

1333 Broadway, Suites 220 & 300

Oakland, CA 94612

PH:(510) 208-7400 www.AlamedaCTC.org

Alameda County Transportation Commission meeting as a committee of the whole as the

PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS COMMITTEE

MEETING NOTICE Monday, July 11, 2011, 12:15 P.M.

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

Mayor Mark Green

Chair: Vice Chair: Members:

1

3

Chair: Supervisor Scott Haggerty bers: Supervisor Nate Miley Mayor Tim Sbranti Councilmember Larry Reio Vice Mayor Luis Freitas

Mayor Farid Javandel Councilmember Ruth Atkin Vice Mayor Suzanne Chan

Ray Akkawi

Councilmember Larry Reid Vice Mayor Luis Freitas Staff Liaisons: Matt Todd Executive Director: Arthur L. Dao Clerk of the Commission: Vanessa Lee

AGENDA

Copies of Individual Agenda Items are Available on the: Alameda CTC Website -- <u>www.AlamedaCTC.org</u>

Public Comment

Members of the public may address the Committee during "Public Comment" on any item <u>not</u> on the agenda. Public comment on an agenda item will be heard when that item is before the Committee. Only matters within the Committee's jurisdictions may be addressed. Anyone wishing to comment should make their desire known by filling out a speaker card and handling it to the Clerk of the Commission. Please wait until the Chair calls your name. Walk to the microphone when called; give your name, and your comments. Please be brief and limit comments to the specific subject under discussion. Please limit your comment to three minutes.

2 Consent Calendar

2A. Minutes of June 13, 2011 – page 1

A

Programs

- 3A. Approval of Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Draft A Draft Program for the FY 2011/12 Remaining Balance
 page 7
- 3B. Approval of Process for Capital Project Element of Alameda A County's Safe Routes to School Capital Program – page 11

Commission Chair Mark Green, Mayor – Union City

Commission Vice Chair Scott Haggerty, Supervisor – District 1

AC Transit Greg Harper, Director

Alameda County

Supervisors Nadia Lockyer – District 2 Wilma Chan – District 3 Nate Miley – District 4 Keith Carson – District 5

BART Thomas Blalock, Director

City of Alameda Rob Bonta, Vice Mayor

City of Albany Farid Javandel, Mayor

City of Berkeley Laurie Capitelli, Councilmember

City of Dublin Tim Sbranti, Mayor

City of Emeryville Ruth Atkin, Councilmember

City of Fremont Suzanne Chan, Vice Mayor

City of Hayward Olden Henson, Councilmember

City of Livermore Marshall Kamena, Mayor

City of Newark Luis Freitas, Vice Mayor

City of Oakland Councilmembers Larry Reid Rebecca Kaplan

City of Piedmont John Chiang, Vice Mayor

City of Pleasanton Jennifer Hosterman, Mayor

City of San Leandro Joyce R. Starosciak, Councilmember

Executive Director Arthur L. Dao 4

3C.	Discussion of MTC Potential Block Grant Policies and Implications for Alameda CTC –page 15	Ι
3D.	Review of the 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Fund Estimate – page 21	Ι
3E.	Update on Programs and Vehicle Registration Fee Master Funding Agreements – page 27	Ι
3F.	Review MTC's 2010 Regional Pavement Condition Report (Pot Hole Report) – page 29	Ι
Draio	sta	
4A.	I-580 San Leandro Sound Wall Landscape Project - Approval of Authorization to Execute All Necessary Agreements for the Construction Element of the Project – page 53	A
4B	Eastbound I-580 Express Lane and Auxiliary Lane Projects – Approval to Revise Funding Plan and Authorization to Execute Agreements and Contracts for Environmental and Design Utilizing Tri-Valley Transportation Council (TVTC) Funds – page 55	Α
4C.	Northbound I-680 Express Lane Project (ACTIA No. 8) – Approval of Consultant Team to Provide Project Approval and Environmental Document and Authorization to Execute a Contract – page 59	A
4D.	Approval of Various Actions Related to the Disposal of Surplus Right of Way and the Award of a Contract to Maintain Landscaping for the I-580 Castro Valley Interchange Improvements Project (ACTIA No. 12) – page 65	A
4E.	Northbound I-680 Express Lane, Eastbound and Westbound I-580 Express Lane Projects – Approval of Consultant Team to Provide System Manager Services to Approved Express Lanes Network in Alameda County and Authorization to Execute a Contract – page 69	A
4F	Southbound I-880 HOV Lane Project – Approval to Execute Agreements and Contracts for Landscaping and Davis Street Improvements – page 75	A
4G.	I-880/23 rd /29 th Operational Improvement Project - Approval to Execute Agreements for Project Righ-of-Way Requirements – page 77	A
4H.	Grand – MacArthur Transportation Management System Project – Approval of CMA TIP Funds to Supplement the Project Budget – page 79	A
4I.	I-80 ICM Project - Approval of System Manager Services Contract and Approval of Amendment to the Design Contract for the San Pablo Corridor Arterial and Transit Improvement Project No. 6 and the Traffic Operations Systems Project No. 3 – page 81	A

- 4J. I-680 Sunol Express Lanes (ACTIA No. 8) Project Approval of Amendment A No. 2 to the Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans to Allow the Payback of the Letter of No Prejudice (LONP) page 83
- 4K. Route 238/Mission-Foothill-Jackson Corridor Improvement Project (ACTA No. A 238) Authorization to Execute Amendments to Project Funding Agreements to Transfer Funds from the Right-of-Way to the Construction Phase of the Project page 85
- 4L. Webster Street SMART Corridor Project Approval of Amendment No. 1 to A Extend the Expiration Date of the Contract with Harris & Associates to Provide Construction Management Services – page 91
- 4M. I-580 Castro Valley Interchange Improvements Project (ACTIA No. 12) A Approval of Various Actions to Complete and Close-Out Project – page 93

5 Committee Member Reports

6 Staff Reports

7 Adjournment/Next Meeting: September 12, 2011

Key: A- Action Item; I – Information Item; D – Discussion Item (#) All items on the agenda are subject to action and/or change by the Committee.

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

Glossary of Acronyms

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

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



1333 Broadway, Suites 220 & 300

Oakland, CA 94612

PH: (510) 208-7400 www.AlamedaCTC.org

18th 17th 161 150 ΑСТС 980 14th 513th 0 Bu **Oakland City** 12th ¥ Center -12th St ППП 2 1 11 **BART Station** City Cer City Center Lake Merritt BART ÷ Garage Oakland 9th Station h (enter from Convention Metro Center 11th or 14th) 8th Center 7th 6th To San Francisco 880 To San Jose 5m コンコ 4th 0.8 3rd AMTRAK 2nd Depot 1 Embarcadero Alameda **Oakland Ferry** Jack London's Waterfront OAKLAND HARBOR BERKELEY 80 24 580 AND San Francisco / Oakland **Bay Bridge Alameda County Transportation Commission** 1333 Broadway, Suite 220 Oakland, CA 94612

Directions to the Offices of the Alameda County Transportation Commission:

1333 Broadway, Suite 220 Oakland, CA 94612

Public Transportation Access:

BART: City Center / 12th Street Station

AC Transit:

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

Auto Access:

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

This page intentionally left blank

PPC Meeting 07/11/11 Agenda Item 2A



PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS COMMITTEE MINUTES OF JUNE 13, 2011 OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA

The meeting was convened by the Chair, Mayor Green, at 12:42 p.m.

1. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

- 2 Consent Calendar
- 2A. Minutes of May 9, 2011
- 2B. Approval of Allocation request for FY 2010/11 Proposition 1B Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) Funds
- 2C. I-580 Eastbound HOV Lane Widening Project (Project 420.5)/Tri-Valley Corridor Improvement Project (MTC RM-2 Sub-Project 32.1d) - Approval of the Initial Project Report to Request Allocation of Regional Measure 2 Funds
- 2D. Approval of Authorization to Accept Construction Contract for the I-580/Castro Valley Interchanges Improvements (ACTIA No. 12)
- 2E. Safe Routes To School Program
- 2E1. Approval of Necessary Agreements for the Operations of the Alameda County Safe Route to School Program in FY 2011/12 and 2012/13
- 2E2. Approval of Necessary Agreements for the Operations of the Bike Mobile Program in FY 2011/12 and 2012/13
- 2F. Approval of FY 2011-12 Measure B Strategic Plan
- 2G. Approval of Amendment No. 2 to Extend the Expiration Date of the Contract with URS Corporation Americas to Prepare Scoping Documents for the I-580 Westbound Express Lane Project

Vice Mayor Freitas moved for the approval of the consent calendar; Mayor Javandel made a second. The motion passed 7-0.

3 Programs

3A. Approval of 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Principles

Matt Todd requested the Committee to recommend that the Commission approve the principles for the development of the 2012 STIP project list. The 2012 STIP will cover fiscal years 2012/2013 – 2016/17. A motion to approve staff recommendation was made by Supervisor Haggerty; a second was made by Councilmember Atkin. The motion passed 7-0.

3B. Review of Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) Draft Program Guidelines

Matt Todd requested the Committee to recommend that the Commission review the VRF Draft Program Guidelines. He stated that the VRF Program Guidelines are intended to describe the program, provide basic background information, and additional details regarding how the Alameda CTC intends to administer the funding as well as what will be expected from the recipients of the funds. The VRF Draft Program Guidelines provides that an equitable share of the funds will be distributed among the four planning areas of Alameda County over successive five year cycles. Geographic equity will be measured by a formula weighted: 50% by population of the planning area; 50% of registered vehicles of the planning area; planning area and geographic equity for each program will be monitored and considered as goal. The Committee also discussed the concept of coordinating agreements with the Measure B program, a timely use of funds policy, and how to define eligible project costs.

3C. Approval of Altamont Commuter Express (ACE) Baseline Service Plan For FY 2011/12 Vivek Bhat requested the Committee to recommend that the Commission approve the ACE Baseline Service Plan for FY 2011-12, contingent on the receipt of additional project information regarding the Altamont Rail Corridor Environmental Documentation project included in the ACE FY 2011-12 Capital Program. A motion to approve staff recommendation was made by Supervisor Haggerty; a second was made by Mayor Javandel. The motion passed 7-0.

3D. Approval of Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee (PAPCO) Recommendations for Fiscal Year 2011/2012 Paratransit Program Plans and Budgets

Tess Lengyel requested the Committee to recommend that the Commission approve PAPCO's recommendations for both the mandated and non-mandated paratransit programs for \$8.95 million and for two Minimum Service Level Grants for a total of \$100,000. A motion to approve staff recommendation was made by Mayor Javandel; a second was made by Vice Mayor Freitas. The motion passed 7-0.

4 **Projects**

4A. I-80 Integrated Corridor Mobility (ICM) Project - Approval of Award of the Construction Contract for the San Pablo Corridor Arterial and Transit Improvement Project No. 6 (491.6)

John Hemiup requested the Committee to recommend that the Commission approve the following actions: (1) Award the construction contract to Steiny & Company Inc. for the construction of the I-80 ICM San Pablo Corridor Arterial & Transit Improvement Project No. 6; (2) Authorize the Executive Director to execute the construction contract with Steiny & Co. Inc. in an amount not to exceed \$9,212,000 which includes \$300,000 of Optional Bid Items. He stated that Steiny & Co. Inc was the lowest responsive and responsible bidder for the construction contract. He also said that the construction contract amount will be included in the construction capital budgtet of \$11,137,000 which also includes budget for supplemental work, contract contingency and agency furnished materials. A motion to approve staff recommendation was made by Mayor Janvandel; a second was made by Councilmember Atkin. The motion passed 7-0.

4B. Westbound I-580 Express Lane Project (424.1) - Approval of Consultant Team to Provide Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Document and Authorization to Execute a Contract

Steve Haas requested the Committee to recommend that the Commission approve the the selection of the top-ranked team, led by URS Corporation, to prepare Project Approval and Environmental Clearance Documents (PA&ED) and provide other necessary services for the completion of PA&ED in support of the I-580 Westbound Express Lane Project and authorize the Executive Director to execute a contract for these services in the amount of \$686,502. A motion to approve staff recommendation was made by Supervisor Haggerty; a second was made by Mayor Javandel. The motion passed 8-0.

4C. I-680 Sunol Express Lanes (ACTIA No. 8) - Approval of Amendment to I-680 Sunol Smart Carpool Lane Joint Powers Agreement

James O'Brien requested the Committee to recommend that the Commission approve an amendment to the Sunol Joint Powers Agreement to reflect statutory changes and the transition from development to operations of the southbound I-680 Express Lane. He stated that the revision reflects he merger of ACTIA and ACCMA into the Alameda CTC. The revisions to Sreets and Highways Code section 149.5 also included other provisions related to the administration of the JPA. A motion to approve staff recommendation was made by Supervisor Haggerty; a second was made by Mayor Javandel. The motion passed 70.

4D. Approval of Authorization to Execute an Agreement with the Sunol Smart Carpool Lane Joint Powers Authority for the Funding and Implementation of the I-680 Sunol Express Lanes I-680 Sunol Express Lanes (ACTIA No. 8)

James O'Brien requested the Committee to recommend that the Commission authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to execute an agreement with the Sunol Smart Carpool Lane Joint Powers Authority (Sunol JPA) to establish procedures and requirements for the Alameda CTC to provide funding and/or resources to the Sunol JPA for the implmentation (project development, construction and operation) of the I-680 Sunol Express Lanes Project (ACTIA 8). He said that ACCMA took the lead on the implementation of this project and ACTIA provided Measure B funding for the deivery of the Measure B Expenditure Plan project (ACTIA 8). Since the merger of the ACCMA and ACTIA to the Alameda CTC, statutory changes have been made to reflect the new organization of the Sunol JPA. A motion to approve staff recommendation was made by Mayor Javandel; a second was made by Supervisor Haggerty. The motion passed 7-0.

4E. Approval of Measure B Allocation for Preliminary Right of Way Activities for the Dumbarton Rail Corridor (ACTIA No. 25)

James O'Brien requested the Committee to recommend that the Commission authorize the following actions related to the Dumbarton Rail Corridor Project (DRC): (1) Allocate \$150,000 of Measure B funds; and (2) Authorize the Executive Direcor or his designee, to negotiate and execute a funding agreement with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to secure matching funds for the Measure B funds allocated. He stated that the DRC is currently in the Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Studies phase. The current funding plan shows a significant shortfall and the project plays a significant role in the ongoing discussions related to long range planning such as the Countywide Transportation Plan update and the development of a Transportation Expenditure Plan for a future sales tax measure. The Alameda CTC will take the lead on developing the right-of-way acquisition plan and will need a funding agreement with MTC to secure reimbursment of the RM2 share of eligible costs. A motion to approve staff recommendation was made by Supervisor Haggerty; a second was made by Mayor Green. The motion passed 7-0.

4F. Route 84 Niles Canyon Safety Improvement Project – A Project Update Presentation by Caltrans

Supervisor Haggerty stated that he will step out during the presentation. He said that allegations were made that he has conflict of interest on this project. Although he doesn't believe that he has any conflict of interest, he will step out. Mark Zabaneh, Caltrans District 4 Deputy Director, and Ron Kaiaaina, Project Manager, gave a presentation on Route 84 Niles Canyon Safety Improvement

Project. They presented accident data over the 10-year period from 1999-2008 on Route 84 in Niles Canyon. In 2003, Caltrans's safety monitoring program identified this location with a concentration of cross-centerline fatal collisions. Based on the accident history, Caltrans initiated the Niles Canyon 2 project to improve safety. The proposed safety improvements include: (a) Standard shoulders; (b) Soft median barrier; and (c) Shoulder rumble strip. The standard shoulders will provide the following safety improvements: Room for vehicles leaving the lane to safely recover; Reduce reduce head-on collisions due to driver overcorrection; Room for emergency use by disabled vehicles; Increased horizontal stopping sight distance on curves; Improve safety for bicycle travel; and Room for CHP enforcement. The soft median barrier acts as a buffer that provides an audible and physical warning to motorists crossing over centerline towards oncoming traffic. The shoulder rumble strip enhances bicycle safety.

There were five public comments on this item. (1) Michael Powell of Save Niles Canyon stated that this is an expensive project; (2) Jeff Miller of Alameda Creek Alliance stated that he supports making the Niles Canyon safe but his concern is how the project will impact on the habitat; (3) Robert Foster commented that he is concerned that the retaining walls will make the Niles Canyon graffiti ready; (4) Kimberly Harbin of Save Niles Canyon commented that if Caltrans is building a track route they should call it such and not disguise it as a safety project; and (5) Supervisor Nadia Lockyer encouraged the Alameda CTC, Caltrans and the County to work together on this project.

During the discussions, Vice Mayor Chan said that the City of Fremont supports safety. However, neighboring communities and some organizations have concerns on the environmental impact of the project (e.g. removal of trees to construct retaining walls) and requested Caltrans to balance safety and environmental impact. Mayor Green said that he fully supports this project and it is a safety project and he does not see it environmentally devastating. Legal Counsel, Zack Wasserman, clarified that the agency has no funding and direct jurisdiction on this project. This item was for information only.

5 Staff and Committee Member Reports

There was no report.

6 Adjournment/Next Meeting: July 11, 2011

Chair Green adjourned the meeting at 2:10 p.m. The next meeting is on July 11, 2011.

Attest by:

Judy Marmelee

Gladys V. Parmelee Office Supervisor and Interim Clerk of the Commission



1333 Broadway, Suites 220 & 300

Oakland, CA 94612

PH: (510) 208-7400 www.AlamedaCTC.org

PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS COMMITTEE MEETING

-

ROSTER OF MEETING ATTENDANCE June 13, 2011 12:15 p.m. 1333 Broadway, Suite 300, Oakland, CA 94612

BOARD MEMBERS	Initials	ALTERNATES	Initials
Chair : Mark Green – City of Union City	2	Emily Duncan – City of Union City	
Vice Chair: Scott Haggerty – Alameda County, District 1	and a	Bill Harrison – City of Fremont	
Members:	March	: · · ·	
Nate Miley – Alameda County, District 2	an		
Farid Javandel – City of Albany	T	Peggy Thomsen – City of Albany	
Tim Sbranti – City of Dublin		Don Biddle – City of Dublin	
Ruth Atkin – City of Emeryville	RA	Kurt Brinkman – City of Emeryville	
Suzanne Chan – City of Fremont (M	Bill Harrison – City of Fremont	
Luis Freitas – City of Newark	-bGC	Alberto Huezo – City of Newark	
Larry Reid – City of Oakland		Patricia Kernighan – City of Oakland	
LEGAL COUNSEL			
Zack Wasserman – WRBD			
Neal Parish – WRBD			
Geoffrey Gibbs - GLG (GTG)			
STAFF		Λ	
Arthur L. Dao – Executive Director		Merler	
Gladys Parmelee – Office Supervisor and Interim Clerk of th	e Commission	anfarmelee	
Matt Todd - Manager of Programming		1 MT	
Ray Akkawi – Manager of Project Delivery		Mij. KIL	
		L L	

STAFF	Initials	STAFF	Initials
Tess Lengyel – Deputy Director of Policy, Public Affairs and Legislation	R	Yvonne Chan – Accounting Manager	
Beth Walukas – Deputy Director of Planning	EA	Arun Goel – Project Controls Engineer	AICG
Patricia Reavey – Director of Finance	hink	Linda Adams – Executive Assistant	•
Matt Todd - Manager of Programming		Lei Lam – Senior Accountant	
Ray Akkawi – Manager of Project Delivery		Sammy Ng – Senior Accountant	
Steve Haas – Senior Transportation Engineer	524	Patty Seu - Accountant	
John Hemiup – Senior Transportation Engineer	AN	Jacki Taylor – Programming Analyst	(JTJ)
Saravana Suthanthira - Senior Transportation Planner	K	Laurel Poeton – Assistant Transportation Planner	
Diane Stark - Senior Transportation Planner		Frank R. Furger – Executive Director, I-680 JPA	
Vivek Bhat - Senior Transportation Engineer	11/200	James O'Brien	PO
Liz Brazil – Contract Compliance & Outreach Analyst	-B	Stefan Garcia	
		Clandin Leyva	On

	NAME	JURISDICTION/ ORGANIZATION	PHONE #	E-MAIL
1.	RON KINAINA	CAUTRANS	(510) 286- 4193	M. Kinging Cot. Ca. gov
2.	JIM PIERSON	CITY OF FIRENCONST	510-494-4722	piersone fremont. gov,
3.	Mark Zabanch	CALTRANS	510-286-6293	MARK-I- Zabanche gov.
4.	Stefan García	Alameda CTC-PCT	510 208 7474	Sgavia @ alamedacter org
5.	RAMIN three	urs	579-893-3400	+ a u say - his esca ours carp on
6.	Madda Lackye	r ACBOS	(510) 272-66	12 padla, lockyere
7.	Juni Mitin	Alawe Lam	1- 510-276-66	76 acijovio raj
8.	Jeft Miller	ACA	(510) 799-9183	alanedaciek@lotmil.co
9.	Michelle Pouse	11 Save Mikes C	ANTON (510) 797-10	54 MAPITRECOMEast. net
10.	EIMBERLY HA	RBIN SAVE NILES I	(ANYON (510)713-19	192 KIMBERLY@HARBIN.CON
11.	ROBERT FOST	ER SAVE NIKES	CANMEN 925-86	20223 Robert foster Sund
12.	Patrick Foster	Some Niles Ca	unyon 125 200 326	8 pr-foster Cijahos. com
13.			/	· · · ·
14.				



Memorandum

DATE: June 29, 2011

TO: Programs and Projects Committee (PPC)

FROM: Jacki Taylor, Program Analyst

SUBJECT: Approval of Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Draft Program for the FY 2011/12 Remaining Balance

Recommendation

It is recommended the Commission approve the TFCA draft program for the FY 2011/12 remaining balance of 623,556. A draft staff recommendation is attached. ACTAC is scheduled to consider this item on July 5th.

Summary

It is recommended the Commission approve the attached draft staff recommendation for programming the TFCA FY 2011/12 remaining balance of \$623,556. The FY 2011/12 TFCA program was approved by the Alameda CTC Board at its May 26, 2011 meeting with the provision that a programming recommendation for the remaining balance would be brought to the Board for consideration at a future date. During May and June, ACTAC representatives were requested to propose additional projects. Any funds that remain unprogrammed as of November 2, 2011 will be reclaimed by the Air District.

Background

TFCA is generated by a \$4.00 vehicle registration fee and collected by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Air District). As the TFCA Program Manager for Alameda County, the Alameda CTC is responsible for programming 40 percent of the four dollar vehicle registration fee that is collected in Alameda County for this program. Per the Alameda CTC TFCA Guidelines, 70 percent of the available funds are to be allocated to the cities/county based on population, with a minimum of \$10,000 to each jurisdiction. The remaining 30 percent of the funds are to be allocated to transit-related projects on a discretionary basis. All available TFCA funds are required to be completely programmed annually. A jurisdiction may borrow against its projected future share in order to receive more funds in the current year which can also help to facilitate the programming of all available funds in the current year. Projects proposed for TFCA funding are required to meet the eligibility and cost-effectiveness requirements of the TFCA Program.

The FY 2011/12 TFCA program was approved by the Alameda CTC on May 26, 2011 with a remaining balance of \$623,556. A draft recommendation for the remaining balance is attached. The recommendation includes \$421,000 for arterial management projects from the cities of

Alameda and Hayward. Both of these cities currently have a large negative TFCA balance and while it is generally preferred to program TFCA funds to agencies with positive TFCA balances, these projects are being recommended to comply with the Air District's requirement that all available TFCA County Program Manager funds be fully programmed each cycle. The draft recommendation for the remaining balance also includes \$52,356 for Oakland's Broadway shuttle which is contingent upon receipt of additional project information and the completion of the required project evaluation.

A final program is scheduled for Board consideration in September. Any funds that remain unprogrammed as of November 2, 2011 will be reclaimed by the Air District.

Attachment

Attachment A: TFCA Draft Program for the FY 2011/12 Remaining Balance

Sponsor	Project Name	Project Description	Total Project Cost	TFCA Requested	TFCA Share Balance	Draft Cost- effectiveness (TFCA \$/ton)	Amount Recommended	Notes
70% City/Cou	inty Share							
Alameda	Webster St. Arterial Management	Park Street Corridor Operations Improvement Project. Signal timing and coordination improvements and installation of flashing beacons as advance warning for bridge, 1-880 traffic, and increased activity on the Rail Rd. Xing.	\$964,250	\$230,900	\$ (318,660)	\$ 80,411	\$230,900	Project evaluated at 2 years cost effectiveness.
Albany	Buchanan Bike Path	Construction of the Buchanan Bikeway along the south side of Marin Avenue/Buchanan Street from San Pablo Avenue to the Buchanan Bridge overcrossing. Proposed matching funds for existing federal funding.	\$2,511,000	\$100,000	\$ 55,245	\$ 76,362	\$100,000	High priority project in county bike plan
Hayward	Arterial Mgmt 10ALA04 Post- project Retiming	Additional funding for TFCA project 10ALA04 to complete the required post-project retiming for arterial management projects evaluated at 4 years of cost effectiveness.	\$50,300	\$50,300	\$ (285,054)	\$47,000- \$89,000	\$50,300	Additional \$1,000 - \$15,000 for each segment
Hayward	Arterial Management	Arterial Management on Clawiter Road. from Winter Avenue to Enterprise Avenue.	\$218,000	\$218,000	\$ (285,054)	\$ 89,997	\$190,000	Project evaluated at 2 years cost effectiveness.
Oakland	Broadway Shuttle	Funding for existing daytime operations for calendar year 2012. Requesting matching funds for 2012 TFCA regional grant.	TBD	\$52,000	\$ 267,392	TBD	\$52,356	Project evaluation is pending
		Total		\$651,200			\$623,556	

Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Recommended Draft Program for the FY 2011/12 Remaining Balance, July 2011

' \$	\$ 623,556	\$ 1,208,805	\$ 1,832,361	\$ 1,307,305	Total TFCA
\$ (14,050)	\$0	\$429,489	\$ 415,439	\$ 429,489	Total TFCA 30%
\$ 14,050	\$623,556	\$779,316	\$ 1,416,922	\$877,816	Total TFCA 70%
Difference	Total Recommended July 2011	Total Programmed May 2011	TFCA Available To Program	Total Request	TFCA Share
	i July 2011	nary - Updatec	Program Sumr	Final I	

Sponsor	Project Name	Project Description	Total Project Cost	TFCA Requested	TFCA Balance	Cost- effectiveness	Amount Recommended
70% City/Cor	unty Share						
Alameda County	Mattox Road Bike Lanes	Install new Class 2 bike lanes (in both directions) on Mattox Rd. between Foothill Blvd and Mission Blvd.	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$ 58,290	\$ 49,316	\$40,000
California State University, East Bay	CSUEB - 2nd Campus to BART Shuttle	Implementation of a second shuttle bus for a.m. and p.m. peak hour service at the Cal State East Bay campus connecting to the Hayward BART station. Requesting two years of funding for operations (FYs 11/12 & 12/13).	\$514,000	\$194,000	' Ө	\$ 63,283	\$194,000
California State University, East Bay	Transportation Demand Management Program	Pilot Transportation Demand Management and Trip Reduction program at the Cal State East Bay to encourage the use of driving alternatives for staff, faculty and the University students. Requesting funding for FY 11/12.	\$52,000	\$52,000	۰ ب	\$ 36,719	\$52,000
Fremont	North Fremont Arterial Management	Improved arterial operations along four corridors in North Fremont: Fremont Blvd, Decoto Rd, Paseo Padre Pkwy, and Alvarado Blvd. Some signal system equipment upgrades. New signal coordination timings will be implemented at all signalized project intersections.	\$265,000	\$265,000	\$ 307,765	\$ 64,931	\$256,000
Oakland	Traffic Signal Synchronization along Martin Luther King Jr. Way	Along Martin Luther King Jr. Way, synchronization of traffic signals at four intersections between 55th and Hwy 24 and installation of detection equipment at the Hwy 24 WB on-ramp intersection.	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$ 392,392	\$ 88,820	\$125,000
Pleasanton	Pleasanton Trip Reduction Program	The project consists of a three-pronged approach to reducing trips through various employer-based, residential-based and school-based programs. Funding for FY 11/12.	\$148,000	\$52,816	\$ 32,836	\$ 59,622	\$52,816
San Leandro	San Leandro LINKS Shuttle	Free shuttle providing service from the San Leandro BART station to businesses in West San Leandro. Shuttle runs every 20 min, Mon - Friday from approx. 5:45am - 9:45 am & 3pm - 8pm. Two years of operations funding (FYs 11/12 & 12/13).	\$629,000	\$149,000	\$ 83,613	\$ 89,672	\$59,500
		Total	\$1,773,000	\$877,816			\$779,316
	-			L %02	FCA Availabl	le to Program	\$ 1,416,922
			·	Amo Re	unt Programn maining City/C	ned May 2011 ounty Balance	\$ 779,316 \$ 637,606
						•	
Sponsor	Project Name	Project Description	Total Project Cost	TFCA Requested	TFCA Balance	Cost- effectiveness (TFCA \$/ton)	Amount Recommended
30% Transit	Discretionary Share						
Alameda CTC	Alameda County Guaranteed Ride Home (GRH) Program	The GRH program provides a "guaranteed ride home" to registered employees in Alameda County as an incentive to use alternative modes of transportation (bus, train, carpool, vanpool, etc.) to get to work. Two years of funding (FYs 11/12 & 12/13).	\$245,000	\$245,000	NA	\$ 20,093	\$245,000
LAVTA	Route 9 Shuttle BART/Hacienda Business Park	Route 9 provides service to the Dublin/Pleasanton BART Station and major employment centers within the City of Pleasanton. Funding for FY 11/12 operations.	\$343,575	\$42,947	ΔN	\$ 83,166	\$42,947
LAVTA	Route 10 - Dublin/ Pleasanton BART to Livermore ACE Station	Route 10 services the Dublin/Pleasanton BART, ACE Livermore stations and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL). Funding for FY 11/12 operations.	\$3,825,450	\$141,542	NA	\$ 26,165	\$141,542
		Total	\$4,414,025	\$429,489			\$429,489
				30% T	FCA Available	e to Program	\$ 415,439
				Amo	unt Programn	ned May 2011	\$ 429,489
				Tota	I FY 11/12 Rem	ransit Balance aining Balance	\$ (14,U5U) \$ 623.556

Summary of Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) FY 2011/12 Program, approved May 26, 2011



Memorandum

DATE:	June 29, 2011
то:	Programs and Project Committee
FROM:	Vivek Bhat, Senior Transportation Engineer
RE:	Approval of Process for Capital Project Element of Alameda County's Safe Routes to School Capital Program

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Commission approve the process to select the Capital Projects Element of the Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Program. The Call for Projects is proposed to be released on July 29, 2011.

ACTAC is scheduled to consider this item on July 5, 2011.

Summary

The Countywide SR2S Program approved last year (July 2010) by the Alameda CTC Board included approximately \$1.3 million for the Capital Program. The Capital Program proposal included two primary elements: the Capital Project element which included \$600,000 in Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds, and the Project Support element which included \$700,000 from a combination of Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) and CMAQ funds.

Under the Federal STP/CMAQ funding requirements, only certain SR2S capital projects are eligible to receive CMAQ funding. In addition, eligible projects that are selected to receive federal funds must have the funds obligated through the Caltrans Local Assistance Office by April 1, 2012. This deadline for federal funding obligation is also prescribed by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606). Consistent with past practices, project readiness will be a primary consideration for project selection because it is a requirement that the selected project must have a completed Federal Authorization Request Package (commonly known as Form E-76) submitted to Caltrans Local Assistance by February 1, 2012, in order to receive the FY 2011-12 CMAQ funds.

Background

At its July 2010 meeting, the Alameda CTC Board approved a \$3.6 million Countywide SR2S Program which included \$2.3 million for the SR2S Operations and \$1.3 million for the Capital

Program. The Capital Program proposal included two primary elements. The Capital Project element included \$600,000 of Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding that will support the overall SR2S program by providing resources for physical improvements that have been identified though prior SR2S efforts. The Project Support element included \$700,000 of a combination of Surface Transportation Program (STP) and CMAQ funds intended to support development of new capital projects and ongoing SR2S operations.

Capital Project Element:

The Countywide SR2S Program approved by the Alameda CTC Board on July 22, 2010 included \$600,000 of federal funding for capital improvements.

Projects are to be eligible for federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding. Examples of CMAQ-eligible SR2S projects include the following:

- Improvements to school drop off zones
- Address gaps in the route to the school
- Constructing bicycle and pedestrian facilities (lanes, paths, bike racks, support facilities, etc.) that are not exclusively recreational and reduce vehicle trips
- Programs for secure bicycle storage facilities and other facilities, including bicycle lanes, for the convenience and protection of bicyclists, in both public and private areas
- New construction and major reconstructions of paths, tracks, or areas solely for the use by pedestrian or other non-motorized means of transportation
- Traffic calming and speed reduction improvements
- Sidewalk improvements
- Pedestrian and bicycle crossing improvements
- Traffic control devices
- Traffic diversion improvements

The funding is available for programming in FFY 2011/12, so proposed projects would need to be obligated by April 1, 2012 per the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606). Readiness will be a primary consideration as authorizing FFY 11/12 CMAQ funds will require submittal of the complete federal authorization (E-76) request package to Caltrans Local Assistance by February 1, 2012.

The Call for Projects is proposed to be released on July 29, 2011. The time required to process TIP amendments and submit requests for federal authorizations necessitates an accelerated programming schedule. Applications are proposed to be due to the Alameda CTC by Friday, August 19, 2011. Staff is working with MTC on the schedule / process to include the selected projects into the TIP. The draft and final SR2S capital program is scheduled to be considered by the Alameda CTC Committees and Board in September and October 2011, respectively.

Proposed Schedule

Date	Activity	
July 29, 2011	Release Call for Projects	
August 19, 2011	Applications due to Alameda CTC	
September 2011	Approve Draft Project list	
October 2011	Approve Final Project list	
February 1, 2012	E-76 Requests due to Caltrans Local Assistance	

Fiscal Impact

Approval of the recommended action will have no significant fiscal impact. Funds to implement the project are assumed in the FY 2011/12 Alameda CTC budget.

This page intentionally left blank



Memorandum

DATE: July 4, 2011

TO: Programs and Projects Committee

FROM: Tess Lengyel, Deputy Director of Policy, Public Affairs and Legislation

SUBJECT: Discussion of MTC Potential Block Grant Policies and Implications for Alameda CTC

Recommendation

This item is for information only. No action is requested.

Summary

This item provides information on proposed policies under development at MTC regarding allocation of the Cycle 2 Federal Surface Transportation Program and Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (STP/CMAQ) funds for next three fiscal years (2012/2013, 2013/2014, 2014/2015). MTC has named this funding cycle the "OneBayArea" grant. MTC's proposed grant program includes funding objectives, funding distributions, policy outcomes and implementation issues, as further described below. The purpose of this memorandum is to provide an overview of MTC's grant program concepts, illustrate potential policy considerations for the Alameda CTC that could position the county well for these funds, and to share MTC's implementation timeline.

Discussion

The OneBayArea grant proposal is linked to the development of the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in the Bay Area. Guided by the requirements of SB 375, an unfunded mandate, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to house the region's population by all income sectors, the OneBayArea grant proposal aims to provide flexible funding to support implementation of the SCS, which will primarily be implemented through focused growth in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and Growth Opportunity Areas (GOAs), protection of Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs) and linking transportation investments with these land uses. Significant regional work has been underway in developing the region's first SCS, which is scheduled to be adopted in April 2013 along with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for a planning and funding horizon through 2040.

As planning continues on the SCS, MTC is also looking at how to financially support and reward jurisdictions that help in fulfilling the state's mandates as well as many of the additional targets established in the region for the SCS. Some of the federal funding sources available to support implementation of the SCS are STP/CMAQ funds. MTC will more fully define the OneBayArea grant proposal in the coming months, and has shared a preliminary draft with the Congestion Management Agencies. As this program becomes more fully defined, the Alameda CTC can address several policy level issues in the preliminary MTC grant proposal. The following summarizes the OneBayArea grant and Alameda CTC policy considerations.

<u>OneBayArea Grant Proposal Overview</u>

The OneBayArea grant proposal objectives are to expand the amount of funds that go into supporting PDA's and to create more flexibility by eliminating program funding silos, expanding opportunities for leveraging funds, and ultimately offering more discretion at the local level for program implementation. This is consistent with the MTC federal legislative advocacy efforts regarding reauthorization of the Federal surface transportation bill.

The OneBayArea grant program proposal to includes a number of funding categories and a majority of which would be implemented at the county level. The following summarizes potential funding distributions, policy outcomes and implementation issues.

Funding Distributions

<u>Funding Formula</u>: MTC has identified scenarios for funding formula allocations that link transportation funding to housing investments, including distributions to counties based on 50% population and 50% based upon some form of housing production numbers. At this juncture, MTC is considering a hybrid option looking at actual housing construction data over a quantifiable period (1999-2006) combined with Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) numbers is under consideration. This would provide funding based upon past performance as well as projected required housing numbers (RHNA numbers). The RHNA numbers will require housing production at all income levels and will therefore implicitly address low income housing needs. MTC is proposing a funding floor so no county would receive less funding that originally anticipated in Cycle 2 STP/CMAQ funds. MTC may be considering other options for funding formula as well.

<u>Minimum PDA Requirement</u>: At this point, MTC is proposing that 70% of the funds are allocated to PDAs (planned and potential) and GOAs.

<u>Priority Conservation Areas</u>: MTC's proposal includes \$2 million for a pilot program to develop PCA plans and potentially implement some recommendations.

<u>Local Planning Funding</u>: MTC proposes continuing planning funds to the counties to support station area and CEQA planning.

Policy Outcomes

MTC has included some desired policy outcomes of this increased funding and expanded flexibility proposal to help support the implementation of the SCS, including:

- 1) <u>Housing Production</u>: Incentivizing housing production through its funding formula allocations
- 2) <u>Eligibility</u>: Require local agency adoption of two or more of the items below to be eligible for the funds:
 - a) Establishment of parking/pricing policies and employer trip reduction strategies
 - b) Develop Community Risk Reduction Plans (CRRP) as defined by the Air District per CEQA guidelines
 - c) Create affordable housing policies to ensure that new development does not displace low income housing
 - d) Require adoption of local bicycle and pedestrian plans and complete streets policies pursuant to the Complete Streets Act of 2008.

Implementation Considerations

While MTC aims to increase county share funding amounts and flexibility for implementing the SCS, there is uncertainty regarding the authorization of the new surface transportation bill. MTC indicates that it will closely monitor the federal bill development to ensure that Cycle 2 STP/CMAQ policies are responsive to any new federal program, eligibility or funding distributions.

In addition, MTC is working with the Air District to potentially expand the OneBayArea grant program by pooling funds into the grant cycle for regional Air District Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) funds (potentially \$6 million). Discussions around this topic will include whether only the regional funds are applied to this funding pool, or if the county program manager funds are expected to be included.

Eligibility, performance and accountability will be important factors in distributing and monitoring the Cycle 2 STP/CMAQ funds. MTC is proposing that the same eligibility requirements are used as in Cycle 1, and that both housing and transportation performance measures be included in monitoring efforts.

Alameda CTC Policy Considerations

While MTC is in the process of developing program funding structures linked to implementation of the SCS, Alameda CTC is poised to address many of the policy level considerations in the proposed grant program.

Funding Allocation Formulas and PDA Readiness in Alameda County: Alameda County currently has 34 PDAs (both planned and potential), 14 GOAs, and 18 PCAs located throughout the county. This ranks Alameda County as having the highest number of PDAs in the Bay Area, and second highest of total PDAs and GOAs combined behind Santa Clara County, which has 14 PDAs (planned and potential) and 40 GOAs. In addition, Alameda County has the highest number of transit operators operating in a single county in the Bay Area, the highest number of BART stations, and a large number of operating and planned bicycle and pedestrian networks. These are components of a potentially highly integrated system that could support housing, transportation and job linkages. With 20% of the Bay Area's population in Alameda County is well suited to receive a significant amount of funds through the OneBayArea grant program. The planning funds that MTC proposes to continue for each of the counties may also be used in Alameda County for additional technical studies that can support PDA implementation.

Policy Considerations: Funding for on-going maintenance and operations has been echoed in public outreach efforts, by many Commission members and through previous Commission funding actions. If the OneBayArea Grant program does not have any prescribed funding percentage allocations by program type, Alameda CTC may consider establishing minimums for certain types of funding to ensure on-going support for many different types of transportation programs. For example, local streets and roads, Safe Routes to Schools and TOD would compete for the same funding pot without any specific set-aside percentages required by MTC.

Alameda CTC action: Staff has initiated a process to evaluate the recent housing construction and construction readiness of transit oriented developments in each of the PDA's, and to overlay the current and planned transit, roadway, and walking and biking investments in each of these areas. This work will help illustrate the level of readiness and funding each of the PDAs requires and can help facilitate the Commission in making priority decisions on funding allocations out of the OneBayArea grant program, particularly since the program may require that 70% of the funds are used to support the PDAs and GOAs in the county.

MTC Policy Outcomes

As described earlier, MTC has proposed desired policy outcomes as a condition of the increased funding and flexibility of the OneBayArea grant program and would require that more than two of them are met to be eligible for the funds. The Alameda CTC could address many of these policy outcomes through upcoming efforts as described below:

1) <u>MTC Policy outcome</u>: Establishment of parking/pricing policies and employer trip reduction strategies

Alameda CTC policy consideration: An outcome of the update of the current Countywide transportation plan could include recommendations for countywide guidelines for parking and pricing policies as well as other Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs. Alameda CTC currently funds and administers a TDM program – the Guaranteed Ride Home program.

Alameda CTC action: Work with Alameda County jurisdictions to determine what parking or pricing and TDM programs are in place and what are in the planning stages.

2) <u>MTC Policy outcome</u>: Develop Community Risk Reduction Plans (CRRP) as defined by the Air District per CEQA guidelines.

Alameda CTC policy consideration: The Alameda CTC could fund the development of large area CRRPs to cover many of the PDAs and GOAs throughout the County. This could be funded through some of the Measure B Transit Center Development Funds and would need to be done in close coordination and collaboration with the Planning Directors.

Alameda CTC action: Work with Alameda County jurisdictions and the Air District to assess the opportunities and constraints for development of CRRPs.

3) <u>MTC Policy outcome</u>: Create affordable housing policies to ensure that new development does not displace low income housing

Alameda CTC policy consideration: The Alameda CTC would seek the guidance and direction from each of the cities and the county on this issue and would look to them to serve as the experts in this area. The Alameda CTC would not partake in policy-level issues on this topic, unless requested to provide resources to do so, since the cities and counties deal directly with these types of land use decisions.

4) <u>MTC Policy outcome</u>: Require adoption of local bicycle and pedestrian plans and complete streets policies pursuant to the Complete Streets Act of 2008.

Alameda CTC policy consideration: The Alameda CTC is beginning the process of developing new master funding agreements for Measure B pass-through funds and grants and the Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) program. A potential new requirement in the funding agreements could be to demonstrate adoption, or the process and timeline for adoption, of the Complete Streets Act policies, and to report annually on funding complete streets projects and programs. In addition, the Alameda CTC has historically funded bicycle and pedestrian plans through the discretionary Measure B Bicycle and Pedestrian Program. Future grant funding cycles could also incorporate the VRF bicycle and pedestrian funds and prioritize funding for bicycle and pedestrian plans and plan updates.

Alameda CTC action: Work with Alameda County jurisdictions to identify how many have updated their General Plans to adopt Complete Streets policies, and identify how many jurisdictions have adopted bicycle and pedestrian plans.

MTC OneBayArea Preliminary Timeline

MTC has identified a preliminary grant program development timeline that includes MTC adoption of the program after the approval of the draft preferred SCS and at the same time as the final RHNA numbers in spring 2012.

Timeline	MTC Actions	Alameda CTC-Related planning efforts
July-September	Conceptual discussion of	First draft of the Countywide
2011	OneBayArea Grants	Transportation Plan (CWTP)
Fall 2011	Presentation of Cycle 2 Approach	First draft of Transportation Expenditure
		Plan (TEP)
December	Adoption of Cycle 2 funding	Second draft of the CWTP
2011	commitments for MTC regional	
	programs	
February 2012	Adoption of draft preferred SCS	Full adoption of TEP and seek approvals
		from cities and the County
March 2012	Adoption of Cycle 2, OneBayArea	Finalization of CWTP, and TEP approvals
	grant, with final RHNA numbers	
April 2012-	Delegation to CMAs for project	Approval of final plans, placement of TEP
Feb. 2013	selection process	on ballot, approval of measure and
		implementation of county-level
		OneBayArea Program
April 2013	Adoption of final SCS	Plans implementation
Committee		

Fiscal Impact

None at this time.

This page intentionally left blank



Memorandum

DATE: June 30, 2011

TO: Programs and Projects Committee

FROM: Matt Todd, Manager of Programming

RE: Review of the 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Fund Estimate

Recommendation

This item is for information only. No action is requested.

Summary

The California Transportation Commission (CTC) updates the STIP biennially, in evennumbered years. Each coordinated statewide STIP update is roughly a one-year process, with the 2012 STIP update starting spring 2011. The STIP is a five-year programming document adopted by the CTC which identifies transportation projects for state transportation funds. Projects that have been funded through the STIP include State highways, local roads, transit, intercity rail, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, intermodal facilities, and safety. Each STIP cycle makes available two new years of funding to program. The 2012 STIP will cover fiscal years 2012/2013 -2016/17.

The overall process for the development of the STIP begins with the development of the STIP Fund Estimate. The STIP Fund Estimate serves as the basis for determining the county shares for the STIP and the amounts available for programming each fiscal year during the five-year STIP period. Typically, the county shares represent the amount of new STIP funding made available in the last two years of a given STIP period. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) approved the final assumptions for the 2012 STIP Fund Estimate in May 2011.

At the June 2011 meeting, the CTC approved a Statewide 5-year summary forecast of the Draft 2012 STIP Fund Estimate (Attachment A). The fund estimate indicates negative balances in the first year (FY 2012/13) and is subject to change based on the State Budget that is approved. The information released by the CTC did not include a county level detail of funds available. Attachment B is the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) staff estimate of the STIP funding anticipated in the Bay Area Region. Alameda County's STIP share ranges between a high of \$45 Million and a low of \$18 Million based on different budget scenarios.

The Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds will be included in the overall amount received and would range from 25% to 60% of the STIP amount received (based on range of budget scenarios).

The CTC is scheduled to adopt a final Fund Estimate in August 2011.

Fiscal Impact

There is no fiscal impact at this time.

Attachment A

DRAFT 2012 FUND ESTIMATES

5 12 -

The Department of Transportation (Department) is providing the California Transportation Commission (Commission) with a five year estimate of available state and federal funds on June 22, 2011. Due to timing constraints, this is 23 days before the due date as required by Section 14524(a) of the Government Code. Because the State Budget is not currently in place, there may be significant changes between this Draft Fund Estimate and the adopted 2012 Fund Estimate. The enclosed packet contains a draft summary of the total funding available and program capacities over the 2012 Fund Estimate period, and the Draft 2012 Fund Estimate tables for the State Highway Account and Federal Trust Fund, the Public Transportation Account, and the Aeronautics Account.

The Draft 2012 Fund Estimate displays a forecast of \$11.5 billion of program capacity for the State Highway Operation & Protection Program and \$3.5 billion of program capacity for the State Transportation Improvement Program for the five-year period covering 2012-13 through 2016-17.

This estimate does not include Assembly Bill (AB) 115 as this bill has not been signed into law as of June 17, 2011. AB 115 would forgive about \$1 billion in loans from transportation funds to the General Fund.

The Department will continue to work with Commission staff to consider and implement suggestions prior to the adoption of the Fund Estimates at the Commission's August 10-11, 2011, meeting. Once the 2011-12 Budget Act is signed, the final Fund Estimates will be updated as needed.

Draft Estimated Program Capacity Available, All Funds Fund Estimate Five-Year Period (\$ millions)

							5-Year	6-Year
	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	_Total	Total
2012 FE SHOPP Target Capacity	\$2,050	\$2,000	\$2,300	\$2,400	\$2,400	\$2,400	\$11,500	\$13,550
2010 SHOPP Program ¹	2,045	1,950	2,005	0	0	0	3,955	6,000
Net Difference	\$5	\$50	\$295	\$2,400	\$2,400	\$2,400	\$7,545	\$7,550
Cumulative Difference	\$5	\$55	\$350	\$2,750	\$5,150	\$7,550		
		-					5-Year	6-Year
2012 FE STIP Target Capacity	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Total	Total
SHA Program Capacity	\$550	\$550	\$550	\$600	\$650	\$650	\$3,000	\$3,550
TE Program Capacity	83	83	83	83	83	83	416	499
PTA Program Capacity	25	25	25	25	25	25	125	150
TFA Available Capacity ²	229	0	0	0	0	0	0	229
Total 2012 FE STIP Target Capacity	\$887	\$658	\$658	\$708	\$758	\$758	\$3,541	\$4,427
2010 STIP Program ³	763	792	499	612	· 0	0	1,902	1,902
Net Difference	\$123	(\$133)	\$159	\$96	\$758	\$758	\$1,638	\$2,525
Cumulative Difference	\$123	(\$10)	\$149	\$245	\$1,003	\$1,762		

Notes:

General note: Program capacity includes construction, right-of-way, and capital outlay support.

¹ 2010 SHOPP Program totals from Transportation Programming as of May 16, 2011.

² TFA available capacity represents unallocated funding available for commitment to STIP projects.

³ 2010 STIP Program estimates as of June 30, 2011 (provided by Commission staff).

۹,

Attachment B

5-Year FE

Estimated 2012 STIP County Shares (as of 6/23/11) Metropolitan Transportation Commission Preliminary Draft Based On June 2011 Draft Fund Estimate Based on 5-year Fund Estimate Period FY 2012-13 through FY 2016-17 All numbers in millions

			Low Range (all AB 115 from STIP)	Mid Range (AB 115 split between STIP and SHOPP)	High Range (all AB 115 from SHOPP, or no AB 115)
Estimated Fund Estimate for STIP		<u> </u>	1,152	1,638	
	75%	for RTIP	500	. 864	1,229
		MTC	88	152	216
County	% State %	6 Region	Low Shares	Mid Shares	High Shares
Alameda	3.6%	20.6%	18	31	45
Contra Costa	2.4%	13.3%	. 12	20	29
Marin	0.7%	3.9%	3	6	8
Napa	0.4%	2.4%	2	4	5
San Francisco	1.9%	10.5%	9	16	23
San Mateo	1.9%	11.0%	10	17	24
Santa Clara	4.3%	24.1%	21	37	52
Solano	1.1%	6.3%	6	10	14
Sonoma	1.4%	7.8%	7	12	17
Totals	17.6%	100.0%	88	152	216

Estimated 2012 RTIP-TE County Shares (as of 6/23/11)

Based on 5-year Fund Estimate Period FY 2012-13 through FY 2016-17

(TE funds included in amounts shown above)

All numbers in millions

			TE	TE	TE
Estimated Fund Estimate for STIP		416	416	416	
75% for RTIP		312	312	312	
		MTC	55	55	. 55
			٤		
County	% State %	6 Region	TE Shares	MTC	County
Alameda	3.6%	20.6%	11	6	6
Contra Costa	2.4%	13.3%	7	4	4
Marin	0.7%	3.9%	2	1	1
Napa	0.4%	2.4%	1	1	1
San Francisco	1.9%	10.5%	6	3	3
San Mateo	1.9%	11.0%	6	3	3
Santa Clara	4.3%	24.1%	13	7	. 7
Solano	1.1%	6.3%	3	2	2
Sonoma	1.4%	7.8%	4	2	2
Totals	17.6%	100.0%	55	27	27

J:\PROJECT\Funding\RTIP\12 RTIP\[Est 2012 STIP Shares Jun-11.xls]MTC ShareCalc - 6 years

This page intentionally left blank

Memorandum

DATE: July 4, 2011

TO: Programs and Projects Committee (PPC)

FROM: Tess Lengyel, Deputy Director of Policy, Public Affairs and Legislation

SUBJECT: Update on Programs and Vehicle Registration Fee Master Funding Agreements

Recommendation

This item is for information only and no action is requested. This item provides an update on the development of integrated master funding agreements for Measure B Programs pass-through and Vehicle Registration funds with transit operators, Alameda County, and 14 local jurisdictions.

Background

Transit agencies, Alameda County, and local jurisdictions receive Measure B "pass-through funds" for four types of programs: bicycle and pedestrian, local streets and roads, mass transit, and paratransit. Transit agencies include the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit), the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART), the Water Emergency Transportation Authority, the San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission (the operator of the Altamont Commuter Express service), the Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority (LAVTA), and Union City Transit. Other Measure B Pass-Through Funding recipients include all cities in Alameda County (Alameda, Albany, Berkeley, Dublin, Emeryville, Fremont, Hayward, Livermore, Newark, Oakland, Piedmont, Pleasanton, San Leandro, and Union City) and the County itself.

The Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority (ACTIA) executed funding agreements with these agencies/jurisdictions shortly after the measure began in 2000 as follows:

- Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety: Agreements with Alameda County and 14 cities began in 2002.
- Local Streets and Roads: Agreements with Alameda County and 14 cities began in 2002.
- Mass Transit: Agreements with five transit agencies began in 2002.
- Paratransit: Agreements with three transit agencies and 11 cities began in 2002. In 2003, ACTIA revised these agreements, and in 2007, ACTIA again revised the agreements with the agencies and cities.

The majority of these agreements expire in mid-2012.

Vehicle Registration Fee Program Considerations

The Measure F Alameda County Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) Program was approved by the voters on November 2, 2010, with 63 percent of the vote. The fee will generate about \$11 million per year through a \$10 per year vehicle registration fee. As the congestion management agency for Alameda County, the Alameda CTC will distribute these funds to four main types of programs:

- Local streets and roads (60 percent)
- Transit (25 percent)
- Local transportation technology (10 percent)
- Bicycle and pedestrian projects (5 percent)

Rather than create separate agreements with the agencies and jurisdictions that will receive these funds as well as Measure B funds, staff will incorporate language in the master funding agreements that specify the types of funds that the agencies/jurisdictions can receive from the Commission, including grant funds and VRF funds, and funding and reporting requirements.

Master Agreement Update Schedule and Process

The schedule below shows the timeline for production and execution of the master funding agreements. Before finalizing the agreements, staff plans to bring the master funding agreement policies and templates for review and input to the Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee, the Paratransit Technical Advisory Committee, a Citizens Watchdog Committee Compliance subcommittee, the Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee, as well as to the Commission standing committees and the Commission as a whole.

Because there will be policy-level implications regarding proposed changes in the agreements, staff will bring policy considerations for discussion in September. Once those are vetted in September, draft agreements will be prepared for review in October by the committees with the aim of receiving final approval of the master funding agreement templates in December and full execution by February/March 2012. The proposed development schedule is below:

Master Funding Agreement Development Tasks	COMPLETION DATE		
Update Committees on Master Funding Agreements Schedule	July 2011		
Review Draft Policy Considerations for the Master Agreements	September 2011		
Review Draft Master Agreement Templates	October 2011		
Review Final Draft Master Agreement Templates	November 2011		
Commission Adoption of Master Funding Agreement Templates	December 2012		
Execute Master Funding Agreements	January – March 2012		
Allocation of Funds Pursuant to Master Agreements	March-April 2012		

Fiscal Impacts

There are no fiscal impacts at this time.

The Pothole **Report: Can the Bay Area** Have **Better Roads?**

June 2011



METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION



MTC Commission

Adrienne J. Tissier, Chair San Mateo County

Amy Rein Worth, Vice Chair *Cities of Contra Costa County*

Tom Azumbrado U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

Tom Bates *Cities of Alameda County*

David Campos *City and County of San Francisco*

Dave Cortese Santa Clara County

Bill Dodd *Napa County and Cities*

Dorene M. Giacopini U.S. Department of Transportation

Federal D. Glover Contra Costa County

Mark Green Association of Bay Area Governments

MTC Executive Staff

Steve Heminger *Executive Director*

Ann Flemer Deputy Executive Director, Policy

Andrew B. Fremier Deputy Executive Director, Operations **Scott Haggerty** *Alameda County*

Anne W. Halsted San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

Steve Kinsey *Marin County and Cities*

Sam Liccardo Cities of Santa Clara County

Jake Mackenzie Sonoma County and Cities

Kevin Mullin Cities of San Mateo County

Bijan Sartipi State Business, Transportation and Housing Agency

James P. Spering Solano County and Cities

Scott Wiener San Francisco Mayor's Appointee
The Pothole Report: Can the Bay Area Have Better Roads?

June 2011

Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter 101 Eighth Street Oakland, CA 94607-4700

510.817.5700 **tel** 510.817.5848 **fax** 510.817.5769 **tty/tdd**

info@mtc.ca.gov email www.mtc.ca.gov web



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
Pavement Preservation and Pavement Management	4
Regional Pavement Condition Summary	8
Pavement Recycling:	
Seeing Green in New Technology	10
Complete Streets: Safer, More Livable	12
Looking Forward: The Funding Picture	14
Pavement Condition Index for Bay Area	45
Jurisdictions: 2006–2010	15



Executive Summary

The condition of pavement on the Bay Area's local streets and roads is fair at best. The typical stretch of asphalt shows serious wear and will likely require rehabilitation soon. At 66 out of a possible 100 points, the region's average pavement condition index (PCI) score is now far closer to the 60-point threshold at which deterioration accelerates rapidly and the need for major rehabilitation becomes much more likely than to the 75-point score that MTC established as a target for roadway quality in its long-range *Transportation 2035 Plan* adopted in 2009. Indeed, despite efforts by the Commission and the region's local governments, overall conditions on our 42,500 lane-miles of city streets and county roads essentially are the same as they were in 2001, a decade ago.

Improved pavement quality can play a small but important role in meeting state targets for curbing greenhouse gas emissions. Not only does better pavement promote better vehicle fuel economy (and hence fewer emissions), but low-cost preventive maintenance also requires less asphalt and fewer heavy truck trips than major roadway rehabilitation projects, and new, cleaner application methods can also cut down on emissions. As the Bay Area works to achieve state targets for greenhouse gas emission reductions and to develop the Sustainable Communities Strategy mandated by state Senate Bill 375 (Steinberg, 2008), the time is right for an updated analysis of the region's local streets and roads.

Fresh Data, New Developments

Building on the foundation established in MTC's original *Pothole Report*, published in 2000, this update includes both a primer on the cost and life cycle of pavement and a comprehensive look at the current state of the Bay Area's local streets and roads network, featuring a jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction ranking of the 2010 PCI scores of the region's nine counties and 101 cities. This report also provides a briefing on two important new developments in the pavement management field:

- **Cold In-Place Recycling:** a relatively new and highly promising technique that has been shown to cut asphalt rehabilitation costs by 20 percent to 40 percent, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from pavement repair projects by eliminating the need to produce new paving material or transport it to the worksite; and
- **Complete Streets:** a design approach for urban neighborhoods in which the entire streetscape, from sidewalk to sidewalk, is geared for safe access and use by pedestrians, bicyclists and transit riders as well as motorists. Common ele-



ments typically include bike lanes, sidewalk bike racks, transit stops, pedestrian signals, street trees and curb ramps. Building Complete Streets requires a somewhat larger construction investment, but the benefits of this spending are spread to a wider spectrum of road users.

Scarce Funding Puts Premium on Prevention Practices

Funding for roadway maintenance typically comes from a range of sources, including the state gasoline tax, county sales taxes, and local sources such as city or county general funds, bonds and traffic-impact fees. But as the need for maintenance grows, the available funding from these sources has been shrinking. Not only are general fund contributions declining, but the state gas tax loses an average of 3 percent of its purchasing power each year due to inflation. County transportation sales taxes typically dedicate less than 25 percent of revenues to local street and road maintenance, and receipts from these taxes have fallen sharply in recent years due to the deep economic recession that began in 2007.

To help cities and counties get the biggest bang for their buck, MTC has long advocated pavement preservation. A municipality that spends \$1 on timely maintenance to keep a section of roadway in good condition would have to spend \$5 to restore the same road if the pavement is allowed to deteriorate to the point where major rehabilitation is necessary. All 109 Bay Area jurisdictions — and over 300 additional public agencies nationwide — now use MTC's StreetSaver® pavement management software to inventory their street networks, determine maintenance needs and devise maintenance programs based on available revenues.

Fixing the Fiscal Pothole

While pavement quality has rebounded slightly in recent years and now stands about where it did a decade ago, the challenge of boosting the regional average to "good" (a goal of MTC's *Transportation 2035 Plan*) is more daunting — and more expensive — than ever.

MTC estimates that meeting the Transportation 2035 goal of a local street and road network in "good" condition (average PCI score of 75) will require \$25 billion, or \$1 billion a year through 2035. This level of investment is nearly three times higher than the current \$351 million spent annually by all sources on roadway maintenance. Fixing this fiscal pothole will be a local and regional challenge as we move toward adoption (in 2013) of *Plan Bay Area*, the comprehensive regional plan that will guide transportation investment in the nine Bay Area counties through 2040.





Pavement Preservation and Pavement Management

Streets and roads take a beating under the weight of traffic. The first sign of distress on surface pavement is usually cracking. While cracks may not immediately alter the pavement's ride quality, they expose the sub-base of the roadway to water leaking through the surface layer. In time, water erodes pavement strength and cracks begin to lengthen and multiply, forming networks of interconnected cracks referred to as "alligator cracking."

At this point, the pavement is no longer able to sustain the weight of traffic and the cracked pavement disintegrates, forming depressions more familiarly known as potholes. Since potholes result from damage to the roadway's sub-base, once they appear — regardless of whether or not they are patched — the roadway will continue to deteriorate until it reaches a failed state.

Heavy vehicles such as trucks and buses put far more stress on pavement than does a passenger car. A bus exerts more than 7,000 times the stress on pavement than does a typical sport utility vehicle. And a garbage truck exerts more than 9,000 times as much stress as an SUV. Not surprisingly, cracks appear more quickly on streets with large traffic volumes and/or heavy use by trucks and buses. And these roadways need maintenance more frequently than residential streets with comparatively light vehicle traffic.

Relative Impact of Vehicle Types on Pavement Conditions



About 28 percent of the Bay Area's local road mileage consists of arterial and collector roadways, which are heavily used by both trucks and buses. The pounding that pavement receives from trucks and buses can be especially problematic in more rural parts of the Bay Area, where many roadways have not been designed to accommodate heavy vehicles but which are nonetheless used by growing numbers of trucks carrying goods between farms and cities.

Page 36



Time varies depending on traffic, climate, pavement design, etc. The most cost-effective way to maintain a roadway is to address cracks in the pavement as soon as they surface. Just as regular oil changes are far less expensive than a complete engine rebuild, it is five to 10 times cheaper to properly maintain streets than to allow them to fail and then pay for the necessary rehabilitation (see chart above). Deteriorating pavement carries private costs as well. A 2010 report by TRIP, a nonprofit organization that researches, evaluates and distributes technical data on highway transportation issues, estimated that drivers in the San Francisco-Oakland area pay an extra \$706 in annual operating costs for each vehicle as a result of roadway conditions¹.

The Importance of Early Intervention

The Bay Area has long emphasized the importance of early intervention through the adoption of proactive maintenance strategies, better education in pavement preservation concepts, and regional policies that give cities and counties incentives to practice pavement preservation on their street and road networks. MTC's *Transportation 2035 Plan* reaffirms this overall approach by conditioning regional funds for local street and road maintenance not only on need and level of system usage but also on preventive-maintenance performance.

By contrast, cities and counties that spend almost all of their paving budgets to fix only a handful of failed roadways, instead of proactively maintaining a much larger percentage of their network that is still in good condition, are practicing what is known as a "Worst First" strategy. With this approach, the good roads for which maintenance is deferred soon fall into disrepair and require more extensive and costly treatments.

Best and Worst Bay Area Roads

Many factors affect a city's or county's pavement condition index, or PCI score. These include pavement age, climate and precipitation, traffic loads and available maintenance funding. A municipality with new housing developments and new streets may have a high overall PCI, while an older, urbanized jurisdiction may have a much lower PCI, even though both are practicing pavement preservation. Cities and counties that practice preventive maintenance will have lower longterm pavement costs and will safeguard their investment in local streets and roads. For a full listing of Bay Area jurisdictions' pavement conditions, please go to page 15.

Bay Area Jurisdictions With Best and Worst Pavement Conditions in 2010, Based on 3-Year Average PCI Scores

Best PCI Ratings	Worst PCI Ratings
Brentwood – 86	Rio Vista – 42
Belvedere – 84	Larkspur – 45
Dublin – 82	Sonoma County – 45*
Los Altos - 82	St. Helena – 46
Foster City – 81	Orinda — 49

*Unincorporated area



- MTC pavement management software designed specifically for cities and counties.
- Over 400 users including Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, San Jose, Stanford University, US Forest Service
- Available online anytime, and anywhere with Internet access at www.streetsaveronline.com



El Cerrito streets have had a major makeover, funded in part by revenues from a voter-approved sales tax.

Bay Area governments' support for the preventive-maintenance philosophy — and their shift away from the ineffective "Worst First" strategy — has helped cities and counties squeeze the most out of existing resources. Indeed, the quality of Bay Area pavement (on average) actually increased slightly from 2005 to 2008, despite the fact that growth in maintenance revenues failed to keep pace with increases in the cost of paving materials.

El Cerrito: A Pavement Success Story

In 2006, the city of El Cerrito's local street network was in poor condition (single-year PCI score of 48) and the city had a backlog of more than \$21 million in maintenance work. Four years later, the city had boosted its single-year PCI score to 85 and had trimmed its maintenance backlog to just \$500,000. How did El Cerrito improve pavement conditions so much and so quickly?

After launching a public outreach campaign that included citizens, city council members and public works staff, El Cerrito won passage of a half-cent sales tax measure in 2008 for a Street Improvement Program. With \$2.1 million in sales tax revenues, augmented by \$10.5 million in bond proceeds and \$1.8 million in grant funds, the city improved pavement conditions and created a direct, local source of revenue for future maintenance. The biggest impact of the Street Improvement Program was El Cerrito's ability to reduce its maintenance backlog. The city also resurfaced 68 percent of its streets, built over 400 new curb ramps and replaced 50 storm drain crossings.

El Cerrito's Pavement Program and Conditions, 2006 vs. 2010

	2006	2010
Single-year PCI score	48 (Poor)	85 (Very Good)
PCI: 3-year moving average	53 (At Risk)	62 (Fair)
Maintenance backlog	\$21.2 million	\$500,000
Annual budget needed to maintain PCI	\$1.3 million	\$500,000
Annual average funding level	\$250,000	\$500,000

Pavement Management Boosts Preservation Returns

Building on pavement preservation principles established by the Federal Highway Administration², MTC developed a pavement management software package called StreetSaver® to assist local agencies in maintaining their roadways. StreetSaver® integrates the three main pavement preservation components: preventive maintenance, minor rehabilitation (non-structural) and routine maintenance activities, as well as pavement rehabilitation and reconstruction.

Today, all 109 Bay Area jurisdictions — and more than 300 additional public agencies nationwide — use StreetSaver[®]. The software allows cities and counties to inventory their street networks, determine their maintenance needs and devise maintenance programs based on available revenues. The software develops a list of recommended treatments,

Page 38

classified as preventive maintenance, minor rehab or major rehab, or reconstruction, and prioritizes treatments based on a weighted effectiveness ratio. Within the constraints of each jurisdiction's budget, the software selects the most cost-effective treatments for implementation and defers the remainder.

As with any other software package, StreetSaver[®]'s effectiveness depends on the input of reliable data. So for StreetSaver[®] to work, public works staff must promptly enter updated information about maintenance treatments once the treatments have been applied.

Reduced Greenhouse Gas Emissions

In addition to long-term cost savings, pavement preservation and pavement management strategies pay dividends by reducing the greenhouse gas emissions associated with both vehicle use and roadway construction. According to a June 2009 Caltrans report, *Prioritization of Transportation Projects for Economic Stimulus with Respect to Greenhouse Gases*, smooth pavement reduces GHG emissions by improving vehicles' fuel economy. The report also notes that more-frequent, low-cost treatments produce fewer emissions than do major rehabilitation projects made necessary by deferred maintenance (see graph below). This is due to the need to produce less asphalt or other paving materials, and the need for fewer truck trips to transport materials to and from the worksite.

Pavement rehabilitation and reconstruction requires large amounts of energy to acquire and process raw materials, transport materials to the construction site, apply the materials, and remove, haul away and discard old materials. Over a 20-year period, these processes combined produce an estimated 212,000 pounds of GHG emissions per lane mile of roadway. Pavement preservation treatments, by contrast, would emit about 30,100 pounds of GHGs over this time, even when done more frequently. This 20-year savings of more than 180,000 pounds of GHG emissions is equivalent to taking 15 cars off the road for a year for each lane mile that is properly maintained. And because preservation treatments keep the roadway in better condition, more motorists are able to travel at steady speeds — and fewer are required to slow down to avoid potholes — thus promoting better fuel economy and even lower GHG emissions.



GHG Emissions With Pavement Preservation vs. Deferred Maintenance³

Benefits of a Pavement Management System

- Provide a systematic way of gauging pavement conditions, and present a series of steps for using this information to identify and schedule the most appropriate treatments.
- Help cities and counties make more efficient use of public funds by allowing them to immediately put any available new moneys to their most cost-effective use.
- Allow local governments to predict what conditions would be at different levels of funding, and to quantify the consequences of underfunded road maintenance.
- Allow local governments to establish performance-based funding allocation policies.
- Reduce governments' overall maintenance spending once the management system reaches its goal of getting all pavement segments to the condition where preservation is the primary strategy being applied.
- Build support for increased funding by systematically tracking pavement inventories, conditions and maintenance activities across multiple jurisdictions.

Page 39 The Pothole Report: Can the Bay Area Have Better Roads? | 7

Bay Area Pavement Condition Index (PCI) Scores, 2001–2010*



*PCI scores are 3-year moving averages, except for 2001 and 2002, which are singleyear scores, and 2008/09, which is a 3-year moving average computed from individualyear scores for 2006, 2007 and 2009.

Regional Pavement Condition Summary

The Bay Area's local street and road network comprises nearly 42,500 lane miles of roadway, and includes not only paved surfaces but also the curbs and gutters, side-walks, storm drains, traffic signs, signals and lights that are necessary for functioning roadways. To replace this network would cost at least \$50 billion. The roadway network provides access to jobs, homes, schools, shopping and recreation, and is vital to the region's livability and economic health. As with any asset, regular maintenance is required in order to ensure serviceability.

Every year, local jurisdictions analyze pavement conditions to help gauge their success in maintaining their local street and road networks. MTC, in turn, collects this information to determine regional state of repair. MTC and local jurisdictions use a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) score that rates segments of paved roadways on a scale from 0 to 100. MTC looks at the percentage of the region's roadways that fall into various condition categories, ranging from a low of "failed" to a high of "excellent." The classifications used in the regional pavement condition analysis are shown in the following table:

Very Good-Excellent (PCI = 80-100)	Pavements are newly constructed or resurfaced and have few if any signs of distress.
Good (PCI = 70-79)	Pavements require mostly preventive maintenance and have only low levels of distress, such as minor cracks or spalling, which occurs when the top layer of asphalt begins to peel or flake off as a result of water permeation.
Fair (PCI = 60-69)	Pavements at the low end of this range have signifi- cant levels of distress and may require a combination of rehabilitation and preventive maintenance to keep them from deteriorating rapidly.
At Risk (PCI = 50-59)	Pavements are deteriorated and require immediate attention including rehabilitative work. Ride quality is significantly inferior to better pavement categories.
Poor (PCI = 25-49)	Pavements have extensive amounts of distress and require major rehabilitation or reconstruction. Pave- ments in this category affect the speed and flow of traffic significantly.
Failed (PCI = 0-24)	Pavements need reconstruction and are extremely rough and difficult to drive.
	Page 40

The 2010 pavement condition analysis shows that Bay Area streets and roads have a three-year moving average PCI score of 66, which is unchanged from the same calculation for 2009. This score falls in the "fair" range, indicating that the typical city street or county road is becoming worn to the point where rehabilitation may be needed to prevent rapid deterioration. The stability of the Bay Area's average PCI score is mirrored in the percentage of lane miles included in the various pavement quality classifications in recent years. As the bar graph below shows, roadways in the "excellent" or "very good" ranges account for about one-third of the paved lane miles in the nine-county region. Another one-third falls in the "good" or "fair" ranges, while the final third is classified as "at-risk," "poor" or "failed."

Functional Classifications

Just as there are different ranges of pavement quality, so too are there various classifications for local streets and roads. A roadway's "functional classification" is determined primarily by the number of vehicles that use it. About 70 percent of roadways are residential (see chart at right). These are the streets and roads that run through neighborhoods and carry few buses or trucks, other than waste management vehicles. Collector roadways serve to "collect" traffic from the residential streets and deposit them onto arterials, which carry the most car, truck and bus traffic, and which typically provide an outlet onto state highways or freeways. Arterials also function as alternatives to highways and freeways to relieve traffic congestion. Federal funding can be used only on roadways that have a functional classification of collector or arterial, or roughly 28 percent of the Bay Area street system.

Local streets and roads, which are owned and maintained by cities or counties, account for 90 percent of the Bay Area's total lane mileage. State highways (including interstate highways) are maintained by Caltrans and comprise about 7 percent of total mileage. Roadways that fall under the responsibility of the federal government primarily include those in national parks, reserves, tribal lands and military installations. About 2 percent of roadways are either privately owned, or are owned and maintained by special districts such as the California Department of Parks and Recreation or the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District.

Bay Area Local Roadway Characteristics

Functional Classification of Local Street and Road Network, by Percentage of Mileage



Ownership of Maintained Roads in Bay Area, by Percentage of Mileage (2008)



Pavement Conditions on Bay Area Local Roadways, 2006–2010 (% of lane miles)

2010	32%		34%	11%	23%	
2008/09	33%		34%	11%	21%	1%
2007	35%		32%	10%	22%	1%
2006	34%		31%	10%	25%	
Excellent or Very Good	Good or Fair	At Risk	Poor or Failed	No Data	Bago /1	

The Pothole Report: Can the Bay Area Have Better Roads? | 9

Cost, Energy, Materials and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Associated with Recycled Asphalt Pavement (RAP)⁴



Recycled Asphalt Pavement (RAP) Mix (RAP as a percentage of total pavement material mix)

Pavement Recycling: Seeing Green in New Technology

State law obliges MTC and other regional agencies to work together with local governments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions related to transportation. Promising innovations in pavement maintenance, including alternative methods of construction and the use of sustainable materials and technologies, highlight an opportunity to not only move the GHG needle in the right direction but to reduce cities' and counties' longterm maintenance costs as well. And unlike other strategies for reducing GHG emissions, these innovations can deliver immediate benefits — with no large-scale behavioral changes required.

Cold In-Place Recycling

Several Bay Area municipalities already are experimenting with a relatively new technology known as Cold In-Place Recycling (CIR), which eliminates the need for the extraction and processing of raw materials, as well as the transportation and lay-down of finished asphalt-concrete (the main material in pavement resurfacing). On average, each lane mile paved with CIR instead of conventional hot-mix asphalt reduces CO_2 emissions by 131,000 pounds — or more than 400 percent — at a cost 20 to 40 percent below that of conventional techniques.

Because CIR requires the use of specialized machinery, local governments typically bid out these jobs to contractors who are experienced in the use of this equipment. A CIR "train" travels down the roadway, cold-planing the existing pavement to a depth of two to eight inches. As soon as the first machine scoops up the pavement, a second pulverizes and mixes it with additives, while a third machine replaces and then smooths the mix back onto the roadway.

MTC recently awarded a \$2 million grant through its Climate Initiatives Program to help finance a joint CIR demonstration project by Sonoma County and the city of Napa, with the intention of piloting the use of this technology for possible applications elsewhere in the Bay Area. The grant includes funds for outreach to familiarize other jurisdictions with the benefits of CIR. Planned outreach elements include site visits, video and sample technical specifications for use by other cities and counties. All climate grants will be evaluated for effectiveness in reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Off-Site Recycling

Another way in which road maintenance and construction are becoming more green is the off-site recycling of asphalt. In this process, workers remove asphalt and transport it to a plant for reprocessing, where machines grind up and mix the recycled material with fresh asphalt, and then apply the mix — known as recycled asphalt or RAP — to the roadways. (Graph at upper left shows cost, energy, materials and greenhouse reductions possible with RAP.)



Road Rehabilitation Equipment: Conventional vs. Cold In-Place Recycling



Rubberized Asphalt Concrete

The image above shows the traditional paving equipment that would be replaced by Cold In-Place Recycling. Studies show that for each lane mile treated with CIR instead of conventional paving methods, the GHG emissions savings are equivalent to removing 11 cars from the road for one year. With 42,500 lane miles of local roadways in the Bay Area, the potential impact is enormous.

While off-site asphalt recycling does not deliver the scale of greenhouse gas reductions offered by CIR, it does limit the need to secure, process and transport virgin materials. The quality of recycled asphalt has improved greatly in recent years, and now meets or exceeds the quality of virgin materials. Caltrans has set a target of 15 percent recycled asphalt in highway paving projects statewide. Local jurisdictions across the nation are experimenting with even higher percentages of recycled asphalt.

Just as asphalt is being recycled and reused in roadway maintenance, other materials such as roofing shingles and rubber tires are getting second lives as roadway surfacing materials. Rubberized asphalt concrete — made with a combination of regular asphalt concrete and ground-up tires - produces highly durable, skid-resistant and quiet pavement surfaces while using a material that would otherwise end up in landfills. One lane mile of roadway paved with a two-inch-thick surface of rubberized asphalt concrete consumes about 2,000 scrap tires.

The state of California launched a Rubberized Asphalt Concrete (RAC) Grant Program through its CalRecycle initiative to decrease the environmental impacts from the illegal disposal and stockpiling of waste tires. Any California city or county is eligible to apply for a RAC grant through CalRecycle.⁵

According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, about 12 million tires are converted into rubberized asphalt concrete annually.

Photos courtesy of CalR

Cost to Maintain Bay Area Local Streets and Roads, 2010-2035, Including Complete Streets Enhancements



Complete Streets: Safer, More Livable

Pedestrians and bicyclists share the Bay Area's streets and roads with cars, trucks and buses. To make roadways — particularly those in urban areas more pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly, a new design approach known as Complete Streets has emerged in recent years. While there is no standard template, common elements typically include bike lanes, sidewalk bike racks, transit stops, pedestrian signals, street trees and curb ramps. By incorporating these elements into Complete Streets, transportation agencies help ensure that people of all ages and abilities can use the street safely.

MTC has embraced the Complete Streets concept. MTC Resolution 3765, adopted in 2006 to promote routine accommodation of non-motorized travelers in project planning and design, led to development of a Complete Streets checklist which Bay Area cities and counties must submit with applications for regional funding. At the state level, Caltrans adopted Deputy Directive 64-R-1 in 2008, recognizing bicycle, pedestrian and transit modes as integral elements of the transportation system and considering all transportation improvements as opportunities to improve safety, access and mobility for all travelers. And a Federal Highway Administration safety review found pedestrian safety is improved by streets designed with sidewalks, raised medians, optimal bus stop placement, trafficcalming measures and treatments for disabled travelers⁶. One study cited by the National Complete Streets Coalition found that designing for pedestrian travel by installing raised medians and redesigning intersections and sidewalks reduced pedestrian injury and fatality risk by 28 percent⁷.

Investing in Complete Streets

Because each street is unique, the cost of upgrading to a Complete Street can vary widely from project to project. But, on average, costs for Complete Street projects tend to run 15 percent to 25 percent higher than projects without these enhancements. This includes both the pavement (e.g., a bike lane) and nonpavement (e.g., street furniture and plantings) elements that make up a Complete Street. The illustration and table on page 13 show an example of a downtown Complete Street and its associated costs, as estimated by staff from the city of Santa Rosa.

Elements of an Urban Complete Street⁸



Based on *Transportation 2035 Plan* estimates of the cost to maintain existing pavement and non-pavement assets in the Bay Area, an additional \$7 billion would be required to upgrade to Complete Street status just the region's major roadways, which account for about 28 percent of the local street and road network. (See chart on page 12.)

Example: Estimated Construction Costs for Urban Complete Street

	Item	Total Cost Per Block Conventional Street	Total Cost Per Block Complete Street
1	Pavement Costs Attributed to Cars	\$152,533	\$152,533
2	Pavement Costs Attributed to Buses/Trucks	\$238,333	\$238,333
3	Pavement Costs Attributed to Bicycles		\$47,667
	Subtotal Pavement Costs	\$390,866	\$438,533
4	Lights/Signs/ Markings	\$41,600	\$41,600
5	Curb and Gutter	\$42,900	\$42,900
6	Storm Drain	\$153,439	\$153,439
7	Sidewalk and ADA Ramp	\$182,000	\$182,000
8	Traffic Signal	\$390,000	\$390,000
9	Street Furniture and Plantings**		\$187,590
	Subtotal Non-Pavement Costs	\$809,939	\$997,529
	Total Cost	\$1,200,805	\$1,436,062

* Estimate provided by city of Santa Rosa.

** Street Furniture and Plantings includes bike racks, street trees, lighted bus shelters, trash and recycle bins, benches and plant pots.

What Will It Take?

To improve the Bay Area's local streets and roads to a "good" pavement condition (PCI of 75), additional revenues roughly equal to a 20-cent increase in the gas tax — dedicated to local street and road maintenance — would be needed. The figure below illustrates the levels to which per-gallon gas taxes would need to rise in order to generate the funds necessary to maintain current pavement conditions, or to bring them up to a "good" level. To also improve the region's non-pavement assets to a "good" condition, an additional 18 cents per gallon would be required. (Note: These calculations do not include the cost of Complete Street-type upgrades.)



* Revenues from the existing fuel tax are dedicated to many purposes — streets and roads are only one of these.



Looking Forward: The Funding Picture

With a regionwide average PCI score of 66, the Bay Area's city streets and county roads are close to the tipping point on the pavement life-cycle curve, after which pavement may decline rapidly and repair costs increase (see illustration on page 5).

Predictable, long-term funding is imperative if cities and counties are to travel toward a pothole-free future. The Bay Area currently invests about \$351 million annually in maintaining local streets and roads. If investment continues at this level, local streets and roads will, on average, deteriorate to poor condition (PCI of 45) by 2035. In order to bring the region's pavement conditions up to good condition (PCI of 75), the region would need to triple current maintenance expenditures to nearly \$1 billion annually. The chart below details the average pavement conditions that are projected at each investment level.

Projected Pavement Conditions in 2035 Based on Annual Expenditure Level Scenarios

	Existing Funding	Maintain Current Pavement Condition	Improve Conditions*
Average Regional PCI** in 2035	45	66	75
Pavement Condition	Poor	Fair	Good
Average Annual Expenditure Level***	\$351 million	\$740 million	\$975 million
Annual Expenditure/ Lane Mile	\$8,000	\$17,000	\$23,000
Increase Over Current Expenditure Level (%)	0%	110%	177%

* Improvements do not include Complete Street-type upgrades.

** PCI is the Pavement Condition Index (Scale of 0 to 100, with 100 being the highest PCI).

*** Average Annual Expenditure Level assumes a 3 percent inflation rate.

Currently, revenue sources typically used to pay for roadway maintenance include state gas taxes, federal highway funds, county sales taxes, city and county general funds, bonds and traffic fees. As the various levels of government look to renew and/or reauthorize funding measures and long-range plans, attention to the cost of maintaining streets and roads at a good state of repair should remain a high priority.

			3	B-Year Mov	ing Averag	e
Jurisdiction	County	Total Lane Miles	2006	2007	2009 ¹	2010 ²
	V	ery Good (PCI=80–	89)			
Brentwood	Contra Costa	416	85	84	85	86
Belvedere	Marin	24	81	79	82	84
Dublin	Alameda	240	80	80	81	82
Los Altos	Santa Clara	226	85	84	83	82
Foster City	San Mateo	121	82	83	82	81*
Santa Clara	Santa Clara	597	83	82	82	80*
San Pablo	Contra Costa	104	67	72	76	80
		Good (PCI=70-79))			
Livermore	Alameda	655	79	79	78	78
Union City	Alameda	331	76	75	76	78
Contra Costa County	Contra Costa	1327	83	82	80	78
Redwood City	San Mateo	353	74	76	77	78*
Atherton	San Mateo	106	68	69	73	77
Brisbane	San Mateo	57	70	73	76	77
Daly City	San Mateo	254	70	73	75	77*
Pleasanton	Alameda	498	74	75	76	77
Burlingame	San Mateo	162	68	72	75	77*
Morgan Hill	Santa Clara	259	71	75	76	77
Emeryville	Alameda	47	76	79	76	77
Los Altos Hills	Santa Clara	113	74	75	76	77
Sonoma	Sonoma	68	80	79	79	77
Oakley	Contra Costa	229	83	80	78	76
Gilroy	Santa Clara	243	82	80	79	76*
Mountain View	Santa Clara	331	74	74	75	76
Dixon	Solano	129	81	77	76	76
Concord	Contra Costa	713	78	78	78	76
Vacaville	Solano	533	78	79	77	76*
Clayton	Contra Costa	95	75	77	76	75
Campbell	Santa Clara	218	78	76	75	75*
Sunnyvale	Santa Clara	636	80	77	74	75

Pavement Condition Index (PCI) for Bay Area Jurisdictions, 2006–2010

3-Year Moving Average Total Jurisdiction County Lane Miles 2009¹ 2010² Marin San Rafael Santa Clara Santa Clara County San Ramon Contra Costa American Canyon Napa Contra Costa Hercules Windsor Sonoma Novato Marin 73* Portola Valley San Mateo 73* San Mateo San Mateo Palo Alto Santa Clara N/A N/A Danville Contra Costa Walnut Creek Contra Costa 73* 73* South San Francisco San Mateo Solano Fairfield Alameda County Alameda Contra Costa Lafayette 72* Corte Madera Marin Cloverdale Sonoma 71* 71** Saratoga Santa Clara Hillsborough San Mateo Piedmont Alameda Cupertino Santa Clara Pinole Contra Costa Tiburon Marin Fair (PCI=60-69) Fairfax Marin Yountville Napa Milpitas Santa Clara Alameda Hayward Antioch Contra Costa San Mateo County San Mateo Los Gatos Santa Clara

Pavement Condition Index (PCI) for Bay Area Jurisdictions, 2006–2010 (continued)

Pavement Condition Index (PCI) for Bay Area Jurisdictions, 2006–2010 (continued)

			3-Year Moving Average			
	0	Total		0007	00001	00103
Jurisdiction	County	Lane Miles	2006	2007	2009	20102
Monte Sereno	Santa Clara	27	65	70	68	69
Newark	Alameda	252	75	71	69	69**
Rohnert Park	Sonoma	206	68	67	67	69
Ross	Marin	22	64	65	69	67
San Carlos	San Mateo	175	68	69	70	67
Pleasant Hill	Contra Costa	242	62	65	65	67
Solano County	Solano	932	58	61	64	67
Healdsburg	Sonoma	93	66	66	67	67
Alameda	Alameda	275	63	63	62	66
Colma	San Mateo	23	67	72	67	65
Santa Rosa	Sonoma	1090	64	64	65	65
Sebastopol	Sonoma	47	67	67	66	65
Fremont	Alameda	1063	70	68	66	64
Pittsburg	Contra Costa	319	65	64	64	64
San Jose	Santa Clara	4182	63	63	63	64
Cotati	Sonoma	46	66	66	64	64*
San Francisco	San Francisco	2130	64	64	64	64
San Bruno	San Mateo	178	62	64	63	63
Benicia	Solano	190	70	68	66	63
Sausalito	Marin	54	69	68	65	63*
Menlo Park	San Mateo	200	62	62	62	63
El Cerrito	Contra Costa	145	53	50	50	62
Half Moon Bay	San Mateo	55	55	59	61	62
Suisun City	Solano	150	53	50	55	62
Mill Valley	Marin	117	64	62	60	61
Albany	Alameda	59	62	63	63	60
Calistoga	Napa	29	57	57	59	60*
Berkeley	Alameda	453	62	60	60	60*
Belmont	San Mateo	135	61	61	61	60

Pavement Condition Index (PCI) for Bay Area Jurisdictions, 2006–2010 (continued)

		3-Year Moving Average							
Jurisdiction	County	Total Lane Miles	2006	2007	2009 ¹	2010 ²			
At-Risk (PCI=50–59)									
Millbrae	San Mateo	124	60	57	57	59*			
Pacifica	San Mateo	189	64	60	59	59*			
Martinez	Contra Costa	233	57	57	59	59**			
Moraga	Contra Costa	110	61	60	59	58**			
Napa County	Napa	840	54	51	55	57*			
Woodside	San Mateo	97	62	60	57	57			
San Leandro	Alameda	392	62	60	58	57*			
Napa	Napa	464	52	53	55	57			
Oakland	Alameda	1963	56	57	59	56			
Richmond	Contra Costa	549	46	50	53	55*			
San Anselmo	Marin	80	59	58	57	55**			
Petaluma	Sonoma	390	60	57	55	55			
East Palo Alto	San Mateo	80	60	56	52	53			
Vallejo	Solano	681	54	54	53	53			
Marin County	Marin	848	48	49	50	52			
		Poor (PCI=25-49)							
Orinda	Contra Costa	193	46	47	48	49			
St. Helena	Napa	51	58	53	48	46			
Larkspur	Marin	64	51	48	47	45			
Sonoma County	Sonoma	2718	44	44	44	45			
Rio Vista	Solano	45	51	48	45	42***			
Regional		42,499	64	65	66	66			

Notes:

Where "NA" is indicated, the jurisdiction used pavement management software that does not use the PCI scale.

¹ Increased utilization of online reporting options by many jurisdictions in 2009 allowed MTC to collect and tabulate 2009 pavement condition data, even as 2008 data was still being compiled. To simplify reporting, MTC decided not to separately report 2008 data, electing instead to bring PCI data up to date as of 2009. The reported 2009 3-year moving average is computed from the individual-year scores for 2006, 2007 and 2009.

² The 2010 3-year moving average is computed from the individual-year scores for 2007, 2009 and 2010.

* 3-year moving average score is an estimate based on inspections done in 2008.

** 3-year moving average score is an estimate based on inspections done in 2007.

*** 3-year moving average score is an estimate based on inspections done in 2006.

Footnotes/Citations

¹ (Page 5) Press release reference: www.tripnet.org/national/Urban_Roads_PR_092210.pdf

- ² (Page 6) Pavement Preservation: a program employing a network-level, longterm strategy that enhances pavement performance by using an integrated, cost-effective set of practices that extend pavement life, improve safety and meet motorist expectations. (FHWA Pavement Preservation Expert Task Group; see Federal Highway Administration website: www.fhwa.dot.gov/pavement/preservation/091205.cfm)
- ³ (Page 7) Jim Chehovits & Larry Galehouse, "Energy Usage and Greenhouse Gas Emissions of Pavement Preservation Processes for Asphalt Concrete Pavements," *Proceedings of the International Conference for Pavement Preservation*, 2010
- ⁴ (Page 10) Source: Meyer, Wendall L., FHWA Update, *Proceedings of the North Dakota Asphalt Conference*, 2010. Based on data from: Robinette, C. and J. Epps, "Energy, Emissions, Material Conservation and Prices Associated with Construction, Rehabilitation and Materials Alternatives for Flexible Pavement," *Proceedings of the 89th Annual TRB Meeting*, 2010
- ⁵ (Page 11) More information about Cal Recycle and the Rubberized Asphalt Concrete Grant Program is available at www.calrecycle.ca.gov
- ⁶ (Page 12) Federal Highway Administration website: safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped_bike/ped_transit/ped_transguide/ch3.cfm
- ⁷ (page 12) National Complete Streets Coalition, www.completestreets.org/complete-streets-fundamentals/factsheets/safety
- ⁸ (Page 13) Urban Complete Streets graphic courtesy of Pavement Engineering, Inc., CA

Project Staff

The Pothole Report: Can the Bay Area Have Better Roads? was produced by MTC's Programming and Allocations Section.

Alix Bockelman

Director, Programming and Allocations

Theresa Romell Pavement Program Manager

Amy Burch Project Manager

Theresa Romell, Sui Tan Data Analysis

Joe Curley Editor

John Goodwin Assistant Editor

Peter Beeler Design

Peter Beeler, Michele Stone Production

Karl Neilsen Photography (except where otherwise indicated)

Dakota Press, San Leandro, CA Printing

To order additional copies of this publication, contact the MTC Library: library@mtc.ca.gov email 510.817.5932 fax 510.817.5836 phone





Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter 101 Eighth Street Oakland CA 94607-4700

510.817.5700 tel 510.817.5848 fax 510.817.5769 tty/tdd

info@mtc.ca.gov email www.mtc.ca.gov web



Memorandum

- **DATE:** June 27 2011
- **TO:** Programs and Project Committee
- **FROM:** Vivek Bhat, Senior Transportation Engineer
- SUBJECT: I-580 San Leandro Sound Wall Landscape Project Approval of Authorization to Execute All Necessary Agreements for the Construction Element of the Project.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Commission take the following actions in support of delivering the I-580 San Leandro Sound Wall Landscape Project:

- 1. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements for the Construction element of the Project.
- 2. Authorize staff to prepare and issue a request for proposals (RFP) and proceed with the contract procurement process to obtain a consultant construction management team for the Project.
- 3. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to execute all necessary agreements with the selected consultant for construction management services for the I-580 Landscape Project in San Leandro for an amount not to exceed \$80,000. This contract will be funded with existing federal funds programmed to the project.

Summary

The Alameda CTC is the sponsor of the I-580 San Leandro Sound Wall Landscape Project. This Project is a follow on contract to the recently completed I-580 San Leandro Sound Wall Project in the City of San Leandro. The Alameda CTC is also responsible for advertise, award and administration (AAA) of the construction contract for the project. The detailed design plans, specifications, and estimates (PS&E) documents for the project have been completed. The Alameda CTC has programmed \$350,000 in State Transportation Improvement Program - Transportation Enhancement (STIP-TE) Funds to repair the existing irrigation system, plant new plants and add additional irrigation system.

Background

The Alameda CTC is the sponsor of the I-580 San Leandro Landscape Project. This project is a follow on contract to the recently completed I-580 San Leandro Sound Wall Project in the City of San Leandro and will repair the existing irrigation system, plant new plants and add an additional irrigation system around the sound walls.

At the December 2009 meeting, the ACCMA Board approved programming \$350,000 of STIP TE funds to the I-580 San Leandro Landscape Project. Alameda CTC would need to submit a Request for Funds Authorization (E-76) package and Allocation request to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) in order to access these funds.

Caltrans has prepared draft cooperative agreements for the Construction of the project. The execution of the cooperative agreement with Caltrans will permit the work by Alameda CTC staff and its contractors in the Caltrans Right of Way.

The Alameda CTC is also responsible for the Advertise, Award and Administration (AAA) component of the project. The Alameda CTC will contract with a qualified consultant to provide the necessary support for the construction administration, management and inspection of this project. The consultant contract will be initiated prior to the start of construction, which is anticipated to begin in Spring 2012, to assist with bid packaging, quality assurance and constructability reviews. The estimated cost for these services is \$80,000 and is included in the \$350,000 programmed STIP-TE funds.

The consultant services may include the following:

- Constructability and reasonableness reviews of the plans, specifications and estimate;
- Assist with the bidding process (including preparation of bid package, advertisement, pre-bid meeting, responding to requests for information during the bid period), bid evaluation and contract award;
- Construction administration, management, inspection and testing services; and
- Construction closeout services.

Fiscal Impact

Approval of the recommended actions will encumber \$350,000 for the project which will be reimbursed by Federal and State funding sources. Funds to implement the project are assumed in the FY 2011/12 Alameda CTC budget.



Memorandum

DATE: June 27, 2011

TO: Programs and Project Committee

- FROM:Stephen D. Haas, Project MangerRay T. Akkawi, Manager of Project Delivery
- SUBJECT: Eastbound I-580 Express Lane and Auxiliary Lane Projects Approval to Revise Funding Plan and Authorization to Execute Agreements and Contracts for Environmental and Design Utilizing TVTC Funds

Recommendations

It is recommended that the Commission take the following actions in support of the combined I-580 Eastbound Express Lanes/Auxiliary Lane Project:

- Approve the revised funding plan for the combined I-580 Eastbound Express Lanes/Auxiliary Lane Project. The funding plan has been revised to move \$1.45 million in Tri-Valley Transportation Council (TVTC) funds from first year operations and maintenance to the design, right of way and construction support phases, including system integration. \$1.45 Million in funds to be determined has been moved from the design, right of way and construction support phases to first year operations and maintenance.
- 2. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements and contracts to continue design and right of way phase activities, including system integration, utilizing \$1.275 million in TVTC funds shifted from first year operations and maintenance to the design and right of way phases. \$175,000 will be held in reserve for construction support.

Summary

The combined I-580 Eastbound Express Lane/Auxiliary Lane Project will construct a double express (HOT) lane from Hacienda to Greenville and will construct auxiliary lanes between Isabel Avenue and North Livermore Avenue and between North Livermore Avenue and First Street in Livermore. The I-580 Eastbound Auxiliary Lane Project was delayed pending an agreement between the Alameda CTC and Caltrans on the scope of the I-580 Eastbound Express Lane Project as changes to the Express Lane project would require changes to the Auxiliary Lanes project. In December 2010, the Alameda CTC and Caltrans reached an agreement on the scope of the Express Lane project requiring an additional six (6) feet of widening within the limits of the Auxiliary Lanes project, and some spot widening at other locations. The two projects will be combined for construction.

As reflected in the approved funding plan for the combined project, this additional scope has resulted in an \$8.5 million shortfall. The approved funding plan also identified \$1.45 Million in TVTC funds for the express lanes' first year operations and maintenance expenses. By exchanging \$1.45 million of the shortfall from design, right of way and construction support with \$1.45 million of TVTC funds in operations and maintenance the design revisions may continue. Other minor changes have been made to the funding plan to reflect current expectations; these changes are limited to shifting funds between project phases. Staff will prepare a plan to fund the shortfall for a future Commission Agenda.

	Total	Funding (\$ x 1,000)							
Project Components	Costs (\$ x1, 000)	TVTC	CMIA	RM2	I-580 Corridor - EB HOV	ARRA	Fed	TBD	Total Funding
PE/Env	\$3,604.3	\$918.1	0	\$2,686.2	0	0	0	0	\$3,604.3
Final Design – PS&E	\$2,302.9	\$343.7	0	\$733.8	0	120.4	\$225.0	880.0	\$2,302.9
System Integrator	\$7,667.8	\$288.2	0	0	0	\$7,379.6	0	0	\$7,667.8
Right of Way	\$900.0	0	0	\$700.0	0	0	0	200.0	\$900.0
Construction Engineering	\$4,295.0	0	\$2,535.0	\$965.0	0	0	0	\$795.0	\$4,295.0
Major Contract Capital	\$38,717.0	0	\$19,028.0	\$8,075.0	\$4,989.0	0	0	\$6,625.0	\$38,717.0
Operations & Maintenance	\$1,450.0	\$1,450.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$1,450.0
Total	\$58,937.0	\$3,000.0	\$21,563.0	\$13,160.0	\$4,989.0	\$7,500.0	\$225.0	\$8,500.0	\$58,937.0

Approved Funding Plan:

Proposed Funding Plan

	Total	Funding (\$ x 1,000)							
Project Components	Costs (\$ x1, 000)	TVTC	CMIA	RM2	I-580 Corridor - EB HOV	ARRA	Fed	TBD	Total Funding
PE/Env	\$3,429.6	\$1,081.5	0	\$2,348.1	0	0	0	0	\$3,429.6
Final Design – PS&E	\$2,841.2	\$1,244.3	0	\$1,371.9	0	0	\$225.0	0	\$2,841.2
System Integrator	\$7,799.2	\$299.2	0	0	0	\$7,500.0	0	0	\$7,799.2
Right of Way	\$600.0	\$200.0	0	\$400.0	0	0	0	0	\$600.0
Construction Engineering	\$4,100.0	\$175.0	\$2,535.0	\$965.0	0	0	0	\$425.0	\$4,100.0
Major Contract Capital	\$38,717.0	0	\$19,028.0	\$8,075.0	\$4,989.0	0	0	\$6,625.0	\$38,717.0
Operations & Maintenance	\$1,450.0		0	0	0	0	0	\$1,450.0	\$1,450.0
Total	\$58,937.0	\$3,000.0	\$21,563.0	\$13,160.0	\$4,989.0	\$7,500.0	\$225.0	\$8,500.0	\$58,937.0

Action 1:

It is recommended that the Commission approve the revised funding plan for the combined I-580 Eastbound Express Lanes/Auxiliary Lane Project to move \$1.45 million in TVTC funds from first year operations and maintenance to the design, right of way and construction support phases, including system integration. \$1.45 Million in shortfall will be moved from the design, right of way and construction support phases to first year operations and maintenance.

Action 2:

It is recommended that the Commission authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to negotiate and execute all necessary contracts and agreements for the allocation and use of the TVTC funds not to exceed \$1,275 million. \$175,000 will be held in reserve for construction support.

Fiscal Impact

The Alameda CTC's Consolidated FY 2011-12 budget will be revised to reflect the expenditure of an additional \$1.275 million of TVTC funds in FY 2011/2012. This expenditure of these funds is currently budgeted for FY 2012/2013.

This page intentionally left blank



Memorandum

DATE: June 24, 2011

- **TO:** Programs and Projects Committee
- **FROM:** Ray Akkawi, Manager of Project Delivery
- SUBJECT: Northbound I-680 Express Lane Project (ACTIA No. 8) Approval of Consultant Team to Provide Project Approval and Environmental Document and Authorization to Execute a Contract

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Committee approve the selection of the top-ranked team, WMH Corporation (WMH), to prepare a Combined Project Study Report/Project Report and Environmental Document for the delivery of the I-680 Northbound High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV)/Express Lane Project, and authorize execution of a consultant contract for these services.

Summary

On April 28, 2011, the Alameda CTC Board approved the issuance of an RFP for consultant services to prepare a Combined Project Study Report/Project Report (PSR/PR) and Environmental Document. Staff released an RFP on May 9, 2011. A mandatory pre-proposal meeting was held on May 19, 2011, and a total of forty-two (42) firms attended. Five (5) teams submitted proposals to the Alameda CTC by the due date of May 27, 2011, and after careful review of each proposal and with consideration of the interview process by an independent consultant selection panel, the WMH team was unanimously selected as the top-ranked team.

Background

The I-680 Corridor is a primary north-south transportation corridor between Alameda and Santa Clara Counties, which serves commuter, commercial, and recreation traffic. Previously the corridor was considered the second most congested corridor in the San Francisco Bay Area. Recently constructed improvements to southbound I-680 along with the slower economy have reduced the southbound congestion levels between Route 84 in Alameda County and Route 237 in Santa Clara County. The improvements include the interim HOV lane which was followed by the more standard HOV lane combined with the Express Lane. There are now three general-purpose lanes, one HOV/Express Lane, a truck climbing lane, and auxiliary lanes in the southbound direction.

In 2005, Caltrans approved a Project Report/Environmental Document for a northbound HOV lane project with limits similar to the limits of the recently constructed southbound HOV/Express Lane project. The scope of the northbound project included in the 2005 Project Report has been changed by the late inclusion of the southbound Express Lane with the southbound HOV lane

project. The project footprint of the northbound project included in the 2005 Project Report and Environmental Document did not assume the addition of the southbound Express Lane, which may require a new environmental document to be developed for the I-680 Northbound Express Lane Project.

Given the 2005 timeframe for completion of the previous environmental studies related to the northbound HOV project and the undetermined extent of the impacts due to expanding the southbound HOV to include the Express Lane, it is anticipated that some of the preliminary engineering and environmental work will have to be revisited, and perhaps reworked. The recommended project delivery plan includes an assumption that a combined Project Study Report/Project Report (PSR/PR) will be acceptable to Caltrans as a project approval document. The PSR/PR approach is intended to streamline the typical Caltrans approach of the PSR being a separate document from the PR, but the approach is subject to approval by Caltrans. In effect, the recommended project delivery plan involves reevaluating the PE/Environmental work performed for the northbound HOV project by Caltrans for the 2005 PR/ED and adding the requirements related to developing a combined HOV/Express Lane in the northbound direction.

The northbound direction currently has three general-purpose lanes and a short truck climbing lane. The 2005 Project Report prepared by Caltrans included adding an HOV Lane within the project limits and paving the median. In most areas, the paved median would allow for the extra width required for an Express Lane; however there are areas within the project limits in which the northbound roadway alignment will need to change to accommodate the "as-built" condition of the southbound roadway and areas in which the requirements for the Express Lane features may require additional roadway width. The specifics of including an Express Lane and any reevaluation required due to the age of the 2005 PR/ED will need to be addressed in the project approval document for any project moving forward.

The recommended northbound Express Lane project is intended to improve safety, relieve congestion and provide the opportunity to generate revenues by tolling for the use of excess capacity in the HOV lane by non-HOV vehicles. It is possible to implement incremental improvements along the northbound roadway to provide the intended benefits, but any smaller projects within the larger corridor project will require analysis and approval by Caltrans to secure environmental clearance and project approval within the larger project. It is recommended that the PE/Environmental work be performed for the entire length of the project and include developing an implementation strategy for incremental improvements. The analysis and approval for any smaller projects can be secured in the context of the overall corridor analysis and approval.

An important element of the PE/Environmental work will be a traffic operational analysis report (TOAR). The TOAR will be used to establish the limits of any smaller, incremental improvements and to analyze the benefits of such improvements. The TOAR will also be the basis of the analysis to determine the feasibility of the Express Lane including a revenue study.

The PE/Environmental work will include updating the project cost estimate. The 2005 PR/ED prepared by Caltrans included a cost estimate of \$132.5 million. The cost estimate will need to be revised to reflect the recommended project scope, including the Express Lane, and to be updated to reflect the current project implementation schedule and the current cost environment.

Measure B funds have been allocated to the PE/Environmental phase of an I-680 Northbound Express Lane Project. A portion of the funding allocated for the southbound project being administered by Caltrans will not be needed. Twenty million (\$20 million) of Measure B funds were allocated to advance the Traffic Congestion Relief Program funds from the State that were not available at the time they were needed for the southbound project. The southbound HOV project is in the process of being closed out and the final TCRP share is estimated at \$12 million.

On April 28, 2011, the Alameda CTC Board approved the issuance of an RFP for consultant services to prepare a Combined Project Study Report/Project Report (PSR/PR) and Environmental Document. Staff released an RFP on May 6, 2011, and a mandatory pre-proposal meeting was held on May 19, 2011, where a total of thirty-eight (38) firms attended. Five (5) teams, collectively representing forty-two (42) individual firms, submitted proposals to the Alameda CTC by the due date of May 27, 2011 (see below):

Duimo	Location	Agency Ce	ertification
IIIIie	Location	LBE	SLBE
WMH Corporation	Oakland, CA	79%	49%
AECOM	Oakland, CA	99%	25%
BKF Engineers	Pleasanton, CA	97%	30%
Mark Thomas & Company, Inc.	Pleasanton, CA	97%	28%
Rajappan & Meyer Consulting Engineers, Inc.	Oakland, CA	98%	20%

An experienced panel made up of representatives from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, California Department of Transportation, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, City of Pleasanton, and Alameda CTC staff evaluated the five proposals. On June 16, 2011, interviews were held for the top three ranked teams. After careful review, the WMH team was unanimously selected as the top-ranked team.

The WMH team, which is comprised of eighteen (18) individual firms, exceeded ACTIA's Local Business Contract Equity Program goals of 70% for Local Business Enterprise and 30% for Small Local Business Enterprise. In addition, the WMH team included significant participation from Very Small Local Business Enterprise certified firms. The WMH team is committed to obtaining 79% LBE participation, 49% SLBE participation, and 43% VLSBE participation on this contract.

Staff is recommending the Committee approve the selection of the WMH team to prepare a Combined Project Study Report/Project Report (PSR/PR) and Environmental Document for the Alameda CTC and authorization to execute a contract. The schedule for the remaining activities is as follows:

Schedule	Date
Recommend PPC Committee approval	July 11, 2011
Recommend Alameda CTC Board approval	July 28, 2011
Contract Commencement	August 15, 2011

Fiscal Impacts

The fiscal impact of this recommendation would obligate \$3,661,366 in Measure B funds for the PSR/PR and Environmental Document for the I-680 Northbound High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV)/Express Lane Project.

Attachment

Attachment A: Score Sheet Summary

Attachment A

Interview - Irine 16 2011	Мах			AFCO	MC					Mark Thon	se				NW	H Cornoratio	-		
	Score				-						22						-		
		P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P1	P2	P3	P4	-2 E	9 P	1 P2	БЧ	P4	P5	9d	
1 Knowledge and Understanding of the required services and scope of work.	25	25	18	20	21	20	23	25	20	22	18	23	22 2	5 20	22	16	23	22	
Management Approach and Staffing Plan to perform scope of work efficiently and 2 effectively. The ability and willingness to work within a managed contract budget.	25	24	20	22	13	23		22	20	22	22	22		5 20	24	20	20		
scope of work, and schedule of deliverables							19						50					20	
3 Qualifications of the Proposer Firm and ability of the consultant team and key staff	25	25	18	21	17	20		23	18	22	15	22		5 20	22	20	23		
in performing the scope of work.		1					20		2		2		- 6			2	2	20	
4 Effectiveness of interview - Overall interview discussions and presentation	25	20	18	20	12	20	18	22	20	20	18	20	20 2	3 20	24	20	22	21	
OTAL INTERVIEW POINTS	100	94	74	83	63	83	80	92	78	86	73	37 8	31 5	8 80	92	76	88	83	
IRM RANKING	Average			80						83						86			

1680 Preparation of Project Study Report, Project Report, Ed Documents Alameda CTC RFP No. A11-0034 Due Date : May 27, 2011

This page intentionally left blank



Memorandum

DATE: July 5, 2011

TO: Programs and Projects Committee

- **FROM:** Arthur L. Dao, Executive Director James O'Brien, Project Controls Team
- SUBJECT: Approval of Various Actions Related to the Disposal of Surplus Right-of-Way and the Award of a Contract to Maintain Landscaping for the I-580 Castro Valley Interchange Improvements Project (ACTIA No. 12)

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Commission authorize the following actions related to the I-580 Castro Valley Interchange Improvements Project (ACTIA No. 12):

- 1. Approval of the disposal of surplus right of way acquired for the I-580 Castro Valley Interchange Improvements Project and authorization for the Executive Director, or a designee of the Executive Director, to execute all agreements, amendments to existing agreements, and other documents as required for the disposal of the surplus properties.
- 2. Authorization to award a construction contract to Forster and Kroeger Landscape Maintenance, Inc. in the amount of \$231,820 for the landscaping maintenance "Extended Establishment Period" (EEP) required by Caltrans for the I-580 Castro Valley Interchange Improvements Project;
- 3. Authorization of a total contract budget for the EEP contract (recommended for award under item two above) of \$255,000 based on the contract award amount plus a ten percent (10%) contract change order contingency; and
- 4. Approval of Amendment No. 1 to Professional Services Agreement No. A07-0037 with S&C Engineers to extend the contract termination date to March 31, 2014 and to increase the contract amount by \$60,000 to allow for construction management services related to the EEP contract (recommended for award under item two above).

Discussion/Background

The I-580 Castro Valley Interchange Improvements Project (ACTIA No. 12) is one of the 27 capital projects receiving Measure B funding authorized by the 2000 Measure B Transportation Expenditure Plan. The reconfigured interchange area has been open to traffic for some time, but from the project delivery perspective, the project is still active. The project required acquisition of right of way. The Right of Way Phase is in the process of being closed out concurrently with the Construction Phase. Right of way close out includes disposing of surplus properties. Construction

close out involves settling any outstanding issues and processing the final payment to the contractor for the interchange construction contract, and satisfying the three-year landscaping maintenance "Extended Establishment Period" (EEP) requirement in the Cooperative Agreement between the Alameda CTC and Caltrans.

The following actions related to project closeout have recently been approved by the Alameda CTC:

- March 2011: The Alameda CTC approved the transfer of right of way required for the continuing operation of the State Highway System from the Alameda CTC to Caltrans;
- May 2011: The Alameda CTC approved three actions:
 - 1) Amending the professional services agreement with the project designer to support the right of way and construction close out activities;
 - 2) Issuing a request for bids to provide landscaping maintenance services for more than two years as required by the Cooperative Agreement between the Alameda CTC and Caltrans which allowed the construction of the project on the State Highway System; and
 - 3) Accepting the transfer of surplus right of way from Caltrans for disposal by the Alameda CTC. (Note: In March 2011, The Alameda CTC approved the transfer of property to Caltrans.)
- June 2011: The Alameda CTC approved accepting of the construction contract and making the final payment to the contractor up to the limits of the approved budget. (Note: The acceptance of the construction contract, which included the first portion of the required landscaping maintenance period, necessitated the separate contract to provide the remainder of the required landscaping maintenance, i.e. the EEP contract.)

Close out of the Right of Way Phase consists primarily of the disposal of the remaining, surplus properties owned by the Alameda CTC. A number of properties are being grouped for sale in an effort to expedite disposal, to minimize the Alameda CTC's risks related to owning property, and to eliminate ongoing expenditures related to owning property such as maintenance, insurance, etc. The disposal is expected to be complete by the end of 2011 with the net proceeds from the sales returning to the Measure B coffers to offset project expenditures.

Close out of the Construction Phase requires satisfying the provisions of the Cooperative Agreement between the Alameda CTC and Caltrans which authorized the Alameda CTC to construct the interchange reconfiguration project. The Cooperative Agreement included a provision for three years of landscaping maintenance within the project limits. The construction contract (approved for acceptance in June 2011 and currently being closed out) included the first year of the three-year EEP. The first year ends in November 2011, and the three-year EEP correspondingly ends in November 2013. Since the interchange construction contract will be closed out prior to November 2011, the follow on EEP contract recommended for award in this agenda item will be for a period longer than two years. In other words, the interchange contract was shortened, and the EEP contract must be long enough to satisfy the overall three-year requirement in the Cooperative Agreement.
In May 2011, the Alameda CTC approved the issuance of a request for bids for the EEP contract. The bid opening occurred on June 30, 2011 at the Alameda CTC office in Oakland. Two bids were received: One from RMT Landscape Contractors, Inc.; and the second from Forster and Kroeger Landscape Maintenance, Inc. Shortly following the bid opening, RMT Landscape Contractors, Inc. contacted the Alameda CTC requesting relief from their bid citing a discovery on their part that they had made a mistake in their bid. Initial review of the information provided in support of the request for relief has led to the recommendation for the award of the EEP contract to Forster and Kroeger Landscape Maintenance, Inc. The relief of RMT Landscape Contractors, Inc. from their bid leaves Forster and Kroeger Landscape Maintenance, Inc. as the sole bidder determined to be responsive to the request for bids. The amount of the bid has been determined as reasonable for the services required, however the proposer, Forster and Kroeger Landscape Maintenance, Inc. did not meet the contract goal for Local Business Enterprises (LBE) of sixty percent (60%) or for Small Local Business Enterprises (SLBE) of twenty percent (20%). (Note: The SLBE percentage counts toward both the SLBE and LBE goals.) In light that the proposal did not meet the contract goals, the proposer provided documentation as evidence they performed a Good Faith Effort to include LBE and SLBE vendors in their proposal. The documentation has been determined to be adequate to substantiate a Good Faith Effort.

The Alameda CTC has an existing Professional Services Agreement (A07-0037) with S&C Engineers to provide construction management services for the project. S&C Engineers provided the construction management for the interchange construction contract and has assisted with the transition from that contract to the EEP contract. The recommended Amendment No. 1 to Agreement No. A07-0037 with S&C Engineers will extend the termination date to March 31, 2014 and increase the total amount of the contract by \$60,000 from the current contract value of \$2,800,000 to \$2,860,000. Table 1 below summarizes contract information related to Agreement No. A07-0037.

Table 1: Summary o v	f Alameda CTC (vith S&C Engine	Contract No. A07 ers	-0037
Description	Contract Termination Date	Amendment Amount	Total Contract Not to Exceed Amount
Original Contract (dated April 26, 2007)	12/31/11	NA	\$ 2,800,000
Recommended Amendment No. 1 (This Agenda Item)	3/31/14	\$ 60,000	\$ 2,860,000
Т	otal Amended Co	ontract Amount	\$ 2,860,000

Approval of the recommended actions will allow for close out of the Right of Way and Construction Phases.

Fiscal Impact

Approval of the recommended actions will make \$315,000 (\$255,000 + \$60,000) of Measure B funds available for encumbrance and subsequent expenditure. The total amount of Measure B funds allocated for the project (from project numbers ACTIA 12 and ACTA MB239) includes sufficient capacity for the recommended encumbrances.

This page intentionally left blank



DATE: June 24, 2011

- **TO:** Programs and Projects Committee
- **FROM:** Ray Akkawi, Manager of Project Delivery
- SUBJECT: Northbound I-680 Express Lane, Eastbound and Westbound I-580 Express Lane Projects- Approval of Consultant Team to Provide System Manager Services to Approved Express Lanes Network in Alameda County and Authorization to Execute a Contract

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Committee approve the selection of the top-ranked team, Wilbur Smith Associates (WSA), to provide system manager services to the approved express lanes network in Alameda County, and authorize the execution of a contract for these services.

Summary

At its meeting in February 2011, the Alameda CTC Board authorized staff to prepare and issue an RFP for a System Manager for the I-580 Eastbound Express Lane Project. Staff determined that having a single system manager for all Alameda CTC managed Express Lanes Projects would provide consistency between the express lanes in the same corridors. On April 28, 2011, the Alameda CTC Board approved the issuance of an RFP for a single system manager to provide coordination support services to all express lanes networks. Staff released an RFP on May 9, 2011. A mandatory pre-proposal meeting was held on May 19, 2011, and a total of 13 firms attended. Two teams submitted proposals to the Alameda CTC by the due date of May 31, 2011, and after careful review of each proposal and with consideration of the interview process the WSA team was selected as the top-ranked team.

Background

The Alameda CTC currently manages the following express lane projects in Alameda County: the I-580 Westbound Express Lane Project, the Eastbound I-580 Express Lane Project, and the I-680 Northbound Express Lane Project.

- The I-580 Westbound Express Lane Project will convert the proposed westbound High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane to an express lane that meets the full geometrics standards and widen the freeway to allow the conversion of the HOV lane to a single express lane.
- The Eastbound I-580 Express Lane Project will convert one HOV lane to Express Lane between Hacienda Boulevard in the City of Pleasanton and Greenville Road in the City of

Livermore. The project will add another express lane on I-580 between Santa Rita Road and First Street in the City of Livermore. The project is in the environmental phase and all tasks needed to bring the system integrator on board were completed and approved by the appropriate agency.

• The I-680 Northbound Express Lane Project will construct an HOV/Express Lane on I-680 between State Route (SR) 237 in the City of Milpitas and SR 84 in the City of Pleasanton. A Southbound Express Lane between SR 84 and SR 237 was opened in September, 2010.

On April 28, 2011, the Alameda CTC Board approved the issuance of an RFP for a single system manager to provide coordination support services to all Express Lanes networks. Staff released an RFP on May 9, 2011, and a mandatory pre-proposal meeting was held on May 19, 2011, where a total of thirteen (13) firms attended. Two teams, collectively representing nine (9) individual firms, submitted proposals to the Alameda CTC by the due date of May 31, 2011 (see below):

Prime	Location	AC' Certifi	TIA ication	DBE	UDBE
		LBE	SLBE		
Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.	Oakland, CA	86.29%	-	6.38%	6.38%
Wilbur Smith Associates	Walnut Creek, CA	-	-	6.50%	6.50%

An experienced and independent panel made up of representatives from the Bay Area Toll Authority, the Federal Highway Administration, and Alameda CTC staff evaluated the two proposals. On June 14, 2011, interviews were held for both teams. After careful review of each proposal, and with consideration of the interview process, the WSA team was selected as the top-ranked team.

The WSA team, comprised of four individual firms, met the Underutilized Disadvantage Business Enterprise (UDBE) goal of 6.17 percent in compliance with federal-aid project rules.

Staff is recommending the Committee approve the selection of the WSA team as the system manager to all express lanes network for the Alameda CTC and authorization to execute a contract for an amount not to exceed \$1,433,934. The schedule for the remaining activities is as follows:

Schedule	Date
Recommend PPC Committee approval	July 11, 2011
Recommend Alameda CTC Board approval	July 28, 2011
Contract Commencement	Issued upon completion of Caltrans' Pre-award Audit survey

Fiscal Impacts

The fiscal impact of this recommendation would obligate \$1,433,934 for the system manager services to the I-580 Westbound Express Lane Project, Eastbound I-580 Express Lane Project, and I-680 Northbound Express Lane Project.

Attachment

Attachment A: Score Sheet Summary

This page intentionally left blank

System Manager Alameda CTC RFP No. A11-0033 Due Date : May 31, 2011

		Max Score		Wilbur	Smith			Jacobs El	ngineering		
			Gray Bowe&	Company, Aver	Solutions, and	Vovani LLC	Frank Wilson	& Associates,Sc Solu	olemn & Associa ttions	ites, Iteris, Ave	
			P1	P2	E1	P4	٤	8	F3	P4	
1	Knowledge and Understanding - Demonstrated understanding of the RFP objectives and work requirements. Methods of approach, work plan, understanding of Alameda CTC RFP. Description and experience with similar projects related to type of services.	30	20	25	27	30	25	25	25	25	
N	Management Approach and Staffing Plan - Qualifications of project staff, particularly key personnel, especially the project manager, and key personnel's level of involvement in performing related work.	25	20	20	22	25	20	17	18	22	
ß	Qualifications of the Proposer Firm - Technical experience in performing work related to type of services; experience working with public agencies; record of completing work on schedule; strenght and stability of the firm; technical experience and strenght and stability of proposed subconsultants; and assessments by client references.	25	23	23	23	25	20	18	20	25	
4	Schedule and Capacity to provide qualified personnel.	10	8	8	8	10	8	9	9	10	
5	Local Participation - (Will be determined by Alameda CTC Staff)	10	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	4	
TOT	AL TECHNICAL POINTS	100	71	76	80	06	17	70	73	86	
FIRN	A RANKING	Average		79.	25			76	3.5		
	Interview - June 14, 2011	Max Score		Wilbur	Smith			Jacobs El	ngineering		
			P1	P2	P3		ы	52	Р3		
٢	Knowledge and Understanding of the required services and scope of work.	25	24	18	25		20	23	20		
2	Management Approach and Staffing Plan to perform scope of work efficiently and effectively. The ability and willingness to work within a managed contract budget, scope of work, and schedule of deliverables	25	20	20	20		20	20	24		
ß	Qualifications of the Proposer Firm and ability of the consultant team and key staff in performing the scope of work	25	20	23	22		20	20	20		

15 79 80

17 80

22 82

20 85

23

²⁰

25 100

4 Effectiveness of interview - Overall interview discussions and presentation

TOTAL INTERVIEW POINTS FIRM RANKING

verage

This page intentionally left blank



DATE:	June 27, 2011
то:	Programs and Project Committee
FROM:	Stephen D. Haas, Project Manger Ray T. Akkawi, Manager of Project Delivery

SUBJECT: Southbound I-880 HOV Lane Project – Approval to Execute Agreements and Contracts for Landscaping and Davis Street Improvements

Recommendations

It is recommended that the Commission take the following actions in support of the I-880 Southbound HOV Lane Project – South Segment:

- 1. Approve the revised funding plan for the I-880 Southbound HOV Lane Project. The revised funding plan incorporates \$400,000 in Federal Transportation Enhancement funds for aesthetic features at the Davis Street and Marina Boulevard Interchanges. The funding plan already includes \$1,149 million for intersection improvements on Davis Street at the I-880 Interchange.
- 2. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to negotiate and execute all necessary agreements and contracts to incorporate enhanced aesthetic features at the Marina Boulevard and Davis Street Interchanges and for operational improvements on Davis Street at the I-880 Interchange.

Summary

I-880 Southbound HOV Lane Project – South Segment is located in the City of San Leandro. The Project, in combination with the I-880 Southbound HOV Lane Project – North Segment will extend the existing Southbound HOV Lane from its current beginning point approximately 1000 ft. south of the Marina Boulevard overcrossing in San Leandro to just south of Hegenberger Road in Oakland. In order to accommodate the widening required for the HOV lane, the Project will reconstruct bridges over I-880 at Davis Street and Marina Boulevard. Reconstruction will eliminate existing bridge columns that conflict with the widening of I-880 to accommodate standard mainline lane widths, standard shoulders, and the proposed HOV lane, which will be extended by almost three miles. The design of the I-880 Southbound HOV Lane Project – South Segment is underway and bid documents are expected to be completed in late 2011.

The Alameda CTC has secured \$400,000 in Federal Transportation Enhancement Funds to provide enhanced architectural features on I-880 in the City of San Leandro. The enhancements

will help to delineate the city entrance using special aesthetic treatment at the Marina Boulevard and Davis Street Overcrossings.

The project includes scope to accommodate City of San Leandro improvements on Davis Street at the I-880/Davis Street interchange. An agreement with San Leandro will be required to transfer \$1,149 million of funds from San Leandro to the project. A draft agreement has been prepared and a final agreement will be executed following Commission approval.

T Toposeu T t	muning I	ian.								
		Funding (\$ x 1,000)							
Project Components	Total Costs (\$ x1, 000)	Fed STP	Fed CMAQ	CMA TIP	San Leandro Davis St.	San Leandro Marina Blvd.	CMIA	ТЕ	Short-Fall	Total Funding
Scoping/PA&ED	\$4,116.8		\$2,634.9	\$971.3		\$510.6				\$4,116.8
PS&E	\$10,871.0	\$198.0	\$4,947.1	\$5,015.0	\$145.7	\$165.2		\$400.0		\$10,871.0
Right of Way	\$1,063.7			\$1,063.7						\$1,063.7
Utilities	\$525.0			\$275.0	\$250.0					\$525.0
Construction Support	\$10,600.0						\$10,600.0			\$10,600.0
Design Support During Const.	\$925.0				\$600.0	\$325.0				\$925.0
Construction	\$91,232.5				\$153.3	\$3999.2	\$83,700.0		\$3,380.0	\$91,232.5
Contengency	\$3,750.0								3,750.0	\$3,750.0
Total	\$123,084.0	\$198.0	\$7,582.0	\$7,325.0	\$1,149.0	\$5,000.0	\$94,300.0	\$400.0	\$7,130.0	\$123,084.0

Proposed Funding Plan:

Action 1:

It is recommended that the Commission approve the revised funding plan for the I-880 Southbound HOV Lane Project to incorporate \$400,000 in Federal transportation Enhancement funds.

Action 2:

It is recommended that the Commission authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to negotiate and execute all necessary contracts and agreements for the allocation and use of Transportation Enhancement funds and for operational improvements on Davis Street at the I-880 Interchange as identified in the revised funding plan.

Fiscal Impact

The Alameda CTC's Consolidated FY 2011-12 budget will be revised to reflect the addition of \$400,000 of Federal Transportation Enhancement funds in FY 2011/2012.



DATE:	June 30 2011

TO: Programs and Project Committee

FROM: Matt Todd, Manager of Programming

SUBJECT: I-880/23rd/29th Operational Improvement Project – Approval to Execute Agreements for Project Right-of-Way Requirements.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the Commission Authorize the Executive Director to execute the necessary Agreements to acquire real property, both fee and easements, and utility agreements required to deliver the I-880/23rd/29th Operational Improvements Project.

Summary

I-880/23rd/29th Operational Improvement Project proposes to construct operational and safety improvements on Interstate 880 at the existing overcrossings of 29th Avenue and 23rd Avenue in the City of Oakland. The project will improve the vertical clearance of the structures as well as recurring congestion in the area and improve safety related features such as ramp lengths/design and shoulder widths with \$73 million in Proposition 1B Trade Corridor Improvement Funds programmed to complete the project. The Environmental Document and the Project Report were completed in April 2010 and the design and ROW phases are underway.

To continue to advance the project, staff is requesting the Commission to authorize the Executive Director to execute necessary Agreements for Project Right-of-Way requirements. The Alameda CTC has contracted with RBF Consulting to provide design and right-of-way engineering, and Associated Right of Way Services, Inc. (ARWS), a subconsultant to RBF Consulting, for Right-of-way acquisition services.

Background

In December 2010, the Alameda CTC Board approved an amendment to the RBF Consulting contract to complete the PS&E for the project. Associated Right of Way Services, Inc. (ARWS) is a subconsultant to RBF Consulting for Right-of-way acquisition services.

At this time, it is anticipated that 15 parcels will be affected, through fee takes, utility easements or temporary construction easements. As with any right-of-way process, condemnation may be required if negotiations are not successful. Early planning for the right-of-way acquisition is underway, as the right-of-way certification process is on the project delivery critical path schedule.

Staff is requesting the Commission to authorize the Executive Director to execute necessary Agreements for Project Right-of-Way requirements.

Fiscal Impact

Approval of the recommended action will have no significant fiscal impact. Funds to implement the project are assumed in the FY 2011/12 Alameda CTC budget.



DATE: June 24, 2011

TO: Programs and Projects Committee

FROM: Ray Akkawi, Manager of Project Delivery

SUBJECT: Grand – MacArthur Transportation Management System Project - Approval of CMA TIP Funds to Supplement the Project Budget

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Commission approve the allocation of \$200,000 in CMA TIP funds for the completed Grand – MacArthur TMS Project. These funds are included in the approved project budget but a request for the CMA Board to allocate these funds was never prepared. With this allocation, the project will be closed out.

Discussion

The Grand – MacArthur TMS project was developed by the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency in association with AC Transit and the City of Oakland. The project implemented an integrated, multi-modal advanced transportation management system consistent with previous SMART Corridors projects on two major and critical arterials in the City of Oakland, Grand Avenue and MacArthur Boulevard.

Project Development Phase of this project began in 2005 and the construction phase began in 2008. The total cost of the project is \$4,420,000. The cost of each phase of the project is as follow:

Project Scoping	\$ 210,000.00
Project Approval and Environmental Document	\$ 525,000.00
Final Design and System Integration	\$ 1,345,192.00
ACCMA Staff	\$ 572,853.00
Construction Management	\$ 360,808.00
Construction Capital	\$ 1,406,147.00
Funding for the project was as follow:	
Regional Measure 2 (RM2)	\$ 3,515,000.00
Federal - CMAQ	\$ 500,000.00
TFCA	\$ 205,000.00
CMA TIP	\$ 200,000.00

Project was completed and the CMA Board accepted contract on September 24, 2009. All invoices from the consultants and contractor were paid. Requests for reimbursement were submitted and

payments were received from RM 2, TFC and CMAQ. Request for reimbursement from CMA TIP was denied due to absence of CMA Board approval.

In order to reimburse CMA general funds and close the project, the Commission is requested to approve the allocation of \$200,000 of CMA TIP to Grand – MacArthur TMS project.

Fiscal Impact

The CMA TIP program can accommodate the proposed programming, but the revenues and costs associated with this change will reduce the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) capacities by \$200,000. The approved Alameda CTC budget will be adjusted accordingly.



Date:June 29, 2011To:Programs and Projects Committee

From: John Hemiup, Project Manager

Subject: I-80 ICM Project - Approval of System Manager Services Contract and Approval of Amendment to the Design Contract for the San Pablo Corridor Arterial and Transit Improvement Project No. 6 and the Traffic Operations Systems Project No. 3

Recommendations

Staff recommends that the Commission:

- 1. Approve a contract with Kimley Horn & Associates for System Manager Services to support the San Pablo Corridor Arterial and Transit Improvement Project No. 6; and
- 2. Approve an amendment to the existing design contract with Kimley Horn & Associates for providing Design Services during construction for the San Pablo Corridor Arterial and Transit Improvement Project No. 6 (491.6) and for the Traffic Operations Systems (TOS) Project No. 3 (491.3).

Discussion

The I-80 ICM Project will reduce congestion and delays in the 20-mile I-80 corridor and San Pablo Avenue from Emeryville to the Carquinez Bridge through the deployment of intelligent transportation system (ITS) and transportation operation system (TOS), without physically adding capacity through widening of the corridor. This \$93 million project is funded with the Statewide Proposition 1B bond funds (\$76.7 million), and a combination of funding from Alameda and Contra Costa counties sales tax programs, as well as federal and other local and regional funds. The I-80 ICM Project has been divided into seven sub-projects in order to stage the delivery of contracts, take advantage of the good construction bidding climate of recent years, and minimize project delivery risk to these projects by narrowing each contract's scope. The seven projects are:

Project #1: Software & Systems Integration
Project #2: Specialty Material Procurement
Project #3: Traffic Operations Systems (TOS)
Project #4: Adaptive Ramp Metering (ARM)
Project #5: Active Traffic Management (ATM)
Project #6: San Pablo Corridor Arterial and Transit Improvement Project

Project #7: Richmond Parkway Transit Center

The California Transportation Commission (CTC) allocated over \$23 million in State bond funds for the implementation of Project No. 3 and Project No. 6. Under an agreement with Caltrans, the Alameda CTC is responsible for the construction administration and management of the Projects 1, 2, 3, and 6. Implementation of Project No. 6 requires two (2) professional services:

- 1. To provide Design Services during Construction phase including Request for Information (RFI), Submittal review, Design changes, etc.
- 2. To provide System Management services to manage and oversee System Integration functions performed by the System Integrator.

Implementation of Project No. 3 requires following professional service:

1. To provide Design Services during Construction phase including Request for Information (RFI), Submittal review, Design changes, etc.

In 2007, the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACCMA) had previously retained Kimley Horn & Associates to provide design services for the I-80 ICM project through RFP No. A07-007. Said RFP had provisions granting ACCMA/ACTC the option to retain Kimley Horn & Associates for the System Integrator/System Manager role for the project.

Staff is recommending that the Commission approve a Contract with Kimley Horn & Associates to provide System Manager Services for Project No. 6 for an amount not to exceed \$700,000.

Staff is also recommending that the Commission approve an amendment with Kimley Horn & Associates to provide Design Services during Construction Phase for Project No. 6 and Project No. 3 for an amount not to exceed \$470,000.

Fiscal Impacts

The revenues and costs associated with these projects will be funded through the Traffic Light Synchronization Program (TLSP) and the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) both within the State Infrastructure Bond Program (Proposition 1B) and are included in the approved Alameda CTC budget.



DATE: June 24, 2011

- **TO:** Programs and Projects Committee
- **FROM:** Ray Akkawi, Manager of Project Delivery
- SUBJECT: I-680 Sunol Express Lanes (ACTIA No. 8) Project Approval of Amendment No. 2 to the Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans to Allow the Payback of the Letter of No Prejudice (LONP)

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Commission approve amendment No. 2 to cooperative agreement number 04-2138 with Caltrans to allow the payback of the LONP to Alameda CTC and to authorize the Executive Director to execute this amendment. Upon execution of the agreement, Caltrans will reimburse Alameda CTC for Measure B funds that have been expended to construct the Express Lane. These funds will be part of ACTIA No. 8 project and will be spent on developing the northbound express lane project.

Summary

Caltrans, the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency and the Sunol Smart Carpool Lane JPA executed a cooperative agreement effective April 8, 2008 to define the terms and conditions under which the project is to be constructed and financed. The agreement was then amended to include Measure B funds as a loan to the project in lieu of Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) that was not available when the project was ready to begin construction. The first amendment did not include the terms for the reimbursement process. Amendment number 2 will stipulate the terms for reimbursement of Measure B that have been expended in the construction of the Express Lane.

Discussion/Background

The I-680 Express Lane project allows carpools to travel free of charge and charges a toll for single occupancy vehicles to use the excess capacity in the High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lane. The project widened the southbound I-680 to accommodate the exiting High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane and HOT lane; constructed improvements to provide a HOT lane along southbound I-680 from State Route (SR) 84 to Santa Clara County SR 237; and rehabilitated the existing pavement. The capital cost of project has several sources of funds. TCRP funds contributed \$36 million to the project. However, in 2008 when the project was ready to receive allocation form California Transportation Commission (CTC) so that the project could proceed to construction, TCRP funds were not totally available. A shortfall of \$20 million in TCRP was identified. CTC approved a LONP request allowing the use of \$20 million of Measure B funds to be used for the I-680 project with reimbursement of

TCRP funds at a later date. CTC also approved the payback schedule of two \$10 million payments of TCRP to take place in FY 10/11 and FY 11/12.

At their May 2011 meeting, the CTC authorized reimbursement of \$10 million in Measure B expenditures related to the I-680 Project from TCRP funds programmed for I-680. An amendment to the Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans is needed prior to processing the reimbursement of the Measure B funds that were expended.

Upon execution of the agreement, Caltrans will reimburse Alameda CTC \$10 million. These funds will used to develop the I-680 Northbound Express Lane Project.

On June 13, 2011 the Sunol Smart Carpool Lane JPA took an action approving the amendment and authorizing the Express Lane Executive Director to execute this amendment.

Fiscal Impact

The TCRP reimbursement will be included in the funding plan for the I-680 Northbound Express Lane Project. Alameda CTC budget will be amended to reflect the inclusion of these funds.



DATE: July 4, 2011

TO: Programs and Projects Committee

- **FROM:** Arthur L. Dao, Executive Director Stefan Garcia, Project Controls Team
- SUBJECT: Route 238/Mission-Foothill-Jackson Corridor Improvement Project (ACTA No. 238) – Authorization to Execute Amendments to Project Funding Agreements to Transfer Funds from the Right-of-Way to the Construction Phase of the Project

Recommendations

It is recommended that the Commission authorize the Executive Director to execute amendments to project funding agreements with the City of Hayward for the Route 238/Mission-Foothill-Jackson Corridor Improvement Project (ACTA No. 238) to transfer funds from the Right-of-Way to the Construction phase of the project.

Summary

On June 2, 2011, staff received a letter from the City of Hayward (Attachment A) requesting amendments to two existing Project Funding Agreements with the Alameda CTC for the Route 238/Mission-Foothill-Jackson Corridor Improvement Project (ACTA No. 238).

The recommended actions will allow the project sponsor (City of Hayward) to use remaining, previously allocated Right-of-Way phase funds to complete the Construction phase of the project.

Table 1 below summarizes the Measure B commitment to this project.

Table 1: Summary of Measur Route 238/Mission-Foothill-Jackson Cor (ACTA No. 23	e B Commitment ridor Improvem 8)	ent Project
Description	Amount (\$ x 1,000)	Balance (\$ x 1,000)
Total Measure B Commitment (from Adopted 2011-12 Strategic Plan)	NA	\$ 80,000
Previously Allocated Total	\$ 80,000	\$ O
Remaining Program	nmed Balance	\$ 0

Discussion/Background

The Route 238/Mission-Foothill-Jackson Corridor Improvement project in the City of Hayward is included in the amended 1986 Measure B Expenditure Plan and in the adopted 2011-12 Strategic Plan. The plan identifies \$80 million in Measure B funds for this project.

On June 2, 2011, staff received a letter from the City of Hayward (Attachment A) requesting amendments to two existing Project Funding Agreements with the Alameda CTC for the Route 238/Mission-Foothill-Jackson Corridor Improvement project to transfer funds from the Right-of-Way to the Construction phase of the project. The project is sponsored by the City of Hayward and is funded by Measure B, local sources and future State Local Alternative Transportation Improvement Program (LATIP) funds.

The project was advertised and awarded by the City of Hayward and is currently under construction by Top Grade Construction Inc. The project is expected to be completed and open to traffic by December 2012.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed action to authorize the administrative actions and agreement amendments necessary to transfer funds as requested.

Fiscal Impacts

Approval of the recommended actions is fiscally neutral, as the requested action reassigns existing allocation authority to other eligible project phases.

Attachment

Attachment A: City of Hayward letter dated June 2, 2011



Attachment A

June 2, 2011

Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority 1333 Broadway, Suite 300 Oakland CA 94612

Attention: Stefan Garcia

SUBJECT: PHASE FUNDING CHANGE REQUEST ACTA – PROJECT SPECIFIC FUNDING AGREEMENTS No. A08-0001 and No. A09-0002 CITY OF HAYWARD (MB 238) MISSION/FOOTHILL CORRIDOR PROJECT

Dear Mr. Garcia:

In accordance with our Project Specific Funding Agreements for the Mission/Foothill Corridor Project (MB 238), we are requesting a redistribution of funds within the PS&E/ROWS/ROWC agreement and a transfer of funds from that agreement to the ConSup/ConCap agreement. We have attached two documents entitled Exhibit I that detail our request to change the Measure B Funding Obligation distribution within each agreement's project phases.

Because work on the PS&E phase of the project is complete, this request will provide for the actual expenses to date for this phase. It increases the ROW Support phase amount by \$0.2 million to address any remaining PUE and acquisition issues and the future sale of surplus lands. The ROW Capital phase allocation is decreased significantly while retaining a sufficient balance to complete the acquisition of a Caltrans property, two parcels near Mission/Broadway and miscellaneous PUEs, as well as any remaining demolition and abatement. There is a \$6.7 million reduction in the funding obligation for our agreement as shown on the Exhibit I for A08-0001. We are requesting that these funds be transferred to the ConSup/ConCap agreement and have shows the funds as a new prior year obligation on the attached Exhibit I for A09-0002.

There is no change to the overall project phase funding obligation.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS ENGINEERING & TRANSPORTATION DIVISION Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority MB238 Phase Funding Change Request June 2, 2011 Page 2

Any questions should be directed to our Project Manager, Kevin S. Briggs. You may contact Mr. Briggs at 510-583-4760.

Sincerely,

MORAD FAKHRAI Deputy Director of Public Works

KB/fr Enclosures cc: Kevin Briggs Yaw Owusu Chron File The tables in Section I(6) of ACTA A09-0002 are replaced with the following tables:

5,400,000	1,755,000	3,645,000		PHASE TOTAL
2,400,000	1,200,000	1,200,000		SPONSOR Staff
3,000,000	555,000	2,445,000		Contracts
TOTAL	11/12	10/11	Prior Years	SUPPORT PHASE
	ing Obligations	Measure B Fundi		CONSTRUCTION

CONSTRUCTION CALIFOR		Measure b r und	ing Obligations	
PHASE	Prior Years	10/11	11/12	TOTAL
Contracts	6,700,000	21,025,000	13,675,000	41,400,000
PHASE TOTAL	6,700,000	21,025,000	13,675,000	41,400,000

SASVIA IIV		Measure B Fund	ing Obligations	
ALL I HAJES	Prior Years	10/11	11/12	TOTAL
FUNDING AGREEMENT	000 002 23	000 027 7 63	015 130 000	000 000 71
TOTAL	000,000 / 00¢	000,00,0,45¢	000,004,010	40,000,000

DS & DU ASE		Measure B Fur	nding Obligation	S
F3&E FIIA3E	07/08	60/80	01/60	TOTAL
Contracts	\$ 100,000	\$ 6,608,869	- \$	\$ 6,708,869
Sponsor Staff	\$ 100,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 247,899	\$ 847,899
PHASE TOTAL	\$ 200,000	\$ 7,108,869	\$ 247,899	\$ 7,556,768

bles:
ng ta
llowii
le fo
ith th
N pa
place
ire re
001 a
00-80
Ť
TA /
of ACTA /
1(6) of ACTA /
ction I(6) of ACTA /
in Section I(6) of ACTA /
bles in Section I(6) of ACTA
The tables in Section I(6) of ACTA /

RIGHT-OF-WAY				Measure B Fun	ding	g Obligations			
SUPPORT PHASE		07/08		08/09		09/10	TO	TAL	
Contracts	Ş	140,000	Ş	290,000	Ş	270,000	Ŷ	700,0	8
Sponsor Staff	Ş	80,000	Ş	180,000	ŝ	440,000	Ŷ	700,0	8
PHASE TOTAL	Ş	220,000	Ş	470,000	Ŷ	710,000	Ŷ	1,400,0	8

RIGHT-OF-WAY		Measure B Fune	ding Obligations	
CAPITAL PHASE	80/20	60/80	09/10	TOTAL
Contracts		\$ 22,743,232		\$ 22,743,232
Sponsor Staff		- \$		
PHASE TOTAL		\$ 22,743,232		\$ 22,743,232

			Measure	B Func	ling Obligation	S
ALL FUASES	07	/08	60/80		09/10	TOTAL
					-	
FUNDING AGREEMENT						
TOTAL	Ş	420,000	\$ 30,322	,101	\$ 957,899	\$ 31,700,000



DATE: June 24, 2011

- **TO:** Programs and Projects Committee
- **FROM:** Ray Akkawi, Manager of Project Delivery
- SUBJECT: Webster Street SMART Corridor Project Approval of Amendment No. 1 to Extend the Expiration Date of the Contract with Harris & Associates to Provide Construction Management Services

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Commission approve Amendment No. 1 to extend the expiration date from June 30, 2011 to June 30, 2012 of the contract with Harris & Associates, CMA contract number: A 10-010. The contract time extension is needed to allow for the Commission to continue to providing construction management services to the construction of the Webster Street SMART Corridor Project.

Approval of the contract expiration date will not increase the contract budget and will not have a fiscal impact.

Summary

The CMA entered into a construction management services agreement with Harris & Associates in August 2010 with an expiration date of June 30, 2011. The construction phase of the project was scheduled to go to construction in summer of 2010. However, during the process of allocating federal funds, it was determined that the project needed to obtain FHWA approval of the design and environmental documents to be eligible for Federal funding. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Right of Way certification were approved in May 2011. The request to allocate federal funds has been submitted to the Department of Transportation. The contract will be advertised for construction soon after the allocation of federal funds is made. The extension of the expiration date will allow Harris & Associates to provide construction management services during the construction phase of the project.

Discussion/Background

The Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC), in partnership with the City of Alameda, Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), Caltrans, and AC Transit are implementing a full design and implementation of the Webster Street SMART Corridor Project. This project would be an expansion of the existing East Bay SMART Corridors System. The project will install Closed Circuit Television Cameras (CCTV) for monitoring, Video Image Detection (VID) Systems for actuating pre-timed traffic signals, and Microwave Vehicle Detection System (MVDS)

devices along various corridors leading to the Webster/Posey Tubes on the City of Alameda. The field elements will connect to a communications network that will transmit the data to the City of Alameda Traffic Management Center (TMC). The project is also being coordinated with the City of Oakland.

In September 2008 the CMA Board authorized the execution of a professional services contract to provide construction management services for the Webster Street SMART Corridor Project. Harris & Associates was selected and a contract was executed in August 2010. Due to delays in obtaining FHWA approval of the project and the allocation of Federal funds, amendment to the expiration date to the Harris & Associates contract is needed to provide construction management services during the construction phase of the project.

Fiscal Impact

Approval of the requested action will have no impact on the approved Alameda CTC budget. This action will extend contract time only.



DATE: July 5, 2011

TO: Programs and Projects Committee

FROM: Arthur L. Dao, Executive Director James O'Brien, Project Controls Team

SUBJECT: I-580 Castro Valley Interchange Improvements Project (ACTIA No. 12) --Approval of Various Actions to Complete and Close-Out Project

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Commission approve the following actions related to the I-580 Castro Valley Interchange Improvements Project (ACTIA No. 12):

- 1. Approval of the disposal of surplus right of way acquired for the I-580 Castro Valley Interchange Improvements Project and authorization for the Executive Director, or a designee of the Executive Director, to execute all agreements, amendments to existing agreements, and other documents as required for the disposal of the surplus properties;
- 2. Authorization to award a construction contract to Forster and Kroeger Landscape Maintenance, Inc., in the amount of \$231,820 for the landscaping maintenance "Extended Establishment Period" (EEP) required by Caltrans for the I-580 Castro Valley Interchange Improvements Project;
- 3. Approval of a total contract budget for the EEP contract (recommended for award under item two above) of \$255,000 based on the contract award amount plus a ten percent (10%) contingency; and,
- 4. Approval of Amendment No. 1 to Professional Services Agreement No. A07-0037 with S&C Engineers to extend the contract termination date to March 31, 2014 and to increase the contract amount by \$60,000 to allow for construction management services related to the EEP contract (recommended for award under item two above).

Approval of the recommended actions will allow for close out of the Right of Way and Construction Phases.

Discussion/Background

The I-580 Castro Valley Interchange Improvements Project (ACTIA No. 12) is one of the 27 capital projects receiving Measure B funding authorized by the 2000 Measure B Transportation Expenditure Plan. The reconfigured interchange area has been open to traffic for some time, but

from the project delivery perspective, the project is still active. The project required acquisition of right of way. The Right of Way Phase is in the process of being closed out concurrently with the Construction Phase. Right of way close out includes disposing of surplus properties. Construction close out involves settling any outstanding issues and processing the final payment to the contractor for the interchange construction contract, and satisfying the three-year landscaping maintenance "Extended Establishment Period" (EEP) requirement in the Cooperative Agreement between the Alameda CTC and Caltrans.

The following actions related to project closeout have recently been approved by the Alameda CTC:

- March 2011: The Alameda CTC approved the transfer of right of way required for the continuing operation of the State Highway System from the Alameda CTC to Caltrans;
- May 2011: The Alameda CTC approved three actions:
 - 1) Amending the professional services agreement with the project designer to support the right of way and construction close out activities;
 - 2) Issuing a request for bids to provide landscaping maintenance services for more than two years as required by the Cooperative Agreement between the Alameda CTC and Caltrans which allowed the construction of the project on the State Highway System; and
 - 3) Accepting the transfer of surplus right of way from Caltrans for disposal by the Alameda CTC. (Note: In March 2011, The Alameda CTC approved the transfer of property to Caltrans.)
- June 2011: The Alameda CTC approved accepting of the construction contract and making the final payment to the contractor up to the limits of the approved budget. (Note: The acceptance of the construction contract, which included the first portion of the required landscaping maintenance period, necessitated the separate contract to provide the remainder of the required landscaping maintenance, i.e. the EEP contract.)

Close out of the Right of Way Phase consists primarily of the disposal of the remaining, surplus properties owned by the Alameda CTC. A number of properties are being grouped for sale in an effort to expedite disposal, to minimize the Alameda CTC's risks related to owning property, and to eliminate ongoing expenditures related to owning property such as maintenance, insurance, etc. The disposal is expected to be complete by the end of 2011 with the net proceeds from the sales returning to the Measure B coffers to offset project expenditures.

Close out of the Construction Phase requires satisfying the provisions of the Cooperative Agreement between the Alameda CTC and Caltrans which authorized the Alameda CTC to construct the interchange reconfiguration project. The Cooperative Agreement included a provision for three years of landscaping maintenance within the project limits. The construction contract (approved for acceptance in June 2011 and currently being closed out) included the first year of the three-year EEP. The first year ends in November 2011, and the three-year EEP correspondingly ends in November 2013. Since the interchange construction contract will be

closed out prior to November 2011, the follow on EEP contract recommended for award in this agenda item will be for a period longer than two years. In other words, the interchange contract was shortened, and the EEP contract must be long enough to satisfy the overall three-year requirement in the Cooperative Agreement.

In May 2011, the Alameda CTC approved the issuance of a request for bids for the EEP contract. The bid opening occurred on June 30, 2011 at the Alameda CTC office in Oakland. Two bids were received: One from RMT Landscape Contractors, Inc.; and the second from Forster and Kroeger Landscape Maintenance, Inc. Shortly following the bid opening, RMT Landscape Contractors, Inc. contacted the Alameda CTC requesting relief from their bid citing a discovery on their part that they had made a mistake in their bid. Initial review of the information provided in support of the request for relief has led to the recommendation for the award of the EEP contract to Forster and Kroeger Landscape Maintenance, Inc. The relief of RMT Landscape Contractors, Inc. from their bid leaves Forster and Kroeger Landscape Maintenance, Inc. as the sole bidder determined to be responsive to the request for bids. The amount of the bid has been determined as reasonable for the services required, however the proposer, Forster and Kroeger Landscape Maintenance, Inc. did not meet the contract goal for Local Business Enterprises (LBE) of sixty percent (60%) or for Small Local Business Enterprises (SLBE) of twenty percent (20%). (Note: The SLBE percentage counts toward both the SLBE and LBE goals.) In light that the proposal did not meet the contract goals, the proposer provided documentation as evidence they performed a Good Faith Effort to include LBE and SLBE vendors in their proposal. The documentation has been determined to be adequate to substantiate a Good Faith Effort.

The Alameda CTC has an existing Professional Services Agreement (A07-0037) with S&C Engineers to provide construction management services for the project. S&C Engineers provided the construction management for the interchange construction contract and has assisted with the transition from that contract to the EEP contract. The recommended Amendment No. 1 to Agreement No. A07-0037 with S&C Engineers will extend the termination date to March 31, 2014 and increase the total amount of the contract by \$60,000 from the current contract value of \$2,800,000 to \$2,860,000. Table 1 below summarizes contract information related to Agreement No. A07-0037.

Table 1: Summary o v	f Alameda CTC (vith S&C Engine	Contract No. A07 ers	-0037
Description	Contract Termination Date	Amendment Amount	Total Contract Not to Exceed Amount
Original Contract (dated April 26, 2007)	12/31/11	NA	\$ 2,800,000
Recommended Amendment No. 1 (This Agenda Item)	3/31/14	\$ 60,000	\$ 2,860,000
Т	otal Amended Co	ontract Amount	\$ 2,860,000

Approval of the recommended actions will allow for close out of the Right of Way and Construction Phases.

Fiscal Impact

Approval of the recommended actions will make \$315,000 (\$255,000 + \$60,000) of Measure B funds available for encumbrance and subsequent expenditure. The total amount of Measure B funds allocated for the project (from project numbers ACTIA 12 and ACTA MB239) includes sufficient capacity for the recommended encumbrances.