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Bicycle and Pedestrian Community Advisory Committee
Thursday, October 9, 2014, 5:30 p.m.
1111 Broadway, Suite 800
Oakland, CA 94607

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

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

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

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

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

Alameda CTC
1111 Broadway, Suite 800
Oakland, CA 94607

Alameda CTC is accessible by multiple transportation modes. The office is conveniently located near the 12th Street/City Center BART station and many AC Transit bus lines. Bicycle parking is available on the street and in the BART station as well as in electronic lockers at 14th Street and Broadway near Frank Ogawa Plaza (requires purchase of key card from bikelink.org). There is bicycle parking inside of the garage located off of 11th Street. Press the white button on the call box to inform security of the meeting you are attending at Alameda CTC. Once approved, security will open the gate and there is bicycle parking straight ahead.

Garage parking is located beneath City Center, accessible via entrances on 14th Street between 1300 Clay Street and 505 14th Street buildings, or via 11th Street just past Clay Street. To plan your trip to Alameda CTC visit www.511.org.

Accessibility

Public meetings at Alameda CTC are wheelchair accessible under the Americans with Disabilities Act. Guide and assistance dogs are welcome. Call 510-893-3347 (Voice) or 510-834-6754 (TTD) five days in advance to request a sign-language interpreter.

Meeting Schedule

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

Paperless Policy

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

Connect with Alameda CTC

www.AlamedaCTC.org
facebook.com/AlamedaCTC
@AlamedaCTC
youtube.com/user/AlamedaCTC
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
Meeting Agenda
Thursday, October 9, 2014, 5:30 p.m.

5:30 – 5:35 p.m.  
Midori Tabata
1. Welcome and Introductions

5:35 – 5:40 p.m.  
Public
2. Public Comment

5:40 – 5:45 p.m.  
Midori Tabata
3. BPAC Meeting Minutes
   3.1. Approval of July 10, 2014 BPAC Meeting Minutes

5:45 – 5:50 p.m.  
Midori Tabata
4. BPAC Bylaws

5:50 – 6:40 p.m.  
Matt Bomberg
5. Draft Alameda County Bicycle Master Plan Guidelines

6:40 – 7:00 p.m.  
Matt Bomberg
6. Measure B/Vehicle Registration Fee Local Direct Program Distribution Compliance Report, Bicycle and Pedestrian Expenditure Analysis

7:00 – 7:20 p.m.  
Matt Bomberg

7:20 – 7:25 p.m.  
Matt Bomberg
8. Commission Actions and Staff Reports (Verbal)
   8.1. Transportation Expenditure Plan Update (Verbal)
   8.2. East Bay Greenway Active Transportation Program Grant Award (Verbal)
   8.3. Countywide Discretionary Fund Bike/Ped Project Progress Reports

7:25 – 7:30 p.m.  
BPAC Members
9. BPAC Member Reports (Verbal)
   9.1. BPAC Roster
   9.2. Alameda CTC Public Outreach Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5:30 – 5:35 p.m.</th>
<th>1. Welcome and Introductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:35 – 5:40 p.m.</td>
<td>2. Public Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:40 – 5:45 p.m.</td>
<td>3. BPAC Meeting Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45 – 5:50 p.m.</td>
<td>4. BPAC Bylaws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:50 – 6:40 p.m.</td>
<td>5. Draft Alameda County Bicycle Master Plan Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:40 – 7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>6. Measure B/Vehicle Registration Fee Local Direct Program Distribution Compliance Report, Bicycle and Pedestrian Expenditure Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 – 7:20 p.m.</td>
<td>7. Annual Report on Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Implementation Progress and Work Program for Upcoming Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:20 – 7:25 p.m.</td>
<td>8. Commission Actions and Staff Reports (Verbal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:25 – 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>9. BPAC Member Reports (Verbal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A = Action Item; I = Information Item)
9.3. BPAC Project Review Look-ahead 129

7:30 p.m. 10. Adjournment
Midori Tabata

Next meeting: January 8, 2015

All items on the agenda are subject to action and/or change by the Committee.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABAG</td>
<td>Association of Bay Area Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Transit</td>
<td>Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCMA*</td>
<td>Alameda County Congestion Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>Altamont Commuter Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTA</td>
<td>Alameda County Transportation Authority (1986 Measure B authority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTAC</td>
<td>Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIA*</td>
<td>Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority (original 2000 Measure B authority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>Americans with Disabilities Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT</td>
<td>Average daily traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda CTC</td>
<td>Alameda County Transportation Commission (current Measure B authority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATG</td>
<td>Automobile trip generated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAAQMD</td>
<td>Bay Area Air Quality Management District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART</td>
<td>San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Bus rapid transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARB</td>
<td>California Air Resources Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBTP</td>
<td>Community Based Transportation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTA</td>
<td>Contra Costa Transportation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDT</td>
<td>Community Design and Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>Capital Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>Congestion management agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA TIP</td>
<td>Congestion Management Agency Transportation Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMP</td>
<td>Congestion Management Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC</td>
<td>California Transportation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWTP</td>
<td>Countywide Transportation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCR</td>
<td>Flexible Congestion Relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG</td>
<td>Greenhouse gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOA</td>
<td>Growth opportunity areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>General Plan Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRH</td>
<td>Guaranteed Ride Home Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>Highway Capacity Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOT</td>
<td>High occupancy toll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOV</td>
<td>High occupancy vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRRS</td>
<td>Interregional Road System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITIP</td>
<td>State Interregional Transportation Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPA</td>
<td>Joint Powers Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATIP</td>
<td>Local Area Transportation Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAVTA</td>
<td>Livermore Amador Valley Transportation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Level of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP-21</td>
<td>Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>Notice of Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBAG</td>
<td>One Bay Area Grant Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD</td>
<td>Origin/destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>Priority conservation area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI</td>
<td>Pavement Condition Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDA</td>
<td>Priority development area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMS</td>
<td>Pavement management system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSR</td>
<td>Project Study Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM2</td>
<td>Regional Measure 2 (bridge toll)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTIP</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Improvement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan (MTC's Transportation 2035)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETEA-LU</td>
<td>Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act, a Legacy for Users (replaced by MAP-21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>Sustainable Communities Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFCTA</td>
<td>San Francisco County Transportation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>State Highway Operations and Protection Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJCOG</td>
<td>San Joaquin Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>San Mateo County Transportation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP</td>
<td>State Implementation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>State Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR2S</td>
<td>Safe Routes to School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTP</td>
<td>Short Range Transit Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>Sacramento Transportation Authority, State Transit Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP</td>
<td>Federal Surface Transportation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP/CMAQ</td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program/Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWITRS</td>
<td>Statewide Integrated Traffic Record System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>Transportation Authority of Marin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASAS</td>
<td>Traffic Accident Surveillance and Analysis System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAD</td>
<td>Traffic analysis district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAZ</td>
<td>Traffic analysis zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCM</td>
<td>Transportation control measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRP</td>
<td>Transportation Congestion Relief Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>Transportation Development Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM</td>
<td>Transportation demand management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEP</td>
<td>Transportation Expenditure Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFCA</td>
<td>Transportation Fund for Clean Air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>Federal Transportation Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC</td>
<td>Transportation for Livable Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMA</td>
<td>Transportation Management Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMP</td>
<td>Traffic management plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD</td>
<td>Transit-oriented development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOS</td>
<td>Transportation operations systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSM</td>
<td>Transportation system management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVTC</td>
<td>Tri-Valley Transportation Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/C</td>
<td>Volume/capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHD</td>
<td>Vehicle hours of delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT</td>
<td>Vehicle miles traveled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRF</td>
<td>Vehicle Registration Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Merged to become Alameda County Transportation Commission in 2010.*
1. Welcome and Introductions
BPAC Chair Midori Tabata called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. The meeting began with introductions, and the chair confirmed a quorum. All BPAC members were present, except the following: Mike Ansell, Mike Bucci, Preston Jordan, Ben Schweng, and Matt Turner. Midori welcomed new member Diane Shaw.

Matt Turner arrived prior to the vote on agenda item 4.2.

2. Public Comment: There were no public comments.

3. Approval of April 10, 2014 Minutes
David Fishbaugh moved to approve the April 10, 2014 minutes as written. Sara Zimmerman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 7-0 (Mike Ansell, Mike Bucci, Preston Jordan, Ben Schweng, and Matt Turner were absent).

4. Organizational Meeting

4.1. Election of Officers
Jeremy Johansen nominated Midori Tabata for chair. David Fishbaugh seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 7-0 (Mike Ansell, Mike Bucci, Preston Jordan, Ben Schweng, and Matt Turner were absent).

Midori Tabata nominated Sara Zimmerman for vice chair. Jeremy Johansen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 7-0 (Mike Ansell, Mike Bucci, Preston Jordan, Ben Schweng, and Matt Turner were absent).

4.2. Review and Approval of BPAC Bylaws
Matt Bomberg led the discussion on the BPAC Bylaws. He mentioned that there were significant changes to the BPAC Bylaws this year as a result of the discussions with BPAC on the “Committee Purpose,” Article 2.1 and “Roles and Responsibilities,” Article 2.2. He requested the committee review the illustration of committee roles and responsibilities on page 23 in the agenda packet for an easy way to view staff’s proposed changes.

Committee members and staff discussed the bylaws, and members requested the following changes:

- Section 3.3 – Staff made the recommendation to add “and non-profit” after “agency.” However, the committee did not agree on the modifications to this section. The committee requested that staff review this section and bring back a recommendation to the committee at a later date.
- Section 8.2 – The committee requested staff to review this section in relation to Section 3.3 in terms of members having a conflict of interest when affiliated...
with projects, programs, and policies that members evaluate. Staff agreed to bring back a recommendation to the committee at a later date.

- Midori requested modifying the committee name to “Alameda Countywide Bicyclists and Pedestrian Advisory Committee.” Staff informed the committee that changing the name has more ramifications because of the agency Administrative Code.

_Sara Zimmerman moved to approve the BPAC Bylaws, with the exception of Articles 3.3 and 8.2, which staff will present to the committee at a later meeting. David Fishbaugh seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 8-0 (Mike Ansell, Mike Bucci, Preston Jordan, and Ben Schweng were absent)._"

4.3. Review of FY 14-15 BPAC Meeting Calendar
Matt Bomberg reviewed the FY 14-15 calendar with the committee.

Public comment: Ken Bukowski suggested BPAC meet bi-monthly instead of quarterly, since the committee reviews projects. Staff stated that Alameda CTC does not have many active projects at this time to review. Many Alameda CTC projects are near completion and are past the point of bringing to the BPAC for review.

Committee members discussed the calendar and made the following recommendations:

- A member suggested Alameda CTC hold workshops between the quarterly meetings to assist with the process of members reviewing projects. Midori stated that due to the new role of the BPAC, we need to see how the new process will work and then reevaluate it at the end of the year.

- A member requested that staff explain how the new process outlined in the Project Review Guidelines works for the chair and vice chair to preselect projects for the BPAC to review. Staff mentioned that this discussion will take place in agenda item 5.

- The committee inquired if the calendar only highlights large topics and not smaller topics, such as Bike to Work Day. Staff said yes. The topics may also change, and committee members may request the addition of a particular item to any agenda.

- A member suggested adding another category called “input” when items are not information or action.

- A request was made to change the meeting date to any day other than Thursday. Staff informed members that considerable review of other local BPACs, planning committees, and other public meetings led to the selection of the second Thursday date. The committee agreed to keep the meeting date as is.

The committee agreed to accept the calendar. A formal action was not taken on this agenda item.

5. Update on BPAC Project Review Look-Ahead
Matt Bomberg reviewed the BPAC project review look-ahead with the committee. He noted that the list is an inventory of all active projects receiving Measure B/VRF funds and
contains information related to whether the project would be a good candidate to receive BPAC review. He reviewed each project on the list and explained why the project was or wasn’t recommended to receive BPAC review.

Questions/feedback from the members about process for developing inventory:

- How did staff decide on which projects to select? Matt noted that there was a sequential consideration of the criteria that had been discussed with the committee previously. First staff looked at whether the project fell within the “BPAC project review window” of its project development—scoping, environmental, or preliminary design phases. If the project was still within this window, then other factors such as countywide significance and bike/ped nexus were considered.
- A member noted that the Cross Alameda Trail project is having public meetings related to design during the summer of 2014. Matt noted that for projects from the 2013 coordinated call for projects, staff used the schedule from the grant application to determine the project phase and status, and that project may have fallen behind this schedule. Staff will contact these project sponsors to obtain correct information.
- The committee requested an updated spreadsheet of projects on a regular basis and suggested that staff should make the project list available on the website. Also, members suggested it would be helpful to adjust the spreadsheet to include links to the project for BPAC to follow. Staff agreed that both of these requests were possible to respond to.
- How can a project from 1986 in design be 65 percent complete, and a more recent project is in final design? Staff noted that projects can encounter a variety of hurdles and that many lessons were learned from the 1986 projects about timely use of fund policies that now apply to Alameda CTC projects.
- A member suggested that until the concrete is poured, BPAC can have input on a project. Staff noted that generally speaking, the opportunities for incorporating input diminish as a project is in more advanced stages, which is why the BPAC project review focuses on earlier stages as shown in the diagram on page 34.
- A member suggested that projects in jurisdictions without local BPACs should be highest priority.
- A member suggested that non-bike/ped projects such as arterial projects may be highest priority as bicycle/pedestrian considerations may be possible but not a primary focus of the project. For example, a project in Castro Valley eliminated the bicycle and pedestrian connections to BART; therefore, if someone had commented before project completion, something could have been done.

Staff recommended five projects for BPAC review starting in January 2015. Staff noted that there are fewer projects recommended for BPAC review because Alameda CTC has delivered most of the projects from its 2000 expenditure plan and because recent programming actions contained many projects that were already in advanced stages. Staff requested input from the committee on the project they would like to review first.

During the discussion, staff noted that BPAC will review at least one project per meeting. The committee stated that BPAC will provide detailed comments on approximately four projects a year; however, remaining projects will not receive any comments from BPAC. Midori and staff stated that once BPAC is familiar with the process, BPAC can complete
more than one project in a meeting. Staff assured the committee that the process will be reviewed and adjusted if necessary.

As a result of the discussion, the committee agreed that the following projects have lower priority for BPAC review:

- Kains Street and Adams Street Bicycle Facility Study
- Clement Avenue Complete Streets

The following three projects out of the five recommended by staff have a higher priority for BPAC review and will begin in January, subject to the project’s staying on schedule:

- I-880/Broadway-Jackson Interchange Improvements
- Fruitvale Alive Gap Closure Streetscape Project
- Iron Horse Connectivity to BART

Staff will verify the status of the other projects and update the inventory to include additional columns requested and hyperlinks to the projects.

6. **Measure B/Vehicle Registration Fee Local Direct Program Distribution Compliance Report, Bicycle and Pedestrian Expenditure Analysis**
   Item was deferred to October due to lack of time.

7. **Commission Actions and Staff Reports**
   Tess Lengyel informed the committee that Alameda CTC received unanimous approval of the Transportation Expenditure Plan from all 14 cities in Alameda County and the Board of Supervisors. In addition, the Board of Supervisors approved placing the measure on the November 2014 ballot.

8. **BPAC Member Reports**
   Sara Zimmerman discussed a report recently released report and accompanying webinar from the Safe Routes to Schools National partnership called “Buses, Boots, and Bicycles: Exploring Collaboration between Safe Routes to School and School Busing Professionals to Get Children to School Safely and Healthily.”

   Midori said Walk Oakland Bike Oakland has an event scheduled on Saturday July 12, 2014 called “Love Our Neighborhood Day.”

9. **Meeting Adjournment**
   The meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for October 9, 2014 at the Alameda CTC offices.
DATE: October 3, 2014

SUBJECT: BPAC Bylaws

RECOMMENDATION: Approve proposed changes to BPAC Bylaws.

Summary

At its organizational meeting in July 2014, the BPAC approved updated bylaws, excluding sections 3.3 and 8.2, which deal with Membership Qualifications and Conflicts of Interest, respectively. Staff has prepared proposed revisions to these sections, as presented below:

3.3 Membership Qualification. Each member must be an Alameda County resident and be interested in improving the safety and convenience of bicycling and/or walking in the county. Public agency employees who are responsible for bicycle and pedestrian projects and/or programs and who work for an eligible agency likely to submit an application for the Discretionary Fund may not serve on the Committee. Any public agency or nonprofit employees appointed to the Committee shall recuse themselves from evaluating and voting to fund a project/program application from their agency or nonprofit organization. Public agency, non-profit, or other employees who are directly responsible for bicycle and pedestrian projects and/or programs and who work for an eligible agency likely to submit an application for Alameda CTC discretionary funding must recuse themselves from decisions related to policy development, project review, or other matters that directly relate to their work, consistent with Section 8.2.

8.2 Conflicts of Interest. A conflict of interest exists when any Committee member has, or represents, a financial interest in the matter before the Committee. Such direct interest must be significant or personal. In the event of a conflict of interest, the Committee member shall declare the conflict, recuse him or herself from the discussion, and shall not vote on that item. Failure to comply with these provisions shall be grounds for removal from the Committee.

Fiscal Impact: There is no fiscal impact.

Attachments

A. Proposed Changes to BPAC Bylaws
Staff Contact

Tess Lengyel, Deputy Director of Planning and Policy
Matthew Bomberg, Assistant Transportation Planner
Article 1: Definitions

1.1 Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC). Alameda CTC is a joint powers authority resulting from the merger of the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (“ACCMA”) and the Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority (“ACTIA”). The 22-member Alameda CTC Commission (“Commission”) is comprised of the following representatives:

1.1.1 All five Alameda County Supervisors.

1.1.2 Two City of Oakland representatives.

1.1.3 One representative from each of the other 13 incorporated cities in Alameda County.

1.1.4 A representative from Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (“AC Transit”).

1.1.5 A representative from San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (“BART”).

1.2 Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority (ACTIA). The governmental agency previously responsible for the implementation of the Measure B half-cent transportation sales tax in Alameda County, as approved by voters in 2000 and implemented in 2002. Alameda CTC has now assumed responsibility for the sales tax.

1.3 Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACCMA). The governmental agency which previously served as the state legislatively required congestion management agency with responsibilities to coordinate transportation planning, funding, and other activities in a congestion management program.

1.4 Appointing Party. A person or group designated to appoint committee members.

1.5 Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC or “Committee”). The Alameda CTC Committee that involves interested community members in the Alameda CTC’s policy, planning, and implementation efforts related to bicycling and walking.

1.6 Brown Act. California’s open meeting law, the Ralph M. Brown Act, California Government Code, Sections 54950 et seq.
1.7 Citizens Watchdog Committee (CWC). The Alameda Committee of individuals created by the ACTIA Board, as required by Measure B, with the assistance of the League of Women Voters and other citizens groups, and continued by the Commission. The Committee reports directly to the public and is charged with reviewing all expenditures of the agency. Citizens Watchdog Committee members are private citizens who are not elected officials at any level of government, nor individuals in a position to benefit in any way from the sales tax.

1.8 Expenditure Plan. The plan for expending transportation sales tax (Measure B) funds, presented to the voters in 2000, and implemented in 2002.

1.9 Fiscal Year. July 1 through June 30.

1.10 Measure B. The measure approved by the voters authorizing the half-cent sales tax for transportation services now collected and administered by the Alameda CTC and governed by the Expenditure Plan. The sales tax authorized by Measure B will be in effect for 20 years, beginning on April 1, 2002 and extending through March 31, 2022.

1.11 Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF). The $10 fee imposed on each annual motor vehicle registration or renewal of registration in Alameda County. The fee, approved by voters as Measure F in 2010, is collected and administered by the Alameda CTC and governed by the Alameda County Transportation Improvement Measure Expenditure Plan.

1.12 Measure B Bicycle and Pedestrian Countywide Discretionary Fund ("Discretionary Fund"). A grant program developed to expand and enhance bicycle and pedestrian transportation in Alameda County, focusing on projects, programs and plans with countywide significance or demonstration programs/projects that could be applied countywide. The program is funded by a portion of the 5 percent Measure B set-aside for bicycle and pedestrian projects.

1.13 VRF Pedestrian and Bicyclist Access and Safety Program. A program 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. The program will be administered as a discretionary program.

1.14 Measure B or VRF Project. Transportation or transportation-related construction project that receives Measure B or VRF funding.

1.15 Measure B or VRF Program. Transportation or transportation-related program that receives Measure B or VRF funding.

1.16 Measure B Direct Local Program Distribution. Measure B revenues distributed directly to local jurisdictions or transit operators.

1.17 Discretionary Funding Guidelines. Document that specifies eligible projects and programs, selection criteria, and weighting for a Measure B or VRF funding cycle.
1.18 Organizational Meeting. The annual regular meeting of the BPAC in preparation for the next fiscal year’s activities.

1.19 Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee (PAPCO). The Alameda CTC Committee that meets to address funding, planning, and coordination issues regarding paratransit services in Alameda County. Members must be an Alameda County resident and an eligible user of any transportation service available to seniors and people with disabilities in Alameda County. PAPCO is supported by a Technical Advisory Committee comprised of Measure B-funded paratransit providers in Alameda County.

1.20 Planning Area. Geographic groupings of cities and of Alameda County for planning and funding purposes. North County: Alameda, Albany, Berkeley, Emeryville, Oakland, Piedmont; Central County: Hayward, San Leandro, unincorporated county (near Hayward); South County: Fremont, Newark, Union City; East County: Dublin, Livermore, Pleasanton, the unincorporated area of Sunol.

Article 2: Purpose and Responsibilities

2.1 Committee Purpose. The BPAC purpose is to involve interested community members in the Alameda CTC’s policy, planning, and implementation efforts related to bicycling and walking, with the goal of increasing the safety and convenience of walking and bicycling conditions in Alameda County in order to increase the proportion of trips made by walking and bicycling.

2.2 Committee Roles and Responsibilities. The roles and responsibilities of the Committee are to:

2.2.1 Advise Alameda CTC staff and the Alameda CTC on the development and update of the Countywide Pedestrian and Bicycle Plans.

2.2.2 Review and provide input on Measure B and VRF discretionary funding guidelines that can be used for bicycle and pedestrian capital projects, programs, and plans/studies.

2.2.3 Review and provide input on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Complete Streets Checklists for Alameda County projects.

2.2.4 Review and provide input to Alameda CTC and sponsor agency partners in early phases of project development, as described in Alameda CTC Countywide BPAC Project Review Guidelines document.

2.2.5 Review the implementation of the Measure B direct local program distribution Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety funds.

2.2.6 Review and provide input on the progress and outcomes of Measure B and VRF funded bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs.
2.2.7 Annually monitor implementation of the Countywide Pedestrian and Bicycle Plans.

2.2.8 Serve as a review committee for other Alameda County public agencies, on request, on bicycle and pedestrian issues. The Committee’s input will be provided directly to the public agency staff, will be strictly advisory, and will not be taken as a recommendation to the Alameda CTC. The Committee will consider requests for input on a case-by-case basis. If a quick decision is needed on whether to provide input or not, Alameda CTC staff will consult with the Committee chair to make this decision. This role may include, but is not limited to:

2.2.8.1 Providing input to Alameda CTC Project Sponsors.

2.2.8.2 Serving as the Countywide Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) for Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Funding.

2.3 Additional Responsibilities. BPAC members are encouraged to do the following:

2.3.1 Perform outreach regarding Alameda CTC bicycle and pedestrian activities. Examples of outreach may include attending a transportation fair, attending a meeting or event related to a grant-funded project, accompanying staff to Alameda CTC outreach presentations, or disseminating information at a local library, community center, or other public location.

2.3.2 Participate in trainings and information-sharing events sponsored by the Alameda CTC, such as the Pedestrian and Bicycle Working Group meetings. This group, which has an open membership, consists of agency and nonprofit staff working to improve the bicycling and walking environment in Alameda County.

Article 3: Members

3.1 Number of Members. The BPAC consists of 11 members. The intent is to have the BPAC represent both bicycling and pedestrian interests, to include representatives from all areas of the county, and to represent the variety of interests in bicycling and walking needs including the needs of seniors and children. In addition, the BPAC should represent Alameda County’s diversity in age, income level, gender, ethnicity, and bicycling experience, to the greatest extent feasible.

3.2 Appointment. The Commission will make appointments in the following manner:

3.2.1 One appointee per County Supervisor (five total).

3.2.2 One appointee for each supervisorial district, selected by the Mayors’ Conference (five total).

3.2.3 One appointee representing transit agencies. Alameda CTC will lead the recruitment for this appointee, including noticing the general managers of all transit agencies.
that receive Measure B funding. Alameda CTC staff will bring a final appointment recommendation to the Commission for approval.

3.3 Membership Qualification. Each member must be an Alameda County resident and be interested in improving the safety and convenience of bicycling and/or walking in the county. Public agency employees who are responsible for bicycle and pedestrian projects and/or programs and who work for an eligible agency likely to submit an application for the Discretionary Fund may not serve on the Committee. Any public agency or nonprofit employees appointed to the Committee shall recuse themselves from evaluating and voting to fund a project/program application from their agency or nonprofit organization. Public agency, non-profit, or other employees who are directly responsible for bicycle and pedestrian projects and/or programs and who work for an eligible agency likely to submit an application for Alameda CTC discretionary funding must recuse themselves from decisions related to policy development, project review, or other matters that directly relate to their work, consistent with Section 8.2.

3.4 Membership Term. Appointments shall be for two-year terms. There is no maximum number of terms a member may serve. Members shall serve until the Commission appoints their successors.

3.5 Attendance. Members will actively support committee activities and regularly attend meetings. Accordingly, members who miss more than half of the BPAC meetings per fiscal year may be removed from the Committee. If an odd number of meetings occur in a year, then the minimum attendance will be half of the total number of meetings, rounded up to the whole number. A member removed from the Committee may be reappointed by a Commissioner.

3.6 Termination. A member’s term shall terminate on the occurrence of any of the following:

3.6.1 The member voluntarily resigns by written notice to the chair or Alameda CTC staff.

3.6.2 The member fails to continue to meet the qualifications for membership, including attendance requirements.

3.6.3 The member becomes incapable of continuing to serve.

3.6.4 The appointing party or the Commission removes the member from the Committee.

3.7 Vacancies. An appointing party shall have the right to appoint (subject to approval by the Commission) a person to fill the vacant member position. Alameda CTC shall be responsible for notifying an appointing party of such vacancy and for urging expeditious appointment of a new member, as appropriate.
Article 4: Officers

4.1 Officers. The BPAC shall annually elect a chair and vice chair. Each officer must be a duly appointed member of the BPAC.

4.1.1 Duties. The chair shall preside at all meetings and will represent BPAC before the Commission to report on BPAC activities. The vice chair shall assume all duties of the chair in the absence of, or on the request of the chair. In the absence of the chair and vice chair at a meeting, the members shall, by consensus, appoint one member to preside over that meeting.

4.2 Office Elections. Officers shall be elected by the members annually at the Organizational Meeting or as necessary to fill a vacancy. An individual receiving a majority of votes by a quorum shall be deemed to have been elected and will assume office at the meeting following the election. In the event of multiple nominations, the vote shall be by ballot. Officers shall be eligible for re-election indefinitely.

Article 5: Meetings

5.1 Open and Public Meetings. All BPAC meetings shall be open and public and governed by the Brown Act. Public comment shall be allowed at all BPAC meetings. The time allotted for comments by a member of the public in the general public comment period or on any agenda item shall be limited at the discretion of the chair.

5.2 Regular Meetings. BPAC will hold regular meetings on a quarterly basis. Annually, at the Organizational Meeting, the Committee shall establish the schedule of regular meetings for the ensuing year. Meeting dates and times may be changed and additional regular meetings scheduled during the year.

5.3 Quorum. For purposes of decision making, a quorum shall consist of at least half (50 percent) plus one of the total number of members appointed at the time a decision is made. No actions will be taken at meetings with less than 50 percent plus one member present. Items may be discussed and information may be distributed on any item even if a quorum is not present.

5.4 Special Meetings. Special meetings may be called by the chair or by a majority of the members on an as-needed basis. Attendance at special meetings is not counted as part of members’ attendance requirement. Agenda item(s) for special meeting(s) shall be stated when the meeting is called, but shall not be of a general business nature. Specialized meetings shall be concerned with studies, emergencies, or items of a time-urgent nature. Agenda item(s) of a regular meeting may be tabled for further discussion and action at a special meeting, the time and location to be announced in the tabling motion. Notice of such meetings shall be given to all members at least 72 hours prior to such meetings and shall be published on the Alameda CTC’s website and at the Alameda CTC office, all in accordance with the Brown Act.
5.5 Agenda. All meetings shall have a published agenda. Action may be taken only on items indicated on the agenda as action items. Items for a regular meeting agenda may be submitted by any member to the chair and committee staff. The Commission and/or Committee staff may also submit items for the agenda. Every agenda shall include provision for members of the public to address the BPAC. The chair and the vice chair shall review the agenda in advance of distribution. Copies of the agenda, with supporting material and the past meeting minutes, shall be mailed to members and any other interested parties upon request. The agenda shall be posted on the Alameda CTC website and office and provided at the meeting, all in accordance with the Brown Act.

5.6 Roberts Rules of Order. The rules contained in the latest edition of “Roberts Rules of Order Newly Revised” shall govern the proceedings of the BPAC and any subcommittees thereof to the extent that the person presiding over the proceeding determines that such formality is required to maintain order and make process and to the extent that these actions are consistent with these bylaws.

5.7 Place of Meetings. BPAC meetings shall be held at the Alameda CTC offices, unless otherwise designated by the Committee. Meeting locations shall be within Alameda County, accessible in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (41 U.S.C., Section 12132) or regulations promulgated there under, shall be accessible by public transportation, and shall not be in any facility that prohibits the admittance of any person, or persons, on the base of race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, or sex, or where members of the public may not be present without making a payment or purchase.

5.8 Meeting Conduct. BPAC members shall conduct themselves during meetings in a manner that encourages respectful behavior and provides a welcoming and safe environment for each member and staff member characterized by an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect. Members shall work with each other and staff to respectfully, fairly, and courteously deal with conflicts if they arise.

Article 6: Subcommittees

6.1 Establishment. The Committee may establish subcommittees when and as necessary or advisable to make nominations for office of BPAC, to develop and propose policy on a particular issue, to conduct an investigation, to draft a report or other document, or for any other purpose within the authority of the BPAC. Subcommittees will be staffed by the Alameda CTC.

6.2 Membership. BPAC members will be appointed to subcommittees by the BPAC, on a voluntary basis, or by the chair. No subcommittee shall have fewer than three members, nor will a subcommittee have sufficient members to constitute a quorum of the BPAC.

Article 7: Records and Notices

7.1 Minutes. Minutes of all meetings, including actions and the time and place of holding each meeting, shall be kept on file at the Alameda CTC office.
7.2 Attendance Roster. A member roster and a record of member attendance shall be kept on file at the Alameda CTC office.

7.3 Brown Act. All meetings of the BPAC will comply with the requirements of the Brown Act. Notice of meetings and agendas will be given to all members and any member of the public requesting such notice in writing and shall be posted at the Alameda CTC office at least 72 hours prior to each meeting. Members of the public may address the BPAC on any matter not on the agenda and on each matter listed on the agenda, pursuant to procedures set by the chair and/or the Committee.

7.4 Meeting Notices. Meeting notices shall be in writing and shall be issued via U.S. Postal Service, personal delivery, Alameda CTC website, and/or email. Any other notice required or permitted to be given under these bylaws may be given by any of these means.

Article 8: General Matters

8.1 Per Diems. Committee members shall be entitled to a per diem stipend for meetings attended in amounts and in accordance with policies established by the Alameda CTC.

8.2 Conflicts of Interest. A conflict of interest exists when any Committee member has, or represents, a financial interest in the matter before the Committee. Such direct interest must be significant or personal. In the event of a conflict of interest, the Committee member shall declare the conflict, recuse him or herself from the discussion, and shall not vote on that item. Failure to comply with these provisions shall be grounds for removal from the Committee.

8.3 Amendments to Bylaws. These bylaws will be reviewed annually, and may be amended, repealed, or altered, in whole or in part, by a vote taken at a duly-constituted Committee meeting at which a quorum is present.

8.4 Public Statements. No member of the Committee may make public statements on behalf of the Committee without authorization by affirmative vote of the Committee, except the chair, or in his or her place the vice chair, when making a regular report of the Committee activities and concerns to the Alameda CTC.

8.5 Conflict with Governing Documents. In the event of any conflict between these bylaws and the July 2000 Alameda County Transportation Expenditure Plan, California state law, or any action lawfully taken by the Alameda CTC, the conflicting provision in the Expenditure Plan, state law, the lawful action of ACTIA or the Alameda CTC shall prevail.

8.6 Staffing. Alameda CTC will provide all staffing to the Committee including preparation and distribution of meeting agendas, packets, and minutes; preparation of reports to the Alameda CTC Committees and Commission; tracking of attendance; and stipend administration.
Memorandum

DATE: October 3, 2014

SUBJECT: Alameda CTC Bicycle Master Plan Guidelines

RECOMMENDATION: Provide Input on Draft Alameda CTC Bicycle Master Plan Guidelines

Overview

Bicycle master plans typically contain a community’s long term vision for improving bicycling, an assessment of current conditions and needs, and a plan of action for realizing this vision, including infrastructure, program, and policy interventions.

Alameda CTC is developing Bicycle Master Plan Guidelines that contain required and recommended core elements for inclusion in plans prepared by Alameda County jurisdictions. These guidelines aim to ensure that plans are effective, are comparable and facilitate countywide planning, can meet requirements for state grant funding and incorporate best practices to the extent feasible.

The Bicycle Master Plan Guidelines provide necessary guidance for jurisdictions complying with the Measure B/Vehicle Registration Fee Master Program Fund Agreement requirements. According to these requirements, as a condition of receiving Measure B and VRF local direct program distribution funds, jurisdictions must adopt a bicycle master plan and pedestrian master plan (or a combined plan), update these plans every five years, and ensure that the plans contain required core elements.

Development Process

The process for developing the guidelines is as follows:

- July 2014 – initial review of proposed core elements by Pedestrian/Bicycle Working Group (PBWG)
- August 2014 – best practice survey of local consultants
- October 2014 – review of draft guidelines by Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee and PBWG
- November 2014 – review of draft guidelines by Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee (ACTAC)
- January 2015 – guidelines considered for approval by ACTAC
The guidelines include all required elements from state guidance plus select additional requirements needed to ensure transferability of local networks, cost estimates, and other information to the countywide bicycle plan. Further, the guidelines include recommended core elements (in addition to required elements).

**Applicability**

The Bicycle Master Plan Guidelines will apply to all Bicycle Master Plans for which development commences after the approval of the guidelines by ACTAC. In the interim, local jurisdictions developing Bicycle Master Plans should reference the list of plan components from the Active Transportation Program Cycle I program guidelines.

**Bikeway Facility Classification System**

A key feature of the guidelines is a proposed bikeway facility classification system. Bicycle planning has moved beyond the Class I, II, and III classification system of the Caltrans Highway Design Manual, yet there is no standard for categorizing different bikeway types and many Alameda County jurisdictions have developed custom local classifications. The lack of harmony means that information on detailed bikeway types cannot be easily incorporated into the Countywide Bicycle Plan. The proposed classification system aims to create a standard system that captures nuances within the Caltrans classifications (while maintaining a correspondence to this system) and incorporates emerging types of bikeways (some of which already exist or have been identified in Alameda County plans).

**Supporting Tools**

Alameda CTC is working to develop two supporting tools in conjunction with the guidelines that will assist local jurisdictions in preparing bicycle master plans. These tools are:

1. a cost-estimating guide that ensures costs for projects, programs, and other expenses developed as part of bicycle master plans use consistent assumptions, and
2. a mode share estimate spreadsheet tool that assists in estimating the “increase in number of bicycle trips from implementation of the plan” as required by state guidelines.

Draft versions of the tools will be presented to the Pedestrian/Bicycle Working Group in early 2015 and the final versions will be incorporated as additional appendices when completed.

**Pedestrian Master Plan Guidelines**

The *Toolkit for Improving Walkability in Alameda County* includes a set of recommended sections or elements for Pedestrian Master Plans which currently provides guidance for jurisdictions complying with Measure B/Vehicle Registration Fee Master Program Fund Agreement Local Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan requirements.

The guidance on pedestrian master plans in the *Toolkit* does not capture current best practices or state guidance. An update of this guidance may be undertaken following adoption of Bicycle Master Plan Guidelines, as staff resources permit.
Attachments

A. Draft Bicycle Master Plan Guidelines
B. Results of Survey of Local Consultants Regarding Bicycle Master Plan Best Practices

Staff Contact

Tess Lengyel, Deputy Director of Planning and Policy
Matthew Bomberg, Assistant Transportation Planner
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Alameda CTC Local Bicycle Master Plan Guidelines

DRAFT VERSION – OCTOBER 2014
**Introduction**

**Planning Context**
Bicycle Master Plans are a critical planning, policy, and implementation document to support a jurisdiction’s efforts to improve the safety, attractiveness, and participation in bicycling as a means of transportation and recreation. A Bicycle Master Plan helps a jurisdiction to achieve a number of key objectives including identifying a network of facilities, supportive programs, and policies; gathering input on needs and opportunities related to bicycling and ensuring that recommended improvements are aligned with community and partner agency priorities; and identifying available resources, needed additional resources, and formulating an implementation workplan.

Good planning practice and adopted funding requirements in Alameda County dictate that all local jurisdictions develop Bicycle Master Plans, either as a standalone document or as part of a combined bicycle/pedestrian or active transportation plan. Further, these documents are to be updated every five years to ensure continued alignment with community priorities.

In addition, Alameda CTC develops a Countywide Bicycle Plan which focuses on routes and programs of countywide significance. Because local jurisdictions own and operate the right of way in which bicycle facilities reside, Alameda CTC’s plan is formulated based on local plans.

**Purpose and Goals of Guidelines**
These guidelines serve three major objectives:

- Ensure plans throughout the county are comparable and facilitate countywide planning
- Ensure plans meet requirements for state grant funding (e.g. Active Transportation Program)
- Ensure plans incorporate best practices to the extent feasible

**Relationship to Other Requirements/Guidelines**
These guidelines implement a requirement from the Master Program Fund Agreements adopted by local jurisdictions in Alameda County. Specifically, the guidelines provide the required core elements that jurisdictions need to meet the Local Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan Requirement in Section 7.A.3 (see Appendix A for relevant text from MPFAs).

The State’s Active Transportation Program Cycle 1 guidelines contain a list of components that should be included in an active transportation plan.¹ The guidelines also specify that “In future funding cycles, the [California Transportation Commission] expects to make consistency with an approved active transportation plan a requirement for large projects.” Therefore, Alameda CTC Bicycle Master Plan Guidelines are based on Active Transportation Program guidelines to ensure future eligibility for statewide competitive funds. Alameda CTC Bicycle Master Plan Guidelines contain some additional required core elements needed to facilitate countywide comparability and smooth transition of local plans into the Countywide Bicycle Plan.

¹ These components are updated from the former Bicycle Transportation Account required components
## Bicycle Master Plan Core Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Introduction** | • Introduction which summarizes plan’s purpose and/or vision and goals.  
  • Performance measures related to plan goals. |
| **Stakeholder Engagement** | • Public/community outreach process that gathers input at different stages of plan development process.  
  • Coordination with other city departments, transit operators, park districts, neighboring cities, and other agencies as applicable at different stages of plan development process.  
  • **A description of the extent of community involvement in development of the plan, including disadvantaged and underserved communities.**  
  • **Ride alongs, walk audits, or other participatory field observation.**  
  • “Pop-up meetings” – gathering input by going to heavily used facilities.  
  • Open houses, small group meetings, or workshops at schools, places of worship, and community organization standing meetings, particularly within disadvantaged and underserved communities.  
  • Online interactive web mapping sites |
| **Policy Framework** | • **A description of how the plan has been coordinated with neighboring jurisdictions, including school districts within the plan area, and is consistent with other local or regional transportation, air quality, or energy conservation plans, including, but not limited to, general plans and a Sustainable Community Strategy in a Regional Transportation Plan.**  
  • A description of how plan has been coordinated with the Countywide Transportation Plan and its component modal plans.  
  • Benchmarking of policies against national and regional best practices.  
  • Discussion of policies related to development review (e.g. how impacts of development on bicycling network are assessed, how entitlement process is used to implement bikeways and supportive facilities). |
| **Existing Conditions** | • **The estimated number of existing bicycle trips in the plan area, both in absolute numbers and as a percentage of all trips.**  
  • **The number and location of collisions, serious injuries, and fatalities suffered by bicyclists in the plan area, both in absolute numbers and as a percentage of all collisions and injuries**  
  • Level of traffic stress analysis of existing bikeway network to inform possible additions or modifications to network.  
  • Reporting on performance measures from previous bicycle master plan.  
  • Analysis of most common collision types at locations with |

Required core elements that correspond to a component from the ATP guidelines are indicated in this document using bold underlining.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* A map and description of existing and proposed land use and settlement patterns which must include, but not be limited to, locations of residential neighborhoods, schools, shopping centers, public buildings, major employment centers, and other destinations.</td>
<td>extensive collision history (to inform spot improvements).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikeway Network</td>
<td>* A map and description of existing and proposed bicycle transportation facilities. Existing and proposed bikeway networks should be two separate maps. Maps should indicate segments that are existing, existing with improvements proposed, and proposed. * Map and description of major barrier/gap closure projects (bridges, freeway crossings, major arterial crossings, etc.). * Maps of bikeway facilities should utilize the facility classification shown in Appendix C. * A description of design guidelines to be used for bikeway geometry, striping, and traffic control devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Infrastructure and Intermodal Facilities</td>
<td>* A map and description of existing and proposed end-of-trip bicycle parking facilities. * A description of existing and proposed policies related to bicycle parking in public locations, private parking garages and parking lots and in new commercial and residential developments. * A description of proposed signage providing wayfinding along bicycle networks to designated destinations. * A description of design guidelines to be utilized for the development of bicycle parking and wayfinding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Required core elements that correspond to a component from the ATP guidelines are indicated in this document using bold underlining.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A map and description of existing and proposed bicycle transport and parking facilities for connections with and use of other transportation modes. These must include, but not be limited to, parking facilities at transit stops, rail and transit terminals, ferry docks and landings, park and ride lots, and provisions for transporting bicyclists and bicycles on transit or rail vehicles or ferry vessels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programs | • A description of bicycle safety, education, and encouragement programs conducted in the area included within the plan, efforts by the law enforcement agency having primary traffic law enforcement responsibility in the area to enforce provisions of the law impacting bicycle safety, and the resulting effect on accidents involving bicyclists. | • Identify partners and concrete action items needed to implement programs. • Establish ongoing program or platform to solicit recommended improvements from public in order to “build up a queue” of spot improvements, traffic calming projects, etc. |

Costs and funding | • A description of past expenditures for bicycle facilities and programs, and future financial needs for projects and programs that improve safety and convenience for bicyclists in the plan area. Include anticipated revenue sources and potential grant funding for bicycle and pedestrian uses. • Infrastructure cost estimates developed for individual projects or network segments (planning-level cost estimates acceptable). • Estimates of maintenance (including repaving of bikeway and trail network) and staffing costs over life of plan. |  |

Implementation | • A description of the projects and programs proposed in the plan and a listing of their priorities for implementation, including the | • Prioritization of projects and programs that is fiscally constrained. • Maps of near-term (and mid-
Required core elements that correspond to a component from the ATP guidelines are indicated in this document using bold underlining.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>methodology for project prioritization and a proposed timeline for implementation.</td>
<td>term) networks to ensure that short-term projects close gaps or result in continuous corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A description of steps necessary to implement the plan and the reporting process that will be used to keep the adopting agency and community informed of the progress being made in implementing the plan.</td>
<td>• Integration of bicycle projects and programs with Capital Improvement Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The estimated increase in the number of bicycle trips resulting from implementation of the plan.</td>
<td>• Project “cut sheets” or conceptual designs that can be used in grant applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A description of the policies and procedures for maintaining existing and proposed bicycle facilities, including, but not limited to, the maintenance of smooth pavement, freedom from encroaching vegetation, maintenance of traffic control devices including striping and other pavement markings, and lighting.</td>
<td>• Outcome based performance targets – e.g. install X miles of bikeways by year Y, install 1 bike rack on every commercial block, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A goal for collision, serious injury, and fatality reduction after implementation of the plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Table of implementation actions that clearly illustrates the timeline for implementing this action and the departments/staff positions responsible for implementation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discussion of ongoing stakeholder involvement process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Description of ongoing data collection plans such as counts, facility inventory, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A: Measure B/Vehicle Registration Fee Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Program Implementation Guidelines Text

Section 7. Local Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan Requirement

A. To receive Measure B and VRF funds, local jurisdictions must do all of the following with respect to local bicycle and pedestrian master plans. The Alameda CTC will provide technical assistance and funding to local jurisdictions to meet these requirements through the competitive Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Grant Program. Jurisdictions may also use pass-through funds for the development of local bicycle and pedestrian master plans.

1. Have an adopted Local Pedestrian Master Plan AND Local Bicycle Master Plan, OR have an adopted combined Local Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan; or demonstrate that the plan is being developed and will be adopted by December 31, 2015.

2. Each plan must be updated, at a minimum, every five years. This policy is consistent with the state’s Bicycle Transportation Act (BTA) grant requirement for bicycle plans, and will ensure that plans are addressing current local needs, while also allowing jurisdictions to be eligible for BTA funding.

3. Each plan must include core elements to ensure that the plan is effective, and that plans throughout the county are comparable, to the extent that is reasonable, to facilitate countywide planning. The Alameda CTC will develop and maintain guidelines outlining these core elements. For pedestrian plans, these elements are described in the Toolkit for Improving Walkability in Alameda County: http://www.alamedactc.org/files/managed/Document/11852/ACTIA_Ped_Toolkit_UPDATE_FIN AL_EL_web_2009.pdf.

The Alameda CTC will develop guidelines for bicycle plans.
Appendix B: Active Transportation Program Cycle 1 Guideline Text

A city, county, county transportation commission, regional transportation planning agency, MPO, school district, or transit district may prepare an active transportation plan. An active transportation plan prepared by a city or county may be integrated into the circulation element of its general plan or a separate plan which is compliant or will be brought into compliance with the Complete Streets Act, Assembly Bill 1358 (Chapter 657, Statutes of 2008). An active transportation plan must include, but not be limited to, the following components or explain why the component is not applicable:

a) The estimated number of existing bicycle trips and pedestrian trips in the plan area, both in absolute numbers and as a percentage of all trips, and the estimated increase in the number of bicycle trips and pedestrian trips resulting from implementation of the plan.
b) The number and location of collisions, serious injuries, and fatalities suffered by bicyclists and pedestrians in the plan area, both in absolute numbers and as a percentage of all collisions and injuries, and a goal for collision, serious injury, and fatality reduction after implementation of the plan.
c) A map and description of existing and proposed land use and settlement patterns which must include, but not be limited to, locations of residential neighborhoods, schools, shopping centers, public buildings, major employment centers, and other destinations.
d) A map and description of existing and proposed bicycle transportation facilities.
e) A map and description of existing and proposed end-of-trip bicycle parking facilities.
f) A description of existing and proposed policies related to bicycle parking in public locations, private parking garages and parking lots and in new commercial and residential developments.
g) A map and description of existing and proposed bicycle transport and parking facilities for connections with and use of other transportation modes. These must include, but not be limited to, parking facilities at transit stops, rail and transit terminals, ferry docks and landings, park and ride lots, and provisions for transporting bicyclists and bicycles on transit or rail vehicles or ferry vessels.
h) A map and description of existing and proposed pedestrian facilities at major transit hubs. These must include, but are not limited to, rail and transit terminals, and ferry docks and landings.
i) A description of proposed signage providing wayfinding along bicycle and pedestrian networks to designated destinations.
j) A description of the policies and procedures for maintaining existing and proposed bicycle and pedestrian facilities, including, but not limited to, the maintenance of smooth pavement, freedom from encroaching vegetation, maintenance of traffic control devices including striping and other pavement markings, and lighting.
k) A description of bicycle and pedestrian safety, education, and encouragement programs conducted in the area included within the plan, efforts by the law enforcement agency having primary traffic law enforcement responsibility in the area to enforce provisions of the law impacting bicycle and pedestrian safety, and the resulting effect on accidents involving bicyclists and pedestrians.
l) A description of the extent of community involvement in development of the plan, including disadvantaged and underserved communities.
m) A description of how the active transportation plan has been coordinated with neighboring jurisdictions, including school districts within the plan area, and is consistent with other local or regional transportation, air quality, or energy conservation plans, including, but not limited to, general plans and a Sustainable Community Strategy in a Regional Transportation Plan.
n) A description of the projects and programs proposed in the plan and a listing of their priorities for implementation, including the methodology for project prioritization and a proposed timeline for implementation.
o) A description of past expenditures for bicycle and pedestrian facilities and programs, and future financial needs for projects and programs that improve safety and convenience for bicyclists and pedestrians in the plan area. Include anticipated revenue sources and potential grant funding for bicycle and pedestrian uses.

p) A description of steps necessary to implement the plan and the reporting process that will be used to keep the adopting agency and community informed of the progress being made in implementing the plan.

q) A resolution showing adoption of the plan by the city, county or district. If the active transportation plan was prepared by a county transportation commission, regional transportation planning agency, MPO, school district or transit district, the plan should indicate the support via resolution of the city(s) or county(s) in which the proposed facilities would be located.
Appendix C: Bikeway Facility Classification

Description of classification system
The Alameda CTC bikeway facility classification system consists of subcategories within the Caltrans Highway Design Manual bikeway classifications that capture differences in treatment/design that meaningfully impact bicyclist experience as well as implementation cost. Many jurisdictions in Alameda County already use subcategories as part of their local bicycle plans. The Alameda CTC system aims to harmonize these local classification systems (so they may be used in the Countywide Bicycle Plan) and to incorporate emerging bikeway types.

In addition to bikeway types, many jurisdictions in Alameda County designate networks of bikeways that have lower traffic volumes, include traffic calming measures, are signed for lower vehicle travel speeds, and generally appeal to a wide range of bicyclists (e.g. children or individuals less comfortable contending with traffic). The Alameda CTC system would incorporate this designation as an overlay in addition to the facility classification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Classifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Paved Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Unpaved Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Cycletrack (permanent-one way)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d. Cycletrack (permanent-two way)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e. Cycletrack (semi-permanent-one way)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1f. Cycletrack (semi-permanent-two-way)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Standard bike lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Upgraded bike lane (includes buffered bike lanes, green bike lanes, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. Climbing bike lane (bike lane in uphill direction, route in downhill direction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d. Contraflow bike lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. Signage-only route (e.g. bike route)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Wide curb lane or shoulder (may also include signage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Route with standard sharrows or other pavement stenciling (may also include signage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d. Route with green-backed sharrows or super sharrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street is identified as a bicycle boulevard, rideway, crosstown route, slow bicycle route, neighborhood greenway, or other similar designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street not designated as any of above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Will be reclassified as 4a, 4b, 4c, and 4d, once Caltrans revises bikeway classifications pursuant to Protected Bikeways Act (AB 1193).

Use of classification system
As a part of bicycle plan network development and mapping, Alameda County jurisdictions should identify the facility classes and bicycle boulevard Designations for each network segment. These should be identified for both existing and planned cases, as illustrated below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Exst_Class</th>
<th>Exst_BB</th>
<th>Prop_Class</th>
<th>Prop_BB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main St</td>
<td>1st Ave</td>
<td>2nd Ave</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak St</td>
<td>Jefferson St</td>
<td>Adams St</td>
<td>Existing, Improvements Planned</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Ave</td>
<td>Lake St</td>
<td>Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>3c</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3c</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exst_Class = Existing bikeway classification
Exst_BB = Existing bicycle boulevard designation
Prop_Class = Proposed bikeway classification
Prop_BB = Proposed bicycle boulevard designation

Bicycle facilities should be mapped in GIS. All files should be obtained and shared with Alameda CTC.
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Bicycle Plan Best Practice Survey Results

Method
An online survey was distributed to current or former consultants at Bay Area transportation planning firms who frequently work on bicycle master plan development. The survey was distributed to 10 individuals and 5 responses were obtained (50 percent).

Key Findings
Plan Components/Elements:

- Strong support for identifying a process for reporting on implementation, identifying departmental implementation roles, developing project-level cost estimates and conceptual designs, and establishing a vision and goals and performance measures.
- Lower support for design guidelines, benchmarking to peer cities, and projecting the mode share increase that will result from implementation of plan.

Outreach/engagement:

- Strongest support for participatory needs assessment and staff/technical advisory committee
- Interactive online and web-based methods identified as strategy to reach broad cross-section of population
- Recognition that traditional planning methods (e.g. public meeting formats) may fail to engage representative cross-section of population.

Costs:

- Estimated costs to develop bicycle master plans varied widely
- Quality of existing plans (many cities have already adopted a plan and are now in a position of performing updates) as well as quality of city infrastructure and GIS data greatly influence cost
- Many of components noted to increase cost most also identified as most useful

Overall:

- Plans with clear implementation next steps identified as best practices
- Plans that consider networks for all ages and abilities identified as best practices
- Plans that develop project-level concepts identified as strong
**Survey Results: Plan Components/Elements**

**Please rank the following plan elements/components in terms of importance.**

- Vision & Goals
- Performance Measures
- Performance Targets
- Collision Analysis
- Count & Mode Share Analysis
- Projected Increase in Mode Share
- Benchmarking to peer cities
- Design guidelines - bikeways
- Design guidelines - bike parking
- Design guidelines - wayfinding/signage
- Identifying departmental implementation roles
- Process for reporting on implementation
- Project "cut sheets" and/or conceptual designs
- Cost estimates developed to project-level
- Maintenance and staffing cost estimates
- Integration into CIP

- Unimportant
- Slight Importance
- Moderate Importance
- Essential

**How useful do you find the following network analysis techniques?**

- Map of proposed upgrades to existing bikeways
- Use of detailed facility classification
- Map of proposed intersection improvements
- Analysis of overlap with other networks
- Level of Traffic Stress analysis

- Not Useful
- Slightly Useful
- Moderately Useful
- Very Useful
Are there any elements that you feel should be required?

Response 1
1 - strong policy support that allows for staff to be opportunistic to implement projects as funding or opportunistic circumstances permit
2 - Clear process for establishing modal priority when plans conflict
3 - performance measures that are repeatable and contribute to the state of the practice
4 - policy guidance to fund and conduct before/after studies

Response 2
-- Community-informed needs assessment process
-- Prioritized list of recommended projects; should be "fiscally constrained," based on an estimate of expected funding available over the life of the plan
-- Recommended programmatic activities (not a generic list but rather a list that responds closely to the key needs identified by the community and that takes into account limitations on local staff resources)
-- Recommended changes to policies and practices

Response 3
collision analysis

Survey Results: Outreach

How common are the following methods of gathering input?

How effective are the following methods of gathering input?
Are there any public participation/engagement methods, tools, or techniques that you feel should be required, and why?

Response 1 interactive web mapping sites (see Palo Alto - http://gis.fehrandpeers.com/Apps/PaloAlto/) and other crowdsourced input processes (like SFMTA's bike share site).

Response 2 None that should be *required*; methods should vary depending on a jurisdiction’s needs.

Please provide any other comments regarding stakeholder engagement.

Response 1 A very important nut to crack, I recommend building alliances with existing trusted community groups and disseminating information through their established distribution channels.

Response 2 The larger problem with many of these methods is that they fail to engage a broader, representative cross-section of the population. We have been emphasizing crowdsourced data, textizen and other interactive/ready-when-you-are input methods, but budgets for plans often lack sufficient resources and the exhaustive ATP requirements often consume most of those.

Response 3 For bi/multi-lingual outreach, translating text (of a fact sheet, survey, webpage, etc.) is just one of several techniques and not a particularly effective one. While a generalization, planning tends to be a middle-class concern, so what's more important for non-native English speakers (who tend to not be middle class—another generalization) is to translate the concept and culture of a planning process. This is more effectively done in small-group settings sponsored by individuals and organizations trusted by the targeted community. While much more effective than simply translating text, it is also, unfortunately, much more time-intensive...

Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What would be your estimate of the cost for the following plans in the Bay Area – typical plan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smaller city, standalone bike plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller city, combined bike/ped plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midsized city, standalone bike plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midsized city, combined bike/ped plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- $25k - $50k
- $50k - $75k
- $75k - $100k
- $100k - $125k
- $125k - $150k
- $150k - $175k
- $175k - $200k
- More than $200k
In your experience, what elements tend to increase the cost of developing a bicycle plan most?

Response 1
Public Outreach
Multiple Drafts
modeling in cities where GIS data are not high quality

Response 2
Most of the more costly elements are worthwhile. The problem is the number of unimportant, but required ATP elements that despite the cursory work associated (for most jurisdictions) still consumes budgets and creates bike plans that are unnecessarily voluminous.

Response 3
The main one is anything that involves a consultant's travel time (site/field visits or audits, meetings, workshops, presentations, etc.). All of these are essential to a planning process but should be approached strategically in order to keep costs down.

Response 4
The cost depends on whether there is an existing plan and its quality i.e. how good it was to begin with.
You shouldn't have to start from scratch each time you do a bike plan if there was a decent one done the first time.
Cost also depends on how detailed the crash analysis will be since that can vary a LOT

Response 5
level of detail of inventory work
extent of GIS/ demand modeling
extent of public outreach/ number of workshops / meetings
extent of feasibility / concept work - e.g. number of cut sheets

Please provide any other comments regarding bicycle plan costs.

Response 1
This is an unanswerable set of questions. It depends on what a jurisdiction is trying to accomplish. Because most Alameda County jurisdictions are in their second or greater generation of a plan, we have been focusing on developing improvement plans that can be incorporated into grant applications (see Albany ATP). The cost to do this depends on how many and how much detail.

Response 2
I feel that planning in general--including but not limited to bicycle plans--is suffering from "mission creep," with too much effort devoted to somewhat secondary tasks and purposes (to me the main culprits are existing conditions and goals/objectives; also, design guidelines keep reinventing the wheel). The results are overly costly processes that many cities cannot afford and intimidating plans that--once appendices are included--run into the hundreds of pages. I feel the public would be better served with streamlined processes that focus on the essentials: the main needs, as expressed by the community and an action plan for addressing those needs.
Overall Best Practices

*Please provide any examples of bicycle plans that you consider to be best practices and briefly explain why you regard them highly.*

Response 1

1 - Santa Monica Bike Action Plan - provides clear direction to staff for project implementation and is a regular resource for their bike program
2 - Seattle Bike Master Plan - establishes networks for all ages and abilities separate from confident riders; multimodal conflicts considered during planning
3 - City of Chicago - action oriented resulting in rapid network deployment

Response 2

Albany ATP - Efficient use of resources to focus on developing improvement concepts for grant applications
Richmond Bike and Ped Plan - Same as Albany, but also directly addresses chronic lack of staff as the constraint to implementation
West Sacramento Bike Plan - citywide LTS analysis

Response 3

VTA Santa Clara Countywide Bicycle Plan that identified the need for a bike pedestrian overcrossing over freeways and rivers and railroad tracks at a min spacing of every mile which led to a list of over 80 needed bridges. tunnels that were not on any local city plan.

Response 4

Palo Alto - combined bike ped, extensive community process, has resulted in significant implementation from plan adoption

*Please provide any other comments or feedback.*

Response 1

Thanks for doing this. Look forward to seeing the findings.

Response 2

Jurisdictions lack staff to implement ATPs. Flexibility in allowing portions of Alameda CTC grants aimed at funding ATPs to go toward staffing assistance is recommended.
Measure B History

- Voters approved Measure B in 1986
- Reauthorized in November, 2000 with 81.5% voter approval rate
- Sales tax collections and distributions began on April 1, 2002
- Alameda CTC has distributed approximately $640 million in funds through FY 12-13
Measure B
Annual Revenues and Distributions

- Measure B generates approximately $115 million annually
  - **Approximately 60 percent**
    - Distributed to 20 agencies as Direct Local Program Distribution funds for:
      1. Bicycle and pedestrian safety
      2. Local transportation (Streets & Roads)
      3. Mass transit
      4. Paratransit
  - **Approximately 40 percent**
    - Distributed to Capital Projects

Vehicle Registration Fee History

- Voters approved Measure (F) and the Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) in November, 2010
- Collection of the annual $10 per vehicle fee
- Collections and distributions began in May 2011
- Alameda CTC has distributed $14.4 M in funds through FY 12-13
Vehicle Registration Fee
Annual Revenues and Distributions

- **60% of annual VRF revenues**
  - Distributed to 15 agencies as Direct Local Program Distribution funds for:
    1. Local Road Improvement and Repair Program

- **40% of annual VRF revenues**
  - Distributed to three countywide discretionary programs
    1. Transit for Congestion Relief Program
    2. Local Transportation Technology Program
    3. Pedestrian and Bicyclist Access and Safety Program

### Measure B Direct Local Program Distribution FY 12-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure B Direct Local Program Distribution FY 12-13</th>
<th>Amount (in millions)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Local Transportation (Streets &amp; Roads)</td>
<td>$25.7</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mass Transit</td>
<td>$24.4</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Paratransit</td>
<td>$10.4</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td>$4.3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DISTRIBUTIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$64.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VRF Direct Local Program Distribution FY 12-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VRF Direct Local Program Distribution FY 12-13</th>
<th>Amount (in millions)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Road Improvement and Repair Program</td>
<td>$6.9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DISTRIBUTIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annual Compliance Requirements

• In Spring 2012, jurisdictions receiving Measure B/VRF funds entered into a Master Programs Funding Agreement (MPFA) with Alameda CTC

• Recipients are required to submit annual Measure B/VRF expenditure reports and document use of funds and fulfillment of other requirements

Bicycle and Pedestrian Fund Expenditure Analysis - Goals and Caveats

• Goals
  ▪ Determine overall percentage of local direct program distribution funds supporting walking and biking
  ▪ Track investment levels in different categories of needs

• Caveats
  ▪ Initial data provided by local jurisdiction staff
  ▪ Modest reclassification for consistency by Alameda CTC staff for this analysis
  ▪ Categorization often tricky; no attempts to split projects across multiple categories
  ▪ Order of magnitude findings
Overall Expenditures on Biking and Walking (FY 12/13)

- MB Bike/Ped Fund: $4,542,574
- MB LSR Fund: $6,956,314
- VRF LSR Fund: $455,037
- Total: $11,953,924

Use of Local Streets and Roads Funds for Bicycle/Pedestrian Needs

- MB LSR: $0
- VRF LSR: $0
Bicycle/Pedestrian Expenditures By Mode

- Bicycle Only: $4,420,904
- Pedestrian Only: $702,389
- Combined Bicycle/Pedestrian: $6,830,632

Bicycle/Pedestrian Expenditures by Project Phase

- Construction: $7,938,100
- Maintenance: $1,931,867
- Plans/Scoping: $1,530,439
- Program Implementation: $490,370
- Other: $63,148
Next Steps

- Multi-year trend analysis
- Analysis of leveraging
Questions/Comments?
DATE: October 3, 2014

SUBJECT: Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Implementation Progress

RECOMMENDATION: Receive an update on implementation of the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans.

Summary

The Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans, adopted in October 2012, contain an ambitious series of implementation actions to ensure that the vision and goals of these plans are realized. The implementation actions span three categories: funding, technical tools and assistance, and countywide initiatives. There are 70 implementation actions identified across the two Plans. The implementation actions are found in chapter 7 of the Plans (page 95 of the Bicycle Plan and page 103 of the Pedestrian Plan).

The Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans are available at this link: http://www.alamedactc.org/app_pages/view/5390

One of the action items included in the Plans is to annually review the implementation actions to ensure that they are incorporated into the agency’s work plan and to monitor progress made. This report is in fulfillment of that implementation action, and covers progress from October 2013 to October 2014.

Alameda CTC has primary responsibility for most actions, but many require partnership with local jurisdictions, other public agencies, and other organizations. The plans specify that implementation of most actions is dependent upon funding and resource availability.

45 of the Plan’s actions pertain to 2014. Of these, as of October 2014, 28 are complete (or are multi-year tasks for which the 2014 component is complete), 7 are in progress, and 10 have been deferred due to resource constraints. Attachment A summarizes progress on implementation actions for 2014.

Attachments

A. Status of 2014 Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Implementation Actions

Staff Contacts

Tess Lengyel, Deputy Director of Planning and Policy
Matthew Bomberg, Assistant Transportation Planner
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## Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans

### Implementation Actions - 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Action</th>
<th>2014 Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUNDING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Implement the Countywide Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan by continuing to dedicate funding and staff time to the plan priorities, and integrating the priorities into the agency's activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Use this plan to guide the agency’s bicycle/pedestrian program and funding priorities.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 In each funding cycle for all of the funding sources administered by the agency, consider funding the plan priorities (as applicable), using this plan as a guide.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Continue to have a countywide bicycle and pedestrian coordinator and/or team.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Advocate for additional and/or new funding to support the plan priorities at the county, regional, state and federal levels.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Annually review the plan’s implementation actions to ensure that they are incorporated into the agency's work plan and to monitor progress made.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Implement grant funding cycles for bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs every two years, or as discretionary funding is available.</td>
<td>No 2014 Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Fund and provide technical assistance for the development and updating of local bicycle/pedestrian master plans</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Continue to fund local master plans so that jurisdictions without an adopted plan can develop one, and the 14 local jurisdictions [bike ] and 11 local jurisdictions [ped ] and also other public agencies (such as BART [bike ], AC Transit [ped ], and UC Berkeley [bike/ped ]) with plans can keep them up to date.</td>
<td>No 2014 Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Develop a toolkit of technical resources to assist agencies in developing and updating their plans, such as best practices, to ensure that plans are effective, and, to the extent feasible, comparable to each other.</td>
<td>Bicycle Master Plan Guidelines under development; Pedestrian Master Plan Guidelines to be considered along with possible update to Toolkit to Improving Walkability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Coordinate transportation funding with land use decisions that support and enhance bicycling/walking</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Develop and implement a Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment and Growth Strategy and PDA Strategic Plan that identifies “ready” PDAs and transportation projects within them, including developing cost estimates, incorporating complete communities and streets concepts and policies, and developing Transit-Oriented Design Guidelines.</td>
<td>PDA Investment and Growth Strategy update adopted in summer 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Develop a countywide Community-Based Transportation Program, including updating the existing Community-Based Transportation Plans (CBTPs), incorporating new Communities of Concern areas as defined by MTC, identifying high priority projects (including bicycle and pedestrian projects) and costs estimates, and an implementation strategy.</td>
<td>Action deferred - CBTPs to be updated in 2016-17.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Green indicates action was completed (or is a multi-year action, for which 2014 portion was completed).
Gold indicates action is in progress.
Blue indicates no progress or action deferred.
## Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans

### Implementation Actions - 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Action</th>
<th>2014 Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Conduct a feasibility study to design a program that integrates land use and transportation supported by financial incentives, similar to Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority’s “Community Design &amp; Transportation” program, and identify a tracking method.</td>
<td>This action deferred due to resource availability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Investigate other ways to maximize the coordination of transportation funding with land use decisions to support and enhance bicycling.</td>
<td>No 2014 Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. B Pursue additional dedicated funding for bikeway maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 B Consider setting aside a portion of discretionary funding for maintenance of facilities on the countywide network.</td>
<td>No 2014 Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 B Advocate for dedicated funding for bikeway maintenance, particularly for trails, at the regional, state and federal levels.</td>
<td>Ongoing as part of legislative activities. Alameda CTC staff gave input to state Active Transportation Program and Cap-and-Trade guideline development and advocated for trail maintenance through these funding sources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. P Conduct research on, and develop resources for, best practices for funding sidewalk maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 P Conduct research on sidewalk maintenance in Alameda County by surveying local jurisdictions on how sidewalk maintenance is currently funded and comparing these funding mechanisms to those used for roadway maintenance.</td>
<td>No 2014 Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 P Develop best practices and recommendations for funding the maintenance of sidewalks, including suggesting possible new funding sources.</td>
<td>No 2014 Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TECHNICAL TOOLS AND ASSISTANCE

### 5. Develop resources to support local jurisdictions in adopting and implementing Complete Streets policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Develop a package of recommended technical assistance and resources that support complete streets in the county. [starting in 2012]</td>
<td>No 2014 Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Implement complete streets technical assistance and resources.</td>
<td>Ongoing. Many complete streets technical resources such as design guidelines and project development checklists to be developed through SC-TAP program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Assist local jurisdictions with updating the circulation element of their general plans in compliance with Assembly Bill 1358, the “California Complete Streets Act of 2008,” by 2014, to be in compliance with the MTC policy requirement.</td>
<td>Staff developed White Paper on Best Practices for Incorporating Complete Streets in Circulation Element.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Offer regular trainings and information-sharing forums for local-agency staff on best practices in bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure and programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Continue to provide free access to a monthly webinar presented by the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals, and consider expanding the reach of this program to those not located near the Alameda CTC offices.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Host additional webinars on topics of interest, as they are made available.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Green indicates action was completed (or is a multi-year action, for which 2014 portion was completed)  
Blue indicates no progress or action deferred.  
Gold indicates action is in progress.
### Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans

#### Implementation Actions - 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Action</th>
<th>2014 Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Host half-day educational forums on best practices in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and programs, at least every other year.</td>
<td>No 2014 Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Re-convene the Pedestrian Bicycle Working Group (PBWG), a group of local agency and advocacy staff that meets up to four times a year to share information, learn about best practices, and give input to Alameda CTC on its programs and projects.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Establish a quarterly speaker series featuring bicycle and pedestrian experts to address timely topics such as the implementation of Complete Streets, liability concerns, innovative infrastructure treatments, and CEQA-related obstacles.</td>
<td>Some speakers hosted as part of PBWG. Topics have included complete streets and emergency response and cycletrack design.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **Develop a local best practices resource and other tools that encourage jurisdictions to use bicycle/pedestrian-friendly design standards**

| 7.1 Develop a local best practices resource that includes engineering-level detail for both basic and innovative infrastructure in use in Alameda County, as a way to share and spread best practices throughout the county, and to reduce the need for local agencies to re-invent the wheel. Information about programs, such as signage or enforcement, could also be included. The resource will be developed with input from local agencies, and could be print or web-based. | Staff has collected some information and examples; development of a print or online resource deferred. |
| 7.2 Disseminate information about best practices and innovative design guidelines, [bike : such as the NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide], as they become available, and work with local jurisdictions to determine which are the most useful and should be highlighted. | Ongoing. Alameda CTC staff routinely distribute such information. Alameda CTC funding development of complete streets design guidelines in Central County via SC-TAP program. |
| 7.3 B Determine if a Bicycle Design Guidelines and Best Practices document would be useful to local jurisdictions as a resource for designing bicycle projects in Alameda County, including those funded by Alameda CTC, and if so, develop the document. | Action deferred. |
| 7.3 P Update the "Toolkit for Improving Walkability in Alameda County," last published in 2009. At the same time (or earlier), consider developing Pedestrian Design Guidelines and Best Practices to be used by local jurisdictions as a resource for designing all pedestrian projects in Alameda County, including those funded by Alameda CTC. | Action deferred - focused update of sections to be considered for 2015. |
| 7.4 Once the above tools have been established, select a new tool to develop each year, via input from local jurisdictions (see list of possible tools in the “Countywide Priorities” chapter under “Technical Tools and Assistance” program). | No 2014 Action |
| 7.5 Support local jurisdictions in testing and implementing innovative infrastructure, as feasible. | Alameda CTC staff has given input on incorporating innovative design treatments into state design guidance through Caltrans advisory committees. |
| 7.6 Via information-sharing forums, such as the PBWG, develop a better countywide understanding of the limitations of the Highway Design Manual being used for the design of local streets, and the alternative design standards available for facilities. | Ongoing. |

Green indicates action was completed (or is a multi-year action, for which 2014 portion was completed)
Gold indicates action is in progress.
Blue indicates no progress or action deferred.
### Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans

#### Implementation Actions - 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Action</th>
<th>2014 Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Offer technical assistance to local jurisdictions on complex bicycle/pedestrian design projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.1 Research and develop the best method of offering technical assistance that is simple for local jurisdictions to use and feasible for Alameda CTC to operate. This could be done by expanding Alameda CTC’s current Transit-Oriented Development Technical Assistance program (TOD TAP) to include bicycle and pedestrian projects.</strong></td>
<td>Alameda CTC implementing Sustainable Communities Technical Assistance Program (SC-TAP) to support local PDA, complete streets, and bike/ped design efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Develop tools and provide technical assistance to help local jurisdictions overcome CEQA-related obstacles</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.1 Provide technical assistance to local jurisdictions to develop alternative CEQA policies, guidelines and standards to overcome, or at least lessen, some of the obstacles noted above. This may be done by developing a CEQA mitigation toolkit based on the best practices and resources developed in previous implementation actions.</strong></td>
<td>Alameda CTC staff has given substantial input and played a large role in facilitating discussions around reforming transportation impact analysis in CEQA, as directed by SB 743.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.2 Provide trainings and speaker sessions (via implementation action #6 above) for local jurisdictions that address relevant topics, such as expanding LOS standards to include multi-modal measures; the appropriate level of environmental review for different types of bicycle and pedestrian plans and projects; trip-generation methodologies appropriate for smart growth developments; and significance thresholds for transportation impacts.</strong></td>
<td>Alameda CTC staff has given substantial input and played a large role in facilitating discussions around reforming transportation impact analysis in CEQA, as directed by SB 743.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### COUNTYWIDE INITIATIVES

| 10. Develop and implement a strategy to address how to improve and grow (as feasible) four near-term priority countywide programs (10.1 to 10.4 below) | |
| **10.1 Safe routes to schools (SR2S) program.** Approximately 100 schools had established SR2S programs in 2012. This plan’s long-term goal is to have a program in every school in the county (see Strategy 2.6 in the “Vision and Goals” chapter). | Ongoing |
| **10.2 B Countywide bicycle safety education program.** Safety classes are offered around the county in a variety of languages. The goal is to further expand the program to broaden its reach (see Strategy 2.5 in the “Vision and Goals” chapter). | Ongoing |
| **10.2 P Countywide pedestrian safety advertising campaign.** This is a new program that will create a countywide safety campaign aimed at promoting road safety among motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists and bus drivers. | Action deferred. |
| **10.3 B Countywide bicycle safety advertising campaign.** This is a new program that will create a countywide safety campaign aimed at promoting road safety among motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists and bus drivers. | Action deferred. |

Green indicates action was completed (or is a multi-year action, for which 2014 portion was completed)
Gold indicates action is in progress.
Blue indicates no progress or action deferred.
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## Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans

### Implementation Actions - 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Action</th>
<th>2014 Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.3 P</strong> Countywide Safe Routes for Seniors program. Many walking clubs and programs for seniors already exist around the county. The goal is to create a comprehensive countywide program that encourages seniors to walk, bike, and access transit safely (see Strategy 2.7 in the &quot;Vision and Goals&quot; chapter).</td>
<td>No 2014 Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.4 B</strong> Countywide bicycling promotion program. The current “Ride into Life!” advertising campaign, which is coordinated with Bike to Work Day each year, was evaluated in 2010/2011. The agency will re-examine this program, and other possible new efforts, to determine possible improvements.</td>
<td>Ongoing, including substantial update of messaging and look/feel for 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.4 P</strong> Countywide walking promotion program. The agency will develop new strategies to promote walking for health, recreation and transportation.</td>
<td>No 2014 Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.5</strong> Work with local jurisdictions to grow the above programs even further by developing and offering an easy-to-administer option for jurisdictions to contribute local funding toward countywide programs to expand the programs in their jurisdiction.</td>
<td>Action deferred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. Develop and adopt an internal Complete Streets policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.1</strong> Alameda CTC will develop an internal Complete Streets policy that addresses the wide variety of activities that the agency performs, including capital projects development, fund programming, and countywide planning, tools and resources. This will ensure that capital projects implemented and/or funded by the agency provide safe and convenient access to all users, including bicyclists/pedestrians, as appropriate and feasible for each project.</td>
<td>Action was deferred from 2013; item being considered in relation to Complete Streets requirements in 2014 Transportation Expenditure Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. Determine options for modifying the countywide travel demand model to make it more sensitive to bicycling/walking and implement the best feasible option</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.1</strong> As part of the model update—which will among other things, align the model with the 2010 Census, update the model years to 2010 and 2040, and incorporate the Sustainable Communities Strategy—evaluate options for modifying the model to make it more sensitive to bicycling/walking trips, and select the best feasible option. Implement the selected option. [starting in 2012]</td>
<td>Model update completed; travel demand model now includes representation of bicycling infrastructure and explicitly assigns bicycling trips meaning model can be used to estimate order of magnitude bicycling volumes on corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.2</strong> Consider leading a study, in collaboration with a local jurisdiction, of a road diet (possibly along a CMP network segment) to better understand the impacts to non-motorized transportation of using the model. Based on such a study, further recommendations could be developed to improve the model and the application of LOS standards.</td>
<td>Action deferred.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Determine options for revising the Congestion Management Program to enhance bicycle/pedestrian safety and access, and implement the best feasible option

Green indicates action was completed (or is a multi-year action, for which 2014 portion was completed)
Gold indicates action is in progress.
Blue indicates no progress or action deferred.
## Implementation Actions - 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Action</th>
<th>2014 Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.1 During the update to the CMP, explore the options for revising the CMP to improve bicycle/pedestrian safety and access, and implement the best feasible option. As one option, consider using minimum safety and access standards for bicyclists and pedestrians, rather than multi-modal LOS, which may not provide direct guidance on future improvements.</td>
<td>No 2014 Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2 Update the CMP guidelines to better define how to develop Areawide Deficiency Plans to address deficiencies on the CMP network, which will allow bicycling and walking improvements to more easily be incorporated into projects, or at a minimum, not pit the implementation of bicycle and pedestrian projects against auto projects to improve LOS.</td>
<td>Areawide deficiency plan guidelines adopted in 2013. No new LOS deficiency plans declared in 2014 so areawide guidelines have not yet been applied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3 Conduct a feasibility study to explore implementing an impact analysis measure that supports alternative modes, such as San Francisco’s Automobile Trip Generated (ATG) measure, instead of using LOS methodologies that primarily address auto impacts. [starting in 2012]</td>
<td>Action deferred. A replacement metric for analyzing development and transportation projects through CEQA is being implemented through SB 743.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4 Create maps of the areas of overlap between the CMP and the countywide bicycle/pedestrian vision network. This analysis will reveal the areas and routes on which to focus efforts to improve the CMP process from a bicycle and pedestrian safety and access perspective.</td>
<td>No 2014 Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 14. Work with the County Public Health Department to consider bicycle/pedestrian data and needs in the development and implementation of health and transportation programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work with the County Public Health Department to consider bicycle/pedestrian data and needs in the development and implementation of health and transportation programs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>14.1</strong> Identify specific bicycle and pedestrian data and social marketing efforts on which to partner with the Alameda County Public Health Department (PHD) to further the goals of this plan.</td>
<td>No 2014 Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14.2</strong> Continue to work collaboratively with the PHD on the intersection of public health and bicycling/walking.</td>
<td>Ongoing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 15. Monitor, evaluate and report on progress annually on implementation of the Countywide Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitor, evaluate and report on progress annually on implementation of the Countywide Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>15.1</strong> Monitor the status of the plan’s eight performance measures included in this chapter, and report on them in the Alameda CTC’s annual Performance Report. In future years, the results of these and all other performance measures, as reflected in the Performance Report, will be used by Alameda CTC to set priorities in the agency’s Capital Improvement Program.</td>
<td>Ongoing (Performance Report presented every April).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15.2</strong> Annually review the plan’s implementation actions to ensure that they are incorporated into the agency’s work plan and to monitor progress made (this action is also reported under implementation action #1). Create a public report with this data, to be posted on the agency’s website.</td>
<td>Ongoing (reports every October).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Green indicates action was completed (or is a multi-year action, for which 2014 portion was completed)
Gold indicates action is in progress.
Blue indicates no progress or action deferred.
### Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans

#### Implementation Actions - 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Action</th>
<th>2014 Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>Create and update a Geographic Information System (GIS) database to include all countywide, and also local, planned and built bicycle facilities [bike] and to track completion of the pedestrian facilities in the Ped Plan’s vision system [ped]. Work with local jurisdictions to update this database annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>Continue the annual bicycle and pedestrian count program, as a way to gauge the effectiveness of new facilities and programs at encouraging bicycling/walking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>Update the Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan every four to five years, coordinating with the updates of the Countywide Transportation Plan and of the Countywide Pedestrian/Bicycle Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 16. Conduct research to inform future plan updates and countywide bicycle/pedestrian planning

**Before next plan update [2013–2016]**

| 16.1 Performance targets: | Work with local jurisdictions and other stakeholders to research and, as feasible and appropriate to a countywide agency, develop comprehensive and meaningful quantitative targets for bicycling/walking in Alameda County. Also, consider establishing a future vehicle miles traveled target and using the countywide travel demand model to determine what actions are needed today to achieve the goal. | Background research completed but recommendations deferred. |
| 16.2 Data collection: | Assess the benefits and disadvantages of Alameda CTC collecting its own bicycling/walking data, rather than relying on outside sources of data, in order to have more timely information for reporting on performance measures, and possibly targets, and in the next plan update. | Staff has determined the most fruitful expansion of data collection related to bicycling/walking is enhanced household travel survey efforts. Staff continues to advocate for more frequent household travel surveys at regional level. Staff exploring cost and feasibility of alternative collision data sources (as opposed to state’s database which has a 2.5 year lag) |
| 16.3 Collision analysis: | Conduct a detailed countywide collision analysis, which can help guide future plan and funding priorities, and the direction and focus of the countywide bicycle/pedestrian safety advertising campaign. | Completed - presented to PBWG in May 2014. |

---

Green indicates action was completed (or is a multi-year action, for which 2014 portion was completed)
Gold indicates action is in progress.
Blue indicates no progress or action deferred.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No 2014 Action</th>
<th>Implementation Action</th>
<th>2014 Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.4</td>
<td><strong>Caltrans-owned facilities:</strong> Work with local jurisdictions, Caltrans and other agencies, as appropriate, to develop a list of interchanges, overcrossings, undercrossings and at-grade crossings of Caltrans highways and roadways on which bicycle and pedestrian access could be improved, and consider prioritizing the list and working with Caltrans to identify funding for the highest priority projects. [bike: This work would build upon the list of major non-bikeway capital projects already included in Appendix X.] This list would be shared with Caltrans, and other agencies, as appropriate, to help them identify opportunities to better accommodate non-motorized users.</td>
<td>Action deferred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5</td>
<td><strong>Typical project costs:</strong> Work with local agencies to refine typical construction and maintenance costs for bicycle/pedestrian capital projects. These cost assumptions could be used for estimating project costs not only in the Countywide Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan update but also in local master plans.</td>
<td>No 2014 Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.6</td>
<td><strong>Countywide and local BPACs:</strong> Evaluate the staffing, funding, administration, composition and performance of the countywide and local BPACs for strengths, weaknesses and opportunities to improve their effectiveness.</td>
<td>No 2014 Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**During next plan update [2017]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No 2014 Action</th>
<th>Implementation Action</th>
<th>2014 Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.7</td>
<td><strong>Bicycling/Walking rates:</strong> Develop case studies of how other cities and counties around the nation have managed to increase bicycling/walking rates, and develop best practices and recommended policies both for internal use and for local jurisdictions.</td>
<td>No 2014 Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.8</td>
<td><strong>Central business districts [ped : and major commercial districts]:</strong> Review and standardize the definition of central business districts (CBDs) [ped : and major commercial districts (MCDs)], as used in the “Countywide Priorities” chapter, and determine their distribution throughout the county for planning purposes under the updated Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan.</td>
<td>No 2014 Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.9 B</td>
<td><strong>Major bus transfer points:</strong> Re-evaluate the purpose and definition of major bus transfer points, included in the “Countywide Priorities” chapter.</td>
<td>No 2014 Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.9 P</td>
<td><strong>Rail transit access costs:</strong> Develop separate costs for high ridership rail stations, such as many BART stations, and low ridership rail stations, such as some Amtrak stations, so that cost estimates are more accurate.</td>
<td>No 2014 Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.10 B</td>
<td><strong>Types of Bikeways:</strong> Differentiate bicycle boulevards from other Class III bicycle routes in the vision network, since the cost and usage of these facilities are very different.</td>
<td>No 2014 Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.10 P</td>
<td><strong>Major [non-bikeway] capital projects:</strong> Identify the major [non-bikeway] capital projects (such as over- and under-crossings, and bicycle/pedestrian bridges) needed along the bicycle/pedestrian vision network [bike : that are along access to transit and access to CBD routes]. This will assist in estimating</td>
<td>No 2014 Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Green indicates action was completed (or is a multi-year action, for which 2014 portion was completed)
Gold indicates action is in progress.
Blue indicates no progress or action deferred.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Action</th>
<th>2014 Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.11 B the full costs of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan and prioritizing projects.</td>
<td>No 2014 Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.11 P Facilities needing major repair and/or upgrades: Work with local jurisdictions to develop an inventory of countywide bicycle/pedestrian facilities in the vision network that are considered “built” but still are in need of repair or upgrades in order to be considered “completed,” and also the estimated costs to improve them.</td>
<td>No 2014 Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.12 B Re-paving needs: Refine the cost to improve and maintain pavement along all bikeways in the bicycle vision network.</td>
<td>No 2014 Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Green indicates action was completed (or is a multi-year action, for which 2014 portion was completed)
Gold indicates action is in progress.
Blue indicates no progress or action deferred.
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## Measure B and Vehicle Registration Fee Bicycle and Pedestrian Countywide Discretionary Grand Fund Programs

Cycle 4 and 2013 Coordinated Funding Program Semi-Annual Progress Reports and Final Reports

Reporting Period Ending June 30, 2014

### Submissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Number</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Progress Report</th>
<th>Final Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A09-0022</td>
<td>Newark Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan</td>
<td>City of Newark</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13-0059</td>
<td>Christie Ave Bay Trail Gap Closure</td>
<td>City of Emeryville</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13-0061</td>
<td>Bay Trail – Gilman to Buchanan</td>
<td>East Bay Regional Park District</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13-0062</td>
<td>Cross Alameda Trail (Ralph Appezatto Memorial Parkway, Webster to Poggi)</td>
<td>City of Alameda</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13-0063</td>
<td>Buchanan/Marin Bikeway</td>
<td>City of Albany</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13-0064</td>
<td>W. Juana Ped Improvements</td>
<td>City of San Leandro</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13-0065</td>
<td>Fruitvale Alive Gap Closure Streetscape Project (Fruitvale Ave E.12th to Estuary)</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13-0066</td>
<td>Piedmont Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan</td>
<td>City of Piedmont</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13-0067</td>
<td>Bike-Go-Round (education/safety program)</td>
<td>Cycles of Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT No.: 9
REPORTING PERIOD: From: January 1, 2014 To: June 30, 2014
PROJECT SPONSOR: CITY OF NEWARK
PROJECT TITLE: Newark Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan
AGREEMENT NO.: A09-022

STATUS:
A draft of the Newark Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan has been completed and major components have been reviewed by the City’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC). However, staff and the City’s consultant are still in the process of revising the master plan document into a final draft for review and approval by the BPAC, the City’s Planning Commission, and the Newark City Council. The final draft requires incorporation of key elements of recently approved documents, including the City’s General Plan Update and the Bay Trail Realignment Feasibility Study, as well as bicycle and pedestrian improvements planned in the Dumbarton Transit Oriented Development.

ACTIONS (in this reporting period):
Staff has continued to work on several different chapters of the master plan document including further development of a detailed list of potential projects, prioritization of identified projects and programs, and incorporation of some of the key elements of the recently approved Transportation Element of the General Plan Update and the Bay Trail Realignment Feasibility Study. Additional work is needed in this area of the plan.

ANTICIPATED ACTIONS (in next reporting period):
Design elements associated with the Dumbarton Transit Oriented Development and other residential projects that are in various stages of approval need to be incorporated into the master plan along with key applicable elements of the Transportation Element of the General Plan Update and the Bay Trail Realignment Feasibility Study. When staff and the City’s consultant have completed these additions, the final draft master plan will be prepared for review by the City’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee. This is scheduled for early 2015. Along with completion of the master plan document, the environmental document for the plan will be finalized. Following the BPAC’s review, the master plan will be taken before the Planning Commission and the Newark City Council. It is anticipated that all of these actions will be completed by July 1, 2014.
GENERAL:
☐ At this time we anticipate no problems on the project.
☐ We anticipate problems in the following area(s) but do not feel we need your assistance at this time:
☒ We anticipate problems in the following area(s) and would appreciate any assistance you could offer: An additional extension to the project schedule is needed.

SCHEDULE, SCOPE, AND BUDGET:
☐ The project schedule, scope, task budgets, and performance measures remain unchanged, as shown in Attachments A, B, C, and D of the Grant Funding Agreement or previously approved amendment.
☒ There are proposed changes to the project schedule, scope, task budgets, and/or performance measures. (If checked, proceed to the section below)
☐ A Grant Amendment Request was previously submitted on (enter date) and is awaiting approval.
☒ Revisions to the following area(s) are being proposed and a Grant Amendment Request is attached for review and approval. (Check all that apply)
☐ Project Scope
☐ Task Budgets
☒ Project Schedule
☐ Project Performance Measures

EXPENDITURES
☐ A Request for Reimbursement is included with this Progress Report.
☒ No Request for Reimbursement is included with this Progress Report. (If checked, proceed to section below.)
☐ A Request for Reimbursement was submitted within the last six months on (enter date).
☒ No Request for Reimbursement has been submitted within the last six months for the following reason(s):

We have submitted requests for all reimbursable funds except final closeout costs. These costs will be expended during the final reporting period when the project is completed.
PUBLICITY:

☑ As required per the Grant Funding Agreement, updated and accurate project information is included at the following website address, with a link to the Alameda CTC website and reference to Measure B and/or VRF fund usage:
http://www.newark.org/departments/public-works/engineering-division/pedestrian-bicycle-master-plan/

The webpage is in the process of being updated by staff.

☐ As required per the Grant Funding Agreement, an annual article was published in the Project’s Sponsors newsletter, newspaper, or Alameda CTC’s newsletter, highlighting the Project and Measure B and/or VRF fund usage.
Publication Date:
Publication Name:

☐ An article was included in the previous progress report. Thus, no article was published in this reporting period. An article is planned for the Fall 2014 version of the Newark News.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES PROGRESS REPORT:

☐ There were [enter total numbers] trips provided during the reporting period.

☐ There were [enter total numbers] people served during the reporting period.

☐ Project Performance Measures Progress Report is completed and attached.

☒ Project Performance Measures Progress Report is not included / completed because no performance measures are associated with this project.
**PERFORMANCE MEASURES PROGRESS REPORT**

**Project Performance Measures:** Evaluate the PROJECT using the outcome-based performance measures set forth in Table D-1 (AGREEMENT Attachment D) to demonstrate that the PROJECT is meeting its objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Performance Measure Target (1)</th>
<th>Progress/Activity to date</th>
<th>Progress/Activity this Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. List all performance measures included in application for PROJECT submitted by PROJECT SPONSOR to ALAMEDA CTC.
September 30, 2014

Mr. Matthew Todd, P.E.
Principal Transportation Engineer
Alameda County Transportation Commission
1111 Broadway, Suite 800
Oakland, CA 94612

Subject: Request No. 8 for Administrative Change to
Grant Agreement No. A09-022 for
Newark Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan

Dear Mr. Todd:

We are hereby requesting an administrative change to the grant agreement in the subject line as per Section IV Part 8 of the subject agreement. We have attached the appropriate exhibits to reflect our requested change(s) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attached (Yes or No)</th>
<th>Documentation for Change Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Exhibit A Written Explanation for Change Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Exhibit B Revised Attachment A: Project Description and Task Breakdown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Exhibit C Revised Attachment B: Task Budgets and Other Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Exhibit D Revised Attachment C: Task Deliverables and Project Milestone Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Exhibit E Revised Attachment D: Project Performance Measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have signed each of the exhibits showing the requested changes and understand that Alameda CTC will review our requested changes and, if agreeable, will also sign the exhibits and return copies of the approved exhibits. The approved exhibits signed by both parties will become the current agreement information on file at Alameda CTC.

If you have any questions or need additional information please contact Soren Fajeau at telephone number (510) 578-4286.

Sincerely,

Soren Fajeau, P.E.
Assistant City Engineer
September 29, 2014

Mr. Matthew Todd, P.E.
Principal Transportation Engineer
Alameda County Transportation Commission
1111 Broadway, Suite 800
Oakland, CA 94612

RE: ADDITIONAL EXTENSION FOR GRANT AGREEMENT NO. A09-022
CITY OF NEWARK PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE MASTER PLAN

Dear Mr. Todd:

The City of Newark is formally requesting an additional extension of Grant Agreement No. A09-0022 to October 31, 2015, for completion of the Newark Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan. While progress has been made towards completion of the master plan in the past year, there are several factors that have influenced the need for additional plan modifications, further environmental analysis, and additional time to complete these final changes to the document.

The City of Newark recently adopted a new General Plan with a completely revised Transportation Element. The Transportation Element includes significant revisions to goals, policies, and actions related to bicycle and pedestrian components that require additional detail within the master plan document. An example includes the potential conversion of a tract of land previously reserved for a southerly extension of Cedar Boulevard between Haley Street and Willow Street to a linear bicycle and pedestrian parkway, including a potential bridge over the Union Pacific Railroad. The segment of dedicated, but unimproved roadway backs-up to many residential properties and would result in a significant change for residents. This addition, along with many other changes to the Transportation Element of the General Plan, requires further evaluation in terms of scope and prioritization in the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan.

The City also recently approved a Bay Trail Realignment Feasibility Study, coordinated with the City of Fremont, which identifies a preferred ultimate alignment, an interim alignment, various
loop/spur trails, and other phased approaches to the Bay Trail segment through Newark. Work on the Bay Trail will be a challenging long-term commitment and requires now additional detailed analysis within the City's Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan for both short-term and long-term connectivity between the trail alignment alternatives and the other planned improvements.

The previously approved Specific Plan for the Dumbarton Transportation Oriented Development (TOD), an important project for Newark as part of Plan Bay Area, includes plans for significant bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure improvements. The City currently has several tentative maps and improvement plans related to this TOD under review. Given the complexity of converting former industrial properties to higher density residential development projects, there is a need to coordinate the scope and detailed designs for improvements in this major planning area with the various developers to ensure feasibility. The TOD area includes the planned installation of roundabouts on a major arterial street and Class I bicycle facilities that have never been constructed previously in the City. Prior to finalizing the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan, it is essential that the details associated with this infrastructure be further analyzed and that the master plan be properly informed in terms of scope and feasibility.

The City currently has 15 proposed residential subdivisions under various forms of review, an unprecedented number in the recent history of the City. Many of these developments have surfaced within the last year and staff feels strongly that the master plan needs to include relevant information related to all of these projects in order to be a complete document.

For these reasons, we are requesting an additional year for completion of the City of Newark Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan, through October 31, 2015. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Soren Fajeau, Assistant City Engineer, at (510) 578-4286 or soren.fajeau@newark.org. Thank you very much for your consideration.

Regards,

PEGGY A. CLAASSEN, P.E.
Public Works Director
(510) 578-4671
REVISED ATTACHMENT C

TASK DELIVERABLES AND PROJECT MILESTONE SCHEDULE

Project Sponsor: CITY OF NEWARK

Project Title: Newark Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan

Agreement Number: A09-0022

Project Task Deliverables and Due Dates: The following Revised Table C-1 is intended to replace the current, approved Table C-1 in its entirety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No. (from Table A-1)</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Previously Approved Deliverable Due Date</th>
<th>Revised Deliverable Due Date to Alameda CTC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Copy of RFP</td>
<td>December 31, 2009</td>
<td>December 31, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Copy of executed consultant contract</td>
<td>June 30, 2010</td>
<td>June 30, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Council Resolution to create the BPAC</td>
<td>June 30, 2010</td>
<td>June 30, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Copy of Draft Master Plan</td>
<td>September 30, 2011</td>
<td>September 30, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Copy of Final Master Plan</td>
<td>July 31, 2014</td>
<td>July 31, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Invoices submitted to Alameda CTC</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Final Report/Presentation to BPAC/Final Invoice</td>
<td>September 30, 2014</td>
<td>September 30, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Grant Funding Agreement Expires</td>
<td>October 31, 2014</td>
<td>October 31, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Project Sponsor shall provide Alameda CTC with not less than 10 days advance notice of any public meetings or events related to implementation of this grant.

Signature of Person Requesting Change

Date: 9/30/2014

Alameda CTC Approval

Date
ALAMEDA CTC
GRANT PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT

PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT No.: 2
REPORTING PERIOD: From: January 1 To: June 30, 2014
PROJECT SPONSOR: City of Emeryville
PROJECT TITLE: Christie Ave Bay Trail Gap Closure
AGREEMENT NO.: A13-0059

STATUS:
Design is 65% complete with bid expected in fall (next period). Community review completed.

ACTIONS (in this reporting period):
Staff brought the contract for City Council approval on January 21, 2014. The Consultant (Aliquot) drafted preliminary design for presentation to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee of the Transportation Commission of the City of Emeryville on April 7, 2014 and incorporated comment into presentation to City Council on May 20, 2014. Citizen Watchdog Committee representative for Bike East Bay was invited to BPAC and City Council meetings (did not attend). Bike East Bay staff comments were noted at BPAC. The adjacent hotel development traffic consultant commented on the preliminary design. Aliquot revised design to incorporate intermittent right turn on red signage per public comment. The City Council sought revision to Bay Trail alignment consistent with the project from the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG).

ANTICIPATED ACTIONS (in next reporting period):
ABAG will approve realignment in July 2014, consultant will complete design and City will bid work in the next period. City will provide Final Plans and Bid Documents to ACTIA (Deliverables 1f and 2a).

GENERAL:

x At this time we anticipate no problems on the project.

☐ We anticipate problems in the following area(s) but do not feel we need your assistance at this time:

☐ We anticipate problems in the following area(s) and would appreciate any assistance you could offer:

SCHEDULE, SCOPE, AND BUDGET:
The project schedule, scope, task budgets, and performance measures remain unchanged, as shown in Attachments A, B, C, and D of the Grant Funding Agreement or previously approved amendment.

There are proposed changes to the project schedule, scope, task budgets, and/or performance measures. (If checked, proceed to the section below)

- A Grant Amendment Request was previously submitted on (enter date) and is awaiting approval.
- Revisions to the following area(s) are being proposed and a Grant Amendment Request is attached for review and approval. (Check all that apply)
  - Project Scope
  - Task Budgets
  - Project Schedule
  - Project Performance Measures

EXPENDITURES

- A Request for Reimbursement is included with this Progress Report.

- No Request for Reimbursement is included with this Progress Report. (If checked, proceed to section below.)
  - A Request for Reimbursement was submitted within the last six months on (enter date).
  - No Request for Reimbursement has been submitted within the last six months for the following reason(s): (enter reason)

PUBLICITY:

- As required per the Grant Funding Agreement, updated and accurate project information is included at the following website address, with a link to the Alameda CTC website and reference to Measure B and/or VRF fund usage:

- As required per the Grant Funding Agreement, an annual article was published in the Project's Sponsors newsletter, newspaper, or Alameda CTC's newsletter, highlighting the Project and Measure B and/or VRF fund usage.

  Publication Date: April 2014
  Publication Name: Emeryville City News and Activity Guide
  
  Attachment A is a print-out of the published article(s).

- An article will be included in the next progress report. Thus, no article was published in this reporting period.
PERFORMANCE MEASURES PROGRESS REPORT:

☐ There were [enter total numbers] trips provided during the reporting period.

☐ There were [enter total numbers] people served during the reporting period.

☐ Project Performance Measures Progress Report is completed and attached.

x Project Performance Measures Progress Report is not included / completed because no performance measures are associated with this project.
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NEW BIKE/PEDESTRIAN TRAIL FUNDED TO FILL “CRITICAL GAP”

The City of Emeryville just received $550,000 from the Alameda County Transportation Commission’s One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) to build a key section of the Bay Trail in central Emeryville. The project is a multi-use Class I (ie: physically separated from the street/cars) bicycle/pedestrian path on the northeast side of Christie Avenue between Powell Street and Shellmound Street. Bike East Bay ranked this project the #1 priority of all the bicycle access and safety improvement projects competing for grant funding in the entire County.

The project fills a critical gap in access from the Bay Trail north of Powell Street to key destinations in Emeryville and will be a critical link to the newly opened Bay Bridge bicycle and pedestrian trail off Shellmound Street, across from IKEA. The improvements will allow the Bay Trail to abandon the current route that crosses one of its systems’ most congested intersections and also traverses a one-way back alley going the wrong way.

The multi-use pathway will replace the existing sidewalk and one vehicle travel lane. Both bicycle and pedestrian users will be accommodated within an 18-foot wide area that will include a multi-use pathway and landscaping. Additional improvements will include:

- traffic signal modifications at two intersections: Shellmound Street/Christie Avenue and Christie Avenue/Powell Street Plaza Entrance;
- two new crosswalks: Christie Avenue/Powell St Plaza Entrance and Shellmound Street/Christie Avenue (north side);
- bicycle crossing markings;
- changes to pavement delineations; and
- landscaping & storm water planters

In early 2014, the City of Emeryville selected Aliquot & Associates to design the project and prepare construction documents for bidding this fall. The construction to begin in early 2015.

The project is funded by a combination of Measure B and the Vehicle Registration Fees administered by the Alameda-CTC to improve safety and access for bicyclists and pedestrians in the county. For more information on this and other projects supported by Measure B Sales Tax Initiative and the Vehicle Registration Fee, visit the Alameda-CTC’s website at http://www.alamedactc.org/. You may also contact grant manager Amber Evans at aevans@emeryville.org or 510-596-4382.

CELEBRATE EMERYVILLE’S GREEN BUSINESSES

Congratulations to the 27 businesses in Emeryville that have made the pledge to keep it green! Join the movement in your own company by joining the Bay Area Green Business Program today at www.greenbiz.ca.gov.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUSINESS NAMES</th>
<th>WEBSITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizmendi Bakery &amp; Pizzeria</td>
<td><a href="http://www.arizmendi-bakery.org">www.arizmendi-bakery.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art.com</td>
<td><a href="http://www.art.com">www.art.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspera, Inc.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aspera.com">www.aspera.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacchus Press Inc.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bacchuspress.com">www.bacchuspress.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back to Earth Inc. Organic Catering</td>
<td><a href="http://www.backtoearth.org">www.backtoearth.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASELINE Environmental Consulting</td>
<td><a href="http://www.baseline-env.com">http://www.baseline-env.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Economics</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bacen.com">www.bacen.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Street Emeryville</td>
<td><a href="http://www.baystreetemeryville.com">www.baystreetemeryville.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBF Bar</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cbfbar.com">www.cbfbar.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Financial Service Corporation</td>
<td><a href="http://www.consumerfinancial.com">www.consumerfinancial.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeryville Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td><a href="http://www.emeryvillechamber.com">www.emeryvillechamber.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essexia Bilingue International</td>
<td><a href="http://www.esexiarienternational.org">http://www.esexiarienternational.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairley’s on 65th St.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fairleyescoffee.com/">http://www.fairleyescoffee.com/</a> emeryville.html</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Points Sheraton</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fourpointssheraton.com">www.fourpointssheraton.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenberg Brand Strategy</td>
<td><a href="http://www.greenberginc.com">www.greenberginc.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hines 2100 Powell</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hines.com">www.hines.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Holcomb Printers</td>
<td><a href="http://www.julieholcombprinters.com">www.julieholcombprinters.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med America</td>
<td><a href="http://www.medamerica.com">www.medamerica.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula LeDu Fine Catering</td>
<td><a href="http://www.paulaledu.com">www.paulaledu.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulding and Company</td>
<td><a href="http://www.pauldingandco.com">www.pauldingandco.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo Science</td>
<td><a href="http://www.photoscience.com">www.photoscience.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PrintingGreen.com</td>
<td><a href="http://www.printinggreen.com">www.printinggreen.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ScanArt</td>
<td><a href="http://www.scanart.com">www.scanart.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siegel &amp; Strat Architects</td>
<td><a href="http://www.siegelsstrata.com">www.siegelsstrata.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Summer Thai</td>
<td><a href="http://summersummahtai.com">http://summersummahtai.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubuntu</td>
<td>Find on Facebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIE Horticulture Garden Design</td>
<td><a href="http://www.viehorticulture.com">http://www.viehorticulture.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ALAMEDA CTC
GRANT PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT

PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT No.: 2
REPORTING PERIOD: From: January 1, 2014 To: June 30, 2014
PROJECT SPONSOR: East Bay Regional Park District
PROJECT TITLE: Bay Trail - Gilman to Buchanan Project
AGREEMENT NO.: A13-0061

STATUS:
Signed grant contract in February 2014

ACTIONS (in this reporting period):
As stated on the grant application, EBRPD has filed eminent domain with the owners of Golden Gate Fields in 2012 in order to obtain the right-of-way for the project. EBRPD is working to resolve land tenure for the property.

ANTICIPATED ACTIONS (in next reporting period):
Resolve land tenure and begin geotechnical boring and begin final engineering design.
GENERAL:
☐ At this time we anticipate no problems on the project.
☒ We anticipate problems in the land tenure but do not feel we need your assistance at this time:
☐ We anticipate problems in the following area(s) and would appreciate any assistance you could offer:

SCHEDULE, SCOPE, AND BUDGET:
☒ The project schedule, scope, task budgets, and performance measures remain unchanged, as shown in Attachments A, B, C, and D of the Grant Funding Agreement or previously approved amendment.
☐ There are proposed changes to the project schedule, scope, task budgets, and/or performance measures. *(If checked, proceed to the section below)*
  ☐ A Grant Amendment Request was previously submitted on *(enter date)* and is awaiting approval.
  ☐ Revisions to the following area(s) are being proposed and a Grant Amendment Request is attached for review and approval. *(Check all that apply)*
    ☐ Project Scope
    ☐ Task Budgets
    ☐ Project Schedule
    ☐ Project Performance Measures

EXPENDITURES
☐ A Request for Reimbursement is included with this Progress Report.
☒ No Request for Reimbursement is included with this Progress Report. *(If checked, proceed to section below)*
  ☐ A Request for Reimbursement was submitted within the last six months on *(enter date)*.
  ☒ No Request for Reimbursement has been submitted within the last six months for the following reason(s): *Working to resolve land tenure.*
PUBLICITY:

☐ As required per the Grant Funding Agreement, updated and accurate project information is included at the following website address, with a link to the Alameda CTC website and reference to Measure B and/or VRF fund usage:

*Attach a print-out of the website page and information.*

☐ As required per the Grant Funding Agreement, an annual article was published in the Project’s Sponsors newsletter, newspaper, or Alameda CTC’s newsletter, highlighting the Project and Measure B and/or VRF fund usage.

Publication Date: *(enter publication date)*

Publication Name: *(enter name of newsletter, newspaper, publication, etc.)*

*Attach a print-out of the published article(s).*

☐ An article was included in the previous progress report. Thus, no article was published in this reporting period.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES PROGRESS REPORT:

☐ There were *[enter total numbers]* trips provided during the reporting period.

☐ There were *[enter total numbers]* people served during the reporting period.

☐ Project Performance Measures Progress Report is completed and attached.

☐ Project Performance Measures Progress Report is not included / completed because no performance measures are associated with this project.
**Performance Measures Progress Report**

**Project Performance Measures:** Evaluate the PROJECT using the outcome-based performance measures set forth in Table D-1 (AGREEMENT Attachment D) to demonstrate that the PROJECT is meeting its objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Performance Measure Target (1)</th>
<th>Progress/Activity to date</th>
<th>Progress/Activity this Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. List all performance measures included in application for PROJECT submitted by PROJECT SPONSOR to ALAMEDA CTC.
PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT No.: 2

REPORTING PERIOD: From: January 1, 2014 To: June 30, 2014

PROJECT SPONSOR: City of Alameda

PROJECT TITLE: Cross Alameda Trail Segment Project

AGREEMENT NO.: A13-0062

STATUS:
Design and outreach are in progress.

ACTIONS (in this reporting period):
A draft cross section is completed (Exhibit 1). Focus groups and a community workshop are scheduled for July 2014. Staff is working with a survey company to confirm exact right-of-way boundaries. Staff compiled pedestrian and bicycle counts for baseline/before construction data (Tables 1 and 2), and took before construction photos of the project site (Exhibit 2).

For the pedestrian and bicyclist counts, the focus is on the Webster Street/Atlantic Avenue intersection, which is the City’s most congested intersection and is the City’s busiest bus stop. The northerly adjacent land uses include the College of Alameda with 8,000 students and faculty in the northwest corner; Independence Plaza, which is a 186-unit senior living residence in the northeast corner; and the Webster/Posey Tubes to the north, which is one of the five access/egress points on/off the island. The southerly adjacent land uses include the Webster Street Business District along Webster Street to the south, Starbucks/Kinkos/Walgreens in the southeast corner and the Cross Alameda Trail in the southwest corner.

Table 1 shows manual pedestrian and bicyclist counts at this intersection. One PM peak hour averages almost 200 pedestrians crossing an intersection leg and about 20 bicyclists originating at an intersection leg. Midday counts are high, averaging 443 pedestrians per hour and 15 bicyclists per hour.
Table 1: Pedestrian and Bicyclist Counts at Webster Street/Atlantic Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pedestrian Counts</th>
<th></th>
<th>Bicyclist Counts</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midday</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Weekends</td>
<td>Midday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>313</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>457</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>399</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>373</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>7-9 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midday</td>
<td>12-2 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>4-6 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend</td>
<td>varies - for two hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The bus stops at the Webster Street/Atlantic Avenue intersection, which represent 3.6 percent of all boardings and alightings in the entire City of Alameda, have a total of 1,348 boardings and alightings each weekday from the various bus lines that serve this intersection (Table 2). The AC Transit bus lines include local lines 20, 31, 851 and 51A and Transbay lines O and W. The Estuary Crossing Shuttle, which transports up to ten bicycles on the shuttle, carries passengers between West Alameda and the Lake Merritt BART station.
Table 2: Weekday Bus Boardings and Alightings at Webster Street/Atlantic Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>On</th>
<th>Off</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51A</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51A</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total 626 475 1,101

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>On</th>
<th>Off</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Alameda Stops - Local Lines</td>
<td>15,810</td>
<td>15,842</td>
<td>31,652</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Alameda Stops %</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>On</th>
<th>Off</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>To Alameda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>To Transbay Terminal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>To Alameda</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>To Transbay Terminal</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total 65 61 126

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>On</th>
<th>Off</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Alameda Stops - Transbay</td>
<td>2,858</td>
<td>2,884</td>
<td>5,742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>To Alameda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>To Transbay Terminal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total 1 1 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>On</th>
<th>Off</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Alameda Stops - Night Line</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estuary XING Shuttle: Intersection</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estuary XING Shuttle: Alameda</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total - All Alameda Lines</td>
<td>18,954</td>
<td>18,862</td>
<td>37,816</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Total - Intersection 811 537 1,348

Grand Total - Intersection % 4.3% 2.8% 3.6%

Source: AC Transit.

ANTICIPATED ACTIONS *(in next reporting period)*:

Complete outreach at community workshop on Monday, July 28, focus groups in July and August and the Transportation Commission on Wednesday, September 24. Complete detailed design (PS&E) and environmental review.
GENERAL:

☐ At this time we anticipate no problems on the project.

☒ We anticipate problems in the following area(s) but do not feel we need your assistance at this time: The project tasks are delayed yet the overall schedule still is on track for construction completion by September 30, 2015.

☐ We anticipate problems in the following area(s) and would appreciate any assistance you could offer:

SCHEDULE, SCOPE, AND BUDGET:

☐ The project schedule, scope, task budgets, and performance measures remain unchanged, as shown in Attachments A, B, C, and D of the Grant Funding Agreement or previously approved amendment.

☒ There are proposed changes to the project schedule, scope, task budgets, and/or performance measures. The project tasks are delayed yet the overall schedule still is on track for construction completion by September 30, 2015.

☐ A Grant Amendment Request was previously submitted on (enter date) and is awaiting approval.

☐ Revisions to the following area(s) are being proposed and a Grant Amendment Request is attached for review and approval. (Check all that apply)

☐ Project Scope
☐ Task Budgets
☐ Project Schedule
☐ Project Performance Measures

EXPENDITURES

☒ A Request for Reimbursement is included with this Progress Report.

☐ No Request for Reimbursement is included with this Progress Report. (If checked, proceed to section below.)

☐ A Request for Reimbursement was submitted within the last six months on (enter date).

☐ No Request for Reimbursement has been submitted within the last six months for the following reason(s):
PUBLICITY:

☐ As required per the Grant Funding Agreement, updated and accurate project information is included at the following website address, with a link to the Alameda CTC website and reference to Measure B and/or VRF fund usage: [http://alamedaca.gov/public-works/cross-alameda-trail](http://alamedaca.gov/public-works/cross-alameda-trail)

☐ As required per the Grant Funding Agreement, an annual article was published in the Project’s Sponsors newsletter, newspaper, or Alameda CTC’s newsletter, highlighting the Project and Measure B and/or VRF fund usage.

  Publication Date: March 21, 2013
  Publication Name: Contra Costa Times, San Jose Mercury News and the Oakland Tribune

  Previously attached articles are in progress report #1.

☐ An article was included in the previous progress report. Thus, no article was published in this reporting period.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES PROGRESS REPORT:

☐ There were [enter total numbers] trips provided during the reporting period.

☐ There were [enter total numbers] people served during the reporting period.

☐ Project Performance Measures Progress Report is completed and attached.

☒ Project Performance Measures Progress Report is not included / completed because no performance measures are associated with this project.
Exhibit 1: Cross Alameda Trail Draft Cross Section
FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS OF THE MODES OF TRANSPORATION TO BE INCORPORATED (0.5M):

- 2 dedicated transit lanes
- Sidewalk on each side of transit stop
- 2-4 travel lanes
- Left turn lane / median
- Expanded median & landscaping

RAMP
PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS
MAIN STREET TO WEBSTER
CITY OF ALAMEDA - ALAMEDA COUNTY - CALIFORNIA
DATE: JUNE 16, 2014 - NOT TO SCALE
Exhibit 2: Before Construction Photos of the Project Site
Ralph Appezzato Memorial Parkway – Webster Street to West Campus Drive

(west of Webster Street, looking east)

(west of Webster Street, looking west)
(east of Public Storage, looking west)

(west of Public Storage, looking east)
(further west of Public Storage, looking east)

(east of West Campus Drive, looking east)
(at West Campus Drive, looking east – Summerhouse and HOA boundary)

(at West Campus Drive, looking north)
Ralph Appezzato Memorial Parkway – West Campus Drive to Fifth Street

(west of West Campus Drive, looking east)

(west of West Campus Drive, looking east)
(Fifth Street – west and east sides of the intersection)
Ralph Appezzato Memorial Parkway – Fifth Street to Poggi Street

(west of Fifth Street, looking south to Summerhouse)

(east of Poggi Street, looking west)
Ralph Appezzato Memorial Parkway – Poggi Street to Third Street

(west of Poggi Street, looking northeast)

(west of Poggi Street, looking east)
(west of Poggi Street, looking east – Alameda Boys and Girls Club)
(east of Third Street, looking west by Alameda Unified School District property)

(east of Third Street, looking west)
Ralph Appezzato Memorial Parkway – Third Street to Main Street

(Third Street, looking west)

(trees in right-of-way, looking east)
(east of Main Street, looking south)

(east of Main Street, looking west)
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PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT No.: 1
REPORTING PERIOD: From: 1/1/2014 To: 06/30/2014
PROJECT SPONSOR: City of Albany
PROJECT TITLE: Buchanan Marin Bikeway Phase III
AGREEMENT NO.: A13-0063_636 6

STATUS:
The project design is advancing according to schedule along with the undergrounding design. 35 percent design was presented to the T&S Commission in February 2014 to receive more feedback for the design of bulb outs at intersections.

ACTIONS (in this reporting period):
Presented response to comments to Traffic and Safety Commission (February 2014) and informational meeting with PG&E and other utility companies.
Met with Utility Companies in March 2014
Sent letter to property owners in the project area informing them of the conversion panel work that would take place in September 2014.

ANTICIPATED ACTIONS (in next reporting period):
Meet with Caltrans to discuss modifications at the San Pablo/Marin intersection in September
Panel conversion for utility undergrounding in project area in September/October 2014
Present 95% plans to T&S Commission in October or November of 2014
GENERAL:
☒ At this time we anticipate no problems on the project.
☐ We anticipate problems in the following area(s) but do not feel we need your assistance at this time:
☐ We anticipate problems in the following area(s) and would appreciate any assistance you could offer:

SCHEDULE, SCOPE, AND BUDGET:
☒ The project schedule, scope, task budgets, and performance measures remain unchanged, as shown in Attachments A, B, C, and D of the Grant Funding Agreement or previously approved amendment.
☐ There are proposed changes to the project schedule, scope, task budgets, and/or performance measures. (If checked, proceed to the section below)
☐ A Grant Amendment Request was previously submitted on (enter date) and is awaiting approval.
☐ Revisions to the following area(s) are being proposed and a Grant Amendment Request is attached for review and approval. (Check all that apply)
☒ Project Scope
☐ Task Budgets
☐ Project Schedule
☐ Project Performance Measures

EXPENDITURES
☐ A Request for Reimbursement is included with this Progress Report.
☒ No Request for Reimbursement is included with this Progress Report. (If checked, proceed to section below)
☐ A Request for Reimbursement was submitted within the last six months on (enter date).
☒ No Request for Reimbursement has been submitted within the last six months for the following reason(s):
PUBLICITY:

☑️ As required per the Grant Funding Agreement, updated and accurate project information is included at the following website address, with a link to the Alameda CTC website and reference to Measure B and/or VRF fund usage: Attach a print-out of the website page and information. Link to project description: http://www.albanyca.org/index.aspx?page=1285

☑️ As required per the Grant Funding Agreement, an annual article was published in the Project’s Sponsors newsletter, newspaper, or Alameda CTC’s newsletter, highlighting the Project and Measure B and/or VRF fund usage.

Publication Date: February, 2014

Publication Name: City of Albany Newsletter

Attach a print-out of the published article(s). No publication has been issued yet. It will be included in the next reporting period.

☐ An article was included in the previous progress report. Thus, no article was published in this reporting period.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES PROGRESS REPORT:

☐ There were [enter total numbers] trips provided during the reporting period.

☐ There were [enter total numbers] people served during the reporting period.

☐ Project Performance Measures Progress Report is completed and attached.

☐ Project Performance Measures Progress Report is not included / completed because no performance measures are associated with this project.
**Project Performance Measures:** Evaluate the PROJECT using the outcome-based performance measures set forth in Table D-1 (AGREEMENT Attachment D) to demonstrate that the PROJECT is meeting its objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Performance Measure Target (i)</th>
<th>Progress/Activity to date</th>
<th>Progress/Activity this Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. List all performance measures included in application for PROJECT submitted by PROJECT SPONSOR to ALAMEDA CTC.
ALAMEDA CTC
GRANT PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT

PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT No.:  2
REPORTING PERIOD:  From: 1/1/2014  To: 6/30/2014
PROJECT SPONSOR:  City of San Leandro
PROJECT TITLE:  West Juana Pedestrian Improvements
AGREEMENT NO.:  636.7

STATUS:
Design has not yet started.

ACTIONS (in this reporting period):
The City has selected a consultant for design of the project and negotiated a contract. We are working on obtaining a purchase order for the design work.

ANTICIPATED ACTIONS (in next reporting period):
We will complete the design in the next six months.

GENERAL:
☒ At this time we anticipate no problems on the project.
☐ We anticipate problems in the following area(s) but do not feel we need your assistance at this time:
☐ We anticipate problems in the following area(s) and would appreciate any assistance you could offer:

SCHEDULE, SCOPE, AND BUDGET:
☐ The project schedule, scope, task budgets, and performance measures remain unchanged, as shown in Attachments A, B, C, and D of the Grant Funding Agreement or previously approved amendment.
☒ There are proposed changes to the project schedule, scope, task budgets, and/or performance measures. (If checked, proceed to the section below)
☐ A Grant Amendment Request was previously submitted on (enter date) and is awaiting approval.
☐ Revisions to the following area(s) are being proposed and a Grant Amendment Request is attached for review and approval. (Check all that apply)
☐ Project Scope
☐ Task Budgets
☐ Project Schedule
☐ Project Performance Measures

EXPENDITURES
☒ A Request for Reimbursement is included with this Progress Report.
☐ No Request for Reimbursement is included with this Progress Report. (If checked, proceed to section below.)
☐ A Request for Reimbursement was submitted within the last six months on (enter date).
☐ No Request for Reimbursement has been submitted within the last six months for the following reason(s):
PUBLICITY:

☒ As required per the Grant Funding Agreement, updated and accurate project information is included at the following website address, with a link to the Alameda CTC website and reference to Measure B and/or VRF fund usage:


☒ As required per the Grant Funding Agreement, an annual article was published in the Project’s Sponsors newsletter, newspaper, or Alameda CTC’s newsletter, highlighting the Project and Measure B and/or VRF fund usage.

Publication Date: June, 2014
Publication Name: Alameda CTC newsletter


☐ An article was included in the previous progress report. Thus, no article was published in this reporting period.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES PROGRESS REPORT:

☐ There were trips provided during the reporting period.

☐ There were people served during the reporting period.

☒ Project Performance Measures Progress Report is completed and attached.

☒ Project Performance Measures Progress Report is not included / completed because no performance measures are associated with this project.
Project Development Division

The City's Project Development Division provides engineering services in support of various public improvements and provides engineering related services to staff in all City departments. This division implements the City's Capital Improvement Program, which includes contract development, project oversight, and design services for capital projects within San Leandro. This division is also responsible for inspection of public improvement projects during construction.

Capital Improvement Projects
Each year the City allocates funds toward the maintenance of existing City facilities and the design and construction of new projects to enhance the quality of life for San Leandro residents. Examples of capital improvement projects include street improvements, sewer replacements, street tree planting, municipal building enhancements, and Marina area and park improvements. As part of the City's annual budget process, the City Council approves a list of new capital improvement projects. For information about current or proposed City projects, call (510) 577-3433.

Measure B Program
The Measure B Program, first authorized by voters in 1986 and re-approved in 2000, utilizes a half-cent sales tax to fund a variety of transportation improvements throughout Alameda County. For larger projects, proceeds are allocated to specific improvements identified in the Measure B Expenditure Plan, which includes projects from throughout the whole county. In addition to projects in the Expenditure Plan, cities such as San Leandro are allocated funds separately, based on population figures, that are used directly for use in local roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facility improvements. These funds are administered by the Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC).

- **Measure B Funded Local Streets and Roads Program**
  Each year, the City performs a variety of roadway improvements to maintain and upgrade the pavement condition of the City's streets. These improvements range from the application of cape and slurry seals to extend the useful life of structurally sound streets to complete asphalt surface reconstruction on those streets where the paving has deteriorated. The process of selecting streets for improvement is determined by the street's Pavement Condition Index (PCI) based on yearly street inspections and coordination with other City projects. During 2007, funds provided by the Alameda CTC via Measure B, the 1/2 cent sales tax initiative, funded the improvement of 16 street segments.

- **Measure B Funded Bicycle and Pedestrian Program**
  The City strives to ensure safety for bicyclists and pedestrians by publishing informational pamphlets. The City also plans pedestrian and bicycle projects. Measure B funds were used to prepare a Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan for the City. This document will provide the framework for future bicycle and pedestrian improvements throughout the City.

  One of the projects is a pedestrian/bicycle bridge across the San Leandro Slough. This project will complete a critical gap in the San Francisco Bay Trail and will provide access to the bay shoreline. This and other bicycling projects benefit from funding provided by the Alameda CTC.

  For further information on these programs, contact the Engineering and Transportation Department at (510) 577-3428.

For more information on the Measure B program, visit the Alameda CTC website at http://www.sanleandro.org/depts/transit/project/default.asp
This project will install underground conduit for fiber optic communication cable at the locations indicated in red on the map. The new conduit will be used to extend the City's current communication system and will improve redundancy of that system by creating alternate data paths. The conduit system may be used for communication between City buildings, traffic signals, and other City infrastructure as well as for high-speed broadband communications.

The project is in design phase and installation will be completed in 2014. Funding for this project is provided by the Economic Development Administration of the Federal Government.

**Bicycle Network East**

This project will stripe 4.5 miles of Class II Bikeways (bike lanes) and mark 13.2 miles of Class III Bikeways (lanes shared by cars and bicycles) in portion of San Leandro which is east of the Union Pacific Railroad track. The project area includes downtown San Leandro and the San Leandro BART station, top destinations for workers and commuters. This project will complete gaps in the bicycle network in the eastern half of San Leandro to supplement the existing Class II and III Bikeways on Bancroft Avenue, Hesperian Boulevard, Estudillo Avenue, San Leandro Boulevard, and Foothill Boulevard making work commute trips easier and safer for residents and employees.

Construction is planned for Winter 2014-2015. Funding for this project is provided through Measure B Bicycle and Pedestrian Funds.

**West Juana Pedestrian Improvements**

This project will enhance the pedestrian environment on a street that links the City's Downtown with the San Leandro BART station. This project will design and construct sidewalk bulb outs at the intersections of West Juana Street and Carpenter Street, Clarke Street, and Hayes Street as well as stamped asphalt decorative crosswalks at all locations. Additionally, the work includes widening the sidewalk on the north side of West Juana Street between San Leandro Boulevard and Carpenter Street four feet by moving the curb toward the center of the street. The City will select a consultant to perform the design work in Summer 2014.

Construction is expected to be complete by the end of 2015. Funding for this project is provided through Measure B Bicycle and Pedestrian Funds and Regional Measure 2 Traffic Congestion Relief Funds.
The City of San Leandro is using Measure B funds for this project which will repair spalling concrete and seal the deck of a Monarch Bay Drive bridge. The project will extend the life of the structure which forms a portion of the San Francisco Bay Trail and is located south of Marina Park. A construction contract has been awarded and construction is planned for September 2014.

**San Leandro Boulevard Rehabilitation**

The City of San Leandro will use Measure B funds to complete preventive street maintenance on San Leandro Boulevard from Williams to Hudson Streets in San Leandro. Repair will comprise replacing the top 4 inches of asphalt concrete with new paving to extend the service life of the existing street. Construction is anticipated to begin in spring 2015.

**Storm Drain Inventory and Replacement**

The City of San Leandro is using Measure B funds for this project to develop a system to manage the 100 miles of storm water pipelines in the City. Inventory, such as pipeline lengths, diameter, material and condition will be input into an Asset Management System and their locations will be mapped and linked in GIS. The completed system will provide comprehensive management and of the storm system and will allow monitoring and prioritizing of individual sections needing repair or replacement. This project is ongoing.

**Storm Drain Outfall Repair**

The City of San Leandro is using Measure B funds to repair Storm Drain Outfalls at 3 separate locations. At the bay shoreline, a broken pipeline will be replaced in kind. Two existing outfalls at San Leandro Creek have collapsed and their upstream flows will be diverted into nearby functioning outfalls. This project is in design phase currently and construction dates will be set after permits are obtained.

**West Juana Pedestrian Improvements**

The City of San Leandro is using Measure B funds for this project which will design and construct sidewalk bulb outs at the intersections of West Juana Street and Carpenter Street, Clarke Street, and Hayes Street as well as stamped asphalt decorative crosswalks at all locations. Additionally, the work includes widening the sidewalk on the north side of West Juana between San Leandro Boulevard and Carpenter Street four feet by moving the curb toward the center of the street. This project will enhance the pedestrian environment on a street that links San Leandro’s Downtown with a BART station. The City is in the process of selecting a consultant to perform the design work; construction is expected to be complete by the end of 2015.
PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT No.: 2  
REPORTING PERIOD: From: January 1, 2014 To: June 30, 2014  
PROJECT SPONSOR: City of Oakland  
PROJECT TITLE: Fruitvale Alive Gap Closure Streetscape Project - Feasibility Study  
AGREEMENT NO.: A13-0065  

STATUS:  
Start of Feasibility Study  

ACTIONS (in this reporting period):  
Released request for proposal (RFP)  
Selected design consultant team  
Issued notice to proceed (NTP) to consultant  
Held kick-off meeting  
Feasibility Study began  
Topographic Survey Development  

ANTICIPATED ACTIONS (in next reporting period):  
Project Announcement in the Unity Council Fall (September) Newsletter  
Complete a Draft Feasibility Study
GENERAL:

- At this time we anticipate no problems on the project.
- We anticipate problems in the following area(s) but do not feel we need your assistance at this time:
- We anticipate problems in the following area(s) and would appreciate any assistance you could offer:

SCHEDULE, SCOPE, AND BUDGET:

- The project schedule, scope, task budgets, and performance measures remain unchanged, as shown in Attachments A, B, C, and D of the Grant Funding Agreement or previously approved amendment.
- There are proposed changes to the project schedule, scope, task budgets, and/or performance measures. *(If checked, proceed to the section below)*
  - A Grant Amendment Request was previously submitted on *(enter date)* and is awaiting approval.
  - Revisions to the following area(s) are being proposed and a Grant Amendment Request is attached for review and approval. *(Check all that apply)*
    - Project Scope
    - Task Budgets
    - Project Schedule
    - Project Performance Measures

EXPENDITURES

- A Request for Reimbursement is included with this Progress Report.
- No Request for Reimbursement is included with this Progress Report. *(If checked, proceed to section below)*
  - A Request for Reimbursement was submitted within the last six months on *(enter date).*
  - No Request for Reimbursement has been submitted within the last six months for the following reason(s): The Project has not incurred significant City Staff costs yet and the consultant has not yet submitted an invoice.
PUBLICITY:

- As required per the Grant Funding Agreement, updated and accurate project information is included at the following website address, with a link to the Alameda CTC website and reference to Measure B and/or VRF fund usage: Their City's Measure B website (http://www2.oaklandnet.com/Government/o/PWA/o/EC/s/MeasureB/OAK022502) will be updated in the next two weeks with updated and accurate project information.

  Attach a print-out of the website page and information.

- As required per the Grant Funding Agreement, an annual article was published in the Project’s Sponsors newsletter, newspaper, or Alameda CTC’s newsletter, highlighting the Project and Measure B and/or VRF fund usage.

  Publication Date: TBD. Since this project has just begun and there have been no public meetings yet, the Project Announcement has not yet been published. It is scheduled to go out in the fall (September) newsletter.

  Publication Name: Project Announcement in the Unity Council Fall (September) Newsletter.

  Attach a print-out of the published article(s).

- An article was included in the previous progress report. Thus, no article was published in this reporting period.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES PROGRESS REPORT:

- There were [enter total numbers] trips provided during the reporting period.
- There were [enter total numbers] people served during the reporting period.
- Project Performance Measures Progress Report is completed and attached.
- Project Performance Measures Progress Report is not included / completed because no performance measures are associated with this project.
**Performance Measures Progress Report**

*Project Performance Measures:* Evaluate the PROJECT using the outcome-based performance measures set forth in Table D-1 (AGREEMENT Attachment D) to demonstrate that the PROJECT is meeting its objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Performance Measure Target (1)</th>
<th>Progress/Activity to date</th>
<th>Progress/Activity this Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Performance Measures are Associated with this Project</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. List all performance measures included in application for PROJECT submitted by PROJECT SPONSOR to ALAMEDA CTC.
ALAMEDA CTC
GRANT PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT

PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT No.: 2
REPORTING PERIOD: From: January 1, 2014 To: June 30, 2014
PROJECT SPONSOR: City of Piedmont
PROJECT TITLE: Piedmont Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan
AGREEMENT NO.: A13-0066

STATUS:
Presented draft Improvement Options report to Planning Commission, Park and Recreation Commissions and now developing the Implementation Strategy and subsequently the Draft Plan and environmental clearance document.

ACTIONS (in this reporting period):
- Met with Project consultant, Public Works staff, Police Department, City Engineer and other stakeholders as necessary to review feasibility of preliminary improvement options (late January)
- Presented PBMP to the Piedmont Unified School District principals (January 28, 2014)
- Mailed out city-wide notice of February Public Workshop to the public (February 6, 2014)
- Made draft list of Improvement Options available to the public (week of February 10, 2014)
- Opened Improvement Options survey to the public (week of February 17, 2014)
- Held public workshop on draft Improvement Options (week of February 24, 2014)
- Presented Improvement Options report and comments at Planning Commission hearing (March 10, 2014)
- Presented Improvement Options report and comments at joint Park and Recreation hearing (May 7, 2014)

ANTICIPATED ACTIONS (in next reporting period):
- Present the draft Implementation Strategy at joint Park and Recreation meeting (July 2, 2014)
- Present the draft Implementation Strategy at Planning Commission meeting (July 14, 2014)
- Make draft PBMP and environmental clearance document available to the public (August 4,
2014)

- Present draft PBMP and environmental clearance document to Alameda CTC (August 4, 2014)
- Present draft PBMP and environmental clearance document for recommendation to City Council at Planning Commission hearing (August 11, 2014)
- Present draft PBMP to Piedmont Unified School District Board (August 20, 2014)
- If necessary, present draft PBMP and environmental clearance document at Planning Commission again (September 8, 2014)
- Present final PBMP and environmental clearance document for adoption at City Council hearing (October 6, 2014)
GENERAL:
☒ At this time we anticipate no problems on the project.
☐ We anticipate problems in the following area(s) but do not feel we need your assistance at this time:
☐ We anticipate problems in the following area(s) and would appreciate any assistance you could offer:

SCHEDULE, SCOPE, AND BUDGET:
☐ The project schedule, scope, task budgets, and performance measures remain unchanged, as shown in Attachments A, B, C, and D of the Grant Funding Agreement or previously approved amendment.
☒ There are proposed changes to the project schedule, scope, task budgets, and/or performance measures. (If checked, proceed to the section below)
☐ A Grant Amendment Request was previously submitted on May 14, 2014 and is awaiting approval.
☒ Revisions to the following area(s) are being proposed and a Grant Amendment Request is attached for review and approval. (Check all that apply)
☐ Project Scope
☐ Task Budgets
☐ Project Schedule
☐ Project Performance Measures

EXPENDITURES
☒ A Request for Reimbursement is included with this Progress Report.
☐ No Request for Reimbursement is included with this Progress Report. (If checked, proceed to section below.)
☐ A Request for Reimbursement was submitted within the last six months on (enter date).
☐ No Request for Reimbursement has been submitted within the last six months for the following reason(s):
PUBLICITY:
☒ As required per the Grant Funding Agreement, updated and accurate project information is included at the following website address, with a link to the Alameda CTC website and reference to Measure B and/or VRF fund usage: http://www.ci.piedmont.ca.us/walkbike

Attach a print-out of the website page and information.

☒ As required per the Grant Funding Agreement, an annual article was published in the Project’s Sponsors newsletter, newspaper, or Alameda CTC’s newsletter, highlighting the Project and Measure B and/or VRF fund usage.

Publication Date: February 19, 2014
Publication Name: Piedmont Post

Attach a print-out of the published article(s).

☐ An article was included in the previous progress report. Thus, no article was published in this reporting period.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES PROGRESS REPORT:
☐ There were [enter total numbers] trips provided during the reporting period.
☐ There were [enter total numbers] people served during the reporting period.
☐ Project Performance Measures Progress Report is completed and attached.
☒ Project Performance Measures Progress Report is not included / completed because no performance measures are associated with this project.

ATTACHMENTS:

Request for Reimbursement Attachment I
Copy of invoices for reimbursement Exhibit A
City website page and information Attachment II
Published newspaper article Attachment III
Presentations on the Ped/Bike Plan

In July, the Piedmont Recreation and Park Commissions (in a joint meeting on July 2) and the Planning Commission (on July 14) heard presentations on recent progress in the planning process for the City’s Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan (PBMP).

The purpose of the hearings was for City staff and its project consultant to present and receive feedback on the “implementation strategy” for the plan—namely the prioritization, funding and phasing of projects and other improvements that will make up the plan. The implementation strategy is an interim step in the planning process; based on feedback at the hearings, the list of high-priority projects (and other aspects of the strategy) will be refined and presented more broadly to the public as part of the draft Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan, beginning in August.

The prioritization of projects will be based in large part on feedback received from Piedmonters and other stakeholders on ideas presented to the community in recent months. An important opportunity for feedback was through an online survey that ran for four weeks in February and March and received more than 260 responses. For a summary of the survey results, as well as the full list of comments received through the survey, click here.

The slideshow presentation presented at these two meetings can be viewed here.

For more information about the PBMP, contact Kate Black at kblack@ci.piedmont.ca.us or at (510) 420-3063. If you would like to stay up to date on the development of the plan, contact Janet Chang at janetchang@ci.piedmont.ca.us or at (510) 420-3094 to be added to the email list for the project.

Get involved—these are your streets and sidewalks. Your voice is important!

The PBMP is being funded entirely through a grant from the Alameda County Transportation Commission (CTC; www.alamedactc.org) and through the City’s existing funds for pedestrian and bicycle improvements (pass-through Measure B funds), also distributed by the Alameda CTC.
Bike/walk improvements to be picked Feb. 24
City will release list of potential projects today

By Pauley Sorellis

On February 19 the city’s Planning Department will release specific ideas for pedestrian and bicycle projects. They will be part of the city’s first Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan (PBMP).

Next Monday, February 24 a workshop will be held at 7 p.m. in the Community Hall, 711 Highland Avenue, to allow residents to help decide which of these projects think are most urgently needed. Community input will help inform the City Council about how to prioritize projects with a finite amount of funding.

What is the PBMP?
Why does it matter?
"The purpose of the plan is to make walking and biking in Piedmont safer and easier," explained City Planner Kate Black. Piedmont is the only city in Alameda County not to currently have a plan, or series of written policies, outlining how to make its streets more accessible for people who are on foot or riding bikes.

A key element of the Plan will be addressing ways in which Piedmont can connect to existing bike and pedestrian pathways in Oakland to make it easier for people to travel throughout the region.

Black and her staff secured a grant of more than $100,000 from the Alameda County Transportation Commission (CTC; www.alamedactc.org) to pay for the creation of a plan. Using that money, and the City’s existing funds for pedestrian and bicycle improvements (pass-through Measure B funds), also distributed by the Alameda CTC, the City was able to retain the services of Nina Letunic of EisenLetunic to help develop the bike-pedestrian plan since last August. The City has been holding several public meetings as well as a brainstorming workshop and an online survey which received more than 450 responses - all eliciting ideas for bike and pedestrian improvements.

What improvements are being considered?
The ideas for changes include: better crosswalks, paths, stairs; more and better designation for bike lanes; bike racks at key destinations; more aggressive enforcement of traffic laws; and activities to promote traffic safety and to encourage walking and biking, especially among school kids.

The city’s four principal arterials, Grand, Highland, Moraga and Oakland avenues, have each been identified as being in special need of traffic calming. For Grand and Highland, residents have suggested “road diets” (removing one lane in each direction to slow down traffic, making room for bike lanes and a center turn lane).

Streets leading to schools - Linda, Magnolia and Wildwood avenues - or to the Civic Center, parks and other key destinations, such as Blair, La Salle and Vista avenues, Hampton Road and St. James Drive - have also been identified as needing improvement.

"All of these ideas have come from the community," said Black. Though Piedmonters are known for their higher-than-average participation in civic issues, Black was still impressed by the number of residents who have shared their thoughts about a bike-pedestrian plan.

"There were certain ideas that we heard over and over again," said Black. "We took those very popular ideas and made them into a list of suggested improvements."

Black estimates that over the next decade, barring major

A Roast & A Toast

It all started in a garage

Piedmont resident Ray Sherman offered the use of his garage as an office when the Piedmont Post was founded in late 1998.

Editor: I have fond memories of the Post’s beginnings. You and your staff were incredibly patient with the circumstances of your working space. Having you there was an honor. It hadn’t occurred to me until now, but those Silicon Valley types can brag all they want about startups in garages, but they’ve got nothing on the Post. (By the way, when will that book be written?)

You are doing more with putting along these many years later. The Post is a fantastic accomplishment, thanks to your hard work and the work of your many writers, reviewers, cartoonists and others. It just keeps getting better.

I doubt you need reminding, but you have done a singularly wonderful thing for this community.

-Ray Sherman

Piedmont Boy Scout Council will honor
Gray Cathrall
with a Distinguished Citizen Award
Saturday, March 22, 6:30 p.m.
Turf Club, Golden Gate Fields, Berkeley
To receive an invitation, call 220-0743 or e-mail theweberfamily@aol.com.
City wins $40,000 in landslide settlement
Total cost to city was $57,000 in direct expenses and staff time

By Patricle Streifels

The City of Piedmont has settled its legal action against the property owners of 3 Maxwellton Road for $40,000 to cover the cost of cleaning up a mudslide that blocked Moraga Avenue for 36 hours in April 2012. The settlement is in addition to the $5,000 paid by the homeowners at the time of the slide.

A total of 45 households lost power when power poles were knocked over. As any of those residents will remember, the slide occurred at approximately 7:15 a.m. on April 13, 2012. More than 250 cubic yards of dirt and vegetation from the slope was cleared.

turnout

Continued from page 1

more than 250 cubic yards of debris had to be cleared from Moraga Avenue and transported to Blake Park as a result.

By Patricle Streifels

The City of Piedmont has settled its legal action against the property owners of 3 Maxwellton Road for $40,000 to cover the cost of cleaning up a mudslide that blocked Moraga Avenue for 36 hours in April 2012. The settlement is in addition to the $5,000 paid by the homeowners at the time of the slide.

A total of 45 households lost power when power poles were knocked over. As any of those residents will remember, the slide occurred at approximately 7:15 a.m. on April 13, 2012. More than 250 cubic yards of dirt and vegetation from the slope was cleared.

Barnes

Continued from page 28

Wages (red) jump as employment (blue) declines. When wages get too hot, the Fed tightens hard and we have a recession, wage growth falling. In this chart, wages are shown as “rate of change,” which is improving now, but barely over inflation and not nearly as fast as unemployment is dropping.

Many people doubt the inflation rate is so low. Conspiracy theories abound, allaging cooked books. Do not believe a word of that. This week, Bloomberg ran this spectacular chart showing how pervasive deflation has become. We do not have low inflation because some prices are rising, and lots of others by falling. Prices are flat for nearly everything, in largest part because incomes are too flat to compete by buying anything.

Los Barnes is a mortgage broker based in Oakland. He can be reached at barnes@calguns.net.
ALAMEDA CTC
GRANT PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT

PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT No.:  2
REPORTING PERIOD:           From:  1/1/14         To:  6/30/14
PROJECT SPONSOR:            Cycles of Change
PROJECT TITLE:              Bike-Go-Round/ Neighborhood Bicycle Centers
AGREEMENT NO.:              A13-0067

STATUS:
Active 3/25/14

ACTIONS (in this reporting period):
Hosted four education/distribution classes, with a total of 52 participants. Provided additional services and training to approximately 120 residents per month, for a total of 355.

ANTICIPATED ACTIONS (in next reporting period):
Provide education/distribution program for 75 local residents for whom bicycles will be provided as a means of transportation. Publish one or more articles about the program. Provide service to an additional 750 low-income bike commuters.
GENERAL:
☑ At this time we anticipate no problems on the project.
☐ We anticipate problems in the following area(s) but do not feel we need your assistance at this time:
☐ We anticipate problems in the following area(s) and would appreciate any assistance you could offer:

SCHEDULE, SCOPE, AND BUDGET:
☑ The project schedule, scope, task budgets, and performance measures remain unchanged, as shown in Attachments A, B, C, and D of the Grant Funding Agreement or previously approved amendment.
☐ There are proposed changes to the project schedule, scope, task budgets, and/or performance measures. (If checked, proceed to the section below)
  ☐ A Grant Amendment Request was previously submitted on (enter date) and is awaiting approval.
  ☐ Revisions to the following area(s) are being proposed and a Grant Amendment Request is attached for review and approval. (Check all that apply)
    ☐ Project Scope
    ☐ Task Budgets
    ☐ Project Schedule
    ☐ Project Performance Measures

EXPENDITURES
☐ A Request for Reimbursement is included with this Progress Report.
☑ No Request for Reimbursement is included with this Progress Report. (If checked, proceed to section below)
  ☑ A Request for Reimbursement was submitted within the last six months on May, June, July 2014.
  ☐ No Request for Reimbursement has been submitted within the last six months for the following reason(s): New contract
**PERFORMANCE MEASURES PROGRESS REPORT:**

- [ ] There were [enter total numbers] trips provided during the reporting period.
- □ There were 407 people served during the reporting period.
- ☑ Project Performance Measures Progress Report is completed and attached.
- [ ] Project Performance Measures Progress Report is not included / completed because no performance measures are associated with this project.

**PUBLICITY:**

☑ As required per the Grant Funding Agreement, updated and accurate project information is included at the following website address, with a link to the Alameda CTC website and reference to Measure B and/or VRF fund usage: [http://www.cyclesofchange.org/programs/bike-go-round/](http://www.cyclesofchange.org/programs/bike-go-round/)

> Attach a print-out of the website page and information.

☑ As required per the Grant Funding Agreement, an annual article was published in the Project’s Sponsors newsletter, newspaper, or Alameda CTC’s newsletter, highlighting the Project and Measure B and/or VRF fund usage.

Publication Date:  (enter publication date)

Publication Name:  (enter name of newsletter, newspaper, publication, etc.).

> Attach a print-out of the published article(s).

☐ An article was included in the previous progress report. Thus, no article was published in this reporting period.

* As this is the first active period of the project, we will publish our first annual article next period.*
Performance Measures Progress Report

**Project Performance Measures:** Evaluate the PROJECT using the outcome-based performance measures set forth in Table D-1 (AGREEMENT Attachment D) to demonstrate that the PROJECT is meeting its objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Performance Measure Target (1)</th>
<th>Progress/Activity to date</th>
<th>Progress/Activity this Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. List all performance measures included in application for PROJECT submitted by PROJECT SPONSOR to ALAMEDA CTC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Appointed By</th>
<th>Term Began</th>
<th>Re-apptmt</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
<th>Mtgs Missed Since Jul '14*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Tabata, Chair</td>
<td>Midori</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-4</td>
<td>Jul-06</td>
<td>Sep-13</td>
<td>Sep-15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Zimmerman,</td>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-5</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Bucci</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>Alameda County Supervisor Richard Valle, District 2</td>
<td>Sep-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sep-14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Fishbaugh</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>Alameda County Supervisor Scott Haggerty, District 1</td>
<td>Jan-14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Gigli</td>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>Alameda County Supervisor Wilma Chan, District 3</td>
<td>Jan-07</td>
<td>Oct-12</td>
<td>Oct-14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Johansen</td>
<td>Jeremy</td>
<td>San Leandro</td>
<td>Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-3</td>
<td>Sep-10</td>
<td>Sep-13</td>
<td>Sep-15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Jordan</td>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>Alameda County Supervisor Keith Carson, District 5</td>
<td>Oct-08</td>
<td>Sep-12</td>
<td>Sep-14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Schweng</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-2</td>
<td>Jun-13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jun-15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Shaw</td>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>Transit Agency (Alameda CTC)</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Turner</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Castro Valley</td>
<td>Alameda County Supervisor Nate Miley, District 4</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Name</td>
<td>Sponsor/Agency/Organization</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Estimated Number of Attendees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 01, 2014</td>
<td>City Center Fall Music Series</td>
<td>East Bay EDA</td>
<td>Oakland, City Center</td>
<td>12 - 1pm</td>
<td>Vailes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, October 02, 2014</td>
<td>East Bay EDA Executive committee Meeting</td>
<td>Korea Town Oakland, Inc</td>
<td>Zero Net Energy Center</td>
<td>11:30am - 2pm</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, October 03, 2014</td>
<td>KONO - First Fridays</td>
<td>Supervisor Richard Valle and Hayward Recreation &amp; Park District</td>
<td>Telegraph Ave between 27th Street and Wall St, Oakland, CA</td>
<td>5 - 9:30pm</td>
<td>Vailes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, October 04, 2014</td>
<td>Science in the Park - BikeMobile</td>
<td>Supervisor Richard Valle and Hayward Recreation &amp; Park District</td>
<td>Alameda E.O. Science Park</td>
<td>9am - 4pm</td>
<td>5,000+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, October 04, 2014</td>
<td>City Center Fall Music Series</td>
<td>East Bay EDA</td>
<td>City Center Fall Music Series</td>
<td>12 - 1pm</td>
<td>Vailes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, October 04, 2014</td>
<td>Oaktoberfest/BikeMobile</td>
<td>Dimond District Association</td>
<td>Dimond District, Oakland, CA</td>
<td>10 - 2pm</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, October 04, 2014</td>
<td>Oaktoberfest/BikeMobile</td>
<td>Dimond District Association</td>
<td>Dimond District, Oakland, CA</td>
<td>11am - 6pm</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, October 04, 2014</td>
<td>Senior Info Fair</td>
<td>Senior Info Fair</td>
<td>Dublin Senior Center</td>
<td>9am - 12pm</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, October 04, 2014</td>
<td>Meet the Primers</td>
<td>Business Outreach Committee</td>
<td>St. Rose Hospital</td>
<td>8:30am - 1pm</td>
<td>830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, October 07, 2014</td>
<td>Business Expo - 29th Annual Hayward Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Hayward Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>27201 Alameda Ave, Hayward, CA</td>
<td>4:30 - 7:30pm</td>
<td>Vailes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, October 07, 2014</td>
<td>Senior Resource Fair: Healthy Lifestyle and Fin.</td>
<td>Hayward Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>27201 Alameda Ave, Hayward, CA</td>
<td>4:30 - 7:30pm</td>
<td>Vailes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, October 07, 2014</td>
<td>City Center Fall Music Series</td>
<td>City Center Fall Music Series</td>
<td>City Center Fall Music Series</td>
<td>12 - 1pm</td>
<td>Vailes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, October 07, 2014</td>
<td>Livable Berkeley</td>
<td>Livable Berkeley</td>
<td>City Center Fall Music Series</td>
<td>11 - 5 pm</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 08, 2014</td>
<td>Sunday Streets in Berkeley</td>
<td>Livable Berkeley</td>
<td>Downtown Berkeley</td>
<td>7:30 - 9:30pm</td>
<td>Vailes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday, October 12, 2014</td>
<td>Sunday Streets in Berkeley</td>
<td>Livable Berkeley</td>
<td>Downtown Berkeley</td>
<td>7:30 - 9:30pm</td>
<td>Vailes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 14, 2014</td>
<td>Lakeshores Homes Association Meeting</td>
<td>Lakeshores Homes Association</td>
<td>City Center Fall Music Series</td>
<td>12 - 1pm</td>
<td>Vailes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 15, 2014</td>
<td>APBP Webinar: Design Treatments to Transition from Trails to Roadways</td>
<td>Alameda CTC</td>
<td>Alameda CTC</td>
<td>12 - 1pm</td>
<td>Vailes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 12, 2014</td>
<td>Lakeshores Homes Association Meeting</td>
<td>Lakeshores Homes Association</td>
<td>Alameda CTC</td>
<td>12 - 1pm</td>
<td>Vailes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Name</td>
<td>Sponsor Agency/Organization</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Estimated Number of Attendees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, October 16, 2014</td>
<td>Society of Marketing Professional Services (SMPS) Panel Discussion</td>
<td>Society of Marketing Professional Services (SMPS)</td>
<td>AIA 130 Sutter Street San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>8:30 - 10am</td>
<td>50-80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, October 17, 2014</td>
<td>Mobility Workshop</td>
<td>Alameda CTC</td>
<td>Location TBD</td>
<td>9:30 - 3:30pm</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday, October 19, 2014</td>
<td>Montclair Farmer's Market</td>
<td>Urban Village</td>
<td>La Salle Avenue at Monera Avenue</td>
<td>9am - 1pm</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday, October 19, 2014</td>
<td>Wheels for Meals Ride</td>
<td>Alameda County Meals on Wheels</td>
<td>Shadow Cliffs Regional Park (Lakeside Picnic Area) 2500 Stanley Boulevard Pleasanton, CA</td>
<td>10:30am - 4pm</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 22, 2014</td>
<td>City Center Fall Music Series</td>
<td>City Center</td>
<td>Oakland, City Center</td>
<td>12 - 1pm</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 22, 2014</td>
<td>Live more Rotary Club 2014 Plan Presentation by Supervisor Scott Haggerty</td>
<td>Livermore Rotary Club</td>
<td>Double Tree by Hilton 720 Las Flores Road Livermore, CA</td>
<td>12:10pm</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, October 23, 2014</td>
<td>Berkeley Farmers' Market - North Berkeley</td>
<td>Pacific Coast Farmers' Market Association</td>
<td>Shattuck @ Rose</td>
<td>3 - 7pm</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday, October 26, 2014</td>
<td>Temescal Farmer's Market</td>
<td>Urban Village</td>
<td>5300 Claremont</td>
<td>9am - 1pm</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday, October 26, 2014</td>
<td>Halloween Community Carnival</td>
<td>Unity Council</td>
<td>Holly Community Center 31,600 Alameda Blvd Union City, CA 94587</td>
<td>1 - 4pm</td>
<td>400-600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, October 28, 2014</td>
<td>Berkeley Farmers' Market - South Berkeley</td>
<td>Ecology Center</td>
<td>Adeline Street and 63rd Street</td>
<td>2 - 6:30pm</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday, November 02, 2014</td>
<td>Dia de los Muertos/ BikeMobile</td>
<td>Unity Council</td>
<td>Fruitvale Village and BART parking lots 12th St. between 33rd and 37th Streets Oakland, CA</td>
<td>10am - 5pm</td>
<td>60,000+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, November 19, 2014</td>
<td>APBP Webinar: E-bikes, Electric Assist Bikes and Transportation Policy</td>
<td>Alameda CTC/APBP</td>
<td>Alameda CTC 1111 Broadway, Suite 800 Oakland, CA 94607</td>
<td>9:30 - 10am</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, December 17, 2014</td>
<td>APBP Webinar: Getting to Better Outcomes from Public Engagement</td>
<td>Alameda CTC/APBP</td>
<td>Alameda CTC 1111 Broadway, Suite 800 Oakland, CA 94607</td>
<td>9:30 - 10am</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Alameda CTC Funding Process</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Project Type (Capitol Programs)</td>
<td>Funding Sources ($M)</td>
<td>2000 DAM</td>
<td>VRF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BIKP 2000</td>
<td>Sacramento River Delta Access Committee</td>
<td>The project will construct a coordinated north-south connection between I-880 and Route 356 on the Island and a continuation of new roadways and improvements to existing roadways and improvements to intersections along Rosan Road, Fremont Boulevard, Para Marin Parkway, Aravada Hills Road and Route 236 on the Island.</td>
<td>Alameda C.C.</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$86, 711</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$225, 900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2000 TIP</td>
<td>1st/3rd/5th Street Bridge Improvement Project</td>
<td>The project involves constructing improvements in the area of East 14th Street, Estuary Boulevard, and 153rd Avenue. The improvements include a second left turn lane for northbound East 14th Street at 153rd Ave and a second left turn lane for southbound Estuary Boulevard at East 14th Street. The road will be widened the median replaced, and the crossings reconfigured to accommodate this change. Traffic signals and pedestrian crosswalks at all three intersections will be upgraded to comply with current Americans with Disabilities Act regulations.</td>
<td>City of San Leandro</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$19, 000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$60, 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2000 TIP</td>
<td>East 14th Street/Bayshore Boulevard Interchange Improvement</td>
<td>The project involves constructing improvements in the area of East 14th Street, Estuary Boulevard, and 153rd Avenue. The improvements include a second left turn lane for northbound East 14th Street at 153rd Ave and a second left turn lane for southbound Estuary Boulevard at East 14th Street. The road will be widened the median replaced, and the crossings reconfigured to accommodate this change. Traffic signals and pedestrian crosswalks at all three intersections will be upgraded to comply with current Americans with Disabilities Act regulations.</td>
<td>City of Dublin</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$46, 500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$58, 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2000 TIP</td>
<td>Route 93/14th Street, Whitefield Lane and related Routes</td>
<td>The project involves improving access to and from Route 93 in the area of the existing Route 93/14th Street interchange. The improvements include constructing a future extension of Route 93/14th Street from San Leandro Avenue to Commercial Street and connecting it to the existing Route 93/14th Street interchange.</td>
<td>City of Hayward</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$27, 450</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$27, 750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2000 TIP</td>
<td>Route 93 Improvement - South Shore</td>
<td>The project involves widening I-880 from Freeway Grade to 3.5-lane highway, including 632-foot grade separation of 2-lane freeway.</td>
<td>City of Concord</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$39, 750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$58, 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2000 TIP</td>
<td>San Leandro - Fremont Corridor Corridor Improvements/Study Only</td>
<td>The project involves constructing a connector with 2-lane freeway connections to the Bayshore Corridor connecting southern Alameda County and the Peninsula and other improvements to support transit-oriented development and pedestrian development areas, and to improve local streets and facilitate pedestrian infrastructure within the cities of Fremont, Newark and Union City.</td>
<td>City of San Leandro</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$22, 400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$22, 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2000 TIP</td>
<td>South Corridor Light Rail Line Improvements Only</td>
<td>The project involves studies to evaluate improvements on the 1-480 corridor (including highway, rail, transit or other related highway improvements and right-of-way (ROW) preservation for future rail corridor.</td>
<td>Alameda C.C. and 880/C</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$6, 750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$23, 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2000 TIP</td>
<td>I-580 Corridor Study - Imp, Highway, Corridor and Development</td>
<td>The project involves studies to evaluate improvements on the I-580 corridor (including highway, rail, transit or other related highway improvements, traffic management studies, and related city management actions.</td>
<td>Alameda C.C. and 880/C</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$11, 200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$21, 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2000 TIP</td>
<td>Alameda RR From Corridor Studies</td>
<td>The project involves studies in three corridors associated with an improved connection between 880 and 880 in southern Alameda County: Potential improvements include road realignations, intersection capacity improvements and traffic management.</td>
<td>Alameda C.C.</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$6, 100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$12, 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Alameda CTC Funding Process</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>Regional Significance of Interjurisdictional Nature</td>
<td>Local Review Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>2000 ATP</td>
<td>Emeryville-Oakland Interchange Improvement</td>
<td>For the project includes development work to identify improvements between 880, 19th Street, and West Oakland streets, including access to and from the Bay/West Oakland tubes which connect Oakland and the City of Alameda. The improvements are intended to enhance or replace access to and from the freeway in the area of the existing Broadway and Alber Street interchanges.</td>
<td>Emeryville/Oakland</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$6,130</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>$6,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>2013 Coordinated Call</td>
<td>880/Broadway to Jackson Pedestrian Projects</td>
<td>Project proposes to connect the 880/Bay Trail in central Emeryville with the implementation of a segment from 880/Bay Trail to 880/Broadway to Jackson Street and connects to the 880/Bay Trail in Southern Emeryville.</td>
<td>City of Emeryville</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>2013 Coordinated Call</td>
<td>880/Bay Trail - Project for Both Caltrans &amp; Emeryville</td>
<td>Construction of 4,300 feet of new separated bike trail between 880/Bay Trail and Broadway at Alber Street Park between the Obis of the Broadway and Alber</td>
<td>BPRD</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>$4,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>2013 Coordinated Call</td>
<td>Emeryville Bike &amp; Pedestrian Trail</td>
<td>Project enhances a designated shared use path along 880/Bay Trail in Emeryville.</td>
<td>City of Emeryville</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$850</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>$850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>2013 Coordinated Call</td>
<td>Broadway/Bay Trail (Phase 1)</td>
<td>This project includes the construction of a bike/pedestrian path between 880/Bay Trail and Broadway, and the construction of a bike/pedestrian path along the Broadway. This project will connect to the existing Bay Trail at 880/Bay Trail</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$966</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>$1,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>2013 Coordinated Call</td>
<td>Broadway/Bay Trail (Phase 2)</td>
<td>This project will enhance crosswalks with sidewalk bulbouts and other features between the Bayshore Campus and down Alber Street.</td>
<td>City of Alameda</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$866</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>$866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>2013 Coordinated Call</td>
<td>Oakland Gap Closure (Alameda Projects)</td>
<td>Complete the design and develop construction documents for a project to provide new bike/pedestrian improvements, thus closing the existing gap along 880/Bay Trail between the 880/Bay Trail and Alber Street.</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$133</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>$133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>2013 Coordinated Call</td>
<td>Berkeley BART Station Improvement</td>
<td>The project involves realigning existing bike/pedestrian facilities, education and distribution programs which include support 1,500 new residents living around the station, and supports bus service on local roads.</td>
<td>Cities of Berkeley</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>$623</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8</td>
<td>SC-TAP</td>
<td>Karis St and Adams St Bicycle Facility Study</td>
<td>Evaluate the type of bike facility, including contra-flow bike lanes, suitable for implementation at the intersections and Adams shoots in Alameda. These streets serve as a parallel facility to San Pablo Ave.</td>
<td>City of Alameda</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>$12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Alameda/CTC Funding Process</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Project Type (Capitol/Program)</td>
<td>Local Sponsor / Agency</td>
<td>Project Status</td>
<td>Local Review Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>X-1-TAP</td>
<td>Horton Bikeway and Complete Streets Project</td>
<td>Project will construct streets throughout 2000 Albany Street and 3rd Street and median traffic calming and speed reduction of motor vehicles to increase safety and pedestrian safety. Project will convert Horton Street adjacent to the transit station covering the area from Powell Street to 4th Street. The project of Horton Street is designated as both a local priority and a Transit Priority Street. There are commercial and residential uses in the area that have more walking and parking needs that are currently not being met legally with the existing street configuration.</td>
<td>City of Emeryville</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$116,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>X-1-TAP</td>
<td>Safety Study for Pedestrian and Bicycle Bridges</td>
<td>The project is to conduct a safety study for pedestrian and bicycle bridges in the city of Emeryville. The existing bridges have a history of failure or damage. The project will include a comprehensive review of the existing bridges, including their design and construction, and will provide recommendations for improvements.</td>
<td>City of Emeryville</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>No - next locations on local routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>X-1-TAP</td>
<td>Alameda Avenue Complete Streets</td>
<td>The project will include the development of a concept plan for the Alameda Avenue Complete Streets project. The plan will focus on improving the safety and accessibility of the street for pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers.</td>
<td>City of Alameda</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>No - next locations on local routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>X-1-TAP</td>
<td>Bikeway Network 2.0</td>
<td>The project will include the development of a bikeway network that connects the existing bikeway corridors in Emeryville with additional corridors in the City of Alameda and beyond. The project will also include the development of a bikeway network that connects the existing bikeway corridors in Emeryville with additional corridors in the City of Alameda and beyond.</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>No - next locations on local routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>X-1-TAP</td>
<td>Fruitvale Connectivity to BART Feasibility Study</td>
<td>The project will examine the feasibility of connecting Fruitvale Avenue to the BART station. The project will include the development of a concept plan for the connection, including the design of the connection and the construction of the necessary infrastructure.</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>No - next locations on local routes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>