are considering policies such as:⁷

- Commercial and Residential Parking Benefit
 Districts
- Investing meter parking revenues in TDM programs
- Deeply-discounted group transit pass programs
- Mandatory parking cash-out
- Unbundling parking costs
- Broader removal of minimum parking requirements

⁶ The South Hayward BART/Mission Boulevard Parking Area is defined as land zoned as Station Area Residential or Mission Boulevard Residential, as well as that zoned Neighborhood Commercial-Residential in the area bounded by Harder Road and Industrial Parkway along Mission Boulevard.

⁷ South Hayward BART/Mission Boulevard Form-Based Code Parking & Transportation Demand Management Strategy, January 2010 http://www.ci.hayward.ca.us/forums/SHBARTFBC/pdf/2010/SO_HAY-WARD_Parking_Strategy_FINALDRAFT.pdf

Union City

Union City has also been moving towards a more urban, transit-oriented approach to parking in their BART station area. Union City broke ground on the "Intermodal Station District" in 2007. This will transform the Union City BART station area from a large industrial area with commuter parking lots into a vibrant, integrated downtown neighborhood. This will serve as an intermodal transit hub with BART, a major 16-bay bus facility, Capitol Corridor and Altamont Commuter Rail. It will also include new retail, job centers, housing, and public amenities.

Futhermore, the recent Union City Parking Meter Implementation Project resulted in the installation of Union City's first parking meters around the Union City BART station on both city streets and in the City's municipal parking lots near the BART station. The multi-space pay stations were installed just a few months after BART started charging \$1 per day at BART parking lots in Union City. Commuters have multiple parking options and Union City has priced these options to incentivize commuters to park in o street facilities and less convenient on-street locations, while the most convenient on-street parking near BART is prioritized for short term visitors and customers to Union City businesses. Pricing is used ensure that BART parking does not negatively impa residents and businesses close to the BART station. while BART patron parking fees will be used to build and maintain sufficient parking for these commuters. Ridership at the Union City BART station actually increased after the parking charges were initiated at the station.

Union City is also currently engaged in TDM plans at some of the new developments in the Intermodal Station District. For projects in this District, parking requirement may be reduced contingent on implementation of a TDM program. Programs can include transit incentives, carsharing, and bicycle parking.

Figure 10-4 Union City BART Station Parking Map



e	BART commuters	neighborhood visitors	BART user
off-	Area S Permit	Pay & Display	Pay by Space
	Where: Parking Lot 2, Meyers Dr., J st. and Lot. 12th St. Alvarado - Niles Rd. (Northbound). Hours: Monday - Friday 8AM - 6PM	Where: Union Square, 11th St > Enter hours to park > Use credit/debit card or coin > Take receipt	Where: Parking Lot 1 Enter space number Enter hours to park Use credit/debit card or coir
to ict	Cost: \$120 per quarter Buy online: www.ucparking.org (510) 477-1780	 Return to car and diplay receipt on dashboard Cost: \$0.50 per hour Hours Mon - Sat, 8 am - 8 pm 	 Keep receipt, no need to return to car Cost: \$0.50 per hour • \$3 max. Hours Mon - Fri, 8 am - 6 pm

Two hours limited FREE parking is also available on Meyers Drive, 12th Street, J Street Parking Lot and Alvarado-Niles Road.

Pleasanton

Hacienda Business Park Trip Reduction Ordinance (TRO)

The Hacienda Business Park, located in Pleasanton, is a 500-acre development containing approximately eight million square feet of office, commercial and light industrial uses. This area is zoned as a planned unit development and, as such, landowners are subject to a trip reduction ordinance (TRO). The TRO is unique in that it was one of the first ordinances to be applied to existing, as well as new employers, and it requires that all employers participate regardless of size.

Employers in the Hacienda Business Park must participate in an assessment district to fund any roadway changes which are necessary to prevent the intersection or freeway interchange level of service (LOS) from falling below D during peak hours. Those employers with 100 or more employees must participate in a trip reduction program.

The TRO establishes a performance standard for peak hour drive alone commute trips with a threshold of 55% or less of daytime workers driving alone during the peak hour. The threshold was set to enable all planned development to be accommodated while still meeting the LOS guidelines. Employers may meet this standing using any TDM measures they choose and are given three years to meet this standard. However, at a minimum, employers must name a transportation coordinator, establish a traffic mitigation program, and conduct an annual survey of employees' commute patterns.

In addition to meeting performance standards, employers must also abide by monitoring and enforcement requirements and procedures established in the TRO. This includes procedures for mandating the implementation of additional transportation management programs if monitoring results show that they are necessary. A task force made up of individuals from the business community rather than city staff, is responsible for overseeing employers to ensure that they are meeting the requirements of the TRO. By using members of the business community, the enforcement process becomes a peer review, and potentially peer pressure, rather than relying on government enforcement to ensure compliance. However, the City does maintain the ability to assess substantial fines if necessary.

Parking Cash-out in Pleasanton

The City of Pleasanton has a parking cash-out system called "pRide" that reimburses employees for using travel modes other than the single-occupant vehicle.⁸ The City reimburses employees \$2 a day (\$1 if one-way). Participants register with the program, fill out a monthly log indicating which modes they used each day, and indicating any absences. This is reviewed by a manager, and then submitted to payroll. The reimbursement is added to the employee's paycheck as taxed income. Although the program is run on the honor system, where the employee simply states how they got to work, there are checks in place such as manager review of the log and verification of absences. Fraud appears to be minimal. This is supplemented by a pre-tax transit subsidy.

BEST PRACTICES

There are a number of "best practices" that can be found right here in Alameda County, as described above. However, other parking and TDM best practices are profiled here that might be instructive for Alameda County.

San Francisco's SFpark Pilot Project

San Francisco's SF*park* project is using "demandresponsive pricing to manage parking demand towards availability targets."⁹ SF*park* is currently installing parking occupancy sensors on streets in eight pilot areas throughout San Francisco. The wirelessly networked sensors—



Source: SF Park

mostly in metered spaces, but some in unmetered spaces—transmit data on parking space occupancy to the computers of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA). The sensors are paired with wirelessly networked single-space and multi-space parking meters, which accept credit and debit cards as well as coins. The meter installations began in July and by December, nearly 5,100 spaces will be regulated by the new networked meters.

⁸ Source: Interview with Becky Perry, Pleasanton Transportation Department. www.ci.pleasanton.ca.us/

⁹ San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency. SFpark Updated Scope of Work—Parking Pilot Projects Urban Partnership Program, August 6, 2008.

Requiring projects to develop and implement transportation demand management plans can be a highly effective way of reducing vehicle trips. However, to be effective, transportation demand management requirements must meet several conditions. Transportation demand management can be required through the terms of a development agreement for a specific project, included as part of the requirements of a Specific Plan, or mandated by a citywide ordinance. In all these cases, several conditions must be met. A City's transportation demand management plans and requirements must:

- 1. Work toward the achievement of a clear goal set by the City.
- 2. Set measurable goals and clear requirements for each project.
- 3. Establish viable long-term mechanisms for actively monitoring compliance with and then enforcing those requirements.

Setting transportation demand requirements is similar, in general terms, to the process of setting many other requirements for new buildings. For example, for life safety, communities require that a building's elevators be: (a) clearly shown on the plans submitted to the City; (b) built to a certain standard; (c) properly installed and tested before a certificate of occupancy for the building is issued; and (d) regularly inspected to ensure that they continue to be maintained. Finally, if these conditions are not met, cities have viable enforcement mechanisms (e.g., assessing penalties, or shutting down a site). To be more than words on paper, transportation demand management requirements must be approached in the same manner. Cities with effective TDM plans have thorough programs for monitoring, enforcement, and when necessary, assessing penalties.

Moreover, the best and most successful transportation demand management plans work to create an active partnership between the public and private sectors. This means crafting requirements that work to achieve legitimate public goals (such as minimizing traffic congestion and air pollution) at the lowest possible cost for property owners, developers and employers. The best transportation demand management requirements set for development projects also often build on and are supported by significant public investments in public transit (such as San Marcos' new Sprinter rail stations), ridesharing programs (such as SANDAG's regional ridesharing services) and citywide bicycle and pedestrian networks.

The occupancy sensors allow the city's parking managers to observe, on a continuous basis, parking occupancy on each block. The networked meters allow managers to easily adjust parking rates and hours of operation at each meter, simply by reprogramming the meters from a central computer.

The goal is to adjust prices up or down in increments of \$0.25/hour every four to six weeks based on availability data from parking sensors. Prices can be adjusted block-to-block, in two-block units, or at any other appropriate scale area. The new prices may also be adjusted by time-of-day towards a goal of managing congestion, rather than strictly pricing based on length of stay.

SFMTA's goal with SF*park* is "to create a driver experience in which drivers either (a) go directly to a parking garage with available spaces; or (b) are able, most of the time, to find an on-street parking space as near to their destination as possible, preferably within a block or two of their destination."¹⁰

The SF*park* project relies on the fact that parking demand patterns are actually fairly predictable and recurring. In neighborhood commercial districts on a Sunday, for example, demand on many blocks is higher at 11 A.M., when restaurants are open, than at 6 A.M. So, on those blocks, Sunday rates may higher for the hour from 11 A.M. to noon than the hour from 6 to 7 A.M.

The goal is to shift some demand from the curb to private lots and garages and eliminate acute recurring curb parking shortages. This will have the added effect of lessening the phenomenon of cars circling the block in search of a free parking space.

MTC Parking Toolbox/Handbook

Another resource that could be useful in addressing parking and demand management for the Countywide Plan is a "Toolbox/Handbook" that was developed by MTC: *Reforming Parking Polices to Support Smart Growth: Parking Best Practices* & *Strategies for Supporting Transit Oriented Development in the San Francisco Bay Area.* This tool was developed by MTC for a training seminar on parking policies to support smart growth for local jurisdictions held in 2007. The handbook helps local jurisdictions define what type of area they are and identifying parking strategies that are likely to be effective in this type of area. It describes the various strategies and provides examples of best practices from around the region and country.

¹⁰ San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency. SFpark Updated Scope of Work—Parking Pilot Projects Urban Partnership Program, August 6, 2008.

Bellevue, Washington

In downtown Bellevue, Washington, the drive alone commute rate fell by 30% from 1990 to 2000, falling from 81% driving alone to 57%.

Bellevue, Washington, (population 117,137) sits on the east side of Lake Washington, about a ten mile drive from downtown Seattle. Like many cities in Alameda County, it is a relatively prosperous and growing suburb in the orbit of a much larger city. Bellevue is notable for the progress that it has made in reducing drive alone rates in its downtown, despite the fact that it is not served by rail transit and has relatively little influence over its regional transit agency.

The City of Bellevue's Commute Trip Reduction program (CTR) was implemented by ordinance in 1993, two years after the State of Washington adopted the Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) Law, requiring cities in the most populous counties of the State to develop and implement a commute trip reduction ordinance. The city CTR now encompasses 53 employers and roughly 22,000 employees. The ordinance applies to every employer (private, public or non-profit) with 100 or more full-time employees arriving at a single worksite between 6 to 9 A.M.

The Bellevue Downtown Association, composed of 186 businesses, manages several voluntary programs to limit commute trips. TransManage, the transportation arm of the association, has actively promoted transit, ridesharing, and carpool services, partially through an employee commute benefit package. The package includes a FlexPass, to be used on different transit services and taxis, as well as a Qualified Transportation Fringe Benefits package, which allows employers with 20 or more employees to contribute up to \$100 per month in transit or vanpool services as a tax-deductible expense. FlexPasses, issued by King County Metro, the Seattle area's regional transit agency, provide employees with free access to all of the agency's buses. Under this "universal transit pass" program, employers pay \$65 per year per employee for every employee in their workforce: in return, every employee receives an annual pass, a benefit which has a normal annual price of \$396-\$1584.

Employers can require employees to pay for up to half the cost of the FlexPass. Employers who do participate in this program are eligible for a maximum \$5,000 King County telework grant. The size of the incentive is based on the number of employees who telework at least one day a week.



Parking Policy

Currently, Bellevue requires downtown office buildings of more than 50,000 square feet to identify the cost of parking as a separate line item in all leases, with the minimum monthly rate per space not less than twice the price of a bus pass. For example, since the price of a monthly bus pass was \$72 in 2003, the minimum price of a leased parking space was \$144 a month. This requirement for "unbundling" parking costs does not increase the overall cost of occupying office space in a building because the payment for the office space itself declines as a result. In other words, unbundling separates the rent for offices and parking, but does not increase their sum. Bellevue is perhaps unique in routinely requiring the unbundling of parking costs from office leases. This innovative policy has several advantages. It makes it easy for employers to "cash-out" parking for employees (that is, to offer employees the value of their parking space as a cash subsidy if they do not drive to work), since employers can save money by leasing fewer spaces when fewer employees drive. It also makes it easier for shared parking arrangements to occur, since building owners can more easily lease surplus parking spaces to other users.

In addition, the city has shifted from high minimum parking requirements to enforcing parking maximums. The city code now set no minimums for housing and mixed-use retail located in certain downtown zones. All downtown residential units are limited to no more than two parking spaces. This move to less parking has had a noticeable impact on private employers. The engineering firm CH2M Hill still offers free parking to drive-alone employees,



but it also gives \$40 per month to employees if they opt instead to walk, bicycle, carpool, or take transit. Ultimately, this saves employers money who no longer have to provide expensive parking and it lightens an employee's transportation budget.

Trip Reduction Results

Bellevue's CTR sets trip reduction goals in terms of reducing the proportion of single-occupant vehicles and vehicle-miles traveled per employee from the 1992 base year values. These targets started at the goal of a 15% reduction by 1995, rising to 20% in 1997, 25% in 1999, and 35% in 2005. Vehicle commute trips are calculated at one trip per person (twoperson carpools counting as 1/2 trips per occupant, three-person carpools as 1/3 trips, etc.) Each vehicle commute trip eliminated due to telecommuting, alternative work schedules, bicycling, or walking counts as 1.2 trips eliminated.

Results from the Commute Trip Reduction program have been impressive. Overall in downtown Bellevue, the drive alone commute rate fell by 30% from 1990 to 2000, falling from 81% driving alone to 57%. In 1993, after considerable progress in reducing drive alone rates had already taken place, the Commute Trip Reduction went into effect. Among the CTRaffected worksites in the downtown, drive alone rates then dropped from 72.9% in 1993 to 58.5% in 2001, almost a 20% decrease. Among all CTR-affected worksites citywide, the drive-alone rate has dropped from 76.6% in 1993 to 69.2% in 2001—almost a 10% decrease respectively. These numbers do not meet the ambitious targets set under the Bellevue ordinance, but are notable nonetheless.

FUTURE CONDITIONS AND SUMMARY OF NEEDS

As the population grows and traffic gets worse, innovative approaches to congestion management will become more important. Most people agree that parking management and TDM measures must be addressed through the Alameda Countywide Transportation Plan since they are such a useful tool in meeting the goals of the plan, namely congestion management and encouraging use of non-auto modes. The following concepts describe the levels of programs that could be developed to support better management. In addition, this Countywide Plan will need to consider system performance more broadly than previous plans, including rewarding projects that actually reduce demand rather than expanding capacity. Using energy policy as an example, projects that reduce demand on the electric grid through efficiency or conservation are rewarded as "negawatt" projects—understanding that reducing demand defers the need for enhanced supply. While this concept is less well developed for transportation plans, the Countywide Plan will need to prioritize projects that reduce demand on our limited roadway infrastructure as a cost effective technique for reducing capacity needs.

Fund Purchase of New Parking Technology: Parking technology is quite expensive. For example, upgrading all downtown single space meters to "smart" multi-space meters or purchasing license plate recognition technology and funding a staff person to collect and interpret parking data, is a large up front, and on-going, expense. Parking technology does not easily fall within current regional MTC funding programs, highlighting the need for local funding. However, most cities cannot fund this through their General Funds alone. So, county funding must be directed to local entities for purchase of new parking technologies and/or data collection they require to implement parking reforms.

However, there are also many components of parking and TDM that are local policy changes, not requiring funding per se. How can the Countywide Plan encourage policy changes that will move us towards our congestion reduction goals, but which the CWTP does not have direct control over?

Incentivize policy changes: The county can give cities financial incentives and matching grants to encourage cities to reform their parking policies, adopting measures such as removing minimum parking requirements, actively managing curb parking, unbundling parking costs from housing costs, etc. These local parking reforms create significant regional benefits of many kinds, such as reducing traffic congestion, air and water pollution; making housing more affordable; and spurring economic development. Specifically, the Countywide Plan could:

- Provide grants to cities for the acquisition and installation of parking meters (for curb parking) and parking access and revenue control systems (for off-street lots).
- Provide grants to cities to assist them with the management of curb parking. This would include:
 - Planning grants for the development of residential parking permit districts, residential parking benefit areas, and commercial parking benefit areas.

- o Capital and operating grants for the purchase and operation of enforcement vehicles and license plate recognition systems, parking stall occupancy sensors, handheld enforcements.
- Provide matching funds to cities that raise parking revenues by increasing curb parking rates, off-street rates, and/or enacting parking taxes. For example, providing cities with one dollar in regional funding for every one dollar in new local parking revenue that they raise would encourage cities to reduce existing parking subsidies and/or to enact parking taxes.
- Provide grants to cities to assist them in establishing and/or enforcing parking cash-out requirements and other transportation demand management ordinances.
- Provide planning grants to cities to help them reform outdated parking requirements.
- Fund training programs, technical assistance and symposia on best practices in reducing traffic and greenhouse gas emissions by reforming parking policies and practices.

APPENDIX B: TDM AND PARKING MANAGEMENT ISSUE PAPER

ISSUE PAPER: TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (TDM) AND PARKING MANAGEMENT^{1,2}

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This issue paper outlines the key principles of transportation demand management (TDM) and parking management, and how they may be implemented in Alameda County. Key conclusions include:

- TDM and parking management include a wide variety of different demand measures that can be designed to influence travel behaviors in a variety of urban and suburban contexts.
- TDM and parking management have been shown to be highly effective at achieving the transportation vision, goals, and objectives of the new Countywide Transportation Plan, most notably the need to reduce vehicle trips in light of new statewide regulation.
- Determining a specific role for the Alameda CTC is one of the biggest challenges in regards to TDM and parking management. TDM and parking management are often implemented at the local level, yet there likely remains a robust regional role for the Alameda CTC to play in terms of guidance and oversight, direct program administration (such as Alameda County's Guaranteed Ride Home program), and technical assistance for local jurisdictions.
- The Countywide Transportation Plan presents a unique opportunity to guide a growing regional movement that emphasizes demand-side solutions to the county's transportation challenges. The Countywide Transportation Plan is also well-positioned to support the efforts of municipalities to further innovate and utilize these strategies to achieve a shared vision for a sustainable and efficient transportation network. Initial concepts include:
 - Provide dedicated funding to the Guaranteed Ride Home (GRH) program, the Alameda CTC's primary TDM program.
 - Develop a comprehensive TDM program in which the Alameda County GRH program is expanded.
 - Develop Countywide TDM and parking management guidelines.
 - Create a robust technical assistance program to help jurisdictions implement TDM.
 - Initiate a TDM and/or parking certification program for.



¹ For purposes of this paper TDM and parking management are largely discussed as separate strategies. However, parking management by itself can also be categorized as one of many TDM tools.

² Certain concepts and specific language in this paper were adapted from a previous Nelson\Nygaard report: "Regional Parking Strategies for Climate Protection," Metropolitan Transportation Commission, January 2010.

- Ample precedent exists for the Alameda CTC to refer to in its efforts to establish countywide TDM and parking management policies and programs. The case studies included in this issue paper include:
 - o San Mateo C/CAG Trip Reduction Guidelines
 - o San Francisco Commuter Benefits Ordinance
 - National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board Technical Assistance Program and the D.C. Performance Based Parking Pilots
 - o Massachusetts Downtown Initiative (MDI)
 - o GreenTRIP Certification Program

INTRODUCTION

The Alameda CTC *Countywide Transportation Plan and Transportation Expenditure Plan Briefing Book* provides an overview of transportation demand management (TDM) and parking management, identifies best practices, and highlights what Bay Area jurisdictions and agencies are currently doing to utilize these strategies. This issue paper builds on the information provided in the *Briefing Book* to describe how TDM and parking management can be supported through the Countywide Transportation Plan and Transportation Expenditure Plan.

The development and implementation of the new Countywide Transportation Plan and Transportation Expenditure Plan are occurring within the context of a changed economic, regulatory, and social environment in which the concept of creating a more sustainable way of living through transportation and land use investments has become a primary focus. The passage of AB 32 and SB 375 requires that Alameda County take a different approach to transportation planning – one that aggressively addresses the impact of greenhouse gas emissions by reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Managing travel demand through TDM and/or parking management techniques offers cost effective and proven approaches to reducing VMT, by leveraging existing investments, and can complement investments in transit systems and other alternatives to driving. This issue paper further illustrates the efficacy and importance of TDM and parking management, while offering a potential framework for ways in which the Alameda CTC might facilitate supportive TDM and parking management policies.

The *Briefing Book* also addressed the related field of Transportation Systems Management, or TSM, at some length. TSM measures seek to improve the efficiency of road networks using technology-based solutions such as ramp metering and user information systems. By contrast, TDM measures seek to reduce demands on existing roadway and parking capacity using incentives and disincentives designed to influence travel choice. While TSM measures have an important role to play in developing a comprehensive transportation strategy, they are already well understood and widely used in Alameda County, while TDM strategies remain largely the purview of private employers. For this reason, this paper focuses on TDM and parking management.

What is TDM and Parking Management?

As discussed in the *Briefing Book*, TDM and parking management strategies represent a new, and increasingly prevalent, approach to transportation planning. This approach seeks to address transportation challenges, such as congestion and the need for adequate parking, not with traditional supply-side solutions, but rather with projects and programs that manage travel *demand*. Supply-side solutions focus on increasing roadway capacity or building more parking, an approach that has been criticized for creating additional congestion through "induced demand,"^{3.4.5} exacerbating parking inefficiencies,⁶ and contributing to a number of other public health and social impacts related to driving.⁷ As discussed below, research shows that TDM and parking management have had demonstrable and cost-effective success in influencing people's core travel choices and behaviors, thereby reducing vehicle trips, congestion, and vehicle emissions; while improving mobility, accessibility, and the efficiency of local and regional transportation networks.

TDM strategies are diverse and vary depending on the context, but typically fall into the following categories:⁸

- **Financial incentives,** such as subsidized transit passes, parking cash-out programs, commuter checks, or guaranteed ride home programs;
- Shared vehicle services, such as shuttles or carpools/vanpools;
- Alternative commute scheduling, such as telecommuting or compressed work weeks;
- **Promotional activities,** such as travel marketing programs, travel training, or on-site transportation coordinators;
- Infrastructure, such as car or bicycle sharing services, secure bicycle parking, or on-site amenities (lockers, showers, etc.);
- **Parking management** is a broad topic, but typically includes demand-responsive pricing of curb spaces, "unbundling" of parking costs from rents and leases, reduced or eliminated minimum parking requirements, use of new meter technologies to allow multiple forms of payment and dynamic pricing, district-based parking management, shared parking strategies, and the use of parking revenue to support other mobility programs.

It is important to note that TDM and parking management usually take place at the local level with local jurisdictions approving TDM ordinances, establishing transportation conditions of approval and setting parking policy. Similarly, execution of TDM strategies also typically happens at the local, and often at the project level, as municipalities, employers, developers, and public or private institutions assume responsibility for ensuring that TDM programs and parking management efforts are implemented. However, parking and demand management can have regional impacts. This is discussed in greater detail below.

³ Hansen, M., & Huang, Y. (1997). Road supply and traffic in California urban areas. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice,* 31(3), 205-218.

⁴ Goodwin, P. (1996). Empirical evidence on induced traffic: A review and synthesis. *Transportation, 23*, 35-54.

⁵ Cervero, R. (2003). Road Expansion, Urban Growth, and Induced Travel: A Path Analysis. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 69 (2), 145-163.

⁶ Shoup, D. (2005). The High Cost of Free Parking. Planners Press, American Planning Association.

⁷ American Public Health Association. (2010). *The Hidden Health Costs of Transportation*. Washington D.C.: American Public Health Association.

⁸ For a complete description and list of these strategies, please refer to the *Briefing Book*.

BENEFITS OF TDM AND PARKING MANAGEMENT

The Countywide Plan must balance a multitude of competing priorities within a highly competitive funding environment. Because TDM and parking management have been shown to be effective transportation planning tools in a variety of urban and suburban contexts, it is likely that these concepts can play an important role in ensuring that the Countywide Plan meets its goals and objectives. Some of the key benefits are:

- **Congestion and trip reduction:** Numerous studies demonstrate the effectiveness of TDM and parking management strategies in reducing vehicle trips and VMT. These include, but are not limited to:
 - Pricing of parking: "Market-based" parking pricing strategies seek to achieve availability targets (typically, 15% of spaces) by setting prices based on demand. A 2005 study showed that a 10% increase in parking charges reduces vehicle trips by 1-3%, depending on demographic, geographic, travel choice and trip characteristics.⁹ Figure 1 shows how minimum employee parking charges affected VMT, trips taken, and trip delay in four California regions. In the San Diego region, a \$3 employee parking charge reduced VMT by 2.4% and trip delay by 7%.¹⁰ Parking fees and pricing programs can also:
 - Reduce vehicle emissions from cars circling around looking for a parking space;
 - Generate funds for alternative modes, like bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and
 - Discourage people from driving, and encourage them to take alternative modes.

Region	Price	VMT	Trips	Delay
Bay Area	\$1	-0.8%	-0.9%	-2.7%
	\$3	-2.1%	-2.4%	-7.0%
Sacramento	\$1	-1.0%	-1.1%	-2.5%
	\$3	-2.6%	-2.8%	-6.5%
San Diego	\$1	-0.9%	-1.0%	-2.5%
	\$3	-2.4%	-2.6%	-7.0%
South Coast	\$1	-0.9%	-1.1%	-2.9%
	\$3	-2.5%	-2.8%	-8.5%

Figure 1 Impacts of Employee Parking Fees

Source: Harvey and Deakin, 1997, Table B.7, in 1991 U.S. dollars; Accessed at VTPI, http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm26.htm

⁹ Erin Vaca and J. Richard Kuzmyak (2005), *Parking Pricing and Fees*, Chapter 13, TCRP Report 95, Transit Cooperative Research Program, Transportation Research Board, Federal Transit Administration

⁽www.trb.org/publications/tcrp/tcrp_rpt_95c13.pdf). Accessed on Victoria Transport Policy Institute, http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm26.htm

¹⁰ Greig Harvey and Elizabeth Deakin (1997), "The STEP Analysis Package: Description and Application Examples," Appendix B, in Apogee Research, *Guidance on the Use of Market Mechanisms to Reduce Transportation Emissions,* USEPA (Washington DC; www.epa.gov/omswww/market.htm). Accessed on Victoria Transport Policy Institute, http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm26.htm

Subsidized transit passes: Passes purchased in bulk at a discount can be provided free to users (such as residents of an area, students at a university, or other groups) or at a discount. Figure 2 shows the drive-alone and transit mode splits before and after subsidized transit pass implementation in different locations. These programs all led to reductions in driving alone, as well as a 3-16% increase in transit use.

Location	Drive to work		Transit to work	
Municipalities	Before	After	Before	After
Santa Clara (VTA) ¹¹	76%	60%	11%	27%
Bellevue, WA ¹²	81%	57%	13%	18%
Ann Arbor, MI ¹³	N/A	(4%)	20%	25%
Universities				
UCLA ¹⁴ (faculty/staff)	46%	42%	8%	13%
Univ. of Washington ¹⁵	33%	24%	21%	36%
Univ. of British Colombia ¹⁶	68%	57%	26%	38%
Univ. of Wisconsin, Mil. ¹⁷	54%	41%	12%	26%
Colorado Univ. (students) ¹⁸	43%	33%	4%	7%

Figure 2 Mode Shifts Achieved with Free or Discounted Transit Passes

¹¹ Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, 1997.

^{12 1990} to 2000; http://www.commuterchallenge.org/cc/newsmar01_flexpass.html.

¹³ White et. al. "Impacts of an Employer-Based Transit Pass Program: The Go Pass in Ann Arbor, Michigan."

¹⁴ Jeffrey Brown, et. al. "Fare-Free Public Transit at Universities." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 23: 69-82, 2003.

¹⁵ 1989 to 2002, weighted average of students, faculty, and staff; From Will Toor, et. al. *Transportation and Sustainable Campus Communities*, 2004.

¹⁶ 2002 to 2003, the effect one year after U-Pass implementation; From Wu et. al, "Transportation Demand Management: UBC's U-P ass – a Case Study", April 2004.

¹⁷ Mode shift one year after implementation in 1994; James Meyer et. al., "An Analysis of the Usage, Impacts and Benefits of an Innovative Transit Pass Program", January 14, 1998.

¹⁸ Six years after program implementation; Francois Poinsatte et. al. "Finding a New Way: Campus Transportation for the 21st Century", April, 1999.

Parking Cash Out: Parking cash out is a TDM program that provides a subsidy to employees who choose to commute by alternative modes rather than making use of on-site parking. The primary benefit of parking cash out programs is their proven effect on reducing auto congestion and parking demand. Figure 3 illustrates the effect of parking cash-out at seven different employers located in and around Los Angeles. Additionally, a 1997 demonstration program including Alameda County and the Cities of Oakland, Pleasanton and Albany showed great promise: in the county, Oakland and Albany, 16-20% of participants changed their commute behavior (in Pleasanton, participation declined, but the existing program there had already grown substantially since implementation). Incentives consisted of Commuter Check transit vouchers or cash incentives ranging from \$1.50 to \$2.50 per day. All of the program sites were within one-quarter mile of transit and offered BART connections.

Figure 3 Effects of Parking Cash Out on Parking Demand¹⁹



Ridesharing: Ridesharing programs nationally have been shown to reduce daily auto commute trips to specific worksites by 5-15% if they consist solely of educational efforts, and up to 30% if combined with cash incentives such as parking cash out or vanpool subsidies.²⁰ Furthermore, because rideshare passengers tend to have relatively long commutes, mileage reductions can be relatively large. Rideshare programs have also been shown to reduce commute VMT by up to 8.3%, total regional VMT by up to 3.6%, and regional vehicle trips by up to 1.8%.²¹

¹⁹ Source: Derived from Donald Shoup, "Evaluating the Effects of Parking Cash-Out: Eight Case Studies," 1997. Based on the cost in 2005 dollars.

²⁰ Reid Ewing (1993), TDM, Growth Management, and the Other Four Out of Five Trips.

²¹ Apogee (1994), Costs and Cost Effectiveness of Transportation Control Measures; A Review and Analysis of the *Literature,* National Association of Regional Councils (www.narc.org). Accessed at VTPI, http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm34.htm

TDM Resource Center (1996), *Transportation Demand Management; A Guide to Including TDM Strategies in Major Investment Studies and in Planning for Other Transportation Projects,* Office of Urban Mobility, WSDOT (www.wsdot.wa.gov).

- Carsharing: Carsharing programs are short-term, members-only rental arrangements in which cars can be obtained on short notice (typically, by making a reservation online) from various unstaffed locations using cards or fobs. Research demonstrates that each carsharing vehicle takes nearly 15 private cars off the road a net reduction of almost 14 vehicles.²² Additionally, the average reduction in vehicle ownership in North American cities with carsharing programs was 20%. Finally, a UC Berkeley study of San Francisco's City CarShare found that members drive nearly 50% less after joining. The study also found that when people joined the carsharing organization, nearly 30% reduced their household vehicle ownership and two-thirds avoided purchasing another car.²³
- Guaranteed Ride Home Program: A GRH program provides "commuter insurance" for employees, in the form of vouchers allowing participants who do not drive to work to make a limited number of free (excepting tips and gas) after-work trips via taxi or rental car under certain conditions. In Alameda County's GRH program, these include medical emergencies, unscheduled overtime, or times when a rideshare vehicle is unavailable (because the vehicle has broken down or the driver had to leave early or stay late). One survey found that 59% of rideshare and transit users said GRH was a factor in their decision not to drive 24. GRH programs are also relatively inexpensive: another study found average costs of less than \$5 per employee, per year 25.
- Quick results and longer-term impacts: Capital projects can take years to design, clear environmental review, and construct. TDM and parking reform efforts can be implemented on a relatively fast timeline. Moreover, impacts from these programs and projects are often immediate. TDM programs have been shown to have immediate effects on travel behavior and mode choice, while implementation of parking reforms, such as dynamic pricing, can result in instantaneous changes to parking availability and local congestion related to "cruising" for parking. Finally, many of the behavioral impacts result in long-term and systemic changes. As described above, as an example, the use of car sharing has been shown to fundamentally reduce household vehicle ownership and travel behavior.
- **Cost-effective:** TDM programs and parking reform efforts are cost-effective, a crucial factor for the Countywide Transportation Plan to consider in the context of competing priorities.²⁶ First, TDM strategies can be implemented quickly, have relatively small up-front capital costs, and relatively low ongoing operating costs. Second, TDM programs can leverage existing infrastructure investments, such as transit service or high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes. For example, as shown in Figure 2, substantial mode shifts to transit can be achieved through transit pass programs, thereby increasing transit ridership and making transit systems themselves more cost-effective. Third, TDM programs can leverage the resources of the private sector. Many TDM programs, such as new shuttle services, financial incentives, ridesharing services, and marketing, are actually funded by private employers and institutions. Finally, effective parking management can be an additional source of revenue for local jurisdictions, although this aspect of parking management should be managed carefully, as discussed below.

www.bts.gov/ntl/DOCS/474.html. ²⁶ For example, see the cost effectiveness of TDM in Portland for reducing GHG. Portland Bureau of Transportation. "Technical Memorandum #2: Strategies for Reducing GHG Emissions." July 2010. Prepared by Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates.



²² Transportation Research Board (2005), *Carsharing: Where and How it Succeeds*, Transit Cooperative Research Program Report 108. http://onlinepubs.trb.org/Onlinepubs/tcrp/tcrp_rpt_108.pdf

²³ Cervero, R., & Tsai, Y.-H. (2003). San Francisco City CarShare: Travel-Demand Trends and Second-Year Impacts. University of California at Berkeley, Institute of Urban and Regional Development, Berkeley.

²⁴ K.T. Analytics (1992), TDM Status Report; Guaranteed Ride Home, Federal Transit Administration, USDOT (www.fta.dot.gov/library/planning/tdmstatus/FTAGUAR2.HTM).

²⁵ Comsis Corporation (1993), Implementing Effective Travel Demand Management Measures: Inventory of Measures and Synthesis of Experience, USDOT and Institute of Transportation Engineers (www.ite.org). Available at www.bts.gov/ntl/DOCS/474.html.

• **Politically viable:** Whether it is carpooling, using the company shuttle, utilizing commuter checks, or even riding a bicycle to work, large numbers of people already participate in a TDM program. In fact, many public and private employers highlight their TDM efforts and commute benefits as a means to attract employees. Consequently, these programs appear to be a politically viable option for additional funding and expansion throughout the County.

Parking management, however, can be more politically challenging, as parking policy decisions tend to generate vociferous debate, as seen in the City of Oakland in the summer of 2009 when the City raised parking rates and lengthened meter hours in several commercial districts. However, if "done right" in terms of program design and responsiveness to community concerns, the implementation of dynamic pricing and other parking reforms can result in strong support from the public and local business community. Experience in Redwood City, Pasadena, and numerous other jurisdictions has shown that clear articulation of policy goals such as parking availability, as well as reinvestment of additional revenue back in the community in the form of infrastructure improvements or complementary mobility strategies, can overcome the typical public objections to changes in parking policy.

- **Region-wide applicability and flexibility:** TDM and parking management strategies are adaptable to local conditions, needs, and policies. As an example, clearly, the parking challenges facing Berkeley are quite different that those in Hayward or Pleasanton. However, the core philosophies and methodologies behind each of the strategies remain the same, and can be tweaked or refined to meet the goals and objectives of different municipalities.
- **Pro-market:** Most municipal codes require that developers build more parking than the market warrants, thereby artificially distorting the market for parking. Parking reforms, such as reduced, maximum or eliminated minimum parking requirements, can improve the efficiency of the regional economy in general. In particular, reducing parking requirements reduces the overall cost to build new housing and commercial developments, especially in transit-rich and walkable locations.

CHALLENGES

One of the Alameda CTC's primary challenges is to determine exactly what its role will be in regards to TDM and parking management. Currently, the Alameda CTC does play a direct, but limited role in these areas. For example, the Alameda CTC currently administers the County's Guaranteed Ride Home program. However, parking management is typically under the control of local jurisdictions, while many TDM programs are implemented at the project level. Moving forward with the development of the Countywide Transportation Plan it is crucial that the Alameda CTC find the appropriate balance between regional involvement and local implementation.

One potential countywide role would be to support smart parking and transportation demand management at the local level through technical assistance and incentive programs. There are a number of challenges at the local level that a countywide program could assist cities to overcome. Many of these are driven by the fact that local governments are increasingly constrained by limited budgets. Many cities simply do not have the capital or staffing resources to expand their TDM efforts or engage in comprehensive parking reform.

First, technical assistance directed at helping cities design TDM programs, write TDM ordinances and conditions of approval, and tailor strategies to local conditions could be a worthwhile role for the Alameda CTC. Second, any successful TDM program requires ongoing enforcement and evaluation. Traditionally, enforcement and evaluation efforts for TDM programs fall to local jurisdictions, and private entities. However, local jurisdictions often lack the resources to continually monitor TDM programs, while private developers and employers do not always prioritize the ongoing implementation of their TDM efforts. There is also potential for the Alameda CTC to provide a universal framework for program development, implementation, and ongoing management. For example, the Alameda CTC could fund a countywide evaluation of existing TDM and parking management efforts, which would likely involve developing a universal and consistent reporting format and/or contracting for a single evaluator. The Alameda CTC could also help develop model TDM ordinances, thereby helping to reduce the concern some communities

might have that higher parking rates, for example, would drive development to the next city or town. Finally, the Alameda CTC could develop countywide guidelines similar to those used in San Mateo County, which would then be implemented at the local level.

Parking reform efforts are resource intensive. Their success depends on a process that is well-designed, highly transparent, supported by robust data, and responsive to public input. However, many cities have not comprehensively reviewed their parking codes in years or decades, while even fewer have conducted a recent inventory of their existing parking supply or gathered data on parking demand. Consequently, even cities that have clear policy direction and political will to address parking challenges lack the required data to make informed and transparent decisions. The need for parking technical assistance is substantial, and, potentially offers the most appropriate role for the Alameda CTC in regards to parking management. As discussed in the case studies below, other regional agencies throughout the country have had success in supporting locally-driven TDM and parking reform efforts through technical assistance programs.

CASE STUDIES

San Mateo C/CAG Trip Reduction Guidelines

The San Mateo City and County Association of Governments (C\CAG) serves as the state designated Congestion Management Agency for San Mateo County. As such, C/CAG is responsible for preparing a periodic Congestion Management Program for the County. To comply with Air District Regulation 13, Rule 1, C\CAG developed a set of guidelines for the implementation of the land-use component of the congestion management program that includes TDM requirements for new development²⁷. Whereas many other Congestion Management Agencies have retreated from TDM requirements in the face of opposition from employers and developers, the flexible nature of the program implemented in San Mateo County has led to continued success and innovation.

As required in county Congestion Management Programs, C/CAG guidelines must be followed for all projects that are projected to generate a net increase of 100 or more peak hour vehicle trips, and local governments are encouraged to apply the guidelines to all projects that the jurisdiction believes may have an impact on local or countywide traffic conditions.

Rather than requiring or prescribing specific actions by local governments, the C/CAG guidelines provide a framework and a recommended set of options for achieving vehicle trip reduction goals. Local governments are responsible for ensuring that the developer, property-owner, and/or tenant will "reduce demand for all new peak hour trips projected to be generated by a development [and] can select one or more of the options that follow," or may propose other methods for mitigating vehicle trips. C/CAG recommended options include:

- 1. Reducing the scope of the project
- 2. Accepting a one-time payment from the project sponsor of \$20,000 per peak hour trip to fund ongoing TDM implementation (if a jurisdiction collects its own transportation impact fee, the "portion used to mitigate the impacts of the project's traffic will count as credit toward the [required] reduction in trips.")
- 3. Adopt CMA guidelines for projects
- 4. Require the developer and subsequent tenants to implement a package of TDM programs that have the capacity to fully reduce demand for new peak hour trips (the developer/tenants are not held responsible for the extent to which these programs are actually used)
- 5. Negotiate with C/CAG staff for other acceptable ways to mitigate trips

²⁷ City and County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), "Guidelines for Implementing the Land Use Component of the Congestion Management Program, " as amended by the C/CAG Board of Directors, September, 2004. Note that Air District Regulation 13, Rule 1: Employer Trip Reduction Requirements was suspended in 1996, following passage of SB 437.



These C\CAG guidelines are not meant to limit choices, and note specifically that "it is up to the local jurisdiction, working together with the project sponsor to choose the method(s) that will be compatible with the intended purpose of the project and the community that it will serve."

Project sponsors and tenants that are required to implement TDM programs may choose a combination of complementary TDM measures from a checklist developed by C/CAG. Each of the TDM strategies has been assigned a peak hour vehicle trip reduction value that is based on evidence from transportation-related academic and professional research and the best professional judgment of C/CAG staff. TDM measures include the parking related measures, as shown in Figure 4 below.

In addition to these measures, C\CAG offers to credit each employer/tenant with reduction of up to three peak hour trips for conducting a twice-yearly survey of employees, to examine their travel patterns and assess performance of specific TDM measures and the program as a whole. Although individual commuters are not subject to monitoring and enforcement of TDM provisions by cities or other outside agencies, and developers/property owners and their tenants are not responsible for actual participation rates, or trip reduction performance, employers are accountable to local governments for program implementation.²⁸ This combination of auto-enforcement and accountability can serve as a model for implementation of a flexible but results-oriented regional parking reform agenda.

Figure 4 C/CAG San Mateo County TDM Checklist

TDM Measure	Trip Reduction Credit
Charging employees for parking	Two peak-hour trips will be credited for each parking spot charged out at \$20 per month for one year. Money shall be used for TDM measures such as shuttles or subsidized transit tickets.
Implementation of a parking cashout program	One peak-hour trip will be credited for each parking spot where the employee is offered cash payment in return for not using parking at the employment site.
Encourage shared parking	Five peak hour trips will be credited for an agreement with an existing development to share existing parking
Participate in/create/ or sponsor a Transportation Management Association	Five peak hour trips will be credited
Coordinate TDM programs with existing developments/employers	Five peak-hour trips will be credited

Lessons Learned

- One possible role for the county would be to develop guidelines which could then be implemented by cities.
- A "menu" of options for achieving trip reduction targets can offer flexibility and contribute to employer acceptance.
- TDM trip-reduction impacts can be quantified using available research and professional judgment.
- Offering trip-reduction credits for surveys is a way to collect data and ensure ongoing monitoring.

²⁸ C/CAG TDM guidelines state that, "the developer/tenants will not be held responsible for the extent to which these programs are actually used [but] the developer shall pay for a monitoring program for the first three years of the development. The purpose of the monitoring program is to assess the compliance of the project with the final TDM plan."

San Francisco Commuter Benefits Ordinance

In January 2009, San Francisco's Commuter Benefits Ordinance (Ordinance 199-08) went into effect. Under this local ordinance, all employers with 20 or more employees are required to offer a commuter benefits program to their employees. This ordinance promises to contribute to reduced parking demand, reduced VMT, and ultimately reduced greenhouse gas emissions in the Bay Area by seeking to make more comparable the subsidies and benefits available to commuters using all modes of transportation (similar to parking cashout).

The federal government currently allows employees to deduct up to \$230 per month from their paychecks, pre-tax, to pay for transit and vanpool expenses. Under the Commuter Benefits Ordinance affected employers are now required to allow their employees to participate in the existing federal government's program as described above. Employees who work an average of at least 10 hours per week while working for the same employer within the previous calendar month are eligible.

Employers have three options for providing commuter benefits to their employees and may offer a combination of options 1 and 2:

- 1. **Pre-tax Transit:** Under existing Federal Tax Law 132(f), employers set up a program that allows employees to use up to \$230 a month in pretax wages to purchase transit passes or vanpool rides.
- 2. Employer Paid Transit Benefits: Employer pays for workers' transit fares on any of the San Francisco Bay Area mass transit systems or reimburses workers for their vanpool expenses. Reimbursements for transportation expenses must be of at least an equivalent value to the purchase price of a San Francisco MUNI Fast Pass.
- **3. Employer Provided Transit:** Employer offers workers free shuttle service on a company-funded bus or van between home and place of business.

Employers can administer the benefit themselves by purchasing transit tickets or vouchers that can be redeemed for passes, tickets, and vanpool expenses each month and distributing them to employees or employers may hire a third-party administrator to manage their program.

The Department of the Environment may issue employers a fine for non-compliance. The current fee structure is: \$100 for a first violation, \$200 for a second violation within the same year, \$500 for each additional violation within the same year.

Lessons Learned

• The San Francisco program offers another example of a flexible approach to achieving TDM objectives.

National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board Technical Assistance Program and the D.C. Performance Based Parking Pilots

The National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB) is the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the District of Columbia and surrounding jurisdictions in Maryland and Virginia. In addition to its core responsibilities as an MPO, TPB provides a variety of technical assistance programs to its local partners, such as congestion monitoring, travel forecasting, traffic counts, and surveys of personal travel behaviors. Technical assistance is funded by formula as each jurisdiction is allocated a flexible technical assistance budget.

In recent years, the District Department of Transportation (DDOT) in D.C. has begun to focus on parking management as a means to address severe parking challenges. In particular, the DDOT wanted to utilize variable pricing of parking as a means to: 1) ensure adequate parking for residents; 2) encourage turnover as a means to support local business; and 3) promote non-automotive transportation and reduce congestion. Parking challenges and congestion related to high demand for curbside spaces in the Capitol



Hill/Ballpark and Columbia Heights neighborhoods was particularly acute, and these two areas were targeted for a performance-based parking pilot program.

The first step in implementing the pilot program was to gather a robust data set on existing parking conditions that would enable the DDOT to accurately set meter rates to achieve desired occupancy and turnover rates. The resource challenges presented by the data collection effort, however, were immense. The study area for the Columbia Heights zone was 43 blocks, while the study area for the Capitol Hill/Ballpark zone was 145 blocks. Furthermore, the DDOT wanted to collect data for a variety of parking conditions, especially around the Washington Nationals ballpark where data was needed for days/nights when the Nationals were playing and days/nights when the Nationals were not in town. Data was also needed for a combination of days, nights, weekdays, and weekends.

The data collection effort involved the use of License Plate Reader (LPR) technology, which involves outfitting data collection vehicles with LPR cameras and laptops to count vehicles, record license plates, and cross-check with vehicle registrations (\$7,500 to \$10,000 installation costs per vehicle). The raw data is then used to generate occupancy and turnover rates by block. The LPR technology requires two individuals to conduct the counts, one to drive and one to monitor the data collection software. Data collection and analysis was managed by staff at TPB. DDOT was required to submit a formal letter requesting technical assistance. TPB provided a draft scope of work and budget, which DDOT had to then review, modify, and approve. The approximate budget for the data collection and analysis was \$150,000 to \$200,000 per pilot area.

The pilot program just completed its second year of data collection, and while there have been challenges, both MPO and DDOT staff indicate that the partnership has been a success and resulted in positive outcomes. More specifically, the data collection has enabled the DDOT to obtain an accurate inventory of its on-street spaces, determine occupancy and turnover rates, and highlight "hot spots" of high demand and parking congestion. The data has also enabled the DDOT to initiate dynamic pricing, as well as adjust district boundaries. For example, the DDOT has proposed both increases and decreases to parking meter rates as a means to achieve its target occupancy rates. The pilot zones have also generated additional parking revenue, which has since been allocated to a variety of projects within each zone, such as streetscape work, sidewalk improvements, additional bike sharing stations, wayfinding signage, as well as additional transportation studies. Finally, the data collection vehicles offer a means by which to "piggyback" enforcement onto the data collection efforts. While not a focus of this effort, the LPR technology could also be tailored to enforcement of parking regulations.

When evaluating the pilot projects, TPB and DDOT staff highlighted some of the challenges they encountered. First, the LPR technology is expensive, thereby limited by the number of data collection vehicles. This can be problematic with study areas over a certain size. Second, the LPR camera and software is effective, but does have its deficiencies. For example, the LPR camera and software have trouble reading dirty license plates and plates from certain states. In addition, the technology requires ongoing maintenance to ensure accurate data collection. The software is updated frequently and costs approximately \$3,000 per year. Another drawback is that the data collection vehicles must be driven slowly (5-10 miles per hour) in order to get accurate readings, which makes data collection challenging for larger study areas.

Another challenge is that the data is not "real-time." Given the volume of data records obtained by the LPR technology it does take a significant amount of time to analyze and "scrub" the data. At its fastest, the data analysis for the two pilot projects could take two months, but for the first two years of the pilot project it has taken 9-12 months. It is likely that the turnaround time for the data analysis will improve in recent years as TPB staff becomes more familiar with the analysis process. The DDOT believes that as the pilot programs continue they will be able to obtain quarterly data to make additional pricing adjustments.

The Performance Based Parking Pilots in D.C. highlight the potential for a technical assistance partnership between a regional agency and a local jurisdiction. While there are some challenges to overcome, this partnership model and the use of LPR technology appear to be crucial to effective parking management in the future.

Lessons Learned

- Another useful role for county or regional bodies is to provide technical assistance in areas that may be difficult for cities for financial or other reasons.
- Parking management requires robust data collection.
- License plate reader technology enabling parking data collection can be expensive, and its purchase and use by cities would likely be prohibitive.

Massachusetts Downtown Initiative (MDI)

The Massachusetts Downtown Initiative (MDI) is a program of the State of Massachusetts' Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD). As part of DCHD's Division of Community Services, the MDI is a core component of DCHD's various technical assistance programs. Its primary mission is to assist local jurisdictions in revitalizing their downtowns through workshops, "desktop" technical assistance with DCHD planning staff, an on-call consultant database, and an annual grant program to fund downtown planning processes. The MDI is managed by one dedicated DCHD staff member and has a three-year budget of approximately \$300,000.

While the MDI stresses a "holistic" approach to downtown revitalization that includes both economic and community development needs, parking management has become a primary focus of the initiative in recent years. In 2007, MDI hosted a workshop for municipal planners, city staff, and elected officials to provide an overview of parking management practices and how they could benefit and support downtown revitalization. The workshop focused on parking theory, best practices, and implementation of parking reforms. The workshop was viewed as a success by program participants and MDI staff. As a result, MDI now hosts an annual parking workshop, where parking management theory and best practices are highlighted, but the primary focus is on the practical challenges of implementation, such as legal authority, new technology, and funding. The popularity of the workshop also resulted in the creation of a dedicated "parking" category within MDI's annual technical assistance grant program.

Since 2008, MDI has awarded \$10,000 in on-site technical assistance to several jurisdictions in Massachusetts. For example, a 2009 the grant was awarded to the Town of Needham, where a parking study resulted in a set of parking recommendations that included shared parking arrangements to manage existing supply, better management of on-street parking through pricing, zoning changes, and the creation of an in-lieu fee program. In 2010, work in the Town of Lexington resulted in a similar set of recommendations, including the establishment of variable pricing to meet newly defined availability goals, improved parking information, access improvements to existing parking supply, and establishment of a shared parking program.

In addition to the immediate project outcomes, the MDI technical assistance program has catalyzed additional parking work – grant recipients have allocated additional local resources to the implementation of the parking recommendations, while several local jurisdictions have funded independent parking studies. Finally, the MDI's recent work in parking management has enabled the MDI to support one of its top priorities – the creation of downtown business improvement districts (BIDs). The MDI program manager has capitalized on the increasing awareness of the nexus between effective parking management and downtown economic vitality to facilitate the development of BIDs new within several downtowns.

Lessons Learned

- Another approach to technical assistance would be to offer workshops for local staff and officials.
- Yet another approach would be to offer grants for on-site technical assistance.
- Grants can serve as a catalyst for additional local investment.

GreenTRIP Certification Program

GreenTRIP is a certification program which seeks to reward residential projects located within "infill" development areas that reduce vehicle trips and associated greenhouse gas emissions in the San Francisco Bay Area. The program was initiated by TransForm, a non-profit that focuses on Bay Area transportation issues. Eligibility requirements include:

- Primarily multi-family housing with a maximum of 20% single family homes,
- Minimum 50 units,
- Minimum project density of 20 units/net acre,
- Project cannot violate a jurisdiction's urban growth boundaries,
- Project is within the nine-county Bay Area.

Developers submit their projects for consideration by filling out a detailed application form that requires the developer to provide a host of project information, including size, number and type of units, number and type of parking, trip reduction strategies, transit proximity, and other TDM measures. The project is then evaluated according to specific project characteristics and project location, as opposed to a single set of universal standards that do not take into account local context (for example, parking can range as high as 1.5 spaces per unit).

If a project is approved and certified, the GreenTRIP program is designed to support the development of the project to see that it is actually built. More specifically, the developer is provided with a number of benefits, including:

- Letters of support to appropriate agencies and decision-making bodies
- Testimony at public hearings
- Customized project reports, including traffic models
- Customized press releases
- Tailored technical assistance to help implement TDM and parking strategies

The GreenTRIP program recently completed its pilot phase in which five new residential projects were awarded certification.²⁹ The outcomes of these five projects are substantial. For example, the reduction in parking in one project allowed the developer to save \$3.9 million in construction costs, allowing for construction of 30 more affordable units. In addition, the five GreenTRIP projects will result in the distribution of more than 2,000 subsidized transit passes and over \$7 million will be paid by the developers to VTA and AC Transit over the next 40 years.

Lessons Learned

- An existing incentives-based strategy within the county encourages development that reduces trips by offering public support, customized publicity and reports, and technical assistance.
- Developers can reduce costs substantially by reducing the amount of parking in their developments, savings which can then be used to generate additional housing or other uses.

Vehicle Trip "Cap and Trade"

Overview

²⁹ Three of these initial projects were located in Alameda County: South Hayward BART Affordable Family & Senior Housing, The Crossings in San Leandro and Parker Place in Berkeley.

The concept of "cap and trade" has typically been discussed in the context of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, but there has also been limited application of the "cap and trade" as a transportation demand management (TDM) tool. An initial research scan reveals that vehicle trip cap and trade has been applied on a geographically limited basis, primarily at the community, campus-wide, or project level. In short, a city will set a limit, or "cap," on the number of daily vehicle trips allowed for a project (e.g., no more than 1,000 daily motor vehicle trips to and from the site). Alternatively, a trip cap can be set to limit only peak period trips (e.g. no more than 100 trips allowed during the evening rush hour period of 4-6 pm). The "trade" part of the concept in these instances usually takes the form of the developer or land owner "buying down" vehicle trips in excess of the cap in the form of per-trip fees.

Whether a trip cap is expressed as a limit on daily trips or peak period trips, the limit is normally monitored and enforced by conducting regular traffic counts. Typically, if the project exceeds the allowable number of trips during any particular count period, a grace period is allowed during which the project is given time to make additional efforts to strengthen its TDM programs. If a subsequent count shows that the allowable number of trips continues to be exceeded, then a per-trip fee is often assessed. The proceeds of the fee are then used to help develop additional transportation infrastructure and services (e.g. additional roadway capacity, public transit service or public transportation demand management programs).

A trip cap can be compared to the practice used in many communities of limiting the number of square feet of development allowed on a property, in order to avoid generating too many vehicle trips. Rather than limiting development on a site *in order to limit traffic*, a trip cap directly limits traffic – the real public goal of many development caps – and then allows the property owner to develop at considerably higher intensity, provided that the resulting traffic is kept within the agreed-upon limit. Trip caps can be adjusted based on the occupancy of a particular building so that trip reduction can be realized before the project is fully occupied.

As currently developed, trip caps require a project site that can be isolated – at least reasonably well – for counting purposes. If a development project has only one, or only a limited number, of entries and exits, then counting entering and exiting vehicles is relatively easy. A trip cap can also be applied to an entire district (such a large office park or mixed-use development), provided that the district has an institutional framework – such as a master property developer with the power to assess dues and implement rules, or an assessment district with the power to assess fees.

One potential drawback to trip caps is that employers or land owners can respond to them by simply reducing or capping the number of employees on a property, while continuing to maintain heavy employee subsidies for driving to work alone. Employers often just expand operations in a different local jurisdiction, such as a nearby suburb with an auto-oriented zoning code and limited transit service where there are no transportation demand management requirements.

Case Study

Stanford University

As Stanford University continued to grow and develop throughout the 1980s, the impacts from increased traffic were impacting the surrounding neighborhoods. In an effort to manage this growth, limit its impacts, yet ensure that Stanford could continue to develop in a manner that would ensure its prominence as one of the country's preeminent academic and research institutions, Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors approved the Stanford University General Use Permit (GUP) in 1989, which placed many conditions on Stanford's land use, growth, and development. By agreeing to the GUP and meeting its requirements Stanford was granted approvals to develop its land. The 1989 CUP was revised and updated in 2000.

A major component the GUP was a cap placed on the number of vehicle commute trips. In short, the university's goal is not to exceed the 2001 measured number of vehicles entering and exiting the university during peak periods over the life of the GUP. The vehicle trip cap is monitored through three cordon counts conducted each year. The County provides Stanford a great deal of flexibility in how it meets the trip cap – it does not mandate a specific employee trip reduction program, but rather sets a cap and allows



Stanford to figure out what array of programs are best to meet the cap. As a result, Stanford as a robust and varied campus-wide transportation and TDM program that includes: a free campus shuttle, subsidized transit passes, ridesharing, a commute "club", various financial incentives, commute planning services, carsharing and car rental, emergency-ride-home services, and various parking policies designed to reduce vehicle trips to and from campus.

In addition to ensuring it retains its development approvals, one of Stanford's primary motivations for meeting the trip is the financial costs of CUP-defined mitigations. More specifically, if the cordon counts exceed the baseline volume by 1% or more for any two out of three consecutive years, Stanford will be required to pay for intersection mitigations in several nearby jurisdictions and fund additional trip-reduction programs. The cost of such mitigations, especially the intersection mitigations, is significant.

As a result of its TDM efforts, the drive-alone at Stanford for all commuters decreased by more than 13% from 2003 to 2007. In addition, Stanford has benefited from the flexibility of the GUP and its approval process. In short, Stanford has been highly competitive for research and development grants because its land use approval process is streamlined and allows for quick turnaround on development projects.

Applicability to Alameda County

An initial scan of research on vehicle trip "cap and trade" programs indicates that the concept has been applied on a limited basis, and not at a regional or countywide level. However, cities have begun to look more closely at citywide trip caps. For example, the City of Santa Monica is exploring how a citywide trip cap and trade program might be implemented through a network of sub-area transportation management associations (TMAs). In short, each TMA would be allocated a trip cap and a "market" would be established that would allow TMAs to buy and sell trips.

Given the diversity of Alameda County and issues facing the four planning areas, the use of regionwide vehicle cap and trade program might be overly ambitious and complex at this time. However, the County could play a role in helping cities better utilize trip caps at the district or project-level by providing guidelines and best practices for such efforts.

Lessons Learned

- Not applied extensively. Limited examples have been focused on small geographic areas, such as individual development projects or campuses.
- Another approach to technical assistance would be to offer guidelines to jurisdictions for "cap and trade" programs for new development.
STRATEGIC INVESTMENTS

The Countywide Transportation Plan presents a unique opportunity to guide a growing regional movement that emphasizes demand-side solutions to the county's transportation challenges. The Countywide Transportation Plan is also well-positioned to support the efforts of municipalities to further innovate and utilize these strategies to achieve a shared vision for a sustainable and efficient transportation network. Outlined below are some concepts for specific actions that the Alameda CTC could take, and programs that the Countywide Plan could include, to support TDM and parking management. This list is not exhaustive, but offers an initial framework for moving forward.

1. Provide dedicated funding to the Guaranteed Ride Home (GRH) program, the Alameda CTC's primary TDM program.

The Alameda County GRH Program is currently administered by the Alameda CTC. When a registered employee uses an alternative means of transportation to get to work, they are guaranteed a means of getting home should they have medical emergency or unexpected changes to their work schedule. Twelve years of employee and employer surveys to enrolled participants have shown that employees' assurance that they have a "back-up" way to get home is often incentive enough to encourage them to not drive alone. This program has eliminated approximately 180,000 vehicle round trips per year since its inception.

Since its inception, the Alameda County GRH program has been funded exclusively through grants from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Transportation Fund for Clean Air (BAAQMD-TFCA) and has been free of charge to employers and employees in Alameda County. Despite the fact that GRH has been highly competitive in the TFCA program over the past twelve years, being reliant on a sole funding source may not be sustainable, particularly in today's fiscal climate.

Given the program's continued success in eliminating vehicle trips, the Alameda CTC could expand this program by including the GRH program within the next Countywide Transportation Plan either alone or as part of an overall TDM Program as described below. A dedicated revenue source would help to diversify GRH's funding sources while ensuring greater program stability. Furthermore, additional funding would enable the Alameda CTC to expand its outreach and marketing of the program to additional employers, as one of the biggest obstacles to higher use of the GRH program is simply lack of information about the program's existence. Locally, other counties such as Contra Costa, San Francisco, and San Mateo fund their guaranteed ride home programs through similar provisions that enable sales tax funds to be used for TDM programs.

2. Expand the Alameda County GRH program into a comprehensive countywide TDM program.

This concept was one of the primary recommendations of the "Performance Evaluation of the ACCMA (now Alameda CTC) Guaranteed Ride Home Program," adopted by the Board in 2009³⁰. The full recommendation is included below:

"We recommend that the CMA expand the GRH program into a comprehensive TDM program. Of all the GRH programs we examined, the CMA program is the only one that is not operated as part of a comprehensive program that includes other TDM or commute alternative efforts. Expanding the program would allow the CMA to broaden the range of commute alternative services it provides to residents of Alameda County while fulfilling the Travel-Demand Management Element of its Congestion Management Program. It would also work toward meeting the objectives of AB 32 and SB 375, state legislative mandates to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases. Additional commute alternative services that the CMA could offer include ridematching, financial incentives for carpooling and vanpooling, discounted transit passes, personalized transit itineraries, subsidized bicycle parking racks and lockers,



³⁰ Prepared by Eisen Letunic.

bicycle commuting maps and promotions and other marketing strategies. To fund these additional services, the CMA should investigate the county's sales tax for transportation, the TFCA and funding sources from other public agencies."³¹

Best practices show that a well-balanced and comprehensive TDM program, which offers a variety of measures which support each other, will be more effective than a TDM program built around a single trip reduction measure. Many TDM measures are mutually supportive and offer an excellent opportunity to leverage the trip reduction effects of other measures. A sample of potential TDM measures that the Alameda CTC could also fund include additional ridematching services, subsidized transit passes, bicycle infrastructure at work places, and additional marketing and promotion. The County's GRH program has thus far been successful at reducing vehicle trips. Through additional dedicated funding, the Alameda CTC could build on the success of this program by incorporating other TDM measures that are mutually supportive.

3. Develop Countywide TDM and parking management guidelines.

Given the countywide transportation oversight and planning responsibilities of the Alameda CTC, the agency is well-positioned to provide guidance to local jurisdictions. The development of countywide guidelines has several potential benefits. First, though some Alameda County cities have already been aggressively developing TDM programs and parking reform efforts, others have not implemented such strategies. A set of countywide guidelines could help cities begin to "tackle" those questions, and ensure that jurisdictions integrate best practices. (See Case Study San Mateo C/CAG)

Of course, the question of how those guidelines are applied and implemented is also crucial. On the one hand, "guidelines" could remain just that – a set of regional advisory statements or "best practices" that local jurisdictions could refer to as they move forward with developing their own TDM or parking management policies and programs. On the other hand, regional "guidelines" could also be tied to regional funding allocations to ensure that local jurisdictions follow them and meet certain targets. One Bay Area precedent that illustrates this dynamic is MTC's 2005 Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Policy for transit expansion projects, discussed in greater detail in the case studies. (See Case Study MTC TOD Policy)

It is beyond the scope of this paper to answer these questions and develop a specific set of such guidelines. However, based on best practices in TDM and parking management it is recommended that any set of guidelines related to TDM and parking management emphasize some, or all, of the following core characteristics.

- Outcome based, with specific performance targets. Performance-based strategies with specific project-level, corridor-level or regional targets promise to be the most effective and politically viable, and the easiest to implement and administer. Performance-based strategies will facilitate more locally-appropriate solutions and can tap into the innovation and entrepreneurship of the public, private and non-profit sectors to a greater extent than strategies that prescribe specific implementation methods.
- Effectiveness at achieving regional goals.
- Well-balanced and comprehensive. Experience has shown that the most effective TDM programs are ones that have varied and mutually supportive demand management measures. For example, a TDM program that includes both subsidized transit passes and a guaranteed ride home program has the potential to reduce vehicle trips to a greater degree than one of those measures by itself. In short, TDM programs should offer as broad a choice to employees and travelers as possible in order to encourage a variety of travel behaviors and populations.

³¹ Alameda County Congestion Management Agency. "Performance Evaluation of the ACCMA Guaranteed Ride Home Program," February 27, 2009.

- *Flexible,* so implementers can "play or pay." Some employers particularly those with labor contracts and multiple work sites are limited in the changes they can make to their existing parking and commuter benefits programs at all their work sites. Some jurisdictions will be more willing to reform parking codes and management policies than others.
- *Non-punitive*, so that stakeholders are not penalized for compliance with previous parking policies. For buildings that were constructed to meet local minimum parking standards, any new parking taxes, fees, or regulations should be calculated based on audited parking utilization rates. Limits on the expansion or reconstruction of existing parking lots are appropriate if audits reveal excess supply.
- *Politically viable.* As discussed before, parking decisions are one of the more high-profile components of local land use decisions. As is often the case with proposed policy changes, there are many stakeholders with different perceptions of the problem and potential solutions. Local businesses often believe that free and available public parking is crucial to their economic health, banks often refuse to lend to development that does not meet traditional parking requirements, and elected officials may understand the need to manage parking supply, but may not fully understand the linkage between managing parking and managing congestion. Implementing parking management strategies depends on extensive education and outreach with many stakeholders.
- Effective marketing and public outreach. As local experience has demonstrated, the manner in which TDM programs, and parking management policies in particular, are rolled out is crucial to their success. If the public perceives that such policies and programs have been developed without community input, it is very likely they will actively reject such measures, irrespective of their intent. Therefore, any countywide TDM and parking policy should require a local jurisdiction to demonstrate a proactive communication strategy with opportunities for education to, and feedback and input from the public.
- User friendly. Furthermore, TDM programs and parking management must be easy for the public to understand and use. Policies and their objectives should be clearly articulated and supported by data, while new technologies (such as parking meters) should be designed for straightforward public consumption.
- *Financially feasible and cost-effective.* Prioritize strategies that are low cost or no cost and provide the biggest "bang for the buck" should be encouraged.
- Easy and efficient to administer. Difficulties with implementation, administration, and enforcement highlight the importance of considering the implementation steps of all relevant stakeholders in program design. Strategies that are easy and efficient to administer (a) will be transparent and simple to understand for the public and implementers; (b) will be supported with proper funding and targeted technical assistance; (c) will have clearly defined roles and responsibilities for stakeholders, including enforcement agencies; (d) provide a clear nexus; and (e) be accountable, with periodic monitoring and evaluation. Those responsible for enforcement need to be funded, staffed and informed of additional responsibilities.

Individual jurisdictions or groups of jurisdictions could also initiate local or subregional programs. These would ideally include opportunities to measure success so that they might serve as a pilot for future countywide and regional efforts.

4. Create a robust technical assistance program.

Perhaps the most obvious and crucial role that the Alameda CTC could fill in regards to TDM and parking management is in the area of technical assistance. For the most part, Alameda County jurisdictions understand the concepts of TDM and parking management, and would like to, at a minimum, gain a better understanding of how these strategies could address local challenges. Meanwhile, some cities are ready to implement new TDM and parking management policies, yet are unable to move forward without additional resources.



The types of technical assistance that the Alameda CTC could provide are numerous. Outlined below are a number of potential "categories" of technical assistance concepts, many of which are illustrated in greater detail in the case studies.

- Information clearinghouse: As TDM and parking management play an increasingly important role in improving the region's transportation network, it is crucial that elected officials, staff, developers, financial institutions, employers, and the public have a shared understanding what TDM and parking management are, how they can benefit their communities, and how they can be implemented in a local context. In order to facilitate this dialogue, the Alameda CTC could fund a number of "shared learning" activities (see Case Study: Massachusetts Development Initiative). These include:
 - A full-time position at Alameda CTC to coordinate and monitor TDM and parking management efforts throughout the county.
 - A regional TDM and parking management sub-committee that could serve as an advisory body to both the Alameda CTC and local jurisdictions. The sub-committee would be comprised of local and regional staff, as well as individuals representing developers, financial institutions (lenders), employers, local business, and the public.
 - TDM and parking management workshops and trainings that emphasize key concepts, best practices, but, more importantly, the practicalities of implementation.
 - On-site assistance, such as one-day charrettes that evaluate a well-defined local challenge and outline potential solutions.
 - o Development and distribution of easy-to-understand reference materials.
 - o Marketing and promotional materials for local and regional TDM programs.
 - A list of on-call TDM and parking management consultants to assist local governments.
 - o Model ordinances.

MTC and Alameda CTC have already undertaken a number of these technical assistance programs as part of the campaign on regional parking reform and local assistance for Priority Development Areas.³² For example, MTC currently hosts parking fundamentals workshops and in 2007 put on a regional parking "seminar," which had over 125 participants. Furthermore, MTC funds six customized "Parking Advanced Implementation Labs" that are designed to assist local jurisdictions with a "particular actionable policy." One of these labs focused on parking at the San Leandro BART station. Finally, MTC recently developed a parking "Toolbox/Handbook": *Reforming Parking Polices to Support Smart Growth: Parking Best Practices & Strategies for Supporting Transit Oriented Development in the San Francisco Bay Area.* The handbook helps local jurisdictions define what type of area they are and identifying parking strategies that are likely to be effective in this type of area. It describes the various strategies and provides examples of best practices from around the region and country.

Additionally, the Alameda CTC, through its Transit Oriented Development Technical Assistance Program (TOD TAP), has funded two parking studies, a shared parking study at MacArthur BART and a parking and stormwater study at Coliseum BART, in Oakland.

Alameda CTC continues to fund technical assistance activities that complement other regional efforts. The Alameda CTC could expand the TOD TAP program to further focus on local parking needs in Alameda County, supplement MTC's activities or continue to work with MTC to ensure some of its efforts continue to be directly tailored to the experiences of Alameda County jurisdictions, such as the San Leandro parking labs example. One possibility would be

³² http://mtc.ca.gov/planning/smart_growth/parking/

for Alameda CTC to fund additional MTC "parking labs" specifically within Alameda County. Alternatively, individual jurisdictions could implement programs within their cities or subregionally within the County, again, serving as pilots for the County.

- TDM and parking management grant programs: The success of TDM and parking management efforts depends on a planning process that is well-designed, highly transparent, supported by robust data, and responsive to public input. In addition, capital expenses for TDM programs (such as carsharing or on-site amenities) and parking management (new meter and sensor technology) are also substantial. To help overcome these basic resource challenges, the Alameda CTC could expand its technical assistance grant program to include:
 - Planning grants:
 - Development of local TDM and commute benefits ordinances (see Case Study: SF Commuter Benefits Ordinance).
 - Development of project-specific TDM programs.
 - Parking studies to revise local parking codes and/or develop parking ordinances for jurisdictions to adopt, develop district-based management, etc. (see Case Studies: Massachusetts Development Initiative and National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board Technical Assistance Program and DC Performance Based Pilots).
 - Parking impact fee studies.
 - Data collection and analysis (see Case Study: National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board Technical Assistance Program and DC Performance Based Pilots).
 - Capital grants:
 - On-site transportation coordinators for employers or institutions of a certain size.
 - Installation of on-site amenities, such as secure bicycle parking, lockers/showers, etc.
 - Acquisition and installation of parking meters (for curb parking) and parking access and revenue control systems (for off-street lots).
 - Purchase and operation of enforcement vehicles and license plate recognition systems, parking stall occupancy sensors, or handheld enforcements (see Case Study: National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board Technical Assistance Program and DC Performance Based Pilots).
 - Monitoring, enforcement, and evaluation grants:
 - Local monitoring and enforcement of TDM ordinances and project-specific TDM programs.
 - "Follow-up" evaluations of planning or capital grants to measure outcomes of studies and resulting policies, programs, and projects.
 - Travel demand surveys.
 - Data collection and analysis.

Alameda CTC's current TOD TAP program is funded by MTC's Transportation and Land Use Program and the transportation sales tax. This program does not require a local funding match. The details and requirements of an expanded grant program merit additional research and planning. If the Alameda CTC were to move forward with such a program it would likely need to address some key program parameters. First, eligibility requirements would have to be determined. Currently, local jurisdictions are eligible for the TOD TAP program but private and public developers, employers, and institutions would also benefit from such technical assistance. Second, it would have to be determined if County dollars would leverage local and private dollars by requiring a local match.

Finally, how such an expanded grant program is funded is a fundamental, yet complicated question. It is beyond the scope of this paper to identify a specific funding mechanism or the details of allocations. The most obvious choice, and the one in which the Alameda CTC has the most influence over, is through the local sales tax measure. More specifically, Alameda CTC could consider expanding the funding category within the next Countywide Plan and Transportation Expenditure Plan that allocates a certain percentage of the local sales tax measure to TDM and parking management. Moving forward, this is an issue that must be addressed in much more detail.

5. Initiate a TDM and/or parking certification program.

Much as the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification program administered by the U.S. Green Building Council has spurred a sustainable building boom, a TDM and/or parking certification program could help achieve widespread regional adoption of TDM programs and parking reforms. Such a program could bestow recognition upon communities and individual employers and developers who lead the way forward as the first to implement policy and program reforms.

- Such a program would establish policy and program reform targets for local governments, developers, and employers that vary based on the transit accessibility of their location and for employers by their industry sector (e.g. regional medical clinics would have different standards than offices housing professional service firms).
- Through a coordinated marketing strategy, regional agencies would highlight the successful implementation of parking reforms by certified cities, projects, and employers, articulating the connection between parking policies and climate change.
- Local governments may also consider requiring communities to meet certain certification standards in order to receive planning assistance, infrastructure, or service funds.

As stated earlier, TransForm, a Bay Area non-profit focused on regional transportation issues, recently created GreenTRIP, a certification program for residential infill projects within the ninecounty Bay Area. This certification program rewards residential projects that seek to reduce vehicle trips and greenhouse gas emissions through TDM and parking management. Alameda CTC may wish to explore ways in which to partner with TransForm to see how this program could be expanded, applied to commercial developments, or tailored to specific contexts with Alameda County. The biggest challenge for the GreenTRIP program is expanding its reach and ensuring that developers, local agencies, and decisions makers are aware of the benefits of the program. One option is to require GreenTRIP certification in certain locations, such as Alameda County's priority development areas (PDAs).



Attachment B

GUARANTEED RIDE HOME PROGRAM EVALUATION • 2012

DRAFT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

MAY 2013













EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: PROGRAM UPDATE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of the 2012 Alameda County Transportation Commission Guaranteed Ride Home (GRH) Program Evaluation. It provides an analysis of how well the program achieved its goals of reducing the number of drive-alone trips Alameda County commuters took to work in 2012. It also includes a review of the program's operations and compares the results of the program in 2012 to previous years. The evaluation provides information about:

- 1. The program's success in increasing the use of alternative travel modes
- 2. GRH program operations and marketing
- 3. Employer and employee participation and usage
- 4. The status of the Commission recommendations made for the GRH program in 2012 and proposed recommendations for 2013

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Alameda County Guaranteed Ride Home gives commuters an "insurance policy" against being stranded at work if they need to make an unscheduled return trip home. By providing commuters with assurance that they can get home quickly in an emergency, GRH removes one of the greatest barriers to choosing an alternative to driving alone. GRH addresses concerns such as, "What if I need to get home because my child is sick?" or "What if I have unscheduled overtime and miss my carpool ride home?" In doing so, GRH empowers employees to take alternative modes when they might not otherwise view them as viable options, resulting in less traffic congestion and pollution. GRH also benefits businesses,

"For a long while I was taking Wheels Bus express bus between Pleasant Hill BART and California Center in Pleasanton. My shift was changed so the bus is no longer an option. GRH makes taking transit that much better knowing I won't be stranded."

- Michael Smith, AT&T

as it enables stress-free, reliable employee commuting and helps them save money on payroll taxes by deducting the amount employees spend on transit or vanpools from their reported gross salary.

The GRH program is one of many Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs in Alameda County that aim to reduce strains on existing roadway and parking capacity without engaging in expensive capacity additions. GRH is unique in that it is the only program that provides a vital safety net for other commute alternatives.

The Alameda County GRH program has been in operation since April 9, 1998. Over the last 15 years, the program has matured from a demonstration program with a handful of participating employers to a robust one with 5,104 registered employees and 282 active registered employers throughout Alameda County.

The Alameda County GRH program is administered by the Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC), whose mission is to plan, fund, and deliver a broad spectrum of transportation projects and programs to enhance mobility throughout Alameda County.¹ The GRH program was developed to help reduce the number of single-occupant vehicles on the road and as a means of reducing traffic congestion and improving air quality. The Alameda County GRH program is funded entirely through grants from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA).

MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION

The program evaluation consists of an examination of the program's operations and outreach functions, statistics on employer and employee participation and use, data from the surveys of participating employees and employers, and recommendations for program changes and enhancements. For the first time, the GRH recommendations for future years are being developed in conjunction with a proposed Alameda County Comprehensive TDM Strategy. The following sections present the major findings and recommendations from the evaluation.

Employers of all sizes located in Alameda County have been eligible to participate in the GRH program since June 2009. Prior to that time, the GRH program required an employer to have at least 75 employees to register with the program. Opening the eligibility to all employees in Alameda County coincided with an increased number of employees making the commitment to travel to work by alternative modes. The combination resulted in the program's all time highest enrollment of 5,104 employees in 282 businesses in 2012. It has also resulted in a reduction of 335,921 one-way vehicle trips in 2012, or 3,230

Category	2012 Savings
Cost per Trip Reduced	\$0.33
Drive-alone roundtrips reduced per year	167,961
Drive-alone one-way trips reduced per year	335,921
GRH rides taken in 2012	51
Average commute distance of GRH users	28
Average miles saved per workday	36,176
Annual miles saved per work year	9,044,000
Tons of CO2 not released	1,873
Average U.S. vehicle fuel economy (MPG)	33.8
Average gallons of gas saved per workday	1,070.3
Annual gallons of gas saved per work year	267,574
Average gas price in 2012	\$4.03
Average dollars not spent on gas per workday	\$4,313
Annual dollars not spent on gas per work year	\$1,078,323

¹ The Alameda CTC is a newly formed countywide transportation agency, resulting from a merger of the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency and the Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority. The merger was completed in February 2012. vehicle roundtrips per week.² During the same year, the number of rides that were taken in the program was a record low of 51 rides. This represents less than one percent of eligible rides that employees could have taken. It also illustrates the "insurance" nature of the program. Insurance programs tend to be used infrequently, but they help give users peace of mind. Commuters are often concerned about the perceived inflexibility of alternative modes like transit or carpools and how they would return home if an emergency or if unexpected circumstances arise. The GRH program eases fears about being able to get home by ensuring that the user has a ride home if an emergency were to occur.

Fifteen years of employee and employer surveys of enrolled participants have shown that the availability of a "back-up" way to get home is incentive enough to encourage employees not to drive alone. According to the 2012 survey results:

- 34% of participants stated that without the GRH program they would not use an alternative travel mode or would use one less frequently.
- 23% of participants stated that, with the program, they use alternative modes four or more times a week.
- 93% of respondents stated that the GRH program likely encourages participants to use alternative modes more often.
- 59% of respondents stated that the program was at least somewhat important in encouraging them to use alternative modes at least one more day per week.

Based on the average reported commute distance by GRH participants and the number of registered participants, the GRH program eliminated approximately 9 million vehicle miles from roadways in 2012.³ It is estimated that the program saved participants over one million annually on fuel expenses in 2012, which is the equivalent of saving 267,574 gallons of gas or 1,873 tons of CO2.⁴ These goals were accomplished at a cost of 33 cents per trip removed.

"Fortunately, I have not yet had to use this benefit, but it is VERY important to me to know it is available, if/when I may need it."

– Safeway Employee

The charts below show that while program enrollment grew substantially in 2011 and 2012, the number of rides taken has actually decreased. The cost per trip reduced has ranged between \$0.37 (2009) to \$0.30 (2011).

² Based on 2012 survey results described in Chapter 4.

³ 3,230 drive alone roundtrips per week = 6,640 one-way trips per week = 1,328 one-way trips per weekday (based on 1,328 reported reduced weekday one-way trips by participants from the annual survey, 250 days in a work year, and the average reported commute distance of 28 miles).

⁴ Based on the calculated number of annual miles reduced, the annual US vehicle fuel economy reported by the US Bureau of Transportation Statistics (33.8 MPG), and the average Bay Area fuel price per gallon reported by MTC in 2012 (\$4.03). Each gallon of gas produces about 14 pounds of carbon dioxide.







Program Operating Principles and Outreach

- The Alameda County GRH program assigns a paper voucher to employees that can be redeemed for a ride home using a taxi or rental car. The limitation of six trips per employee per year continues to be appropriate. Very few program participants reach this limit.
- Program literature is available in hard copy and electronic formats. Employees and employers can download registration forms (as PDF files) and other program information from the program's website and employees can register online.
- Program staff participated in information sessions such as employee benefit and transportation fairs in different parts of Alameda County in 2012. These face-to-face opportunities have been successful in spreading the word about the program and encouraging employees and employers to sign up.

Employer and Employee Registration

- In 2012, the program added 491 new employees and 34 new employers. As of December 31, 2012, there were 282 employers and 5,104 employees enrolled in the GRH program.
- Thirty-four new employers enrolled in the GRH program in 2012. This was a slight decrease compared to 2011 (when 49 new employers enrolled), but is in line with historical trends.
- North and East Alameda County continue to be the areas with the greatest number of employers enrolled in the program. Oakland has the most registered employers, followed by Berkeley and Pleasanton.

Trips Taken and Employee Commute Patterns

- In 2012, 51 trips were taken (37 taxicab, 14 rental car). The average trip distance was 30.1 miles and the average trip cost was \$70.51.
- "Personal illness" was the most common reason for taking a trip in 2012 (27% of trips) followed by "unscheduled overtime" (18% of trips).
- The most prevalent users of guaranteed rides home are car- and vanpoolers. Historically, people who used these modes accounted for 61% of emergency rides taken.
- In 2012, the most common GRH trip origin cities were Oakland, Pleasanton, and Berkeley. The most common GRH trip destination cities were Antioch, Emeryville, and San Francisco.
- The majority of employee participants live in Alameda and Contra Costa counties. A significant number also live in San Joaquin, San Francisco, Stanislaus, and Solano counties.

Employee Survey

An annual evaluation survey was sent to employees in February 2013. Of the 5,104 active participating employees, 782 surveys were returned, a 15% response rate.⁵ According to 2012 survey responses:

- When asked how important GRH was in their decision to stop driving alone, 59% of respondents said that it was at least somewhat important. Most respondents (93%) stated that they thought the program encourages others to use alternative modes more often.
- If the program were not available, 25% of respondents reported they would use an alternative mode, but less frequently than before, and 9% reported that they would stop using an alternative mode and go back to driving alone. This finding illustrates that for some employees GRH is the decisive factor while for others it provides a critical incentive that helps them develop familiarity with and habits around using alternative modes.
- Using the survey findings, impact of the program on travel behavior of all participants was extrapolated. In 2012, approximately 3,230 drive-alone roundtrips or 6,460 drive-alone one-way trips per week were replaced by alternative mode trips by those who are in the program. This is equivalent to 335,921 total drive-alone, one-way trips per year.
- The most common alternative modes for program participants are BART, carpool, or bus. Survey respondents reported driving less by approximately one-third (39%) compared to before they enrolled in the GRH program. All alternative modes experienced an increase after participants joined the GRH program. Vanpooling and commuting on ACE train and ferry experienced the largest increases, according to the survey.

Commuting Behavior

Survey respondents reported that their commute distances are generally 50 miles or less (84%). Over half (56%) are below 30 miles, and 18% live less than 10 miles from home. The average commute distance for program participants is 28 miles.

Customer Service

- The administrative functions of the GRH program continue to receive very high ratings for the quality of customer service including the telephone hotline and printed materials, consistent with previous years' evaluations. The vast majority of respondents had no opinion about hotline assistance (82%).
- Passengers were very positive in their evaluation of the transportation services provided through GRH. In 2012, the participants reported wait times for a taxi to be on average 15 minutes.

Program Involvement

• Most participants found out about the GRH program through their employer or onsite representative (49%), 11% from an on-site posting, and 16% from a co-worker. This indicates that workplace advertising and an employer representative contact is an effective and important part of the GRH program.

⁵ According to the Constant Contact Resource Center, 10-20% is a common survey response rate. It is also worth noting that the survey sample size is roughly 10 times that of the number of people who actually used a ride voucher, indicating that the sample is broadly representative (i.e. those surveyed were not just those who have had occasion to take a ride).

• In 2012, the majority of participants registered for the GRH program online (54%). This number has continued to rise since online registration was introduced in 2010.

Employer Survey

An annual evaluation survey was sent to employers in February 2013. Of the 282 active participating employers, 66 surveys were returned, a 23% response rate. According to the 2012 survey responses:

Alternative Modes

 A large majority (85%) of employer representatives that responded reported that they thought participation in the GRH program is "very important" or "somewhat important" in encouraging employees to commute to work using alternative modes more often. "This program has given me the confidence that I can return home quickly in an emergency. My husband has health problems that are sometimes critical, and the thought of being stuck at work when he needs me is very stressful."

– LLNL Employee

 Most employers reported that they provide some type of commuter benefits in addition to GRH. The most common transportation benefit was Commuter Checks, now offered by over 50% of employers, which was only offered by one-third of employers in the 2011 survey. Bicycle parking, shower/changing room, and telecommuting also remained among the top benefits provided by employers.

Program Management

• Almost all employer contact respondents stated that their GRH workload is either "manageable" or that they "could do more work if needed."

Customer Service

• The administrative functions of the GRH program received very high ratings for the quality of customer service, which is consistent with the employee survey results. As with employees, most have not used the hotline, and those who have rated it excellent or good.

Outreach and Marketing

- Employer representatives were then asked how they market the GRH program to their employees. The majority (37%) indicated that they make periodic companywide announcements and 24% said they use email "blasts" or include information in company newsletters.
- Twenty-six percent of employer representatives include information on the GRH program as part of their employee benefits orientation for new employees. Thirteen percent of employer representatives said they rely on word of mouth to market the GRH program to their employees.
- In addition, employer contacts were asked if they have used the new GRH website (www.grh.alamedactc.org) for information, and 43% responded that they have used the site recently. Several made comments about the new design:
 - "The new website and marketing materials look great!"

- "The website is thorough and informational. I've not had a need to call the hotline."
- "Really like the new look!"

Program Value

- Program value in the eyes of employer representatives continued to grow considerably. In 2012, 64% stated that they thought that their employees value the GRH program as much as or more than other transportation benefits offered by their employer (an increase from 55% in 2011).
- Thirteen percent of respondents stated that their employer does not offer any other transportation benefits.

GUARANTEED RIDE HOME 2013 RECOMMENDATIONS

Through the Guaranteed Ride Home Program, the Alameda CTC has continued to be successful in changing Alameda County employees' mode choice for work commutes from driving alone to using alternative transportation modes. Data from this year's participant survey indicate that the program is continuing to reduce the number of drive-alone trips made within the county by eliminating one of the significant barriers to alternative mode use – namely, the uncertainty of being unable to return home in the event of an emergency or unplanned overtime.

The 2013 Guaranteed Ride Home recommendations are based on an evaluation of the program issues raised by the Alameda CTC, and the following funding and schedule considerations:

- Current TFCA funding for the GRH program has been approved by the Air District and Alameda CTC through November 2013
- Future TFCA funding for the GRH program for 2013 to 2015 is anticipated to be approved by the Air District and the Alameda CTC;
- The Alameda CTC recently prepared Countywide Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Strategy, which is presented together with this report. The TDM Strategy includes recommendations for the Alameda CTC's role in the Guaranteed Ride Home Program, as well as other countywide TDM strategies that aim to reduce vehicle trips and greenhouse gas emissions, and comply with the Congestion Management Plan, AB32 and SB 375.

The following recommendations for 2013 aim to move the Alameda CTC's GRH program into a new era of more efficient administration, increased ease of use, and higher visibility, and to place it in the context of an overall Comprehensive TDM Strategy.

1. Investigate feasibility of switching from the current paper voucher system to either an online voucher system or a reimbursement system and implement appropriate solution.

Moving from paper vouchers to an online voucher system or a reimbursement system has significant potential to increase ease of use for GRH participants, reduce administrative costs, and improve program tracking and security. Many other GRH programs around the country have made such a switch and realized benefits from doing so. As a first step towards a possible transition, GRH staff performed a peer review of other GRH programs that have switched from paper vendors and contacted software vendors that could support an online voucher system. This investigation identified both online vouchers and a reimbursement based system as possible alternative service delivery models, and identified advantages and disadvantages associated with each. It is recommended that, as

a next step, GRH staff use this information to determine if transitioning to an online or reimbursement system is feasible for the Alameda CTC in light of program budget, legal issues, and possible future regional TDM integration considerations.

An **Online Voucher** system allows registered users to print a voucher on the day when they have an emergency and need a ride home. Users must be registered in the GRH program and create an account prior to using a voucher. Employees (and GRH staff) can track the number of vouchers used (limited to six per calendar year). An online voucher system would require a new database and operating system in order to track use and enrollment and generate a voucher when requested. A **Reimbursement** system allows registered employees to take their ride home whenever they need. This program could be structured to allow employees to use any mode or provider they choose (taxi, car rental, transit, etc.), or could include a set list of transportation providers. Employees would still be required to first register in the GRH program before taking their ride. After they register, if they experience an emergency, they take the ride and then submit their receipt to be reimbursed. Employees could mail, scan/e-mail, or fax a copy of their receipt to the GRH program. The table below summarizes advantages and disadvantages associated with each model.

While both an online voucher system and a reimbursement system seem to hold potential for the Alameda County GRH program, a more detailed feasibility assessment is needed. Such an assessment would estimate the cost implications of a transition including start-up costs, ongoing costs of operating an alternative system (software platform subscription, etc.), and cost savings from reduced administrative activities. A more detailed assessment would also consider any legal issues pertaining to opening up the GRH program to more taxi and rental car companies as part of a switch to an online voucher or reimbursement system. Finally, a more detailed assessment would consider what selection of a particular model means for possible future regional integration of GRH programs. While the Alameda CTC remains committed to operating an Alameda County program for the foreseeable future, there are advantages to leaving the possibility of regional consolidation open given the tendency of GRH trips to cross county lines and possible cost savings from pooling resources between programs.

GUARANTEED RIDE HOME PROGRAM EVALUATION | 2012 | DRAFT Report

Alameda County Transportation Commission

	Advantages	Disadvantages
Online Voucher System	 GRH staff no longer have to assign and mail printed vouchers to employees 	 Requires access to a computer during the time of the emergency
	 Employees have the ability to manage their GRH registration and view information on used vouchers. 	Requires access to a printer to print voucher
	 Registered participants will be able to print a voucher when an emergency occurs 	 Upfront costs to develop database and software platform
	 Significantly reduces the amount of administrative time spent on mailing program materials 	 Back-up vouchers still have to be provided at worksites without access to computers
	 Very minimal delay between registration and program use 	 Requires contracts with taxi and car rental companies
		• Still need a signed waiver (can be done online)
Reimbursement System	 No need for voucher or printed form during time of emergency 	 People may not have access to a credit card or cash to pay for ride home
	 Can use any taxi, car rental, ride-sharing, or transit alternative to get home 	 Limits the amount that can be reimbursed each year (under \$600 per person/calendar year)
	 Reduces issues with liability and the need for a signed waiver 	 People may not like paying up front and submitting a receipt; could be an equity issue
	 Consistent with other Bay Area Guaranteed Ride Home programs (San Francisco and Contra Costa) 	 Back-up vouchers may be needed for people who do not have a credit card or cash to pay for the ride home
	 Significantly reduces the amount of administrative time spent on mailing program materials 	 Upfront costs to develop database and software platform
	 Could eliminate the need for contracts with taxi and car rental companies if so desired 	

2. Explore updating the current Access Database of registered employers and employees to a cloud-based database.

The current Access database system is unwieldy, especially in light of the number of participants it is required to handle, and lacks a user-friendly online interface. It is recommended that if a new system is chosen for GRH vouchers (either online voucher system or reimbursement system), the GRH program database be updated to a cloud-based database to allow an improved online user interface for registration and voucher distribution. This would allow greater functionality by enabling employees to log in and update contact information, enhance communication with participants, improve ease of accessing information, and more securely store information as the program grows. The costs of database transition would be largely shared with the costs of transitioning away from the current paper voucher system.

3. Investigate changing GRH employee enrollment requirements such that being part of an employer with an Employer Representative is recommended but not required, and modify program if appropriate.

Currently, employees may only enroll in the GRH program if they belong to a participating employer that has a designated Employer Representative. This requirement adds a barrier to immediate enrollment for any employee whose company is not already enrolled. It particularly disadvantages smaller employers where it is difficult to find someone willing to serve as an Employer Representative. There may also be geographic equity implications because the larger employers in Alameda County are concentrated in certain parts of the County.

Employer Representatives, while helpful in a variety of ways, are not essential to program operations. As noted throughout this report, Employer Representatives assist the program in a variety of ways. However, Employer Representatives are increasingly optional because of the GRH program's use of social media marketing and the GRH website to reach and maintain contact with employees and answer questions; a switch to online vouchers or a reimbursement system may further diminish the need for Employer Representatives.

It is recommended that GRH staff explore the feasibility of changing program rules and operations such that employees can join GRH even if their employer is not enrolled with a designated Employer Representative and modify the program if it proves to be feasible; such a change should continue to aim to recruit Employer Representatives (even if they are not required). The registration form could have an *optional* field in which the employee can list the name of his or her HR administrator or someone who can be a champion for the GRH program in their workplace. As with a switch away from paper vouchers, the practices of other GRH programs around the region will be considered in such an investigation.

4. Continue to enhance marketing and outreach through coordination with Alameda CTC for events, print, and social media marketing to promote the GRH program to employers and employees throughout Alameda County.

An updated Marketing Plan was developed in late 2012 and submitted to the Alameda CTC in January 2013. This plan hinges on the co-marketing opportunities with Alameda CTC in publicizing the GRH program. Coordinating with the ongoing marketing and communications efforts at the Alameda CTC will continue to improve visibility of the GRH program and reduce administrative costs associated with attending outreach events and marketing the program. The Alameda CTC attends hundreds of events each year in Alameda County. The Alameda CTC also has excellent connections with local businesses, chambers of commerce, and transit providers, and will promote the program and coordinate release of information to these outlets, such as program changes and milestones.

A key feature of this marketing plan is the continued development of the GRH Facebook page. Social media tools, such as Facebook, are commonly used by other programs and services in Alameda County, including Alameda County Safe Routes to School Program, Oakland Broadway Shuttle, BART, and Alameda Harbor Bay Ferry. Social media marketing will allow GRH to promote events in Alameda County and stay in communication with major employers and other program partners. The Alameda CTC began tweeting and posting to Facebook about the program in early 2013, including welcoming new employers and employees on a regular basis. Social media marketing is a great means to harness user anecdotes and engender a sense of participants promoting the program to other participants. In addition, social media allows more constant contact and visibility with participants, reminding people in a very unobtrusive way about the opportunity that GRH provides.

5. Expand the GRH program in Alameda County to include a countywide TDM "One-stop-shop" clearinghouse website and TDM Fact Sheets as part of the proposed Comprehensive TDM Program Approach recommendations.

A continued recommendation from previous years is to investigate ways to expand the Alameda CTC's overall TDM portfolio. These evaluation reports recognized that GRH cannot provide its full benefit as a stand-alone program. GRH is a program that makes other TDM options like transit, shuttles, vanpooling, etc. viable, but it is not in and of itself a transportation option. Good alternative transportation options and other supportive incentives to use alternative transportation must be in place before GRH can reach its maximum potential. There are a number of other TDM programs that already exist in Alameda County with a range of providers including the region, cities, and employers. Unfortunately, centralized information about the range of TDM options in Alameda County is not easily available for users. It is recommended that the GRH program be expanded to include a TDM information "One-stop-shop" clearinghouse website and TDM Fact Sheets.

The current GRH program provides a strong foundation for an expanded role for the Alameda CTC in providing TDM information. The GRH hotline has functioned as a general TDM information tool for some time now, albeit on an informal basis. GRH program staff already has strong relationships with many of the large employers in Alameda County and connections with over 5,000 registered employees. Finally, the GRH website currently provides a separate page listing the transportation options in Alameda County. The webpage contains links to various transportation providers (such as ACE Train, AC Transit, BART, Capitol Corridor, WHEELS, Union City Transit, Emery-Go-Round, San Francisco Bay Ferries, Amtrak, VTA, and Dumbarton Express); ridesharing options (511.org and East Bay Casual Carpool); and biking/walking information (East Bay Bicycle Coalition, Walk Oakland Bike Oakland, Alameda County Bicycle and Pedestrian Program). The web presence will be expanded to provide a "one-stop-shop" with additional information for employers and employees. This would include expanding and rebranding the GRH program to contain more information about Alameda County TDM opportunities. New printed materials would be given to people enrolled in GRH that further encourage use of more sustainable modes of transportation. In all of these materials, the GRH program can be emphasized as the "safety net" that makes other commute options work well.



Memorandum

DATE: May 15, 2013

TO: Alameda County Transportation Commission

FROM: Programs and Projects Committee

SUBJECT: Approval of Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) FY 2013/14 Allocation Plan

Recommendation

It is recommended the Commission approve the Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) FY 2013/14 Allocation Plan.

Summary

The Measure F Alameda County Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) Program was approved by the voters in November 2010. The fee will generate about \$11.5 million per year by a \$10 per year vehicle registration fee. The collection of the \$10 per year vehicle registration fee started in May 2011.

The FY 2013/14 VRF Allocation Plan proposes to:

- Establish a 1-year Implementation Plan that will include the approval of specific projects and programming cycles (discretionary funding) for the upcoming year;
- Establish the Beginning Programmed Balance for each Program; and
- Estimate the cash flow over next five fiscal years of the VRF to assess the financial capacity to deliver the various programs.

Based on the actual VRF collections to date, staff has adjusted the FY 2012/13 and beyond revenue estimates presented in last month's Draft FY 2013/14 Plan.

Background

The goal of the VRF program is to sustain the County's transportation network and reduce traffic congestion and vehicle related pollution. The program includes four categories of projects to achieve this, including:

- Local Road Improvement and Repair Program (60%)
- Transit for Congestion Relief (25%)
- Local Transportation Technology (10%)
- Pedestrian and Bicyclist Access and Safety Program (5%)

An equitable share of the funds will be distributed among the four planning areas of the county over successive five year cycles. Geographic equity will be measured by a formula, weighted fifty percent by population of the planning area and fifty percent of registered vehicles of the planning area.

The Alameda County Transportation Commission will prepare an annual Allocation Plan to guide the implementation of the four programs identified in the Vehicle Registration Fee Expenditure Plan. The Allocation Plan identifies the priority for program implementation based on multiple factors including project readiness, the availability and potential for leveraging of other fund sources, and the anticipated revenues from the vehicle registration fee over the upcoming five years of the program.

The FY 2012/13 Coordinated Program aligned the discretionary VRF programs for Transit for Congestion Relief and Pedestrian and Bicyclist Access Safety Programs with the One Bay Area Grant call for projects (federal funding). The coordinated programming effort also included the Measure B Bicycle and Pedestrian Countywide Discretionary Funds and Measure B Express Bus Funds. The programming estimate included \$1.5 Million of VRF Bike and Pedestrian funds and \$5.0 Million of VRF Transit funds.

The Local Transportation Technology category will fund the operation and maintenance of ongoing transportation management technology projects such as the "Smart Corridors Program" operated by the Alameda CTC. This policy is consistent with the original intent of the VRF Program. The Alameda CTC Board has the authority to program the Local Transportation Technology funds directly to the operation and maintenance of ongoing transportation management technology projects. If programming capacity remains after addressing ongoing operation and maintenance costs of existing corridor operations, the program will be opened to other eligible project categories.

FY 2013/2014 Programming

The Local Road Improvement and Repair Program funds will be passed through to the cities and county based on the program formula. The Local Transportation Technology Program funds are proposed to be programmed to ongoing Alameda CTC Corridor Operations projects.

Fiscal Impact

There is no fiscal impact at this time.

Attachment(s)

Attachment A: Final Alameda County Transportation Commission Vehicle Registration Fee FY 2013/14 Allocation Plan



ALAMEDA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEE

FY 2013/14 ALLOCATION PLAN

ALAMEDA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION FY 2013/14 VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEE ALLOCATION PLAN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page Number

Purpose of the Allocation Plan	1
Introduction / Background of VRF Program	2
Program Categories	4
Distribution of VRF Funds	7
Allocation Plan Implementation	9
FY 2013/14 Implementation Plan Overview	13

List of Tables

Table 1	Draft 2013/14 Allocation Plan
Table 2	LSR Program - Projected Distribution through FY 2013/14

Purpose of the Allocation Plan

The Alameda County Transportation Commission prepares an annual Allocation Plan to guide the implementation of the 4 programs identified in the Vehicle Registration Fee Expenditure Plan. The Allocation Plan identifies the priority for program implementation based on multiple factors including project readiness, the availability and potential for leveraging of other fund sources, and the anticipated revenues from the vehicle registration fee over the upcoming 5 years of the program.

The FY 2013/14 Allocation Plan will:

- Establish a 1-year Implementation Plan that will include the approval of specific projects and programming cycles (discretionary funding) for the upcoming year;
- Establish the Beginning Programmed Balance for each Program; and
- Estimate the cash flow over next 5 fiscal years of the VRF to assess the financial capacity to deliver the various programs;

Introduction / Background of VRF Program

The opportunity for a countywide transportation agency to place a measure for a vehicle registration fee before the voters was authorized in 2009 by the passage of Senate Bill 83 (SB83), authored by Senator Loni Hancock. The Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC), formerly the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency, placed transportation Measure F (Measure) on the November 2, 2010 ballot to enact a \$10 vehicle registration fee that would be used for local transportation and transit improvements throughout Alameda County. The Alameda County Transportation Improvement Measure Expenditure Plan was determined to be compliant with the requirements of SB83 and the local transportation and transit improvements were included in the ballot measure as the Alameda County Transportation Improvement Measure Plan (Expenditure Plan).

The Measure was approved with the support of 62.6% of Alameda County voters. The \$10 per year vehicle registration fee (VRF) will be imposed on each annual motor-vehicle registration or renewal of registration in Alameda County starting in May 2011, six-months following approval of the Measure on the November 2, 2010 election.

Alameda County has significant unfunded transportation needs, and this Fee will provide funding to meet some of those needs. The Measure allows for the collection of the Fee for an unlimited period to implement the Expenditure Plan.

The goal of this program is to support transportation investments in a way that sustains the County's transportation network and reduces traffic congestion and vehicle-related pollution. The VRF is part of an overall strategy to develop a balanced, well thought-out program that improves transportation and transit in Alameda County.

The VRF will fund projects that:

- Repair and maintain local streets and roads in the county.
- Make public transportation easier to use and more efficient.
- Make it easier to get to work or school, whether driving, using public transportation, bicycling or walking.
- Reduce pollution from cars and trucks.

The money raised by the VRF will be used exclusively for transportation in Alameda County, including projects and programs identified in the Expenditure Plan that have a relationship or benefit to the owner's of motor vehicles paying the VRF. The VRF Program will establish a reliable source of funding to help fund critical and essential local transportation programs and provide matching funds for funding made available from other fund sources.

Vehicles subject to the VRF include all motorized vehicles – passenger cars, light-duty trucks, medium-duty trucks, heavy-duty trucks, buses of all sizes, motorcycles and motorized camper homes. The VRF will be imposed on all motorized vehicle types, unless vehicles are expressly exempted from the payment of the registration fee.

Program Categories

The Expenditure Plan identifies four types of programs that will receive funds generated by the VRF. The descriptions of each program and the corresponding percentage of the net annual revenue that will be allocated to each program include:

Local Road Improvement and Repair Program (60%)

This program will provide funding for improving, maintaining and rehabilitating local roads and traffic signals. It will also incorporate the "complete streets" practice that makes local roads safe for all modes, including bicyclists and pedestrians, and accommodates transit. Eligible projects include:

- Street repaying and rehabilitation, including curbs, gutters and drains
- Traffic signal maintenance and upgrades, including bicyclist and pedestrian treatments
- Signing and striping on roadways, including traffic and bicycle lanes and crosswalks
- Sidewalk repair and installation
- Bus stop improvements, including bus pads, turnouts and striping
- Improvements to roadways at rail crossings, including grade separations and safety protection devices
- Improvements to roadways with truck or transit routing

Transit for Congestion Relief Program (25%)

This program will seek to make it easier for drivers to use public transportation, make the existing transit system more efficient and effective, and improve access to schools and jobs. The goal of this program is to decrease automobile usage and thereby reduce both localized and area wide congestion and air pollution. Eligible projects include:

- Transit service expansion and preservation to provide congestion relief, such as express bus service in congested areas
- Development and implementation of transit priority treatments on local roadways

- Employer or school-sponsored transit passes, such as an "EcoPass Program"
- Park-and-ride facility improvements
- Increased usage of clean transit vehicles
- Increased usage of low floor transit vehicles
- Passenger rail station access and capacity improvements

Local Transportation Technology Program (10%)

This program will continue and improve the performance of road, transit, pedestrian and bicyclist technology applications, and accommodate emerging vehicle technologies, such as electric and plug-in-hybrid vehicles. Eligible projects include:

- Development, installation, operations, monitoring and maintenance of local street and arterial transportation management technology, such as the "Smart Corridors Program", traffic signal interconnection, transit and emergency vehicle priority, advanced traffic management systems, and advanced traveler information systems
- Infrastructure for alternative vehicle fuels, such as electric and hybrid vehicle plug-in stations
- New or emerging transportation technologies that provide congestion or pollution mitigation
- Advance signal technology for walking and bicycling
- Development and implementation of flush plans
- Development of emergency evacuation plans

Pedestrian and Bicyclist Access and Safety Program (5%)

This program will seek to improve the safety of bicyclists and pedestrians by reducing conflicts with motor vehicles and reducing congestion in areas such as schools, downtowns, transit hubs, and other high activity locations. It will also seek to improve bicyclist and pedestrian safety on arterials and other locally-maintained roads and reduce occasional congestion that may occur with incidents. Eligible projects include:

- Improved access and safety to schools, such as "Safe Routes to Schools Programs", "Greenways to Schools Programs", and other improvements (including crosswalk, sidewalk, lighting and signal improvements) for students, parents and teachers
- Improved access and safety to activity centers (such as crosswalk, sidewalk, lighting and signal improvements)
- Improved access and safety to transit hubs (such as crosswalk, sidewalk, lighting and signal improvements)
- Improved bicyclist and pedestrian safety on arterials, other locally-maintained roads and multi-use trails parallel to congested highway corridors



Administration Costs of the VRF

The Alameda CTC will collect and administer the VRF in accordance with the Expenditure Plan. The Alameda CTC will administer the proceeds of the VRF to carry out the mission described in the Plan. Not more than five percent of the VRF shall be used for administrative costs associated with the programs and projects, including amendments of the Expenditure Plan.

Distribution of VRF Funds

An equitable share of the VRF funds will be distributed among the four geographical subareas of the county (Planning Areas 1, 2, 3, and 4). The sub-areas of the county are defined by the Alameda CTC as follows:

- Planning Area 1 / North Area
 - Cities of Oakland, Berkeley, Albany, Piedmont, Emeryville and Alameda, as well as other unincorporated lands in that area
- Planning Area 2 / Central Area
 - Cities of Hayward and San Leandro, and the unincorporated areas of Castro Valley and San Lorenzo, as well as other unincorporated lands in that area
- Planning Area 3 / South Area
 - o Cities of Fremont, Newark and Union City
- Planning Area 4 / East Area
 - Cities of Livermore, Dublin and Pleasanton, and all unincorporated lands in that area

The Alameda CTC is authorized to redefine the planning areas limits from time to time.

An equitable share of the VRF funds will be distributed among the four geographical subareas, measured over successive five year cycles. Geographic equity is measured by a formula, weighted fifty percent by population of the sub-area and fifty percent of registered vehicles of the sub-area. Population information will be updated annually based on information published by the California Department of Finance. The DMV provides the number of registered vehicles in Alameda County. As part of the creation of the expenditure plan, the amount of registered vehicles in each planning area was determined. This calculation of the registered vehicles per planning area will be used to determine the equitable share for a planning area. The amount of registered vehicles in each planning area may be recalculated in the future, with the revised information becoming the basis for the Planning Area share formula. The VRF funds will also be tracked by the programmatic expenditure formula of:

- Local Road Improvement and Repair Program (60%),
- Transit for Congestion Relief Program (25%),
- Local Transportation Technology Program (10%), and
- Pedestrian and Bicyclist Access and Safety Program (5%).

Though it is not required to attain Planning Area geographic equity measured by each specific program, it will be monitored and considered a goal.

Allocation Plan Implementation

The Alameda CTC will evaluate and update a multi-year Allocation Plan on an annual basis that will include funding targets for programmatic categories identified in the Expenditure Plan for a five year period. The Allocation Plan will project the programming of VRF revenues to meet the geographic equity goals of the program. The Allocation Plan will also project the programming of VRF revenues to meet the programmatic category funding goals identified for the program. Adjustments based on projected compared to actual VRF received will be made in future Allocation Plans.

The Alameda CTC will also adopt an Implementation Plan for the upcoming fiscal year. The one year implementation plan will detail the distribution of VRF funds to each program and/or specific projects in a particular fiscal year. Projects will be monitored by Programmatic Category and Planning Area.

Allocation Plan

The Alameda CTC Board each year shall adopt a multi-year Allocation Plan. The Allocation Plan will include funding targets for programmatic categories identified in the Expenditure Plan for a five year period. The percentage allocation of Fee revenues to each category will consider the target funding levels, as identified in the Expenditure Plan.

Implementation Plan

The 5 year Allocation plan will include a shorter term implementation plan that will detail the approval of specific projects or discretionary programming cycles to be programmed. Projects will be approved within the eligible categories based on projected funding that will be received. Based on the actual revenue received each year, funding adjustments will be made to ensure geographic equity by planning area will be met over the 5 year window as well as to ensure funding targets for each programmatic category as

identified in the Expenditure Plan are met. Variances from projected to actual will be identified and be considered in future updates of the Allocation Plan.

Administration

Certain ongoing administrative costs are allowed for in the program. In FY 2013/14 approximately \$605,000 shall be allocated for administrative costs associated with the programs and projects.

Local Road Improvement and Repair Program (60%)

The Local Road Improvement and Repair category will be administered as a pass through program, with the 14 cities and the County receiving a portion of the Local Road Improvement and Repair Program based on a formula weighted fifty percent by population of the sub-area and fifty percent of registered vehicles of the sub-area. The fund distribution will be based on population within each Planning Area. Agencies will maintain all interest accrued from the VRF Local Road Program pass through funds within the program. These funds are intended to maintain and improve local streets and roads as well as a broad range of facilities in Alameda County (from local to arterial facilities).

Transit for Congestion Relief Program (25%)

The Transit for Congestion Relief category will be administered as a discretionary program that will be programmed approximately every other year. The Alameda CTC Board will approve the projects for programming. Opportunities to coordinate programming with other fund sources will be considered in the scheduling of the call for projects.

Strategic capital investments that will create operating efficiency and effectiveness are proposed to be priorities for this Program. Projects that address regionally significant transit issues and improve reliability and frequency are proposed to be given consideration.

Local Transportation Technology Program (10%)

The genesis of the VRF program was to create a reliable source of funding to support ongoing operational requirements for capital investments that benefit corridors with technology projects such as the "Smart Corridors Program". The Local Transportation Technology category priority will fund the operation and maintenance of ongoing transportation management technology projects such as the "Smart Corridors Program" operated by the Alameda CTC. This policy is consistent with the original intent of the VRF Program. The Alameda CTC Board will have the authority to program the Local Transportation Technology funds directly to the operation and maintenance of ongoing transportation management technology projects. If programming capacity remains after addressing ongoing operation and maintenance costs of existing corridor operations, the program will be opened to other eligible project categories.

Based on current patterns of the operation and maintenance levels of existing corridor programs, there may be an imbalance between the geographic equity formula and the use of the funds within the Local Transportation Technology category. The expenses incurred by Planning Area will be monitored. The programming assigned to the Local Transportation Technology Program by Planning Area will be considered with programming for all four program categories when overall VRF Program geographic equity is evaluated.

Pedestrian and Bicyclist Access and Safety Program (5%)

The Pedestrian and Bicyclist Access and Safety category will be administered as a discretionary program that will be programmed approximately every other year. The Alameda CTC Board will approve the projects for programming. Opportunities to coordinate programming with other fund sources will be a primary consideration in the scheduling of the call for projects. Projects identified in the Countywide bike and pedestrian plans are proposed to be priorities for this Program.

<u>Schedule</u>

Each year the Allocation /Implementation Plan will be presented to the Commission in April – June for approval.

FY 2013/2014 Programming

The Local Road Improvement and Repair Program funds will be passed through to the cities and county based on the program formula. The Local Transportation Technology Program funds are proposed to be programmed to ongoing Alameda CTC Corridor Operations projects.
FY 2013/14 Implementation Plan Overview

Collection of fees on vehicle registrations started in May 2011. With the execution of Master Program Fund Agreements (MPFA) with agencies, the first VRF funds were distributed in June 2012 as LSR pass through funds. It is projected that approximately \$14.4 Million will be distributed through the LSR pass through program through FY 2012/13.

For FY 2013/14, it is proposed to continue the LSR pass through program, with about \$6.9 Million projected to be distributed. Additional distribution projection information on the LSR program is included in Table 2.

The Bike/Pedestrian and Transit Program are discretionary programs and were included in a coordinated programming effort along with the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Program. \$1.5 Million of Bike/Pedestrian program revenues and \$5 Million of Transit Program revenues will be programmed as a part of the FY 2012/13 Coordinated Programming effort.

Funding for the Technology program is prioritized, consistent with the Commissions intent, to ongoing corridor operations. Approximately \$1.03 Million is proposed to be programmed in FY 2013/14.

Although the program targets (percentages) for the Bike/ Ped, Transit and Technology programs are not aligned with the targets specified in the Expenditure Plan for each individual year, the year by year funding targets detailed in the Allocation Plan will ensure each programmatic category target is achieved over a 5 year period. Funding adjustment may also be required in the future based on the actual revenue received each year.

Programming of VRF funds in future will be coordinated within the Alameda CTC's Strategic Planning and Investment Policy framework that establishes a comprehensive approach for allocating federal, state, regional and local funds in a manner that provides both short- and long-term solutions for transportation investments consistent with Alameda CTC's vision for transportation as defined in the Countywide Transportation Plan.

%	60.0%	25.0%	5.0%	10.0%	100.0%
Cycle Summary	42,005,823	17,529,540	3,505,691	6,968,651	70,009,705
•1	S	S	S	S	Ś

	%	2010/11 (2 Months)	%	2011/12	%	2012/13	%	2013/14	%	2014/15	%	2015/16	%	2016/17	%	2017/18
Local Roads	60.00%	\$ 527,810	%0.09	\$ 6,978,013	%0.0%	\$ 6,900,000	60.0%	6,900,000	60.0%	6,900,000	60.0%	\$ 6,900,000	60.0%	\$ 6,900,000	60.0%	6,900,000
Transit Program	0.00%	•	24.0%	\$ 2,785,390	25.8%	\$ 2,967,000	25.8%	3 2,967,000	25.8%	\$ 2,967,000	25.8%	\$ 2,968,150	25.0%	\$ 2,875,000	25.0%	\$ 2,875,000
Ped/Bike Program	0.00%	۲ ۲	4.8%	\$ 558,241	5.2%	\$ 593,400	5.2%	\$ 593,400	5.2%	\$ 593,400	5.2%	\$ 592,250	5.0%	\$ 575,000	5.0%	\$ 575,000
Tech. Program	40.00%	\$ 351,874	11.3%	\$ 1,308,377	9.0%	\$ 1,039,600	9.0%	1,039,600	9.0%	\$ 1,039,600	9.0%	\$ 1,039,600	10.0%	\$ 1,150,000	10.0%	3 1,150,000
	100.00%	\$ 879,684	100.0%	\$ 11,630,021	100.0%	\$ 11,500,000	100.0%	11,500,000	100.0%	8 11,500,000	100.0%	\$ 11,500,000	100.0%	\$ 11,500,000	100.0%	3 11,500,000

Alameda County VRF Program - TABLE 1

Draft 2013/14 Allocation Plan (Multi-Year Projection by Program Category)

Projections of Available Programming Capacity

FY 10/11	FY 11/12	FY 12/13 and beyond
879,684	11,630,021	11,500,000
S	\$	S

Alameda County VRF Program - TABLE 2

Local Streets and Roads - Projected Distribution through FY 2013/14

	D	istribution within Planning Area FY 2010/11	D	istribution within Planning Area FY 2011/12	D	istribution within Planning Area FY 2012/13	Dis 1	TOTAL stribution within Planning Area Through FY 2012/13	Disti Pl]	ribution within anning Area FY 2013/14
PA 1	•	22.264			_	204.120		(24.050)	•	204.120
Alameda	\$	23,264	\$	307,566	\$	304,128	\$	634,958	\$	304,128
Albany	\$	5,251	\$	69,423	\$	68,646	\$	143,320	\$	68,646
Berkeley	\$	33,355	\$	440,979	\$	436,049	\$	910,382	\$	436,049
Emeryville	\$	3,155	\$	41,712	\$	41,246	\$	86,113	\$	41,246
Oakland	\$	132,862	\$	1,756,532	\$	1,736,894	\$	3,626,288	\$	1,736,894
Piedmont	\$	3,4/4	\$	45,934	\$	45,420	\$	94,828	\$	45,420
	\$	201,362	\$	2,662,145	\$	2,632,383	\$	5,495,890	\$	2,632,383
PA 2	-									
Havward	\$	55.043	\$	727.710	\$	719.574	\$	1.502.327	\$	719,574
San Leandro	\$	29,906	\$	395,372	\$	390,952	\$	816,230	\$	390,952
County of Alameda	\$	47,888	\$	633,118	\$	626,040	\$	1,307,046	\$	626,040
	\$	132,837	\$	1,756,200	\$	1,736,566	\$	3,625,603	\$	1,736,566
D.4. 0										
PA 3	•	75.011	Φ.	001 700	Φ.	000 (15	¢	2.047.220	Φ.	000 (15
Fremont	\$	/5,011	\$	991,702	\$	980,615	\$	2,047,329	\$	980,615
Newark	\$	15,262	\$	201,//0	\$	199,515	\$	416,547	<u>\$</u>	199,515
Union City	\$	25,810	\$	341,227	\$	337,412	\$	/04,450	\$	337,412
	3	116,083	3	1,534,700	3	1,51/,542	3	3,168,325	2	1,517,542
PA 4										
Dublin	\$	17,596	\$	232,634	\$	230,033	\$	480,264	\$	230,033
Livermore	\$	30,748	\$	406,515	\$	401,971	\$	839,235	\$	401,971
Pleasanton	\$	25,486	\$	336,941	\$	333,174	\$	695,601	\$	333,174
County of Alameda	\$	3,697	\$	48,877	\$	48,330	\$	100,904	\$	48,330
	\$	77,528	\$	1,024,968	\$	1,013,509	\$	2,116,004	\$	1,013,509
County Total	\$	527,810	\$	6,978,012	\$	6,900,000	\$	14,405,822	\$	6,900,000



Memorandum

DATE: May 15, 2013

TO: Alameda County Transportation Commission

FROM: Programs and Projects Committee

SUBJECT: Approval of Measure B Special Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities Gap Grant Cycle 5 Program

Recommendation

It is recommended the Commission approve the following actions relating to the Measure B Special Transportation Program for Seniors and People with Disabilities (Paratransit) Gap Grant Cycle 5 Program:

- 1. Approval to allocate \$2,150,644 of Measure B Paratransit Grant funds to the 1st through 12th ranked Paratransit Gap Grant Cycle 5 applicants;
- 2. Approval to allocate \$50,000 of Implementation Guidelines Assistance Measure B Paratransit Grant funds to the City of San Leandro to fund the city's Door-to-Door Medical Transportation service.

Summary

The 2000 Measure B Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) provides funds for services mandated by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), non-mandated services to improve transportation for individuals with special transportation needs, and discretionary grant funds to reduce differences that might occur based on the geographic residence of individuals needing services.

The 2000 Measure B TEP allocates 10.45% of net revenues for special transportation for seniors and people with disabilities (Paratransit). 1.43% of net Measure B revenues are designated as discretionary funds to fill gaps in paratransit services i.e. competitive grants.

The Alameda CTC Commission approved the Paratransit Gap Grant Cycle 5 Program Guidelines at its January 24, 2013 meeting. Per the Gap Grant Cycle 5 Program Guidelines, approximately \$2 million of Measure B paratransit discretionary funds were allocated to fund successful grant applications selected from a competitive call-for-projects. The proposed grant period is from July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2015. On February 1, 2013 a call-for-projects was issued, with an application due date of March 4, 2013. A total of 17 applications were received from local agencies and community based non-profit organizations.

The Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee (PAPCO) established a Gap Grant Review Subcommittee that convened on three separate occasions to review the 17 submitted applications and evaluated them based on seven criteria, as outlined in the guidelines, to rank the applications 1 through 17. The Gap Grant Review subcommittee also queried applicants if they would accept reduced amounts of funding in order to fund additional programs. Through the cooperation and concurrence from several applicants in accepting reduced funding, the Gap Grant Review Subcommittee was able to recommend the 12th highest applications for funding. By providing funding to additional grant applications, a greater distribution of paratransit discretionary funds was allocated across the four planning areas of Alameda County.

At its April 22, 2013 meeting, PAPCO accepted the Gap Grant Review Subcommittee's findings and hence recommends to the Alameda CTC Commission to approve \$2,150,644 million of Measure B paratransit gap grant funds to be allocated to the twelve (12) highest ranked Gap Grant Cycle 5 applicants for the two year duration of the program for Fiscal Years (FY) 2013-2014 and 2014-2015.

At its April 22, 2013 meeting, PAPCO also accepted the City of San Leandro request for Implementation Guidelines Assistance funding. PAPCO recommends the Alameda CTC Commission approve \$50,000 of Measure B paratransit discretionary funds to be allocated, for FY 2013-2014, to assist the City of San Leandro paratransit program to fund the city's Door-to-Door Medical Transportation service.

Discussion

The 2000 Measure B TEP allocates 10.45% of net revenues for special transportation for seniors and people with disabilities. These revenues fund operations for ADA mandated services, city-based paratransit programs, and gap services or programs to reduce the difference in services based on the geographic residence of individuals needing special transportation services. From the 10.45% overall amount classified for special transportation services for seniors and people with disabilities, 1.43% of net Measure B revenues are designated as discretionary funds to fill gaps in paratransit services.

At its January 24, 2013 meeting, the Alameda CTC Commission approved the Paratransit Gap Grant Cycle 5 Program Guidelines. The Cycle 5 Gap Grant Program encouraged local agencies and non-profits to submit proposals/applications that support mobility management types of activities which improve consumers' ability to access services and/or improve coordination between programs. The Cycle 5 Gap Grant Program also encouraged multi-jurisdictional approaches and non-traditional transportation options, such as volunteer driver and taxi programs. Per the Gap Grant Cycle 5 Program Guidelines, approximately \$2 million of Measure B paratransit discretionary funds were allocated to fund successful grant applications selected from a competitive call-for-project. The proposed grant period is from July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2015.

The timeline for the Paratransit Gap Grant Cycle 5 Program is as follows:

- January 24, 2013 Alameda CTC Commission approved Paratransit Gap Grant Cycle 5 Program Guidelines
- February 1, 2013 Paratransit Gap Grant Cycle 5 Call for Projects was issued
- February 7, 2013 Mandatory Applicant Workshop was conducted
- March 4, 2013 Grant applications due and seventeen (17) applications were received by the Alameda CTC
- March-April 2013 Grant applications reviewed by Alameda CTC staff & the PAPCO Gap Grant Subcommittee
- April 22, 2013 PAPCO accepts Gap Grant Subcommittees' recommendations and recommends to the Alameda CTC Commission the top twelve (12) Cycle 5 Gap Grant applications for approval
- May 13, 2013 Projects and Programs Committee to consider approval of the Cycle 5 Gap Grants
- May 23, 2013 Commission to consider approval of the Cycle 5 Gap Grants
- June 1, 2013 Recipients submit resolutions
- July 1, 2013 Cycle 5 Gap Grant funding commences

Following the Alameda CTC Commission approval of the Paratransit Gap Grant Cycle 5 Program Guidelines, PAPCO established a seven member subcommittee that provided representation from the four planning areas of Alameda County. The Gap Grant Subcommittee met on three separate occasions and reviewed and evaluated the 17 applications based on the seven criteria established in the Cycle 5 Program Guidelines, as follows:

- Gap Closure (maximum 20 points)
- Cost Effectiveness/Efficiency (maximum 15 points)
- Applicants Experience/Qualifications (maximum 15 points)
- Demand (maximum 15 points)
- Implementation Readiness (maximum 15 points)
- Innovation (maximum 10 points)
- Leverage Outside Funds (maximum 10 points)

The Gap Grant Subcommittee was challenged with funding constraints. If the highest ranked applications were fully funded, only 5 of the seventeen 17 applications would have been funded. Furthermore, these applications may not have distributed the limited funds and services to all four planning areas as equitably as desired. The subcommittee required all applicants to confirm if the intended project benefits could be delivered with reduced funding. Applicants responded that they could provide the project benefits, with some reduction in quantity of services at reduced funding levels. The City of Fremont did request reallocation of grant funds between the three successful grants they submitted and committed \$50,000 of paratransit pass-through funds to support the Tri-City Taxi grant in order to deliver intended project benefits for all three grants. In addition, Alameda CTC staff revisited the fund estimate assumptions as well as leveraging opportunities. It was determined that two of the applicants were current Coordination and Mobility Management Planning (CMMP) Pilot Projects and that remaining CMMP funds could be allocated to fund two favorably ranked volunteer driver applications; the CMMP funds are from a prior Measure B paratransit gap grant programming action. Also with the improved

economy and the mid-year budget completed, staff reviewed the revenue projections and an increase in available funding for this grant cycle is recommended to fund the program.

PAPCO met on April 22, 2013 to review and discuss the Gap Grant Subcommittees' findings, and recommends the Alameda CTC Commission approval of the 1st- 12th ranked applications for funding. These are noted on Attachment (A), along with all 17 applications that were received, scored and ranked.

In funding the recommended 1st- 12th ranked applications, the distribution of Measure B paratransit discretionary funds will be allocated across the four planning areas as noted in the following table:

Planning Areas	Funding Recommended by Planning Area*	Percent	Funding Recommended by Planning Area (Countywide distributed**)	Percent	Planning Area Portion of Pass-Through Funding Formula
Countywide	\$622,000.00	28.9%			
North	\$553,000.00	25.7%	\$870,220.00	40.5%	51%
Central	\$104,100.00	4.8%	\$ 253,380.00	11.8%	24%
South	\$636,000.00	29.6%	\$ 735,520.00	34.2%	16%
East	\$235,544.00	11.0%	\$ 291,524.00	13.6%	9%
Totals	\$2,150,644.00	100.0%	\$2,150,644.00	100.0%	

* Includes appropriate portion of Alzheimer Services of the East Bay grant which covers three planning areas (North, Central, and South).

** Assumes countywide program split into Planning Area components based on pass-through formula percentages.

The Paratransit Gap Grant Cycle 5 Program Guidelines also allocated \$150,000 annually to the following three (3) annually renewed programs:

- \$50,000 Grant Matching funds to assist applicants in acquiring non-Alameda CTC grants
- \$50,000 Capital Purchasing funds to assist applicant in making a capital purchase
- \$50,000 Implementation Guidelines Assistance.

The Implementation Guidelines Assistance fund is available to applicants during the yearly Paratransit Program Plan review when local agencies can demonstrate that they may not be able to provide critical paratransit activities to meet the Paratransit Implementation Guidelines based on projected Measure B paratransit pass-through funds. The City of San Leandro demonstrated that they are forecasting an operational reserve of \$1,444 at the end of FY 2013-2014, and without Implementation Guidelines Assistance funds, will need to discontinue their Door-to-Door Medical Transportation service (FLEX Medical Trips Service). The FLEX Medical Trip service allows people, who are qualified, to call and make a reservation for a shuttle to pick them up and drop them off at a specific location within Alameda County for medical purposes only. To qualify the individual must be a resident of the City of San Leandro, be registered with the City of San Leandro's paratransit program, and must be seventy-five (75) years old or older, or at least 18 years old and East Bay Paratransit certified.

PAPCO met on April 22, 2013 to reviewed and discuss the City of San Leandro's request for Implementation Guidelines Assistance funds and recommend the Alameda CTC approval of \$50,000 Measure B paratransit discretionary funds be allocated to the City of San Leandro for FY 2013-2014.

Fiscal Impact

Approval of funding for the 1st- 12th ranked Paratransit Gap Grant Cycle 5 applications will encumber \$1,948,644 of Measure B Paratransit Grant funds and \$202,000 of CMMP funds for a total encumbrance of \$2,150,644. These funds will support the 12 grants for FY 2013-2014 and FY 2014-2015. There are sufficient Measure B Paratransit Grant funds and CMMP funds to support this request.

Approval of funding for the City of San Leandro Door-to-Door Medical Transportation service will allocate \$50,000 of Implementation Guidelines Assistance Measure B Paratransit Grant funds. These funds will support the program for FY 2013-2014. There are sufficient Measure B Paratransit Grant funds to support this request.

Attachment(s)

Attachment A: Paratransit Gap Grant Cycle 5 Grant Applications

This page intentionally left blank

Paratı	ansit Gap Grant Cycle	5 Applications Recommended	d For Funding			
AVG RANK	Sponsor	Program/Project Title	MB Funds Requested	Total Program/ Project Cost	Recommended MB Funding	Notes
1	Alzheimer's Services of the East Bay	Special Transportation Services for Individuals with Dementia	\$300,000	\$837,318	\$200,000	Ranked in top third. Subcommittee recommended partial funding. Reduction is based on \$75,000 from pass-through funding, small number of consumers served, and overall funding limitations.
2	Center for Independent Living, Inc.	Mobility Matters Project	\$500,000	\$833,560	\$350,000	Ranked in top third. Subcommittee recommended partial funding. Reduction is based on \$140,000 designated to partners that already have Measure B funding from other sources, potential for other funding sources (e.g. New Freedom), and overall funding limitations.
3	Bay Area Outreach & Recreation Program	Accessible Group Trip Transportation for Youth and Adults with Disabilities	\$272,000	\$340,200	\$272,000	Ranked in top third. Subcommittee recommended full funding.
4	City of Fremont/Human Services Department	Tri-City Mobility Management and Travel Training Program	\$233,982	\$269,982	\$200,000	Ranked in top third. Subcommittee recommended partial funding. Reduction is based on the fact that all Tri-City grants are recommended for funding and overall funding limitations.
5	Senior Support Program of The Tri Valley	Volunteer Assisted Senior Transportation Program	\$150,000	\$165,000	\$150,000	Ranked in top third. Subcommittee recommended full funding.
9	City of Pleasanton	Downtown Route Shuttle (DTR)	\$85,544	\$105,777	\$85,544	Ranked in top third. Subcommittee recommended full funding.
L	City of Fremont/Human Services Department	Tri-City Volunteer Driver Programs	\$285,626	\$285,626	\$250,000	Ranked in middle third. Subcommittee recommended partial funding. Reduction is based on the fact that all Tri-City grants are recommended for funding and overall funding limitations.
∞	City of Fremont/Human Services Department	Tri-City Taxi Voucher Program	\$228,188	\$228,188	\$150,000	Ranked in middle third. Subcommittee recommended partial funding. Reduction is based on the fact that all Tri-City grants are recommended for funding and overall funding limitations. The City has committed to utilizing up to \$50,000 of paratransit pass- through funds should the project require additional funding in the last fiscal year of operations FY 14/15.
6	City of Emeryville	8-To-Go: A Demand Response, Door to Door Shuttle	\$106,000	\$186,200	\$106,000	Ranked in middle third. Subcommittee recommended full funding. Program/project demonstrates mobility management, sustainability, and cannot reasonably be implemented without full funding.
10	Senior Helpline Services	Rides for Seniors	\$220,000	\$231,580	\$150,000	Ranked in middle third. Subcommittee recommended partial funding. Reduction is based on removal of Central County component and overall funding limitations. Funding will be provided through remaining CMMP funds, which is appropriate as this was a CMMP Pilot.
11	Central County Taxi Program / City of Hayward	Central County Taxi Program	\$52,100	\$144,500	\$52,100	Ranked in middle third. Subcommittee recommended full funding. Funding will be provided through remaining CMMP funds, which is appropriate as this was a CMMP Pilot.
12	City of Oakland/Department of Human Services	Taxi-Up & Go Project	\$248,468	\$248,468	\$185,000	Ranked in middle third. Subcommittee recommended partial funding. Reduction is based on the overall funding limitations.
		TOTAL	\$2,681,908	\$3,876,399	\$2,150,644	
Paratı	ansit Gap Grant Cycle	5 Applications Not Recomme	ended			
13	Lions Center for the Blind	Tech-to-Trek Travel Training for the Blind and Visually Impaired	\$180,474	\$190,474	\$0	Ranked in bottom third. Subcommittee did not recommend funding. Subcommittee hopes that there may be opportunities for coordination with funded programs/projects.
14	Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority	Wheels Para-taxi	\$60,000	\$75,000	\$0	Ranked in bottom third. Subcommittee did not recommend funding. Subcommittee hopes that other sources of funding will allow applicant to continue program on reduced scale.
15	Bay Area Community Services (BACS)	BACS Senior Shopping Shuttle and Group Trip Program	\$225,362	\$237,532	80	Ranked in bottom third. Subcommittee did not recommend funding.
16	Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority	Paratransit Scholarship Program	\$25,000	\$26,250	\$0	Ranked in bottom third. Subcommittee did not recommend funding. Subcommittee hopes that other sources of funding will allow applicant to continue program on reduced scale.

Attachment A

Ranked in bottom third. Subcommittee did not recommend funding. Subcommittee hopes that there may be opportunities for coordination with funded programs/projects.

 $^{\circ}$

\$315,000

\$300,000

Allen Temple Health & Social III Take You There Rides Services Ministries

17

Page 185

This page intentionally left blank



Memorandum

DATE: May 15, 2013

TO: Alameda County Transportation Commission

FROM: Programs and Projects Committee

SUBJECT: Approval of Three-Year Project Initiation Document Strategic Plan for Alameda County

Recommendation

It is recommended the Commission approve the Three-Year Project Initiation Document (PID) Strategic Plan for Alameda County (FY 2013/14, 2014/15 and 2015/16).

Summary

Caltrans has requested the Alameda CTC to update the Three-Year PID Strategic Plan for Alameda County (FY 2013/14, 2014/15 and 2015/16).

Discussion

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 Strategic Plan for Alameda County (FY 2013/14, 2014/15 and 2015/16) (Attachment A). Per Caltrans' Non-SHOPP Workload Guidance (Attachment B), any PSR/PID work that needs Caltrans oversight must be listed in this three year Strategic 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.

The FY 2013/14 list includes projects carried over from FY 2012/13. Projects with an identified fund source i.e. SR-238 LATIP funds, are proposed to be considered in FY 2014/15. Projects with less secured fund sources are proposed in FY 2015/16. Project sponsors would be provided an opportunity to re-prioritize projects when this list will be revisited in the upcoming fiscal years.

The PSR/PID strategic plan process in the future will be coordinated within the Alameda CTC's Strategic Planning and Investment Policy framework that establishes a comprehensive approach for allocating federal, state, regional and local funds.

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

Fiscal Impact

There is no fiscal impact at this time.

Attachment(s)

Attachment A: Draft Alameda County Three-Year PID Strategic Plan Attachment B: Caltrans Non- SHOPP Workload Guidance

γวnອጿA gnitnອmອlqml		City of Berkeley ACTC	City of Oakland		ACTC	Ala County redevelopment Agency Caltrans	Alameda County Public Works Agency	City of San Leandro ACTC	ACTC	Alameda County Public Works Agency	City of Oakland	ACTC	ACTC
Project Sponsor		City of Berkeley ACTC	City of Oakland		ACTC	Ala County redevelopment Agency Caltrans	Alameda County Public Works Agency	City of San Leandro ACTC	ACTC	Alameda County Public Works Agency	City of Oakland	ACTC	ACTC
Type of PID		PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS		PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	NBSSR	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS
(M\$) tsoJ troqqu2		2.0	2.0		43.0	1.5	1.5	0.7	2.0	1.5	2.0	3.0	3.0
(M\$) tsoJ letiqeJ		7.0	10.5		234.0	7.5	6.5	2.4	10.0	3.5	10.0	12.0	12.0
Estimated PID Completion Date (MM/YYYY)		06/2013	06/2014		06/2015	06/2015	06/2015	06/2015	06/2015	06/2015	06/2015	06/2015	06/2015
eteD noitsitinl (۲۲۲۲/DD/MM)		3/4/2004											
RTP Project Number		21144	240227		230244				230110		230094		
noifsool		Gilman St I/C in Berkeley	In Oakland, below I880 between the San Francisco Bay Trail and Laney College		Widen SR-84 from Pigeon Pass to I-680	East 14th St from 162nd Ave to SR-238 O/C	Mission Blvd SR-238 O/C to Hayward City Limits	E.14th St/Hesperian Blvd, and E.14th St/150th Ave	Rte 262 (Mission Blvd)	Strobridge/Castro Valley	Between MacArthur Blvd. and Kingsland Place	Various	Provide integrated corridor management (ICM) and traffic operations systems (TOS) elements to the South County area, primarily on I-880 south of SR-92.
lmprovement Description		I/C reconfiguration	Lake Merritt Channel Bicycle Pedestrian Bridge		Widening for auxiliary lanes, HOV/HOT lane.	Streetscape improvement (Phase II)	Streetscape improvement (Phase III)	Intersection Improvements: Adding lane, signal modification	I-680 I/C Improvement. Rt 262 roadway iprovement, and Rt 262/Warm Sprongs Blvd Intersection Improvement	Castro Valley Local Area Traffic Circulation Imps	Construct Noise Barrier along I-580 between MacArthur Blvd. and Kingsland Place in Oakland	Integrated Corridor Mobility (ICM) Program and adaptive ramp metering	Improve mobility
Purpose & Need		lmprove traffic operations	Bike Ped		Improve traffic operations	Streetscape	Streetscape	Improve traffic operations	Improve traffic operations	lmprove traffic operations	Noise Mitigation	Improve traffic operations	Improve traffic operations
elimtso9 bn3	or Years	6.8			24.0	2.9	3.7	3.9	1.1	Var	40.1	Var	Var
alimtzo9 niga8	ides Pric	6.3			18.0	0.0	1.2	3.6	0.0	Var	39.8	Var	Var
Boute	AN (inclu	80	880	Z	84	185	185	185	262	580	580	238 580 880	880 238 84 92
AOI\AO\b69J	ORK PL	IQA	IQA	ORK PL	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA
Agreement Number	3/14 W(04- 2368	TBD	4/15 W(TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Executed Reimbursement Agreement (Y/N)	FY 201	~	z	FY 201	z	z	z	z	z	z	z	z	z
(Juamesrudmiaß) A no AHS	POSED	SHA	Reim	POSED	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim
# xəpul	PRO	Ч	7	PRO	ſ	4	ъ	9	7	∞	6	10	11

/16)
, 15,
/15
l, 14
3/14
2013
FY
Plan
gic
trate
D S1

γวnອጿA gnitnອmອlqml		City of Emeryville	City of Hayward	City of Hayward	ACTC	ACTC	City of Oakland	City of Livermore	Alameda County Public Works Agency	BART	ACTC
Project Sponsor		City of Emeryville	City of Hayward	City of Hayward	ACTC	ACTC	City of Oakland	City of Livermore	Alameda County Public Works Agency	BART	ACTC
Type of PID		PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	NBSSR	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS
(M¢) tsoJ troqqu2		1.0	1.5	7.0	3.0	22.0	2.0	5.0	2.0	TBD	20.0
(M ද) tso D letiqe D		3.0	4.5	45.0	12.0	100.0	10.0	27.5	7.0	1000	150.0
Estimated PID Completion Date (MM/YYYY)		06/2016	06/2016	06/2016	06/2016	06/2016	06/2016	06/2016	06/2016	06/2016	06/2016
Initiation Date (YYYY)											
RTP Project Number		230108		21093	94506		230094	21100			
noiteool		Emeryville	Hayward	Hayward	SR-238(Mission Blvd Improvements in the vicinity of the East West Connector Project)	San Leandro	Between 98th Ave. and Foothill Blvd.	Vasco Rd I/C in Livermore	Strobridge/Castro Valley	Livermore	Tri Valley
lmprovement Description		า I-80 Eastbound Powell Street mp	rial Blvd I/C reconstruction	r I/C modification	al Improvements & Safety	nnector to NB 880	ct Noise Barrier along I-580 n 98th Ave. and Foothill Blvd.	fication	nodifications Strobridge/Castro /C	Livermore	80 Interchange Improvements
		Wideı Off-ra	Indust	Clawite	Operatio	Widen co	Construe betweer	I/C modi	Ramp m Valley I/	BART to	1580 /6
Purpose & Need		Improve traffic Wide operations Off-ra	Improve traffic operations	Improve traffic operations	Improve traffic operations	Improve traffic Widen co operations	Noise Mitigation betweer	Improve traffic operations	Improve traffic Ramp m operations Valley I/	Improve traffic operations	Improve traffic 1580 /6
End Postmile Purpose & Need		4.0 Improve traffic Wide operations Off-ra	R5.3 Improve traffic Indust operations	R4.9 Improve traffic Clawite operations	11.1 Improve traffic Operation Operation	16.7 Improve traffic Widen co	36.34 Noise Mitigation betweer	10.2 Improve traffic I/C modi operations	R31.4 Improve traffic Ramp m valley ly operations	TBD Improve traffic BART to operations	21.0 Improve traffic I580 /6
Begin Postmile End Postmile b99N & 920qnuq		3.5 4.0 Improve traffic Wider operations Off-ra	R4.9 R5.3 Improve traffic Indust operations	R4.1 R4.9 Improve traffic Clawite operations	10.5 11.1 Improve traffic Operation Operation	16.3 16.7 Improve traffic Widen co	30.9 36.34 Noise Mitigation betweer	9.2 10.2 Improve traffic I/C modi operations	R29.4 R31.4 Improve traffic Ramp m Valley I	TBD TBD Improve traffic BART to operations	20.0 21.0 Improve traffic 1580 /6
Route Begin Postmile Furpose & Need	N	80 3.5 4.0 Improve traffic Wide operations Off-ra	92 R4.9 R5.3 Improve traffic Indust operations	92 R4.1 R4.9 Improve traffic Clawite Operations	238 10.5 11.1 Improve traffic Operation	238 16.3 16.7 Improve traffic Widen co	580 30.9 36.34 Noise Mitigation betweer	580 9.2 10.2 Improve traffic I/C modi operations	580 R29.4 R31.4 Improve traffic Ramp m operations Valley I	580 TBD TBD Improve traffic BART to operations	580 20.0 21.0 Improve traffic 1580 /6
Lead/QA/IQA Route Begin Postmile End Postmile b99N & Soqruf	ORK PLAN	IQA 80 3.5 4.0 Improve traffic Wide	IQA 92 R4.9 R5.3 Improve traffic Indust operations	IQA 92 R4.1 R4.9 Improve traffic Clawite operations	IQA 238 10.5 11.1 Improve traffic Operation	IQA 238 16.3 16.7 Improve traffic Widen co	IQA 580 30.9 36.34 Noise Mitigation betweer	IQA 580 9.2 10.2 Improve traffic I/C modi	IQA 580 R29.4 R31.4 Improve traffic Ramp m Valley I	IQA 580 TBD TBD Operations BART to	IQA 580 20.0 21.0 Improve traffic I580 /6
Agreement Number Lead/QA/IQA Begin Postmile End Postmile Purpose & Need	5/16 WORK PLAN	TBD IQA 80 3.5 4.0 Improve traffic Wide Off-ra 0 0 3.5 4.0 0 0	TBD IQA 92 R4.9 R5.3 Improve traffic Indust operations	TBD IQA 92 R4.1 R4.9 Improve traffic Clawite operations	TBD IQA 238 10.5 11.1 Improve traffic operation Operation	TBD IQA 238 16.3 16.7 Improve traffic Widen co	TBD IQA 580 30.9 36.34 Noise Mitigation betweer	TBD IQA 580 9.2 10.2 Improve traffic I/C modi	TBD IQA 580 R29.4 R31.4 Improve traffic Ramp m Valley I	TBD IQA 580 TBD TBD operations BART to	TBD IQA 580 20.0 21.0 Improve traffic 1580 /6
Executed Reimbursement Agreement (Y/N) Agreement Number Route Begin Postmile End Postmile Purpose & Need) FY 2015/16 WORK PLAN	N TBD IQA 80 3.5 4.0 Improve traffic Wide	N TBD IQA 92 R4.9 R5.3 Improve traffic Indust operations	N TBD IQA 92 R4.1 R4.9 Improve traffic Clawite operations	N TBD IQA 238 10.5 11.1 Improve traffic Operation	N TBD IQA 238 16.3 16.7 Improve traffic Widen co	N TBD IQA 580 30.9 36.34 Noise Mitigation betweer	N TBD IQA 580 9.2 10.2 Improve traffic I/C modi	N TBD IQA 580 R29.4 R31.4 Improve traffic Ramp m Valley I	N TBD IQA 580 TBD TBD Operations BART to	N TBD IQA 580 20.0 21.0 Improve traffic I580 /6
SHA or R (Reimbursement) Executed Reimbursement Agreement (Y/N) Agreement Number Route End Postmile End Postmile	OPOSED FY 2015/16 WORK PLAN	Reim N TBD IQA 80 3.5 4.0 Improve traffic Wide	Reim N TBD IQA 92 R4.9 R5.3 Improve traffic Indust operations	t Reim N TBD IQA 92 R4.1 R4.9 Improve traffic Clawite operations	Reim N TBD IQA 238 10.5 11.1 Improve traffic Operation Operation	Reim N TBD IQA 238 16.3 16.7 Improve traffic Widen co	⁷ Reim N TBD IQA 580 30.9 36.34 Noise Mitigation betweer	Reim N TBD IQA 580 9.2 10.2 Improve traffic I/C modi) Reim N TBD IQA 580 R29.4 R31.4 Improve traffic Ramp m Valley I) Reim N TBD IQA 580 TBD TBD Operations BART to	Reim N TBD IQA 580 20.0 21.0 Improve traffic I580 /6

/16)
15/
15,
14/
14,
13/
Y20
n(F
Pla
egic
rate
) St

γวnອጿA gnitnອmອlqml		ACTC	City of Hayward ACTC	ACTC	ACTC	City of Hayward	Union City/ Hayward	ACTC	ACTC	ACTC	ACTC Caltrans
Project Sponsor		ACTC	City of Hayward ACTC	ACTC	ACTC	City of Hayward	Union City/ Hayward	ACTC	ACTC	ACTC	ACTC Caltrans
Type of PID		PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS	PSR-PDS
(M\$) fsoJ froqqu2		50.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	45.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
(M\$) tso D letiqe D		310.0	36.0	27.5	15.0	34.0	34.0	170.0	34.0	22.0	20.0
Estimated PID Completion Date (MM/YYYY)		06/2016	06/2016	06/2016	06/2016	06/2016	06/2016	06/2016	06/2016	06/2016	06/2016
Initiation Date (۲۲۲۲۲)											
RTP Project Number		230683	230053	230052	230054	230052		230088		230047	
noiteool		l-680 between SR-84 Contra Costa County Line	Hayward	⁻ rom West A St. I/C to Winton I/C in Hayward	⁻ rom Whipple Road to Industrial Pkwy Nest, Hayward	Winton Ave. Hayward	Jnion City	⁻ rom Hacienda to north of Washington and north of Washington to Hegenberger in San Leandro & Ala County	san Leandro	Nest A Street, Hayward	⁻ remont, Newark, Union City
lmprovement Description		NB and SB HOV/HOT lane from Alcosta Blvd. to SR-84	Industrial Parkway West I/C	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
Purpose & Need		lmprove traffic operations	lmprove traffic operations	lmprove traffic operations	lmprove traffic operations	lmprove traffic operations	lmprove traffic operations	Improve traffic operations	lmprove traffic operations	lmprove traffic operations	Improve traffic operations
elimtso¶ bn∃		R21.8	14.8	18.3	14.5	18.2	14.2	25.5	20.8	18.6	13.0
alimtzo9 niga8	inued)	R11.0	14.1	17.6	13.7	16.7	13.0	R32.0	20.2	18.0	10.4
Route	AN (cont	680	880	880	880	880	880	880	880	880	880
AOI\AO\b69J	ORK PL	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA	IQA
Agreement Number	5/16 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
אר סר R (Reimbursement) אר AHS	POSED	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim	Reim
# xəpul	PRO	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31

This page intentionally left blank

Non-SHOPP Workload Guidance

District Non-SHOPP work program for projects planned in Fiscal Years 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015 -16

Non-SHOPP related PID work must be part of the workload and may be resourced using one of two methods.

- 1. Use State Highway Account (SHA) funds.
- Use reimbursement authority after a cooperative agreement has been executed. The cooperative agreement will need to be fully executed before PID work is ready to be charged. Districts may use the cooperative agreement templates that are provided on the Design's website at http://onramp.dot.ca.gov/hq/design/coop/pid-template.php.

For SHA Non-SHOPP PID work, the project must be funded <u>entirely</u> using state resources, such as ARRA (Caltrans), bonds, CMAQ (federal pass-through funding), RSTP, STIP, TCRP, or other state programs. Use of any funds not administered by the State for project work after the completion of the PID will require that the Department's PID work be reimbursed by the local agency.

FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED PROJECTS

Only RTP financially-constrained projects may be included in the Non-SHOPP as SHA workload. This means that the regional agency must provide documented inclusion of the project in the financially constrained tier of an RTP. The project and its funding information must be identified in the Districts' workload template. Projects not contained in the financially constrained tier of an RTP may only be added as reimbursement. Districts will need to ensure their existing and proposed reimbursement projects are identified in the Non-SHOPP spreadsheet.

DISTRICT Non-SHOPP PID INVENTORY VALUE

Districts will also need to consider any completed Non-SHOPP PIDs that are listed in their Inventory when assessing their total available state funding. Any completed PIDs listed in the PID Inventory will count toward their available state funds. Similar to the SHOPP Inventory, the district will need to assess the need to keep, refresh, or discontinue the PID from the Inventory list.

This page intentionally left blank



Memorandum

DATE: May 15, 2013

TO: Alameda County Transportation Commission

FROM: Programs and Projects Committee

SUBJECT: Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program Overview and Summary of FY 2013/14 Applications Received

Recommendation

This item is for information only.

Summary

This overview of the TFCA program is to provide background information on the purpose, structure and requirements of TFCA County Program Manager funding and includes a summary of the applications received for the FY 2013/14 program.

Discussion

The Clean Air Act requires the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Air District) to periodically adopt and implement a Clean Air Plan. The Plan which identifies measures for the purpose of reducing motor vehicle emissions, namely, Transportation Control Measures (TCMs), which are strategies to reduce vehicle trips, vehicle use, vehicle miles traveled, vehicle idling, or traffic congestion, and Mobile Source Measures (MSMs). The MSMs encourage the retirement of older, more polluting vehicles and the introduction of newer, less polluting motor vehicle technologies. The TFCA program was created as a way to fund the implementation of the TCMs and MSMs identified in the Clean Air Plan.

Funding for this program is provided by a four dollar vehicle registration fee collected by the DMV within the nine-county Bay Area and distributed by the Air District as authorized by the California State Legislature and set forth in California Health and Safety Code Sections 44241 and 44242. As required, 40 percent of the revenue is returned to the county in which it was collected for distribution within the county by the "overall program manager." The overall program manager must be designated by resolutions adopted by the county board of supervisors and the city councils of a majority of the cities representing a majority of the population. As the designated overall program manager for Alameda County, the Alameda CTC is responsible for programming the TFCA County Program Manager funding, which averages \$1.8 million annually. The Air District distributes the remaining 60 percent through the regional TFCA program, on a competitive basis.

Program Requirements

The overall TFCA program structure is set forth in the California Health and Safety Code (HSC) along with many of the program requirements. The stipulations of the HSC include:

- Air District's role and authority for the TFCA program is defined.
- Eligible project types are identified, including bicycle facilities, trip reduction programs, arterial management projects and clean air vehicles.

• A complete list of eligible project types is included in Attachment A;

- Program administration costs are limited to five percent of revenues;
- Air District required to adopt cost-effectiveness criteria to maximize emissions reductions and health benefits;
- Air District required to annually adopt criteria for expenditure of funds;
- The expenditure of revenues received is to be reviewed annually;
- Funds are to be allocated within six months of Air District's approved expenditure plan;
- Funds are to be expended within two years;
 - Time extensions allowed if significant progress has been made; and
- Independent audits required every two years.

The Air District adds to the HSC requirements through adopted TFCA County Program Manger Policies (Attachment A) and TFCA County Program Manager Expenditure Plan Guidance. These additional requirements include:

- TFCA "cost-effectiveness" criteria for the four main project categories (trip reduction, clean air vehicles, bicycle projects, and arterial management).
 - TFCA cost-effectiveness is primarily expressed as: eliminated single occupancy vehicle (SOV) trips per day x days per year trips eliminated x eliminated trip length.
 - A threshold of not more than \$90,000 of TFCA funds per ton of emissions reduced by project (unless a different value is specified in the TFCA Policies for a specific project type).
 - Calculated emissions reductions are limited to the following:
 - Reactive organic gasses (ROG);
 - Oxides of nitrogen (NO); and
 - Weighted particulate matter, 10 microns in diameter or smaller (PM10).
 - Two cost-effectiveness evaluations are required for each project: one prior to TFCA programming and one upon project completion.
 - Default assumptions have been established for certain project types (e.g., the default length for a one-way bike trip is 3 miles).
 - Project types without defaults require custom assumptions to be developed and actual data collection is required for certain project types prior to the initiation of the project to establish a baseline.
 - Completed projects are required to provide actual data for emissions reduction assumptions (e.g., traffic, bike and ridership counts, surveys, etc.).

- Projects consistent with TFCA legislation, but not specifically referenced in Air District policies, are to be considered by the Air District Board on a case-by case basis (e.g., bike sharing programs);
- Sets annual and final project reporting requirements and schedule.

The Alameda CTC Guidelines are updated annually, consistent with legislation, and include additional provisions specific to the administration of Alameda County's TFCA program (Attachment B), including the adopted funding distribution formula and "Timely Use of Funds" provisions.

- Per the funding distribution formula:
 - 70 percent of the available funds are to be allocated to the cities/county based on population, with a minimum of \$10,000 to each jurisdiction
 - The remaining 30 percent of the funds are to be allocated to transit-related projects on a discretionary basis

A jurisdiction is allowed to roll over its annual share as well as borrow against future shares when feasible. This flexibility helps to ensure all received revenue is programmed annually. (The 70/30 percent split is realized over the life of the program)

- The FY 2013/14 TFCA fund estimate is provided for reference as Attachment C
- The Timely Use of Funds provisions set deadlines for certain program and project administration tasks such as agreement execution, invoicing, and project reports

Program Accomplishments - Past and Future

Although the TFCA program's emissions reductions, reporting and auditing requirements result in an administratively intensive program, the projects receiving TFCA funds have been able to successfully fulfill these requirements. Over the life of the TFCA program, approximately \$38 million has been programmed to projects in Alameda County, resulting in roughly 422 tons of reduced emissions (ROG, NO, and PM10). Looking forward, the Air District and County Program Managers are working together to improve the TFCA program and meet periodically throughout the year. In response to the direction of the Commission Chair, staff is currently compiling suggestions for how TFCA project evaluation and reporting activities may be streamlined at the county and regional level. This information will be scheduled for discussion at a future Commission meeting.

The FY 2013/14 TFCA program is currently under development. A summary of applications received is provided as Attachment D. A draft program is scheduled for review during June 2013 and a final program approval is scheduled for July 2013.

Fiscal Impact

This item is for informational only. There is no fiscal impact at this time.

Attachment(s)

Attachment A:	BAAQMD Board Adopted TFCA County Program Manager Fund Policies for FYE 2014
Attachment B:	Alameda CTC FY 2013/14 TFCA County Program Manager Guidelines
Attachment C:	TFCA FY 2013/14 Fund Estimate
Attachment D:	Summary of Applications Received for FY 2013/14 Program

This page intentionally left blank

Appendix D: Board-Adopted TFCA County Program Manager Fund Policies for FYE 2014

Adopted November 7, 2012

The following Policies apply only to the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) County Program Manager Fund.

BASIC ELIGIBILITY

1. **Reduction of Emissions**: Only projects that result in the reduction of motor vehicle emissions within the Air District's jurisdiction are eligible.

Projects must conform to the provisions of the California Health and Safety Code (HSC) sections 44220 et seq. and these Air District Board of Directors adopted TFCA County Program Manager Fund Policies for FYE 2014.

Projects must achieve surplus emission reductions, i.e., reductions that are beyond what is required through regulations, ordinances, contracts, and other legally binding obligations at the time of the execution of a grant agreement between the County Program Manager and the grantee. Projects must also achieve surplus emission reductions at the time of an amendment to a grant agreement if the amendment modifies the project scope or extends the project completion deadline.

2. TFCA Cost-Effectiveness: Projects must achieve TFCA cost-effectiveness, on an individual project basis, equal to or less than \$90,000 of TFCA funds per ton of total of emissions reduced, unless a different value is specified in the policy for that project type. (See "Eligible Project Categories" below.) Cost-effectiveness is based on the ratio of TFCA funds divided by the sum total tons of reactive organic gases (ROG), oxides of nitrogen (NOx), and weighted particulate matter 10 microns in diameter and smaller (PM10) reduced (\$/ton). All TFCA-generated funds (e.g., TFCA Regional Funds, reprogrammed TFCA funds) that are awarded or applied to a project must be included in the evaluation. For projects that involve more than one independent component (e.g., more than one vehicle purchased, more than one shuttle route, etc.), each component must achieve this cost-effectiveness requirement.

County Program Manager administrative costs are excluded from the calculation of a project's TFCA cost-effectiveness.

- Eligible Projects, and Case-by-Case Approval: Eligible projects are those that conform to the provisions of the HSC section 44241, Air District Board adopted policies and Air District guidance. On a case-by-case basis, County Program Managers must receive approval by the Air District for projects that are authorized by the HSC section 44241 and achieve Board-adopted TFCA cost-effectiveness but do not fully meet other Boardadopted Policies.
- 4. **Consistent with Existing Plans and Programs:** All projects must comply with the transportation control measures and mobile source measures included in the Air District's most recently approved plan for achieving and maintaining State and national ambient air quality standards,

which are adopted pursuant to HSC sections 40233, 40717 and 40919, and, when applicable, with other adopted State, regional, and local plans and programs.

- 5. Eligible Recipients: Grant recipients must be responsible for the implementation of the project, have the authority and capability to complete the project, and be an applicant in good standing with the Air District.
 - A. Public agencies are eligible to apply for all project categories.
 - B. Non-public entities are only eligible to apply for new alternative-fuel (light, medium, and heavy-duty) vehicle and infrastructure projects, and advanced technology demonstrations that are permitted pursuant to HSC section 44241(b)(7).
- 6. **Readiness:** Projects must commence in calendar year 2014 or sooner. "Commence" includes any preparatory actions in connection with the project's operation or implementation. For purposes of this policy, "commence" can mean the issuance of a purchase order to secure project vehicles and equipment, commencement of shuttle and ridesharing service, or the delivery of the award letter for a construction contract.
- 7. **Maximum Two Years Operating Costs:** Projects that provide a service, such as ridesharing programs and shuttle and feeder bus projects, are eligible to apply for a period of up to two (2) years. Grant applicants that seek TFCA funds for additional years must reapply for funding in the subsequent funding cycles.

APPLICANT IN GOOD STANDING

8. Independent Air District Audit Findings and Determinations: Grantees who have failed either the fiscal audit or the performance audit for a prior TFCA-funded project awarded by either County Program Managers or the Air District are excluded from receiving an award of any TFCA funds for five (5) years from the date of the Air District's final audit determination in accordance with HSC section 44242, or duration determined by the Air District Air Pollution Control Officer (APCO). Existing TFCA funds already awarded to the project sponsor will not be released until all audit recommendations and remedies have been satisfactorily implemented. A failed fiscal audit means a final audit report that includes an uncorrected audit finding that confirms an ineligible expenditure of TFCA funds. A failed performance audit means that the program or project was not implemented in accordance with the applicable Funding Agreement or grant agreement.

A failed fiscal or performance audit of the County Program Manager or its grantee may subject the County Program Manager to a reduction of future revenue in an amount equal to the amount which was inappropriately expended pursuant to the provisions of HSC section 44242(c)(3).

- 9. Authorization for County Program Manager to Proceed: Only a fully executed Funding Agreement (i.e., signed by both the Air District and the County Program Manager) constitutes the Air District's award of County Program Manager Funds. County Program Managers may only incur costs (i.e., contractually obligate itself to allocate County Program Manager Funds) after the Funding Agreement with the Air District has been executed.
- 10. **Insurance:** Both the County Program Manager and each grantee must maintain general liability insurance, workers compensation insurance, and additional insurance as appropriate for specific projects, with required coverage amounts provided in Air District guidance and final amounts specified in the respective grant agreements.

INELIGIBLE PROJECTS

- 11. **Duplication:** Grant applications for projects that provide additional TFCA funding for existing TFCA-funded projects (e.g., Bicycle Facility Program projects) that do not achieve additional emission reductions are ineligible. Combining TFCA County Program Manager Funds with other TFCA-generated funds that broaden the scope of the existing project to achieve greater emission reductions is not considered project duplication.
- 12. **Planning Activities:** A grantee may not use any TFCA funds for planning related activities unless they are directly related to the implementation of a project or program that results in emission reductions.
- 13. **Employee Subsidies**: Projects that provide a direct or indirect financial transit or rideshare subsidy or shuttle/feeder bus service exclusively to the grantee's employees are not eligible.

USE OF TFCA FUNDS

- 14. **Cost of Developing Proposals:** Grantees may not use TFCA funds to cover the costs of developing grant applications for TFCA funds.
- 15. **Combined Funds:** TFCA fund may be combined with other grants (e.g., with TFCA Regional Funds or State funds) to fund a project that is eligible and meets the criteria for all funding sources.
- 16. Administrative Costs: The County Program Manager may not expend more than five percent (5%) of its County Program Manager Funds for its administrative costs. The County Program Manager's costs to prepare and execute its Funding Agreement with the Air District are eligible administrative costs. Interest earned on County Program Manager Funds shall not be included in the calculation of the administrative costs. To be eligible for reimbursement, administrative costs must be clearly identified in the expenditure plan application and in the Funding Agreement, and must be reported to the Air District.
- 17. **Expend Funds within Two Years:** County Program Manager Funds must be expended within two (2) years of receipt of the first transfer of funds from the Air District to the County Program Manager in the applicable fiscal year, unless a County Program Manager has made the determination based on an application for funding that the eligible project will take longer than two years to implement. Additionally, a County Program Manager may, if it finds that significant progress has been made on a project, approve no more than two one-year schedule extensions for a project. Any subsequent schedule extensions for projects can only be given on a case-by-case basis, if the Air District finds that significant progress has been made on a project the revised schedule.
- 18. Unallocated Funds: Pursuant to HSC 44241(f), any County Program Manager Funds that are not allocated to a project within six months of the Air District Board of Directors approval of the County Program Manager's Expenditure Plan may be allocated to eligible projects by the Air District. The Air District shall make reasonable effort to award these funds to eligible projects in the Air District within the same county from which the funds originated.
- 19. **Incremental Cost (for the purchase or lease of new vehicles):** For new vehicles, TFCA funds awarded may not exceed the incremental cost of a vehicle after all rebates, credits,

and other incentives are applied. Such financial incentives include manufacturer and local/state/federal rebates, tax credits, and cash equivalent incentives. Incremental cost is the difference in cost between the purchase or lease price of the new vehicle, and its new conventional vehicle counterpart that meets the most current emissions standards at the time that the project is evaluated.

20. Reserved.

21. Reserved.

ELIGIBLE PROJECT CATEGORIES

22. Alternative Fuel Light-Duty Vehicles:

Eligibility: For TFCA purposes, light-duty vehicles are those with a gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) of 8,500 lbs. or lighter. Eligible alternative light-duty vehicle types and equipment eligible for funding are:

- A. Purchase or lease of new hybrid-electric, electric, fuel cell, and CNG/LNG vehicles certified by the CARB as meeting established super ultra low emission vehicle (SULEV), partial zero emission vehicle (PZEV), advanced technology-partial zero emission vehicle (AT-PZEV), or zero emission vehicle (ZEV) standards.
- B. Purchase or lease of new electric neighborhood vehicles (NEV) as defined in the California Vehicle Code.
- C. CARB emissions-compliant vehicle system retrofits that result in reduced petroleum use (e.g., plug-in hybrid systems).

Gasoline and diesel (non-hybrid) vehicles are not eligible for TFCA funds. Funds are not available for non-fuel system upgrades, such as transmission and exhaust systems, and should not be included in the incremental cost of the project.

23. Alternative Fuel Medium Heavy-Duty and Heavy Heavy-Duty Service Replacement Vehicles (low-mileage utility trucks in idling service):

Eligibility: For TFCA purposes, medium and heavy-duty service vehicles are on-road motor vehicles with a GVWR of 14,001 lbs. or heavier. Eligible alternative fuel service vehicles are only those vehicles in which engine idling is required to perform the vehicles' primary service function (for example, trucks with engines to operate cranes or aerial buckets). In order to qualify for this incentive, each new vehicle must be placed into a service route that has a minimum idling time of 520 hours/year, and a minimum mileage of 500 miles/year. Eligible MHDV and HHDV vehicle types for purchase or lease are:

A. New hybrid-electric, electric, and CNG/LNG vehicles certified by the CARB or that are listed by the IRS as eligible for a federal tax credit pursuant to the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

Scrapping Requirements: Grantees with a fleet that includes model year 1998 or older heavy-duty diesel vehicles must scrap one model year 1998 or older heavy-duty diesel vehicle for each new vehicle purchased or leased under this grant. Costs related to the scrapping of heavy-duty vehicles are not eligible for reimbursement with TFCA funds.

24. Alternative Fuel Heavy-Duty Replacement Vehicles (high mileage):

Eligibility: For TFCA purposes, Alternative Fuel Heavy-Duty Vehicles are defined as follows: Light-heavy-duty vehicles (LHDV) are those with a GVWR between 8,501 lbs. and 14,000 lbs., medium-heavy-duty vehicles (MHDV) are those with a GVWR between 14,001 lbs. and 33,000 lbs., and heavy-heavy-duty vehicles (HHDV) are those with a GVWR equal to or greater than 33,001 lbs. Eligible LHDV, MHDV and HHDV vehicle types for purchase or lease are:

A. New hybrid-electric, electric, and CNG/LNG vehicles certified by the CARB or that are listed by the IRS as eligible for a federal tax credit pursuant to the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

TFCA funds may not be used to pay for non-fuel system upgrades such as transmission and exhaust systems.

Scrapping requirements are the same as those in Policy #23.

25. Alternative Fuel Bus Replacement:

Eligibility: For purposes of transit and school bus replacement projects, a bus is any vehicle designed, used, or maintained for carrying more than 15 persons, including the driver. A vehicle designed, used, or maintained for carrying more than 10 persons, including the driver, which is used to transport persons for compensation or profit, or is used by any nonprofit organization or group, is also a bus. A vanpool vehicle is not considered a bus. Buses are subject to the same eligibility requirements listed in Policy #24 and the same scrapping requirements listed in Policy #23.

26. Alternative Fuel Infrastructure:

Eligibility: Eligible refueling infrastructure projects include new dispensing and charging facilities, or additional equipment or upgrades and improvements that expand access to existing alternative fuel fueling/charging sites (e.g., electric vehicle, CNG). This includes upgrading or modifying private fueling/charging sites or stations to allow public and/or shared fleet access. TFCA funds may be used to cover the cost of equipment and installation. TFCA funds may also be used to upgrade infrastructure projects previously funded with TFCA-generated funds as long as the equipment was maintained and has exceeded the duration of its years of effectiveness after being placed into service.

TFCA-funded infrastructure projects must be available to and accessible by the public. Equipment and infrastructure must be designed, installed and maintained as required by the existing recognized codes and standards and approved by the local/state authority.

TFCA funds may not be used to pay for fuel, electricity, operation, and maintenance costs.

27. **Ridesharing Projects:** Eligible ridesharing projects provide carpool, vanpool or other rideshare services. Projects that provide a direct or indirect financial transit or rideshare subsidy are also eligible under this category.

28. Shuttle/Feeder Bus Service:

These projects link a mass transit hub (i.e., rail or Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) station, ferry or bus terminal, airport) to or from a final destination. These projects are intended to reduce single-occupancy, commonly-made vehicle trips (e.g., commuting or shopping center trips) by enabling riders to travel the remaining, relatively short, distance between a mass transit hub and the nearby

final destination. The final destination must be a distinct commercial, employment or residential area. The project's route must operate to or from a mass transit hub and must coordinate with the transit schedules of the connecting mass transit's services. Project routes cannot replace or duplicate an existing local transit service. These services are intended to support and complement the use of existing major mass transit services.

Shuttle/feeder bus service applicants must be either:

- 1) a public transit agency or transit district that directly operates the shuttle/feeder bus service; or
- 2) a city, county, or any other public agency.

The project applicant must submit documentation from the General Manager of the transit district or transit agency that provides service in the area of the proposed shuttle route, which demonstrates that the proposed shuttle service does not duplicate or conflict with existing transit agency service.

The following is a listing of eligible vehicle types that may be used for service:

- A. a zero-emission vehicle (e.g., electric, hydrogen)
- B. an alternative fuel vehicle (CNG, liquefied natural gas, propane);
- C. a hybrid-electric vehicle;
- D. a post-1998 diesel vehicle with a CARB Verified Diesel Emission Control Strategy (e.g., retrofit); or
- E. a post-1990 gasoline-fueled vehicle.

Pilot shuttle/feeder bus service projects are required to meet a cost-effectiveness of \$125,000/ton during the first two years of operation (see Policy #2). A pilot project is a defined route that is at least 70% unique and has not previously been funded through TFCA. Applicants must provide data supporting the demand for the service, letters of support from potential users and providers, and plans for financing the service in the future.

29. Bicycle Projects:

New bicycle facility projects that are included in an adopted countywide bicycle plan or Congestion Management Program (CMP) are eligible to receive TFCA funds. Eligible projects are limited to the following types of bicycle facilities for public use that result in motor vehicle emission reductions:

- A. New Class-1 bicycle paths;
- B. New Class-2 bicycle lanes;
- C. New Class-3 bicycle routes;
- D. New bicycle boulevards;
- E. Bicycle racks, including bicycle racks on transit buses, trains, shuttle vehicles, and ferry vessels;
- F. Bicycle lockers;
- G. Capital costs for attended bicycle storage facilities;
- H. Purchase of two-wheeled or three-wheeled vehicles (self-propelled or electric), plus mounted equipment required for the intended service and helmets; and
- I. Development of a region-wide web-based bicycle trip planning system.

All bicycle facility projects must, where applicable, be consistent with design standards published in the California Highway Design Manual.

30. Arterial Management:

Arterial management grant applications must identify a specific arterial segment and define what improvement(s) will be made to affect traffic flow on the identified arterial segment. Projects that provide routine maintenance (e.g., responding to citizen complaints about malfunctioning signal equipment) are not eligible to receive TFCA funds. Incident management projects on arterials are eligible to receive TFCA funds. Transit improvement projects include, but are not limited to, bus rapid transit and transit priority projects. For signal timing projects, TFCA funds may only be used for local arterial management projects where the affected arterial has an average daily traffic volume of 20,000 motor vehicles or more, or an average peak hour traffic volume of 2,000 motor vehicles or more (counting volume in both directions). Each arterial segment must meet the cost-effectiveness requirement in Policy #2.

31. Smart Growth/Traffic Calming:

Physical improvements that support development projects and/or calm traffic, resulting in motor vehicle emission reductions, are eligible for TFCA funds, subject to the following conditions:

- A. The development project and the physical improvements must be identified in an approved area-specific plan, redevelopment plan, general plan, bicycle plan, pedestrian plan, traffic-calming plan, or other similar plan; and
- B. The project must implement one or more transportation control measures (TCMs) in the most recently adopted Air District plan for State and national ambient air quality standards. Pedestrian projects are eligible to receive TFCA funds.
- C. The project must have a completed and approved environmental plan.

Traffic calming projects are limited to physical improvements that reduce vehicular speed by design and improve safety conditions for pedestrians, bicyclists or transit riders in residential retail, and employment areas.

Appendix E: Glossary of Terms

The following is a glossary of terms found in the TFCA County Program Policies:

Final audit determination - The determination by the Air District of a County Program Manager or grantee's TFCA program or project, following completion of all procedural steps set forth in HSC section 44242(a) - (c).

Funding Agreement - The agreement executed by and between the Air District and the County Program Manager for the allocation of County Program Manager Funds for the respective fiscal year.

Grant Agreement - The agreement executed by and between the County Program Manager and a grantee.

Grantee - Recipient of an award of TFCA Funds from the County Program Manager to carry out a TFCA project and who executes a grant agreement with the County Program Manager to implement that project. A grantee is also known as a project sponsor.

TFCA funds - Grantee's allocation of funds, or grant, pursuant to an executed grant agreement awarded pursuant to the County Program Manager Fund Funding Agreement.

TFCA-generated funds - The Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) program funds generated by the \$4 surcharge on motor vehicle registration fees that are allocated through the Regional Fund and the County Program Manager Fund.

ALAMEDA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION TRANSPORTATION FUND FOR CLEAN AIR (TFCA) PROGRAM GUIDELINES

I. <u>BACKGROUND</u>

Pursuant to the 1988 California Clean Air Act, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Air District) is required to adopt a Clean Air Plan (CAP), which describes how the region will work toward compliance with State and Federal ambient air quality standards and make progress on climate protection. To reduce emissions from motor vehicles, the 2010 CAP includes transportation control measures (TCMs) and mobile source measures (MSMs). A TCM is defined as any strategy to reduce vehicle trips, vehicle use, vehicle miles traveled, vehicle idling, or traffic congestion for the purpose of reducing motor vehicle emissions. MSMs encourage the retirement of older, more polluting vehicles and the introduction of newer, less polluting motor vehicle technologies.

To fund the implementation of TCMs and MSMs, the State Legislature, through AB 434 (Sher; Statutes of 1991) and AB 414 (Sher, Statutes of 1995), authorized the Air District to collect a fee of up to \$4 per vehicle per year for reducing air pollution from motor vehicles and for related planning and programs. This legislation requires the Air District to allocate 40% of the revenue to an overall program manager in each county. The overall program manager must be designated by resolutions adopted by the county board of supervisors and the city councils of a majority of the cities representing a majority of the population.

AB 414 references the trip reduction requirements in the Congestion Management Program (CMP) legislation and states that Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) in the Bay Area that are designated as AB 434 program managers "shall ensure that those funds are expended as part of an overall program for improving air quality and for the purposes of this chapter (the CMP Statute)." The Air District has interpreted this language to allow a wide variety of transportation control measures as now eligible for funding by program managers, including an expansion of eligible transit, rail and ferry projects.

AB 414 adds a requirement that County Program Managers adopt criteria for the expenditure of the county subventions and to review the expenditure of the funds. The content of the criteria and the review were not specified in the bill. However, the Air District has specified that any criteria used by a Program Manager must allocate funding to projects that are: 1) eligible under the law, 2) reduce motor vehicle emissions, 3) implement the relevant Transportation Control Measures and/or Mobile Source Measures in the Air District's most recently approved strategy(ies) for state and national ozone standards (2010 Clean Air Plan, or CAP), and 4) are not planning or technical studies.

II. <u>ELIGIBLE PROJECTS</u>

Only projects that result in the reduction of motor vehicle emissions are eligible for TFCA funding. Projects must achieve surplus emission reductions beyond what is currently required through regulations, ordinances, contracts, or other legally binding obligations at the time of the execution of a funding agreement between the program manager (Alameda CTC) and the project sponsor. Projects and programs eligible for funding from revenues generated by this fee include (consistent with the project types authorized under the California Health and Safety Code (HSC) Section 44241):

- 1. Implementation of rideshare programs;
- 2. Purchase or lease of clean fuel buses for school districts and transit operators;
- 3. Provision of local feeder bus or shuttle service to rail and ferry stations and to airports;
- 4. Implementation and maintenance of local arterial traffic management, including, but not limited to, signal timing, transit signal preemption, bus stop relocation and "smart streets";
- 5. Implementation of rail-bus integration and regional transit information systems;
- 6. Implementation of demonstration projects in telecommuting and in congestion pricing of highways, bridges and public transit;
- 7. Implementation of vehicle-based projects to reduce mobile source emissions, including, but not limited to light duty vehicles with a gross vehicle weight (GVW) of 10,000 pounds or lighter, engine repowers (subject to Air District approval on a case-by-case basis), engine retrofits, fleet modernization, alternative fuels, and advanced technology demonstrations;
- 8. Implementation of smoking vehicles program;
- 9. Implementation of bicycle facility improvement projects that are included in an adopted countywide bicycle plan or congestion management program; and
- 10. Design and construction by local public agencies of physical improvements that support development projects that achieve motor vehicle emission reductions. The projects and the physical improvements shall be identified in an approved area-specific plan, redevelopment plan, general plan, or other similar plan.

Projects that are authorized by the HSC section 44241 and achieve TFCA cost-effectiveness, but do not fully meet the Air District's current TFCA Policies are subject to Air District approval on a case-by-case basis.

TFCA funds may not be used for:

- Planning activities that are not directly related to the implementation of a specific project; or
- The purchase of personal computing equipment for an individual's home use.

III. COST EFFECTIVENESS

The Air District requires the evaluation of all proposed and completed projects for TFCA costeffectiveness. The Alameda CTC will measure the effectiveness level of TFCA-funded projects using the TFCA cost of the project divided by an estimate of the total tons of emissions reduced (reactive organic gases (ROG), oxides of nitrogen (NOx), and weighted particulate matter ten microns in diameter and smaller (PM_{10})) due to the project. These are used to calculate a cost effectiveness number of \$/ton. The Alameda CTC will only approve projects with a TFCA cost effectiveness, on an individual project basis, equal to or less than \$90,000 of TFCA funds per ton of total ROG, NOx and weighted PM_{10} emissions reduced (\$/ton). Project sponsors are required to provide the data necessary to evaluate projects for TFCA cost-effectiveness. This may include but is not limited to transit ridership, verifiable survey data, bicycle counts, and results from comparable projects.

Page 2 of 8

Approved February 2013

IV. GENERAL PROGRAM STRUCTURE

As the overall program manager in Alameda County, the Alameda CTC is allocated 40% of the funds collected in Alameda County. The Air District will advance these funds to the Alameda CTC in biannual installments each fiscal year. The Alameda CTC must program the TFCA revenue received each year within the Air District's allowable time period. Any unallocated funds may be reallocated by the Air District.

The TFCA funds programmed by the Alameda CTC will be distributed as follows:

- A maximum of 5% of the annual revenue to the Alameda CTC for program implementation and administration.
- 70% of the remaining funds to be allocated to the cities/county based on population as follows:
 - A minimum of \$10,000 to each jurisdiction.
 - City population will be updated annually based on State Department of Finance (DOF) estimates.
 - The 70% funds will be programmed annually in its own call for projects or in a coordinated call for projects with like funding sources.
 - A city or the county, with approval from the Alameda CTC, may choose to roll its annual 70% allocation into a future program year.
 - A jurisdiction may borrow against its projected future year share in order to use rolled over funds from other jurisdictions available in the current year.
 - Relinquished funds from a city's or the county's completed projects are made available to the same jurisdiction through its 70% allocation for reprogramming to future projects.
 - The Commission may also program against future TFCA revenue for projects that are larger than the annual funds available.
- 30% of the funds allocated to transit related projects on a discretionary basis, as follows:
 - 30% funds will be programmed annually in its own call for projects or in a coordinated call for projects with like funding sources.
 - Projects competing for the 30% discretionary funds will be evaluated based on the total emissions reductions projected as a result of the project. Projects will be prioritized based on the TFCA cost-effectiveness evaluation. When this calculation is not sufficient to prioritize candidate projects, the Alameda CTC Commission may also consider the emissions reductions per total project dollar invested for the project and the matching funds provided by the project sponsor.
 - Relinquished funds from completed discretionary projects are returned to the 30% revenue for reprogramming in future funding cycles.
 - The Commission may also program against future TFCA revenue for projects that are larger than the annual funds available.

Approved February 2013

The minimum TFCA funding request is \$50,000, unless the project sponsor can show special and unusual circumstances to set this limit aside.

V. PROGRAM SCHEDULE

Below is the 2013 schedule for the FY 2013/14 program:

Annual review of Alameda County TFCA Program Guidelines. A call February for projects will be issued by the Alameda CTC. Alameda CTC adopts resolution endorsing the programming of TFCA funds consistent with the Expenditure Plan Application. March Expenditure Plan Application due to Air District. Project applications due to Alameda CTC. Semi-annual project status reports due to Alameda CTC. April May - June Review of draft program by Commission. Alameda CTC submits Semi-annual Report to Air District by May 31st. June - July Final program approval by =Commission. September For on-going projects, annual status reports from project sponsors due to the Alameda CTC. October Alameda CTC submits Annual Report to Air District by October 31st.

Schedule subject to modification based on schedule changes imposed by the Air District and previous programming actions by the Alameda CTC.

VI. APPLICATION PROCESS

Project sponsors shall complete the Alameda CTC TFCA funding application. The application is updated annually and may be included in a coordinated call for projects process that consolidates like fund sources. The type of information required for the application includes the following:

- 1. **Partner agencies/organizations**: If the project is sponsored by more than one agency, the applicant shall list the partner agencies, including the point of contact(s).
- 2. TFCA Funding Category: The applicant shall indicate whether the funds applied for are from the 70% city/county funds or the 30% transit discretionary funds. Project sponsors may choose to rollover their 70% funds to into a future fiscal year 70% allocation. Project sponsors may also request to reprogram any remaining TFCA funds from previous projects or allocations in their jurisdiction, to the proposed project.
- **3.** Funding Sources/Budget: Applicants shall include a funding plan listing all funding sources and amounts (including regional 60% TFCA funds and unsecured funds). Applicants shall include a project budget listing the total project cost by phase and cost type.
- 4. Schedule and Project Milestones: Applicants shall include project schedule and milestones.
- **5. Project Data**: Applicants shall submit the requested project-related data necessary to determine eligibility and calculate the estimated emissions reductions and cost-effectiveness.

Approved February 2013
6. Transportation Control Measures (TCM) and Mobile Source Measures (MSM): Applicants shall list the TCMs and/or MSMs from the Air District's most recently approved strategies for state and national ozone standards that are applicable to the project.

VII. MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

The Air District requires a pre- and post-project evaluation of emissions reductions. The first is an estimate of the projected emissions reduction. Sponsors must provide data for this calculation in the project application.

Sponsors must also conduct post-project monitoring and/or surveys (known as the monitoring requirements) as specified in the fund transfer agreement for the project. This information is required for the post-project evaluation of emissions reductions.

Project sponsors requesting TFCA reimbursement for monitoring costs shall provide the estimated cost in the TFCA application. The cost of collecting data to fulfill the TFCA monitoring requirements is considered an administrative project cost. Administrative project costs reimbursed by TFCA are limited to a total of 5% of the TFCA funds received.

VIII. <u>INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS</u>

Each Project Sponsor must maintain general liability insurance, workers compensation insurance and additional insurance as appropriate for specific projects, with coverage amounts specified in the project funding agreement, throughout the life of the project.

This section provides guidance on the insurance coverage and documentation typically required for TFCA Program Manager Fund projects. Note that the Air District reserves the right to specify different types or levels of insurance in the funding agreement. The typical funding agreement requires that each project sponsor provide documentation showing that the project sponsor meets the following requirements for each of its projects.

- **1. Liability Insurance** with a limit of not less than \$1,000,000 per occurrence, of the type usual and customary to the business of the Project Sponsor, and to the operation of the vehicles, vessels, engines or equipment operated by the Project Sponsor.
- 2. **Property Insurance** in an amount of not less than the insurable value of Project Sponsor's vehicles, vessels, engines or equipment funded under the Agreement, and covering all risks of loss, damage or destruction of such vehicles, vessels, engines or equipment.
- **3. Worker's Compensation Insurance** for construction projects including but not limited to bike/pedestrian paths, bike lanes, smart growth and vehicle infrastructure, as required by California law and employers insurance with a limit not less than \$1 million.

Acceptability of Insurers: Insurance is to be placed with insurers with a current A.M. Best's rating of no less than A, VII. The Air District may, at its sole discretion, waive or alter this requirement or accept self-insurance in lieu of any required policy of insurance.

The following table lists the types of insurance coverage generally required for each project type. The requirements may differ in specific cases.

Page 5 of 8

	М		
County Pi	ogram Manag	ger Fund Con	tract Activity:

Vehicle Purchase and lease / Engine retrofits	Automobile Liability and Automobile Physical Damage
Operation of shuttle to/from transit hubs	Commercial General Liability, Automobile Liability and Automobile Physical Damage
Construction projects including: bicycle/pedestrian overpass; bicycle facilities including bike paths, lanes, and routes; smart growth and traffic calming; and vehicle infrastructure.	Commercial General Liability, Automobile Liability and Worker's Compensation
Bicycle lockers and racks, Arterial Management, and Signal Timing	Commercial General Liability
Guaranteed Ride Home programs, transit marketing programs, and transit pass subsidy or commute incentives.	None

Insurance Required:

IX. FUNDING AGREEMENT, REPORTS AND AUDIT REQUIREMENTS

Prior to receiving any reimbursement of funds, project sponsors must execute a fund transfer agreement with the Alameda CTC. The fund transfer agreement includes a description of the project/program to be funded and specifies the terms and conditions for the expenditure of funds, including audit requirements.

An executed funding agreement between the Air District and the Alameda CTC constitutes final approval and obligation for the Air District to fund a project. Costs incurred prior to the execution of the funding agreement between the Air District and Alameda CTC will not be reimbursed. An executed funding agreement between the Alameda CTC and project sponsor is required before any reimbursements will be made. The funding agreement between the Alameda CTC and project sponsor is to be executed within three months from the date the funding agreement is provided to the project sponsor. After the three month deadline has passed, any funding associated with an unexecuted funding agreement may be considered unallocated and may be reprogrammed.

Project sponsors will be required to submit semi-annual progress reports to the Alameda CTC which provide project status and itemize the expenditure of funds for each project. Project sponsors are also required to submit a final project report upon completion of the project, which includes monitoring requirements.

All projects will be subject to a performance audit including project monitoring requirements established by the Air District. Project sponsors will, for the duration of the project/program, and for three (3) years following completion, make available to the Air District or to an independent auditor, all records relating to expenses incurred in implementing the projects.

X. <u>TIMELY IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECTS AND USE OF FUNDS</u>

The enabling legislation requires project sponsors to encumber and expend funds within two years, unless a time extension has been granted. To ensure the timely implementation of projects and use of funds, the following timelines will be imposed for each program year:

Page 6 of 8

- 1. Within two months of receipt of funds from the Air District, the Alameda CTC will send out fund transfer agreements to each project sponsor.
- 2. Project sponsors must execute a fund transfer agreement with the Alameda CTC within three months of receipt of an agreement from the Alameda CTC. The executed fund transfer agreement must contain an expenditure plan for implementation of the project. After the deadline has passed, any funding associated with an unexecuted funding agreement may be considered unallocated and may be reprogrammed.
- 3. Project sponsors must initiate implementation of a project within three months of the date of receipt of the executed fund transfer agreement from the Alameda CTC, unless an extended schedule has been approved in advance by the Alameda CTC. The Alameda CTC will not approve an extended schedule with a project start date beyond calendar year 2014.
- 4. Funds must be expended within two years from the date of the first receipt of funds by the Alameda CTC from the Air District. The Alameda CTC may, if it finds that significant progress has been made on a project, approve no more than two one-year schedule extensions for a project. Additional schedule extension requests can only be granted with approval from the Commission and Air District.
- 5. Sponsors must submit requests for reimbursement at least once per fiscal year. Requests must be submitted within six (6) months after the end of the fiscal year, defined as the period from July 1 to June 30. All final requests for reimbursement must be submitted no later than the submittal date of the Final Project Report.
- 6. Sponsors must submit semi-annual progress reports within the period established by the Air District.
- 7. Sponsors must submit required Final Project Reports (project monitoring reports) within three months of project completion or, as applicable, within three months after the post-project evaluation period as established in the funding agreement.
- 8. An at risk report will be presented to Alameda CTC Committees periodically to advise sponsors of upcoming critical dates and deadlines.

Any sponsor that does not comply with any of the above requirements within the established time frames will be given written notice from the Alameda CTC that they have 60 days in which to comply. Failure to comply within 60 days will result in the reprogramming of the funds allocated to that project, and the project sponsor will not be permitted to apply for new projects until the sponsor has demonstrated to the Alameda CTC that steps have been taken to avoid future violations of this policy.

XI. <u>REIMBURSABLE COSTS AND REIMBURSEMENT OF FUNDS</u>

TFCA funds can be used for project implementation costs as follows:

- Project implementation costs are charges associated with implementing a specific TFCA-funded project, including:
 - Documented hourly labor charges (salaries, wages, and benefits) directly and solely related to implementation of the TFCA project,
 - o Capital costs,

- Capital equipment and installation costs,
- o Shuttle driver labor and equipment maintenance costs,
- o Shuttle driver labor costs,
- Labor costs related to capital purchases,
- o Operator or personnel training directly related to project implementation,
- Contractor labor charges related to the TFCA project,
- Travel, and training and associated personnel costs that only if these costs are directly related to the implementation of the TFCA-funded project (e.g., the cost of training mechanics to service TFCA-funded natural gas clean air vehicles),
- Indirect costs associated with implementing the project, including reasonable overhead costs incurred to provide a physical place of work (e.g., rent, utilities, office supplies), general support services (e.g., payroll, reproduction) and managerial oversight, and
- Sponsor may choose not to charge any indirect costs to a TFCA project.

Upon execution of a fund transfer agreement, project sponsors may request reimbursement for documented project expenses. All project costs must be identified in the budget from the approved grant application and conform to the project scope included in attachment A of the TFCA funding agreement. For each reimbursement request, project sponsors must complete the TFCA "Request for Reimbursement of Funds" form attached to the fund transfer agreement. The form must have an original signature by an authorized person, and should be sent to the attention of Alameda CTC's Financial Officer.

The form must be accompanied by the following documentation:

- 1. **Direct Costs:** Direct project costs are directly and solely related to the implementation of the project. Documentation includes copies of paid invoices and evidence of payment.
- 2. Labor Charges: Hourly labor charges are the sum of the salary paid to an employee plus the cost of fringe benefits provided, expressed on the basis of hours worked. Documentation of hourly charges includes payroll records indicating job title, hourly pay rate, and time sheets indicating time worked on project (other accounting methods to allocate and document staff time will be considered on a case by case basis).
- **3. Indirect Costs:** Indirect costs may be considered eligible for reimbursement with TFCA funds on a case-by-case basis provided the project sponsor requests and justifies the reimbursement in the approved grant application. Sponsor will be required to submit an Indirect Cost Rate proposal for approval in advance. The required documentation for indirect project costs would be similar to what is required for direct costs and hourly labor charges.
- 4. Administrative Costs: Administrative costs that are reimbursable to a project sponsor are limited to a maximum of 5% of the total TFCA funds received. Administrative project costs may be considered eligible for reimbursement with TFCA funds on a case-by-case basis provided the project sponsor requests and justifies the reimbursement in the approved grant application. The required documentation for administrative project costs would be similar to what is required for direct costs and hourly labor charges.

FCA Balance	(New +	Rollover)	(431,685)	129,410	(31,237)	216,819	155,483	27,565	220,096	(537,913)	311,084	3 229,961	511,454	44,899	(25,085)	104,140	157,522	3 1,082,512
Y 12/13 Sollover T	(Debits/	Credits)	(493,528) \$	11,066 \$	(46,555) \$	121,684 \$	116,719 \$	17,565 \$	39,721 \$	(659,803) \$	242,812 \$	194,299 \$	183,895 \$	34,899 \$	(84,135) \$	32,841 \$	98,988 \$	(189,532) \$
ш. Ш.		Ŭ	\$	\$	\$	φ	φ	ۍ	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	ŝ	\$	ۍ	s
Funds	Relinquished	This FY	1,679	6,090	-	3,515	-	-	۰ ۹	636	-	-	39,858	۰ ۹	-	3 4,843		56,622
	Programmed F	in Last Cycle		- 3	-	-	1						\$ 35,300 \$	-	\$ 57,507			\$ 92,807 \$
	_	_	5 (Z	5 9	5) \$	6	6	5 5	1	6)	2	6	2	6	8)	8	00	7
Balance	from	revious FY	(495,20	4,97	(46,55	118,16	116,71	17,56	39,72	(660,43	242,81	194,29	179,33	34,89	(26,62	27,99	98,98	(153,34
		٦ ۲	Ś	S	\$	S	S	Ś	θ	\$	Ś	Ś	θ	\$	6	θ	\$	\$
FCA Funds	Available	iew this FY)	61,843	118,344	15,318	95,135	38,764	10,000	180,375	121,890	68,272	35,662	327,559	10,000	59,050	71,299	58,534	1,272,044
-		(L	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
	Total % of	Funding	4.86%	9.30%	1.20%	7.48%	3.05%	0.79%	14.18%	9.58%	5.37%	2.80%	25.75%	0.79%	4.64%	5.61%	4.60%	100.00%
	%	Population	4.87%	9.32%	1.21%	7.49%	3.05%	0.67%	14.21%	9.60%	5.38%	2.81%	25.80%	0.71%	4.65%	5.62%	4.61%	100.00%
	Population	(Estimate)	74,640	142,833	18,488	114,821	46,785	10,200	217,700	147,113	82,400	43,041	395,341	10,807	71,269	86,053	70,646	1,532,137
		Agency	Alameda	Alameda County	Albany	Berkeley	Dublin	Emeryville	Fremont	Hayward	Livermore	Newark	Oakland	Piedmont	Pleasanton	San Leandro	Union City	TOTAL:

TFCA FY 2013/14 Fund Estimate - Final - March 2013

mit)				-				
ie admin. li		cretionary 30%	545,162	14,994	246,150	261,144	806,305	
is th		Dis	69	69	69	69	63	
% of this line		3uarantee 70%	1,272,044	56,622	(246, 150)	(189,528)	1,082,516	
(2		0	63	63	69	\$	\$	
1,896,911 4,049 11,091	1,912,052	94,846	1,817,206	71,615	•	71,615	1,888,821	
ააა	ω	\$	φ	÷	\$	÷	\$	
FY 13/14 TFCA Revenue (Per Exp. Plan) FY 11/12 admin "actual" 5% adjustment Calendar vear 2012 Interest Earned	Total Funding Available	Less 5% for Program Administration	Total Programming Capacity	Relinquishments	FY12/13 Rollover (debit/credit) Adjustment	Subtotal Relinquishments & Rollover Adjustments	Adjusted Total Available to Program	

Notes:

1. Includes all TFCA programming actions through 12/31/12.

2. Population estimates as of 1/01/12 from Dept. of Finance (www.dof.ca.gov).

Page 215

This page intentionally left blank

FY 2013/14 TFCA County Program Manager Funding Summary of Applications Received

Sponsor	Project Name	Project Description	Total Project Cost	TFCA Requested
70% City/Count	y Share			
Alameda County	Fairmont Rd Class II Bike Lanes	Class II Bicycle Lane Gap Closure on Fairmont Drive between E. 14th Street and Foothill Blvd, in the Ashland Unincorporated Area of Alameda County.	\$340,000	\$200,000
Berkeley	Berkeley Citywide Bicycle Parking Project	Purchase and installation on the public right-of-way of at least 278 bicycle racks citywide, including six (6) pilot in-street "bicycle corral" locations along commercial corridors. The City will install racks primarily on sidewalks near commercial areas, schools, and parks.	\$155,000	\$155,000
East Bay Regional Park District	Iron Horse Trail Dublin/Pleasanton BART Santa Rita Road	Construct a 1.6-mile concrete Class 1 segment of the Iron Horse Regional Trail between the Dublin/Pleasanton BART Station and Santa Rita Road Project.	\$4,320,000	\$750,000
Fremont	City of Fremont Arterial Management	This project will improve arterial operations along three corridors: Ardenwood Boulevard, Stevenson Boulevard, and Mission Boulevard by implementing new signal coordination timings and upgrading most of the existing traffic signal equipment to enhance the operation of the traffic signal coordination.	\$218,000	\$218,000
Hayward	"A" Street Signal Upgrade and Coordination	Provide traffic signal retiming and coordination along "A" Street at 10 intersections between Mission Boulevard and Hesperian Boulevard, including upgrading existing controllers and closing the gap between the existing signal interconnect system to allow communications between the Traffic Operations Center (TOC) and the on-street controllers.	\$209,000	\$190,000
Oakland	Adeline St Bikeway Gap Closure	The project will install Class 2 bike lanes on Adeline St, 47th to 61st Sts. The new facility will adjoin existing bikeways at each end. The street will be slurry-sealed prior to bike lane installation.	\$73,000	\$58,000
Oakland	CityRacks Bicycle Parking Program Phase 10	This project will fund Phase 10 of Oakland's CityRacks Bicycle Parking Program. Over the two year grant period, the project includes installation of approximately 500 bike rack parking spaces, four electronic bicycle lockers to serve the 12th St BART Station.	\$100,000	\$100,000
Oakland	City of Oakland Broadway Shuttle	The Free Broadway Shuttle (the "B") operates between the Jack London Oakland Amtrak Station and Broadway at 27th Street at 11-16 minute frequencies. Starting July 2013, the B's service hours will be Monday-Thursday 7am-10pm; Friday 7am-12am; and Saturday 6pm- 12am. TFCA request is for a 1.5 year period, July 2013 - Dec. 2014.	\$1,051,000	\$140,268
Pleasanton	Pleasanton Trip Reduction Program	The project consists of a three-pronged approach to reducing trips including employer-based, residential-based and school-based programs. The project also consists of monitoring efforts by conducting transportation surveys to gather data. TFCA request is for FY 13/14 program operations.	\$114,000	\$58,916
San Leandro	San Leandro LINKS Shuttle	The free shuttle provides service from the San Leandro BART station to businesses in West San Leandro. Service is provided every 20 minutes, Monday through Friday during peak commute hours from 5:45AM to 9:45AM and starting again at 3:00PM to 7:00PM. The TFCA request is for FYs 13/14 and 14/15.	\$633,000	\$104,000
		Subtotal TFCA 70	0% Requested	\$1,974,184
		TFCA Bala	ance Available	\$1,082,516
		Amount Requested over Am	ount Available	(\$891,668)

Sponsor	Project Name	Project Description	Total Project Cost	TFCA Requested
30% Transit Dis	scretionary Share			
AC Transit	Bus Electrification Demonstration Project	The conversion of an existing hybrid gasoline bus to a fully electric vehicle to achieve reductions in emissions, noise and operational costs. The electric bus would replace an existing conventional diesel fuel bus from the AC Transit revenue fleet.	\$ 484,000	\$387,276
Alameda CTC	Alameda County Guaranteed Ride Home and Countywide Transportation Demand	The Program provides a "guaranteed ride home" to registered employees in Alameda County as an incentive to use alternative modes of transportation to get to work. TFCA request is for continued program operations for FY 13/14 and FY14/15 and includes the creation of new	\$ 270,000	\$ 270,000

	Management Services Information Program	educational materials providing comprehensive information on different TDM services and commute alternatives available in Alameda County.		
CSU East Bay	Second BART to Campus Shuttle	Continue existing operations of a second free campus to BART shuttle. The route operates in a loop between CSU East Bay campus and the Hayward BART station 7am-930pm, 240 days per year. Request is for FY 13/14 operations.	\$ 159,314	\$ 159,314
LAVTA	Route 20X and RAPID Operations	Routes 20x and Rapid operations for FYs 13/14 and 14/15. These routes serve West and East Dublin/Pleasanton BART and the Livermore Transit Center. Additionally, a new EcoPass/Transit Incentive Program, for employees traveling to work along these corridors, is proposed.	\$ 6,600,000	\$ 450,000
		Subtotal TFCA 3	0% Requested	\$ 1,266,590
		TFCA Bala	ance Available	\$ 806,305
		Amount Requested over Am	nount Available	\$ (460,285)

Total FY 13/14 TFCA Requested	\$ 3,240,774
Total FY 13/14 TFCA Available	\$1,888,821
Total Amount Requested over Amount Available	\$ (1,351,953)

This page intentionally left blank



Memorandum

DATE: May 15, 2013

TO: Alameda County Transportation Commission

FROM: Programs and Projects Committee

SUBJECT: Approval of the FY 2011-2012 Measure B and Vehicle Registration Fee Passthrough Fund Program Compliance Reports

Recommendations:

It is recommended the Commission approve the FY 2011-2012 Measure B and Vehicle Registration Fee Pass-through Fund Program Compliance Reports and approve the San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission's Request for an Exemption from the Master Program's Funding Agreement Timely Use of Funds Policy.

Summary:

The Master Programs Funding Agreement (MPFA) requires all recipients of Measure B and Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) pass-through funds to submit an annual compliance report and an annual compliance audit (i.e. Audited Financial Statement) to Alameda CTC for fiscal year 2011-12 (FY 11-12) that document the use of Measure B and VRF pass-through fund revenues and expenditures.

In accordance with the MPFA's requirements pertaining to the Timely Use of Funds Policy and Reserve Fund Policy, Alameda CTC also required recipient jurisdictions to outline an implementation plan in the compliance report, for both projects and programs that utilized ending FY 11-12 balances and anticipated FY 12-13 pass-through revenues. The Timely Use of Funds Policy dictates that Measure B and VRF funds not placed in reserve funds pursuant to the Reserve Fund Policy shall be spent expeditiously, and no unexpended funds beyond those included in reserves is allowed unless a written request is submitted to the Alameda CTC and approved by the Commission. All jurisdictions receiving Measure B and VRF pass-through funds provided detailed compliance reports (with an implementation plans) and audited financial statements that complied with MPFA requirements.

Discussion:

Since the 2000 Measure B sales tax collections began on April 1, 2002, Alameda CTC has collected and distributed approximately \$632.0 million in Measure B program funds, including pass-through and grant funds, to local agencies, transit agencies, jurisdictions, and nonprofit organizations for transportation purposes. Measure B generates approximately \$107 million annually, of which approximately 60 percent goes directly to 20 jurisdictions as pass-through funds for their bicycle and pedestrian, local transportation (streets and roads), mass transit, and paratransit programs. In FY 11-12,

Measure B net sales tax revenues generated \$107.5 million. Of this amount, approximately \$60.5 million was distributed to eligible jurisdictions as pass-through funds.

Since Vehicle Registration Fee collections began in May 2011, Alameda CTC has collected \$19.0 million in net funds. In FY 11-12, Alameda CTC distributed \$7.0 million (60%) in VRF pass-through program funds to recipients.

In Spring 2012, the 20 jurisdictions receiving Measure B funds, and 15 jurisdictions receiving VRF funds, entered into a MPFA with Alameda CTC. The MPFA and its associated Implementation Guidelines outlined the pass-through funding distribution, eligible expenditures, recipient reporting requirements, and policies on the timely use of funds and establishment of fund reserves.

Each year, Measure B and VRF pass-through recipients are required to submit audited financial statements and compliance reports to Alameda CTC. These reports document pass-through fund revenues and expenditures for the Measure B programs: bicycle and pedestrian, local transportation (streets and roads), mass transit, and paratransit, and pass-through fund expenditures for the VRF local road improvement and repair program. The compliance reports also capture Measure B and VRF pass-through recipients' annual reporting deliverables including:

- Provide the number of road miles served within the agency's jurisdictions
- Provide an updated population figure for their jurisdiction
- Document publication of a newsletter article in the recipient's or Alameda CTC's newsletter
- Document website coverage of Measure B/VRF usage and benefits
- Document project signage requirements
- Report the current Pavement Condition Index for the agency's roadways
- Provide confirmation on Complete Streets Policy Adoption by June 2013
- Report an implementation plan and expenditure plan of reserve balance and annual revenue

For FY 11-12, the audited financial statements of the jurisdictions' revenues and expenditures, were due to Alameda CTC on December 27, 2012, and the compliance reports were due on December 31, 2012. Jurisdictions report revenues and expenditures of Measure B grant funds, in addition to Measure B and VRF pass-through funds, to provide a comprehensive picture of overall usage of funds.

In January 2013, Alameda CTC staff, in collaboration with the Citizens' Watchdog Committee (CWC) reviewed the audited financial statements and compliance reports submitted by the jurisdictions. From this review, Alameda CTC staff sent Request for Information letters to all the jurisdictions to confirm their compliance status, gather additional information on reported expenditures, and clarify fund reserve implementation plans. All 20 agencies/jurisdictions responded with additional information and updated their compliance reports or audited financial statements as requested. The additional information clarified expenditures, provided documentation for the required deliverables, and refined their fund reserve implementation plans utilizing their FY 11-12 ending balance and FY 12-13 anticipated revenues. Each of the 20 agencies receiving Measure B pass-through funds, and 15 agencies receiving VRF pass-through funds, demonstrated compliance with the program requirements. Staff is in the process of mailing final compliance status letters to confirm that each jurisdiction is now fully in compliance.

SJRRC submitted a Request for Exemption Letter from the Timely Use of Funds Policy (see Attachment A). Through a Cooperative Service Agreement executed in 2003 between Alameda CTC and SJRRC, the Alameda portion of the annual operating subsidy for ACE is based on the 2002

operating costs contributed by Alameda (about 33 percent), and escalated annually based on the Consumer Price Index. Measure B provided approximately \$2.3 million of operating funds for the ACE service for FY 11-12. Since the initiation of the collection of Measure B in the spring 2002, SJRRC reports a fund balance of about \$2.7 million at the end of FY 11-12. SJRRC plans to expend these funds on future train operations, and with the addition of a fourth (4th) train this fiscal year, they anticipate expending Measure B operational reserves by FY 16-17. The MPFA Reserve Fund Policy permits a maximum of 50 percent of annual revenues be allocated to Operational Reserves. SJRRC is requesting an exception to the reserve policy in order to allocate \$2.2 million to their FY 12-13 Operational Fund Reserve which will exceed the maximum reserve fund limit by approximately \$1 million. It is recommended the Commission approve the request for an exemption from the Timely Use of Funds Policy to exceed the maximum operational fund reserve limit for FY 12-13.

Alameda CTC staff has prepared a comprehensive Measure B and VRF compliance summary report that describes Alameda CTC pass-through distributions in FY 11-12 and the jurisdictions' reported expenditures for FY 11-12. The compliance summary report also summarizes the jurisdictions' reported future planned expenditures, and documents fund reserve designations for the ending FY 11-12 fund balance and FY 12-13 annual revenue. The Measure B report provides an overview of the revenues and expenditures for the bicycle/pedestrian, local transportation (local streets and roads), mass transit, and paratransit programs and provides a detailed analysis on the phases and types of Measure B-funded projects throughout Alameda County. Similarly, the VRF report depicts this information as it pertains to VRF fund utilization by the jurisdiction in FY 11-12.

The Measure B Pass-through Fund Program Compliance Report and the Vehicle Registration Fee Pass-through Fund Program Compliance Report will be provided to the Commission as handouts at the May 23, 2013 meeting.

Attachments:

Attachment A: SJRRC's Request for Exemption from the Timely Use of Funds Policy Letter

This page intentionally left blank



San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission

Arthur L. Dao, Executive Director

1333 Broadway, Suite 220

Oakland, CA 94612

Alameda County Transportation Commission

February 20, 2013

Dedicated to passengers

Responsive to change

Committed to growth

RE:

Request for exemption authorization from Timely Use of Funds, due to extraordinary circumstances.

Commissioners

Bob Johnson City of Lodi

John W. Harris City of Manteca

Sonny Dhaliwal City of Lathrop

Steve Bestolarides San Joaquin County

> Brent H. Ives City of Tracy

Kathy Miller City of Stockton

Executive Director Stacey Mortensen In July 2008, the San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission (SJRRC) entered into an agreement with the Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority and the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (Alameda County Transportation Commission - ACTC) to be the direct recipient of Measure B sales tax revenue pass-through allocations for operations of the Altamont Corridor Express (ACE) service. This agreement required the transfer of the Measure B ACE reserve fund balance into a SJRRC designated restricted fund for ACE Operations. The amount of this transfer was \$1,691,991.35, providing the initial fund balance to be used for ACE operations as approved annually by the ACTC Board. The current balance is a combination of the initial deposit along with interest earned and subsequent deposits in excess of authorized contribution amounts.

As part of the ACE Cooperative Services Agreement executed in July 2003, between SJRRC, ACTC and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (SCVTA), an annual Baseline Service Plan is developed by SJRRC inclusive of ACTC and SCVTA operating contributions for the next fiscal year. After the Baseline Service Plan is reviewed by ACTC and SCVTA staff the respective Boards take an action on approving the plan and setting their respective local contributions.

The Measure B funds are deposited each month by ACTC, directly to SJRRC's designated restricted fund, Per sections 3.6, 3.8 and 6.3.5 of the Cooperative Services Agreement. SJRRC may only draw ACTC's contribution from the Measure B funds based on an annually approved CPI increase. If amounts deposited by ACTC during the year exceed authorized amounts to draw, an increase in fund balance occurs.

Currently, the calculation for projected funds added to the fund balance exceeds the amounts allowed for retention in the Operations Fund Reserve (3.A.2) and Undesignated Fund Reserve (3.A.3). It is the intent of SJRRC, upon ACTC Board approval of the annual Baseline Service Plan to use Measure B reserved funds to augment ACTC's Baseline contribution to the ACE service over the next five fiscal years and fully expend all funds carried forward by the end of FY16/17. The table below illustrates the expenditure plan for the fund reserves:

1800-411-RAIL

Pagec223m

February 20, 2013 Arthur L. Dao, Executive Director Alameda County Transportation Commission Page 2

	FY 11/12	FY 12/13		FY 13/14	1	FY 14/15		FY 15/16		FY 16/17
Measure B Service Contribution Administrative Fee		\$ 2,097,443 20,000	\$	2,145,893 20,000	\$ \$	2,200,000	\$ \$	2,200,000	\$	2,200,000
Total		\$ <u>498,037</u> 2.615.480	\$ \$	655,055 2,820,948	\$ \$	2 920 000	5	2 920 000	<u>5</u> 5	<u>96,438</u> 2 316 438
Remaining Reserve	\$ 2,649,530	\$ 2,151,493	\$	1,496,438	\$	796,438	\$	96,438	\$	-

Since SJRRC will not expend the reserves in the timely manner defined and set by ACTC's "Master Programs Funding Agreement" Section 3 (FY15/16), SJRRC/ACE is requesting authorization for an exemption due to extraordinary circumstances.

Please do not hesitate to contact George Fink, Manager of Planning & Programming at 209-944-6235, email <u>George@acerail.com</u>, or Margaret Merin, Staff Accountant at 209-944-6246, email <u>Margaret@acerail.com</u> if you have any questions of comments.

Sincerely,

Starry Molout

Stacey Mortensen, Executive Director

c: John Nguyen, ACTC Matt Todd, ACTC Vivek Bhat, ACTC Brian Schmidt, SJRRC Nila Cordova, SJRRC George Fink, SJRRC



Memorandum

DATE: May 15, 2013

TO: Alameda County Transportation Commission

FROM: Programs and Projects Committee

SUBJECT: Approval of Final FY 2013/14 Measure B Capital Program Strategic Plan Allocation Plan Update and Assumptions

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Commission approve the following actions related to Measure B capital funding and the FY 2013/14 Measure B Capital Program Strategic Plan Update (SPU):

- 1. Approve the assumptions described herein as the basis for the development of the FY 2013/14 Measure B Capital Program Strategic Plan Update;
- Approve the reallocation \$3.1M of allocated 2000 Measure B funding between sub-projects under the Congestion Relief Emergency Fund Project (ACTIA No. 27). The funds have been allocated, but not yet encumbered for expenditure for the Studies of Congested Segments/Locations on the CMP Network Project (ACTIA No. 27E), and will be reallocated to the I-880 Corridor Improvements in Oakland and San Leandro Project (ACTIA 27C);
- 3. Confirm the Measure B commitments to the individual capital projects included in the 1986 and 2000 Measure B Capital Programs and to previously approved advances, exchanges and loans; and,
- 4. Approve the Allocation Plans for the 1986 and 2000 Measure B Capital Programs.

Summary

The FY 2013/14 Measure B Strategic Plan Update (FY13/14 SPU) addresses both the 1986 Measure B Capital Program and the 2000 Measure B Capital Program. While the governing boards for each measure have merged, the requirements related to each measure remain in effect and continue to apply to the programming, allocation and expenditure of Measure B funds made available through each of the capital programs. The assumptions related to the FY13/14 SPU are described herein. The attachments to this memorandum consist of the financial information necessary for the fiscal management of the capital program accounts. The attachments include information pertaining to the Measure B commitments to each of the individual capital projects, the anticipated timing of future allocations and expenditures, and the various advances, exchanges and loans currently approved by

the Alameda CTC. The FY13/14 SPU also reflects the shift of \$3.1M of allocated funds between subprojects under the Congestion Relief Emergency Fund (ACTIA No. 27).

The FY 2013-14 Allocation Plan Update included in the FY13/14 SPU provides the road map for the Measure B capital funding of the remaining capital projects in the 1986 and 2000 Measure B capital programs. It is anticipated that the 2000 Measure B Capital Program will require financing and borrowing in the near-term to provide the Measure B funding to the recipient projects at the time they are needed to reimburse eligible project expenditures incurred by the implementing agencies.

The remaining projects from the 1986 Measure B Capital Program along with all of the capital projects from the 2000 Measure B Capital Program, including completed projects, are summarized in Attachment A.

Discussion and Background

The Alameda CTC updates the Measure B Capital Program Strategic Plan annually to confirm the commitments of Measure B capital projects funding to individual capital projects included in the 1986 Measure B Transportation Expenditure Plan (1986 MB) or in the 2000 Measure B Transportation Expenditure Plan (2000 MB). The 1986 MB and 2000 MB capital programs must continue to adhere to the requirements and policies of the respective Measures. The assumptions incorporated into the FY 2013/14 SPU are divided into three categories:

- Assumptions pertaining to both the 1986 MB and 2000 MB Capital Programs;
- Assumptions pertaining only to the 1986 MB Capital Program; and
- Assumptions pertaining only to the 2000 MB Capital Program.

Assumptions pertaining to both the 1986 MB and 2000 MB Capital Programs

The following assumptions are related to both the 1986 MB and 2000 MB capital programs:

- 1. The financial accounts and Measure B commitments for both the 1986 MB and 2000 MB Capital Programs will be kept independent for the purposes of the FY 2013/14 SPU;
- 2. The assumptions related to the timing of the need for Measure B funds for each capital project will be based on existing and anticipated encumbrances of Measure B funds and the most current information available from the project sponsors related to the project status and schedule;
- 3. Projects will be implemented and funded sequentially in phases as prescribed in the individual Master Project Funding Agreements and other funding agreements in accordance with the adopted capital project funding procedure for each Capital Program;
- 4. The commitment of Measure B funds for each capital project will reflect the Cost Allocation Policy adopted by the ACTIA Board in October 2009, which allows for the classification of all direct project costs and assignment of these costs to the appropriate capital project;
- 5. The financing and borrowing assumptions related to providing the Measure B capital funding at the time needed for project delivery include a combination of internal borrowing

between the 1986 MB and 2000 MB Capital Accounts and outside debt financing to maximize the benefits of a favorable financing environment, and to avoid adverse impacts to the delivery of the 1986 MB capital projects to the extent practicable; and

6. Any future advances or exchanges not included in the FY 2013/14 SPU involving Measure B Capital funding will be considered on a case-by-case basis and be the subject of separate actions by the Commission.

Assumptions pertaining only to the 1986 MB Capital Program The following assumptions are related to the 1986 MB Capital Program:

- 1. The commitment of 1986 Measure B funds to the remaining capital projects will maintain the commitments approved in the FY 2012/13 Strategic Plan Update. The timing of the anticipated expenditures of the remaining commitments of 1986 Measure B funding have been adjusted to reflect current project status. The remaining commitments are considered fully allocated for the purposes of the adopted funding procedures for Measure B capital projects.
- 2. The 1986 Measure B commitments to capital projects that are completed or that have begun a fully funded construction phase will be adjusted to reflect the construction phase funding plan. Any unused Measure B funds, i.e. in excess of the amount in the construction phase funding plan including contingency, will be allocated to the 1986 Measure B Capital Projects Contingency Reserve to manage potential risks and liabilities resulting from the implementation of the State Infrastructure Bond funded projects implemented wholly or in part by the Commission, and other projects sponsored by the Commission.
- 3. The Local Match requirements prescribed by the 1986 MB for individual capital projects will remain in effect;
- 4. The Alameda CTC currently owns property that was acquired for 1986 MB capital project rights-of-way which is now considered surplus. The FY13/14 SPU assumes that sales of the surplus property will yield \$3.0 million of proceeds in FY 2014-15.

Assumptions pertaining only to the 2000 MB Capital Program The following assumptions are related to the 2000 MB Capital Program:

- 1. The FY 2012/13 Ending 2000 Measure B Programmed Balance for each capital project will be derived by deducting any amounts allocated during the current fiscal year, FY 2012/13, from the FY 2012/13 Beginning 2000 Measure B Programmed Balance approved in the FY 2012/13 SPU;
- 2. The Program Escalation Factor (PEF) used to convert the FY 2012/13 Ending 2000 Measure B Programmed Balance to the FY 2013/14 Beginning 2000 Measure B Programmed Balance will be 1.0;

- 3. The total 2000 Measure B capital funding commitment to all capital projects will remain at \$756.5 million;
- 4. The FY13/14 SPU will include an Allocation Plan which lays out specific allocations expected from the remaining 2000 Measure B Programmed Balance for each capital project and will serve as the basis of the program-wide financial model;
- 5. The cash demand for the remaining 2000 Measure B capital projects will necessitate some type of debt financing or borrowing between the 2000 Measure B Capital Program and the 1986 Measure B Capital Program in the FY 2013/14 timeframe;
- 6. The financial parameters for future years, such as revenue projections and interest rates, that impact the program-wide financial model will be based on the same parameters approved by the Commission with other agency financial matters, e.g. the FY 2013/14 annual budget and recommendations from the Financing Team assembled to assist with the required debt financing procedures;
- 7. The \$37.03 million exchange related to the 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the Route 84 Expressway Widening Project (Project No. ACTIA 24) is reflected in the FY13/14 SPU. The funding for the Route 84 Expressway Widening Project includes \$37.03 million of STIP funding programmed in FY 2016/17. An equivalent amount from the 2000 Measure B Commitment to ACTIA No. 24 will be paid to the Local Fund Exchange Program administered by the Commission and made available to the 13 projects included in the 2012 STIP exchange as approved by the Commission. The exchanged funds will be distributed to the 13 projects through the CMA TIP Program administered by the Commission as shown in Attachment D.
- 8. The advance of \$8.5 million of Measure B capacity from several capital projects for the I-580 Eastbound HOV/Auxiliary Lane Project and the I-580 Eastbound Express Lanes Project to be repaid from the future toll revenues of the express lane is reflected in the FY13/14 SPU as approved by the Commission in September, 2011. The timing of the advances and the repayments are based on the current project delivery status and schedules of the individual projects involved;
- 9. The reallocation of \$3.1M of allocated 2000 MB funding between sub-projects under the Congestion Relief Emergency Fund Project (ACTIA No. 27). The funds have been allocated, but not yet encumbered for expenditure to the Studies for Congested Segments/Locations on the CMP Network Project (ACTIA No. 27E), and will be reallocated to the I-880 Corridor Improvements in Oakland and San Leandro Project (ACTIA 27C).

Measure B Capital Programs

The summary of Measure B Capital Projects included in Attachment A shows the total Measure B commitment for the remaining capital projects from the 1986 MB (ACTA) capital program, and all of the capital projects included in the 2000 MB (ACTIA) capital program. The remaining commitments from the 1986 Measure B Capital Account were established primarily through two amendments to the 1986 Expenditure Plan approved in FY 2005/06. The amendments deleted projects that could not be

delivered and redirected the 1986 Measure B commitments for the projects that were deleted to replacement projects.

The total 1986 Measure B commitment for the five individual replacement projects and a programwide closeout "project" equals \$199.6 million as shown in Attachment A.

The total 2000 Measure B commitment for the 27 projects included in the 2000 Measure B Expenditure Plan is \$756.5 million as shown in Attachment A. One capital project, the I-580 Castro Valley Interchanges Improvements project, has both 1986 MB and 2000 MB funding as shown in Attachment A (ACTA MB 239 and ACTIA No. 12).

1986 Measure B Capital Program

The total commitment of 1986 Measure B funds to the remaining projects included in Attachment A are shown in more detail in Attachment B. Attachment B shows the timing of the anticipated expenditure of the remaining 1986 Measure B commitments. The remaining 1986 Measure B commitments shown in Attachment B are anticipated for the following purposes:

- 1. I-880 to Mission Boulevard East-West Connector (MB226) The remaining 1986 Measure B commitment is for completing the on-going design, right-of-way, and utility relocation phases, and for the subsequent construction phase which is currently underfunded.
- 2. Route 238/Mission-Foothill-Jackson Corridor Improvement (MB238) The remaining 1986 Measure B commitment is for completing the on-going construction phase and closing out prior phases.
- I-580/Redwood Road Interchange (MB239) The 1986 Measure B commitment for this project is a funding contribution to the I-580 Castro Valley Interchange Improvement Project (ACTIA No. 12) included in the 2000 MB Capital Program. The remaining 1986 Measure B commitment is for completing the construction phase, including the three-year landscape maintenance obligation, and closing out prior phases.
- 4. Central Alameda County Freeway System Operational Analysis (MB240) The remaining 1986 Measure B commitment is for continuing studies related to improving the Alameda County transportation system. The first phase of the project, which is complete, involved the development of a Local Area Transportation Improvement Program (LATIP) related to the use of proceeds from the sales of properties rendered surplus after the Hayward Bypass Project was removed from local, regional and statewide plans. The LATIP, approved by the California Transportation Commission, includes potential funding for projects within the original 3-corridor study area of the Central Alameda County Freeway System Operational Analysis Project. The next phase of the project includes countywide studies of three key aspects of the transportation system as prioritized by the Alameda CTC: 1) a countywide transit plan; 2) a countywide goods movement plan; and 3) a countywide arterial mobility corridor plan.
- 5. Castro Valley Local Area Traffic Circulation Improvement (MB 241) The remaining 1986 Measure B commitment is for the project development, right of way and construction phases.
- 6. Program-wide and Project Closeout Costs (MB Var) The Program-wide and Project Closeout Costs include miscellaneous costs related to program-wide activities and post-

construction commitments such as follow up landscaping projects, required landscape maintenance, right-of-way settlements, right-of-way close-out, interagency agreement closeout, etc. Once project construction is closed out, any remaining 1986 Measure B commitment for the project is moved to this line item for budgeting and cashflow purposes until the project is completely closed out financially.

7. The 1986 Measure B commitment to the BART Warm Springs Extension project is fulfilled completely by the 2000 Measure B commitment under project ACTIA No. 02.

2000 Measure B Capital Program

The procedures for managing the 2000 Measure B commitments are primarily based on allocations from the Measure B "Programmed Balance" for each capital project. The original Programmed Balance was established in the 2000 Expenditure Plan, which was used as the basis for establishing the "Initial Programmed Balance" at the beginning of revenue collection in 2002. Since 2002, the Programmed Balance for each capital project has been adjusted each FY using a "Program Escalation Factor" (PEF) typically adopted by the Board with the other Strategic Plan assumptions. During the FY 2009-10 Strategic Plan process, the Board approved a PEF of 1.0 to be used for the remainder of the 2000 Measure B Capital Program, which effectively holds the total 2000 Measure B commitment to the projects in the 2000 MB Capital Program at \$756.5 million.

The total of the commitments of 2000 Measure B funds to the individual projects included in Attachment A are shown in more detail in Attachment C1 and reflect a PEF equal to 1.0 for the FY13/14 SPU. The FY 2013/14 Beginning Programmed Balance for each project is equal to the Remaining Programmed (Un-Allocated) Balance shown in Attachment C1 and represents the amount available for future allocation. Attachment C2 shows the amount expended through December 31, 2012 compared to the total amount allocated for each of the 2000 MB capital projects. The FY 2013/14 2000 Measure B Allocation Plan Schedule shown in Attachment C3 lays out the timing of the anticipated future allocations for the remainder of the 2000 Measure B Capital Program. The future 2000 Measure B allocations are anticipated for the following purpose(s) as shown in the FY 2013/14 2000 Measure B Allocation Plan Notes in Attachment C4:

- 1. Altamont Commuter Express (ACE) Improvements (ACTIA No. 01) This project is a programmatic project that funds individual improvements proposed by the San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission which operates the ACE service. The eligible project list is updated regularly. The availability of \$2 million of the remaining Programmed Balance is delayed due to the advance for the I-580 Eastbound HOV/Aux Lane and Express Lane projects approved by the Commission in September 2011.
- 2. I-680 Sunol Express Lanes Southbound (ACTIA 08A) The future 2000 Measure B allocations are anticipated for future operation costs above the toll revenues available for operations as approved by the Commission in December 2012.
- 3. I-680 Sunol Express Lanes Northbound (ACTIA 08B) The future 2000 Measure B allocations are anticipated for project development, system management and integration, right of way and construction phases. The availability of \$4.5 million of the remaining Programmed Balance is delayed due to the advance for the I-580 Eastbound HOV/Aux Lane and Express Lane projects approved by the Commission in September 2011.

- 4. Iron Horse Transit Route (ACTIA 09) -- The future 2000 Measure B allocations are anticipated for project development, right of way and construction phases.
- 5. I-880/Route 92/Whitesell Drive Interchange (ACTIA 15) The future 2000 Measure B allocation is anticipated for the construction phase.
- 6. Isabel Avenue Route 84/I-580 Interchange (ACTIA 23) The future 2000 Measure B allocations are anticipated for projects adjacent to the interchange project. The interchange construction is complete and the inter-agency agreements related to the project funding are being closed out.
- 7. Dumbarton Corridor Improvements Newark and Union City (ACTIA 25) The future 2000 Measure B allocations are anticipated for on-going project development phases and for implementation of potential phased improvements while funding for the planned overall corridor is identified. Future allocations will be made available to implementing agencies, including up to \$1 million for costs incurred directly by the Alameda CTC.

Project expenditures for projects included in the 2000 Measure B Capital Program include expenditures incurred directly by the Commission. The ACTIA Board adopted a Cost Allocation Policy in October 2009, to address the allocation of ACTIA-incurred expenses against project funding. The FY13/14 SPU includes the assumption that the Cost Allocation Policy applies to Commission-incurred expenses in the same fashion as it applied to ACTIA-incurred expenses.

Capital Program Financial Plans for the 1986 and 2000 Measure B Capital Programs

Without an ongoing revenue stream, the commitments of the 1986 MB funds are constrained by the balance of the 1986 MB Capital Accounts and any interest revenue earned until the account is completely drawn down for project expenditures (currently anticipated to occur in the FY 2017/18 timeframe). In other words, the remaining commitments to the 1986 MB Capital Program are constrained by the amount of funding currently "in the bank," so debt financing will not be needed to provide the remaining 1986 Measure B commitments for the 1986 MB Capital Program. Attachment B shows the 1986 Measure B commitments to the remaining 1986 MB capital projects and the anticipated timing of the drawdowns based on current project schedules.

By the end of the current FY, i.e. June 30, 2013, more than \$709 million of 2000 Measure B funding will be allocated and ready for encumbrance for capital project expenditures (i.e. 94% of the total 2000 Measure B commitment to all capital projects of \$756.5 million). Once the encumbrances, e.g. funding agreements, contracts, etc., for the allocated funds are approved, the Commission will have encumbered more 2000 Measure B funds than can be provided to the projects on a "pay-as-you-go basis." Current financial analysis shows the 2000 Measure B Capital Program fund balance, based on the assumptions described above without any financing or borrowing, will go negative before the end of FY 2013/14.

The alternative to pay-as-you-go is some type of debt financing or borrowing to effectively make future revenues available sooner to reimburse eligible project expenditures as they are incurred. The amounts encumbered will not be expended immediately. The encumbrances for the larger projects take years to fully expend, but with the encumbrances in place, the financial management of the capital program accounts intensifies. The timing of the anticipated expenditures has a significant effect on the financing options and costs. Current financial analysis indicates a combination of borrowing from the 1986 Measure B Capital Account in the near-term (until the funds are needed for

the 1986 MB capital projects) followed by some type of debt financing from outside sources will be required to provide the 2000 Measure B funding to the capital projects as shown in Attachment D.

Debt Financing for the 2000 Measure B Capital Program

The most likely types of debt financing will involve the issuance of bonds and/or commercial paper. The process for issuing bonds secured by the sales tax, referred to as "limited tax bonds," is prescribed by the California Public Utilities Commission (PUC) Code and expanded upon in guidelines prepared by the California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission (CDIAC). The required process includes the Commission adopting a resolution authorizing the issuance of bonds. The resolution authorizing the issuance of bonds must address the following (from the PUC):

- The purposes for which the proposed debt is to be incurred, which may include all costs and estimated costs incidental to, or connected with, the accomplishment of those purposes, including, without limitation, engineering, inspection, legal, fiscal agents, financial consultant and other fees, bond and other reserve funds, working capital, bond interest estimated to accrue during the construction period and for a period not to exceed three years thereafter, and expenses of all proceedings for the authorization, issuance, and sale of the bonds.
- The estimated cost of accomplishing those purposes.
- The amount of the principal of the indebtedness.
- The maximum term the bonds proposed to be issued shall run before maturity, which shall not be beyond the date of termination of the imposition of the retail transactions and use tax.
- The maximum rate of interest to be paid, which shall not exceed the maximum allowable by law.
- The denomination or denominations of the bonds, which shall not be less than five thousand dollars (\$5,000).
- The form of the bonds, including, without limitation, registered bonds and coupon bonds, to the extent permitted by federal law, and the form of any coupons to be attached thereto, the registration, conversion, and exchange privileges, if any, pertaining thereto, and the time when all of, or any part of, the principal becomes due and payable.

The resolution may also contain other matters authorized by the applicable PUC Code chapter or any other law.

The process for issuing bonds involves identifying a Financing Team which includes a Financial Advisor, an Underwriter (one or more), and Bond Counsel, to determine the specifics related to the bond issuance required to develop the bond package, market the bonds, sell the bonds and secure the proceeds. Once the bonds are issued, the Commission will be responsible for monitoring and tracking the activities related to the expenditure, investment and accounting of the bond proceeds, including the final accounting. Staff has initiated the process to select consultants to participate on the Financing Team. The Financial Advisor for the Financing Team has been selected.

The project expenditure information provided in the attachments will serve as the basis for the financial analysis and cash management efforts related to determining the method, or methods of debt financing best suited to allow the Commission to fulfill the commitments of 2000 Measure B funding. The focus of the financial analysis and management is to provide the 2000 Measure B commitments

to the capital projects at the time they are needed to reimburse eligible project expenditures incurred by the implementing agencies. Once debt financing is initiated, fluctuations to the timing of the need for Measure B funds will have to be considered in the detailed context of cash management in order to maintain minimum balances required to prioritize obligations stemming from the debt financing.

Fiscal Impact

There is no direct fiscal impact expected to result from the recommended action.

Attachments:

Attachment A:	Summary of Measure B Capital Projects Funding
Attachment B:	1986 Measure B Capital Project Remaining Commitments and Line Item Expenditures
Attachment C1:	2000 Measure B Capital Project Commitment Summary
Attachment C2:	2000 Measure B Capital Project Allocations and Expended to Date
Attachment C3:	2000 Measure B Allocation Plan Schedule
Attachment C4:	2000 Measure B Allocation Plan Notes
Attachment D1:	2000 Measure B Capital Project Line Item Expenditures
Attachment D2:	2000 Measure B Capital Program Advances and Repayments
Attachment D3:	2000 Measure B Capital Program Advances 2012 STIP Exchange Project Detail
	Sheet

This page intentionally left blank

May 2	013				
		Project	Measure B	Measure (\$ x m	B Funding illion)
ndex	Project Title	Type (Note 1)	Project Number	1986 MB (ACTA)	2000 MB (ACTIA)
1	I-880 to Mission Blvd East-West Connector	LSR	MB 226	88.8	0.0
2	Route 238/Mission-Foothill-Jackson Corridor Improvement	LSR	MB 238	80.0	0.0
3	Central Alameda County Freeway System Operational Analysis	Hwy	MB 240	5.0	0.0
4	Castro Valley Local Area Traffic Circulation Improvement	LSR	MB 241	5.0	0.0
5	Program-Wide and Project Closeout Costs	Var	MB Var	5.8	0.0
6	Altamont Commuter Express Rail	MT	ACTIA 01	0.0	13.2
7	BART Warm Springs Extension	MT	ACTIA 02	0.0	224.4
8	BART Oakland Airport Connector	MT	ACTIA 03	0.0	89.1
9	Downtown Oakland Streetscape Improvement	BP	ACTIA 04	0.0	6.4
10	Fruitvale Transit Village	MT	ACTIA 05	0.0	4.4
11	Union City Intermodal Station	MT	ACTIA 06	0.0	12.6
12	Telegraph Avenue Bus Rapid Transit	MT	ACTIA 07A	0.0	11.5
13	San Pablo Avenue Corridor Transit	MT	ACITA 07B	0.0	2.3
14	Telegraph Avenue Rapid Bus Service	MT	ACTIA 07C	0.0	10.7
15	I-680 Sunol Express Lanes - Southbound	Hwy	ACTIA 08A	0.0	15.2
16	I-680 Sunol Express Lanes - Northbound	Hwy	ACTIA 08B	0.0	20.0
17	Iron Horse Transit Route	MT	ACTIA 09	0.0	6.3
18	I-880/Broadway-Jackson Interchange Improvement (Study Only)	Hwy	ACTIA 10	0.0	8.1
19	I-880/Washington Ave I/C	Hwy	ACTIA 11	0.0	1.3
20	I-580 Castro Valley Interchanges Improvements (Note 2)	Hwy	ACTIA 12	15.0	11.5
21	Lewelling/East Lewelling Blvd Widening	LSR	ACTIA 13	0.0	13.1
22	I-580 Auxiliary Lane Westbound (Fallon Road to Tassajara Road)	Hwy	ACTIA 14A	0.0	2.5
23	I-580 Auxiliary Lane Westbound (Airway Blvd to Fallon Road)	Hwy	ACTIA 14B	0.0	2.7
24	I-580 Auxiliary Lane Eastbound (El Charro Road to Airway Blvd) (Note 3)	Hwy	ACTIA 14C	0.0	7.8
25	Route 92/Clawiter - Whitesell Interchange and Reliever Route	Hwy	ACTIA 15	0.0	27.0
26	Oakland Local Streets and Roads	LSR	ACTIA 16	0.0	5.3
27	Hesperian Boulevard/Lewelling Boulevard Widening (Stage 1)	LSR	ACTIA 17A	0.0	0.6
28	Hesperian Boulevard/Lewelling Boulevard Widening (Stage 2) (Note 4)	LSR	ACTIA 17B	0.0	0.7
29	Westgate Parkway Extension (Wal-Mart to Williams Street)	LSR	ACTIA 18A	0.0	7.9
30	Westgate Parkway Extension (Davis Street)	LSR	ACTIA 18B	0.0	0.6
31	East 14th St/Hesperian Blvd/150th St Improvements	LSR	ACTIA 19	0.0	3.2
32	Newark Local Streets	LSR	ACTIA 20	0.0	1.4

Attachment A Page 1 of 2

				Measure (\$ x m	B Funding
Index	Project Title	Project Type (Note 1)	Measure B Project Number	1986 MB (ACTA)	2000 MB (ACTIA)
33	I-238 Widening (Note 3)	Hwy	ACTIA 21	0.0	81.0
34	I-680/I-880 Cross Connector Studies	Hwy	ACTIA 22	0.0	1.2
35	Isabel Avenue - Route 84/I-580 Interchange	Hwy	ACTIA 23	0.0	26.5
36	Route 84 Expressway Widening	Hwy	ACTIA 24	0.0	96.5
37	Dumbarton Corridor Improvements (Newark and Union City) (Study Only)	MT	ACTIA 25	0.0	19.4
38	I-580 Corridor/BART to Livermore Studies	MT	ACTIA 26	0.0	11.8
39	Vasco Road Safety Improvements	LSR	ACTIA 27A	0.0	1.5
40	I-80 Integrated Corridor Mobility Project	Hwy	ACTIA 27B	0.0	2.8
41	I-880 Corridor Improvements in Oakland and San Leandro (Note 5)(Note 6)	Hwy	ACTIA 27C	0.0	5.4
42	CWTP/TEP Development (Study Only)	Hwy	ACTIA 27D	0.0	0.1
43	Studies for Congested Segments/Locations on the CMP Network (Note 5)	Hwy	ACTIA 27E	0.0	0.6
				199.6	756.6

Notes:

1. Project Types: Hwy = Highway; LSR = Local Streets and Roads; MT = Mass Transit; and BP = Bicycle and Pedestrian.

 The I-580 Castro Valley Interchanges Improvements project is included in both the 1986 MB Program (MB 239) and the 2000 MB Program (ACTIA No. 12). The 1986 MB commitment is treated as a contribution to the 2000 MB project.

3. The 2000 MB commitment for ACTIA No. 14C was exchanged for other funds in the I-580 Corridor. The ACTIA 14C commitment is treated as a contribution to the I-238 Widening Project included in the 2000 MB Program (ACTIA No. 21).

4. The second stage of the Hesperian Boulevard/Lewelling Boulevard Widening project (ACTIA No. 17B) is being implemented with the Lewelling/East Lewelling Blvd Widening project (ACTIA No. 13) by Alameda County.

5. The FY13/14 SPU reflects the shift of \$3.1M of allocated 2000 MB funding from ACTIA No. 27E to ACTIA No. 27C.

 The I-880 North Safety and Operational Improvements at 23rd and 29th Avenues project and the North and South Segments of the I-880 Southbound HOV Lane project, including follow on landscaping, are eligible for the 2000 MB commitment to the I-880 Corridor Improvements in Oakland and San Leandro project (ACTIA No. 27C).

Attachment A Page 2 of 2

1986 Measure B Capital Project Remaining Commitments and Line Item Expenditures FY 2013/14 Measure B Capital Program Strategic Plan Update

ლ
201
Ň
ž

						\$ × 1,000	in the	FY Shov	vn (Not	e 1)				
		•	rior to	FY		FY		۲	Ĺ	,	FY			
No.	Project Title	Ĺ	r 13/14	13/14		14/15	15	/16	16/	17	17/18		Totals	
MB226	I-880 to Mission Boulevard East-West Connector	\$	15,334	\$ 5,0	\$	22,500	Ś	15,000	5 \$	2,000	\$ 6,037	\$	88,871	
MB238	Route 238/Mission-Foothill-Jackson Corridor Improvement	Ф	80,000	Ф	ن		φ		ф	•	۰ +	÷	80,000	
MB239	I-580/Redwood Road Interchange (contribution to ACTIA 12)	⇔	10,179	\$ 1,3	50 \$	100	\$	1,000	ь	1,000	\$ 1,371	\$	15,000	
MB240	Central Alameda County Freeway System Operational Analysis	⇔	1,847	\$ 1,4	\$ 00	1,753	\$		Ф	,	، +	\$	5,000	
MB241	Castro Valley Local Area Traffic Circulation Improvement	↔	537	\$ 1,1	50 \$	3,313	\$		Ф		، ج	\$	5,000	
MB Var	Program-wide and Project Closeout Costs (Note 2)	\$	161	\$ 1,0	50 \$	2,500	\$	1,700	\$	339	•	\$	5,750	
	Totals	\$	108,058	\$ 9,9	50 \$	30,166	\$	17,700	\$ 2(6,339	\$ 7,408	\$	199,621	
Notes:														

- difference between the actual amount expended by the Alameda CTC in a given FY, including prior FY's, and the maximum shown are assumed available in any subsequent FY without having to recalibrate the program-wide cashflow model for approval to expend any carryover amounts. Before the actual amount expended in a given FY can exceed the maximum constraint for the most aggressive spending scenario of the program-wide cashflow model used to analyze the overall 1986 MB Capital Program from a financial perspective. The The amounts shown per FY represent the maximum amount of 1986 Measure B assumed to be expended by the Alameda CTC in the FY shown. These amounts are used as a shown, the program-wide cashflow model will need to be revisited, and possibly recalibrated, before any amount in excess of the maximum shown can be approved ÷-
- The Program-wide and Project Closeout Costs include miscellaneous costs related to program-wide activities and post-construction commitments such as follow up landscaping projects, landscaping maintenance, right of way settlements, right of way close-out, interagency agreement closeout, etc. for 1986 MB capital projects not listed separately. Once project construction is closed out, any remaining amount of 1986 Measure B commitment for the project is moved to this line item for budgeting and cashflow purposes. Individual encumbrances for 1986 Measure B commitments will continue to be brought before the Alameda CTC for approval before expenditures are approved. сi

Attachment B Page 1 of 1

					Attac	hm	ent C1	
FY 200 ^{Mav 2}	2013/14 Measure B Capital Program Strategic Plar 0 Measure B Capital Project Commitment Summa	n Upo ry	date					
		Tot Measu Commir (\$ x 1,	al Ire B timent 000)	⋖ ₹ ⊢ ⊛	Total mount located o Date x 1,000)		FY 13/14 3eginning ogrammed Balance \$ x 1,000)	1
01	ACE Capital Improvements	с Ф	13,184	φ	11,184	θ	2,000	
02	BART Warm Springs Extension	\$ 2	24,448	φ	224,448	θ		1
03	BART Oakland Airport Connector	\$	39,052	Ф	89,052	÷		
04	Oakland Downtown Streetscape Project	\$	6,358	ф	6,358	ф	1	
05	Fruitvale Transit Village - 5A/5B	\$	4,435	¢	4,435	Ф	1	
06	Union City Intermodal Station	÷	12,561	Ф	12,561	÷		
07A	Telegraph Avenue Corridor Transit Project	÷	11,510	ф	11,510	θ	ı	
07B	San Pablo Avenue Corridor Transit Improvement Project	÷	2,262	φ	2,262	θ		
07C	Telegraph Avenue Corridor Transit Project - Stage 2	÷	10,672	ф	10,672	ф	1	
08A	I-680 Express Lane - Southbound	÷	19,697	ф	15,197	θ	4,500	
08B	I-680 Express Lane - Northbound	÷	15,500	ф	10,000	θ	5,500	
60	Iron Horse Transit Route	\$	6,267	¢	I	Ф	6,267	-
10	I-880/Broadway-Jackson Interchange	\$	8,101	¢	8,101	Ф	I	
11	I-880/Washington Avenue Interchange	\$	1,335	\$	1,335	¢	I	
12	I-580 Interchange Improvements in Castro Valley	\$	11,525	\$	11,525	÷	1	
13	Lewelling Boulevard/East Lewelling Boulevard	\$	13,104	\$	13,104	\$	1	
14A	I-580 Auxiliary Lane Westbound (Fallon Road to Tassajara Road)	\$	2,500	\$	2,500	÷	1	
14B	I-580 Auxiliary Lane Westbound (Airway Blvd to Fallon Road)	\$	2,686	\$	2,686	\$	I	
14C	I-580 Auxiliary Lane Eastbound (El Charro Road to Airway Blvd)	\$	7,843	\$	7,843	φ	·	-
15	I-880/Route 92/Whitesell Drive Interchange	φ	27,037	Ь	12,605	θ	14,432	

Attachment C1 Page 1 of 2

FY 2013/14 Measure B Capital Program Strategic Plan Update 2000 Measure B Capital Project Commitment Summary

May 2(13						
		ŀ	Tot	a		FY 13/14	
		I otal Measure B	Alloca	ted		Beginning Programmed	
		Commitment (\$ x 1,000)	To D; (\$ x 1,(ate 000)		Balance (\$ x 1,000)	
16	Oakland Local Streets and Roads	\$ 5,278	 \$	5,278	\$		
17A	Hesperian Boulevard/Lewelling Boulevard Widening (Stage 1)	\$ 578	 ÷	578	θ		
17B	Hesperian Boulevard/Lewelling Boulevard Widening (Stage 2)	\$ 686	 ÷	686	θ		
18A	Westgate Parkway Extension -Stage 1	\$ 7,918	 \$	7,918	\$		
18B	Westgate Parkway Extension - Stage 2	\$ 600	÷	600	θ		
19	East 14th St/Hesperian Blvd/150th St Improvements	\$ 3,218	 \$	3,218	\$		
20	Newark Local Streets	\$ 1,422	÷	1,422	θ		
21	I-238 Widening	\$ 81,022	8	31,022	\$		
22	I-680/I-880 Cross Connector Studies	\$ 1,233	 \$	1,233	θ		
23	Isabel Avenue - Route 84/I-580 Interchange	\$ 26,529	\$ 2	25,029	θ	1,500	0
24	Route 84 Expressway Widening	\$ 96,459	6 \$	96,459	θ		
25	Dumbarton Corridor Improvements (Newark and Union City)	\$ 19,367	 \$	6,078	θ	13,289	•
26	I-580 Corridor/BART to Livermore Studies	\$ 11,831	\$ 1	1,831	θ	•	
27A	Vasco Road Safety Improvements	\$ 1,500	\$	1,500	\$		
27B	I-80 Integrated Corridor Mobility Project	\$ 2,800	\$	2,800	θ	-	
27C	I-880 Corridor Improvements in Oakland and San Leandro	\$ 5,350	\$	5,350	θ	-	
27D	CWTP/TEP Development	\$ 50	\$	50	θ	-	
27E	Studies for Congested Segments/Locations on the CMP Network	\$ 551	\$	551	\$		
	Totals	\$ 756,469	\$ 70	8,981	\$	47,488	~

Attachment C1 Page 2 of 2

2000 Measure B Capital Project Allocations and Expended to Date FY 2013/14 Measure B Capital Program Strategic Plan Update

May 2013

iviay 4	C10								
					Total	ш —	Expended		
		Me	l otal asure B		Amount	ö	1 nru 2 FY 12/13		Allocated In-Expended
		Com (\$)	mitment < 1,000)	<u> </u>	To Date \$ x 1,000)	<u>_</u>	12/31/12) \$ x 1,000)		ЗЗ FY 12/13 (\$ × 1,000)
01	ACE Capital Improvements	\$	13,184	φ	11,184	θ	4,182	↔	7,002
02	BART Warm Springs Extension	\$	224,448	φ	224,448	θ	100,839	θ	123,609
03	BART Oakland Airport Connector	\$	89,052	÷	89,052	θ	53,103	↔	35,949
04	Oakland Downtown Streetscape Project	\$	6,358	φ	6,358	θ	762	θ	5,596
05	Fruitvale Transit Village - 5A/5B	\$	4,435	φ	4,435	θ	4,435	θ	
06	Union City Intermodal Station	\$	12,561	Υ	12,561	θ	12,561	↔	•
07A	Telegraph Avenue Corridor Transit Project (Note 1)	\$	11,510	φ	11,510	θ	5,495	θ	6,015
07B	San Pablo Avenue Corridor Transit Improvement Project (Note 1)	\$	2,262	θ	2,262	θ	2,262	↔	•
07C	Telegraph Avenue Corridor Transit Project - Stage 2 (Note 1)	\$	10,672	φ	10,672	θ	10,672	θ	
08A	I-680 Express Lane - Southbound (Note 2)	\$	19,697	ŝ	15,197	Ф	13,188	θ	2,009
08B	I-680 Express Lane - Northbound	\$	15,500	\$	10,000	θ	2,374	θ	7,626
60	Iron Horse Transit Route	\$	6,267	ŝ		Ф	I	θ	I
10	I-880/Broadway-Jackson Interchange	\$	8,101	÷	8,101	θ	2,169	↔	5,932
11	I-880/Washington Avenue Interchange	\$	1,335	φ	1,335	θ	1,335	θ	
12	I-580 Interchange Improvements in Castro Valley (Note 3)	\$	11,525	\$	11,525	Ф	12,024	θ	(499)
13	Lewelling Boulevard/East Lewelling Boulevard	\$	13,104	\$	13,104	\$	13,104	⇔	I
14A	I-580 Auxiliary Lane Westbound (Fallon Road to Tassajara Road)	\$	2,500	\$	2,500	Ф	1,788	θ	712
14B	I-580 Auxiliary Lane Westbound (Airway Blvd to Fallon Road)	\$	2,686	¢	2,686	÷	511	⇔	2,175
14C	I-580 Auxiliary Lane Eastbound (EI Charro Road to Airway Blvd) (Note 4)	\$	7,843	\$	7,843	\$	7,843	⇔	•
15	I-880/Route 92/Whitesell Drive Interchange	Ş	27,037	θ	12,605	θ	604	θ	12,001

Attachment C2 Page 1 of 2

							Julia			
FY 200	2013/14 Measure B Capital Program Stra 0 Measure B Capital Project Allocations	itegic Pla and Expe	l n	Jpdate ded to D	ate	D D				
May	2013									
		Total		Total Amount		Expen Thr	u u		Allocated	
		Measure B Commitment (\$ x 1,000)		Allocated To Date (\$ x 1,000)		Q2 FY 1 (12/31, (\$ × 1,0	12/13 /12) 000)	5-	In-Expended Q3 FY 12/13 (\$ x 1,000)	-
16	Oakland Local Streets and Roads	\$ 5,278	\$	5,278		\$	5,278	¢		
17A	Hesperian Boulevard/Lewelling Boulevard Widening (Stage 1)	\$ 578	\$	578	0,	\$	915	¢	(33	1
17B	Hesperian Boulevard/Lewelling Boulevard Widening (Stage 2) (Note 5)	\$ 686	\$	686		ь	86	θ	60	0
18A	Westgate Parkway Extension (Wal-Mart to Williams Street)	\$ 7,918	\$	7,918	•,	\$	7,931	θ	(1	3)
18B	Westgate Parkway Extension (Davis Street) (Note 6)	\$ 600	\$	600	•,	ь	•	Υ	60	0
19	East 14th St/Hesperian Blvd/150th St Improvements (Note 6)	\$ 3,218	\$	3,218	•,	\$	339	θ	2,87	6
20	Newark Local Streets	\$ 1,422	\$	1,422	•,	\$	1,422	θ		
21	I-238 Widening (Note 4)	\$ 81,022	\$	81,022	•,	\$	31,022	φ		
22	I-680/I-880 Cross Connector Studies	\$ 1,233	\$	1,233	•,	\$	715	φ	51	ω
23	Isabel Avenue - Route 84/I-580 Interchange	\$ 26,529	\$	25,029	•,	\$	19,473	φ	5,55	9
24	Route 84 Expressway Widening	\$ 96,459	\$	96,459	•,	\$	14,641	Ф	81,81	ω
25	Dumbarton Corridor Improvements (Newark and Union City)	\$ 19,367	\$	6,078	•,	\$	2,416	\$	3,66	23
26	I-580 Corridor/BART to Livermore Studies	\$ 11,831	\$	11,831	•,	\$	6,918	θ	4,91	З
27	Emerging Projects	- \$	\$	I	•,	\$	'	\$		
27A	Vasco Road Safety Improvements	\$ 1,500	\$	1,500	•,	\$	1,500	θ		
27B	I-80 Integrated Corridor Mobility Project	\$ 2,800	\$	2,800	•,	\$	1,800	φ	1,00	0
27C	I-880 Corridor Improvements in Oakland and San Leandro	\$ 5,350	\$	5,350	•,	\$	1,317	φ	4,03	ŝ
27D	CWTP/TEP Development	\$ 50	\$	50	0,	\$	ı	\$	5	0
27E	Studies for Congested Segments/Locations on the CMP Network	\$ 551	\$	551	0,	\$	·	Ф	55	
	Totals	\$ 756,469	\$	708,981	••	\$ 36	95,024	\$	313,95	

Attachment C2 Page 2 of 2

FY 2013/14 Measure B Capital Program Strategic Plan Update 2000 Measure B Allocation Plan Schedule

May 2013

			\$ x 1	000				
Total easure B mmitment	Total Amount Allocated To Date	Remaining Programmed Balance	FY 13/14	FY 14/15	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	Totals (Future Allocations)
13,184	\$ 11,184	\$ 2,000					2,000	\$ 2,00
19,697	\$ 15,197	\$ 4,500			1,000	3,500		\$ 4,50
15,500	\$ 10,000	\$ 5,500	1,000				4,500	\$ 5,50
6,267	ج	\$ 6,267	6,267					\$ 6,26
27,037	\$ 12,605	\$ 14,432	1,500	12,932				\$ 14,43
26,529	\$ 25,029	\$ 1,500	1,500					\$ 1,50
19,367	\$ 6,078	\$ 13,289	1,500	2,000		9,789		\$ 13,28
127,581	\$ 80,093	\$ 47,488	\$ 11,767	\$ 14,932	\$ 1,000	\$ 13,289	\$ 6,500	\$ 47,48
leasure B mmitment 13,184 19,697 15,500 6,267 27,037 27,037 27,037 19,367 19,367 19,367 19,367		Allocated To Date S 11,184 S 15,197 S 15,197 S 10,000 S 25,029 S 6,078 S 6,078 S 80,093	Allocated To bate Programmed Balance \$ 11,184 \$ 2,000 \$ 15,197 \$ 4,500 \$ 15,197 \$ 4,500 \$ 10,000 \$ 5,500 \$ 10,000 \$ 6,267 \$ 12,605 \$ 14,432 \$ 12,605 \$ 14,432 \$ 25,029 \$ 1,500 \$ 26,078 \$ 1,500 \$ 6,078 \$ 1,500 \$ 6,078 \$ 1,500 \$ 6,078 \$ 1,500 \$ 6,078 \$ 1,500 \$ 6,078 \$ 1,500	Allocated To bate Frogrammed Balance Frogrammed Fy 13/14 \$ 11,184 \$ 2,000 Fy 13/14 \$ 15,197 \$ 4,500 1,000 \$ 15,197 \$ 5,500 1,000 \$ 10,000 \$ 5,500 1,000 \$ 10,000 \$ 5,500 1,000 \$ 12,605 \$ 14,432 1,500 \$ 22,029 \$ 14,432 1,500 \$ 25,029 \$ 13,289 1,500 \$ 6,078 \$ 13,289 1,500 \$ 6,078 \$ 13,289 1,500 \$ 6,078 \$ 13,289 1,500	Allocated To bate Programmed Balance FY 13/14 FY 14/15 \$ 11,184 \$ 2,000 FY 13/14 FY 14/15 \$ 15,197 \$ 4,500 1,000 1,000 1,000 \$ 10,000 \$ 5,500 1,000 1,000 1,2932 \$ 12,605 \$ 14,432 1,500 12,932 \$ 22,029 \$ 1,500 12,932 \$ 25,029 \$ 1,500 12,932 \$ 25,029 \$ 1,500 12,932 \$ 26,078 \$ 1,500 2,000 \$ 8 13,289 1,500 2,000 \$ 8 13,289 1,500 2,000	Allocated To bate Programmed Balance FY 13/14 FY 14/15 FY 15/16 \$ 11,1184 \$ 2,000 1,000 1,000 1,000 \$ 15,197 \$ 4,500 1,000 1,000 1,000 \$ 10,000 \$ 5,500 1,000 1,000 1,000 \$ 10,000 \$ 5,500 1,000 1,000 1,000 \$ 10,000 \$ 5,500 1,000 1,000 1,000 \$ 10,000 \$ 1,000 1,000 1,000 1,000 \$ 10,000 \$ 14,432 1,500 12,932 1 \$ 12,605 \$ 1,500 1,500 1,500 1 \$ 26,078 \$ 1,500 2,000 2,000 2,000 \$ \$ 1,500 2,000 2,000 2,000 1,000	Allocated To bate Programmed Balance FY 13/14 FY 14/15 FY 15/16 FY 16/17 \$ 11,1184 \$ 2,000 1,000 3,500 3,500 \$ 15,1197 \$ 4,500 1,000 3,500 3,500 \$ 10,000 \$ 5,500 1,000 3,500 3,500 \$ 10,000 \$ 5,500 1,000 3,500 3,500 \$ 10,000 \$ 5,500 1,000 3,500 3,500 \$ 10,000 \$ 5,500 1,000 3,500 3,500 \$ 10,000 \$ 5,500 1,000 3,500 3,500 \$ 10,000 \$ 1,500 12,932 1,500 9,789 \$ 26,078 \$ 1,500 1,500 9,789 9,789 \$ 5 6,078 \$ 1,500 2,000 9,789	Allocated To bate FY 13/14 FY 13/14 FY 13/14 FY 13/14 FY 14/15 FY 15/16 FY 16/17 FY 17/18 \$\$ 11,1184 \$\$ 2,000 \$\$ 4,500 \$\$ 1,000 \$\$ 5,500 \$\$ 4,500 \$\$ 2,000 \$\$ 2,000 \$\$ 2,000 \$\$ 2,000 \$\$ 2,000 \$\$ 2,000 \$\$ 2,000 \$\$ 2,000 \$\$ 2,000 \$\$ 2,000 \$\$ 2,000 \$\$ 2,000 \$\$ 2,000 \$\$ 2,000 \$\$ 2,000 \$\$ 4,500 \$\$ 2,000 \$\$ 4,500 \$\$ 4,500 \$\$ 4,500 \$\$ 4,500 \$\$ 4,500 \$\$ 2,000 \$\$ 4,500 \$\$ 2,000 \$\$ 4,500 \$\$ 4,500 \$\$ 4,500 \$\$ 2,000 \$\$ 4,500

Attachment C3 Page 1 of 1

							Attachment C4
FY 2013/14 Measure B C 2000 Measure B Allocati	apital Program Si ion Plan Notes	trategic	Plan	Update	0		
May 2013				\$ x 1.000			
	1			000' V #			
		Total Measure B		Total Amount Ilocated	Re	maining	
		Commitment	•	To Date	Ő	alance	
01 ACE Capital Improvements	97	13,184	\$	11,184	θ	2,000	Remaining 2000 Measure B allocations are anticipated for the Alameda County share of ACE capital costs for various projects approved annually in a list recommended by the SJRRC. The availability of \$2M of the remaining Programmed Balance is delayed due to an advance approved in September 2011 for the I-580 EB Aux/HOT Lane project to be paid back with toll revenues.
08A I-680 Express Lane - Southbound		19,697	φ	15,197	θ	4,500	The future 2000 Measure B allocations are anticipated for future operation costs above the toll revenues available for operations as approved by the Alameda CTC in December, 2012.
08B I-680 Express Lane - Northbound		15,500	ф	10,000	θ	5,500	Remaining 2000 Measure B allocations are anticipated for future project development, system management and integration, right of way and construction phases costs incurred directly by the Commission. The availability of \$4.5M of the remaining Programmed Balance is delayed due to an advance approved in September 2011 for the I-580 EB Aux/HOT Lane project to be paid back with toll revenues.
09 Iron Horse Transit Route		6,267	θ	1	⇔	6,267	The future 2000 Measure B allocations are anticipated for project development, right of way and construction phase costs incurred by the implementing agency(ies).
15 I-880/Route 92/Whitesell Drive Interc	change 4	\$ 27,037	θ	12,605	θ	14,432	Remaining 2000 Measure B allocations are anticipated for reimbursement of future project development and capital phase costs incurred by the implementing agency(ies).
23 Isabel Avenue - Route 84/I-580 Interc	cchange \$	5 26,529	÷	25,029	⇔	1,500	The future 2000 Measure B allocations are anticipated for projects adjacent to the interchange project. The interchange construction is complete and the inter-agency agreements related to the project funding are being closed out.
25 Dumbarton Corridor Improvements (h	(Newark and Union City)	19,367	θ	6,078	θ	13,289	The future 2000 Measure B allocations are anticipated for on-going project development phases and for implementation of potential phased improvements while funding for the planned overall corridor is identified. Future allocations will be made available to implementing agencies, including up to \$1 million for costs incurred directly by the Commission.
Totals (Projects T	This Sheet)	\$ 127,581	⇔	80,093	÷	47,488	

Attachment C4 Page 1 of 1

FY 2013/14 Measure B Capital Program Strategic Plan Update 2000 Measure B Capital Project Line Item Expenditures

~	
12	
ò	
2	
>	
_	

Ma	y 2013													
							\$ x 1,000 ii	n the FY Sh	own					
			Prior to	FY	FY	FΥ	FY	F۲	Ę		FY	ΕY		
°N N	Project Title		FY 13/14	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/1	6	18/19	19/20		Totals
-	ACE Capital Improvements	⇔	7,183	\$ 3,500	\$ 502	•	۔ ج	\$	\$	1,000 \$	1,000	\$	\$	13,185
2	BART Warm Springs Extension	\$	115,839	\$ 24,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 14,609	\$	\$	÷		\$	\$	224,448
е	BART Oakland Airport Connector	⇔	69,051	\$ 20,000	۔ ج	-	\$	\$	\$	÷		\$	\$	89,051
4	Downtown Oakland Streetscape	\$	762	\$ 1,750	\$ 3,846	- \$	-	\$	\$	\$	'	\$	\$	6,358
5	Fruitvale Transit Village	⇔	4,435	- \$	\$	-	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$	به -	4,435
9	Union City Intermodal Station	⇔	12,561	- \$	۔ ج	-	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$	به -	12,561
λA	Telegraph Avenue Bus Rapid Transit	\$	6,969	\$ 4,000	\$ 540	- \$	-	\$	\$ -	\$	'	\$	\$	11,509
7B	San Pablo Avenue Corridor Transit	\$	2,262	-	-	- \$	-	\$	\$ -	\$	'	\$	\$	2,262
7C	Telegraph Avenue Rapid Bus Service	\$	10,672	-	-	-	\$	\$	\$ -	÷	'	\$	\$	10,672
8	I-680 Express Lane	\$	16,938	\$ 4,000	\$ 2,959	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 2,92	5 \$	750 \$	1,125	\$ 20	\$	35,197
6	Ironhorse Trail	\$	500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,000	\$ 1,267	\$	\$	\$	\$	'	\$	\$	6,267
10	I-880/Broadway-Jackson I/C	\$	2,321	\$ 2,500	\$ 3,282	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	8,103
11	I-880/Washington Ave I/C	\$	1,334	-	•	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	1,334
12	I-580 Castro Valley I/C	\$	11,325	\$ 100	\$ 100	- \$	- \$	\$	\$ -	÷	'	\$	\$	11,525
13	Lewelling/East Lewelling	Ŷ	13,105	-	-	•	\$	\$	\$	\$	'	\$	\$	13,105
14A	I-580 Auxiliary Lanes - W/B Fallon to Tassajara	\$	2,500	-	-	- \$	- \$	\$	\$ -	÷	'	\$	\$	2,500
14B	I-580 Auxiliary Lanes - W/B Airway to Fallon	Ŷ	1,761	\$ 925	-	۰ \$	\$	\$	\$	\$ '	'	\$	\$	2,686
14C	I-580 Auxiliary Lanes - E/B El Charro to Airway	¢	7,844	- \$	- \$	۔ ج	، ج	\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	7,844
15	R te 92/Clawiter-Whitesell I/C	¢	2,104	\$ 8,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 6,933	، ج	\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	27,037
16	Oakland Local Streets	\$	5,278	-	•	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$	ري ا	5,278

Attachment D1 Page 1 of 2

FY 2013/14 Measure B Capital Program Strategic Plan Update 2000 Measure B Capital Project Line Item Expenditures

May	y 2013		•										
							\$ × 1,000 ii	the FY Sho	uwu				
No.	Project Title		Prior to FY 13/14	FΥ 13/14	FY 14/15	FΥ 15/16	FΥ 16/17	FY 17/18	FΥ 18/19	FΥ 18/19	FΥ 19/20		otals
17	Hesperian/Lewelling Widening	↔	1,264	י ج	' ج	\$	\$	÷	\$	\$	م	\$	1,264
18	Westgate Extension	↔	8,518	۰ ج	۰ ۲	' ج	\$	÷	\$	\$	م	÷	8,518
19	E. 14th/Hesperian/150th Improvements	↔	839	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,379	۔ ج	\$	\$	\$	\$	' ج	÷	3,218
20	Newark Local Streets	⇔	1,422	- \$	۔ ج	- \$	\$	ج	\$	\$	' ج	÷	1,422
21	I-238 Widening	↔	81,022	•	۔ ج	۔ ج	\$	\$	\$	\$	' ج	÷	81,022
22	1-680/1-880 Cross Connector Study	⇔	740	\$ 493	۔ ج	- \$	\$	ج	\$	\$	' ج	÷	1,233
23	Isabel - Route 84/I-580 I/C	⇔	23,283	\$ 1,746	\$ 1,500	- \$	-	\$	\$	\$	- \$	\$	26,529
24	Route 84 Expressway	⇔	19,641	\$ 19,000	\$ 11,568	\$ 12,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 19,250	\$ (\$	- \$	\$	96,459
25	Dumbarton Corridor	⇔	3,916	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 4,451	\$	- \$	- \$	\$	19,367
26	I-580 Corridor/BART to Livermore	⇔	8,168	\$ 2,750	\$ 913	- \$	•	\$	\$	- \$	- \$	\$	11,831
27	Congestion Relief Emergency Fund - Unallocated	⇔		- \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	\$	\$	- \$	- \$	\$	ı
27A	Vasco Road	\$	1,500	- \$	- \$	- \$	-	\$	\$	- \$ -	- \$	\$	1,500
27B	1-80 ICM	\$	2,799	- \$	- \$	- \$	-	\$	\$	- \$ -	- \$	\$	2,799
27C	I-880 Corridor Improvements in Oakland and San Leandro	\$	3,187	\$ 2,163	- \$	- \$	-	\$	\$	- \$ -	- \$	\$	5,350
27D	CWTP/TEP Development	\$	50	- \$	- \$	- \$	-	\$	\$ -	- \$ -	- \$	\$	50
27E	Studies for Congested Segments/Locations on the CMP	¢	•	\$ 450	\$ 101	- \$	۔ ج	÷	\$	\$	- \$	\$	551
	Totals	\$	451,093	\$ 100,877	\$ 80,690	\$ 55,200	\$ 37,609	\$ 26,626	\$ 1,750) \$ 2,125	\$ 500	÷	756,470

Attachment D1 Page 2 of 2

FY 2013/14 Measure B Capital Program Strategic Plan Update 2000 Measure B Capital Program Advances and Repayments

May 2013

					\$ × 1,00	0 in FY Shov	ų			
	FΥ	FΥ	FY	FY	FY	FY	F۲	FY	FY	
	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	Totals
Sources of Funds (Repayments of Advances/Loans)										
1-580 EB Aux/HOT Payback from Toll Revenues				\$ 250	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 1,250	\$ 8,500
2 2012 STIP Exchange (Route 84 Expressway - South Segment)					\$ 37,030					\$ 37,030
3 Total Sources of Funds (Repayments)	' ج	۶	' \$	\$ 250	\$ 38,530	\$ 1,500	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 1,250	\$ 45,530

					\$ × 1,00	0 in FY Sho	wn				
	FΥ	FΥ	ΕΥ	ЬΥ	FΥ	FΥ	FΥ	FΥ	FY		
	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	To	tals
Uses of Funds (Expenditures for Advances)											
4 I-580 EB Aux/HOT Expenditures funded by Loan	\$ 1,500	\$ 6,000	\$ 1,000							\$	8,500
5 2012 STIP Exchange (See Project Detail Sheet)	\$ 6,500	\$	- \$	- \$	\$ 30,530	\$	\$	ج	ج	\$	37,030
6 Total Uses of Funds (Expenditures)	\$ 8,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 1,000	- \$	\$ 30,530	' \$, \$	' چ	' \$	\$	45,530

Attachment D2 Page 1 of 1
					Attacl	nment D3
FY 2013/14 Measure B Capital Program Strategic Plan Update 2000 Measure B Capital Program Advances - 2012 STIP Exchange Pro	oject Detail	Sheet				
May 2013						
			\$ × 1,000	in FY Show	-	
	FY 12/13	FY 13/14	FY 14/15	FY 15/16	FΥ 16/17	Totals
STIP Exchange Projects						
1 East Bay Bus Rapid Transit (AC Transit)					\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000
2 I-880/Broadway-Jackson (Alameda)					\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500
3 Crow Canyon Road Safety Improvements (Ala. County)					\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000
4 Niles Canyon Rd (Rte 84), Paloma Rd and Pleasanton-Sunol Rd Intersection (Ala. County)					\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500
5 East-West Connector (Alameda CTC)					\$ 14,300	\$ 14,300
6 I-880 Reconstruction, 29th/23rd (Alameda CTC)	\$ 1,000					\$ 1,000
7 I-880/Mission Blvd (Rte 262) Phase 1B/2 Interchange Completion (VTA)	\$ 3,500					\$ 3,500
8 Automall Parkway Project (Fremont)					\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500
9 42nd Ave/High St Access Improvement (Oakland)					\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000
10 Route 85/Hesperian Blvd/150th Ave Channelization Improvements (San Leandro)	\$ 1,000					\$ 1,000
11 RIP-TE Payback of TE Capacity to San Mateo County (TBD)					\$ 200	\$ 200
12 RIP-TE Reserve (Alameda CTC)					\$ 530	\$ 530
13 RIP-TE I-880 SB HOV Lane Widening Project Landscape/Hardscape at Marina/Davis I/C (Alameda CTC)	\$ 1,000					\$ 1,000
14 Totals	\$ 6,500	-	\$ -	- \$	\$ 30,530	\$ 37,030

Attachment D3 Page 1 of 1



Memorandum

DATE: May 15, 2013

TO: Alameda County Transportation Commission

FROM: Programs and Projects Committee

SUBJECT: I-680 Southbound Express Lane (ACTIA No. 8A) – Approval of Contract Amendments to the Professional Services Contracts with ETC, Novani and CDM Smith

Recommendation

It is recommended the Commission approve authorization for the Alameda CTC Executive Director to execute the following items in support of the FY 2013/14 Operations and Maintenance of the Southbound I-680 Sunol Express Lane Project ("the Project"):

- 1. Amendment No. 4 to the Agreement (CMA#A09-028) with Novani, LLC to: 1) extend the term of the Agreement for one year, from July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014, and, 2) include additional compensation for its continued services in FY 2013/14, in the amount of \$71,000, for a total not to exceed amount of \$219,100. The time extension and additional compensation are needed to provide IT technical, hardware and communication support, in addition to host the computer servers for the Project's Toll Data Center at the Server Center.
- 2. Amendment No. 1 to the Agreement (CMA#A08-001) with Electronic Transaction Consultants Corporation to: 1) extend the term of the Agreement for one year, from July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014, and, 2) include additional compensation for its continued services in FY 2013/14, in the amount of \$200,000, for a total not to exceed amount of \$7,564,219. The time extension and additional compensation are needed to provide additional funds necessary for the 3rd Year Maintenance Agreement that will provide necessary field maintenance required for the Express Lanes, including back office and remote support for the dynamic pricing application.
- 3. Amendment No. 8 to Consultant Services Agreement (CMA#A04-007) with CDM Smith (Wilbur Smith Associates), to: 1) extend the term of the Agreement for one year, from July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014, and, 2) include additional compensation for its continued services in FY 2013/14, in the not-to-exceed amount of \$50,000. This would bring the total Agreement amount to \$2,257,821. The time extension and additional compensation to provide on-call services for specialized analysis of toll/revenue data and presenting

Project and Industry trends to the I-680 Sunol Smart Carpool Lane Joint Powers Authority ("JPA").

Sufficient funding for Commission's actions on the above items are included in current project financial plan and the JPA Budget for FY2013/14.

Summary

The Southbound I-680 Express Lane, which opened to traffic in September 2010, is the first operational express lane facility in Northern California. The Alameda CTC, acting as the managing agency of the JPA, accepted the final systems from the System Integrator on April 30, 2012. The Project since moved into the operation and maintenance phase. The FY 2013/14 will be the second year when the toll funds will support a significant portion of the Project's operating expenses, while part of the expenses will be subsidized by Project grant funds.

Discussion

Novani, LLC has been assisting the agency with IT technical, hardware and communication support and hosting the servers for the Toll Data Center (TDC), where all traffic data from the Project are sent and processed through the dynamic pricing algorithm application. The TDC also hosts the servers for the East Bay Smart Corridor where all traffic data is sent and processed before it is sent back to the cities. The servers are placed in a secured, environmentally controlled and structurally sound building with 24 hour power supply and communication redundancy.

The agency has been utilizing consultant services for the specialized system management and operations services. Wilbur Smith Associates staff has been retained to provide these specialized services through an on-call contract for specialized analysis of toll/revenue data and presenting Project and Industry trends to the JPA.

Action 1:

Novani LLC has been providing services since 2009 for hosting the servers including providing communication bandwidth. Their staff services are necessary for continuing the toll operations. A summary of amendments is provided as Attachment A to this item.

Staff recommends that the Commission authorize the Executive Director of Alameda CTC to amend the Agreement with Novani LLC (CMA#A09-028), for extending the term of the Agreement to June 30, 2014 and including additional compensation of \$71,000.

Action 2:

Electronic Transaction Consultants Corporation has been providing services since 2008 as the System Integrator for the I-680 Express Lane Electronic Systems. Following the delivery of the Express Lane and acceptance of the final systems, their staff services are necessary for field maintenance, back office, and remote support for the dynamic pricing application. A summary of amendments is provided as Attachment A to this item.

Staff recommends that the Commission authorize the Executive Director of Alameda CTC to amend the Agreement with Electronic Transaction Consultants Corporation (CMA#A08-001),

for extending the term of the Agreement to June 30, 2014 and including additional compensation of \$200,000.

Action 3:

CDM Smith (previously known as Wilbur Smith Associates) previous tasks included validation of the System Integrator dynamic pricing algorithm for its capability to meet the contract's requirements and the development of the Express Lane Operations Manual needed to document all policies, procedures, parameters and functional requirements of how the express lane operates. The time extension and additional compensation will provide on-call services for specialized analysis of toll/revenue data and presenting Project and Industry trends to the JPA. A summary of amendments is provided as Attachment A to this item.

Staff recommends that the Commission authorize the Executive Director of Alameda CTC to amend the Agreement with CDM Smith (CMA#A04-007), for extending the term of the Agreement to June 30, 2014 and including additional compensation of \$50,000.

Fiscal Impact

Action 1:

Approval of the requested action will encumber additional \$71,000 of Measure B funds. The existing allocated amount of Measure B funds for the Project includes sufficient capacity.

Action 2:

Approval of the requested action will encumber additional \$200,000 of Operating Revenues from JPA funds. The existing amount of JPA funds for the Project is included in the JPA FY2013/14 budget.

Action 3:

Approval of the requested action will encumber additional \$50,000 of Measure B funds. The existing allocated amount of Measure B funds for the Project includes sufficient capacity.

Attachment(s)

Attachment A: Summary of Amendments

Total Description Amount Description	\$ 23,800 Provide technical assistance with Project systems	\$ 23,800 Extend the term of the original agreement by 15 months, for no additional compensation.	\$ 81,100 Host computer server (colocation) for Project traffic/revenue data management	\$ 148,100 Host computer server (colocation) for Project traffic/revenue data management & dashboard reporting upgrades	<i>\$</i> 219,100 Host computer server (colocation) for Project traffic/revenue data management & dashboard reporting upgrades	\$ 7,364,219 Provide system integrator phase services, including development of the toll system and installation of toll equipment	<i>\$ 7,564,219</i> Provide 3rd year of maintenance and operation	\$ 647,365 Provide advise on toll systems and facilitate civil design	\$ 841,201 Provide additional toll system management services	\$ 886,201 Provide system integrator phase services, including selection of an completing detail design documentation	\$ 1,135,821 Provide system management oversight services, pre-operational field testing conducted by the system integrator	\$ 1,485,821 Provide revenue forecasting and continued system management oversight services	\$ 1,885,821 Provide systems operations and performance monitoring, testing for system acceptance	\$ 2,063,821 Provide systems oversight, final system acceptance and maintenance/operation monitoring services	\$ 2,207,821 Provide oversight on system maintenance and operation data manipulation	<i>\$</i> 2,257,821 Provide oversight on system maintenance and operation data manipulation
Total contract Amount	23,800 Pro	23,800 Ext	81,100 Hos	148,100 Hos	219,100 Hos	7,364,219 Pro	7,564,219 Pro	647,365 Pro	841,201 Pro	886,201 Pro	1,135,821 Pro	1,485,821 Pro	1,885,821 Pro	2,063,821 Pro	2,207,821 Pro	2,257,821 Pro
A C	÷	\$	÷	÷	s	÷	65	\$	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	\$
Amount of Amendment)	57,300	67,000	71,000		200,000		193,836	45,000	249,620	350,000	400,000	178,000	144,000	50,000
l/ ≥nt ≱		1	2 \$	3	4 \$		$\begin{pmatrix} d & s \\ 1 & s \end{pmatrix}$		1 \$	2 \$	3 3	4 \$	5	6 \$	7 \$	d \$
Original Amendme	Original	Amend.	Amend.	Amend.	Proposed	Original	Proposed Amend.	Original	Amend.	Amend.	Amend.	Amend.	Amend.	Amend.	Amend.	Proposed Amend. 8
Date	January 2010	April 2010	June 2011	June 2012	May 2013	December 2008	May 2013	December 2004	July 2007	September 2008	August 2009	May 2010	April 2011	January 2012	June 2012	May 2013
Agreement No.	CMA#A09-028 w/ Novani LLC	1	1	1		CMA#A08-001	w/Electronic Transaction Consultants Corporation	CMA#A04-007	(Wilbur Smith)	1	1	1	1	1	L	L

Southbound I-680 Sunol Express Lane Project - Consulting Services Agreements

Attachment A

Page 1 of 1



Memorandum

DATE: May 15, 2013

TO: Alameda County Transportation Commission

FROM: Programs and Projects Committee

SUBJECT: I-680 Northbound Express Lane (ACTIA No. 8B) – Approval of a Cooperative Agreement with California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Commission approve authorization for the Executive Director to enter execute a Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans for the Project Report and Environmental Document (PA&ED) approval phase of the I-680 Northbound Express Lane Project.

Summary

The I-680 Northbound Express Lane Project will widen I-680 from State SR237 in Santa Clara County to SR 84 in Alameda County and construct a northbound High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV)/Express Lane on I-680. The project is intended to provide a number of benefits including: 1) reduce traffic congestion; thereby enhancing mobility along this corridor; 2) reduce travel time and improve travel reliability; 3) reduce congestion related accidents; thereby enhancing safety. The express lane facility will allow solo drivers to access unused capacity in the HOV lane for a fee while allowing carpool users to travel at no cost.

Caltrans completed the PA&ED for the I-680 Northbound HOV Project in June 2005. In mid-2011, the Alameda CTC initiated an effort to convert an already approved I-680 Northbound HOV Lane Project to a combined I-680 Northbound HOV/Express Lane facility. However, in August 2011, in response to a writ filed by a local city, the Alameda County Superior Court directed the Department (Caltrans) to vacate the Environmental Document (ED) prepared for the I-680 Northbound HOV Lane Project in its entirety. Given the Court's direction, in late 2011 Caltrans and Alameda CTC determined that a Project Initiation Document (PID) and a completely new and higher level of ED was needed to obtain environmental clearance for the project; involving expanded preliminary engineering, traffic analysis, and technical studies.

Alameda CTC is the sponsor of this project and implementing agency for the PA&ED phase. As such, Alameda CTC is the implementing agency for both California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) related studies. Caltrans is the lead agency for both CEQA and NEPA. Alameda CTC will be responsible for preparing documentation for CEQA and NEPA compliance. Caltrans will provide Independent Quality Assurance (IQA) with

regard to CEQA and NEPA compliance at no cost to Alameda CTC. Caltrans will also coordinate with state and federal resource agencies for various reviews and approvals.

This Cooperative Agreement between the ACTC and Caltrans is necessary to cover roles and responsibilities during the PA&ED phase of this project. Staff is recommending that the Commission authorize the Executive Director to enter into the Cooperative Agreement.

Fiscal Impact

There is no fiscal impact at this time.



Memorandum

DATE: May 15, 2012

TO: Alameda County Transportation Commission

FROM: Finance and Administration Committee

SUBJECT: Approval of a Revised Sales Tax Revenue Projection for Fiscal Year 2012-2013

Recommendation

It is recommended the Commission approve an increase to the Alameda CTC's sales tax revenue projection in the amount of \$7 million for a total FY2012-13 sales tax projection of \$119 million, and an increase in the corresponding pass-through and other expenditures based on the formula established in the transportation expenditure plan.

Summary

The proposed increase is 7.14 percent higher than the currently adopted budget. Based on receipts to date, sales tax revenues have out-performed the original projection in the budget by 7.12 percent. Overall receipts in the 1st and 2nd quarters of the year were higher than budget by about 5.92 percent. The receipts received over the last couple of months are still estimates until the 3rd quarter adjustment to "true up" the amounts received to date is received in June. The increase in sales tax revenues over the last several months reflects positive changes to the economy in Alameda County. This revised projection exceeds historical peak levels of \$116.3 million experienced in FY2007-08. If approved, this revised sales tax projection will be included as a budget adjustment to the FY2012-13 budget, increasing projected revenues by \$7 million and the corresponding pass-through and other expenditures based on the formula established in the transportation expenditure plan.

Fiscal Impacts

The proposed revision to the Alameda CTC's FY2012-13 sales tax revenue projection would provide additional resources of \$7 million and authorize the corresponding pass-through and other expenditures based on the formula established in the transportation expenditure plan.



Memorandum

DATE: May 15, 2013

TO: Alameda County Transportation Commission

FROM: Finance and Administration Committee

SUBJECT:Approval of the Alameda CTC Fiscal Year 2012-2013 Third Quarter
Consolidated Investment Report

Recommendation

It is recommended the Commission accept the attached Alameda CTC Fiscal Year 2012-13 third quarter Consolidated Investment Report (Attachment A).

Summary

- Alameda CTC investments are in compliance with the adopted investment policies.
- Alameda CTC has sufficient cash flow to meet expenditure requirements over the next six months.
- As of March 31, 2013, total cash and investments held by the Alameda CTC were \$227.9 million. This total is a decrease of \$54.4 million or 19.3% from the prior year-end balance of \$282.4 million.
- The ACTA investment balance decreased \$12.8 million or 9.1% due to capital project expenditures. The ACTIA investment balance decreased \$37.2 million or 32.8% due to capital project expenditures. The ACCMA investment balance decreased \$4.3 million or 15.2% mostly related to CMA TIP project payments.
- Investment yields have declined with the return on investments for the Alameda CTC at 0.67% compared to the prior year's return of 0.99%. Return on investments were projected for the FY2012-13 budget year at varying rates ranging from 0 1.00% depending on investment type.
- Based on the most current cash flow projections updated in February, 2013, ACTIA will require external financing by the 2nd quarter of FY2014-15 to satisfy capital project obligations. The cash flow projection scenario assumes a short term loan from ACTA capital funds, which would be paid back as soon as financing is executed.

Discussion

As of March 31, 2013, the Alameda CTC portfolio managed by investment advisors consisted of approximately 21.4% US Treasury Securities, 47.6% Federal Agency Securities, 2.1% Corporate Notes, 17.8% Commercial Paper, 5.3% Negotiable CDs and 5.8% Money Market Funds (See Attachment B). The Alameda CTC portfolio is in compliance with both the adopted investment policy and the California Government Code.

The Employment Development Department reported an unemployment rate in Alameda County for March, 2013 of 7.7%, down 0.5% from the previous quarter end statement, and between that of California, at 9.4%, and the United States, at 7.6% (per the US Department of Labor). These decreases are believed to be due in part to shrinkage in the labor force as some unemployed workers gave up searching for jobs. Alameda County increases in jobs were in the categories of professional and business services, construction, and local and state government education. Unemployment rates are still very high when compared to historical national rates which ranged from 4.0 - 5.0% in the years 2001 - 2007.

The month of March 2013 showed evidence of continued gradual strengthening of the US economy. Economists are predicting growth in the gross domestic product (GDP), however they are worried about the effects sequestration will have in the second half of the year. The Federal Reserve voted to keep the federal funds rate near zero and reiterated its commitment to monthly purchases of Treasuries and mortgage-backed securities. Treasury bond yields were mainly unchanged for both the shorter-maturity (three years and under) and intermediate-maturity (five years and over). While Europe struggles with weakness in many European economies, the U.S. seems to have gained some momentum driven by strong consumer spending, growing personal income, and a rise in value for housing and equity securities.

Attachment(s)

Attachment A:	Consolidated Investment Report as of March 31, 2013
Attachment B:	Detail of Investment Holdings (managed by PFM and Chandler)

				Alamed	da CTC					
			Ō	onsolidated Inv As of Marc	vestment Report h 31. 2013					
		Un-Audited			Interest Earn	ed			FY 2011	-2012
ACTA		nvestment Balance			As of March 31	, 2013		Investm	tent Balance	Interest earned
			Inte	rest earned	Approx. ROI	Budget	Difference	June	90, 2012	FY 2011-2012
Checking Account	ω	100,596	ക	21	0.03%			s	103,510	\$ 45
State Treas. Pool (LAIF)		20,661,687		28,244	0.18%				14,808,441	105,009
Investment Advisors (1)		96,685,188		853,919	1.18%			,	115,361,268	2,139,191
Loan to ACCMA		10,000,000							10,000,000	
ACTA Total		127,447,470	\$	882,184	0.92% \$	768,750 \$	113,434	•	140,273,219	2,244,245
									Approx. ROI	1.60%
		Un-Audited			Interest Earn	ed			FY 2011	-2012
ACTIA	_	nvestment Balance			As of March 31	, 2013		Investm	tent Balance	Interest earned
			Inte	rest earned	Approx. ROI	Budget	Difference	June	30, 2012	FY 2011-2012
Community Bank (OPEB)(2)	φ	911,054	ф	681	0.10%	>		\$	910,373	\$ 865
Checking Account	ю	4,972,966	ŝ	174	0.00%			ф	8,760,886	\$ 147
State Treas. Pool (LAIF)		17,534,507		63,146	0.48%				36,040,309	208,541
Investment Advisors (1)		53,794,008		116,450	0.29%				68,742,558	218,683
ACTIA Total		76,301,480	\$	179,770	0.31% \$	135,000 \$	44,770	•	113,543,752	427,371
									Approx. ROI	0.38%
		Un-Audited			Interest Earn	ed			FY 2011	-2012
ACCMA		nvestment Balance			As of March 31	, 2013		Investm	ient Balance	Interest earned
			Inte	rest earned	Approx. ROI	Budget	Difference	June	30, 2012	FY 2011-2012
Checking Account	÷	4,235,611			0.00%			¢	2,911,113	•
State Treas. Pool (LAIF)		14,724,899		35,354	0.32%				17,537,573	45,846
Project Deferred Revenue (3)		15,232,429		42,698	0.37%				18,088,066	66,302
Loan from ACTA		(10,000,000)							(10,000,000)	
ACCMA Total	θ	24,192,939	\$	78,053	0.43% \$	- \$	78,053	\$	28,536,752	\$ 112,148
									Approx. ROI	0.39%
ACTC TOTAL	\$	227,941,889	¢	1,140,007	0.67% \$	903,750 \$	236,257	\$	282,353,723	\$ 2,783,764
Notes: (1) See attachments for detail of investr	ment ho	oldings managed by Inv	/estm	ent Advisors.						

The OPEB/Health Retirement account and related interest income is held in a irrevocable trust and does not appear on ACTIA's balance sheet.
Project funds in deferred revenue are invested in LAIF with interest accruing back to the respective project fund which include TVTC, San Leandro Marina, TCRP and PTMISEA funds.
All investments are marked to market on the financial statements at the end of the fiscal year per GASB 31 requirements.
Alameda CTC investments are in compliance with the currently adopted investment policies.
Alameda CTC has sufficient cash flow to meet expenditure requirements over the next six months.

		Manage	ed Ac	count D	etail of	Securiti	es Held		Fc	r the Month Ending	March 31, 2013
ALAMEDA CNTY TRANSPORTA	ATTON AUTHO	DRITY - 03	06850	0							
Security Type/Description Dated Date/Coupon/Maturity	CUSIP	Par	S&P Rating	Moody's Rating	Trade Date	Settle Date	Original Cost	YTM at Cost	Accrued Interest	Amortized Cost	Market Value
U.S. Treasury Bond / Note											
US TREASURY NOTES DTD 06/30/2008 3.375% 06/30/2013	912828JD3	13,830,000.00	AA+	Aaa	03/22/12	03/27/12	14,368,613.67	0.28	117,335.32	13,936,314.53	13,942,368.75
US TREASURY NOTES DTD 09/30/2008 3.125% 09/30/2013	912828JM3	3,900,000.00	AA+	Aaa	03/22/12	03/27/12	4,064,531.25	0.32	332.99	3,954,238.43	3,957,891.60
Security Type Sub-Total		17,730,000.00					18,433,144.92	0.29	117,668.31	17,890,552.96	17,900,260.35
Federal Agency Bond / Note											
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK GLOBAL NOTES DTD 02/03/2012 0.220% 08/08/2013	313376UV5	5,000,000.00	AA+	Aaa	11/27/12	11/28/12	5,001,135.00	0.19	1,619.44	5,000,577.00	5,001,610.00
FHLB NOTES DTD 02/13/2012 0.280% 08/13/2013	313376WB7	9,700,000.00	AA+	Aaa	11/27/12	11/28/12	9,706,372.90	0.19	3,621.33	9,703,300.33	9,705,412.60
FHLB GLOBAL BONDS DTD 08/01/2008 4.000% 09/06/2013	3133XRX88	4,400,000.00	AA+	Aaa	03/22/12	03/27/12	4,629,680.00	0.37	12,222.22	4,468,714.89	4,474,346.80
FNMA NOTES DTD 11/01/2010 0.750% 12/18/2013	31398A5W8	4,725,000.00	AA+	Aaa	08/21/12	08/22/12	4,754,484.00	0.28	10,139.06	4,740,931.90	4,745,719.13
Security Type Sub-Total		23,825,000.00	0				24,091,671.90	0.24	27,602.05	23,913,524.12	23,927,088.53
Commercial Paper											
Bank of Tokyo Mitsubishi UFJ LTD CP 0.000% 05/15/2013	06538BSF1	2,200,000.0	0 A-1	P-1	01/14/13	01/15/13	2,198,093.33	0.26	0.00	2,199,300.88	2,199,443.40
NORDEA NORTH AMERICA INC COMM PAPER 0.000% 05/30/2013	6555P0SW0	4,000,000.0	0 A-1+	P-1	12/03/12	12/04/12	3,994,296.67	0.29	0.00	3,998,098.88	3,998,788.00
BARE OF TOKYO MITSUBISHI LTD COMM PARE 0.000% 06/12/2013	06538BTC7	2,590,000.0	0 A-1	P-1	02/12/13	02/12/13	2,587,841.67	0.25	0.00	2,588,705.00	2,588,873.35 2,588,873.35
TORTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP COMM PAGE 0.000% 07/10/2013	89233GUA2	2,590,000.0	0 A-1+	P-1	01/10/13	01/11/13	2,586,892.00	0.24	0.00	2,588,273.32	2,588,629.89

PFM Asset Management LLC

Account 03068500 Page 4

	X	11	1	h	
<u>I</u>	1d	IJ		l	l,
ľ					Į

Managed Account Detail of Securities Held

For the Month Ending March 31, 2013

ALAMEDA CNTY TRANSPORTA	TION AUTH	ORITY - 03	06850	0						
Security Type/Description Dated Date/Coupon/Maturity	CUSIP	Par	S&P Rating	Moody's Rating	Trade Date	Settle Date	Original Cost	YTM at Cost	Accrued Interest	Amortized Cost
Commercial Paper										
GENERAL ELEC CAP CORP COMM PAPER 0.000% 07/15/2013	36959HUF2	4,325,000.00	1 A-1+	P-1	01/14/13	01/15/13	4,319,998.62	0.23	0.00	4,322,098.66
US BANK NA COMM PAPER 0.000% 09/03/2013	9033E0W36	2,100,000.00	A-1+	P-1	03/07/13	03/08/13	2,098,120.50	0.18	0.00	2,098,372.50
Security Type Sub-Total		17,805,000.00					17,785,242.79	0.25	0.00	17,794,849.24
Certificate of Deposit										
RABOBANK NEDERLAND NV NY CERT DEPOS	21684BDW1	2,755,000.00) A-1+	P-1	02/01/13	02/04/13	2,755,368.77	0.24	1,591.01	2,755,240.51

2,097,309.90

17,795,791.22

4,322,746.68

Market Value 2,755,486.53

\$62,525,488.00

2,755,486.53 62,378,626.63 \$62,378,626.63 \$146,861.37 62,354,166.83 \$62,354,166.83 2,755,240.51 \$146,861.37 1,591.01 146,861.37 \$63,065,428.38 0.26% 0.24 0.26 2,755,368.77 63,065,428.38 62,115,000.00 \$62,115,000.00 2,755,000.00 DTD 01/14/2013 0.270% 07/15/2013 Managed Account Sub-Total Security Type Sub-Total Securities Sub-Total Accrued Interest

Total Investments

Account 03068500 Page 5

TY.	Alameda CTC- Alameda Cnty Trai Account #470	is Authority	Holdi A	ings Report s of 3/31/13					
CUSIP	Security Description	Par Value/Units	Purchase Date Book Yield	Cost Value Book Value	Mkt Price Mkt YTM	Market Value Accrued Int.	% of Port. Gain/Loss	Moody S&P	Maturity Duration
AGENCY				的影響和對於					「二月二日の日本」
3133XXYX9	FHLB Note 1.875% Due 6/21/2013	2,480,000.00	06/18/2012 0.25 %	2,520,324.80 2,488,900.02	100.40 0.08 %	2,489,907.60 12,916.67	8.44 % 1,007.58	Aaa AA+	0.22 0.22
31331JPK3	FFCB Note 1.375% Due 6/25/2013	2,500,000.00	06/18/2012 0.25 %	2,528,575.00 2,506,546.83	100.32 0.02 %	2,507,910.00 9,166.67	8.49 % 1,363.17	Aaa AA+	0.24 0.23
31398ASD5	FNMA Note 3.875% Due 7/12/2013	1,700,000.00	04/09/2009 2.24 %	1,811,683.20 1,707,344.74	101.09 0.01 %	1,718,451.80 14,455.90	5.85 % 11,107.06	Aaa AA+	0.28 0.28
880591DW9	Tennessee Valley Authority Note 4.75% Due 8/1/2013	4,000,000.00	Various 2.35 %	4,411,330.00 4,030,231.05	101.51 0.21 %	4,060,412.00 31,666.67	13.81 % 30,180.95	Aaa AA+	0.34 0.33
31331KZJ2	FFCB Note 0.35% Due 9/23/2013	1,500,000.00	03/22/2012 0.38 %	1,499,430.00 1,499,818.31	100.10 0.14 %	1,501,530.00 116.67	5.07 % 1,711.69	Aaa AA+	0.48 0.48
31331GCS6	FFCB Note 3.875% Due 10/7/2013	2,300,000.00	02/04/2009 2.89 %	2,397,934.00 2,310,856.03	101.95 0.11 %	2,344,744.20 43,077.08	8.06 % 33,888.17	Aaa AA+	0.52 0.51
3133XSAE8	FHLB Note 3.625% Due 10/18/2013	2,000,000.00	03/03/2009 2.69 %	2,080,600.00 2,009,544.11	101.91 0.14 %	2,038,116.00 32,826.39	6.99 % 28,571.89	Aaa AA+	0.55 0.54
3134A4UK8	FHLMC Note 4.875% Due 11/15/2013	2,500,000.00	01/08/2009 2.44 %	2,776,632.50 2,535,613.90	102.99 0.06 %	2,574,795.00 46,041.67	8.84 % 39,181.10	Aaa AA+	0.63 0.61
3137EACZ0	FHLMC Note 0.375% Due 11/27/2013	2,600,000.00	10/25/2012 0.24 %	2,603,848.00 2,602,326.25	100.14 0.17 %	2,603,520.40 3,358.33	8.80 % 1,194.15	Aaa AA+	0.66 0.65
31398A5W8	FNMA Note 0.75% Due 12/18/2013	2,600,000.00	05/23/2012 0.34 %	2,616,822,00 2,607,662,38	100.44 0.14 %	2,611,401.00 5,579.17	8.83 % 3,738.62	Aaa AA+	0.72 0.71
Total Agency		24,180,000.00	1.44 %	25,247,179.50 24,298,843.62	0.12 %	24,450,788.00 199,205.22	83.17 % 151,944.38	Aaa AA+	0.46 0.45
COMMERCIAL	L PAPER				有一世世界理由			the first of the	
4662J0SM5	JP Morgan Discount CP 0.28% Due 5/21/2013	1,060,000.00	11/20/2012 0.28 %	1,058,499.51 1,058,499.51	99.86 0.28 %	1,058,499.51 1,088.27	3.58 % 0.00	P-1 A-1	0.14 0.14
89233GTC0	Toyota Motor Credit Discount CP 0.31% Due 6/12/2013	1,150,000.00	10/11/2012 0.31 %	1,147,583.72 1,147,583.72	99.79 0.31 %	1,147,583.72 1,703.28	3.88 % 0.00	P-1 A-1+	0.20 0.20
Total Commen	rcial Paper	2,210,000.00	0.30 %	2,206,083.23 2,206,083.23	0.30 %	2,206,083.23 2,791.55	7.45 % 0.00	P1 P1	0.17 0.17
MONEY MAR	KET FUND FI		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	: : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :		and the state of the second	in the filler	CHARLEN PROVIDE	
48 114701	Highmark Govt Money Market Fund	183,031.28	Various 0.00 %	183,031.28 183,031.28	1.00 0.00 %	183,031.28 0.00	0.62 % 0.00	Aaa AAA	0.00 0.00
u Money II 216	Market Fund Fl	183,031.28	0.00 %	183,031.28 183,031.28	00.0	183,031.28 0.00	0.62 % 0.00	Aaa AAA	0.00
US CORPOR	ATE		建 动行业 1991年1991年199	PER TRANSFORME	医指数的 医		「「「「「「「「」」」	利用書書の	
91159HGW4	US Bancorp Note 2% Due 6/14/2013	1,175,000.00	09/13/2012 0.31 %	1,189,628.75 1,179,024.27	100.36 0.21 %	1,179,255.85 6,984.72	4.00 % 231.58	A+ 4	0.21 0.20

Execution Time: 4/2/2013 12:39:03 PM

Page 3

Chandler Asset Management - CONFIDENTIAL

|--|

Holdings Report As of 3/31/13

Alameda CTC- Alameda CI Account #470	ıty Trans Authority	Holc	lings Report As of 3/31/13					
CUSIP Security Description	Par Value/Units	Purchase Date Book Yield	Cost Value Book Value	Mkt Price Mkt YTM	Market Value Accrued Int.	% of Port. Gain/Loss	Moody S&P	Maturity Duration
Total US Corporate	1,175,000.00	0.31 %	1,189,628.75 1,179,024.27	0.21 %	1,179,255.85 6,984.72	4.00 % 231.58	A1 A+	0.21 0.20
US TREASURY						Balance Char		
912828PL8 US Treasury Note 0.75% Due 12/15/2013	1,400,000.00	Various 0.23 %	1,408,283.99 1,405,179.33	100.42 0.15 %	1,405,906.60 3,086.54	4.75 % 727.27	Aaa AA+	0.71 0.71
Total US Treasury	1,400,000.00	0.23 %	1,408,283.99 1,405,179.33	0.15 %	1,405,906.60 3,086.54	4.75 % 727.27	Aaa AA+	0.71 0.71
TOTAL PORTFOLIO	29,148,031.28	1.24 %	30,234,206.75 29,272,161.73	0.13 %	29,425,064.96 212,068.03	100.00 % 152,903.23	Aaa AA+	0.44 0.43
TOTAL MARKET VALUE PLUS ACCRUED					29,637,132.99			

	Z	1	11	h	
1	d.	6			h
ŋ			Π		J
2	ų			Į.	

Managed Account Detail of Securities Held

For the Month Ending March 31, 2013

	Street and a state of the second	A Colored a Color	and the second	NAME AND ADDRESS OF	C. THE SHEET		States - States	おけないののの			
ALAMEDA CNTY TRANSPORTA	ATION IMPRO	- HTUA VC	030685	510			And Andrews				
Security Type/Description Dated Date/Coupon/Maturity	CUSIP	Par	S&P I Rating	Moody's Rating	Trade Date	Settle Date	Original Cost	YTM at Cost	Accrued Interest	Amortized Cost	Market Value
U.S. Treasury Bond / Note											
US TREASURY NOTES DTD 04/30/2008 3.125% 04/30/2013	912828НҮ9	9,575,000.00	AA+	Aaa	04/26/12	04/27/12	9,857,013.67	0.20	125,638.81	9,597,419.00	9,597,817.23
US TREASURY NOTES DTD 06/30/2008 3.375% 06/30/2013	912828JD3	3,245,000.00	+AA+	Aaa	08/21/12	08/22/12	3,332,969.92	0.20	27,530.96	3,270,561.74	3,271,365.63
Security Type Sub-Total		12,820,000.00					13,189,983.59	0.20	153,169.77	12,867,980.74	12,869,182.86
Federal Agency Discount Note			1								
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS DISC NOTE 0.000% 09/20/2013	313385LY0	3,500,000.00	1 A-1+	P-1	03/28/13	04/01/13	3,497,826.11	0.13	0.00	3,497,826.11	3,497,531.38
Security Type Sub-Total		3,500,000.00					3,497,826.11	0.13	0.00	3,497,826.11	3,497,531.38
Federal Agency Bond / Note											
FANNIE MAE GLOBAL NOTES DTD 08/06/2010 1.000% 09/23/2013	31398A2S0	3,350,000.00	+A4	Ааа	08/21/12	08/22/12	3,377,034.50	0.26	744.44	3,361,901.98	3,363,611.05
FNMA NOTES DTD 11/01/2010 0.750% 12/18/2013	31398A5W8	3,400,000.0	D AA+	Ааа	08/21/12	08/22/12	3,421,216.00	0.28	7,295.83	3,411,464.22	3,414,909.00
Security Type Sub-Total		6,750,000.0					6,798,250.50	0.27	8,040.27	6,773,366.20	6,778,520.05
Commercial Paper											
TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP COMM PAPER 0.000% 07/01/2013	89233GU12	2,000,000.0	0 A-1+	P-1	01/02/13	01/02/13	1,997,700.00	0.23	0.00	1,998,837.22	1,999,114.00
USTEINK NA COMM PAPER	9033E0W36	2,730,000.0	0 A-1+	P-1	03/07/13	03/08/13	2,727,556.65	0.18	0.00	2,727,884.25	2,726,502.87
Security Type Sub-Total		4,730,000.0	0				4,725,256.65	0.20	0.00	4,726,721.47	4,725,616.87
ertificate of Deposit									42		



Account 03068510 Page 4

		Managed Acc	count D	etail of	Securiti	es Held		R	r the Month Ending	March 31, 2013
ALAMEDA CNTY TRANSPORTA	ATION IMP	ROV AUTH - 03068	510							
Security Type/Description Dated Date/Coupon/Maturity	CUSIP	S&P Par Rating	Moody's Rating	Trade Date	Settle Date	Original Cost	YTM at Cost	Accrued Interest	Amortized Cost	Market Value
Certificate of Deposit										
STANDARD CHARTERED BANK NY FLOATING CD DTD 10/12/2012 0.590% 04/12/2013	85325BRR7	4,500,000.00 A-1+	P-1	10/11/12	10/12/12	4,500,000.00	1.17	12,611.25	4,500,000.00	4,513,680.45
Security Type Sub-Total		4,500,000.00				4,500,000.00	1.17	12,611.25	4,500,000.00	4,513,680.45
Managed Account Sub-Total		32,300,000.00				32,711,316.85	0.34	173,821.29	32,365,894.52	32,384,531.61
Securities Sub-Total		\$32,300,000.00			¥7	:32,711,316.85	0.34%	\$173,821.29	\$32,365,894.52	\$32,384,531.61
Accrued Interest										\$173,821.29
Total Investments										\$32,558,352.90
bolded items are forward setuining diades.										

Page 268

23	Alameda CTC- Alameda Cnty Tr Account #471	ans Improv Author	^{it} y Holdi ^{As}	ngs Report of 3/31/13					
cusip	Security Description	F Par Value/Units	Purchase Date Book Yield	Cost Value Book Value	Mkt Price Mkt YTM	Market Value Accrued Int.	% of Port. Gain/Loss	Moody S&P	Maturity Duration
AGENCY					and State of the Party of the	How with surface			H A
3137EABM0	FHLMC Note 3.75% Due 6/28/2013	1,750,000.00	12/27/2011 0.29 %	1,840,510.00 1,764,534.45	100.86 0.17 %	1,765,120.00 16,953.13	8.48 % 585.55	Aaa AA+	0.24 0.24
313376J55	FHLB Note 0.375% Due 7/9/2013	1,750,000.00	12/05/2012 0.18 %	1,752,047.50 1,750,947.21	100.07 0.13 %	1,751,190.00 1,494.79	8.34 % 242.79	Aaa AA+	0.27 0.27
880591DW9	Tennessee Valley Authority Note 4.75% Due 8/1/2013	1,000,000.00	10/18/2012 0.22 %	1,035,533.00 1,015,104.62	101.51 0.21 %	1,015,103.00 7,916.67	4.87 % (1.62)	Aaa AA+	0.34 0.33
3135G0BR3	FNMA Note 0.5% Due 8/9/2013	1,500,000.00	10/31/2012 0.20 %	1,503,450.00 1,501,596.09	100.13 0.12 %	1,502,002.50 1,083.33	7.15 % 406.41	Aaa AA+	0.36 0.36
313379R76	FHLB Note 0.25% Due 9/6/2013	1,250,000.00	11/16/2012 0.21 %	1,250,425.00 1,250,230.76	100.05 0.13 %	1,250,636.25 989.58	5.96 % 405.49	Aaa AA+	0.44 0.43
31398A3L4	FNMA Callable Note 1X 3/17/11 1.125% Due 9/17/2013	1,225,000.00	11/16/2012 0.22 %	1,234,187.50 1,230,141.35	100.46 0.13 %	1,230,644.80 535.94	5.86 % 503.45	Aaa AA+	0.47 0.46
31398A2S0	FNMA Note 1% Due 9/23/2013	1,750,000.00	12/27/2011 0.35 %	1,769,600.00 1,755,401.57	100.41 0.15 %	1,757,110.25 388.89	8.37 % 1,708.68	Aaa AA+	0.48 0.48
31331GCS6	FFCB Note 3.875% Due 10/7/2013	1,000,000.00	11/15/2012 0.21 %	1,032,610.00 1,018,963.97	101.95 0.11 %	1,019,454.00 18,729.17	4.94 % 490.03	Aaa AA+	0.52 0.51
31398A4H2	FNMA Callable Note 1X 4/8/11 1.125% Due 10/8/2013	1,535,000.00	10/18/2012 0.21 %	1,548,584.75 1,542,270.71	100.51 0.14 %	1,542,871.48 8,298.59	7.38% 600.77	Aaa AA+	0.52 0.52
3134G23H3	FHLMC Note 0.5% Due 10/15/2013	1,650,000.00	10/31/2012 0.22 %	1,654,372.50 1,652,475.24	100.19 0.15 %	1,653,123.45 3,804.17	7.89 % 648.21	Aaa AA+	0.54 0.54
313371UC8	FHLB Note 0.875% Due 12/27/2013	1,780,000.00	12/16/2011 0.39 %	1,797,461.80 1,786,397.13	100.52 0.16 %	1,789,330.76 4,066.81	8.54 % 2,933.63	Aaa AA+	0.74 0.74
Total Agency		16,190,000.00	0.25 %	16,418,782.05 16,268,063.10	0.15 %	16,276,586.49 64,261.07	77.78 % 8,523.39	Aaa AA+	0.45 0.44
COMMERCIAL	PAPER				的这些论言有效	地理であり			
9033E0R40	US Bancorp Discount CP 0.22% Due 4/4/2013	300,000.00	10/04/2012 0.22 %	299,668.17 299,668.17	99.89 0.22 %	299,668.17 326.33	1.43 % 0.00	P-1 A-1+	0.01 0.01
36959HRP4	General Electric Capitial Corp Discount CP 0.23% Due 4/23/2013	350,000.00	10/23/2012 0.23 %	349,593.03 349,593.03	99.88 0.23 %	349,593.03 357.78	1.67 % 0.00	Р-1- А-1+	0.06
4662J0S11	JP Morgan Discount CP 0.3% Due 5/1/2013	350,000.00	10/23/2012 0.30 %	349,445.83 349,445.83	99.84 0.30 %	349,445.83 466.67	1.67 % 0.00	A-1 1	0.08 0.08
B B3GTC0	Toyota Motor Credit Discount CP 0.31% Due 6/12/2013	600,000.00	10/11/2012 0.31 %	598,739.33 598,739.33	99.79 0.31 %	598,739.33 888.67	2.85 % 0.00	P-1 A-1+	0.20
823GTL0	Toyota Motor Credit Discount CP 0.3% Due 6/20/2013	350,000.00	10/23/2012 0.30 %	349,300.00 349,300.00	99.80 0.30 %	349,300.00 466.67	1.66 % 0.00	P-1 A-1+	0.22 0.22
Total Commer	cial Paper	1,950,000.00	0.28 %	1,946,746.36 1,946,746.36	0.28 %	1,946,746.36 2,506.12	9.28 % 0.00	P. P.	0.13 0.13

~

Chandler Asset Management - CONFIDENTIAL

Page 3

Execution Time: 4/2/2013 12:39:07 PM

Alameda CTC- Alameda Cnty Trans Improv Authority Account #471

*

Holdings Report As of 3/31/13

cusip	Security Description	Par Value/Units	Purchase Date Book Yield	Cost Value Book Value	Mkt Price Mkt YTM	Market Value Accrued Int.	% of Port. Gain/Loss	Moody S&P	Maturity Duration
MONEY MARK	ET FUND FI		「「「「「「「」」」」					Renterior II	Section 2
431114701	Highmark Govt Money Market Fund	40,265.68	Various 0.00 %	40,265.68 40,265.68	1.00 0.00 %	40,265.68 0.00	0.19 % 0.00	Aaa AAA	0.00
Total Money M	arket Fund Fl	40,265.68	0.00 %	40,265.68 40,265.68	0.00 %	40,265.68 0.00	0.19 % 0.00	Aaa AAA	0.00
NEGOTIABLE	8								
89112X5J0	Toronto Dominion Bank Yankee CD 0.27% Due 4/15/2013	650,000.00	09/17/2012 0.25 %	650,075.70 650,005.05	100.00 0.25 %	650,005.05 955.50	3.10 % 0.00	P-1 A-1+	0.04 0.04
Total Negotiat	le CD	650,000.00	0.25 %	650,075.70 650,005.05	0.25 %	650,005.05 955.50	3.10 % 0.00	Aaa AAA	0.04 0.04
US CORPORA	TE STATE STATE STATE		いた (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)				的國家的影響		
931142AS2	Wal-Mart Stores Note 7.25% Due 6/1/2013	725,000.00	10/04/2012 0.21 %	757,704.75 733,525.60	101.09 0.68 %	732,904.68 17,520.83	3.57 % (620.92)	Aa2 AA	0.17 0.17
91159HGW4	US Bancorp Note 2% Due 6/14/2013	600,000.00	09/13/2012 0.31 %	607,470.00 602,054.94	100.36 0.21 %	602,173.20 3,566.67	2.88 % 118.26	A1 + A	0.21 0.20
594918AF1	Microsoft Note 0.875% Due 9/27/2013	670,000.00	12/07/2012 0.23 %	673,396.90 672,103.96	100.28 0.30 %	671,871.98 65.14	3.20 % (231.98)	Aaa AAA	0.49 0.49
Total US Corp	orate	1,995,000.00	0.25 %	2,038,571.65 2,007,684.50	0.42 %	2,006,949.86 21,152.64	9.65 % (734.64)	Aa2 AA	0.29 0.28
TOTAL PORTI	OLIO	20,825,265.68	0.25 %	21,094,441.44 20,912,764.69	0.19 %	20,920,553.44 88,875.33	100.00 % 7,788.75	Aaa AA+	0.39 0.39
TOTAL MARK	ET VALUE PLUS ACCRUED					21,009,428.77			



Memorandum

DATE: May 15, 2013

TO: Alameda County Transportation Commission

FROM: Finance and Administration Committee

SUBJECT: Approval of the Consolidated FY2012-13 Third Quarter Financial Report

Recommendation

It is recommended the Commission accept the attached Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) Consolidated FY2012-13 Third Quarter Financial Report.

Summary

At the end of third quarter the Alameda CTC is showing a net decrease in the overall fund balance in the amount of \$23.4 million mainly due to capital project related sales tax expenditures exceeding revenues.

The attached financial report has been prepared on a consolidated basis by governmental fund type including the General Funds, Special Revenue Funds, the Exchange Fund and the Capital Projects Funds to give an overview of the Alameda CTC's revenues and expenditures in comparison to the adopted budget.

General Fund

In the General Fund, the Alameda CTC's revenues are less than budget by \$1.1 million or 13.2% and expenditures are under budget by \$2.2 million or 26.3% (see attachment A). These variances are primarily due to the timing of office relocation expenses and a lower than projected cost for the Safe Routes to School program during this part of the fiscal year.

Special Revenue Funds

The Special Revenue Funds group is made up of Measure B Program funds including funds for express bus, paratransit service, bike and pedestrian, transit oriented development and pass-through funds as well as Transportation for Clean Air (TFCA) funds and Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) funds. In the Special Revenue Funds, the Alameda CTC's revenues are more than budget by \$3.1 million or 5.5% mostly due to actual sales tax and VRF revenues which were higher than projected (see attachment B). Expenditures in the Special Revenue Funds are \$3.6 million or 5.9% less than budget mostly due to timing of project expenses. The final close-out costs of several grant projects are anticipated to be recognized later in the fiscal year.

Exchange Fund

As of March 31, 2013, Exchange Fund revenues and expenditures were under budget by \$3.6 million and \$2.5 million respectively (see attachment C). Budget in this fund is only utilized on an as

needed basis as exchanges are established to accommodate other governmental agencies' needs.

Capital Projects Funds

The Capital Projects Funds incorporate all Alameda CTC capital projects whether they were originally projects of the Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority (ACTIA), the Alameda County Transportation Authority (ACTA) or the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACCMA). In the Capital Projects Funds, the Alameda CTC's revenues are less than budget by \$36.6 million or 39.1% and expenditures are less than budget by \$115.2 million or 58.4% (see attachment D). Expenses for ACTA's East/West Connector project were less than budgeted due to the deferral of right-of-way and subsequent construction phase expenditures. This project is experiencing a funding shortfall due to the outcome of Measure B1 and is awaiting other funding agreements. ACTIA related projects were also below budget with a large portion of the difference attributable to BART's reassessing the timing on the use of Measure B funds on the BART Warm Springs Extension project using other funding sources prior to Measure B; billing to ACTIA is expected to occur in July after BART exhausts its current funding source. ACCMA related capital project costs for the I-80 Integrated Corridor Mobility project got off to a slower start than originally anticipated; preliminary work began just last month and invoices have not yet been received producing a lower than budgeted expense. Since we implemented a rolling capital budget system last fiscal year, any unused approved budget will be available to pay for costs in the next fiscal year. Additional budget authority will be requested by project only as needed.

ACTIA Limitations Calculations

Staff has made the calculations required in ACTIA's Transportation Expenditure Plan related to salary and benefits and administration. The Salary and Benefits Limitation ratio of 0.71% and Administrative Cost Limitation ratio of 2.60% were calculated based on actual expenditures and were found to be in compliance with the requirements of 1.0% and 4.5%, respectively (see attachment E).

Discussion

The Alameda CTC is in a strong position compared to budget after the third quarter of the fiscal year and remains sustainable. Sales tax revenues for FY2012-13 were projected with a conservative increase over the FY2011-12 budget because final receipts had not been received. However, based on actual receipts to date, sales tax revenues are exceeding the original projection by approximately 7.12%. The increase in sales tax revenues over the last several months reflects positive changes in the economy in Alameda County. Staff is presenting an adjustment to the sales tax budget concurrently at this meeting to increase the projection by 7.14% for this fiscal year to \$119 million.

Attachment(s)

Attachment A:	Alameda CTC General Fund Revenues/Expenditures Actual vs. Budget as of
	March 31, 2013
Attachment B:	Alameda CTC Special Revenue Funds Revenues/Expenditures Actual vs.
	Budget as of March 31, 2013
Attachment C:	Alameda CTC Exchange Fund Revenues/Expenditures Actual vs. Budget as
	of March 31, 2013
Attachment D:	Alameda CTC Capital Project Fund Revenues/Expenditures Actual vs. Budget
	as of March 31, 2013
Attachment E:	ACTIA Fiscal Year 2012-2013 Budget Limitations Calculations as of
	March 31, 2013

Alameda CTC General Fund Revenues/Expenditures Actual vs Budget as of March 31, 2013

Attachment A

					ļ	Favorable
	Y	TD Actuals	YTD Budget	% Used	(U	nfavorable) Variance
		TD Actuals	The Budget	/00004		Variance
Revenues:						
Sales Tax Revenues	\$	3,973,307	\$ 3,780,000	105.11%	\$	193,307
Investment Income		15,838	-	-		15,838
Member Agency Fees		1,046,114	1,046,114	100.00%		-
VRF Funds		148,283	-	-		148,283
Other Revenues		293,099	676,541	43.32%		(383,441)
Grants		1,952,574	3,052,244	63.97%		(1,099,671)
Total Revenues	\$	7,429,213	\$ 8,554,899		\$	(1,125,685)
Expenditures:						
Administration						
Salaries and Benefits		2,212,842	2,076,482	106.57%		(136,360)
General Office Expenses		1,133,503	1,766,218	64.18%		632,715
Other Administration		780,425	1,027,283	75.97%		246,859
Commission and Community Support		119,692	201,272	59.47%		81,580
Contingency		-	131,250	0.00%		131,250
Planning						
CWTP/Transportation Expenditure Plan		1,152,178	892,664	129.07%		(259,514)
Congestion Management Program		110,511	274,810	40.21%		164,298
Other Planning Projects		34,851	618,816	5.63%		583,965
Programs						
Programs Management		417,199	652,097	63.98%		234,897
Safe Routes to School Programs		657,870	1,332,972	49.35%		675,102
Other Programming		54,854	83,599	65.62%		28,744
Indirect Cost Recovery/Allocation						
Indirect Cost Recovery from Capital, Spec Rev & Exch Funds		(502,387)	(683,546)	73.50%		(181,158)
Total Expenditures	\$	6,171,539	\$ 8,373,917		\$	2,202,378
Net revenue over / (under) expenditures	\$	1,257,674	\$ 180,982			

Alameda CTC Special Revenue Funds Revenue/Expenditures Actual vs Budget as of March 31, 2013

						ו (U	Favorable nfavorable)
	Y	TD Actuals	Y	TD Budget	% Used		Variance
Revenues:							
Sales Tax Revenues	\$	50,509,118	\$	48,051,780	105.11%	\$	2,457,338
Investment Income		31,594		-	-		31,594
VRF Funds		8,704,585		8,047,125	108.17%		657,460
Other Revenues		1,405,146		1,416,341	99.21%		(11,195)
Grants		60,353		56,236	107.32%		4,117
Total Revenues	\$	60,710,796	\$	57,571,482		\$	3,139,314
Expenditures:							
Administration							
Salaries and Benefits		401,011		506,585	79.16%		105,575
General Office Expenses		4,252		19,575	21.72%		15,323
Other Administration		2,836		10,868	26.10%		8,032
Commission and Community Support		11,554		25,875	44.65%		14,322
<u>Planning</u>							
Other Planning Projects		23,724		57,315	41.39%		33,591
Programs							
Programs Management		639,101		790,759	80.82%		151,658
VRF Programming and Other Costs		5,206,750		6,864,831	75.85%		1,658,081
Measure B Pass-Through		47,261,314		45,069,633	104.86%		(2,191,681)
Grant Awards		2,503,530		5,428,822	46.12%		2,925,292
Other Programming		1,031,364		1,880,374	54.85%		849,010
Total Expenditures	\$	57,085,435	\$	60,654,636		\$	3,569,201
Net revenue over / (under) expenditures	\$	3,625,361	\$	(3,083,154)			

Alameda CTC Exchange Fund Revenue/Expenditures Actual vs Budget as of March 31, 2013

					(۱	Favorable Jnfavorable)
		YTD Actuals	YTD Budget	% Used		Variance
Revenues:						
Exchange Program Funds		\$ 81,034	\$ 3,712,500	2.18%	\$	(3,631,466)
Interest Revenue		10,287	-	-		10,287
	Total Revenues	\$ 91,321	\$ 3,712,500		\$	(3,621,179)
Expenditures:						
Salaries		21,253	38,510	55.19%		17,256
Programming Funds		3,430,012	5,873,200	58.40%		2,443,188
	Total Expenditures	\$ 3,451,265	\$ 5,911,709		\$	2,460,444
Net revenue over /	(under) expenditures	\$ (3,359,944)	\$ (2,199,209)			

Alameda CTC Capital Project Fund Revenues/Expenditures Actual vs Budget as of March 31, 2013

Attachment D

						Favorable
						(Unfavorable)
	、	TD Actuals	``	TD Budget	% llsod	Variance
PEVENIJES		TD Actuals		TD Buuget	78 USeu	Variance
Sales Tax Revenues	¢	33 813 283	¢	32 168 220	105 11%	\$ 1.645.063
Investment Income	Ψ	1 030 637	Ψ	003 750	115 04%	135 887
V/PE Funde		175 8/1		903,730 702 645	22 180/	(616 804)
Other Poyonues		2 673 541		7 92,043 5 658 856	ZZ.10%	(010,004)
Grante		10 208 872		54 127 601	47.23%	(2,905,515)
	201 C	57 011 175	¢	03 651 071	35.07%	(34,010,727)
	ΙΕ Φ	57,011,175	φ	93,031,071	•	¢ (30,039,090)
Administration						
Salaries and Benefits		256 906		20/ 513	87 23%	37 607
Conoral Office Expenses		200,900		234,313	70 33%	68 583
Other Administration		035 /73		1 173 167	70.33%	237 603
Commission and Community Support		933,473		19 521	19.1470 52.05%	237,093
		9,000		10,521	0.00%	0,713
Contingency Conital Projects		-		10,750	0.00%	10,750
Capital Expanditures		70 402		27 7/2	210 61%	(11 740)
L 200 Mod Bto 262 Mission Pl		207 701		JI,143	210.0170	(41,743)
Pouto 84 Fromont & Union City		207,791		400,700	44.52%	200,977
EAN Connector Proj. In N. From		(100)		-	-	16 654 205
E/W Connector Proj. In N. Frem Pto. 229 Corridor Improvement		002,799		17,457,095	4.00%	10,004,290
L 590/Padwood Pood Interchange		11,402,007		1 244 777	97.09%	1 240,372
1-500/Redwood Road Interchange		-		750 000	0.00%	750,000
Control Alamada County Frankov		- 96 620		1 240 592	6.429/	1 262 051
		80,030		1,349,302	0.4270	1,202,951
ACE Capital Improvements		1 800 205		5 047 000	35 66%	3 247 704
ROL Capital Improvements		7 551 055		23 564 023	32.00%	16 012 060
BART Wallin Splings Extension BART Oakland Airport Connector		22 000 000		23,304,923	05 30%	1 094 347
Downtown Oakland Strootscano		22,000,000		23,004,347	93.30 %	2 827 025
Tolograph Avenue Rus Rapid Transit		650 216		2,037,023	24 020/	2,037,023
		1 050,310		7 221 194	24.93%	5 280 865
Iron Horso Trail		1,950,510		272 522	20.97 %	372 522
I-880/Broadway-Jackson Interchange				1 806 330	0.00%	1 896 330
L 580/Castro Vally Interchange Improve		136 400		1,090,000	10.00%	1,090,330
Lowelling/East Lowelling Blvd Widening		6 004		1,340,000	1 2/10/	1,204,390
Leveling/Last Leveling Divid Widening		0,004		534 000	0.00%	534 000
1-580 Aux Lane-WB Airway to Fallon		8/ 325		1 631 047	5 17%	1 5/6 722
1-580 Aux Lane-FB CI Charro to Airway		04,020		33 750	0.00%	33 750
Pto 02/Clawiter Whitesell Interchange		184 503		3 197 500	5 70%	3 002 007
Hesperian Blyd/Lewlling Blyd Widening		104,505		<i>1/</i> 0 717	0.00%	3,002,337
Westgate Parkway Extension				1 630 388	0.00%	1 630 388
F 1/th/Hesperian/150th Improvements		17/ 120		1,030,300	0.00%	1,030,300
L. 1417/Hespenary 130(11) Inprovements		174,129		5/3/0/	0.81%	530 106
L680/L880 Cross Connector Study		4,500		360 388	0.01%	360 388
Isabel Avenue - 84/L580 Interchange		4 107 535		9 110 <i>1</i> 20	51 75%	2 012 804
Pouto 84 Expressivav		4,197,333		0,110,430	51.75%	1 599 225
Nucle of Explessway		4,705,517		9,373,332	51.05 /o 6.069/	4,000,200
L 590 Corridor/PAPT to Livermore Study		140,907		2,437,009	0.00%	2,300,002
1-300 COMUDIART TO LIVERINDLE SLUDY		040 07F		2,449,007 1 005 600	00.3170	402,220
1-ou integrated Control Mobility		010,070		1,000,003	01.30%	107,000
CWTP/TED Dovelopment		070,000		101,077	124.09%	(100,923)
Studios at Concepted Sec/Les at CMD		-		37,500	0.00%	37,500
Studies at Congested Seg/Loc on CIVIP		-		600,000	0.00%	600,000

Alameda CTC Capital Project Fund Revenues/Expenditures Actual vs Budget as of March 31, 2013

				Favorable (Unfavorable)
	YTD Actuals	YTD Budget	% Used	Variance
ACCMA				
I-680 Sunol Express Lanes-Southbound	1,187,045	4,618,382	25.70%	3,431,337
Center to Center	(7,998)	428,384	-1.87%	436,382
Route 24 Caldecott Tunnel Settlement	343,211	1,312,500	26.15%	969,289
I-880 North Safety & Oper Impr @ 23rd/29th	3,060,446	6,116,348	50.04%	3,055,901
I-580 EB HOV Lane - CMIA	(56,928)	, , , -	-	56,928
I-580 Environmental Mitigation	963,341	1,144,976	84.14%	181,636
I-580 EB Express (HOT) Lane	716,470	2,077,088	34.49%	1,360,617
I-580 EB Auxiliary (AUX) Lane	502,683	4,460,458	11.27%	3,957,775
I-680 Sunol Express Lanes-Northbound	1,750,350	4,035,908	43.37%	2,285,558
I-580 Corridor ROW Preservation	21,757	602,864	3.61%	581,107
I-580 Westbound HOV Lane	3,109,244	3,829,153	81.20%	719,909
I-580 Westbound HOT Lane	352,421	2,530,646	13.93%	2,178,225
Altamont Commuter Express-Operations	5,875	16,875	34.82%	11,000
Altamont Commuter Express	1,683,960	5,420,743	31.07%	3,736,782
I-880 Southbound HOV Lane	900,819	3,845,423	23.43%	2,944,604
I-880 Southbound HOV Lane Landscaping	14,990	246,564	6.08%	231,574
I-580 PSR at 106th EB Off-Ramp	1,204	94,785	1.27%	93,581
Webster Street SMART Corridor	89,859	1,476,000	6.09%	1,386,141
Marina Boulevard/I-880 PSR	39,988	206,358	19.38%	166,370
I-580 Landscaping San Leandro	(1,566)	· -	-	1,566
I-80 Gilman Interchange Improvements	128,630	1,389,466	9.26%	1,260,836
I-680/I-880 Cross Connector PSR	6,010	267,000	2.25%	260,990
I-680 SB HOV Lane	-	98,252	0.00%	98,252
I-580 Soundwall Design	175,982	581,625	30.26%	405,643
I-80 Integrated Corridor Mobility	5,475,565	13,456,874	40.69%	7,981,309
SMART Corridors Operation and Management	219,411	717,645	30.57%	498,234
SMART Corridors O&M / Tri-Valley	1,473	36,464	4.04%	34,991
Total Expenditures	\$ 81,966,203	\$ 197,193,100	_	\$ 115,226,897
Net revenue over / (under) expenditures	\$ (24,955,028)	\$ (103,542,029 <u>)</u>		

Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority Fiscal Year 2012-2013 Budget Limitations Calculations As of March 31, 2013

Net Sales Tax	\$ 88,295,707.49 A	
Investments & Other Income	1,689,618.29B	
Funds Generated	89,985,325.78 C	
Salaries & Benefits	624,040.82 D	
Other Admin Costs	1,675,457.19 E	
Total Admin Costs	\$ 2,299,498.01 F	
Gross Admin Sal & Ben to Net Sales Tax	0.7068% = D/A	
Gross Admin Sal & Ben to Funds Generated	0.6935% = D/C	
Total Admin Costs to Net Sales Tax	2.6043% = F/A	


1333 Broadway, Suites 220 & 300

Oakland, CA 94612

PH: (510) 208-7400

www.AlamedaCTC.org

Alameda CTC Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes Thursday, April 11, 2013, 5:30 p.m., 1333 Broadway, Suite 300, Oakland

Attendence Key (A - Abcent D - Drecent)

	Allendance Key (A = Al	Jsent, P = Present)
Memb	pers:	
Р	Midori Tabata, Chair	<u>P</u> Lucy Gigli
Р	Ann Welsh, Vice Chair	P Jeremy Johansen
P	Mike Ansell	P Preston Jordan
A	Mike Bucci	P Heath Maddox
P	Alex Chen	<u>P</u> Sara Zimmerman
Staff:		
Α	Beth Walukas, Deputy Director of Planning	P Matt Todd, Principal Transportation Engineer
Р	Rochelle Wheeler, Bicycle and Pedestrian	P Vivek Bhat, Senior Transportation Engineer
	Coordinator	<u>P</u> Angie Ayers, Acumen Building Enterprise, Inc.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Midori Tabata, BPAC Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. The meeting began with introductions and a review of the meeting outcomes.

Guests Present: Matthew Bomberg, Alameda CTC; Nicole Schneider, Alameda CTC; Tony Dang, California Walks; Robert Prinz, East Bay Bicycle Coalition (EBBC)

2. Public Comment

Tony Dang with California Walks urged the Alameda CTC BPAC to weigh in on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Revised Policies and Procedures for Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 projects. He stated that MTC is proposing to remove the provision that requires Bicycle and Pedestrian Committees to review TDA projects. Tony stated that it would be helpful if Alameda CTC's BPAC became involved in the revisions of the document. The BPAC members requested staff place this item on the agenda for the next BPAC meeting.

3. Approval of February 7, 2013 Minutes

Sara Zimmerman moved to approve the February 7, 2013 minutes as written. Preston Jordan seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (9-0).

4. Coordinated Funding Program Call for Projects

A. Discuss BPAC Review Process and Summary of Applications Received

Matt Todd provided an overview of the Coordinated Funding Program process and current status of applications received in this funding cycle. He informed the committee of the amount of money each fund source will provide to the program, which will total \$65 million. Matt stated that Alameda CTC received 69 applications on March 15, 2013 requesting a total of \$122 million. He also provided a breakdown of the projects that

were requesting One Bay Area Grant (OBAG)/Priority Development Area (PDA) supportive funds, OBAG/Local Streets and Roads (LSR) funds, and Measure B and Vehicle Registration Funds (VRF) funds. Matt mentioned that the next steps will be to present a draft program of projects to the committees and Commission in May and a final program for approval in June 2013. He informed the committee that MTC requires a final program of projects from Alameda CTC by June 30, 2013.

Matt reviewed the BPAC role in this funding cycle, which is to review and provide comments on the MTC complete streets checklists and to give input on the overall package of projects recommended for funding. He described how the BPAC questions and comments received as of April 3rd had been shared with all of the internal agency review team members.

Rochelle Wheeler reviewed the Coordinated Funding Program process timeline with due dates, which lists the activities for Alameda CTC staff and BPAC members. She stated that BPAC had provided the first round of input and questions that Alameda CTC would be forwarding to the applicants. Rochelle stated that staff will bring the applicants' responses to BPAC's May meeting. Rochelle stated that the goal for this agenda item is for BPAC to provide further input and questions on projects and the MTC checklists.

The BPAC provided many comments, and some questions, on the submitted projects and checklists. Overall, BPAC members stated that the information they received to make an informed assessment of the projects being reviewed was very limited. The committee inquired if staff could provide them with additional information, at a minimum, the project applications electronically. Staff informed the committee that it would be sending additional application information to members and that members are welcome to view the applications and the various attachments at the Alameda CTC offices. BPAC requested that in the future it would be helpful if staff would provide BPAC with the application information electronically.

B. Develop Questions on MTC Complete Streets Checklists for One Bay Area Grant Projects

The discussion for agenda item 4B was incorporated into the discussion on agenda item 4A.

5. Recommend Continuation of Bicycle Safety Education Program

Rochelle requested that the BPAC recommend that the Alameda CTC Commission approve the continuation of the Countywide Bicycle Safety Education Program and take the following actions related to the program:

- Use up to \$300,000 of Measure B Bicycle and Pedestrian Countywide Discretionary Funds (CDF) for three years.
- Approve the inclusion of the Bicycle Safety Education Program services in the Safe Routes to Schools (SR2S) request for proposals.
- Approve the request to extend the agreement expiration date for the Measure B Bicycle and Pedestrian CDF grant for up to three months, if needed, to allow the program services to continue for a transition of vendors.

BPAC stated that overall, the Bicycle Safety Education Program is worthwhile for Alameda County, and the scope of work is sufficiently detailed.

Preston Jordan moved to approve that BPAC recommend the Alameda CTC Commission approve the aforementioned items to continue the Countywide Bicycle Safety Education Program. Jeremy Johansen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (9-0).

6. Review of TDA Article 3 Projects

Rochelle informed the committee that one role of the BPAC is to review and provide input on TDA Article 3 projects in Alameda County, upon request by local jurisdictions. She stated that the BPAC review has been requested to review five projects submitted by three local jurisdictions for funding in fiscal year 2013-2014. She noted that all projects submitted for TDA Article 3 funding in this funding cycle are listed in the agenda packet.

Rochelle clarified the TDA Article 3 Guidelines regarding BPAC's review and input on TDA Article 3 projects. She stated that local jurisdictions with a BPAC usually review their own projects. For jurisdictions that do not have a BPAC, Alameda CTC's Countywide BPAC review the projects, upon request. The BPAC does not review the full set of all projects submitted for funding in the county.

Questions/feedback from the members:

The BPAC reviewed and provided input on following projects:

- Alameda County's Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety Education Program: A member requested that this program assess the effectiveness of Bike to Work Day, like was done in Seattle. Rochelle noted that Alameda CTC has done a Bike to Work Day assessment in Alameda County.
- Alameda County's Pedestrian Improvements at Various Locations: A member inquired about addressing the lack of sidewalks in Castro Valley, near the medical center and high school, which was presented at a prior BPAC meeting and requested that the county review that comment to determine if the TDA funds could be used in this area.
- Members noted that some cities have a lot of TDA Article 3 funds carried over from previous years. Does Alameda CTC track what they do with the funds? Staff does not track the amount of fund reserves, but Rochelle noted that many jurisdictions build up their funds, which are relatively small, to use for funding larger-scale projects.

Rochelle stated that she will pass along the project-specific input to the project sponsors.

7. Update on Complete Streets Local Policy Adoption

Rochelle informed BPAC that all jurisdictions in Alameda County have a complete streets policy as of March 19th. She stated that Alameda CTC created a web page to link to these polices. Rochelle mentioned that staff will review the final complete streets polices submitted to ensure that they are compliant with the Alameda CTC policy requirements.

8. Board Actions/Staff Reports

A. General

Rochelle informed the committee that Bike to Work Day is scheduled for May 9, 2013. She announced that MTC is hosting a Complete Streets Workshop on May 13, 2013 in Oakland, which is focused on design and implementation of complete streets.

Rochelle asked BPAC members if they are interested in moving the May and June meeting dates to allow additional time to review the Coordinated Funding Program list of projects. The BPAC members were in favor of moving the dates. Rochelle stated that Angie Ayers would poll the members for the best meeting dates in May and June.

9. BPAC Members Reports

Lucy Gigli informed the committee that a Measure B bicycle/pedestrian grant had funded a feasibility study for the City of Alameda's Estuary Crossing several years ago. She announced that Caltrans is in the process of finalizing a project to improve the Posey Tube without considering the recommendations in the completed feasibility study. Lucy solicited feedback from BPAC and staff for a contact at Caltrans who can provide assistance. Midori and Rochelle stated Caltrans has Bicycle and Pedestrian Committees that may be a good source for assistance and suggested that Lucy contact Beth Thomas of Caltrans, who is the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committees.

Ann Welsh informed the committee that she attended a preliminary outreach meeting that sought citizens' input on an improvement project for Crow Canyon Road. She solicited feedback and input from the committee. Ann noted that she will attend future meetings.

Preston Jordan informed the committee that he read an article that a Chinese firm has invested in the Oak to Ninth project that will produce over 1,000 new housing units in the City of Oakland. He noted that this development project is one reason that the Lake Merritt Channel feasibility study project, submitted for the Coordinated Funding Program, would be beneficial.

Sara Zimmerman informed the committee that her organization, Change Lab Solutions, is working on a Bike Policy Guide intended to provide local and government organizations with examples of policies that support bicycling. They are looking for feedback and Sara offered to send the draft guide to anyone interested in reviewing it.

Midori Tabata informed the committee that the City of Hayward invited her to its March city council meeting where a Bike to Work Day proclamation was read. She also noted that the City of Dublin is further exploring a possible road diet project on Dublin Boulevard, in response to requests from local residents.

Mike Ansell noted that Livermore will have two energizer stations for Bike to Work Day this year, more than ever before.

10. Meeting Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Alameda County Transportation Commission <u>Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee</u> Roster and Attendance Fiscal Year 2012/2013

	Suffix	Last Name	First Name	City	Appointed By	Term Began	Re- apptmt.	Term Expires	Mtgs Missed Since Jul '12*
-	Ms.	Tabata, Chair	Midori	Oakland	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-4	Jul-06	Oct-11	Oct-13	0
2	Ms.	Welsh, Vice-Chair	Ann	Pleasanton	Alameda County Supervisor Nate Miley, District 4	Oct-09	Jan-12	Jan-14	1
с	Mr.	Ansell	Mike	Livermore	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-1	Sep-12		Sep-14	0
4	Mr.	Bucci	Mike	Newark	Alameda County Supervisor Richard Valle, District 2	Sep-12		Sep-14	~
2 2	Mr.	Chen	Alexander	Fremont	Alameda County Supervisor Scott Haggerty, District 1	Oct-09	Jan-12	Jan-14	2
9	Ms.	Gigli	Lucy	Alameda	Alameda County Supervisor Wilma Chan, District 3	Jan-07	Oct-12	Oct-14	٢
7	Mr.	Johansen	Jeremy	San Leandro	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-3	Sep-10	Oct-11	Oct-13	0
ø	Mr.	Jordan	Preston	Albany	Alameda County Supervisor Keith Carson, District 5	Oct-08	Sep-12	Sep-14	2
o	Mr.	Maddox	Heath	Berkeley	Transit Agency (Alameda CTC)	Sep-12		Sep-14	0
10	Ms.	Zimmerman	Sara	Berkeley	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-5	Feb-12		Feb-14	2
11		Vacancy			Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-2				

This page intentionally left blank

Alameda County Transportation Commission <u>Citizen Advisory Committee</u> Roster - Fiscal Year 2012/2013

	Title	Last Name	First Name	City	Appointed By	Term Began	Re-apptmt.	Term Expires	Mtgs Missed Since July '12*
-	Mr.	Ferrier, Chair	Barry	Union City	City of Union City Mayor Carol Dutra-Vernaci	Jan-04	Apr-12	Apr-14	0
2	Ms.	Dorsey, Vice-Chair	Cynthia	Oakland	Alameda County Supervisor Keith Carson, D-5	Feb-02	Apr-12	Apr-14	0
3	Ms.	Chinn	Val	Hayward	City of Livermore Mayor John Marchand	Dec-99	Jan-12	Jan-14	0
4	Ms.	Hilliard	Frances	Oakland	City of Oakland Vice Mayor Larry Ried	Jun-02	Mar-13	Mar-15	0
5	Mr.	Jefferson	Alton	San Leandro	Alameda County Supervisor Wilma Chan, D-3	Sep-08	Jan-13	Jan-15	1
6	Dr.	Jindal	Roop	Hayward	Alameda County Supervisor Scott Haggerty, D-1	Oct-03	Jan-12	Jan-14	0
7	Mr.	Jones	Steven	Dublin	City of Dublin Mayor Tim Sbranti	Apr-13		Apr-15	0
8	Ms.	LePell	Audrey	Hayward	City of Hayward Councilmember Marvin Peixoto	May-04	Jan-12	Jan-14	0
6	Mr.	Mann	Harpal	Union City	Alameda County Supervisor Richard Valle, D-2	Mar-11	Mar-13	Mar-15	1
10	Mr.	Murray	AI G.	Berkeley	City of Berkeley Councilmember Laurie Capitelli	Oct-12		Oct-14	0
11	Mr.	Posson	Mark	Pleasanton	City of Pleasanton Mayor Jerry Thorne	Jan-12		Jan-14	0
12	Ms.	Powell	Michelle	Fremont	City of Fremont Councilmember Suzanne Chan	Jan-12		Jan-14	0
13	Mr.	Scheuerman	John	Emeryville	City of Emeryville Councilmember Ruth Atkin	Sep-12		Sep-14	0

Page 289

Alameda CTC Meeting 05/23/13 Agenda Item 7B

Alameda County Transportation Commission	Citizen Advisory Committee	Roster - Fiscal Year 2012/2013
---	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------

		I							
Title Last Name First Na	Last Name First Na	First Na	me	City	Appointed By	Term Began	Re-apptmt.	Term Expires	Mtgs Missed Since July '12
Ms. Diane Shaw	Diane Shaw	Shaw		Fremont	AC Transit Director Greg Harper	Jul-12		Jul-14	0
Mr. John Knox White	John Knox White	White		Alameda	City of Alameda Vice Mayor Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft	Apr-13		Apr-15	0
Vacancy	Vacancy				Alameda County Supervisor Nate Miley, D-4				
Vacancy	Vacancy				BART Director Tom Blalock				
Vacancy	Vacancy				City of Albany Mayor Peggy Thomsen				
Vacancy	Vacancy				City of Newark Councilmember Luis Freitas				
Vacancy	Vacancy				City of Oakland Councilmember Rebecca Kaplan				
Vacancy	Vacancy				City of Piedmont Mayor John Chiang				
Vacancy	Vacancy				City of San Leandro Vice Mayor Michael Gregory				

Alameda County Transportation Commission <u>Citizens Watchdog Committee</u> Roster - Fiscal Year 2012-2013

	Title	Last	First	City	Appointed By	Term Began	Re-apptmt.	Term Expires	Mtgs Missed Since July '12*
-	Mr.	Paxson, Chair	James	Pleasanton	East Bay Economic Development Alliance	Apr-01		N/A	0
2	Ms.	Saunders, Vice-Chair	Harriette	Alameda	Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee	Jul-09		N/A	٢
3	Ms.	Brady	Petra Olivia	Oakland	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-4	Oct-11		Oct-13	2
4	Mr.	Dubinsky	Peter "Mike"	Fremont	Alameda County Supervisor Richard Valle, D-2	Oct-10	Mar-13	Mar-15	0
5	Mr.	Geen	Arthur B.	Oakland	Alameda County Taxpayers Association	Jan-01		N/A	e
9	Ms.	Sandra	Hamlat	Oakland	East Bay Bicycle Coalition	Apr-13		N/A	0
7	Mr.	Haussener	James	Castro Valley	Alameda County Supervisor Nate Miley, D-4	Feb-10	Sep-12	Sep-14	0
8	Mr.	Jones	Steven	Dublin	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-1	Dec-12		Dec-14	0
6	Mr.	Klinke	William	Berkeley	Alameda Labor Council AFL-CIO	Feb-13		N/A	0
10	Ms.	Lew	Jo Ann	Union City	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-2	Oct-07	Oct-11	Oct-13	0
11	Ms.	Taylor	Deborah	Oakland	Alameda County Supervisor Wilma Chan, D-3	Jan-13		Jan-15	0
12	Mr.	Zukas	Hale	Berkeley	Alameda County Supervisor Keith Carson, D-5	90-un	Apr-12	Apr-14	0
13		Vacancy			Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-3				
14		<mark>Vacancy</mark>			Alameda County Mayors' Confernece, D-5				
15		Vacancy			Alameda County Supervisor Scott Haggerty, D-1				
16		Vacancy			League of Women Voters				
17		Vacancy			Sierra Club				

Alameda CTC Meeting 05/23/13 Agenda Item 7C

Page 291

This page intentionally left blank



1333 Broadway, Suites 220 & 300

Oakland, CA 94612

PH: (510) 208-7400

www.AlamedaCTC.org

Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee Meeting Minutes Monday, February 25, 2013, 1 p.m., 1333 Broadway, Suite 300, Oakland

Attendance Key (A = Absent, P = Present) Members: P Sylvia Stadmire, P Sandra Johnson-P Carmen Rivera-Chair Simon Hendrickson P Will Scott, P Michelle Rousey P Gaye Lenahan Vice-Chair P Jane Lewis P Harriette P Aydan Aysoy P Jonah Markowitz Saunders A Larry Bunn P Rev. Carolyn Orr P Esther Waltz P Shawn Costello P Suzanne Ortt P Hale Zukas P Herb Hastings P Sharon Powers <u>A</u> Joyce Jacobson P Vanessa Proee Staff: A Matt Todd, Principal <u>A</u> John Nguyen, Hatch Mott **Transportation Engineer** MacDonald P John Hemiup, Senior P Krystle Pasco, Paratransit **Coordination Team Transportation Engineer** P Naomi Armenta, Paratransit P Margaret Strubel, Acumen Coordinator Building Enterprise, Inc. P Danielle Rose, Nelson/Nygaard

1. Welcome and Introductions

Sylvia Stadmire called the meeting to order at 1 p.m. The meeting began with introductions and a review of the meeting outcomes.

Guests Present: Jennifer Cullen, Senior Support Program of the Tri-Valley

2. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

3. Approval of January 28, 2013 Meeting Minutes

Esther Waltz moved to approve the PAPCO January 28, 2013 minutes. Shawn Costello seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously (18-0).

4. Begin to establish Finance and Program Plan Review Subcommittees Membership

Naomi Armenta stated PAPCO members are being asked to volunteer to be appointed to the Fiduciary Training and Finance Subcommittee, which will take place on Friday, March 22, 2013, from 1 to 3 p.m. at the Alameda CTC. The committee will discuss PAPCO's fiduciary responsibilities and review the base program plans and compliance reports and identify any issues and questions for programs. The Fiduciary Training and Finance Subcommittee is a part of the Program Plan Review process and appointed members will be expected to attend both subcommittees. Since this is a standing subcommittee, appointed PAPCO members will receive a per diem.

The following PAPCO members volunteered to serve on the Finance subcommittee:

- Shawn Costello
- Joyce Jacobson
- Rev. Carolyn Orr
- Sharon Powers
- Carmen Rivera-Hendrickson
- Michelle Rousey
- Harriette Saunders
- Will Scott
- Sylvia Stadmire
- Esther Waltz

Naomi then asked for members to volunteer to be appointed to the Program Plan Review Subcommittees. Program Plan Review is a primary PAPCO responsibility. According to the bylaws, members will review mandated and non-mandated services for cost effectiveness and adequacy of service levels and to make recommendations to the board for requests for funding. This year, PAPCO will be responsible for reviewing and recommending funding for the Measure B-funded paratransit program totaling more than \$10.2 million.

Final recommendations will go before the PAPCO in April for final approval before going to the Commission. Appointed members will be responsible for carefully reviewing extensive materials provided prior to the meetings and coming prepared with comments and questions. The Program Plan Review Subcommittee meetings are scheduled for April 4, 2012 and April 5, 2013 from 9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. at Alameda CTC, and lunch will be provided. Appointed **Page 294**

3

PAPCO members will receive a per diem for each day in attendance. Staff distributed Program Plan Review Subcommittee Forms for members to sign up.

The following PAPCO members volunteered to serve on the Program Plan Review subcommittee:

- Larry Bunn
- Shawn Costello
- Joyce Jacobson
- Gaye Lenahan
- Jane Lewis
- Jonah Markowitz
- Rev. Carolyn Orr
- Suzanne Ortt
- Sharon Powers
- Vanessa Proee
- Carmen Rivera-Hendrickson
- Michelle Rousey
- Harriette Saunders
- Will Scott
- Sylvia Stadmire
- Esther Waltz

5. Begin to establish Gap Grant Cycle 5 Review Subcommittee Membership

Naomi Armenta stated that PAPCO members are being asked to volunteer to be appointed to the Gap Grant Cycle 5 Review Subcommittee. This grant call will be competitive and evaluation and scoring will be important in this process. Staff held a mandatory workshop on Thursday, February 7, 2013 which was attended by approximately 30 potential applicants. The process will be similar to other subcommittees wherein members will be appointed and will receive a per diem for attending the three subcommittee meetings. The meetings will take place on Friday, March 15th, Wednesday, March 27th, and Friday, April 12th from 10-1 p.m. at the Alameda CTC.

Naomi went over the review process and expectations for each of the three subcommittee meetings. During the first meeting, members will do initial scoring and identify questions for the applicants. During the second meeting members will receive answers to the questions from the applicants, finalize scores and begin to look at geographic equity and partial funding options. During the final meeting, which will take place after Program Plan Review to see what the base **Page 295**

programs have planned, members will finalize recommendations and establish final reasoning and rationales.

Naomi stated all members that are appointed to this subcommittee will be responsible for reviewing and pre-scoring all grant applications prior to the actual review subcommittee meeting. Members will have approximately one week to complete this process and forward their scores to staff. The time commitment is substantial for this subcommittee and all members should consider their ability to meet this commitment prior to signing up. Volunteers need to be available to attend all three meetings. Staff is able to arrange accessible materials.

The following PAPCO members volunteered to serve on the Gap Grant Cycle 5 Review subcommittee:

- Shawn Costello
- Joyce Jacobson
- Sandra Johnson Simon
- Rev. Carolyn Orr
- Sharon Powers
- Carmen Rivera-Hendrickson
- Harriette Saunders
- Will Scott
- Sylvia Stadmire
- Esther Waltz
- Hale Zukas

Questions and feedback from PAPCO members:

- Will PAPCO members have a say in the scoring criteria before they are finalized? The scoring criteria have already been finalized. The criteria are a part of the guidelines but the scoring guidance has not been released yet.
- Can PAPCO members have input on the scoring guidance? Staff will email the guidance to interested PAPCO members, Hale, Carmen, Carolyn, and Esther. Suggestions for edits to the scoring guidance will be due by the end of this week.
- The time of the subcommittee meeting will be changed to 10 a.m. to 1 p.m.

6. Begin to establish a Subcommittee for 5310 Scoring

Naomi went over PAPCO's role as the Alameda County Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC) with regard to county, state and federal funding as requested by MTC. 5310 provides capital grants to assist private, nonprofit, Page 296 corporations and public agencies to purchase vehicles and other radio equipment or dispatching software. The applications are due March 11th. Materials will be accessible to appointed members prior to the scoring meeting on March 18th at 10 a.m. Representatives of applying organizations will be invited to the scoring meeting to observe and to provide input as appropriate. Members will be asked to work cooperatively with each other to obtain a consensus score. Members appointed to this subcommittee will receive a per diem for participation.

The following PAPCO members volunteered to serve on the 5310 Scoring subcommittee:

- Aydan Aysoy
- Shawn Costello
- Herb Hastings
- Joyce Jacobson
- Sandra Johnson-Simon
- Gaye Lenahan
- Suzanne Ortt
- Carmen Rivera-Hendrickson
- Michelle Rousey
- Will Scott
- Sylvia Stadmire
- Esther Waltz

7. Member Reports on PAPCO Mission, Roles, and Responsibilities Implementation

Shawn Costello noted the new West Dublin/Pleasanton BART station's buttons are falling off the elevator panels and is an ongoing issue. Staff will follow up with Laura Timothy and will include Shawn's contact information.

Michelle Rousey noted the Ashby BART station's accessible gates are closing on people and needs to be fixed.

Herb Hastings worked with Supervisor Scott Haggerty on updating the Shadow Cliffs Regional Park bus stop. After eight years of work, the bus stop is reopening in April and there will be a ribbon cutting ceremony. Herb will notify the committee when it will take place.

Hale Zukas noted the BART Accessibility Task Force meets at 2:30 p.m. on the 4th Thursday of the month at MTC. Naomi added these meetings are a great **Page 297**

opportunity to provide feedback on BART issues as BART staff members are present at all meetings.

Harriette Saunders attended the Commissioners' retreat and it was very accessible to transit. The hotel itself was also very accessible. There were several Assemblymembers and Senators present at the retreat who offered their assistance on addressing transportation issues.

Jonah Markowitz will not be at the next PAPCO meeting due to Passover.

Carmen Rivera-Hendrickson noted Transform's transportation summit and advocacy day on April 22nd in Sacramento. More information is available at http://transform.org/choice2013. Carmen will be speaking at this event. She has also applied to be on the rail committee which was also sent to Naomi for further distribution.

8. Committee Reports

- A. East Bay Paratransit Service Review Advisory Committee (SRAC) The next SRAC meeting is on March 5th and will include ethics training.
- B. Citizens Watchdog Committee (CWC)
 The next CWC meeting is on March 11th.

9. Mandated Program and Policy Reports

PAPCO members were asked to review these items in their packets.

10.Information Items

A. Mobility Management

Naomi gave a quick overview of the Walk Friendly Communities' *Giving Cities Legs* resource booklet that can be downloaded online. Staff is currently working on gathering travel training information for a web and print resource.

B. Outreach Update

Krystle Pasco gave an update on the following upcoming outreach events:

- 3/16/13 Transition Information Fair, College of Alameda from 9:30 a.m. to 3 p.m.
- 3/21/13 USOAC Annual Convention, Oakland Zoo from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.

- 4/23/13 North Berkeley Senior Center Health Fair, North Berkeley Senior Center from 1 p.m. to 4 p.m.
- 4/25/13 Albany Senior Center Senior Resource Fair, Albany Senior Center from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m.
- C. Other Staff Updates

John Hemiup gave a quick update on the One Bay Area Grant. There was an applicant workshop on February 7th and applications are due March 15th. There is approximately \$65.2 million available for various projects.

Naomi reported John Hemiup will be making a presentation on paratransit at the PPC meeting in March and possibly at the Commission meeting. In April, East Bay Paratransit may be making a similar presentation at the PPC and Commission meetings.

Naomi also noted a request for transit stories from a staff member, Laurel Poeton, in an effort to portray personal stories around transportation through our outreach and social media efforts.

11. Draft Agenda Items for March 25, 2013 PAPCO Meeting

- A. One Bay Area Grant Program Update
- B. Finance Subcommittee Status Report
- C. Annual Mobility Workshop Update
- D. Gap Grant Cycle 5 Update
- E. Update on HDTS/WSBTS

12.Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

This page intentionally left blank

Alameda County Transportation Commission Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee Roster - Fiscal Year 2012/2013

	Title	Last	First	Appointed By	Term Began	Re-apptmt.	Term Expires	Mtgs Missed Since July-12
-	Ms.	Stadmire, Chair	Sylvia J.	Alameda County Supervisor Wilma Chan, D-3	Sep-07	Jan-13	Jan-15	L
2	Mr.	Scott, Vice Chair	Will	Alameda County Supervisor Keith Carson, D-5	Mar-10	Apr-12	Apr-14	L
ю	Ms.	Aysoy	Aydan	City of Berkeley Councilmember Laurie Capitelli	90-InL	Jan-12	Jan-14	L
4	Mr.	Bunn	Larry	Union City Transit Wilson Lee, Transit Manager	Jun-06	Jan-12	Jan-14	2
5	Mr.	Costello	Shawn	City of Dublin Mayor Tim Sabranti	Sep-08	Apr-12	Apr-14	L
9	Mr.	Hastings	Herb	Alameda County Supervisor Scott Haggerty, D-1	Mar-07	Jan-12	Jan-14	2
7	Ms.	Jacobson	Joyce	City of Emeryville Councilmember Ruth Atkin	Mar-07	Jan-12	Jan-14	£
8	Ms.	Johnson-Simon	Sandra	BART Director Tom Blalock	Sep-10	Jan-12	Jan-14	L
6	Ms.	Lenahan	Gaye	City of Piedmont Mayor John Chiang	May-11	Jan-12	Jan-14	0
10	Ms.	Lewis	Jane	City of Livermore Mayor John Marchand	Sep-09	Jan-12	Jan-14	0
11	Mr.	Markowitz	Jonah	City of Albany Mayor Peggy Thomsen	Dec-04	Oct-12	Oct-14	0
12	Rev.	Orr	Carolyn M.	City of Oakland Councilmember Rebecca Kaplan	Oct-05	Jan-12	Jan-14	3
13	Ms.	Ortt	Suzanne	City of Union City Mayor Carol Dutra-Vernaci	Sep-12		Sep-14	L

Alameda County Transportation Commission Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee Roster - Fiscal Year 2012/2013

	Title	Last	First	Appointed By	Term Began	Re-apptmt.	Term Expires	Mtgs Missed Since July-12
14	Ms.	Powers	Sharon	City of Fremont Councilmember Suzanne Chan	Dec-07	Jan-12	Jan-14	٢
15	Ms.	Proee	Vanessa	City of Hayward Councilmember Marvin Peixoto	Mar-10	Jan-12	Jan-14	٢
16	Ms.	Rivera-Hendrickson	Carmen	City of Pleasanton Mayor Jerry Thorne	Sep-09	Jan-12	Jan-14	2
17	Ms.	Rousey	Michelle	Alameda County Supervisor Richard Valle, D-2	May-10		May-12	0
18	Ms.	Saunders	Harriette	City of Alameda Vice Mayor Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft	Jun-08	Oct-12	Oct-14	2
19	Ms.	Waltz	Esther Ann	LAVTA Executive Director Paul Matsuoka	Feb-11	Jan-12	Jan-14	0
20	Mr.	Zukas	Hale	A. C. Transit Director Greg Harper	Aug-02	Jan-12	Jan-14	0
21		Vacancy		Alameda County Supervisor Nate Miley, D-4				
22		Vacancy		City of Newark Councilmember Luis Freitas				
23		Vacancy		City of San Leandro Vice Mayor Michael Gregory				



Memorandum

DATE: May 15, 2013

TO: Alameda County Transportation Commission

FROM: Planning, Policy and Legislation Committee

SUBJECT: Approval of Legislative Positions and Update

Recommendations

Staff recommends approval of legislative positions and the legislative update.

Summary

This memo provides an update on federal, state and local legislative activities including an update on the federal budget, federal transportation issues, legislative activities and policies at the state level, as well as an update on local legislative activities.

Alameda CTC's legislative program was approved in December 2013 establishing legislative priorities for 2013 and is included in summary format in Attachment A. The 2013 Legislative Program is divided into five sections: Transportation Funding, Project Delivery, Multi-Modal Transportation and Land Use, Climate Change, and Partnerships. The program was designed to be broad and flexible to allow Alameda CTC the opportunity to pursue legislative and administrative opportunities that may arise during the year, and to respond to political processes in Sacramento and Washington, DC. Each month, staff brings updates to the Commission on legislative issues germane to the adopted legislative program, including recommended positions on bills as well as legislative updates.

Background

The following summarizes legislative information and activities at the federal, state and local levels.

Federal Update

The following updates provide information on activities and issues at the federal level and include information contributed from Alameda CTC's lobbyist team (CJ Lake/Len Simon).

President's 2014 Budget: On April 10, 2013, the President submitted a budget for \$3.78 trillion in FY14 spending, and combines both revenues and cuts to reduce the deficit by \$1.8 trillion over the next 10 years in a manner that would replace sequestration. The President's plan anticipates \$3.03 trillion in tax revenues if his policy proposals are implemented. About \$580 billion in additional revenues over ten years would come from tax reform that would close tax loopholes and reduce tax benefits for high income earners. Proposed cuts of about \$200 billion over ten years are proposed from both defense and non-defense programs. The non-defense programs would cover nearly all of the local government grant-making agencies, including the Department of Transportation.

President's FY 2014 Budget and Transportation: The President's FY 2014 budget request for the Department of Transportation is \$77 billion, which is 6% above last year's enacted levels. Increases are primarily in the areas of rail, transit and safety. The President's Budget also includes a \$50 billion program to provide immediate transportation investments in key areas that would immediately fund critical transportation investments and create jobs. One area for expenditure of \$2 billion of the \$50 billion includes transportation leadership awards that encourage states and regions to implement innovative strategies to address pressing transportation needs.

The Alameda CTC has advocated that if the \$2 billion become available, they could be used to reward self-help states like California by creating a Federal-Local Partnership Program modeled after California's State and Local Partnership Program (SLPP). The SLPP rewarded self-help counties by allocating \$1billion of bond funds to counties for transportation purposes that passed transportation sales tax measures. The proposal for paying for these \$50 billion immediate investments is from funds that would not be spent in Afghanistan as the United States reduces defense efforts there, making the realization of these funds uncertain.

President Obama's Proposed Transportation Budget¹ Proposed 2014 budget and comparison to 2012

DOLLARS IN MILLIONS

ADMINISTRATION	FY 2012 ACTUAL	FY 2014 REQUEST	
Federal Aviation Administration	15,902	15,551	
Federal Highway Administration	41,5451	40,995	
Federal Motor Carrier Safety	555	572	
Administration			
National Highway Traffic Safety	800	828	
Administration			
Federal Transit Administration	10,6081	10,910	
Federal Railroad Administration	1,632	6,635	
Pipelines and Hazardous Materials	191	255	
Safety Administration			
Maritime Administration	350	365	
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development	32	33	
Corporation			
Office of the Secretary 2	849	937	
Inspector General	80	86	
Surface Transportation Board	29	31	
Total DOT Budgetary Resources	72,571	77,197	
Immediate Transportation Investments	0	50,000	
Grand Total for DOT	72,571	127,197	

President's 2014 Budget and Municipal Bonds: The President's budget also includes a proposal to limit the municipal bond interest tax exemption by imposing a 28% cap on the interest exempted. If enacted, it is predicted that investors will demand higher yields on municipal bonds to make the investment attractive, increasing the financing costs for local government entities that issue municipal bonds. The costs of the increased tax rates will be borne directly by local governments that issue bonds, making it more costly to raise the capital

¹ http://www.dot.gov/sites/dot.dev/files/docs/FY%202014%20Budget%20Highlights.pdf

needed to finance long-term infrastructure projects like roads, bridges, water projects, schools, and hospitals. Because Alameda CTC is considering financing and this proposal in the President's budget could increase costs for the County, staff recommends sending a letter to the President and our Congressional members to share concerns about provisions in the White House's FY 2014 budget proposal that seek to end the long-standing tax exempt status on municipal bond interest. Elements of the letter would include the following key points:

- The tax exemption has been a successful cornerstone of state and local infrastructure development for over 100 years, and is responsible for financing a majority of the nation's infrastructure needs for state and local governments of all sizes.
- Proposals to cap the exemption would introduce uncertainty into the municipal market, causing investors to fear additional federal intervention in the market where none has existed for the past 100 years. Ultimately these investor concerns translate into demands for higher yields from increased costs to state and local governments.
- Proposals to reduce or repeal the tax exemption would have severely detrimental impacts on national infrastructure development and the municipal bond market, raising costs for state and local borrowers and creating uncertainty for investors.
- We cannot afford to abandon the great success of this important financing instrument, especially as state and local governments continue to recover from the economic downturn.

State Update

The following update provides information on activities and issues at the state level and includes information contributed from Alameda CTC's state lobbyist, Platinum Advisors.

<u>Budget</u>

The Department of Finance's April Monthly bulletin, which reports on March figures, indicated that California's General Fund cash for March was \$254 million above the 2013-14 Governor's Budget forecast of \$5.7 billion and that overall year-to-date revenues are \$5 billion above the forecast of \$59.6 billion. The Governor released his May Budget Revise on May 14, 2013, and staff will present an overview of the revised budget at the Commission meeting, including how Cap & Trade auction proceeds should be spent over the next three years.

Cap & Trade Expenditure Plan: On April 16, 2013, the California Air Resources Board released its draft Cap & Trade Investment Plan. CARB also held a public hearing on the draft plan on Thursday, April 25, 2013. A final expenditure plan will be unveiled as part of the Governor's May Budget Revise.

Given the uncertainty of the cap & trade revenue, the draft plan is less of an expenditure plan and more of an outline that identifies priority programs. The plan does not specify any dollar or percentage amounts for the funding categories identified, but it identifies three priority investment sectors. These sectors include, from largest to smallest, the following:

- Sustainable Communities & Clean Transportation
- Energy Efficiency & Clean Energy, and
- Natural Resources & Water Diversion.

The Sustainable Communities & Clean Transportation sector prioritizes funding for livable communities investments such as funding to increase transit mode share, rail modernization, active transportation, and infrastructure investments in complete streets, traffic management, and pavement improvements. The expenditure plan also includes in each proposed area a

percentage goal for projects benefiting disadvantaged communities as required by state law.

Further the plan states that inclusion in this plan does not guarantee funding. Only a small subset of the programs identified are anticipated to be funded in the first year. The plan recognizes that legislation, such as AB 574, may be enacted creating new allocation methods for implementing the expenditure plan. AB 574 is described in further detail below and staff recommends a support position on the bill.

Policy

Working Groups: The State has established two working groups to address freight and goods movement as well as to address transportation finance and project implementation policies.

California Freight Advisory Committee (CFAC): The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) assembled a freight advisory committee consisting of a representative cross-section of public and private sector freight stakeholders in response to the reauthorization of the federal surface transportation bill, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP–21). The CFAC will initially play a key role in the identification of a national freight network and the development of a California Freight Mobility Plan, and will also serve as a standing committee that will advise the state on freight issues beyond those required by MAP-21. The CFAC will advise the state on freight related priorities, issues, projects, and funding needs, as well as to serve as a forum for discussion for state transportation decisions affecting freight mobility. The Alameda CTC Executive Director, Art Dao, has been selected to serve on this committee. Attachment B includes a list of committee participants.

Transportation Finance Working Group: The Business, Transportation & Housing Agency convened the first meeting of the Transportation Finance Working Group. This first meeting was attended by about 60 individuals representing a wide range of organizations and state agencies, but it does not include a representative from the legislature.

The goal of this group is to explore long-term funding options and evaluate the best ways to deliver transportation needs in California. At the first meeting four subgroups were formed to examine highways, mass transit, local roads, and active transportation. These subgroups are expected to start meeting in May. The entire working group will meet periodically, and be informed by the work of subgroups. In addition, a status reports will also be provided during the California Transportation Commission's monthly meetings.

Key outcomes for the group will include prioritizing infrastructure needs, identifying funding options, identifying the appropriate level of government for delivery of projects, and establishing performance measures. Integrating into all of these issues will be the implementation of SB 375. The results or findings made by this group are not expected to be completed until much later this year, and will likely not influence the budget or legislation until next year at the earliest. Alameda CTC does not have a seat on this committee; however, two members of the Self-Help Counties Coalition (SHCC) sit on this committee and provide updates to the SHCC.

Recommended Legislative Positions

The 2013 Legislative Program is divided into five sections: Transportation Funding, Project Delivery, Multi-Modal Transportation and Land Use, Climate Change, and Partnerships. The following recommendations are categorized per Alameda CTC's legislative program and reflect actions in the adopted program. Staff recommends positions on the following bills:

Federal Bills

H. R. 974. (Congressman Albio Sires, NJ) Multi-modal Opportunities Via Enhanced Freight Act of 2013. H.R. 974 aims to strengthen the nation's freight transportation policy by creating a national plan for moving goods efficiently by road, rail, water, and air. H.R. 974 would direct the federal government to ensure the various and essential modes of the nation's freight network are accounted for and provide investment in freight transportation projects. This bill would expand the definition of the nation's primary freight network beyond the 27,000 centerline miles of existing roadways that are most critical to the movement of freight as noted in MAP-21. Per H.R. 974, a national freight network would be composed of highways, railways, navigable waterways, seaports, airport, freight intermodal connectors, and aerotropolis transportation systems most critical to the multi-modal movement of freight. As Alameda CTC initiates a freight planning and collaboration effort this year, the multi-modal system of freight in Alameda County will be addressed. The Alameda CTC legislative program supports expanding multimodal systems and flexibility. H.R. 974 would expand the national freight system definition to more truly reflect the multi-modal nature and needs associated with freight movement. Staff recommends a **SUPPORT** position on this bill.

State bills

Funding

AB 431 (Mullin) Regional transportation plan: sustainable communities strategy: funding. This bill would allow an MPO to place a sales tax measure on the ballot that covers some or all of the MPO's planning area. The bill would require 25% be allocated to transportation projects, 25% to affordable housing projects, and 25% to parks and recreation programs. The funds must be spent on projects that conform to the Sustainable Communities Strategy. AB 431 is fairly brief and does not address how the expenditure plan is developed nor does it specify a return to source. AB 431 is sponsored by the Nonprofit Housing Association of Northern California. Alameda CTC's legislative program supports efforts to increase funding for transportation. While AB 431 has the potential for increasing some funds for transportation, the mechanism proposed is potentially in direct competition of Alameda CTC's ability to increase transportation funding through a local transportation-specific sales tax measure. The Alameda CTC supports funding streams for housing and open space and is supportive of legislation that offers opportunities to increase funding through other means, separate from those that have been historically the "bread and butter" of major transportation investments in Alameda County and across the state for counties that have voter-approved transportation sales tax measures. Staff recommends an **OPPOSE** position to this bill, but is supportive of SB 391, which offers a housing related opportunity for funding affordable housing, as described below.

SB 391 (DeSaulnier) California Homes and Jobs Act of 2013. This bill would enact the California Homes and Jobs Act of 2013, establishing a permanent, on-going source of funding dedicated to affordable housing development. The bill would impose a fee of \$75 to be paid at the time of the recording of every real estate instrument, paper, or notice required or permitted by law to be recorded, except on property transfers. The bill requires that funds generated would be

used for supporting affordable housing, administering housing programs, and the cost of periodic audits of the fund uses.

The combined effect of the elimination of redevelopment funds and the winding down of Proposition 1C funds for housing, approved by voters in 2006, leaves few opportunities to generate funds to support affordable housing. According to employment information from the East Bay Economic Development Alliance, the East Bay currently supports a significant number of jobs in retail, food and accommodation services, educational services and administrative services that are below average annual California wages. Employment projections indicate that about half of the jobs in the East Bay over the next decade will be in these same below average wage sectors. As Alameda CTC and the Bay Area focus on development of Priority Development Areas (PDAs) to connect transportation, housing and jobs to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and to support SB375 requirements of housing all income levels within the region, the ability to fund multiple types of housing stock is important. SB391 supports funding for low income housing that could support current and projected needs and would generate funding through a fee directly connected with real estate transactions - not competing with historical transportation funding mechanisms.

During the Policy, Planning and Legislation Committee Meeting on May 13, 2013, there were many questions raised regarding types of transactions to which the fee would apply, what organizations support the bill, where the funds would flow and how the funds would be accessible to the cities and counties. According to the bill and Senate analysis, the bill would impose the \$75 fee on recording of real estate documents, except those recorded in connection with a property transfer, which are specifically exempted. The types of transactions that would be subject to the fee include:

- Deeds, grant deeds, trustee deeds, or deeds of trust
- Reconveyance, and quit claim deeds
- Fictitious deeds of trust
- Assignment of deed of trust
- Request for notice, and notice of default
- Abstract of judgment
- Subordination agreement
- Declaration or abandonment of homestead
- Release or discharge of lien or easement
- Notice of trustee sale
- Notice of completion
- Mechanics' lien
- Maps
- Covenants, conditions, and restrictions.

It is estimated that SB 391 could result in revenues ranging from \$300 million to over \$700 million annually. Counties would be required to send on a quarterly basis, after administrative costs, all revenues to the Housing and Community Development (HCD) Department for deposit into the California Homes and Jobs Trust Fund (CHJ Trust Fund) that would be created by the bill. The Legislature would appropriate the funds for development, acquisition, rehabilitation, and preservation of housing affordable to low and moderate income households, and to cover HCD administrative costs and periodic audits. The bill does not specify at this time how the funds would be allocated. Because this bill includes a fee as a means of increasing revenue, it would need to be passed by 2/3 of the members of each chamber.

There are many bills that have been introduced that aim to increase revenues through tax increment financing mechanisms. Staff is evaluating those bills and will bring either specific bill recommendations to the Commission, or a policy recommendation to overall address the bills. The PPLC chose to take a WATCH position on this bill until it had responses to questions raised during the Committee meeting. If members find that their questions have been adequately responded to by the additional information in this memo, staff would recommend a SUPPORT position on this bill. A list of supporters is included in Attachment C, the SB 391 Senate Committee Analysis.

SB791 (Wyland) Motor vehicle fuel tax: rate adjustment. This bill would eliminate the requirement that the State Board of Equalization (BOE) adjust the rate of the excise tax on motor vehicle fuel, and instead would require the Department of Finance to annually calculate that rate and report that calculated rate to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee. The rate for the state's next fiscal year would remain the same as the rate of the current fiscal year or would decrease. This bill only allow the rate to increase upon 2/3 approval by each house of the Legislature.

In 2010, state law authorized what is known as the "gas tax swap," which eliminated the sales tax on gasoline and imposed an increased excise tax that the BOE adjusts annually to equal the amount of sales tax that the state would charge on gasoline sales as if it was still subject to the state portion of the sales tax. The gas tax swap legislation also reduced the excise tax on diesel and increased the sales tax, requiring the BOE to adjust the diesel excise tax on an annual basis to ensure that the total amount of tax collected does not vary from what it would have been if the 18-cent excise tax and the sales tax rate had been left in place. AB 791 makes modifications to gasoline, but not to diesel. In summary, if this bill is enacted, the amount of funds generated for transportation would tend to decrease over time due to the bill making it difficult to adjust rates to reflect price increases in gasoline. The Alameda CTC legislative programs supports increasing transportation funding, including increasing the buying power of the gas tax. This bill is in direct opposition to this section of Alameda CTC's legislative program and staff recommends an **OPPOSE** position on the bill.

Cap and Trade

AB574 (Lowenthal) California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006: Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund: sustainable communities strategies. This bill would create a regional competitive grant program for funding projects related to Sustainable Communities Strategy. Overall the contents of AB 574 match with the funding priorities outlined in the draft Cap & Trade Expenditure Plan, described above, and would reflect in statute the Transportation Coalition for Livable Communities platform that was supported by Alameda CTC earlier this year.

AB 574 directs the CTC to work with California Air Resources Board (CARB) to identify the "regional granting authority" within each region, which according to the bill would be the regional entity responsible for developing the regional transportation plan. The funds would be allocated to each region on a per capita basis. The bill does not specify a dollar amount, but it creates the allocation process for funds allocated to this process through the cap & trade expenditure plan. The bill also allows for funds to be allocated to an "interregional investments" for rail modernization that have regional and interregional benefits and for other statewide priorities. These interregional funds would be administered by Business, Transportation and Housing Agency in consultation with the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and the High Speed Rail Authority.

The bill also directs the, in consultation with CARB, the CTC and the Strategic Growth Council,

to develop guidelines for the regional grant program. These guidelines must include a public participation process, and it requires consultation with air quality districts. However, the bill currently does not specify consultation with countywide planning agencies or other local governments. Alameda CTC's legislative program supports climate change legislation that provides funding for innovative infrastructure, operations, programs that relieve congestion, improve air quality, reduce emissions and support economic development. Staff recommends a **SUPPORT** position on this bill.

Partnerships

AB 935 (Frazier). San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority: terms of board members. This bill would modify the composition and terms of the WETA Board as follows:

- Of the Governor's three appointees one shall be a resident of San Francisco and one shall be a representative of labor.
- The Senate Rules Committee will have two appointees that shall include a resident of Contra Costa County and a resident of San Mateo County.
- The Speaker of the Assembly will have two appointees that shall include a resident of Solano County and a resident of Alameda County.
- Each of the County appointees shall be selected from a list of three nominees provided by the transportation authority from each county.
- If a transportation authority does not submit a list of three names within 45 days of a vacancy then the Governor shall appoint a resident from the specified county.

Alameda CTC's legislative program support efforts that encourage regional cooperation and coordination to develop, promote and fund solutions to regional transportation problems and to improve the ability to enhance or augment Alameda CTC projects and programs that affect bordering counties or regional networks. Since the Alameda County has been amended into the bill to have a seat, staff recommends a **SUPPORT and seek amendments** position on the bill. The amendment is to correct the name listed as the appointing authority from the Alameda County Transportation Authority, to the Alameda County Transportation Commission.

Update on AB 210

AB 210 (Wieckowski with coauthors: Bonta, Buchanan, Quirk, and Skinner) Transactions and use taxes: County of Alameda and the County of Contra Costa Update: Alameda CTC's bill to allow the Commission to exceed the 2% limit on local sales taxes was approved on April 3, 2013, by the Assembly Local Government Committee on a vote of 7-2. Two freshmen Assemblymembers, Melissa Melendez, representing the 67th District located in Southern California, south of Riverside and between Irvine and Palm Springs, and Marie Waldron, representing the 75th District between Los Angeles and San Diego were dissenting votes. AB 210 will be heard next by the Assembly Revenue & Taxation Committee on May 6 and staff will be present to testify in support of the bill.

Staff is analyzing bills, coordinating with other agencies and will be bringing bill positions to the commission in the coming months.

Legislative Coordination and Partnership Activities

Legislative coordination efforts

Alameda CTC leads and participates in many legislative efforts at the local, regional, state and federal levels, including both on coordinating with other agencies and partners as well as seeking grant opportunities to support transportation investments in Alameda County.

Coordination activities: In addition to the local legislative coordination activities, Alameda CTC is leading an effort to develop and provide statewide information on the benefits of Self-Help Counties and is also coordinating the legislative platform and priorities with the Bay Area Congestion Management Agencies. The SHCC is planning a state lobbying day in spring 2013 to bring counties together to visit legislators to support lowering the voter threshold and significant funding for transportation from cap and trade revenues. Alameda CTC made its legislative visit to Washington, D.C. in April and will hold its third legislative roundtable on May 8th.

Fiscal Impact

No direct fiscal impact

Attachments

Attachment A:	Alameda CTC Legislative Program and Actions Summary
Attachment B:	California Freight Advisory Committee Organization Chart
Attachment C:	Bill Analysis for SB 391, including registered supporters and opponents

This page intentionally left blank

2013 Alameda County Legislative Priorities This legislative program supports Alameda CTC's transportation vis

1333 Broadway, Suites 220 & 300 Oakland, CA 94616 (510) 208-7400 <u>www.AlamedaCTC.org</u>

This legislative program supports Alameda CTC's transportation vision adopted in the 2012 Countywide Transportation Plan described below:

"Alameda County will be served by a premier transportation system that supports a vibrant and livable Alameda County through a connected and integrated multimodal transportation system promoting sustainability, access, transit operations, public health and economic opportunities.

Our vision recognizes the need to maintain and operate our existing transportation infrastructure and services while developing new investments that are targeted, effective, financially sound and supported by appropriate land uses. Mobility in geographies; Integrated with land use patterns and local decision-making; Connected across the county, within and across the network of streets, highways and transit, bicycle and pedestrian routes; Reliable and Efficient; Cost Effective; Well [This legislative program table will be updated on a monthly basis] Alameda County will be guided by transparent decision-making and measureable performance indicators. Our transportation system will be: Multimodal; Accessible, Affordable and Equitable of all ages, incomes, abilities and Maintained; Safe; Supportive of a Healthy and Clean Environment"

	· ·)	,
Issue	Priority	Strategy	Actions	Legislation	Status
	Increase transportation funding	 Support efforts to lower the two-thirds-voter threshhold for voter- approved transportation measures. Support legislation that increases the buying power of the gas tax Support efforts to increase transportation revenues through vehicle license fees, vehicle miles traveled or other reliable means. Support legislation for alternative financing methods such as high- occupancy toll lanes, and allow funds collected on the HOT lanes by the California Highway Patrol to be reinvested within that corridor. 	• Leading a portion of Self-Help Counties Coalition (SHCC) efforts to reduce voter- threshold requirements	• Support positions on SCA 8 (Corbett), SCA 4 (Liu), SCA 11 (Hancock) to reduce voter threshold to 55 percent; AB 210 (Wieckowski) to allow Alameda CTC to place another measure on the ballot	•
Transportation Funding	Protect and enhance voter-approved funding	 Support legislation that provides increased funding from new and/or flexible funding sources to Alameda County for operating, maintaining, restoring and improving transportation infrastructure and operations. Support legislation that protects against transportation funding diversions to the General Fund. Support legislation that group of and programs. Support efforts that give priority funding to voter-approved measures and oppose those that negatively affect the ability to implement voterapproved measures. Support rewarding Self-Help Counties and states that provide significant transportation funding into transportation systems. Support rewarding into transportation systems. Support state and implement grants to advance project and program delivery. Support Alameda County as the recipient of funds to implement pilot programs with innovative project implementation or transportation-funding mechanism. 	• On-going monitoring	•	
Project Delivery	Advance innovative project delivery	 Support legislation and policies that improve environmental streamlining and project reviews to expedite project delivery. Support legislation that improves the ability to deliver projects and programs in a timely, cost effective manner using contracting flexibility. Support innovative project delivery methods. Support HOT lane expansion in Alameda County and the Bay Area. Support policies that allow local agencies to advertise, award and administer state highway system contracts largely funded by locals 	• On-going monitoring	•	•
	Ensure cost-effective project delivery	 Support legislation that reduces project and program implementation costs by reducing or eliminating the requirements for state or other agency reimbursements to implement projects on state/regional systems. Support legislation that accelerates funding for transportation infrastructure projects that create jobs and economic growth in Alameda County. 	• On-going monitoring, and work through the SHCC to provide input to the Secretary of Transportation on streamlining project delivery	•	•



Legislation Status			•		A draft Cap and Trade expenditure plan was released in April for review and will be incorporated into the Governor's May Revise.	A draft Cap and Trade expenditure plan was released in April for review and will be incorporated into the Governor's May Revise.
On-coinc monitorinc	0	On-going work with agency coordination, grant development and legislative advocacy		On-going monitoring	On-going monitoring •	On-going monitoring • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
	 Poport legislation that increases flexibility and reduces technical and nding barriers to investments linking transportation, housing and jobs. Pport local flexibility and decision-making on land-use for transit (ented development and priority development areas. Pport innovative financing opportunities to fund TOD and PDA plementation that will increase mobility and jobs and reduce GHGs. 	 (ented development and priority development areas. pport innovative financing opportunities to fund TOD and PDA pport innovative financing opportunities to fund TOD and reduce GHGs. pport policies that provide multimodal transportation systems with intiple choices and better access for all kinds of transportation users. pport policies that provide increased flexibility for transportation users. pport policies that provide increased flexibility for transportation users. pport policies that provide increased flexibility for transportation users. one develop: one people. one people. pport flexibility in transportation delivery to address climate change, increasing unfunded mandates or dramatically increasing costs. pport investments in transportation for transit-dependent mmunities that provide enhanced access to goods, services, jobs d education. pport parity in pre-tax fringe benefits for public transit/vanpoling d parking. 		pport climate change legislation that provides funding for innovative frastructure, operations, programs that relieve congestion, improve air ality, reduce emissions and support economic development. pport climate change legislation that expands transit services and pports safe, efficient, clear connections to transit services, including ee/ped infrastructure. achieve necessary increases in public transit ridership to address fG emissions from transportation sources, support legislation at augments but does not replace transit funding, nor create funded mandates.	pport climate change legislation that provides funding for innovative irastructure, operations, programs that relieve congestion, improve air ality, reduce emissions and support economic development. pport climate change legislation that expands transit services, including pport climate change legislation that expands transit services, including tec/ped infrastructure.• On-going active necessary increases in public transit ridership to address including, nor create funded mandates.• On-going active necessary increases in public transit funding, nor create funded mandates.• Working e working e he CMA on this e but does not replace transportation funding statewide and on this e heleter to supporti Coalition	pport climate change legislation that provides funding for innovative rastructure, operations, programs that relieve congestion, improve air ality, reduce emissions and support economic development.• On-going rastructure opport climate change legislation that expands transit services, including tec/ped infrastructure.• On-going reservices, including
educe barriers to • Support legislation ne implementation funding barriers to	f transportation ad land use vestments • Support innovative implementation th	ad land useoriented developrwestments• Support innovativwestments• Support innovativxpand multimodal• Support policies thstems and• Support policies thservice delivery thneeds of commuteincome people.• Support flexibilityservice delivery th• Support flexibilityservice delivery thneeds of commuteincome people.• Support flexibilityservice delivery th• Support flexibilityand education flexibility• Support flexibilityservice delivery th• Support flexibilityservice people.• Support investmerservice people.• Support investmerservice performenties that performent• Support periformentservice performent• Support periforment </td <td>and parking.</td> <td>and parking.apport climateapport climateinfrastructure, opequality, reduce emsupport climate chsupports safe, efficbike/ped infrastruo achieve necesséGHG emissions fruunfunded mandati</td> <td>and parking. apport climate ange legislation equality, reduce em equality, reduce em equality, reduce em equality, reduce em support climate ch support climate ch support safe, effic bike/ped infrastru eGHG emissions fr unfunded mandate unport cap-and- ade expenditure in Alameda Count.</td> <td>and parking.upport climateupport climateinfrastructure, opequality, reduce emSupport climate chsupports safe, efficbike/ped infrastrubike/ped infrastruunfunded mandatunfunded mandatunfunded mandatunfunded mandatupport cap-and-expenditureade expenditurelanupport legislationupport legislationad policies thatupport emergingupport emergingupport legislationupport lenergingupport legislationupport legislationupport lenergingupport lenergingupport lenergingupport lenergingupportupportupportupportupportupportupportupportupportupport</td>	and parking.	and parking.apport climateapport climateinfrastructure, opequality, reduce emsupport climate chsupports safe, efficbike/ped infrastruo achieve necesséGHG emissions fruunfunded mandati	and parking. apport climate ange legislation equality, reduce em equality, reduce em equality, reduce em equality, reduce em support climate ch support climate ch support safe, effic bike/ped infrastru eGHG emissions fr unfunded mandate unport cap-and- ade expenditure in Alameda Count.	and parking.upport climateupport climateinfrastructure, opequality, reduce emSupport climate chsupports safe, efficbike/ped infrastrubike/ped infrastruunfunded mandatunfunded mandatunfunded mandatunfunded mandatupport cap-and-expenditureade expenditurelanupport legislationupport legislationad policies thatupport emergingupport emergingupport legislationupport lenergingupport legislationupport legislationupport lenergingupport lenergingupport lenergingupport lenergingupportupportupportupportupportupportupportupportupportupport
	Rec the of ti and inve	and inw Exp Syst fransportation und Land Use		Sup chai	Sup chan chan chan chan plan	Sup chai chai chai plai plai sup sup

California Freight Advisory Committee

Organization Chart



Standing State, Regional, and Sub-regional Freight Committees such as CALMITSAC and Southern California National Freight Collaboration Working Group This page intentionally left blank

Ó

SENATE GOVERNANCE & FINANCE COMMITTEE Senator Lois Wolk, Chair

BILL NO: SB 391 AUTHOR: DeSaulnier VERSION: 4/2/13 CONSULTANT: Grinnell HEARING: 4/24/13 FISCAL: Yes TAX LEVY: No

CALIFORNIA HOMES AND JOBS ACT OF 2013

Enacts the California Homes and Jobs Act; applies a \$75 fee on recorded real estate documents.

Background and Existing Law

The California Constitution prohibits transaction taxes or sales taxes on transfers of real property (Article XIIIA, Section 4); however, in 1967, the Legislature authorized counties to approve an ordinance to impose a documentary transfer tax (DTT), which applies to deeds of transfer of realty within that jurisdiction, and is based on the value of the transfer. In counties, the rate is fifty-five cents (\$0.55) for each five hundred dollars (\$500) of value. All of California's 58 counties apply the tax, which is modeled after the repealed Federal Documentary Stamp Tax. Cities may also enact ordinances to impose a DTT may apply its tax at half of the rate of the county and applies it as a credit against the county rate. Charter cities may impose a DTT at a higher rate under the municipal affairs doctrine in the California Constitution (Article XI, Section 5). If they do so at a higher rate than the non-charter rate, then the city DTT does not serve as a credit against the county tax. Exemptions exist for public agencies acquiring land, land acquired as a result of a plan of reorganization or

Exemptions exist for public agencies acquiring land, land acquired as a result of a plan of reorganization or adjustment such as bankruptcy, and certain transfers in lieu of foreclosure, among others.

The Government Code prescribes additional fees that county recorders charge when recording a change in ownership of a property. The law exempts public agencies from paying these fees.

In 2006, voters enacted the Housing and Emergency Shelter

SB 391 (DeSaulnier) - 4/2/13 -- Page 2

Trust Fund Act, which authorized the sale of \$2.85 billion in general obligation bonds for various housing projects (Proposition 1C), on top of \$2.1 billion in general obligation bonds approved in 2002 (Proposition 46). According to the State Treasurer, the state has sold almost all Proposition 46 bonds, but \$1.26 billion of Proposition 1C authorized bonds have not yet been sold.

Citing a significant State General Fund deficit, Governor Brown's 2011-12 budget proposed eliminating RDAs and returning billions of dollars of property tax revenues to schools, cities, and counties to fund core services. Among the statutory changes that the Legislature adopted to implement the 2011-12 budget, AB X1 26 (Blumenfield, 2011) dissolved all RDAs. The California Supreme Court's 2011 ruling in <u>California Redevelopment Association v.</u> <u>Matosantos</u> upheld AB X1 26, but invalidated AB X1 27 (Blumenfield, 2011), which would have allowed most RDAs to avoid dissolution. RDAs' dissolution deprived many local governments of the primary tool they used to increase the supply of affordable housing.

<u>Proposed Law</u>

Senate Bill 391 enacts the California Homes and Jobs Act of 2013, which creates the California Homes and Jobs Trust Fund in the State Treasury. The Legislature may appropriate moneys in the fund to support development, acquisition, rehabilitation, and preservation of low and moderate income households.

SB 391 imposes a fee of \$75 whenever a person records a real estate instrument, paper, or notice required or permitted by law to be recorded, including: Deeds, grant deeds, trustee deeds, or deeds of trust, Reconveyance, and quit claim deeds, Fictitious deeds of trust, Assignment of deed of trust, Request for notice, and notice of default, Abstract of judgment, Subordination agreement, Declaration or abandonment of homestead, Release or discharge of lien or easement, Notice of trustee sale, Notice of completion,

SB 391 (DeSaulnier) - 4/2/13 -- Page 3

UCC financing statement Mechanics' lien, Maps Covenants, conditions, and restrictions.

The measure specifically excludes from the fee any document recorded in connection with a transfer subject to a documentary transfer tax, essentially exempting property transfers.

The bill provides that the fees shall be sent quarterly with the Department of Housing and Community Development for deposit in the Fund. Counties must pay interest at the legal rate for any funds not paid within 30 days of the end of the quarter.

The measure requires the Bureau of State Audits to conduct periodic audits to ensure that the annual allocation to individual programs is awarded in a timely fashion beginning two years from the bill's effective date. The Department of Housing and Community Development must include in its currently required annual report how funds raised by the fee spent, and post the report on its web-site.

The measure also makes legislative findings and declarations.

State Revenue Impact

No estimate.

Comments

1. <u>Purpose of the bill</u>. According to the author, "Everyone in California needs a safe and affordable place to call home. For U.S. military veterans, former foster youth, families with children, people with disabilities, seniors on fixed incomes, and other vulnerable Californians, however, the housing crisis isn't over. Millions of Californians are caught in the "perfect storm" - mortgages remain out of reach, credit standards have
tightened, and the foreclosure crisis has pushed more people into a rental market already suffering from decades

SB 391 (DeSaulnier) - 4/2/13 -- Page 4

of short supply - leading to record-setting rent increases. The most vulnerable risk joining the more than 130,000 Californians who are homeless on any given night. Moreover, rents and mortgages within the reach of working families are critical to maintaining California's business competitiveness. Numerous business groups say California needs to increase the supply of housing options affordable to workers so companies can compete for the talent that drives California's economy. At the same time, California's investment in affordable homes has dried up. State agencies have awarded nearly all of the voter-approved bond funding for affordable housing. Likewise, the elimination of redevelopment agencies has cut off funding from the low- and moderate-income housing set aside. The California Homes and Jobs Act begins to restore California's historic investments in affordable homes by creating an ongoing, pay-as-you-go source of funding dedicated to affordable housing development. The act will:

Create 29,000 jobs annually, primarily in the beleaguered construction sector.

Help businesses attract and retain the talent that fuels California's economy.

Leverage an additional \$2.78 billion in federal and local funding and bank loans to build affordable homes and create jobs.

Deploy these dollars in California communities through a successful private/public partnership model. Get California building again to create affordable home options for all Californians."

2. <u>Who pays</u>? An old piece of tax policy wisdom attributed to Louisiana Governor Russell Long states that, "Don't tax you, don't tax me, tax the man behind the tree." SB 391 assesses a fee of \$75 whenever a person records one of a specified list of documents with the county to pay for public housing programs, except for documents that transfer deeds of realty. As such, the responsibility to pay for housing programs, previously paid for out by a combination of redevelopment funds, state bonds, federal funds, and proceeds from local exactions, is shifted onto the individuals recording these documents, which includes property owners, lenders, and borrowers, among others. While resources for public housing programs have rapidly dried up, is it appropriate to saddle a part of one class of taxpayer with the burden to pay for affordable housing?

SB 391 (DeSaulnier) - 4/2/13 -- Page 5

For example, a contractor filing a mechanics' lien to secure payment for services has to pay the fee, but the individual purchasing a luxury home does not. The Committee may wish to consider whether the correct group of taxpayers should bear the general, public cost of providing affordable housing.

3. <u>Magic words</u>. While SB 391 states that the charge it imposes is a fee, Legislative Counsel has keyed the measure a tax increase for the purposes of Section III of Article XIIIA of the California Constitution. As such, the measure requires the approval of 2/3 of the membership of the Senate and the Assembly to be enacted. Prior to 2010, specified fees could be enacted by majority vote, but this authority was significantly limited by Proposition 26 (2010).

4. <u>Show me the money</u> ! Joint Rule 37.4 prescribes that any bill requiring action by the Bureau of State Audits, as SB 391 does, contain an appropriation for the cost of any audit. The Committee may wish to consider amending the bill to provide the appropriation.

5. <u>Do it again</u>. SB 391 is almost identical to SB 1220 (DeSaulnier, 2012), which the Committee approved last year. However, the measure received only 25 votes, two short of the 2/3 necessary, on the Senate Floor.

Support and Opposition (04/18/13)

California Housing Consortium (sponsor); Housing Support California (sponsor); AARP; Abode Communities; A Community of Friends; Alameda County Board of Supervisors; Alameda County Developmental Disabilities Council; Alpha Construction Company; AMCAL Multi Housing; American Baptist Homes of the West; Amity Foundation; Amstutz Associates; Angelus Plaza; Ashwood Construction; Asian Pacific Environmental Network; Association of Regional Center Agencies; Asthma Coalition of Los Angeles County; Bay Area Business Roundtable; Bay Area Community Land Trust; Bay Area Council; Bay Area Regional Health Inequities Initiative; BRIDGE Housing; Burbank Housing SB 391 (DeSaulnier) - 4/2/13 -- Page 6 Development Corporation; Cabrillo Economic Development Corporation; Cahill Contractors; California Apartment Association; California Association of Housing Authorities; California Association of Local Housing Finance Agencies; California Building Industry Association; California Coalition for Rural Housing; California Coalition for Youth; California Conference of Carpenters; California Council for Af fordable Housing; California Council of Community Mental Health Agencies; California Disabil ity Services Association; California Housing Partnership Corporation; California Partnership to End Domestic Violence; California Police Chiefs Association; California Reinvestment Coali tion; California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation; Bill Lockyer, California State Treasurer; Casa Major; Century Housing; Century Villages at Cabrillo; Cesar Chavez Foundation; CHISPA; City of Emeryville; City of Jurupa Valley; City of Lynwood; City of Oakland; City of Oxnard; City of Pasadena; City of Riverside; City of San Joaquin; City of San Jose; City of San Mateo; City of Santa Barbara; City of Santa Monica; City of West Hollywood; Coachella Valley Housing Coalition; Community Corporation of Santa Monica; Community Health Improvement Partners; Community Housing Opportunities Corporation; Community Housing Works; Community Working Group; Contra Costa Health Services; Corporation for Supportive Housing; County of Alameda; County of Contra Costa; Pacific Ventures; Domus Deveop Curtom-Dunsmuir; DMB ment; EAH Housing; East Bay Developmental Disabilities Legislative Coalition; East Bay Housing Organizations; East LA Community Corporation; Ecumenical Council Pasadena Area Congregations; Eden Housing; Enterprise Community Partners; Environmental Health Coalition;

Episcopal Community Services of San Francisco; First Place for Youth; Foundation for Affordable Housing; Fullerton Chamber of Commerce; Gonzalez Goodale Architects; Habitat for Humanity California; Habitat for Humanity Greater San Francisco; Habitat for Humanity Inland Valley; Habitat for Humanity Pomona Valley; Habitat for

SB 391 (DeSaulnier) - 4/2/13 -- Page 7

Humanity Riverside; Habitat for Humanity San Gabriel Valley; Habitat for Humanity San Luis Obispo County; Habitat for Humanity Santa Cruz County; Hamilton Family Center; Highridge Costa Housing Partners; Hollywood Community Housing Corporation; Home Builders Association of Tulare/Kings Counties; Home Start; Homes for Life Foundation; Housing Authority for the City of San Buenaventura; Housing Choices Coalition for People with Developmental Disabilities; Housing Leadership Council of San Mateo County; ICON Builders; InnerCity Struggle; Interfaith Community Services; International Association for Women of Color Day; Jamboree Housing Corporation; John Stewart Company; Kennedy Commission; The KTGY Group; Larkin Street Youth Services; Laurin Associates; Lauterbach and Associates; LeSar Development Consultants; LifeSTEPS; LINC Housing; Little Tokyo Service Center; Loaves and Fishes; Local Initiatives Support Corporation; Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce; Los Angeles Business Council; Los Angeles Business Leaders Task Force on Homelessness; Los Angeles Community Action Network; L.A. Family Housing; LA Voice; Law Foundation of Silicon Valley; Leading Age California; League of Women Voters of California; Lutheran Office of Public Policy; Mammoth Lakes Housing; Marin Workforce Housing Trust; Mental Health America of Los Angeles; Mercy Housing MidPen Housing Corporation; Move LA; Multicultural Communities for Mobility; Mutual Housing California; Nancy Lewis Associates; National Community Renaissance; National Council of La Raza; National Housing Law Project; Natural Resources Defense Council; Neighborhood Housing Services of Los Angeles County; Neighborhood Partnership Housing Services; NeighborWorks Orange County; Nevada/California Indian Housing Associa tion; Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California; Northern Circle Indian Housing Authority; Northern California Community Loan Fund; Opportune Companies; Orange County Business Council; Orange County Housing Trust; Pacific SB 391 (DeSaulnier) - 4/2/13 -- Page 8

Clinics; Palm Communities; Pasadena Public Health Department; Peninsula Interfaith Action; Penny Lane Centers; People Assisting the Homeless; Peoples' Self-Help Housing Corporation; PolicyLink; Public Advocates; Related California; Resources for Community Development; Ruiz Brothers Construction Co.; Rural Community Assistance Corporation; Rural Communities Housing Development Corporation; Sacramento Homeless Organizing Committee; Sacramento Housing Alliance; St. Joseph Center; St. Paul's Senior Home and Services; San Benito County

Housing and Economic Development Department; San Gabriel Valley Consortium on Homelessness; San Luis Obispo County Housing Trust Fund; Self-Help Enterprises; Service Employees International Union (SEIU) California State Council; Sierra Business Council; Sierra Club California; Silicon Valley Leadership Group; Skid Row Housing Trust; Sonoma County Task Force for the Homeless; Southeast Asian Community Alliance; Southern California Association of Non-Profit Housing; SPUR; Stand Up for Neighborly Novato; State Independent Living Council; State Treasurer Bill Lockyer; Step Up on Second; Sun Country Builders; Sunseri Construction; Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation; Thai Community Development Center; Thomas Safran and Associates; T.R.U.S.T. South LA; Turning Point Community Programs; United Homeless Healthcare Partners; United States Veterans Initiative; United Ways of California; United Way of Fresno County; United Way of Greater Los Angeles; Valley Economic Development Center; Venice Community Housing Corporation; Visionary Home Builders; Wakeland Housing and Develop ment Corporation; Walton Construction Services; Western Center on Law and Poverty; Women Organizing Resources, Knowledge, and Services (WORKS); _ Board of Equalization Member Michelle Steel; Opposition :

Board of Equalization Member George Runner; Butte County

SB 391 (DeSaulnier) - 4/2/13 -- Page 9

Clerk-Recorder; Calaveras County Clerk-Recorder; California Land Surveyors Association; California Land Title Association; City of Cypress; Colusa County Clerk Recorder; Contra Costa County Clerk-Recorder; County Recorders' Association of California; County of Lassen; County of Orange; El Dorado County Recorder-Clerk; Hamman Real Estate; Inyo County Clerk Recorder; Marin County Assessor-Recorder-Clerk; National Notary Association; Nevada County Clerk-Recorder; Plumas County Clerk; San Bernardino County Recorder-Clerk; San Luis Obispo County Clerk-Recorder; Sonoma County Clerk-Recorder-Assessor; Stanislaus County Clerk-Recorder;

_



Memorandum

DATE: May 15, 2013

TO: Alameda County Transportation Commission

FROM: Programs and Projects Committee

SUBJECT: Approval of the 2013 Capital Improvement Program and Programs Investment Plan Revenue Assumptions and Review of the Development Methodology

Recommendation

It is recommended the Commission approve the 2013 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and Programs Investment Plan (PIP) revenue assumptions and review the proposed development methodology for the CIP/PIP.

Summary

As the Congestion Management Agency for Alameda County, Alameda CTC is legislatively required by California Government Code 65088.0 to 65089.10 to develop and update a Congestion Management Program (CMP) every two years. The CMP describes policies to address congestion in the county, while also formulating strategies to improve the transportation system and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The next CMP update, currently underway, is due at the end of 2013.

As required by state statute, the CMP is required to include a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) that outlines projects which help maintain and improve the performance of the multimodal transportation system. In order to meet these legislative requirements, Alameda CTC intends to incorporate a comprehensive CIP and a Programs Investment Program (PIP) in the CMP document as part of the 2013 update. Based on the policy framework proposed with the Strategic Planning and Programming Policy adopted by the Commission in March 2013, the CIP and PIP will be incorporated with an expanded Strategic Plan/CMP that meets state statutory requirements, and serves as a fully integrated strategic planning and programming document that can more effectively guide future planning and programming decisions.

Consistent with the requirements of the CMP, the CIP and PIP will each contain a multi-year planning horizon to guide the programming of Federal, State, and local funds that are under Alameda CTC's purview.

The CIP will include projects that contribute to alleviating traffic congestion and reducing carbon emissions consistent with legislative mandates and Alameda CTC adopted plans. Projects will be prioritized based on funding eligibility and prioritization criteria.

The PIP will include projects/programs that support capital improvements, transit operations, outreach and education, transportation maintenance activities, and reporting tasks that are not included in the CIP. Many of these activities are expected to be funded using Program Funds as available through sources such as Measure B and Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) and will also contribute to reducing congestion and carbon emissions.

This staff report details the development approach for the CIP and PIP, including a discussion on the following:

- CIP and PIP purpose
- Revenue Assumptions
- CIP/PIP Development Methodology and Project/Program Prioritization
- Two-year Allocation Plan

Discussion

Purpose of the Capital Improvement Program and Programs Investment Program

The purpose of the CIP and PIP is to strategically plan and program funding sources under Alameda CTC's purview for capital improvements, operations and maintenance projects and programs consistent with Alameda CTC adopted long range plans such as the Countywide Transportation Plan, Countywide Bicycle Plan, and Countywide Pedestrian Plan. Updated every two years, as part of the CMP, the proposed CIP/PIP will consist of a multi-year planning horizon that integrates and prioritizes transportation investments based on measurable performance measures. The CIP and PIP will provide an inventory of projects and programs that are funded with Federal, State, and local funding sources by the Alameda CTC for the multi-year period. As such, the short range CIP and PIP will be tied to long-range planning efforts and include a system of feedback loops to monitor and evaluate the performance of Alameda County's transportation system (*refer to Attachment A: Feedback Flow Chart*).

The proposed CIP/PIP will contain a project prioritization process, described later in this staff report, that builds upon already adopted selection criteria from the following:

- Current CMP;
- 2012 Countywide Transportation Plan (CWTP);
- Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP);
- Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan;
- Alameda Countywide Pedestrian Plan; and
- Recent Alameda CTC funding programs such as the FY 2012/13 Coordinated Funding Program and Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA).

The PIP will also be structured to provide a link between the goals and policies contained in the CWTP and Alameda CTC programs. Specifically, it will guide programmatic and discretionary funding to the following types of programs:

- Transit Operations
- Paratransit services
- Bicycle programs/projects
- Pedestrian programs/projects
- SMART Corridors operations
- Express Lanes operations

- Transportation Demand Management
- Transportation Systems Management
- Safe Routes to Schools programs
- Local Roadways programs/projects
- Funding for Planning, Programming Monitoring, data collection, and performance reporting

Through the CIP/PIP project/program identification and prioritization process, Alameda CTC will identify shorter term, key transportation improvements that maintain or improve the performance of the multi-modal system for the movement of people and goods or mitigate transportation related impacts on the environment such as air quality. Based on the multi-year CIP/PIP (assume a 5-7 year time period), a two-year Allocation Plan to fund projects/programs will be developed. Projects and programs identified as priorities in the 2-year Allocation Plan are assumed to be ready for funds to be programmed and construction/implementation.

Revenue Assumptions

Alameda CTC is responsible for approximately \$164 million in funding annually for capital projects and programs over the multi-year CIP/PIP. It is assumed the CIP/PIP will cover between a 5 and 7 year period of time. The annual revenues will result in over \$1.1B of investment in transportation through the Alameda CTC over a seven year CIP/PIP timeframe (*refer to Attachment B, Annual Programming Revenue*). The forecasted revenue was developed from actual historical revenue received and projected over the CIP/PIP period. The annual revenue information is also separated into Pass-through and Discretionary components (*refer to Attachment C, Tables 2A – Pass-through Revenues and Table 2B – Discretionary Revenues*).

Alameda CTC distributes or programs revenue from various funding sources including:

- 2000 Measure B
- Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF)
- Surface Transportation Program (STP) / Congestion Management Air Quality (CMAQ)
- State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)
- Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA)
- Lifeline Transportation Program

For the purposes of developing a revenue forecast for the duration of the CIP/PIP, Alameda CTC is using the historical grant programs' funding availability as the basis for future revenue assumptions. The future revenue assumptions for the following funding sources are described in detail below:

• The STP/CMAQ funds are distributed through MTC. The One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) policy sets the priorities for the funds available from FY 2012/13 to 2015/16. The Alameda CTC is programming the OBAG funding through the FY 2012/13 Coordinated

Funding Programming. Approximately \$60.3 million will be programmed through FY 2015/16. It is assumed that the program will continue at approximately the same level through the CIP/PIP time-frame.

- The STIP funds are distributed through the State and the California Transportation Commission. The next available STIP funding will be programmed in summer 2013 and is anticipated to be available to expend in FY 2017/18 and 2018/19. It is assumed that the program will continue at approximately the same historical levels through the CIP/PIP time-frame. Revenue through FY 19/20 and FY 20/21 is forecasted assuming a similar level of funding.
- The Lifeline Transportation Program is funded with a mix of federal Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) and Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds, State Transit Assistance (STA), and State Proposition 1B Transit funds. Approximately \$9.6 million in discretionary funds is anticipated to be available for Alameda County projects over a three year funding cycle. The current Cycle 3 ends in FY 2014/15. It is assumed that the program will continue at approximately the same historical levels through the CIP/PIP time-frame.
- TFCA funding is allocated to the Alameda CTC annually with about \$1.7 million available per year. It is assumed that the program will continue at approximately the same historical level through the CIP/PIP time-frame.
- The 2000 Measure B revenue reflects a two percent annual increase in revenue, consistent with the Capital Program Strategic Plan update for FY 2013/14. It is assumed that the program will continue at approximately the same historical level through the CIP/PIP time-frame.
- The VRF revenue is \$11.5 million, consistent with the VRF Strategic Plan/Allocation Plan update for FY 2013/14. It is assumed that the program will continue at approximately the same historical level through the CIP/PIP time-frame.

The timing of the availability of the funding and the corresponding programming action dates for the various funding sources under Alameda CTC's purview are depicted in Attachment D, Current/Future Programming Cycles. As shown, the individual funding sources represent from one to four years of programming revenue, with the anticipated schedule for Alameda CTC programming actions.

CIP/PIP Development Methodology

The methodology used to develop the CIP and PIP will include the following steps:

- 1. Establish a prioritization process for projects/programs.
 - a. CIP/PIP prioritization criterion will be derived from the current CMP, CWTP, RTP, Countywide Bicycle Plan, Countywide Pedestrian Plan, and previously approved selection criteria from Alameda CTC's current discretionary grant programs such as the FY 2012/13 Coordinated Funding Program, TFCA, and Measure B Paratransit Gap Cycle 5 Program.

- b. Prioritization criterion may include project readiness, needs and benefit, proximity to Priority Development Areas (PDAs), maintenance/sustainability, cost effectiveness/leveraging funds, and geographic equity.
- 2. Create an inventory of projects and programs through an examination of:
 - a. CWTP's Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects, and programmatic categories
 - b. Recent discretionary grant project/program applications
 - c. Countywide Bicycle Plan, Countywide Pedestrian Plan, and other approved planning documents.

Alameda CTC may request updated or additional project/program information from project sponsors to better evaluate the readiness of potential projects. If required, this would occur at the end of June 2013.

- 3. Evaluate and prioritize projects and programs based on defined performance measures.
- 4. Establish a multi-year CIP/PIP.
 - a. Projects/programs will be prioritized in the CIP/ PIP for future funding allocations.
 - b. Projects /programs that are programmed for funding through the current "calls for projects" will be included in the CIP/PIP as committed projects.
 - c. Projects/programs not selected for funding in the current call for projects may be considered for inclusion in the CIP/PIP.
- 5. Include the CIP/PIP in the CMP.
- 6. Establish a two-year Allocation Plan based on the multi-year CIP/PIP (assume a 5-7 year time period). The two-year allocation plan will identify projects/programs from the multi-year CIP/PIP that would be approved for programming in the first two years of the CIP/PIP period (i.e. through FY 15/16). Additional evaluation will be considered to determine the projects/programs identified to receive programming in this period. Criteria that may be considered will include project readiness, needs and benefit, proximity to Priority Development Areas (PDAs), maintenance/sustainability, cost effectiveness/leveraging funds, and geographic equity. The Allocation Plan revenue assumptions are discussed in more detail in the next section.

In future programming cycles, Alameda CTC will use the CIP/PIP and allocation plan to identify projects and programs for consideration. The CIP/PIP and Allocation Plan will be updated every 2 years as part of the CMP. In future CIP/PIP updates, Alameda CTC will reassess the prioritization of projects/programs for consistency with any updated policies, goals, and performance criterion.

Two-Year Allocation Plan

The two-year Allocation Plan will include the annual programmatic pass-through funds from Measure B and VRF to local jurisdictions.

The discretionary funding available for programming during this timeframe will total approximately \$107.8 M. The funding sources and available funding amounts are depicted in detail on Attachment D, Current/Future Programming Cycles, and summarized in the table below.

Two-year Allocation Plan FY 13/14 to FY 15/16	
Discretionary Funding Sources (Funds with Programming Actions during FY 13/14 to FY 15/16)	Amount
STP/CMAQ	\$ 45.2
STIP	\$ 30.0
TFCA	\$ 5.1
Lifeline Transportation Program	\$ 9.6
Measure B	\$ 8.1
VRF	\$ 9.8
Total	\$ 107.8

Based on the prioritization of projects in the CIP/PIP, projects/programs will be recommended for programming under the two-year Allocation Plan.

Schedule/Next steps

The following schedule details milestones for the CIP/PIP (and two-year Allocation Plan) Development.

Timeline	Milestones
May 2013	 Approval of CIP/PIP revenue assumptions
	 Review CIP/PIP Project/Program Prioritization Methodology
June 2013	 Approval of CIP/PIP Methodology and Draft CIP/PIP screening and evaluation
	criteria
	• Initiate Request for Information from sponsors for additional or updated
	project/program information if required
July 2013	 Approval of Final CIP/PIP screening and evaluation criteria
	 Consolidate updated project/program information
	 Evaluate programs/projects using prioritization criteria
October 2013	 Review Draft 2013 Strategic Plan/CMP that includes the draft CIP/PIP
November/	 Approval of Final Strategic Plan/CMP and CIP/PIP
December 2013	
January through	 Develop and adopt Alameda CTC's two-year Allocation plan
April 2014	

Fiscal Impact

There is no fiscal impact at this time.

Attachments

Attachment A:	Alameda CTC Policy Framework for Planning, Programming and
	Monitoring Feedback Loop Process Chart
Attachment B:	Annual Programming Revenue
Attachment C:	Annual Programming Revenue: Pass-through and Discretionary Funds
Attachment D:	Current Program Funding and Current/Future Programming Cycles
Attachment E:	Description of Funding Sources Programmed by Alameda CTC



Page 329

Capital Improvement Program Annual Programming Revenue Attachment B

Summary: The Alameda CTC is responsible for approximately \$164 million in funding annually for capital projects and programs over the seven-year CIP time-frame (FY 13/14 through FY 19/20). This annual revenue forecast was developed from actual revenue, and future funding assumptions.

FUNDING SOURCES		FY 13/14		FY 14/15		FY 15/16	Ë	scal Year FY 16/17	FY 17/	18		FY 18/19		FY 19/20	ΤΟΤΑΙ	
FEDERAL																
STP/CMAQ (inc TE Program)	Ŷ	15,075,000	ŝ	15,075,000	ş	15,075,000	\$	15,075,000	\$ 15,07	75,000	\$	15,075,000	ş	15,075,000	\$ 105,525,00	Q
STATE																
STIP	Ş	3,838,600	Ş	3,838,600	\$	14,750,000	ş	14,750,000	\$ 15,0(000,00	ş	15,000,000	\$	15,000,000	\$ 82,177,20	0
LOCAL/REGIONAL																
Transportation Fund for Clean Air	ş	1,710,000	Ş	1,710,000	ş	1,710,000	Ş	1,710,000	\$ 1,71	10,000	Ş	1,710,000	Ş	1,710,000	\$ 11,970,00	0
Lifeline Transportation Program	Ŷ	3,200,000	Ś	3,200,000	ŝ	3,200,000	Ŷ	3,200,000	\$ 3,2(000,00	Ś	3,200,000	Ŷ	3,200,000	\$ 22,400,00	0
2000 Measure B Revenue	Ŷ	114,600,000	Ŷ	116,892,000	Ŷ	119,229,840	Ş	121,614,437	\$ 124,0	46,726	Ş	126,527,660	Ŷ	129,058,213	\$ 851,968,87	6
MB Programs (59.9%) MB Canital Deviante (40.1%)		68,645,400 45 954 600		70,018,308 46 873 692		71,418,674 47 811 166		72,847,048 48 767 389	74,3	03,989		75,790,068 50 737 592		77,305,870 51 752 344	\$ 510,329,31 \$ 341 639 5	57
Vehicle Registration Fee Revenue	v	10 975 000	v	10 975 000	v	10 975 000	Ŷ	10 925 000	10.9	25,000	v	10 975 000	Ŷ	10 925 000	\$ 76.475.00	
VRF Local Rd Pass-through (60%)	•	6,555,000	<u>۲</u>	6,555,000	}	6,555,000	}	6,555,000	6,5	55,000	}	6,555,000	,	6,555,000	\$ 45,885,00	00
VRF Discretionary (40%)		4,370,000		4,370,000		4,370,000		4,370,000	4,3	70,000		4,370,000		4,370,000	\$ 30,590,00	00
Subtotal Local/Regional	Ś	130,435,000	Ş	132,727,000	Ş	135,064,840	ŝ	137,449,437	\$ 139,8{	31,726	Ş	142,362,660	Ş	144,893,213	\$ 962,813,87	,6
TOTAL	÷	149,348,600	ŝ	151,640,600	ŝ	164,889,840	Ş	167,274,437	\$ 169,95	6,726	ŝ	172,437,660	Ş	174,968,213	\$ 1,150,516,07	9

Pass-through and Discretionary Funding Revenue Capital Improvement Program Attachment C

> TABLE 1 Pass-through Funding Revenue TABLE 2 Discretionary Funding Revenue Transit Center Development (0.19%) Local Streets and Roads (22.34%) **Transportation Fund for Clean Air** Mass Transit Services (21.22%) Lifeline Transportation Program Bike/Pedestrian Safety (5%) Bike/Pedestrian (3.75%) STP/CMAQ (inc TE Program) Bike/Pedestrian Safety (5%) Transit Discretionary (30%) Vehicle Registration Fee Vehicle Registration Fee City/County Share (70%) Bike/Pedestrian (1.25%) Paratransit (9.02%) Local Technology (10%) Subtotal Local/Regional MB Programs (59.9%) Paratransit (1.43 %) FUNDING SOURCES FUNDING SOURCES Mass Transit (25%) VRF Local Rd (60%) Express Bus (0.7%) LOCAL/REGIONAL LOCAL/REGIONAL 2000 Measure B 2000 Measure B TOTAL Federal TOTAL STATE STIP

	FY 13/14		FY 14/15		:Y 15/16	ïL	scal Year FY 16/17		Y 17/18		Y 18/19		-Y 19/20		ΤΟΤΑΙ	
Ś	25,473,632	Ŷ	25,983,104	ŝ	26,502,767	Ŷ	27,032,822	Ŷ	27,573,478	ŝ	28,124,948	ŝ	28,687,447	ŝ	189,378,198	
Ŷ	24,196,529	Ŷ	24,680,460	ŝ	25,174,069	Ŷ	25,677,551	ŝ	26,191,102	ŝ	26,714,924	ŝ	27,249,222	Ş	179,883,856	
ዯ	10,285,235	Ŷ	10,490,940	ŝ	10,700,759	Ŷ	10,914,774	Ŷ	11,133,070	Ŷ	11,355,731	ŝ	11,582,846	Ŷ	76,463,355	
\$ `	4,276,013	\$	4,361,533	\$	4,448,763	\$	4,537,739	ŝ	4,628,493	ŝ	4,721,063	ŝ	4,815,485	Ś	31,789,089	
Ŷ	6,555,000	\$	6,555,000	ŝ	6,555,000	Ŷ	6,555,000	Ŷ	6,555,000	Ŷ	6,555,000	Ŷ	6,555,000	Ş	45,885,000	
Ş	70,786,409	Ş	72,071,037	Ş	73,381,358	Ş	74,717,885	Ş	76,081,143	Ş	77,471,666	Ş	78,889,999	Ş	523,399,497	

Fiscal Year

	FY 13/14		FY 14/15		FY 15/16		FY 16/17		FY 17/18		FY 18/19		FY 19/20		TOTAL	
Ş	15,075,000	Ŷ	15,075,000	ŝ	15,075,000	Ś	15,075,000	\$	15,075,000	10	15,075,000	ŝ	15,075,000	÷	105,525,000	
Ş	3,838,600	Ş	3,838,600	Ş	14,750,000	Ş	14,750,000	Ş	15,000,000 \$	\$	15,000,000	Ş	15,000,000	Ş	82,177,200	
Ŷ	1,197,000	ŝ	1,197,000	Ŷ	1,197,000	Ŷ	1,197,000	Ş	1,197,000	۰.	1,197,000	Ŷ	1,197,000	Ŷ	8,379,000	
ዯ	513,000	Ś	513,000	Ś	513,000	Ś	513,000	ŝ	513,000	ŝ	513,000	Ŷ	513,000	Ŷ	3,591,000	
Ŷ	3,200,000	ŝ	3,200,000	ŝ	3,200,000	ŝ	3,200,000	ŝ	3,200,000	۰A	3,200,000	Ŷ	3,200,000	Ŷ	22,400,000	
Ŷ	798,189	Ŷ	814,153	ŝ	830,436	ŝ	847,045	Ŷ	863,985	•••	881,265	Ŷ	898,890	Ŷ	5,933,963	
Ŷ	1,630,586	Ŷ	1,663,198	Ŷ	1,696,462	Ŷ	1,730,391	Ş	1,764,999 \$	ئ م	1,800,299	ŝ	1,836,305	Ŷ	12,122,239	
Ŷ	1,425,338	Ŷ	1,453,844	ŝ	1,482,921	Ŷ	1,512,580	Ş	1,542,831	ئ م	1,573,688	Ŷ	1,605,162	Ŷ	10,596,363	
Ŷ	216,651	Ŷ	220,984	Ş	225,404	Ŷ	229,912	Ş	234,510	ŝ	239,201	Ŷ	243,985	Ş	1,610,647	
Ŷ	2,731,250	Ŷ	2,731,250	÷	2,731,250	ŝ	2,731,250	Ş	2,731,250	د م	2,731,250	ŝ	2,731,250	Ŷ	19,118,750	
Ŷ	1,092,500	ŝ	1,092,500	ŝ	1,092,500	Ŷ	1,092,500	Ş	1,092,500	ئ م	1,092,500	Ŷ	1,092,500	Ŷ	7,647,500	
Ŷ	546,250	Ŷ	546,250	ŝ	546,250	Ŷ	546,250	Ŷ	546,250	\$	546,250	Ŷ	546,250	Ş	3,823,750	
Ş	13,350,764	Ş	13,432,179	Ş	13,515,223	Ş	13,599,927	Ş	13,686,326	\$	13,774,452	Ş	13,864,341	Ş	95,223,212	
Ş	32,264,364	Ş	32,345,779	Ş	43,340,223	Ş	43,424,927	Ş	43,761,326	Ş	43,849,452	Ş	43,939,341	Ş	282,925,412	

Page 333

Summary:

This table depicts current and future programming cycles of various funding sources, and notes the anticipated year of programming decisions by the Alameda CTC's Commission. Also provided, is a general implementation schedule of planning documents associated with the CIP development.

- The DARK GRAY BOXES represents the cycle duration of available revenues in FY 12/13 Coordinated Call for Projects, Paratransit Gap, TFCA, etc.
- The PATTERN BOXES represents future funding cycles and the anticpated programming actions associated with these call for projects.
- The RECTANGLE from FY 13/14 to FY 15/16 represents the time period of the allocation plan.



						 111111111
Bike/Pedestrian ¹	\$ 2,500,000			,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
Transit Center Development	\$ 426,201					
Vehicle Registration Fee Discretionary Mass Transit (25%) ¹	\$ 5,000,000			,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
Local Technology (10%)	\$ 2,118,500	////////				
Bike/Pedestrian Safety (5.0%) ¹	\$ 1,500,000					
ALAMEDA CTC APPROVAL SCHEDULE						
Countywide Transporation Plan (CWTP)	4 year Cycle - June Approval					
Congestion Management Plan (CMP) / CIP	Odd year Cycle - Dec. Approval					
			Allocation	Plan		

Notes:

¹ Included in the FY 12/13 Coordinated Call for Projects

LEGEND



Attachment E: Description of Funding Sources Programmed by Alameda CTC

FEDERAL FUNDING PROGRAMS

Surface Transportation Program. The Alameda CTC, as Alameda County's congestion management agency, is responsible for soliciting and prioritizing projects in Alameda County for a portion of the federal Surface Transportation Program (STP). The STP is provided through funding from the reauthorization of federal funding for surface transportation, the legislation by which the Alameda CTC receives federal monies. MTC's One Bay Area Grant Program is how these funds will be allocated in the coming years.

Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality Program. The Alameda CTC is responsible for soliciting and prioritizing projects in Alameda County for a portion of the federal Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality Program (CMAQ). These funds are used on projects that will provide an air quality benefit. MTC's One Bay Area Grant Program is how these funds will be allocated in the coming years.

STATE AND REGIONAL FUNDING PROGRAMS

State Transportation Improvement Program. Under state law, the Alameda CTC works with project sponsors, including Caltrans, transit agencies and local jurisdictions to solicit and prioritize projects that will be programmed in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Of the STIP funds, 75 percent are programmed at the county level and earmarked as "County Share." The remaining 25 percent are programmed at the state level and are part of the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program. Each STIP cycle, the California Transportation Commission adopts a Fund Estimate (FE) that serves as the basis for financially constraining STIP proposals from counties and regions.

Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program (TFCA). State law permits the BAAQMD to collect a fee of \$4/vehicle/ year to reduce air pollution from motor vehicles. Of these funds, the District programs 60 percent; the remaining 40 percent are allocated annually to the designated overall program manager for each county—the Alameda CTC in Alameda County. Of the Alameda CTC's portion, 70 percent are programmed to the cities and county and 30 percent are programmed to transit-related projects.

Lifeline Transportation Program (LTP). Alameda CTC is responsible for soliciting and prioritizing projects in Alameda County for the LTP. The LTP provides funds for transportation projects that serve low income communities using a mixture of state and federal fund sources. The current program is made up of multiple fund sources including: State Transit Account, Job Access Reverse Commute and State Proposition 1B funds. The make-up of this program will likely change due to the passage of MAP-21 and most of the Proposition 1B funds already allocated.

LOCAL FUNDING PROGRAMS

Measure B Program Funds: These include 60% of the sales tax dollars that are allocated to 20 separate organizations via direct pass-through funds or discretionary grant programs. In April 2012, the Alameda CTC entered into new Master Program Funding Agreements with all recipients, which require more focused reporting requirements for fund reserves. Agreements were executed Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit), Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA), Altamont Commuter Express (ACE), the Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority (LAVTA), and the Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART); cities include Alameda, Albany, Berkeley, Dublin, Emeryville, Fremont, Hayward, Livermore, Newark,

Oakland, Piedmont, Pleasanton, San Leandro, and Union City (same agreement as for Union City Transit); and Alameda County.

The funds allocated to jurisdictions through the Master Program Funding Agreements include the following:

- Local Transportation, including local streets and roads projects (22.33 percent)
- Mass Transit, including express bus service (21.92 percent)
- Special Transportation (Paratransit) for seniors and people with disabilities (10.5 percent)
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety (5 percent)
- Transit-Oriented Development (0.19 percent)
- Measure B Capital Funds: These include 40% of the sales tax dollars that are allocated to specific projects as described in the voter approved November 2000 Expenditure Plan, as amended. Each recipient has entered into a Master Projects Funding Agreement and Project-Specific Funding Agreements for each project element. Funds are allocated through the project strategic planning process which identifies project readiness and funding requirements on an annual basis. Project-specific funding allocations are made via specific recommendations approved by the Commission.
- Vehicle Registration Fee: The Alameda County Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) Program will be allocated in part through the Alameda CTC Master Program Funding Agreements as pass-through funds, and others through discretionary programs, as noted below:
 - Local streets and roads (60 percent, allocated through MPFA)
 - Transit (25 percent, allocated through discretionary program)
 - Local transportation technology (10 percent, discretionary program)
 - Bicycle and pedestrian projects (5 percent, discretionary program)

Local Exchange Program. Under this program, the Alameda CTC can exchange state and federal funds for local monies, giving project sponsors the flexibility to streamline and expedite project delivery. The local funds also allow agencies to begin projects that would otherwise have been delayed due to the lack of available STIP funding. The program includes projects such as bus purchases, overpasses, intermodal facilities, local road improvements and arterial management projects.

OTHER FUNDING SOURCES

There are numerous other funding programs that fund transportation investments in Alameda County, but the Alameda CTC does not have a direct role in programming these funds, including, but not limited to:

- Federal Disaster Assistance
- Federal Transit Sections 5300 series
- State Interregional Transportation Improvement Program
- State Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program
- State Transportation Development Act (transit, paratransit and bicycle/pedestrian)
- State Transit Assistance
- State Highway Operations and Protection Program
- Local BART Sales Tax
- Local Bridge Tolls (Regional Measure 2) sometimes Alameda CTC may have a role in identifying projects for these funds
- Local Gas Tax (Highway Users Tax Account)



Memorandum

DATE: May 15, 2013

TO: Alameda County Transportation Commission

FROM: Programs and Projects Committee

SUBJECT: Approval of 2014 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Principles

Recommendation

It is recommended the Commission approve the 2014 STIP Principles for the development of the 2014 STIP project list.

Summary

The overall process for the development of the STIP begins with the development of the STIP Fund Estimate. The STIP Fund Estimate serves as the basis for determining the county shares for the STIP and the amounts available for programming each fiscal year during the five-year STIP period. Typically, the county shares represent the amount of new STIP funding made available in the last two years of a given STIP period.

Discussion

The STIP is a multi-year capital improvement program of transportation projects on and off the State Highway System, funded with revenues from the State Highway Account and other funding sources. Senate Bill 45 (SB 45) was signed into law in 1996 and had significant impacts on the regional transportation planning and programming process. The statute delegated major funding decisions to local level and allows the Alameda CTC to have a more active role in selecting and programming transportation projects. SB 45 changed the transportation funding structure; modified the transportation programming cycle, program components, and expenditure priorities.

The STIP is composed of two sub-elements: 75% of the STIP funds going towards the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and 25% going to the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP).

The Alameda CTC adopts and forwards a program of RTIP projects to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for each STIP cycle. As the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the nine-county Bay Area, the MTC is responsible for developing the regional priorities for the RTIP. The MTC approves the region's RTIP and submits it to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) for inclusion in the STIP.

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is responsible for developing the ITIP. Alameda CTC will work with Caltrans District 4 and the MTC to identify potential projects to be included in the ITIP.

Historically, the amount of funding available to Alameda County in a given STIP cycle has varied from highs in the \$200 million range to \$0. The Alameda County shares for the last two STIP cycles have ranged from \$10 to \$30 million (see Attachment A).

The 2014 STIP Fund Estimate will establish the basis by which the Alameda County Share for the 2014 STIP is determined. The Alameda County share represents the amount of new programming capacity that will be available for Alameda County projects in the 2014 STIP cycle. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) is scheduled to approve the final assumptions for the 2014 STIP Fund Estimate in May 2013, the draft Fund Estimate in June 2013 and a final Fund Estimate in August 2013.

The MTC region's STIP proposal (i.e. the RTIP) is due to the CTC in December 2013. Correspondingly, the counties' proposals are due to the MTC in late October 2013. The 2014 STIP Development Schedule (Attachment B) assumes the Alameda CTC Board approving Alameda County's 2014 RTIP in October 2013.

As in past STIP cycles, the CTC and MTC are not scheduled to adopt the final STIP policies until late summer. The development of the Alameda County RTIP proposal will have to be closely coordinated with the statewide and regional development of the 2014 STIP policies. The CTC schedule calls for adoption of the 2014 STIP in April 2014.

Staff is requesting Commission approval of principles by which the Alameda County share of the 2014 STIP will be programmed (see Attachment C). The proposed principles for developing the 2014 RTIP Project List include consideration of previously approved STIP commitments. A number of commitments related to the programming of Alameda County STIP shares have been approved beginning with funds programmed in the 2008 STIP cycle. These commitments include Resolution 3434 projects and funds required to payback Measure B advances for project development work on Proposition 1B Infrastructure Bond funded projects. Local funds committed to the I-Bond project development work helped leverage and deliver approximately \$500 Million of state funded projects.

Some of the previous STIP commitments have been fulfilled, and some remain for consideration in the upcoming 2014 STIP cycle. The summary attached to the proposed principles provides a status of the previously approved STIP commitments. It is anticipated that the previously approved STIP commitments, may be fulfilled by the programming of funds other than STIP funds in the context of the proposed uniform approach to programming all sources of transportation funding available through the Alameda CTC.

The proposed principles for the development of the 2014 STIP are intended to be consistent with the draft "Policy Framework for Planning, Programming and Monitoring" being developed by the Alameda CTC to improve the connection between the planning and programming related to transportation funding in Alameda County. While the policy framework being developed may not

be available in its final form to be employed during the 2014 STIP programming, the goals and objectives stemming from the Countywide Transportation Plan efforts will serve as the basis for the criteria to be used to evaluate candidates for the 2014 STIP RTIP programming. The criteria is intended to provide a measure of the degree to which a proposed project, or other activity intended to be funded by funding programmed by the Alameda CTC, achieves or advances the goals and objectives described in the Countywide Transportation Plan.

During the 2012 STIP development process, the following policies were prioritized and it is proposed that they be applied to the development of the 2014 STIP:

- The Region's CMAs notify all eligible project sponsors within the county of the availability of STIP funds; and
- Caltrans should notify the region's CMAs and MTC of any anticipated costs increases to currently-programmed STIP projects in the same time frame as the new project applications.

Fiscal Impact

There is no fiscal impact at this time.

Attachment(s)

Attachment A: Alameda CTC STIP Programming Levels Attachment B: 2014 STIP Development Schedule Attachment C: Draft Principles for the Development of the 2014 STIP Project List

ALAMEDA CTC STIP PROGRAMMING LEVELS



Attachment A

Ala CTC Programming History-Update-April'12 (Graph).xls

Attachment B

Alameda CTC Activity	Date	MTC/ CTC Activity
• Approve 2014 STIP Schedule	April 2013	
• Alameda CTC Approve 2014 STIP Principles	May 2013	• CTC Approve Final Fund Estimate Assumptions
	June 2013	 CTC Releases Draft Fund Estimate (June 11th) CTC Releases Draft STIP Guidelines
	July 2013	 MTC Reviews Draft RTIP Policies
	August 2013	CTC Approves Fund EstimateCTC Adopts STIP Guidelines
Draft RTIP Proposal to Alameda CTC Commission	September 2013	 MTC Approves Final RTIP Policies
• Final RTIP Proposal to Alameda CTC Committees and Commission	October 2013	
	November 2013	MTC Approves RTIP
	December 2013	• RTIP due to CTC
	April 2014	CTC Adopts 2014 STIP

2014 STIP Development Schedule

1. Sponsors of existing STIP programming in future years of the STIP as well as Caltrans sponsored projects with open Expenditure Authorization authority (or with a close out pending) will also be required to submit a project application for funding consideration.

Draft Principles for the Development of the 2014 STIP Project List

- All current sponsors will be required to provide updated project definition, status, schedule, cost and funding information for currently programmed projects.
- Previous commitments for STIP programming, included in the attached list, will be considered during the development of the 2014 STIP project list.
- It is anticipated that any new funding programmed in the 2014 STIP will be made available in FY's 2017/18 and 2018/19.
- Any project submitted for funding must be consistent with the Countywide Transportation Plan and satisfy all requirements for programming into the STIP.
- Projects recommended for STIP programming must demonstrate readiness to meet applicable programming, allocation and delivery deadlines associated with STIP programming.
- Consideration of the following are proposed for the prioritization required for the development of the 2014 STIP project list:
 - The principles and objectives set forth in the draft "Policy Framework for Planning, Programming and Monitoring" being developed by the Alameda CTC to improve the connection between the planning and programming related to transportation funding in Alameda County;
 - Previous commitments for STIP programming approved by the Alameda CTC (as described in the attached summary);
 - The degree to which a proposed project, or other activity intended to be funded by transportation funding programmed by the Alameda CTC, achieves or advances the goals and objectives included in the Countywide Transportation Plan; and
 - Maintaining a balance of projects in various phases of project delivery with viable project implementation strategies based on project-specific information provided by applicants related to the following aspects of project delivery:
 - The current phase of project delivery, i.e. planning/scoping, preliminary engineering/environmental, design, right of way, or construction;
 - The status of environmental clearance;
 - The project cost/funding plan by phase;
 - The potential for phasing of initial segment(s) which are fully-funded and provide independent benefit; and
 - Potential impediments, i.e. risks, to successful project implementation in accordance with the proposed project delivery schedule.

Attachment(s):

Table A: Summary of Previously Approved Alameda County STIP-RIP Commitments

Table A: Summary of Previously	Adopted A	Alamed	t County STIP-RIP Commitments
	Commit	tment	
	Amo	unt	
Project	(5 X I ,	,000	Notes
Alameda County I-Bond Projects	\$ 8,0	000	• \$8M approved by Alameda CTC July 2012.
			Prioritized programming included in previous ACCMA Board actions
			• See Note 1
Route 24 Corridor	\$ 4,0	000	
Dumbarton Rail Project	\$ 91,0	000	• \$91M identified to satisfy MTC Resolution 3434
			 See Note 2 and Note 3
BART Warm Springs Extension	\$ 69,0	000	\$69M identified to satisfy MTC Resolution 3434 requirement, which will be superceded by Plan Bay Area
			\$3.5M fulfilled in 2012 STIP (Warm Springs Station Access Improvement – Automall Project)
			• See Note 2 and Note 3
AC Transit Bus Rapid Transit Project	\$ 40,0	000	• \$40M identified to satisfy MTC Resolution 3434 requirement, which will be superceded by Plan Bay Area
			• \$3M fulfilled in 2012 STIP (combined with Lifeline Backfill commitment)
			\$1.5M fulfilled with Lifeline/MB Express Bus funding
			• See Note 2 and Note 3
I-880 Broadway/Jackson Interchange	\$ 3,0	000	
I-880 Corridor Project	\$ 1,5	006	

Commitments
y STIP-RIP
meda Count
Adopted Ala
f Previously A
Summary o
Table A:

Notes:

- Resolution 08-018 identified projects in Alameda County funded by CMIA, TCIF or TLSP I-Bond funding collectively as "Infrastructure Bond Projects," including the construction phase, and committed prioritized programming without specifying an amount for the commitment to the Infrastructure Bond Projects.
- programmed to the Reso 3434 Projects; and that a minimum of twenty-five percent (25%) of any new STIP Warm Springs Extension; 2) AC Transit Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project; and 3) Dumbarton Rail Project. programming capacity be programmed to the BART Warm Springs Extension Project if all programming Resolution 08-018 identified three projects collectively referred to as "Reso 3434 Projects." 1) BART Resolution 08-018 requires that up to fifty percent (50%) of any new STIP programming capacity be requirements are met. сi
- capital funding is identified in the long range plan. The environmental phase of the DRC is fully funded by currently under review in the context of the draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), or "Plan Bay Area," existing fund sources, 2)The capital phase of the Bus Rapid Transit Project (BRT) is partially funded by a priority for future funding in the Plan Bay Area, and 3) The capital phase of the Warm Springs Extension which is being developed by the MTC. For example: 1)The Dumbarton Rail Corridor Project (DRC) is included in the Draft Plan Bay Area as "environmental only," which indicates that no priority for future The standing of the Reso 3434 Projects in the Region's transportation planning and funding arena is Project (WSX) is fully funded by existing sources. ω.



Memorandum

DATE: May 15, 2013

TO: Alameda County Transportation Commission

FROM: Programs and Projects Committee

SUBJECT: Approval of Draft Fiscal Year 2012/13 Coordinated Funding Program

Recommendation

It is recommended the Commission approve the Draft FY 2012/13 Coordinate Funding Program.

Summary

The FY 2012-13 Coordinated Program included multiple fund sources allocated by the Alameda CTC under a unified programming and evaluation schedule. Overall, \$65.2 million in funding was available for transportation projects. The fund sources included Federal One Bay Area Grant (OBAG), Measure B and Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) funds. The OBAG funds comprised approximately 80% of the total funds available. The remaining 20% included Measure B Bike / Ped Countywide Discretionary Funds (CDF), Measure B Express Bus Grant, VRF Bike / Ped Grant and VRF Transit funds.

The intent of the FY 2012-13 Coordinated Program was to reduce the number of applications required from project sponsors and to consider multiple county level programming efforts for various funding sources under a unified programming and evaluation schedule. The coordinated programming effort is also intended to provide funding for projects in the context of all programming commitments of the Alameda CTC.

The One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) program is funded with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) Cycle 2 Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) federal funding sources for four fiscal years (FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16) addressed in MTC Resolution 4035. The OBAG program supports California's climate law, SB 375, which requires a Sustainable Communities Strategy to integrate land use and transportation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Per the OBAG requirements 70 percent of the funds must be used towards transportation projects within Priority Development Areas (PDAs).

The OBAG Programming Guidelines were approved by the Commission at their December 2012 meeting. The guidelines included programming categories, program eligibility, and screening and selection criteria for the OBAG projects. The action also provided that additional fund

sources allocated by the Alameda CTC be considered in coordination with the OBAG programming process, with a focus on the PDA Supportive Transportation Investment and Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Categories.

Discussion

The FY 2012-13 Coordinated Program Call for Projects was released on February 4, 2013. The call included multiple fund sources allocated by the Alameda CTC under a unified programming and evaluation schedule. Overall, \$65.2 million in funding is available for transportation projects. The fund sources included:

- 1. Federal OBAG (\$53.9 million):
 - a. Surface Transportation Program (STP)
 - b. Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)
- 2. Local:
 - a. Measure B
 - i. Bicycle/Pedestrian Countywide Discretionary Fund (\$2.5 million)
 - ii. Countywide Express Bus Service Fund (\$2.2 million)
 - b. Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF)
 - i. Pedestrian And Bicyclist Access And Safety Program (\$1.5 million)
 - ii. Transit for Congestion Relief Program (\$5.0 million)

The intent of the FY 2012-13 Coordinated Program was to reduce the number of applications required from project sponsors and to consider multiple county level programming efforts for various funding sources under a unified programming and evaluation schedule. The coordinated programming effort is also intended to provide funding for projects in the context of all programming commitments of the Alameda CTC.

Federal Funding

The Federal OBAG funding is intended to support the Alameda CTC's Sustainable Communities Strategy by linking transportation dollars to land use decisions and target transportation investments to support Priority Development Areas (PDAs). Alameda County's share of the OBAG funding is \$53.9 million of STP/CMAQ spread over four fiscal years (FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16). Per MTC Resolution 4035, 70 percent of the overall OBAG funding must be programmed to transportation projects that support PDAs and the remaining 30 percent of the OBAG funds may be programmed for transportation projects anywhere in the county. Projects must be eligible for STP or CMAQ and one or more of the following OBAG programs:

- PDA Supportive Transportation Investments
 - The transportation project or program must be in one of the 17 PDAs designated as "active PDAs" (Attachment A) by the Alameda CTC, or meet the minimum definition of "Proximate Access" to an active PDA. The 17 "active PDAs" were approved by the Alameda CTC in December 2012.
- Local Streets and Roads (LSR) Preservation

Sub-allocated to cities by formula. The formula's target numbers (Attachment B) will represent the maximum LSR funds that may be received by a jurisdiction. The minimum LSR funds a jurisdiction may receive is \$100,000.

Measure B and VRF Funding

Measure B - Approved by Alameda County voters in 2000, Measure B is a half-cent transportation sales tax that is financing a multitude of projects to improve the County's transportation system. Collections began in April 2002 and will continue through March 2022. The Measure B Expenditure Plan outlines projects and programs that will be funded with the sales tax revenue.

Measure B Bicycle and Pedestrian Countywide Discretionary Fund (CDF) Program -Five percent (5%) of the net revenue collected for Measure B is dedicated to bicycle and pedestrian projects, 25% of which is distributed on a discretionary basis through the Measure B Bicycle and Pedestrian CDF program. The funds are used to expand and enhance bicycle and pedestrian access, convenience, safety and usage in Alameda County, focusing on countywide priorities in the Countywide Bicycle Plan and Countywide Pedestrian Plan.

Measure B Countywide Express Bus Service Fund - A competitive grant program that is funded with 0.7% of the net sales tax revenue collected and is dedicated to express bus service projects. The goal of the Express Bus Grant Program is to create, expand, and enhance express bus services, focusing on projects with countywide significance. Eligible recipients are limited to AC Transit and LAVTA.

Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) - Approved as Measure F by Alameda County voters in 2010, VRF is a \$10 per year vehicle registration fee on each annual motor vehicle registration or renewal of registration in Alameda County starting in May 2011. The goal of the VRF program is to support transportation investments in a way that sustains the County's transportation network and reduces traffic congestion and vehicle-related pollution.

VRF Pedestrian and Bicyclist Access and Safety Program - Funded with 5% of VRF funds, this program is intended to improve the safety of bicyclists and pedestrians by reducing conflicts with motor vehicles on arterials and other locally-maintained roads and to reduce congestion in areas such as schools, downtowns, transit hubs, and other high activity locations.

VRF Transit for Congestion Relief Program - Funded with 25% of VRF funds, this program is to promote the use public transportation, by making the existing transit system more efficient and effective, and improve access to schools and jobs. The goal of this program is to decrease automobile usage and thereby reduce both localized and area wide congestion and air pollution.

Eligibility, Screening and Selection Methodology

The OBAG Programming Guidelines were approved by the Commission at their December 2012 meeting. The guidelines included programming categories, program eligibility, and screening and selection criteria for the OBAG projects. The action also provided that additional fund sources allocated by the Alameda CTC be considered in coordination with the OBAG programming process, with a focus on the PDA Supportive Transportation Investment and Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Categories. Listed below are highlights of principles approved by the Commission.

- In order to be eligible to receive federal funds through the OBAG Program, local agencies were required to:
 - 1. Adopt a Complete Streets Resolutions (or compliant General Plan) by April 1, 2013,
 - 2. Receive certification of agency housing element by the California Department of Housing and Community Development by January 31, 2013.
 - 3. Complete Local Agency Certification Checklist
- Transportation projects were required to be consistent with the adopted Regional Transportation Plan, Alameda Countywide Transportation Plan and / or the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans.
- Transportation projects were required to be eligible for funding from one or more of the fund programs incorporated into the coordinated program.
- Transportation projects within or having proximate access to the 17 "Active" PDAs listed in Alameda CTC's Priority Development Area Investment and Growth Strategy were eligible to apply for OBAG PDA Supportive category funds.
- Local jurisdiction were provided the flexibility of applying for OBAG, Local or a combination of OBAG and Local funds
- Commission approved using Measure B and / or VRF Bike and Pedestrian funds as a local match for the Safe Routes to School Program.
- Alameda CTC may prioritize local funds as matching funds for projects requesting OBAG funding.

On February 4, 2013 a call for projects requesting applications for transportation projects was released. In response to the call, the Alameda CTC received 69 applications requesting a total of \$121.1 Million. Of the 69 applications received:

- 20 projects requesting approximately \$83.6 Million OBAG –PDA supportive funds;
- 15 Projects requesting \$15.2 Million OBAG-LSR funds; and
- 34 projects requesting \$22.2 Million Measure B /VRF funds

Projects were first screened for eligibility based on project selection criteria adopted by the Commission at the December 2012 meeting. The project selection criteria included project
deliverability criteria as well as land use criteria mandated by the OBAG program listed in MTC's Resolution 4035 (Attachment C). Projects requesting Local funds were scored and prioritized based on the project delivery criteria (Attachment D).

A Review Panel comprised of 6 members (Alameda CTC staff and in-house consultants) was convened to review and evaluate the applications. The project review process was a time intensive endeavor, including review of the application material by each team member, panel meetings to discuss the applications and identify follow up questions, meetings to review additional information and scoring.

The Program goal is to fund projects that will best serve the County. The coordinated program provided flexibility to sponsors to request funds from multiple sources. It also allowed the review team to evaluate the funding options available for projects based on project type and need. In some cases local projects were considered for multiple fund sources (i.e. OBAG funds and Measure B / VRF Transit funds).

There were a variety of project applications received. The evaluation process considered the need to balance the different project types. Through the evaluation process, the projects were divided into the following categories:

- PDA Supportive projects
- Bike Ped Capital projects
- Bike Ped Feasibility Studies
- Bike Ped Master Plans
- Bike Ped Programs
- Transit Capital
- Transit Operations

The program recommendation includes categories of projects, such as feasibility studies for capital projects, bicycle and/or pedestrian master plans, and programs in order to compare and rank the similar types of projects.

The Alameda County's Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) also played an active role in the review process. The BPAC is made up of 11 members that represent both bicycling and pedestrian interests from all areas of the county. Since most of the BPAC members are regular users of these facilities, their input assisted in the review panel's understanding of the project. The BPAC's roles in the review process include providing comments on MTC's Complete Streets Checklist as well as providing a recommendation on the overall program as an advisory committee to the Alameda CTC.

Per MTC guidelines sponsors requesting funds programmed through the MTC need to complete an online Complete Streets checklist which must be reviewed by their respective County BPAC. This checklist review process generated multiple questions and comments that were incorporated into the overall review process. The questions from the review panel and the BPAC were submitted to application sponsors, and all responses informed the review and evaluation process. **Revised fund estimate** Based on the number of quality applications received and also revisiting the programming capacity for the respective local grant revenues through the mid-year budget process, staff is proposing to increase the funds available to program as detailed in the table below. The revised assumptions include programming capacity from future year Measure B and VRF revenues.

Program	Fund Estimate (\$)	Revised Estimate (\$)
OBAG-LSR	15,257,000	15,257,000
OBAG-PDA Supportive Transportation Investments	38,702,000	38,702,000
Measure B Bike/Ped CDF	2,500,000	3,000,000
VRF Bike/Ped	1,500,000	1,500,000
VRF Transit	5,000,000	10,000,000
Measure B Express Bus	2,200,000	2,200,000
Total	65,159,000	70,659,000

Draft FY 2012-13 Coordinated Program

The Draft FY 2012-13 Coordinated Program detailed below assumes the availability of the revised fund estimate revenues (also see Attachment E and Attachment F)

Local Streets and Roads (LSR) (\$15.2 Million available)

Alameda CTC received 15 applications requesting \$15.2 million OBAG-LSR funds. The draft FY 2012-13 Coordinated Program includes approximately \$15.2 million of federal OBAG STP funds towards fifteen (15) LSR projects.

The LSR funding was sub-allocated to the cities and County based on a 50% Population and 50% Lane Miles formula. The target programming generated as a result of this formula was the maximum LSR funds that a jurisdiction received. The minimum LSR funds a jurisdiction received was \$100,000. The resulting programming action will support the "fix it first" strategy as well as address the LSR maintenance shortfall within Alameda County.

PDA Supportive Transportation Investments (\$38.7 Million available)

Alameda CTC received 20 applications requesting \$83.6 million OBAG-PDA Supportive funds. The draft FY 2012-13 Coordinated Program includes approximately \$38.7 million of federal funds towards ten (10) PDA Supportive Transportation Investment projects. The projects include bicycle, pedestrian, station improvements, station access, bicycle parking, complete streets improvements that encourage bicycle and pedestrian access, and streetscape projects focusing on high-impact, multi-modal improvements.

The projects selected are consistent with the goal of this program which is to decrease automobile usage and thereby reduce both localized and area wide congestion and air pollution. This program of projects will aim to improve, expand and enhance bicycle and pedestrian access, safety, convenience and usage in Alameda County. It will also make it easier for drivers to use public transportation, make the existing transit system more efficient and effective, and improve access to schools and jobs.

Bicycle Pedestrian Projects requesting Measure B / VRF Funds (\$4.5 Million available)

Alameda CTC received 29 applications requesting \$18.2 million Measure B/VRF Bike and Ped funds. The draft FY 2012-13 Coordinated Program includes approximately \$3.7 million of Measure B/ VRF Bike Ped funds towards nine (9) Bike and Ped projects. The draft program includes:

- Five (5) Capital projects representing 87% of Measure B/ VRF Bike Ped funds,
- One (1) Feasibility Study representing 3% of Measure B/ VRF Bike Ped funds,
- One (1) Master Plan representing 3% of Measure B/ VRF Bike Ped funds, and
- One (1) Program representing 7% of Measure B/ VRF Bike Ped funds.

At its December 2012 meeting, the Commission previously approved Measure B/ VRF Bike Ped funds to be used as local match for the Federal Countywide Safe Routes to School Program (SR2S) program.

Transit Projects requesting Measure B / VRF Funds (\$12.2 Million available)

Alameda CTC received 5 applications specifically requesting approximately \$4 million Measure B/VRF Transit funds. The draft FY 2012-13 Coordinated Program includes approximately \$12.2 million of Measure B/VRF funds towards seven (7) projects. The draft program includes:

- Three (3) PDA supportive capital projects (transit elements) representing 79% of Measure B / VRF Transit funds, and
- Four (4) Transit Operation projects representing 21% of Measure B / VRF Transit funds.

The Draft FY 2012/13 Coordinated Funding Program was presented at to the Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee (ACTAC), the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) and the Programs and Projects Committee (PPC). A summary of the comments received is detailed below:

ACTAC Comments:

- Questions and clarifications about the overall evaluation process including the review and scoring process.
- Questioned if the projects were scored only for the category of funds that were requested by the sponsor.
 - Staff clarified that in addition to the original fund request, some projects were also evaluated across the other funding programs category in order to maximize the ability for a sponsor to receive funding.
- ACTAC members expressed interest in a debriefing process and requested project level feedback that would enable sponsors to improve application submittals in future cycles.
 - Staff concurred with ACTAC request

<u>Public comment</u>- Dave Campbell, EBBC, stated that the EBBC had conducted an online survey requesting its members to vote on their preferred projects within Alameda County. The final result of the poll matched quite closely to the draft program of projects presented. Four out of the top five polled projects appeared on the draft program of projects presented.

BPAC Comments:

- The BPAC expressed concerns about the cost, need, effectiveness and design details of City of Fremont's City Center Multi-Modal Improvements Project.
- The BPAC expressed concerns about the cost, need, effectiveness and design details of City of Berkeley's BART Plaza and Transit Area Improvements Project.
- BPAC also had questions regarding why projects were not funded in the Draft program of projects including:
 - East Bay Bus Rapid Transit Bike/Ped Elements (AC Transit)
 - Bike Lane Component (of Lake Merritt BART Bikeways) (Oakland)
 - Line 51 Corridor GPS-based Transit Signal Priority (AC Transit)
- Expressed concern regarding the lack of projects selected from the East County.

Individual BPAC members' comments:

Support Expressed for Projects Recommended for Funding:

- Bike Lane Component (of Lake Merritt BART Bikeways App.) (Oakland)
- Hearst Ave Complete Streets (Berkeley)
- Shattuck Reconfiguration & Ped Safety (Berkeley)
- Bay Trail Gilman to Buchanan (EBRPD)
- Christie Ave Bay Trail Gap Closure (Emeryville)
- Buchanan/Marin Bikeway (Albany)

Support Expressed for Projects NOT Recommended for Funding:

- Niles Canyon Road Ped Safety (ACPWA)
- Niles Canyon Regional Trail Feasibility Study (EBRPD)
- Foothill Road Bicycle Lane Gap Closure (Pleasanton)
- Segment 1 of the Iron Horse Trail, a Class I Multi-Use Trail (Livermore)
- Line 51 Corridor GPS-based Transit Signal Priority (AC Transit)
- > Update of Citywide Bicycle MP, Prep of Ped MP, SR2S (Hayward)
- Village Parkway Bicycle & Pedestrian Improvements (Dublin)

Public Comments

- 1. Dave Campbell, EBBC See ACTAC meeting comment.
- 2. Rebecca Tumposky, Hope Collaborative and David Ralston, City of Oakland requested the Commission to consider including City of Oakland's Coliseum BART Corridor and Infrastructure Connections Project in the program

PPC Comments:

- Concerns about MTC's Resolution 4035 requirement of 70% funding towards PDAs
- Questions about how to advance projects not included in the proposed program
- Questions about details of proposed LSR projects

Public Comments

1. Dave Campbell, EBBC – stated that three projects, Lake Merritt BART station Bikeways, Christie Avenue Bay Trail Gap Closures and the Hearst Avenue Complete Streets projects are important projects whose implementation will benefit all agencies in the county.

Next Steps:

A final program for consideration will be presented to the Committees and Commission at the June 2013 meetings.

MTC's Bridge Tolls Policy

Projects that are recommended for OBAG funding may have federal funds identified over multiple phases of project delivery (i.e. environmental, design or construction). Under MTC's Regional Toll Credit Policy, local funds used in initial phases of a project may be eligible to be applied toward the 11.47% federal local match requirement. Thus if an agency uses 11.47% of the total project cost for environmental and design cost using local funds, they may be eligible to use 100% federal OBAG funding for the Construction phase using toll credits. The sponsor would still need to follow certain federal-aid process requirements for the environmental and right of way phases even if there are no federal funds in those phases. Caltrans Local Assistance has confirmed that as long as construction funds are programmed in MTC's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) they will conduct the field review when needed for the PE phase even if there are no federal funds in the PE (Environmental and Design) phase. This should

significantly reduce the number of fund authorizations (E-76) processed by Caltrans, which can benefit the local sponsors project delivery schedule as well as the Caltrans Local Assistance resource requirements. Staff will also work with local jurisdiction if a project is a candidate for this option.

Attachment(s)

Attachment A:	"Active" PDAs in Alameda County
Attachment B:	OBAG - LSR Shares
Attachment C:	Final OBAG Selection/ Scoring Criteria
Attachment D:	Final Local Funds Selection / Scoring Criteria
Attachment E:	Draft FY 2012/13 Coordinated Funding Program
Attachment F:	Draft FY 2012/13 Coordinated Funding Program (Sorted by Project type)

"ACTIVE" PDAs in Alameda County

Planning Area	Priority Development Area
	Berkeley: Downtown
	Berkeley: University Avenue
	Emeryville: Mixed Use Core
1	Oakland: Coliseum BART Station Area
1	Oakland: Downtown and Jack London Square
	Oakland: Fruitvale & Dimond Areas
	Oakland: TOD Corridors
	Oakland: West Oakland
2	Hayward: The Cannery
	Fremont: Centerville
2	Fremont: City Center
3	Fremont: Irvington District
	Union City: Intermodal Station District
	Dublin: Downtown Specific Plan Area
4	Dublin: Town Center
4	Dublin: Transit Center/Dublin Crossing
	Livermore: Downtown

OBAG - Local Streets and Roads

Miles
Lane
+ 50%
oulation
50% Pop

Jurisdiction in Alameda County	Population	% Population	Lane Mileage	% Lane Mileage	50 % Population + 50% Lane Miles	LSR Share
County of Alameda**	142,833	9.32%	995	12.51%	10.91%	\$ 1,664,840
Alameda	74,640	4.87%	275	3.46%	4.17%	\$ 635,374
Albany	18,488	1.21%	59	0.74%	0.97%	\$ 148,711
3erkeley	114,821	7.49%	453	5.69%	6.59%	\$ 1,005,702
Dublin	46,785	3.05%	247	3.11%	3.08%	\$ 469,932
Emeryville	10,200	0.67%	47	0.59%	0.63%	\$ 100,000
Temont	217,700	14.21%	1,065	13.39%	13.80%	\$ 2,104,615
Iayward	147,113	9.60%	629	7.91%	8.76%	\$ 1,335,550
ivermore	82,400	5.38%	670	8.43%	6.90%	\$ 1,052,780
Vewark	43,041	2.81%	250	3.14%	2.98%	\$ 454,076
Dakland	395,341	25.80%	1,964	24.69%	25.25%	\$ 3,851,136
Siedmont	10,807	0.71%	78	0.99%	0.85%	\$ 128,963
leasanton	71,269	4.65%	498	6.26%	5.45%	\$ 831,849
ian Leandro	86,053	5.62%	392	4.93%	5.27%	\$ 804,507
Jnion City	70,646	4.61%	331	4.16%	4.39%	\$ 668,965
DOUNTY TOTAL	1,532,137	100.00%	7,954	100.00%	100.00%	\$ 15,257,000

** County of Alameda information includes Planning Area 2 and 4

Population Source - Department of Finance 01/01/2012

Attachment B

Index	Final OBAG Selection / Scoring Criteria	Proposed Weight
	Delivery Criteria	
1	 Transportation Project Readiness Funding plan, budget and schedule Implementation issues Agency governing body approvals Local community support Coordination with partners Identified stakeholders 	25
2	 Transportation Project is well-defined and results in a usable segment Defined scope Useable segment. Project study report / equivalent scoping document 	10
3	 Transportation project need / benefit / effectiveness (includes Safety) Defined project need Defined benefit Defined safety and/or security benefits 	15
4	 Sustainability (Ownership / Lifecycle / Maintenance) Identify funding and responsible agency for maintaining the transportation project Transportation Project identified in a long term development plan 	5
5	 Matching Funds Direct Project Matching above Minimum required Local Match 	5
	Subtotal	60

	Land Use Criteria (Mandated by OBAG)	
	PDA Supportive Investments (Includes Proximate Access)	
6	• Transportation Project supports connectivity to Jobs/ Transit	5
	centers / Activity Centers for a PDA	
	 Transportation Project provides multi modal travel options 	
	Transportation Investment addressing / implementing planned vision of	
7	PDA	4
	• PDA transportation facility will be X% complete with project	
8	High Impact project areas.	

	а	Housing GrowthProjected growth of Housing Units in PDA	2
	b	Jobs Growth Projected growth of Jobs in PDA 	2
	с	 Improved transportation choices for all income levels Proximity of alternative transportation mode project to a major transit or high quality transit corridor stop 	6
	d	 PDA parking management and pricing policies Parking Policies Other TDM strategies 	3
	e	 PDA affordable housing preservation and creation strategies Inclusionary zoning ordinance or in-lieu fee Land banking Housing trust fund Fast-track permitting for affordable housing Reduced, deferred or waived fees for affordable housing Condo conversion ordinance regulating the conversion of apartments to condos SRO conversion ordinance Demolition of residential structures ordinance Rent control Just cause eviction ordinance Others 	9
9	Com	 munities of Concern (C.O.C.) Transportation project mitigates the transportation need of the C.O.C. Relevant planning effort documentation 	4
10	Freig	what and Emissions Project in PDA that overlaps or is collocated with populations exposed to outdoor toxic air contaminants as identified in the Air District's Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE) Program or is in the vicinity of a major freight corridor	5
		Subtotal	40
		Total	100

Approved by Alameda CTC Board on 12/06/12

Index	Final Local Funds Selection / Scoring Criteria	Proposed Weight
1	 Transportation Project Readiness Funding plan, budget and schedule Implementation issues Agency governing body approvals Local community support Coordination with partners Identified stakeholders 	40
2	 Transportation Project is well-defined and results in a usable segment Defined scope Useable segment. Project study report / equivalent scoping document 	20
3	 Transportation project need / benefit / effectiveness (includes Safety) Defined project need Defined benefit Defined safety and/or security benefits 	25
4	 Sustainability (Ownership / Lifecycle / Maintenance) Identify funding and responsible agency for maintaining the transportation project Transportation Project identified in a long term development plan 	10
5	Matching Funds	5
	Total	100

FY 2012/13 COORDINATED FUNDING PROGRAM DRAFT PROGRAM

	Notes				lated with PDA Supportive project												
	Total Recommended	\$ 1,665	\$ 635	\$ 149	\$ 1,006 Coordin	\$ 470	\$ 100	\$ 2,105	\$ 1,335	\$ 1,053	Ş 454	\$ 3,851	\$ 129	\$ 832	\$ 804	\$ 669	\$ 15,257
	/RF Transit																'
	MB Transit																- \$
\$ X 1,000	MB - VRF Bike/Ped																- \$
	OBAG - PDA																۔ ج
	DBAG - LSR	1,665	635	149	1,006	470	100	2,105	1,335	1,053	454	3,851	129	832	804	699	15,257
	Total tequested	1,665 \$	635 \$	149 \$	1,006 \$	470 \$	100 \$	2,105 \$	1,335 \$	1,053 \$	454 \$	3,851 \$	129 \$	832 \$	804 \$	699	15,257
	Project Cost R	1,888 <mark>\$</mark>	829 <mark>\$</mark>	344 <mark>\$</mark>	1,136 <mark>\$</mark>	729 \$	712 \$	3,912 <mark>\$</mark>	1,489 <mark>\$</mark>	1,366 <mark>\$</mark>	760 <mark>\$</mark>	4,351 <mark>\$</mark>	586 <mark>\$</mark>	1,070 \$	1,153 <mark>\$</mark>	736 \$	21,061 \$
	Total (Ŷ	Ŷ	Ŷ	Ŷ	Ŷ	Ŷ	Ŷ	Ŷ	Ş	Ŷ	Ŷ	Ŷ	Ŷ	Ŷ	Ŷ	Ŷ
	Scores	ΥN	NA	ΥN	NA	NA	NA	ΝA	NA	ΥN	ΥN	NA	ΥN	NA	NA	ΝA	
	CATEGORY								ิชรา								
	Project	Pavement Rehabilitation in Unincorporated Alameda Cty	Alameda City Pavement Rehabilitation - FY 2014/15	Santa Fe Avenue Pavement Rehabilitation	Hearst Ave Complete Streets	Dublin Boulevard Street Resurfacing	Emeryville Street Rehabilitation	Fremont 2014 Pavement Rehabilitation	Pavement Rehabilitation - Industrial Blvd	2014 Arterial Street Rehabilitation	Enterprise Drive Pavement Rehabilitation	Oakland Pavement Rehabilitation	City of Piedmont Pavement Rehabilitation Project	Valley Avenue & Hopyard Road Rehabilitation	San Leandro Boulevard Reconstruction	Pavement Rehabilitation - Whipple Road (Ithaca to Amaral)	Total LSR Recommended
					<u> </u>				<u> </u>								
	ırisdiction	lameda County PWA	ity of Alameda	ity of Albany	ity of Berkeley	ity of Dublin	ity of Emeryville	ty of Fremont	ity of Hayward	ity of Livermore	ity of Newark	ity of Oakland	ity of Piedmont	ity of Pleasanton	ty of San Leandro	ty of Union City	

FY 2012/13 COORDINATED FUNDING PROGRAM DRAFT PROGRAM

									\$ X 1,000				
Index#	Jurisdiction	Project	CATEGORY	Scores	Total Projec Cost	t Total Requested	OBAG - LSR	OBAG - PDA	MB - VRF Bike/Ped	MB Transit	VRF Transit	Total Recommended	Notes
1	City of Berkeley	Shattuck Reconfiguration & Ped Safety		81.5	\$ 3,152	\$ 2,777		\$ 2,777				\$ 2,777	
2	City of Oakland	7th St W Oakland Transit Village Phase II		80.7	\$ 4,066	<mark>\$</mark> 3,288		\$ 3,288				\$	
m	City of Berkeley	Berkeley BART Plaza & Transit Area Improvements		80.6	\$ 10,456	\$ 7,784		\$ 4,066			\$ 3,718	\$ 7,784	
4	City of Oakland	Lakeside Green Street Project (at Lakeside/Harrison)		80.0	\$ 11,505	\$ 7,000		\$ 7,000				\$ 7,000	
S	City of Oakland	Peralta St Improvements Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.)		79.7	\$ 3,365	\$ 2,979		\$ 2,979				\$ 2,979	Evaluated application components seperately
9	City of Union City	UC BART Station Imp & RR Ped Xing Component (of BART Phase 2 & Decoto Rd. Complete Streets App.)	۸E	79.0	\$ 26,033	\$ 14,422		\$ 8,692			\$ 5,730	\$	Evaluated application components seperately
7	City of Berkeley	Hearst Ave Complete Streets	птяоч	78.5	\$ 2,865	\$ 1,150	\$ 1,006	\$ 1,150				\$ 2,156	Coordinated with LSR Project
œ	City of Oakland	Bike Lane Component (of Lake Merritt BART Bikeways App.)	US AQ9	ר.רר	\$ 2,640	\$ 2,112		\$ 422				\$ 422	Conditional upon identifying other funds for the rehabilitation component of the project Assume bike lane component is 20% of request (\$422k of total \$2,112K)
6	City of Oakland	MLK Way Improvments Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.)		76.9	\$ 2,795	\$ 2,473		\$ 2,473				\$ 2,473	Evaluated application components seperately
10	City of Emeryville	Christie Ave Bay Trail Gap Closure		75.5	\$ 550	\$ 550			\$ 550			\$ 550	Proposed for Local Bike/Ped funds
11	City of Fremont	Fremont City Center multi-Modal Improvements		71.3	\$ 14,340	\$ 6,360		\$				\$ 5,853	Assumes Fremont would need to provide \$507 in additional Funds
12	AC Transit	East Bay Bus Rapid Transit Bike/Ped Elements		69.1	\$ 7,189	\$ 7,189				\$ 200		\$ 200	Funds approved would be considered to against overall ACTC BRT commitments Contingent on providing detailed scope of locations for improvments
13	EBRPD	Bay Trail - Gilman to Buchanan	утія	81.2	\$ 4,851	\$ 1,000			\$			\$ 1,000	
14	City of Alameda	Cross Alameda Trail (Ralph Appezatto Memorial Parkway, Webster to Poggi)	.МОВК) ВОІ (БВІС	77.9	ş 991	\$ 793			\$ 793			\$ 793	
15	City of Albany	Buchanan/Marin Bikeway	NET PED P	77.8	\$ 1,225	\$ 536			\$ 536			\$ 536	
16	City of San Leandro	W Juana Ped Improvements	BIKE'	74.8	\$ 724	\$ 724			\$ 346			\$ 346	Assumes S Leandro will provide \$378 K in additional Funds
17	City of Oakland	Fruitvale Alive Gap Closure Streetscape Project (Fruitvale Ave E. 12th to Estuary)	FEAS. STUDY	28.0	\$ 2,062	<mark>\$</mark> 206			\$ 113			\$ 113	Reduced Scope to Feasibility Study About 3-4% of Bike/Ped funds
18	City of Piedmont	Piedmont Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan	B/P PLAN	31.8	\$ 120	\$ 102			\$ 102			\$ 102	Master Plan About 3-4% of Bike/Ped Funds
19	Cycles of Change	Bike Go Round (education/safety Program)	B/P OPS	74.8	\$ 840	\$ 360			\$ 240			\$ 240	Program / Operations Would provide 2 years of operations About 7.5% of local Bike/Ped funding
20	City of Alameda	Estuary Crossing Shuttle	S	74.0	\$ 941	\$ 489					\$ 200	\$ 200	Operations Would provide 2 years of operations
21	City of Oakland	Broadway Shuttle	SIT OP3	72.2	\$ 2,670	\$ 546					\$ 352	\$ 352	Operations Would provide 2 years of operations
22	LAVTA	Route 10 & Rapid Route Operations	ИАЯТ	71.2	\$ 7,333	\$ 1,000				\$ 1,000		\$ 1,000	Operations Would provide 2 years of operations
23	LAVTA	Route 12v, 20x and 70x Operations		71.0	\$ 3,905	\$ 1,000				\$ 1,000		\$ 1,000	Operations Would provide 2 years of operations
		SubTotal			\$ 114,618	\$ 64,840	\$ 1,006	\$ 38,700	\$ 3,68 0	\$ 2,200	\$ 10,000	\$ 55,586	
		Total Recommended			\$ 135,679	\$ 80,097	\$ 15,257	\$ 38,700	\$ 3,680	\$ 2,200	\$ 10,000	\$ 69,837	

13
0
Ū.
6
Ē
2

Page 370

__ I 270

FY 2012/13 COORDINATED FUNDING PROGRAM DRAFT PROGRAM

									\$ X 1,000				
Index#	Jurisdiction	Project	CATEGORY	Scores	Total Projeci Cost	t Total Requested	OBAG - LSR	OBAG - PDA	MB - VRF Bike/Ped	MB Transit	VRF Transit	Total Recommended	Notes
7	City of Oakland	Coliseum BART Corridor and Infrastructure Connections		65.7	\$ 2,823	\$ 2,321							
2	City of Livermore	Segment 1 of the Iron Horse Trail, a Class I Multi-Use Trail (Isabel through Murrieta)	Ξ	65.3	\$ 1,841	\$ 1,630							Also Scored in Bike/Ped Category
ŝ	City of Union City	Decoto Road and Decoto Rail Xing Improvement Component (of BART Phase 2 & Decoto Rd. Complete Streets App.)	ΙΛΙΤЯΟϤUS #	64.5	\$ 6,505	\$ 5,312							Evaluated application components seperately
4	City of Oakland	Tyrone Carney Park/105th Reconfiguration	PD/	64.3	\$ 1,972	\$ 1,571							
ъ	City of Dublin	Amador Plaza Road Complete Street Improvements		58.1	\$ 5,437	\$ 4,813							
9	City of Pleasanton	I-580 At Foothill Road Interchange Improvements		57.1	\$ 4,560	<mark>\$ 1,630</mark>							Also Scored in Bike/Ped Category
7	Alameda County PWA	"A" Street Class II Bike Lane	()	72.8	\$ 244	\$ 54							
8	Alameda County PWA	"A" Street Ped Safety	INOR	72.2	\$ 1,245	\$ 400							
6	City of Livermore	Segment 1 of the Iron Horse Trail, a Class I Multi-Use Trail (Isabel through Murrieta)	/ NET/	70.3	\$ 1,841	\$ 1,630							Also Scored in PDA Supportive Category
10	Alameda County PWA	Fairmont Dr Bike Lane	тіяс	64.1	\$ 380	\$ 380							
11	City of San Leandro	E 14th St S Area Streetscape) 184)	63.0	\$ 6,320	\$ 5,630							
12	City of Albany	Albany Bike/Ped Wayfinding	STC	62.6	\$ 311	<mark>\$</mark> 280							
13	City of Pleasanton	Microwave Ped & Bike Detection in Hacienda	BIOA	61.8	\$ 205	<mark>\$</mark> 205							
14	City of Hayward	Main St Complete St	ED b	59.7	\$ 2,127	\$ 2,027							
15	City of Pleasanton	I-580 At Foothill Road Interchange Improvements	KE/b	59.6	\$ 4,560	\$ 1,630							Also Scored in PDA Supportive Category
16	City of Pleasanton	Foothill Road - Bicycle Lane Gap Closure	18	55.6	\$ 1,035	<mark>\$</mark> 915							
17	City of Hayward	Update of Citywide Bicycle MP, Prep of Ped MP, SR2S	B/P PLAN	24.6	\$ 300	\$ 300							
18	City of Oakland	Lake Merritt Chanel Bike/Ped Bridge	٨	29	\$ 15,000	\$ 400							
19	City of Dublin	Iron Horse Trail/BART Connectivity Feasibility Study	auts	25.8	\$ 350	\$ 309							
20	City of Oakland	Park Blvd Path Feasibility Study	רובא	23.2	\$ 395	\$ 197							
21	City of Pleasanton	Feasibility Study for Ped & Bike Bridges	18127	19.6	\$ 50	<mark>\$</mark> 25							
22	EBRPD	Niles Canyon Regional Trail Feasibility Study	/33	18.4	\$ 150	\$ 75							
23	AC Transit	Line 51 Corridor GPS-based Transit Signal Priority	TRANS. CAP	74	\$ 11,515	\$ 1,000							
24	Alameda County PWA	Niles Canyon Road Ped Safety	()	See Notes	\$ 140	\$ 95							Project in Vision Network; Considered Tier 2
25	Alameda County PWA	Mabel Ave Ped Safety	ловк	See Notes	\$ 1,035	\$ 445							Project in Vision Network; Considered Tier 2
26	Alameda County PWA	E Castro Valley Blvd Bike Lane	νтэν	See Notes	\$ 540	\$ 480							Project in Vision Network; Considered Tier 2
27	Alameda County PWA	Mines Rd Bike Lane	I NO	See Notes	\$ 56	<mark>\$</mark> 50							Project in Vision Network; Considered Tier 2
28	City of Dublin	Village Parkway Bicycle & Pedestrian Improvements	ISIV)	See Notes	\$ 2,862	\$ 2,533							Project in Vision Network; Considered Tier 2
29	City of Livermore	Arroyo Las Positas Class I Multi-Use Trail	STCE	See Notes	\$ 3,771	<mark>\$ 2,918</mark>							Project in Vision Network; Considered Tier 2
30	City of Pleasanton	Bernal Avenue Bridge Over Arroyio de la Laguna	IOJ	See Notes	\$ 2,200	\$ 500							Project in Vision Network; Considered Tier 2
31	City of San Leandro	W San Leandro Bikeways	DED E	See Notes	¢ 569	\$ 569							Project in Vision Network; Considered Tier 2
32	EBRPD	Shadow Cliffs to Del Valle Trail	IKE/I	See Notes	\$ 1,430	\$ 1,200							Project in Vision Network; Considered Tier 2
33	LARPD	Sycamore Grove Park Trail Renovation	8	See Notes	\$ 1,852	\$ 1,717							Project in Vision Network; Considered Tier 2
34	City of San Leandro	San Leandro Downtown Parking Mgmt		See Notes	\$ 332	\$ 332							Project not Eligible for OBAG funding; Sponsor requested to consider applying for SC-TAP funds
Ľ						0 1 1 1							Project fully funded;
ζ	ЕВКРО	iron Horse Iraii - Dublin/Pleasanton BARI to Santa Kita		see Notes	ې 4,32U	Uc/ <							Ground Breaking Event Held on May 1st
					\$ 81,872	\$ 41,063	÷ خ	\$	÷ خ	Ş	- ج	\$	

13
20
5
Ţ
2

	Notes					Coordinated with PDA Supportive project												
	Total Recommended		\$	\$ 635	\$ 149	\$ 1,006	\$	\$ 100	\$ 2,105	\$ 1,335	\$ 1,053	\$ 454	\$ 3,851	\$ 129	\$ 832	\$ 804	\$ 669	\$ 15,257
	VRF Transit																	ۍ ۲
	MB Transit																	- \$
\$ X 1,000	MB - VRF Bike/Ped																	۔ چ
	OBAG - PDA																	\$
	OBAG - LSR		\$ 1,665	\$ 635	\$ 149	\$ 1,006	\$ 470	\$ 100	\$ 2,105	\$ 1,335	\$ 1,053	\$ 454	\$ 3,851	\$ 129	\$ 832	\$ 804	\$ 699	\$ 15,257
	Total Requested		\$ 1,665	\$ 635	\$ 149	\$ 1,006	\$ 470	\$	\$ 2,105	\$ 1,335	\$ 1,053	\$ 454	\$ 3,851	\$ 129	\$ 832	\$ 804	\$ 669	\$ 15,257
	Total Project Cost		\$ 1,888	\$ 829	\$ 344	\$ 1,136	\$ 729	\$ 712	\$ 3,912	\$ 1,489	\$ 1,366	\$ 760	\$ 4,351	\$ 586	\$ 1,070	\$ 1,153	\$ 736	\$ 21,061
	Scores		NA	ΝA	NA	ΝA	ΝA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	CATEGORY			1		I												
	Project	LSR Projects	Pavement Rehabilitation in Unincorporated Alameda Cty	Alameda City Pavement Rehabilitation - FY 2014/15	Santa Fe Avenue Pavement Rehabilitation	Hearst Ave Complete Streets	Dublin Boulevard Street Resurfacing	Emeryville Street Rehabilitation	Fremont 2014 Pavement Rehabilitation	Pavement Rehabilitation - Industrial Blvd	2014 Arterial Street Rehabilitation	Enterprise Drive Pavement Rehabilitation	Oakland Pavement Rehabilitation	City of Piedmont Pavement Rehabilitation Project	Valley Avenue & Hopyard Road Rehabilitation	San Leandro Boulevard Reconstruction	Pavement Rehabilitation - Whipple Road (Ithaca to Amaral	Subtota
	lurisdiction		Alameda County PWA	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	
	Index# J		1	5	e S	4	ى د	9	7 (8	6	10 (11 (12 (13 (14 (15 (

FY 2012/13 COORDINATED FUNDING PROGRAM DRAFT PROGRAM (Sorted by Project Type)

Notes						nsor to provide construction with federal and match	nsor to provide construction with federal and match omponents seperately	nsor to provide construction with federal and match components seperately	nsor to provide construction with federal and match components seperately components seperately	nsor to provide construction with federal and match iomponents seperately components seperately roject ifying other funds for the ent of the project bonent is 20% of request	nsor to provide construction with federal and match components seperately components seperately components seperately fying other funds for the ent of the project connont is 20% of request components seperately	nsor to provide construction with federal and match with federal and match components seperately components seperately troject ifying other funds for the ent of the project connent is 20% of request components seperately components seperately	nsor to provide construction with federal and match with federal and match components seperately components seperately roject ifying other funds for the ent of the project component is 20% of request components seperately components seperately id need to provide \$507 in	nsor to provide construction with federal and match omponents seperately components seperately components seperately project ifying other funds for the ent of the project onent is 20% of request) ed funds components seperately id need to against ifments be considered to against nitments g detailed scope of locations	nsor to provide construction with federal and match with federal and match components seperately components seperately roject riying other funds for the ent of the project ponent is 20% of request components seperately ed funds d need to provide \$507 in be considered to against nitments g detailed scope of locations	nsor to provide construction with federal and match components seperately components seperately components seperately roject ifying other funds for the ent of the project component is 20% of request component is 20% of request component seperately ed funds d funds d funds d funds d fategory	nsor to provide construction with federal and match omponents seperately components seperately components seperately rroject rifying other funds for the ent of the project ponent is 20% of request on the project omponents seperately ed funds d need to provide \$507 in be considered to against nitments g detailed scope of locations g detailed scope of locations g detailed scope of locations	nsor to provide construction with federal and match omponents seperately components seperately components seperately roject ifying other funds for the ent of the project bonent is 20% of request ifying other funds for the ent of the project bonent is 20% of request components seperately ed funds d need to provide \$507 in be considered to against nitments g detailed scope of locations g detailed scope of locations g detailed scope of locations	nsor to provide construction with federal and match omponents seperately components seperately components seperately ifying other funds for the ent of the project components seperately components seperately ifying other to against if need to provide \$507 in be considered to against nitments g detailed scope of locations g detailed scope of locations g detailed seperately	Isor to provide construction with federal and match components seperately components seperately ifying other funds for the ent of the project ponent is 20% of request ifying other funds for the ent of the project ponent is 20% of request components seperately if need to provide \$507 in be considered to against it ments g detailed scope of locations g detailed scope of locations g detailed scope of locations g detailed scope of locations g detailed scope of locations	nsor to provide construction with federal and match omponents seperately components seperately ifying other funds for the ent of the project components seperately components seperately ed funds d need to provide \$507 in be considered to against intments g detailed scope of locations g detailed scope of locations
Ż			77	88	88	 77 88 84 <	77 88 84 Have a request for spons 00 level component detail w identified 79 Evaluated application cor	77 77 88 84 84 Fave a request for spons 00 level component detail w 10 level component detail w 79 Evaluated application cor 22 Evaluated application cor	77 77 88 84 84 Anve a request for spons 00 level component detail w 10 identified 79 Evaluated application cor 22 Evaluated application cor 56 Coordinated with LSR Pro	77 88 88 84 Have a request for spons 00 level component detail w identified 20 Evaluated application cor 22 Assume bike lane component 23 Assume bike lane component (\$422k of total \$2,112K)	77 77 88 88 84 Have a request for spons 00 level component detail w identified 79 Evaluated application cor 22 Evaluated application cor 23 Assume bike lane component 65 Conditional upon identify 73 Evaluated application cor 73 Evaluated application cor	77 88 88 88 88 84 Have a request for spons 00 level component detail w identified 20 Evaluated application cor 22 Fvaluated with LSR Pro 23 Fvaluated application cor 24 Conditional upon identify rehabilitation component 23 Assume bike lane component 73 Evaluated application cor 74 Assume bike lane component (\$422k of total \$2,112k) 73 Evaluated application cor 73 Evaluated application cor	77 77 88 88 88 88 88 84 Have a request for spons 00 level component detail w identified 79 Evaluated application cor 79 Evaluated application cor 22 Evaluated application cor 23 Evaluated application component 66 Conditional upon identify rehabilitation componidentify rehabilitation component 73 Evaluated application cor 73 Evaluated application cor 50 Fund with Local Bike/Ped 51 Assumes Fremont would 53 Assumes Fremont would 53 Assumes Fremont would	77 77 88 88 88 88 84 Have a request for spons 10 level component detail w 11 12 12 13 14 15 16 16 17 18 19 10 level component detail w identified 17 18 19 Evaluated application cor 12 12 13 14 15 16 17 17 18 19 10 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 10 10 10 11 </th <th>77 78 88 88 88 88 88 84 Have a request for spons 10 level component detail with LSR Prost 20 Evaluated application correct 22 Evaluated application correct 23 Evaluated application correct 24 Evaluated application correct 25 Conditional upon identify rehabilitation component 73 Evaluated application corr 74 Assumes Fremont would 75 60 Funds approved would be</th> <th>77 77 88 88 88 88 88 84 Have a request for spons 10 level component detail w identified Evaluated application cor 73 Evaluated application cort 60 Fund with Local Bike/Ped 60 Contingent on providing of</th> <th>77 88 88 88 88 88 88 84 Have a request for spons 10 level component detail with LSR Pro- 56 Coordinated with LSR Pro- 56 Coordinated with LSR Pro- 57 Evaluated application cor 73 Evaluated application cor 74 Assumes Fremont would 6 Funds approved would be 00 Funds approved would be overall Acrt BRT commit 00 Contingent on providing of for improvements</th> <th>77 73 88 88 88 84 84 Have a request for spons 10 11 12 13 14 14 15 16 16 17 17 18 19 10 10 11 12 12 13 14 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 10 10 11 12 13 14 14 15 16 17 18 19 10 10 10 10 10 10 11</th> <th>77 33 88 88 84 84 84 94 94 94 95 96 96 1000000000000000000000000000000000000</th> <th>77 78 88 88 88 84 85 84 Have a request for spons 10 level component detail w 11 12 12 13 14 14 15 15 16 16 16 16 17 18 19 10 11 12 12 13 14 14 15 16 17 17 18 19 10 10 11 12 13 14 14 15 16 17 18 18 19 10 14</th> <th>77 77 88 84 84 Have a request for spons 10 11 12 12 13 14 14 15 15 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 17 17 18 19 10 10 11 12 12 13 14 14 14 15 16 16 17 17 18 19 10 11 12 12 13</th>	77 78 88 88 88 88 88 84 Have a request for spons 10 level component detail with LSR Prost 20 Evaluated application correct 22 Evaluated application correct 23 Evaluated application correct 24 Evaluated application correct 25 Conditional upon identify rehabilitation component 73 Evaluated application corr 74 Assumes Fremont would 75 60 Funds approved would be	77 77 88 88 88 88 88 84 Have a request for spons 10 level component detail w identified Evaluated application cor 73 Evaluated application cort 60 Fund with Local Bike/Ped 60 Contingent on providing of	77 88 88 88 88 88 88 84 Have a request for spons 10 level component detail with LSR Pro- 56 Coordinated with LSR Pro- 56 Coordinated with LSR Pro- 57 Evaluated application cor 73 Evaluated application cor 74 Assumes Fremont would 6 Funds approved would be 00 Funds approved would be overall Acrt BRT commit 00 Contingent on providing of for improvements	77 73 88 88 88 84 84 Have a request for spons 10 11 12 13 14 14 15 16 16 17 17 18 19 10 10 11 12 12 13 14 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 10 10 11 12 13 14 14 15 16 17 18 19 10 10 10 10 10 10 11	77 33 88 88 84 84 84 94 94 94 95 96 96 1000000000000000000000000000000000000	77 78 88 88 88 84 85 84 Have a request for spons 10 level component detail w 11 12 12 13 14 14 15 15 16 16 16 16 17 18 19 10 11 12 12 13 14 14 15 16 17 17 18 19 10 10 11 12 13 14 14 15 16 17 18 18 19 10 14	77 77 88 84 84 Have a request for spons 10 11 12 12 13 14 14 15 15 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 17 17 18 19 10 10 11 12 12 13 14 14 14 15 16 16 17 17 18 19 10 11 12 12 13
Total Recommend			\$ 2,7	\$ 2,7 ⁻ \$ 3,28	\$ 2,7 \$ 3,2 8 \$ 7,7	\$ 2,7 \$ 3,2 8 \$ 7,7 8 \$ 7,7 \$	\$ 2,7 \$ 3,2i \$ 5 7,7i \$ 7,7i \$ 7,00	\$ 2,7 \$ \$ \$ 3,28 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ 7,78 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	\$ 2,7 \$ \$	\$ 2,7 \$ \$	\$ 2,7 \$ \$	5 2,7 5 2,7 5 3,28 5 3,28 5 7,76 5 7,70 5 7,70 5 2,91 5 2,91 5 2,11 5 2,11 5 2,11 5 2,11 5 2,11 5 2,11 5 2,11 5 2,11 5 2,11 5 2,11 5 2,11 5 2,11 5 2,11	5 2,7 5 3,28 5 3,29 5 7,76 5 2,91 5 2,41 5 2,41 5 2,41 5 2,41 5 2,41 5 2,41 5 2,41 5 2,41 5 2,41 5 2,41 5 5,81 5 5,81 5 5,81	5 2,7 5 3,28 5 3,28 5 3,29 5 2,44 5 2,41 5 2,41 5 2,41 5 2,41 5 2,41 5 2,41 5 2,41 5 2,41 5 2,41 5 2,51 5 2,51 5 2,81 5 3,81 5 3,81 5 3,81	5 2,7 5 3,28 5 3,28 5 7,78 5 7,70 5 2,91 5 2,11 5 2,11 5 2,11 5 2,11 5 2,11 5 2,11 5 2,11 5 2,11 5 2,11 5 2,11 5 2,11 5 2,11 5 2,11 5 2,11 5 2,11 5 2,11 5 2,11	5 2,7 5 3,28 5 3,21 5 7,70 5 2,11 5 3,11 5 3,11 5 3,11 5 3,11 5 3,11 5 3,11 5 <td< th=""><th>5 2,7 5 3,28 5 3,28 6 5 3,28 5 5 3,24 5 5 3,24 5 5 3,24 5 5 2,41 5 5 3,58 5 5 3,58 5 5 3,58 5 5 3,58 5 5 3,58 5 5 3,58 5 5 3,58 5 5 3,58 5 5 3,58 5 5 3,58 5 5 3,58 5 5 3,58 5 5 3,58 5 5 3,58 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5</th><th>5 2,7 5 3,23 5 3,23 6 5 3,23 5 5 3,24 5 5 5 5 5 2,11 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5</th><th>\$ \$</th><th>5 2,7 5 3,28 5 3,28 5 5 5 7,76 5 2,77 5 2,14 5 5 5 5 5 2,14 5 2,14 5 2,14 5 5</th><th>5 2,7 5 5 5 3,23 6 5 7,73 5 5 5</th></td<>	5 2,7 5 3,28 5 3,28 6 5 3,28 5 5 3,24 5 5 3,24 5 5 3,24 5 5 2,41 5 5 3,58 5 5 3,58 5 5 3,58 5 5 3,58 5 5 3,58 5 5 3,58 5 5 3,58 5 5 3,58 5 5 3,58 5 5 3,58 5 5 3,58 5 5 3,58 5 5 3,58 5 5 3,58 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	5 2,7 5 3,23 5 3,23 6 5 3,23 5 5 3,24 5 5 5 5 5 2,11 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	\$ \$	5 2,7 5 3,28 5 3,28 5 5 5 7,76 5 2,77 5 2,14 5 5 5 5 5 2,14 5 2,14 5 2,14 5 5	5 2,7 5 5 5 3,23 6 5 7,73 5 5 5
VRF Transit					\$ 3,716	\$ 3,716	\$ 3,715	\$ 3,716	\$ 3,716 \$ 5,730	\$ 3,718	\$ 3,718 \$ 5,730	\$ 3,718	\$ 3,718	00 00	00 00	00 00 00	00 00 00	00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	
Ped Transit												220 220	220	500 220 <td>50 220 \$</td> <td>500 220<td>300 220 220 220</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td>	50 220 \$	500 220 <td>300 220 220 220</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	300 220 220 220				
			۲///۶ خ	\$ 3,288	\$ 2,777 \$ 3,288 \$ 4,066	 > 2,777 \$ 3,288 \$ 4,066 \$ 7,000 	 > 2,777 \$ 3,288 \$ 4,066 \$ 7,000 \$ 2,979 	 > 2,777 \$ 3,288 \$ 4,066 \$ 7,000 \$ 7,000 \$ 2,979 \$ 8,692 	 > 2,777 \$ 3,288 \$ 4,066 \$ 7,000 \$ 7,000 \$ 2,979 \$ 8,692 \$ 1,150 	 > 2,777 \$ 3,288 \$ 4,066 \$ 7,000 \$ 7,000 \$ 2,979 \$ 2,979 \$ 1,150 \$ 422 	 > 2,777 \$ 3,288 \$ 4,066 \$ 7,000 \$ 7,000 \$ 2,979 \$ 2,979 \$ 1,150 \$ 1,150 \$ 4,22 \$ 2,473 	 > 2,777 > 2,777 > 4,066 > 7,000 7,000 > 7,000 > 1,150 > 1,150 > 422 > 2,473 > 550 	 > 2,777 \$ 3,288 4,066 7,000 7,000<th> > 2,777 > 2,770 > 4,066 > 4,066 > 7,000 > 7,000 > 2,979 > 5,853 > 5,853 </th><th> > 2,777 > 2,777 > 4,066 > 4,066 > 7,000 > 7,000 > 2,979 > 5,853 > 5,853 > 5,853 </th><th> > 2,777 > 2,770 > 4,066 > 4,066 > 7,000 > 7,000 > 2,979 > 3,297 > 4,297 <</th><th> > 2,777 > 3,288 > 4,066 > 7,000 > 7,000 > 2,979 > 5,853 <</th><th> > 2,777 > 2,777 > 3,288 > 4,066 > 7,000 > 7,000 > 2,979 > 3,550 > 5,853 <</th><th> > 2,777 > 2,777 > 4,066 > 4,066 > 7,000 > 7,000 > 2,979 > 3,297 > 4,207 > 3,297 > 4,207 <</th><th> > 2,777 > 3,288 > 4,066 > 7,000 > 7,000 > 2,979 > 5,853 > 5,853 > 5,853 > 5,853 > 5,853 > 1,150 > 5,853 > 5,853 > 1,150 > 5,853 > 5,853 > 5,853 > 5,853 > 1,150 > 5,853 <</th><th>5 2,777 5 3,288 5 3,286 5 4,066 5 7,000 5 7,000 5 2,979 5 2,979 5 2,473 5 2,473 5 2,473 5 2,473 5 2,473 5 2,473 6 9 7 9 8 5,853 9 9 <t< th=""></t<></th>	 > 2,777 > 2,770 > 4,066 > 4,066 > 7,000 > 7,000 > 2,979 > 5,853 > 5,853 	 > 2,777 > 2,777 > 4,066 > 4,066 > 7,000 > 7,000 > 2,979 > 5,853 > 5,853 > 5,853 	 > 2,777 > 2,770 > 4,066 > 4,066 > 7,000 > 7,000 > 2,979 > 3,297 > 4,297 <	 > 2,777 > 3,288 > 4,066 > 7,000 > 7,000 > 2,979 > 5,853 <	 > 2,777 > 2,777 > 3,288 > 4,066 > 7,000 > 7,000 > 2,979 > 3,550 > 5,853 <	 > 2,777 > 2,777 > 4,066 > 4,066 > 7,000 > 7,000 > 2,979 > 3,297 > 4,207 > 3,297 > 4,207 <	 > 2,777 > 3,288 > 4,066 > 7,000 > 7,000 > 2,979 > 5,853 > 5,853 > 5,853 > 5,853 > 5,853 > 1,150 > 5,853 > 5,853 > 1,150 > 5,853 > 5,853 > 5,853 > 5,853 > 1,150 > 5,853 <	5 2,777 5 3,288 5 3,286 5 4,066 5 7,000 5 7,000 5 2,979 5 2,979 5 2,473 5 2,473 5 2,473 5 2,473 5 2,473 5 2,473 6 9 7 9 8 5,853 9 9 <t< th=""></t<>
		2,777 \$	3 288		7,784 \$	7,784 \$ 7,000 \$	7,784 \$ 7,784 \$ 7,000 \$ 2,979 \$	7,784 \$ 7,784 \$ 7,000 \$ 2,979 \$ 14,422 \$	7,784 5 7,784 5 7,000 5 2,979 5 14,422 5 14,422 5 1,150 5 1,150 5	7,784 5 7,784 5 7,000 5 2,979 5 14,422 5 14,422 5 1,150 5 2,112 5 2,112 5	7,784 5 7,784 5 7,000 5 2,979 5 14,422 5 14,422 5 1,150 5 2,112 5 2,473 5 2,473 5	7,784 5 7,784 5 7,000 5 2,979 5 14,422 5 14,422 5 1,150 5 2,112 5 2,473 5 2,473 5 550 5	7,784 * 7,784 \$ 7,784 \$ 7,000 \$ 2,979 \$ 2,979 \$ 14,422 \$ 1,150 \$ 1,150 \$ 2,112 \$ 2,473 \$ 2,473 \$ 560 \$ 6,360 \$	7,784 * 7,784 * 7,000 \$ 7,000 \$ 2,979 * 14,422 \$ 1,150 \$ 1,150 \$ 2,112 \$ 2,473 \$ 2,112 \$ 5 * 7,189 \$ 7,189 \$	7,784 5 $7,784$ 5 $7,784$ 5 $7,000$ 5 $2,979$ 5 $2,979$ 5 $14,422$ 5 $14,422$ 5 $1,150$ 5 $1,150$ 5 $2,112$ 5 $2,473$ 5 $2,473$ 5 5 5 $5,112$ 5 $5,112$ 5 $5,112$ 5 $5,112$ 5 $5,112$ 5 $5,112$ 5 $5,112$ 5 $5,112$ 5 $5,112$ 5 $5,112$ 5 $5,112$ 5 $5,120$ 5 $5,120$ 5 $5,120$ 5 $5,120$ 5 $5,120$ 5 $5,120$ 5 $5,120$ 5 $5,120$ 5 $5,$	7,784 5 $7,784$ 5 $7,784$ 5 $7,000$ 5 $2,979$ 5 $2,979$ 5 $14,422$ 5 $14,422$ 5 $1,150$ 5 $2,112$ 5 $2,473$ 5 $2,473$ 5 $2,473$ 5 5 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ $7,189$ $7,189$ $7,189$ $7,189$ $7,189$ $7,189$ $7,189$ $7,180$ $7,190$ $7,180$ $7,190$ $7,180$ $7,190$	7,784 5 $7,784$ 5 $7,784$ 5 $7,000$ 5 $2,979$ 5 $2,979$ 5 $14,422$ 5 $1,150$ 5 $1,150$ 5 $2,473$ 5 $2,473$ 5 $2,473$ 5 $2,112$ 5 $5,2112$ 5 $5,312$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ $7,199$	7,784 5 $7,784$ 5 $7,784$ 5 $7,000$ 5 $2,979$ 5 $2,979$ 5 $2,979$ 5 $1,452$ 5 $1,150$ 5 $1,150$ 5 $2,112$ 5 $5,2112$ 5 $5,312$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ $7,189$ $7,189$ $7,189$ $7,189$ $7,189$ $7,180$ $7,190$ $7,180$ $7,190$ $7,190$ $7,190$ $7,190$ $7,190$ $7,190$ $7,190$	7,784 5 $7,784$ 5 $7,784$ 5 $7,000$ 5 $2,979$ 5 $2,979$ 5 $2,979$ 5 $1,150$ 5 $1,150$ 5 $1,150$ 5 $2,112$ 5 $5,310$ 5 $5,320$ $5,320$ $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,199$ 5 <	7,784 5 $7,784$ 5 $7,784$ 5 $7,000$ 5 $2,979$ 5 $2,979$ 5 $2,979$ 5 $14,422$ 5 $14,422$ 5 $1,150$ 5 $2,473$ 5 $2,473$ 5 $2,473$ 5 $2,473$ 5 $2,473$ 5 $2,473$ 5 $2,473$ 5 $5,312$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,199$ 5 <td< td=""><td>7,784 5 $7,784$ 5 $7,784$ 5 $7,000$ 5 $2,979$ 5 $2,979$ 5 $2,979$ 5 $14,422$ 5 $14,422$ 5 $1,150$ 5 $2,473$ 5 $2,112$ 5 $5,312$ 5 $7,189$ 7 $7,199$ $7,199$</td></td<>	7,784 5 $7,784$ 5 $7,784$ 5 $7,000$ 5 $2,979$ 5 $2,979$ 5 $2,979$ 5 $14,422$ 5 $14,422$ 5 $1,150$ 5 $2,473$ 5 $2,473$ 5 $2,473$ 5 $2,473$ 5 $2,473$ 5 $2,473$ 5 $2,473$ 5 $2,473$ 5 $2,473$ 5 $2,112$ 5 $5,312$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 5 $7,189$ 7 $7,199$ $7,199$
		3,152 <mark>\$ 2,</mark>	4,066 <mark>\$ 3,</mark>		10,456 \$ 7,	10,456 <mark>\$ 7,</mark> 11,505 <mark>\$ 7,</mark>	10,456 \$ 7, 11,505 \$ 7, 3,365 \$ 2,	10,456 \$ 7, 11,505 \$ 7, 3,365 \$ 2, 26,033 \$ 14,	10,456 \$ 7, 11,505 \$ 7, 3,365 \$ 2, 3,365 \$ 14, 26,033 \$ 14, 2,865 \$ 1,	10,456 \$ 7, 11,505 \$ 7, 3,365 \$ 2, 2,6033 \$ 14, 2,865 \$ 1, 2,865 \$ 2, 2,640 \$ 2,	10,456 \$ 7, 11,505 \$ 7, 11,505 \$ 7, 3,365 \$ 2, 26,033 \$ 14, 2,865 \$ 14, 2,865 \$ 14, 2,865 \$ 2, 2,865 \$ 2, 2,640 \$ 2, 2,795 \$ 2,	10,456 \$ 7, 11,505 \$ 7, 11,505 \$ 7, 3,365 \$ 2, 2,865 \$ 14, 2,865 \$ 14, 2,865 \$ 2, 2,865 \$ 2, 2,795 \$ 2, 2,795 \$ 2, 550 \$ 2,	10,456 \$ 7, 11,505 \$ 7, 11,505 \$ 2, 3,365 \$ 14, 26,033 \$ 14, 26,033 \$ 14, 2,865 \$ 14, 2,865 \$ 14, 2,865 \$ 2, 2,865 \$ 2, 2,865 \$ 2, 2,865 \$ 2, 14,340 \$ 6,	10,456 \$ 7, 11,505 \$ 7, 11,505 \$ 2, 3,365 \$ 2, 2,865 \$ 14, 2,865 \$ 14, 2,865 \$ 14, 2,865 \$ 14, 2,865 \$ 14, 2,865 \$ 14, 2,865 \$ 2, 14,340 \$ \$ 14,340 \$ 6, 14,340 \$ 6, 7,189 \$ 5 7,	10,456 \$ 7 11,505 \$ 7, 11,505 \$ 7, 3,365 \$ 2, 3,365 \$ 2, 2,865 \$ 14, 2,865 \$ 1, 2,865 \$ 1, 2,865 \$ 1, 2,865 \$ 1, 2,865 \$ 1, 2,865 \$ 1, 2,865 \$ 1, 2,795 \$ 2, 14,340 \$ 6, 14,340 \$ 6, 14,340 \$ 5 7, 7,189 \$ \$ 7, 2,823 \$ \$ 2,	10,456 \$ 7 $11,505$ \$ 7 $11,505$ \$ 2 $3,365$ \$ 2 $3,365$ \$ 2 $3,365$ \$ 2 $2,865$ \$ 14, $2,865$ \$ 14, $2,865$ \$ 14, $2,865$ \$ 14, $2,865$ \$ 2, $2,865$ \$ 14, $2,865$ \$ 2, $2,795$ \$ 2, $14,340$ \$ 6, $14,340$ \$ 6, $14,340$ \$ 2, $2,823$ \$ 2, $2,823$ \$ 2, $1,841$ \$ 1,	10,456 \$ 7 11,505 \$ 7, 11,505 \$ 2, 3,365 \$ 2, 3,365 \$ 14, 2,865 \$ 14, 2,865 \$ 1, 2,865 \$ 1, 2,865 \$ 1, 2,865 \$ 1, 2,865 \$ 2, 2,865 \$ 1, 2,865 \$ 2, 2,795 \$ 2, 14,340 \$ 6, 14,340 \$ 5, 14,340 \$ 7, 2,823 \$ 2, 2,823 \$ 2, 1,841 \$ 1, 1,841 \$ 1, 6,505 \$ 5, 6,505 \$ 5, 5,505 \$ 5, 6,505 \$ 5, 5,505 \$ 5, 6,505 \$ 5,	10,456 \$ 7 11,505 \$ 7 11,505 \$ 2, 3,365 \$ 2, 3,365 \$ 14, 2,865 \$ 1, 2,865 \$ 1, 2,865 \$ 1, 2,865 \$ 1, 2,865 \$ 1, 2,865 \$ 1, 2,865 \$ 2, 14,340 \$ 5, 14,340 \$ 2, 14,340 \$ 2, 14,340 \$ 2, 14,340 \$ 2, 1,841 \$ 1, 6,505 \$ 5, 1,972 \$ 5,	10,456 \$ 7 11,505 \$ 7 11,505 \$ 7 11,505 \$ 2 3,365 \$ 14, 2,865 \$ 1, 2,865 \$ 1, 2,865 \$ 1, 2,865 \$ 1, 2,865 \$ 1, 2,865 \$ 1, 2,866 \$ 2, 14,340 \$ 5, 14,340 \$ 5, 14,340 \$ 5, 14,340 \$ 5, 14,340 \$ 5, 14,340 \$ 5, 1,341 \$ 1, 1,841 \$ 1, 1,972 \$ 5, 5,437 \$ 1, 5,437 \$ 4,	10,456 \$ 7 $11,505$ \$ 7 $11,505$ \$ 2 $3,365$ \$ 2 $3,365$ \$ 2 $3,365$ \$ 2 $3,365$ \$ 2 $2,865$ \$ 1 $2,865$ \$ 1 $2,865$ \$ 1 $2,865$ \$ 1 $2,865$ \$ 1 $14,340$ \$ 6 $14,340$ \$ 5 $14,340$ \$ 5 $14,340$ \$ 5 $14,340$ \$ 5 $14,340$ \$ 5 $14,340$ \$ 5 $1,341$ \$ 1 $1,841$ \$ 1 $1,972$ \$ 5 $1,972$ \$ 4 $5,437$ \$ 4 $5,437$ \$ 1	10,456 \$ 7 11,505 \$ 7 11,505 \$ 2 3,365 \$ 2 3,365 \$ 2 3,365 \$ 2 3,365 \$ 14, 2,865 \$ 14, 2,865 \$ 14, 2,865 \$ 14, 2,865 \$ 1, 2,865 \$ 2, 14,340 \$ 6, 14,340 \$ 2, 2,823 \$ 2, 14,340 \$ 2, 1,972 \$ 1, 1,972 \$ 1, 1,972 \$ 1, 2,437 \$ 4, 4,560 \$ 1, 3332 \$ 1,
		81.5 \$ \$	80.7 \$ 4	80.6 \$ 1(80.0 \$ 1	80.0 \$ 1 [°]	80.0 \$ 1. 79.7 \$ 5 79.0 \$ 2	80.0 \$ 11 79.7 \$ 5 79.0 \$ 21 78.5 \$::	80.0 \$ 11 79.7 \$ 21 78.5 \$ 21 77.7 \$ 3	80.0 \$ 11 79.7 \$ 26 77.7 \$ 26 76.9 \$ 26	80.0 \$ 11 79.7 \$ 26 77.7 \$ 26 76.9 \$ 26 75.5 \$ 2	80.0 \$ 11 79.7 \$ 26 78.5 \$ 26 77.7 \$ 26 76.9 \$ 1 75.5 \$ 1 71.3 \$ 1	80.0 \$ 11 79.7 \$ 26 79.0 \$ 26 77.7 \$ 26 75.5 \$ 26 71.3 \$ 1- 71.3 \$ 1- 69.1 \$ 1-	80.0 \$ 11 79.7 \$ 26 79.0 \$ 26 77.7 \$ 26 76.9 \$ 1 71.3 \$ 1 69.1 \$ 1 65.7 \$ 1 65.7 \$ 5	80.0 \$ 11 79.7 \$ 26 79.0 \$ 26 77.7 \$ 26 76.9 \$ 26 71.3 \$ 14 69.1 \$ 14 65.7 \$ 14 65.3 \$ 5	80.0 \$ 11 79.7 \$ 26 79.0 \$ 26 77.7 \$ 26 76.9 \$ 14 77.7 \$ 26 71.3 \$ 14 75.5 \$ 14 77.7 \$ 26 76.9 \$ 14 77.3 \$ 14 76.9 \$ 14 76.9 \$ 14 69.1 \$ 14 65.3 \$ 14 64.5 \$ 14 64.5 \$ 14	80.0 \$ 11 79.7 \$ 26 79.0 \$ 26 77.7 \$ 26 76.9 \$ 14 76.9 \$ 14 77.7 \$ 26 75.5 \$ 26 71.3 \$ 14 69.1 \$ 14 64.5 \$ 26 64.3 \$ 5 64.3 \$ 5	80.0 \$ 11 79.7 \$ 26 79.0 \$ 26 79.0 \$ 26 77.7 \$ 26 75.5 \$ 26 75.5 \$ 26 71.3 \$ 14 69.1 \$ 14 65.7 \$ 2 65.3 \$ 14 64.5 \$ 2 58.1 \$ 5	80.0 \$ 11 79.7 \$ 26 79.0 \$ 26 79.0 \$ 26 77.7 \$ 26 76.9 \$ 14 77.7 \$ 26 75.5 \$ 26 71.3 \$ 14 69.1 \$ 14 69.1 \$ 14 64.5 \$ 26 58.1 \$ 14 58.1 \$ 14 57.1 \$ 14	80.0 \$ 11 79.7 \$ 1 79.0 \$ 26 78.5 \$ 26 77.7 \$ 26 77.3 \$ 26 69.1 \$ 14 66.3 \$ 5 64.5 \$ 5 64.3 \$ 14 64.3 \$ 14 64.3 \$ 14 58.1 \$ 14 58.1 \$ 14 57.1 \$ 5 57.1 \$ 5 57.
		8	∞	∞	∞		2										Ř Ř N N 9 9 9				See 2 2 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
	DA Suppportive Projects	nattuck Reconfiguration & Ped Safety	7th St W Oakland Transit Village Phase II	Berkeley BART Plaza & Transit Area Improvements	Lakeside Green Street Project (at Lakeside/Harrison)		Peralta St Improvements Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.)	Peralta St Improvements Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) UC BART Station Imp & RR Ped Xing Component (of BART Phase 2 & Decoto Rd. Complete Streets App.)	Peralta St Improvements Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) UC BART Station Imp & RR Ped Xing Component (of BART Phase 2 & Decoto Rd. Complete Streets App.) Hearst Ave Complete Streets	Peralta St Improvements Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) UC BART Station Imp & RR Ped Xing Component (of BART Phase 2 & Decoto Rd. Complete Streets App.) Hearst Ave Complete Streets Bike Lane Component (of Lake Merritt BART Bikeways App.)	Peralta St Improvements Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) UC BART Station Imp & RR Ped Xing Component (of BART Phase 2 & Decoto Rd. Complete Streets App.) Hearst Ave Complete Streets Bike Lane Component (of Lake Merritt BART Bikeways App.) MLK Way Improvments Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.)	Peralta St Improvements Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) UC BART Station Imp & RR Ped Xing Component (of BART Phase 2 & Decoto Rd. Complete Streets App.) Hearst Ave Complete Streets Bike Lane Component (of Lake Merritt BART Bikeways App.) MLK Way Improvments Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) Christie Ave Bay Trail Gap Closure	Peralta St Improvements Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) UC BART Station Imp & RR Ped Xing Component (of BART Phase 2 & Decoto Rd. Complete Streets App.) Hearst Ave Complete Streets Bike Lane Component (of Lake Merritt BART Bikeways App.) MLK Way Improvments Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) Christie Ave Bay Trail Gap Closure Fremont City Center multi-Modal Improvements	Peralta St Improvements Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) UC BART Station Imp & RR Ped Xing Component (of BART Phase 2 & Decoto Rd. Complete Streets App.) Hearst Ave Complete Streets Bike Lane Component (of Lake Merritt BART Bikeways App.) MLK Way Improvments Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) Christie Ave Bay Trail Gap Closure Fremont City Center multi-Modal Improvements East Bay Bus Rapid Transit Bike/Ped Elements	Peralta St Improvements Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) UC BART Station Imp & RR Ped Xing Component (of BART Phase 2 & Decoto Rd. Complete Streets App.) Hearst Ave Complete Streets Bike Lane Component (of Lake Merritt BART Bikeways App.) MLK Way Improvments Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) Christie Ave Bay Trail Gap Closure Fremont City Center multi-Modal Improvements East Bay Bus Rapid Transit Bike/Ped Elements Coliseum BART Corridor and Infrastructure Connections	Peralta St Improvements Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) UC BART Station Imp & RR Ped Xing Component (of BART Phase 2 & Decoto Rd. Complete Streets App.) Hearst Ave Complete Streets Bike Lane Component (of Lake Merritt BART Bikeways App.) MLK Way Improvments Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) MLK Way Improvments Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) East Bay Bus Rapid Transit Bike/Ped Elements East Bay Bus Rapid Transit Bike/Ped Elements Coliseum BART Corridor and Infrastructure Connections Segment 1 of the Iron Horse Trail, a Class I Multi-Use Trail	Peralta St Improvements Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) UC BART Station Imp & RR Ped Xing Component (of BART Phase 2 & Decoto Rd. Complete Streets App.) Hearst Ave Complete Streets Bike Lane Component (of Lake Merritt BART Bikeways App.) MLK Way Improvments Component (of Lake Merritt BART Bikeways App.) MLK Way Improvments Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) Christie Ave Bay Trail Gap Closure Fremont City Center multi-Modal Improvements East Bay Bus Rapid Transit Bike/Ped Elements Coliseum BART Corridor and Infrastructure Connections Segment 1 of the Iron Horse Trail, a Class I Multi-Use Trail Decoto Road and Decoto Rail Xing Improvement (of BART Phase 2 & Decoto Rd. Complete Streets App.)	Peralta St Improvements Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) UC BART Station Imp & RR Ped Xing Component (of BART Phase 2 & Decoto Rd. Complete Streets App.) Hearst Ave Complete Streets Bike Lane Component (of Lake Merritt BART Bikeways App.) MLK Way Improvments Component (of Lake Bay Trail Gap Closure Christie Ave Bay Trail Gap Closure Fremont City Center multi-Modal Improvements East Bay Bus Rapid Transit Bike/Ped Elements East Bay Bus Rapid Transit Bike/Ped Elements Coliseum BART Corridor and Infrastructure Connections Segment 1 of the Iron Horse Trail, a Class I Multi-Use Trail Decoto Road and Decoto Rail Xing Improvement Component Pactoto Road and Decoto Rail Xing Improvement Component Pactore Road and Decoto Rail Xing Improvement Tyrone Carney Park/105th Reconfiguration	Peralta St Improvements Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) UC BART Station Imp & RR Ped Xing Component (of BART Phase 2 & Decoto Rd. Complete Streets App.) Hearst Ave Complete Streets Bike Lane Component (of Lake Merritt BART Bikeways App.) MLK Way Improvments Component (of Lake Merritt BART Bikeways App.) MLK Vay Improvments Component (of Lake Merritt BART Bikeways App.) MLK Way Improvments Component (of Lake Merritt BART Bikeways App.) MLK Vay Improvements (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) Christie Ave Bay Trail Gap Closure Fremont City Center multi-Modal Improvements Coliseum BART Corridor and Infrastructure Connections Segment 1 of the Iron Horse Trail, a Class I Multi-Use Trail Decoto Road and Decoto Rail Xing Improvement Component Decoto Road and Decoto Rail Xing Improvement Component Of BART Phase 2 & Decoto Rd. Complete Streets App.) Tyrone Carney Park/105th Reconfiguration Amador Plaza Road Complete Street Improvements	Peralta St Improvements Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) UC BART Station Imp & RR Ped Xing Component (of BART Phase 2 & Decoto Rd. Complete Streets App.) Hearst Ave Complete Streets Bike Lane Component (of Lake Merritt BART Bikeways App.) MLK Way Improvments Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) Christie Ave Bay Trail Gap Closure Fremont City Center multi-Modal Improvements Fremont City Center multi-Modal Improvements East Bay Bus Rapid Transit Bike/Ped Elements Coliseum BART Corridor and Infrastructure Connections Segment 1 of the Iron Horse Trail, a Class I Multi-Use Trail Decoto Road and Decoto Rail Xing Improvement Component (of BART Phase 2 & Decoto Rai Xing Improvement Tyrone Carney Park/105th Reconfiguration Tyrone Carney Park/105th Reconfiguration	Peralta St Improvements Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) UC BART Station Imp & RR Ped Xing Component (of BART Phase 2 & Decoto Rd. Complete Streets App.) Hearst Ave Complete Streets Bike Lane Component (of Lake Merritt BART Bikeways App.) MLK Way Improvments Component (of Lake Merritt BART Bikeways App.) MLK Way Improvments Component (of MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) Christie Ave Bay Trail Gap Closure (for MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) Christie Ave Bay Trail Gap Closure (for MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) Christie Ave Bay Trail Gap Closure (for MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) Christie Ave Bay Trail Gap Closure (for MLK Jr. Way & Peralta Phase I App.) Fremont City Center multi-Modal Improvements Coliseum BART Corridor and Infrastructure Connections Segment 1 of the Iron Horse Trail, a Class I Multi-Use Trail Decoto Road and Decoto Rail Xing Improvements Coliseum BART Corridor and Infrastructure Connections Segment 1 of the Iron Horse Trail, a Class I Multi-Use Trail Decoto Road and Decoto Rail Xing Improvements Trone Canney Park/105th Reconfiguration Trone Canney Park/105th Reconfiguration Trone Canney Park/105th Reconfiguration Trone Canney Park/105th Reconfiguration I-580 At Foothill Road Interchange Improvements
	<u>с</u>	S		·		1															

5/16/2013

FY 2012/13 COORDINATED FUNDING PROGRAM DRAFT PROGRAM (Sorted by Project Type)

									\$ X 1,000				
Index#	¹ Jurisdiction	Project	CATEGORY	Scores	Total Project Cost	Total Requested	OBAG - LSR	OBAG - PDA	MB - VRF Bike/Ped	MB Transit	VRF Transit	Total Recommendec	Notes
		Bike Ped Capital Projects											
1	EBRPD	Bay Trail - Gilman to Buchanan		81.2	\$ 4,851	\$ 1,000			\$ 1,000			\$ 1,000	
7	City of Alameda	Cross Alameda Trail (Ralph Appezatto Memorial Parkway, Webster to Poggi)		77.9	\$ 991	\$ 793			\$ 793			\$ 793	
ŝ	City of Albany	Buchanan/Marin Bikeway		77.8	\$ 1,225	\$ 536			\$ 536			\$ 536	
4	City of San Leandro	W Juana Ped Improvements		74.8	\$ 724	\$ 724			\$ 346			\$ 346	Assumes S Leandro will provide \$378 K in additional Funds
ъ	Alameda County PWA	"A" Street Class II Bike Lane	ЯЯС	72.8	\$ 244	\$ 54							
9	Alameda County PWA	"A" Street Ped Safety	IETW(72.2	\$ 1,245	\$ 400							
7	City of Livermore	Segment 1 of the Iron Horse Trail, a Class I Multi-Use Trail (Isabel through Murrieta)	и утіяоія	70.3	\$ 1,841	\$ 1,630							Also Scored in PDA Supportive Category
8	Alameda County PWA	Fairmont Dr Bike Lane	d N∀	64.1	\$ 380	\$ 380							
6	City of San Leandro	E 14th St S Area Streetscape	'nd	63.0	\$ 6,320	\$ 5,630							
10	City of Albany	Albany Bike/Ped Wayfinding		62.6	\$ 311	\$ 280							
11	City of Pleasanton	Microwave Ped & Bike Detection in Hacienda		61.8	\$ 205	\$ 205							
12	City of Hayward	Main St Complete St		59.7	\$ 2,127	\$ 2,027							
13	City of Pleasanton	I-580 At Foothill Road Interchange Improvements		59.6	\$ 4,560	\$ 1,630							Also Scored in PDA Supportive Category
14	City of Pleasanton	Foothill Road - Bicycle Lane Gap Closure		55.6	\$ 1,035	\$ 915							
15	Alameda County PWA	Niles Canyon Road Ped Safety		See Notes	\$ 140	\$ 95							Project in Vision Network; Considered Tier 2
16	Alameda County PWA	Mabel Ave Ped Safety		See Notes	\$ 1,035	\$ 445							Project in Vision Network; Considered Tier 2
17	Alameda County PWA	E Castro Valley Blvd Bike Lane	ЗК	See Notes	\$ 540	\$ 480							Project in Vision Network; Considered Tier 2
18	Alameda County PWA	Mines Rd Bike Lane	IOWT	See Notes	\$ 56	\$ 50							Project in Vision Network; Considered Tier 2
19	City of Dublin	Village Parkway Bicycle & Pedestrian Improvements	.an ne.	See Notes	\$ 2,862	\$ 2,533							Project in Vision Network; Considered Tier 2
20	City of Livermore	Arroyo Las Positas Class I Multi-Use Trail	ioisi/	See Notes	\$ 3,771	\$ 2,918							Project in Vision Network; Considered Tier 2
21	City of Pleasanton	Bernal Avenue Bridge Over Arroyio de la Laguna	/ NA_	See Notes	\$ 2,200	\$ 500							Project in Vision Network; Considered Tier 2
22	City of San Leandro	W San Leandro Bikeways	ld	See Notes	\$ 569	\$ 569							Project in Vision Network; Considered Tier 2
23	EBRPD	Shadow Cliffs to Del Valle Trail		See Notes	\$ 1,430	\$ 1,200							Project in Vision Network; Considered Tier 2
24	LARPD	Sycamore Grove Park Trail Renovation		See Notes	\$ 1,852	\$ 1,717							Project in Vision Network; Considered Tier 2
25	EBRPD	lron Horse Trail - Dublin/Pleasanton BART to Santa Rita		See Notes	\$ 4,320	\$ 750							Project fully funded; Ground Breaking Event Held on May 1st
		Subtotal			\$ 44,834	\$ 27,461	۔ ب	; \$	\$ 2,675	ب	\$	\$ 2,675	

5/16/2013

FY 2012/13 COORDINATED FUNDING PROGRAM DRAFT PROGRAM (Sorted by Project Type)

									\$ X 1,000					
Index#	<pre># Jurisdiction</pre>	Project	CATEGORY	Scores	Total Project Cost	Total Requested	dBAG - LSR	OBAG - PDA	MB - VRF Bike/Ped	MB Transii	VRF Transi	Recon	rotal nmended	Notes
		Bike Ped Feasibility Studies												
Ч	City of Oakland	Lake Merritt Chanel Bike/Ped Bridge		29	\$ 15,00	0 \$ 40								
2	City of Oakland	Fruitvale Alive Gap Closure Streetscape Project (Fruitvale Ave E. 12th to Estuary)		28	\$ 2,06	2 <mark>\$ 20</mark>	10		\$ 113			Ŷ	113 Red Abo	uce Scope to Feasibility Study ut 3-4% of Bike/Ped funds
ŝ	City of Dublin	Iron Horse Trail/BART Connectivity Feasibility Study		25.8	\$ 35	0 <mark>\$</mark> 30	6							
4	City of Oakland	Park Blvd Path Feasibility Study		23.2	\$ 39	5 <mark>\$ 19</mark> .	7							
ß	City of Pleasanton	Feasibility Study for Ped & Bike Bridges		19.6	Ş	0 <mark>\$</mark> 2	5							
9	EBRPD	Niles Canyon Regional Trail Feasibility Study		18.4	\$ 15	0 <mark>\$ 7</mark>	5							
		Subtotal			\$ 3,00	7 <mark>\$ 81</mark> :	2 \$ -	- \$	\$ 113	Ş	\$	Ş.	113	
		Bike Ped Planning Documents												
7	City of Piedmont	Piedmont Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan		31.8	\$ 12	0 \$ 10	5		\$ 102			Ŷ	102 Mas Abo	ter Plan. ut 3-4% of Bike/Ped Funds
8	City of Hayward	Update of Citywide Bicycle MP, Prep of Ped MP, SR2S		24.6	\$ 30	0 \$ 30	0							
		Subtotal			\$ 42	0 \$ 40	- \$ 7	۔ ج	\$ 102	Ŷ	۰ ۲	ۍ ۱	102	
		Bike Ped Program/Operations												
6	Cycles of Change	Bike Go Round (education/safety Program)		74.8	\$ 84	0 \$ 36	0		\$ 240			Ś	Prog 240 Wou Abo	gram / Operations ald provide 2 years of operations ut 7.5% of local Bike/Ped funding
		Subtotal			\$ 84	0 <mark>\$</mark> 36) \$ -	÷ \$	\$ 240	Ş	\$ -	\$ '	240	
		Transit Capital Projects												
10	AC Transit	Line 51 Corridor GPS-based Transit Signal Priority		74	\$ 11,51	5 \$ 1,00	0							
		Subtotal			\$ 11,51	5 \$ 1,00	- \$ 0	- \$	- \$	\$	\$	\$ -		
		Transit Operations Projects												
11	City of Alameda	Estuary Crossing Shuttle		74	\$ 94	1 \$ 48	0				Ş	\$ 00;	200 Ope Wou	rations uld provide 2 years of operations
12	City of Oakland	Broadway Shuttle		72.2	\$ 2,67	0 <mark>\$</mark> 54	10				<u>ب</u>	52 \$	352 Ope	rations Jud provide 2 years of operations
13	LAVTA	Route 10 & Rapid Route Operations		71.2	\$ 7,33	3 \$ 1,00	0			\$ 1,(00	÷	1,000 Ope Wou	rations uld provide 2 years of operations
14	LAVTA	Route 12v, 20x and 70x Operations		71.0	\$ 3,9C	5 \$ 1,00	0			\$ 1,(00	÷	1,000 Ope Wou	rations uld provide 2 years of operations
		SubTotal			\$ 14,84	9 \$ 3,03	5 \$ -	\$	Ş	. \$ 2,0	00 \$ 5	52 \$	2,552	
		Totals			\$ 202,55	1 \$ 120,760) \$ 15,257	\$ 38,700	\$ 3,680	\$ 2,2	00 \$ 10,(\$ 00	69,837	

ς Ω
Ξ
0
2
6
7
~
ഗ



Memorandum

DATE: May 15, 2013

TO: Alameda County Transportation Commission

FROM: Finance and Administration Committee

SUBJECT: Approval of the Fiscal Year 2013-2014 Draft Proposed Consolidated Budget for the Alameda County Transportation Commission

Recommendations

It is recommended that the Commission approve the attached Draft Proposed Consolidated Budget for fiscal year 2013-14.

Summary

The Alameda County Transportation Commission's (Alameda CTC) FY2013-14 Proposed Consolidated Budget demonstrates a sustainable, balanced budget utilizing projected revenues and fund balance to fund total expenditures. A budget is considered balanced when (1) total revenues equal total expenditures, (2) total revenues are greater than total expenditures, or (3) total revenues plus fund balance are greater than total expenditures. The Alameda CTC budget should fit into this third category over the next few years, as the accumulation of Measure B and Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) funds are utilized to fund capital projects and programs in Alameda County.

The proposed budget has been prepared based on the modified accrual basis of accounting, which is consistent with the basis utilized to prepare our audited financial statements. It has been segregated by fund type and includes an adjustment column to eliminate interagency revenues and expenditures on a consolidated basis. The fund types are comprised of General Funds, Special Revenue Funds, Exchange Fund, and Capital Project Funds.

The proposed budget contains projected revenues totaling \$165.3 million of which sales tax revenues comprise \$120.0 million, or 73 percent, and VRF revenues comprise \$11.5 million, or 7 percent. In addition, the proposed budget also includes the projected FY2012-13 ending fund balance of \$96.3 million for total available resources of \$261.5 million. The projected revenues are offset by \$168.5 million in anticipated expenditures of which \$65.4 million, or 39 percent, are allocated for capital projects. These revenue and expenditure totals constitute a net reduction in fund balance of \$3.2 million and a projected consolidated ending fund balance of \$93.0 million. The reduction in fund balance is mostly due to the Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority's (ACTIA) capital program and will be funded through accumulated Measure B sales tax revenues.

Approval for the Draft Proposed Capital budgets is requested for the amounts found in the "Proposed FY2013-14 Capital Budget with Estimated Roll Over" column on each of the capital budget sheets for the Congestion Management function, ACTIA 2000 Measure B and Alameda County Transportation Authority (ACTA) 1986 Measure B. This column includes both the additional capital budget amount requested for FY2013-14 as well as the roll over balance from FY2012-13. The capital amount carried forward to the consolidated Alameda CTC Proposed Budget does not include the roll forward balances because these amounts are still included in the projected roll forward fund balance from the FY2012-13 adopted budget. During the mid-year budget update process, the roll forward fund balance will be updated to actual based on the audited financial statements. Therefore the capital budget amount on the consolidated budget spreadsheet for the mid-year budget update will be for the full capital budget including both the actual roll forward balance from FY2012-13 and any additional requested capital budget for FY2013-14. This methodology is required to ensure accurate and reliable fund balance information in Alameda CTC budgets.

The proposed budget incorporates the effort required to address One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) requirements over the next fiscal year and includes revenues and expenditures necessary to provide the following vital programs and planning projects for Alameda County:

- Transportation and Land Use Planning
- Safe Routes to School (SR2S)
- SR2S Capital Technical Assistance Program
- Countywide Transportation Plan
- Community Based Transportation Program
- Congestion Management Programs
- SR2S BikeMobile Program
- Travel Model Support
- Guaranteed Ride Home Program
- Vehicle Registration Fee Programs
- Transportation For Clean Air Programs
- Pass-Through Funding Programs

In addition to the planning projects and programs listed above, the proposed budget also contains revenues and expenditures necessary to fund and deliver significant capital projects that expand access and improve mobility in Alameda County consistent with the FY2013-14 Strategic Plan also being considered this month by the Commission. Some of the most significant projects included in the proposed budget are as follows:

- BART Warm Springs Extension Project
- I-880 to Mission Blvd. and East-West Connector Project
- BART Oakland Airport Connector Project
- I-80 Integrated Corridor Mobility Project
- Isabel Avenue Route 84/I-580 Interchange Project
- Route 84 Expressway Project in Livermore
- Route 92 Clawiter-Whitesell Interchange
- I-880 Southbound HOV Lane Project
- I-580 Corridor Improvement Projects

The proposed budget allows for an additional inter-fund loan from the ACTA Capital Fund to the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACCMA) General Fund of \$5 million, if and when necessary during FY2013-14, which would bring the total authorized loan amount to \$15 million. The loan program was adopted by the Commission in March, 2011 to help cash flow the ACCMA Capital Projects Fund. It also assumes an inter-fund loan of \$36.6 million from the ACTA Capital Fund to the ACTIA Capital Fund, which will delay the need for external financing to the second quarter of FY2014-15 based on the most recent cash flow projections.

Discussion

The proposed budget for FY2013-14 was developed with a focus on the mission and core functions of the Alameda CTC as defined in the Strategic Business Plan and enables the Alameda CTC to plan, fund and deliver transportation programs and projects that expand access and improve mobility in Alameda County. The proposed budget helps meet these goals by assigning available resources in the budget in order to formulate strategies and solutions for transportation opportunities and needs identified in the planning process; assigning the funding necessary to evaluate, prioritize, and finance programs and projects; and programming funds in order to deliver quality programs and projects on schedule and within budget.

Major Line Item Detail

Sales Tax Revenues – Increase of \$1 million, or about 1 percent, over the FY2012-13 Revised Budget of \$119.0 million being proposed today to \$120.0 million. The \$119.0 million budget adjustment being proposed for FY2012-13 exceeds the historical peak level of \$116.3 million collected in FY2007-08 by ACTIA for Measure B.

Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) Revenues – Increase of \$0.8 million, or 7.2 percent, over the FY2012-13 Revised Budget of \$10.7 million to \$11.5 million. This projection is based on revenues received since the beginning of the program as we now have more than one whole year's worth of collection data to use as a basis for projections.

Grant Revenues – Decrease of \$31.5 million, or 63 percent, from the FY2012-13 Revised Budget to \$18.7 million due to capital project roll forward balances accounted for in the budgeted fund balance rolled forward from FY2012-13. Approximately 93 percent of grant revenues in the FY2013-14 budget come from local sources, 1 percent from regional sources, 4 percent from state sources and 2 percent from federal sources.

Salaries and Benefits – Remain unchanged from FY2012-13 Revised Budget of \$4.2 million. The proposed budget for FY2013-14 provides funding for 25 of the 27 approved Full Time Equivalent (FTE) positions in compliance with the approved salary and benefit structure.

General Office Expenses – Increase of \$0.3 million, or 12 percent, from the FY2012-13 Revised Budget to \$2.7 million due to one-time office relocation costs.

Other Administration – Decrease of \$1.4 million, or 46 percent, from the FY2012-13 Revised Budget to \$1.6 million related to an overall cost cutting effort for annually renewed contracts and capital items accounted for in the capital projects budget.

Planning Costs – Increase of \$0.4 million, or 14 percent, over the FY2012-13 Revised Budget of \$2.4 million to \$2.8 million mostly to support the Priority Development Areas (PDA) as defined by the Commission adopted PDA investment and growth strategy and to meet OBAG requirements.

Programs Costs - Increase of \$7.7 million over the FY2012-13 Revised Budget to \$97.8 million mostly due to an increase in Exchange Program activity and in the projection for sales tax revenues. Pass-through funding is based on a calculation of sales tax receipts as prescribed in the 2000 Measure B Transportation Expenditure Plan.

Capital Projects Expenditures – Decrease of \$165.8 million, or 74 percent, from the FY2012-13 Revised Budget of \$224.7 million to \$58.9 million due to the capital budget rolled from FY2012-13 included in the roll forward fund balance from the FY2012-13 Revised Budget.

Limitation Ratios

The ACTIA Salary and Benefits Limitation ratio of 0.58 percent and the Administrative Cost Limitation ratio of 2.68 percent were calculated based on the proposed budgeted expenditures and were found to be in compliance with the 1.00 percent and 4.5 percent limitation requirement, respectively.

Fiscal Impacts

The fiscal impact of the FY2013-14 Proposed Consolidated Budget would be to provide resources of \$165.3 million and authorize expenditures of \$168.5 million with an overall decrease in fund balance of \$3.2 million for a projected ending fund balance of \$93.0 million.

Attachments

Attachment A:	Alameda CTC FY2013-14 Draft Proposed Consolidated Budget
Attachment B:	Congestion Management Function FY2013-14 Draft Proposed Capital Projects Budget
Attachment C:	2000 Measure B Sales Tax FY2013-14 Draft Proposed Capital Project Budget
Attachment D:	1986 Measure B Sales Tax FY2013-14 Draft Proposed Capital Project Budget
Attachment E:	ACTIA FY2013-14 Draft Proposed Budget Limitation Calculations

Alameda County Transportation Commission Fiscal Year 2013-2014 Draft Proposed Budget

Attachment A

		Special		Capital	Inter-Agency	
	General	Revenue	Exchange	Project	Adjustments/	
	Funds	Funds	Fund	Funds	Eliminations	Total
Projected Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 18,562,712	\$ 13,686,045	\$ 1,830,442	\$ 62,176,976	\$-	\$ 96,256,175
Revenues:						
Sales Tax Revenues	5.400.000	68.645.400	-	45,954,600	-	120.000.000
Investment Income	-	-	-	472.000	-	472.000
Member Agency Fees	1.394.819	-	-	-	-	1.394.819
VRF Funds	-	11.500.000	108,108	1.145.000	(1,253,108)	11.500.000
Other Revenues	582.749	1,928,821	11.212.797	(674,190)	141,441	13,191,618
Grants	 9,633,377	116,628	-	14,588,813	(5,619,891)	18,718,927
Total Revenues	17,010,945	82,190,849	11,320,905	61,486,222	(6,731,558)	165,277,363
Expenditures:						
Administration						
Salaries and Benefits	1,659,103	-	-	221,046	-	1,880,149
General Office Expenses	2,705,365	48,000	-	345,874	(367,000)	2,732,238
Other Administration	942,666	340,594	87,000	215,362	-	1,585,622
Commission and Community Support	234,875	33,000	-	20,125	(33,000)	255,000
Contingency	175,000	-	-	25,000	-	200,000
Planning						
Salaries and Benefits	809,459	-	-	-	-	809,459
Countywide Transportation Plan	1,150,000	-	-	-	(1,100,000)	50,000
Congestion Management Program	250,000	-	-	-	-	250,000
Other Planning Projects	2,511,850	-	-	-	-	2,511,850
Programs						
Salaries and Benefits	397,322	705,086	49,941	-	(294,317)	858,033
Programs Management	1,056,543	791,955	11,492	92,842	-	1,952,831
Safe Routes to School Programs	3,101,500	-	-	-	-	3,101,500
VRF Programming and Other Costs	-	10,764,968	-	-	(108,108)	10,656,860
Measure B Pass-Through	-	64,231,409	-	-	-	64,231,409
Grant Awards	-	5,307,392	-	-	(614,093)	4,693,299
Other Programming	125,000	2,094,673	11,064,363	-	(120,000)	13,164,036
Capital Projects						
Salaries and Benefits	-	-	-	1,213,856	(556,206)	657,650
Capital Project Expenditures	-	-	-	63,281,987	(4,376,608)	58,905,380
Indirect Cost Recovery/Allocation						
Indirect Cost Recovery from Capital, Spec Rev & Exch Funds	 (837,774)	-	-	-	837,774	-
Total Expenditures	14,280,909	84,317,077	11,212,797	65,416,091	(6,731,558)	168,495,316
Net Change in Fund Balance	2,730,036	(2,126,228)	108,108	(3,929,869)	0	(3,217,953)
Projected Ending Fund Balance	\$ 21,292,748	\$ 11,559,817	\$ 1,938,550	\$ 58,247,107	\$ 0	\$ 93,038,222

Alameda County Congestion Management Function Fiscal Year 2013-2014 Draft Proposed Capital Project Budget

		Estimated EV 2012-13	Dronored	FY 2013-' FY 2013-' Canital Bur	d 4 14	Total	Total	Total	Total
Project Name	Project #	Rollover to FY 2013-14	FY 2013-14 Capital Budget	w/ Estimat Rollove	eq	Local Local Funding Sources Fu	Regional Inding Sources FL	State State Inding Sources Fun	Federal ding Sources
I-580 San Leandro Soundwall/Landscape	774.0-1	\$ 817.533	\$ (237,685	8 8	79,848	\$ 229,847 \$	9 '	ю ,	350,000
Grand MacArthur	702.0			•	•				
I-680 HOT Lane	710.0-5	3,939,152	199,285	4,13	38,437	2,730,354		1,000,000	408,083
I-680 Northbound HOV / Express Lane	721.0	2,381,211	726,323	3,10	07,534	3,107,534		•	•
I-80 Gilman Interchange Improvements	765.0	1,787,621	(939,423	8	18,198	248,000			600,198
I-580 PSR at 106th Eastbound Off-Ramp	735.0	126,380	(126,380			•	•	•	'
Smart Corridors Operation and Maintenance	945.0	156,860	1,045,000	1,2(01,860	1,201,860	•	•	'
Smart Corridors Operation and Maintenance/Tri-Valley	945.1	47,145		7	17,145	47,145			'
Caldecott Tunnel	917.0	1,150,000	250,000	1,4(00,000	1,400,000			'
Center to Center	715.0	553,183		55	53,183				553,183
I-880 North Safety & Op Improv 23rd&29th	717.0	3,666,632	200,000	3,8(36,632	1,032,605	822,796	2,011,231	'
I-580 Eastbound HOV Lane	720.0	•				•			'
I-580 Enviromental Mitigation	720.3	76,635			76,635		76,635		'
I-580 Eastbound Express (HOT) Lane	720.4	1,697,396	550,000	2,2,	17,396	51,522	555,000	656,646	984,228
I-580 Eastbound Auxiliary (AUX) Lane	720.5	4,801,482	(793,955	4,00	07,527	2,365,000	1,567,527		75,000
I-580 Right of Way Preservation	723.0	643,818	279,122	36	22,940	669,508		253,432	'
I-580 Westbound HOV Lane	724.0, 4-5	2,309,316	4,553,223	6,8(32,539	3,292,123	1,511,000	1,000,000	1,059,416
I-580 Westbound HOT Lane	724.1	3,185,509		3,18	35,509	1,138,590	•	973,090	1,073,829
Altamont Commuter Express Operations	725.0	17,593			17,593	17,593			'
Altamont Commuter Express	725.1	4,623,084		4,62	23,084	4,230,665		392,419	'
I-880 Southbound HOV Lane	730.0-2	2,977,231	4,267,211	7,2,	14,442	7,052,363			192,079
I-880 Southbound HOV Lane Landscaping/Hardscaping	730.3	344,351	672,382	1,0	16,733	53,656		23,077	940,000
Webster Street Smart Corridor	740.0-2	1,936,002	(1,236,374	99	99,628	83,628			616,000
Marina Boulevard/I-880 PSR	750.0	205,144	144,856	Эс	50,000	350,000	•		'
East Bay Greenway - Segment 7A	760.0-1	•	1,577,417	1,5,1	77,417	499,017	•		1,078,400
I-680/880 Cross Connector PSR	770.0	351,814		Э́с	51,814	351,814	•		'
I-680 SB HOV Lane	772.0	131,002		1	31,002	24,486		33,296	73,220
I-80 Integrated Corridor Mobility	791.0-6	10,431,613	2,438,620	12,87	70,233	875,641		11,903,617	90,975
	n	\$ 48,357,706	\$ 13,569,622	\$ 61,92	27,328	\$ 31,052,951 \$	4,532,958 \$	18,246,808 \$	8,094,611

Attachment B

2000 Measure B Sales Tax Fiscal Year 2013-2014 Draft Proposed Capital Project Budget

						Funding Sources	
		Estimated FY 2012-13	Proposed	Proposed FY 2013-14 Capital Budget			
Project Name	Project #	Rollover to FY 2013-14	FY 2013-14 Capital Budget	w/ Estimated Rollover	2000 Measure B	Regional RM2	State TCRP
ACE Capital Improvements	601.0	\$ 4,230,665	ج	\$ 4,230,665	\$ 4,230,665	ب ۲	
BART Warm Springs Extension	602.0	19,548,197	15,000,000	34,548,197	34,548,197		•
BART Oakland Airport Connector	603.0	•	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000		
Downtown Oakland Streetscape	604.0	3,782,700	•	3,782,700	3,782,700	•	•
Fruitvale Transit Village	605.0	•	•				
Union City Intermodal Station	606.0	•	I	ı	•	•	•
Telegraph Avenue Bus Rapid Transit	607.1	2,521,467	2,000,000	4,521,467	4,521,467	•	
San Pablo Avenue Corridor Transit	607.2	•			•	•	•
Telegraph Avenue Rapid Bus Service	607.3	•			•	•	•
I-680 Express Lane	608.0	5,641,578	•	5,641,578	4,301,578	•	1,340,000
Iron Horse Trail	609.0	500,000	500,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	•	•
I-880/Broadway-Jackson Interchange	610.0	2,527,324		2,527,324	2,527,324	•	•
I-880/Washington Ave I/C	611.0	•		•	•	•	•
I-580/Castro Valley Interchanges Improvements	612.0	1,627,243	•	1,627,243	1,627,243		•
Lewelling/East Lewelling	613.0	650,000	•	650,000	650,000	•	•
I-580 Auxiliary Lanes	614.0	•		•	•	•	•
I-580 Auxiliary Lanes - Westbound Fallon to Tassajara	614.1	712,000		712,000	712,000	•	•
I-580 Auxiliary Lanes - Westbound Airway to Fallon	614.2	2,174,729		2,174,729	2,174,729	•	•
I-580 Auxiliary Lanes - E/B EI Charro to Airway	614.3	45,000		45,000	45,000	•	•
Rte 92/Clawiter-Whitesell Interchange	615.0	3,973,246	4,000,000	7,973,246	7,973,246	•	•
Oakland Local Streets	616.0	•			•	•	•
Hesperian/Lewelling Widening	617.1	599,622		599,622	599,622	•	•
Westgate Extension	618.1	2,173,850	(1,573,850)	600,000	600,000	•	•
E. 14th/Hesperian/150th Improvements	619.0	2,104,806	I	2,104,806	2,104,806	•	
Newark Local Streets	620.0	•			•	•	
I-238 Widening	621.0	198,077	I	198,077	198,077		
I-680/I-880 Cross Connector Study	622.0	492,517	I	492,517	492,517	•	•
Isabel - Route 84/I-580 Interchange	623.0	5,749,463	4,525,537	10,275,000	10,275,000	•	
Route 84 Expressway	624.0	6,441,953	2,600,000	9,041,953	9,041,953	•	•
Dumbarton Corridor	625.0	3,281,098	ı	3,281,098	3,131,098	150,000	
I-580 Corridor/BART to Livermore	626.0	3,115,243	384,757	3,500,000	3,500,000	•	
Congestion Relief Emergency Fund - Unallocated	627.0	•			•	•	
Congestion Relief Emergency Fund - Vasco Road	627.1	•			•	•	•
I-80 Integrated Corridor Mobility	627.2	590,844		590,844	590,844	•	
I-880 Corridor Improvements in Oakland and San Leandro	627.3	934,769	438,249	1,373,018	1,373,018		
CWTP/TEP Development	627.4	50,000		50,000	50,000	•	•
Studies at Congested Segments/Locations on CMP	627.5	800,000		800,000	800,000	•	•
Project Closeout	600.0		795,609	795,609	795,609		
		\$ 74,466,390	\$ 48,670,302	\$ 123,136,693	\$ 121,646,693	\$ 150,000 \$	1,340,000

Attachment C

1986 Measure B Sales Tax Fiscal Year 2013-2014 Draft Proposed Capital Project Budget

Project Name		Estimated FY 2012-13 Rollover to FY 2013-14	Cal F	Proposed Y 2013-14 oital Budget	S a T	Y 2013-14 pital Budget Estimated Rollover
-880 to Mission Blvd. Route 262 Interchange Reconstruction 501.0	ഗ	497,357	\$	102,643	ക	600,000
-880 to Mission Blvd. and East-West Connector 505.0		23,141,578				23,141,578
Route 238/Mission-Foothill-Jackson Corridor Improvement 506.0		1,497,419		1,502,581		3,000,000
-580 Interchange Improvements Project in Castro Valley (for ACTIA 12/612.0) 507.0		1,793,036				1,793,036
Central Alameda County Freeway System Operational Analysis 508.0		1,000,000		100,000		1,100,000
Castro Valley Local Area Traffic Circulation Improvement 509.0		1,669,496		330,504		2,000,000
Project Closeout 500.0		186,967		313,033		500,000
	\$	29,785,854	\$	2,348,761	\$	32,134,614

Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority Fiscal Year 2013-2014 Draft Proposed Budget Limitation Calculations

Net Sales Tax	\$ 120,000,000	А	
Investments & Other Income	 2,123,628	В	
Funds Generated	\$ 122,123,628	С	
Administrative Salaries & Benefits	\$ 693,181	D	
Other Administration Costs	2,517,007	Е	
Total Administration Costs	\$ 3,210,189	F	
Gross Salaries & Benefits to Net Sales Tax	0.5777% = D/A		
Gross Salaries & Benefits to Funds Generated	0.5676% = D/C		
Total Administration Costs to Net Sales Tax	2.6752% = F/A		