

# Goods Movement Collaborative and Plan Development

## Technical Team Meeting Agenda

Thursday, January 8, 2015, 11:30 to 1:00 p.m.  
Alameda County Transportation Commission  
1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

---

**Staff Liaisons:** Tess Lengyel, Alameda CTC; Carolyn Clevenger, MTC;

**Technical Team Members:** Alameda CTC Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee

**Consultant:** Michael Fischer, Cambridge Systematics

**Public Meeting Coordinator:** Angie Ayers

- |  | Page | A/I |
|--|------|-----|
| <b>1. Welcome and Introductions</b>  |      | A/I |
| <b>2. July 10, 2014 Meeting Minutes</b>  | 1    | A   |
| Recommendation: Approve the July 10, 2014 meeting minutes.   |      |     |
| <b>3. Work Update</b>  |      | I   |
| Staff/consultants will present a project recap and an updated project schedule, and discuss deliverables completed and in progress.  |      |     |
| <b>4. <a href="#">Discussion of Countywide Goods Movement Needs Assessment (Task 3c)</a></b>   |      | A   |
| Staff/consultants will lead an interactive presentation and discussion of the draft Needs Assessment report. The presentation will provide an overview of the report and will summarize findings. Committee members will discuss any specific questions they have about elements of the report and the data included. At this meeting the focus will be on the Opportunities, Cross-Cutting Issues, and Local Streets and Roads sections of the report. Discussion will include the Interregional and Intraregional Corridors, and Global Gateways sections as time permits. |      |     |
| <b>5. Next Steps/Next Meeting</b>  |      |     |
| Complete discussion of Task 3c report and begin discussion of Strategies Recommended for Evaluation (Task 4a)  |      |     |
| <b>6. Adjournment</b>  |      |     |

*This page intentionally left blank*

Goods Movement Collaborative and Plan  
Technical Team Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, July 10, 2014, 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 on meeting outcomes. She requested the committee provide feedback and adopt the draft performance measures.

**2. June 5, 2014 Meeting Minutes**

*Keith Cooke (San Leandro) moved to approve the June 5, 2014 meeting minutes. Ruben Izon (Alameda County) seconded the motion. The motion passed with one abstention, Obaid Khan.*

**3. Work Update**

Michael Fischer of Cambridge Systematics, the project manager of the Goods Movement Collaborative and Plan, gave an overview of the project approach and the progress to date. He discussed some of the deliverables that are complete and/or in progress. Michael also provided information on the first Goods Movement Roundtable on Wednesday, July 23, 2014 from 12:30 to 4:30 p.m. at Alameda CTC offices.

Michael said the vision and goals are complete and have been approved. Staff will post a comprehensive inventory of existing plans and documents on the Alameda CTC website next week, and comments are due within two weeks to Matt Bomberg. His email address will be included in the email to inform the Technical Team about the items posted to the website.

Questions/feedback on work update:

The committee members inquired about the process for comments on specific tasks. Tess Lengyel mentioned that staff will send an email to the committee noting the staff person who will receive comments. She also requested comments by July 11th, if possible, on the performance measures so the Commission can take action later this month.

Michael noted that the project team would be contacting jurisdictions in coming weeks regarding case studies of goods movement impacts on local roads.

- Will the Goods Movement team use the Countywide Travel Demand Model for the case studies? Michael said that many of the case studies are focused not on arterials but on local roads that may not be represented in the model, and that the case studies seek to capture on-the-ground operational issues that must be observed in person.
- The case studies should seek to capture complete streets type issues
- Concannon/Tesla Road and Hesperian Blvd should be considered as case studies. The project team noted that these are already included on the list.
- At least one case study should seek to capture neighborhood impacts.
- Is the goal of the case studies to sample a few areas to capture issues or to conduct a case study in every jurisdiction? Need to be sure case studies truly produce ideas that support local planning. Michael mentioned that the case studies will not be able to look at every arterial corridor in the county.

- Will the model be used to capture off-peak strategies? Michael stated that the model may not be effective for time of day issues at individual locations. The case studies will pick up those nuances.
- Will the model show the locations where there is a high percentage of trucks? Michael said the model will show where truck volumes are high relative to total average annual daily traffic and will compute truck percentages, delays, and total delays.
- Will the Goods Movement Team request traffic data from the cities in Alameda County or use existing data? Michael reminded the committee of the survey that all of the cities participated in. A member asked if the cities have truck classification data. Michael said the Goods Movement Team will go back and look at the responses from the cities.

#### **4. Revised Draft Performance Measures (Task 3a)**

Michael Fischer discussed the performance-based evaluation process, starting with page 4 on the handout, and described how the performance measures fit into the process.

Questions/feedback on the performance-based evaluation process:

- Is the project team reaching out to communities? Will the evaluation approach allow the community to give feedback to “truth test” results of quantitative analysis? What is the timing for community input and how will it feed into evaluation process? Tess Lengyel stated that Alameda CTC is conducting stakeholder meetings for the Goods Movement Plan and is working on two other plans, a Multimodal Arterial Plan and a Transit Plan. Community meetings will be designed to involve the community and gather input on goods movement, along with the two additional plans. The dates on getting the community involved will be determined as the arterial plan and transit plan teams are in place.
- Who are “stakeholders”? Michael explained that these represent a variety of types of groups (business, environmental, community) with whom the project team will meet one-on-one at three junctures throughout project.
- The committee reiterated its recommendation that the team incorporate community workshops in Alameda County to include a variety of communities. A member expressed concern that a roundtable meeting in downtown Oakland will not garner community feedback from all interested communities. The Technical Team requested that staff identify specific communities and add their involvement in the outreach and education plan. Staff explained the role of the stakeholders in the process.
- If a project that did not score near the top in quantitative evaluation rises to the top because it provides necessary mitigation for other projects, will this be captured in the “cut sheets?” Michael explained that the cut sheets will illustrate how a project scores on different goals, which will aid in identifying which projects may provide balance to an overall portfolio of projects by strengthening performance on a particular goal.
- A member suggested that community and stakeholder input are being separated. Michael responded that the project team views the community as one of many stakeholders. The member further expressed that the presentation on the performance-evaluation process is vague, does not mention public health, and is

too high-level for community members to understand. Michael noted that public health is part of the goals and performance measures and that the presentation may seem less concrete because the planning effort is not yet at the stage of evaluating specific projects.

Questions/feedback from members on Performance Measures:

- Have you obtained PCI data from MTC? How have you identified truck routes? Matt stated that the team collected truck route data from the cities through the survey and follow-up conversations. The data is being compiled in a GIS database. Matt noted that the team is seeking to get access to some detailed summaries of PCI data from MTC.
- What are “key freight routes” used for travel time delay measures? Michael responded that these would include the California Freight Advisory Committee definition for freeways and local truck route designations.
- Will “freight generators” include downtown areas that may receive numerous deliveries? Michael responded that the key question with this measure is “what is being connected to what?” and that “generator” could be defined to include downtowns and other high-shipment receiving destinations.
- Suggest changing “freight generator proximity to non-compatible land uses” to “freight generator and corridor proximity to non-compatible land uses”
- Regarding the public health measure, do “communities” refer to location- or demographic-based communities? Michael noted that the project team would be interested in help identifying which communities should be considered for disproportionate impacts.
- Consider adding asthma rates and pedestrian injuries to community impact measures.
- Consider analyzing particulate matter (PM) 2.5, NOx, and black carbon/soot to the air quality measures as these are asthma triggers.
- Consider using Pacific Institute PDA/industrial land use mapping work.
- For compatibility of land use measure, should look to both existing and future land use.
- Regarding land use decisions, look at patterns.
- For economic impact measure, should be specific regarding the co-benefits for the community such as jobs.
- Suggestion that measures should specifically restrict any additional impacts to West Oakland.
- Infrastructure state of good repair impacts such as pavement and sidewalk degradation can be a community impact as well.
- Why is technology a goal in and of itself? Shouldn't technology assist in meeting other goals? Michael noted that this was included for consistency with state and federal goods movement performance measures. Matt noted that supporting developing technology can help to bring down cost and encourage wider deployment.
- Interaction of bicyclists/pedestrians and trucks can be an issue. Michael noted that this will be captured in the case studies and through the arterial plan.

Recap of feedback on specific topics:

- Emissions/Air Quality/Public Health:
  - Add PM2.5 and NOx as measures.
  - Identify specific communities and their geographic extent, and get additional specific indicators of public health (such as asthma rates).
- Freight-Related Crashes:
  - Also look at bike/pedestrian crashes with trucks.
- Economic Contribution :
  - Look at co-benefits to communities.
- Compatibilities with Land Use Decisions:
  - Look at future land use patterns.
  - Add freight corridors to freight generators, and broaden definition of freight generators.

*Bruce Williams (Oakland) moved to approve the Countywide Goods Movement Plan Performance Measures. Abhishek Parikh seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*

#### **5. Next Steps/Next Meeting**

Tess Lengyel stated that staff will present the feedback received to ACTAC and the Planning, Policy and Legislation Committee.

#### **6. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 1:10 p.m.