

Goods Movement Collaborative and Plan Development Technical Team Meeting Agenda

Thursday, September 10, 2015 11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

Alameda County Transportation Commission
1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

Staff Liaisons: Tess Lengyel, Alameda CTC; Matt Maloney, MTC;

Technical Team Members: Alameda CTC Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee

Consultant: Michael Fischer, Cambridge Systematics

Public Meeting Coordinator: Angie Ayers

- | | Page | A/I |
|---|------|-----|
| 1. Welcome and Introductions | | A/I |
| 2. March 5, 2015 Meeting Minutes
Recommendation: Approve the March 5, 2015 meeting minutes. | 1 | A |
| 3. Work Update (Verbal)
Staff/consultants will present a project recap and an updated project schedule, and discuss deliverables completed and in progress. | | I |
| 4. Countywide Goods Movement Plan Draft Strategy Evaluation

Staff/consultants will provide an overview of the findings from the Strategy Evaluation (Task 4b) technical memorandum. | 5 | I |
| 5. Next Steps/Next Meeting | | |
| 6. Adjournment | | |

This page intentionally left blank

Goods Movement Collaborative and Plan
Technical Team Meeting Minutes
Thursday, March 5, 2015, 11:30 a.m.

2.0

1. Welcome and Introductions

Tess Lengyel called the meeting to order at 11:30 a.m. The meeting began with introductions. Tess provided a brief overview of meeting outcomes. She requested the committee provide feedback on the Countywide Goods Movement Plan Needs Assessment and began the discussion on strategies for evaluation.

2. February 4, 2015 Meeting Minutes

Obaid Khan moved to approve the February 4, 2015 meeting minutes. Brian Beveridge seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Work Update

Michael Fischer of Cambridge Systematics reviewed the project schedule with the committee and provided a recap of the items done to date.

4. Countywide Goods Movement Plan Needs Assessment and Strategies

4.1. Overview of Key Themes in Needs Assessment and Strategies

Michael Fischer reviewed the summary of comments received on the needs assessment and the strategy list. He also informed the group that a fourth Goods Movement Roundtable Workshop will be scheduled to receive a broader spectrum of comments.

Questions/feedback from the committee:

- A request was made to clarify the use of the word strategies. Michael said a strategy is a project, program or policy.
- Will projects compete with programs or policies, and how will the team separate them? Michael stated that the goal is to evaluate projects, programs or policies with the same performance measures. To quantitatively evaluate the impact of a program is different than a project and it will not always be easy to use the same methodology. Essentially we may need to summarize the quantitative and qualitative information in order to compare.
- How were the strategies developed? Michael described the process used, which involved a combination of using projects identified in existing plans such as the Countywide Transportation Plan, Regional Transportation Plan, State Rail Plan, and other prior studies; creating "quasi-projects" if the needs assessment indicated a system gap where no project had previously been identified in a plan, incorporating suggestions of projects from stakeholder outreach, and creating programs if a general need was identified but specific locations are not known.
- Did the team request new projects from agencies? Tess stated that existing planning documents were used for this effort, but that a call for projects will happen as part of the Countywide Transportation Plan.
- Are the projects identified from the case studies included in the project list? Michael said that in an earlier list, specific projects from the case studies were included. A decision was made to create a program to fund those types of projects and use the project example from the case studies, because the case studies only cover select locations.

4.2. Revised List of Proposed Strategies (Projects, Programs, and Policies)

Tess Lengyel noted that this this item is a discussion of the list of strategies for evaluation in order to move to the next phase of the Plan and to pass the information on to ACTA.

Questions/feedback from the committee:

- Indices 69 and 70 – References improving the capacity of heavy truck traffic along particular roadways and adding bicycle facilities – is this okay for safety?
- Who has the authority to carry out the Plans? Tess noted that land use authority remains a local issue.
- Index 90 – Should we request the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to also consider implementing Integrated Corridor Mobility (ICM) on I-580? Michael suggested that Index 17 which covers all major goods movement freeway corridors could be expanded to cover ICM's.
- Index 111 – was noted as a good addition, but the functional element column is not filled in.
- Index 106 – it was noted that this project could help truck circulation in the Tri-Valley but that freeway ramps are also a constraint.
- Index 15 – Modify countywide truck route coordination planning/guidance to address health and community impacts in addition to connectivity.
- Are there strategies that relate to zero emission vehicles? Michael referenced index 26.
- A suggestion was made to include a strategy that focuses specifically on guidance for siting projects that have the potential for adding to emissions in the community. The request stated that this suggestion should go into a policy and include it into the evaluation criteria. Tess suggested that Indices 20 and 105 addresses this request. Michael noted that transportation projects go through CEQA which would further identify issues related to increased emissions form a project.
- Indices 76 and 77 – A request was made to remove Index 77 and move forward with Index 76. Index 77, as currently written, has potentially insurmountable right-of-way impacts. Michael noted that 76 and 77 cover different sections of the Martinez Subdivision, but that 77 could be modified to not assume a particular alignment/alternative to be “add capacity on Martinez Subdivision between Port of Oakland and 65th Street to separate passenger and freight trains.”
- Indices 21 and 34 – Ensure rail and road impacts are considered similarly; ensure that strategies address community impacts for both current conditions and future increases in freight activity.
- Index 91 – A comment was made that index 91 encapsulates several different issues like land use, truck routing, affordable housing, and municipalities following guidelines from other agencies. Consider unintended consequences resulting from project implementation; consider large land-use planning efforts.
- Index 104 – Modify the local road truck safety program to clarify that county roads are eligible.
- Index 27 – Identify specific projects that can be implemented in the near term as part of the truck parking program.
- Add the Clawiter/Whitesell/SR-92 Interchange project.
- Was there mapping of local road truck routes? Will cumulative impacts of multiple strategies be considered? Michael noted that mapping of local truck routes was

conducted as part of the needs assessment, and that the strategy evaluation will consider how projects perform both individually and as packages on relevant performance measures.

- Add a strategy to deal with truck queuing that spills back from I-880 interchanges in the vicinity of the Port's Adeline St entrance; particular issue exist at 5th Street onramp and 3rd St/Market St intersection.
- Are other grade crossings precluded if not specifically identified? Will this study identify needs for specific additional grade crossing rail improvement locations? Index 21 could include railroad grade crossing locations that are not yet specifically identified, but they will not be identified as part of the Countywide Goods Movement Plan.
- Add the Ashby Avenue Interchange Improvements project.

Obaid Khan moved to approve the Countywide Goods Movement Plan proposed strategies for evaluation with amendments. Abhishek Parikh seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Next Steps/Next Meeting

The recommendations from the Plan TAC meeting will be presented to the full ACTAC to approve evaluation of the list of strategies today (March 5, 2015). A fourth Goods Movement Roundtable is schedule for July 22, 2015.

6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

This page intentionally left blank



Memorandum

4.0

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

DATE: September 4, 2015

SUBJECT: Countywide Goods Movement Plan Draft Strategy Evaluation

RECOMMENDATION: Review the Countywide Goods Movement Plan Draft Strategy Evaluation

Summary

Goods movement is critical to a strong economy and a high quality of life in Alameda County. Alameda CTC is developing a Countywide Goods Movement Plan that will outline a long-range strategy for how to move goods efficiently, reliably, and sustainably within, to, from and through Alameda County by roads, rail, air and water. The Goods Movement Technical Team and Alameda County Transportation Commission previously reviewed and approved a set of performance measures (which align with the Plan's adopted goals) and a list of strategies (which include capital projects, programs, and policies) to be evaluated. The Strategy Evaluation task consists of an assessment of the performance of all strategies using the Plan's adopted performance measures.

Attachment A presents the Countywide Goods Movement Plan Draft Strategy Evaluation technical memorandum. The memorandum is organized based on type of strategy (e.g. global gateways, rail, freeway interchanges, etc.). Each strategy is assessed using all relevant performance measures for that strategy type and a mix of quantitative and qualitative methods are used.

In addition to the evaluation of individual strategies, the Draft Strategy Evaluation memorandum introduces the concept of "opportunity packages" which are groupings of interrelated high-performing projects. Opportunity packages serve to ensure that synergistic strategies are considered together (e.g. expansion in Port rail terminal capacity and improvements in rail access routes) and that strategies that address different goals are considered together (e.g. increased warehousing activity at the Port and zero emission truck demonstration projects).

The Draft Strategy Evaluation is being presented to the Goods Movement Technical Team for review in September 2015 and **comments must be sent to Matthew Bomberg by September 25, 2015.**

In October, a summary of comments received and revisions to the Strategy Evaluation technical memorandum will be presented to the Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee. The Draft Countywide Goods Movement Plan is anticipated to be released in winter 2015.

Fiscal Impact:

There is no fiscal impact.

Attachments:

- A. [Alameda County Goods Movement Plan Draft Strategy Evaluation Technical Memorandum](#)

Staff Contact

[Tess Lengyel](#), Deputy Director of Planning and Policy

[Matthew Bomberg](#), Assistant Transportation Planner