Meeting Notice

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607 • 510.208.7400 • www.AlamedaCTC.org

Programs and Projects Committee

Monday, September 12, 2016, 12:15 p.m.
1111 Broadway, Suite 800
Oakland, CA 94607

Mission Statement

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

Public Comments

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

Recording of Public Meetings

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

Reminder

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

Glossary of Acronyms

A glossary that includes frequently used acronyms is available on the Alameda CTC website at www.AlamedaCTC.org/app_pages/view/8081.
Alameda CTC is accessible by multiple transportation modes. The office is conveniently located near the 12th Street/City Center BART station and many AC Transit bus lines. Bicycle parking is available on the street and in the BART station as well as in electronic lockers at 14th Street and Broadway near Frank Ogawa Plaza (requires purchase of key card from bikelink.org).

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

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

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

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

Connect with Alameda CTC
www.AlamedaCTC.org  facebook.com/AlamedaCTC
@AlamedaCTC  youtube.com/user/AlamedaCTC
1. Pledge of Allegiance

Chair: Mayor Carol Dutra-Vernaci, Union City
Vice Chair: Mayor Pauline Cutter, City of San Leandro
Commissioners: Luis Freitas, Scott Haggerty, Dan Kalb, Peter Maass, Nate Miley
Ex-Officio Members: Bill Harrison, Rebecca Kaplan
Staff Liaison: Trinity Nguyen
Executive Director: Arthur L. Dao
Clerk: Vanessa Lee

2. Roll Call

3. Public Comment

4. Consent Calendar

4.1. Approval of the July 11, 2016 Meeting Minutes

5. Programs and Projects

5.1. Approval of FY 2016-17 Consultant Resources for Project Management, Project Controls, and Programming Support Services

5.2. Approval of Administrative Amendment to Project Agreement (A12-0028)

6. Staff Reports (Verbal)

7. Committee Member Reports

8. Adjournment

Next Meeting: October 10, 2016

All items on the agenda are subject to action and/or change by the Committee.
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1. **Pledge of Allegiance**

2. **Roll Call**
   A roll call was conducted. All members were present with the exception of Commissioner Maass and Commissioner Freitas.

   **Subsequent to the roll call:**
   Commissioner Freitas arrived during item 6

3. **Public Comment**
   There were no public comments.

4. **Consent Calendar**
   4.1. **PPC Meeting Minutes: Approval of the June 13, 2016 Meeting Minutes**
   Commissioner Haggerty moved to approve the Consent Calendar. Commissioner Harrison seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following vote:

   - **Yes:** Dutra-Vernaci, Cutter, Miley, Kalb, Haggerty, Harrison, Kaplan
   - **No:** None
   - **Abstain:** None
   - **Absent:** Maass, Freitas

5. **Programs and Projects**
   5.1. **Approval of the One Bay Area Grant Cycle 2 Programming Principles for Alameda County**
   Vivek Bhat recommended that the Commission approve the One Bay Area Grant Cycle 2 Programming Principles for Alameda County. He stated that the OBAG program provides federal funding to the county congestion management agencies (CMAs) for programming to projects, programs and planning activities that advance the goals and objectives of Plan Bay Area. Alameda County’s estimated share of OBAG 2 is approximately $70.2 million of federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds spread over five fiscal years (FYs 2017-18 through 2021-22). Vivek stated that 70% of OBAG 2 funding must be programmed to transportation projects that support Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and 30% may be programmed for transportation projects anywhere within the county. He reviewed the five programming category allocations and stated that CMA’s will be required to provide a final program of projects to MTC by summer 2017. Vivek concluded by stating that MTC revised funding allocations prior to the committee mail-out, which allocates an additional 6-million dollar increase to Alameda Counties share if approved.
Commissioner Cutter asked if local roads are considered when looking at local streets and roads. Vivek stated that the only roads eligible for the funding are ones that are on a federal track.

Commissioner Dutra-Vernaci asked how programming was decided across each category. Vivek stated that staff tried to maintain the same level of funding from OBAG 1 and also considered programming based on funding.

Commissioner Kaplan moved to approve this item. Commissioner Cutter seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following vote:

Yes: Dutra-Vernaci, Cutter, Miley, Kalb, Haggerty, Harrison, Kaplan
No: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Maass, Freitas

5.2. Approval of the Comprehensive Investment Plan 2016 Update

James O’Brien recommended that the commission approve the Comprehensive Investment Plan 2016 Update. He stated that the CIP 2016 Update includes a programming and allocation period from fiscal year 2015/16 through 2019/20, and reflects updates to the current CIP approved in June 2015. Approval of the programming recommendations for projects and programs included in the CIP 2016 Update will result in a total of $1.5 billion programmed from FY 2015/16 to FY 2019/20, and $755 million allocated over the first two fiscal years.

Commissioner Kaplan stated that the City of Oakland will be shifting funding for the city’s projects to accommodate the recent city councils vote banning the shipping of coal through the Port of Oakland.

Commissioner Kaplan moved to approve this item. Commissioner Kalb seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following vote:

Yes: Dutra-Vernaci, Cutter, Miley, Kalb, Haggerty, Harrison, Kaplan
No: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Maass, Freitas

5.3. Approval of Funding Strategy for City of Berkeley’s Hearst Avenue Complete Streets Project included in the OBAG Cycle 1 Program

Vivek Bhat recommended that the Commission reprogram $100,000 of unused OBAG Cycle 1-Local Streets and Roads (LSR) funds from the City of Emeryville’s Hollis Street project to the Hearst Avenue project; reprogram $228,000 of CMA TIP funds programmed from two (2) other City of Berkeley projects to the Hearst Avenue project; and program $88,000 of FY 2016-17 TFCA funds to the bike lanes component of the Hearst Avenue project. The City of Berkeley will be responsible for securing any additional funds needed to eliminate the shortfall and fully fund the project. Approval of this request will allow the City of Berkeley to proceed with the construction phase of the project.
Commissioner Dutra-Vernaci asked if the City of Emeryville could use the reprogrammed money for another Emeryville project. Vivek stated that the City of Emeryville was at risk of losing the funding if not used in this OBAG cycle. The funding will be backfilled in OBAG Cycle 2.

Commissioner Kaplan moved to approve this item. Commissioner Haggerty seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following vote:

Yes: Dutra-Vernaci, Cutter, Miley, Kalb, Haggerty, Harrison, Kaplan
No: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Maass, Freitas

5.4. Approve and Authorize the Executive Director to Negotiate and Execute Professional Services Agreement A16-0075 with HNTB Corporation for a not-to-exceed Amount of $1,000,000 to Provide System Manager Services.

Liz Rutman recommended that the Commission approve and authorize the Executive Director to negotiate and execute Professional Services Agreement A16-0075 with HNTB Corporation for a not-to-exceed amount of $1,000,000 to provide System Manager Services. Following the Commission’s approval to release a request for proposals (RFP) for system manager services in February 2016, Alameda CTC released RFP #R16-0010 in April 2016. Five proposals were received by the proposal due date, May 11, 2016. The selection panel reviewed the proposals and shortlisted three firms. Interviews were held on June 2nd and, at the conclusion of its evaluation, the selection panel selected HNTB Corporation (HNTB) as the top-ranked firm.

Commissioner Cutter moved to approve this item. Commissioner Harrison seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following vote:

Yes: Dutra-Vernaci, Cutter, Miley, Kalb, Haggerty, Harrison, Kaplan
No: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Maass, Freitas

5.5. Approve and Authorize the Executive Director to Negotiate and Execute Professional Services Agreement A17-0004 with Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. for a not-to-exceed Amount of $13,000,000 to Provide Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Services.

Trinity Nguyen recommended that the Commission approve the and authorize the Executive Director to negotiate and execute Professional Services Agreement A17-0004 with Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. for a not-to-exceed amount of $13,000,000 to provide Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Services. In order to provide the consultant resources necessary for the successful delivery of the Project, Request for Proposals (RFP) #R16-0012 for Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Services with optional Final Design/Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E), was released in April 2016. Five proposals were received by the
The selection panel, consisting of representatives from the Port of Oakland and Alameda CTC reviewed the proposals and shortlisted three firms. Interviews were held on June 29th and, at the conclusion of its evaluation, the selection panel selected Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. (Jacobs) as the top-ranked firm.

Commissioner Kaplan moved to approve this item. Commissioner Cutter seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following vote:

Yes: Dutra-Vernaci, Cutter, Miley, Kalb, Haggerty, Harrison, Kaplan
No: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Maass, Freitas

5.6. Approve and Authorize the Executive Director to Execute Amendment No. 4 to the Professional Services Agreement No. A10-0008 With S&C Engineers, Inc. for an Additional Amount of $35,000 for a Total not-to-exceed Amount Of $2,025,750 and a One-Year Time Extension to Provide Construction Management Services Through the Project Completion.

Trinity recommended that he Commission approve and authorize the Executive Director to Execute Amendment No. 4 to the Professional Services Agreement No. A10-0008 With S&C Engineers, Inc. for an Additional Amount of $35,000 for a Total not-to-exceed Amount Of $2,025,750 and a One-Year Time Extension to Provide Construction Management Services Through The Project Completion. During the course of construction, several unforeseen issues arose that have caused a delay in the completion of the project thus requiring additional construction management services for a longer period of time than originally anticipated. Construction issues include problems encountered with the functionality of signs installed on the San Pablo Corridor Arterial and Transit Improvement Project which required troubleshooting and repairs, and longer than anticipated construction of the Active Traffic Management which requires support from the Specialty Material Procurement project. The costs associated with the required additional construction management services to complete the project exceeds the current construction support budget. In order to complete the Project, it is estimated that an additional $35,000 will be required to fund the construction support costs.

Commissioner Haggerty moved to approve this item. Commissioner Harrison seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Yes: Dutra-Vernaci, Cutter, Miley, Kalb, Haggerty, Harrison, Kaplan
No: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Maass, Freitas

6. Committee Reports
There were no committee member reports.

7. Staff Reports
There were no staff reports.
8. Adjournment/ Next Meeting

The next meeting is:
Date/Time: Monday, September 12, 2016 @12:00 p.m.
Location: Alameda CTC Offices, 1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

Attested by:

[Signature]
Vanessa Lee,
Clerk of the Commission
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Memorandum

DATE: September 6, 2016
SUBJECT: FY 2016-17 Consultant Resources for Project Management, Project Controls, and Programming Support Services
RECOMMENDATION: Approval of FY 2016-17 Consultant Resources for Project Management, Project Controls, and Programming Support Services

Recommendation

It is recommended the Programs and Projects Committee approve the following actions for the management, implementation, and delivery of capital projects and programs programmed in the Comprehensive Investment Plan:

1. Approve and authorize a not-to-exceed multi-year budget of $19.5 million (representative of a historical average annual budget of $6.5 million) for consultant support contracts to provide project management, project controls, and programming support services for the delivery of Alameda CTC’s capital projects and programs; and,

2. Authorize the Executive Director to enter into negotiations and execute professional services contracts with eligible prime consultant proposers, as shown in Attachment B, for the required services commencing October 1, 2016, for an initial period of up to 21 months ending in June 30, 2018, with an option to extend in one-year increments for up to a total of three additional years in the event of project schedule delays or subsequent phase continuity is necessary.

Summary

Since the initiation of the 1986 Measure B sales tax measure to present day, Alameda CTC and its predecessor agencies, have contracted with numerous engineering consultant firms to provide support services in the area of project management (when the Agency leads the implementation and delivery of a project) and project management oversight (when the Agency provides funding to projects delivered by others). These engineering consultant contracts provide Alameda CTC with quality resources necessary to support staff during the work program “peaks” and eliminates the need for staff reductions during the work program “valleys”. Alameda CTC staff
periodically conducts assessments of its consultant resource plan to ensure that the Agency is adequately supported to administer and deliver its projects and programs.

Several key events have triggered a reassessment of the current consultant resource plan. Beginning in November 2014, Measure BB was approved, providing an estimated $8 billion in funding for the projects and programs in the 2014 Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) and effectively doubling the workload of the Agency. In March 2016, the Commission approved the Capital Program Delivery Plan (CPDP) that identified 20 regionally significant capital projects to be implemented by Alameda CTC. Most recently, in May 2016, the Commission approved the revised organizational structure, which included significant changes to the Programming and Projects Team structure, to enhance the Agency’s effectiveness and capabilities in project delivery, programming, and project controls. In consideration of the significant increase in workload to the Programming and Projects Team due to the 2014 TEP, CPDP, and Comprehensive Investment Plan (CIP) 2016 Update, as well as the shift in staff responsibilities, the Consultant Resource Plan (CRP) to support programming and project delivery activities was also revised for FY 2016-17. This Plan is presented in Attachment A. The CRP seeks to provide a balanced workload between staff and consultant resources and allow management to transition specific core functions to Agency staff.

A fundamental element and first order of work identified in the Programming and Projects Team FY 2016-17 CRP is to procure a consultant team(s) to perform project management, programming and project controls services. Under this procurement, consultant resources would provide a wide array of professional services, including, but not limited to:

1. Project Delivery Management;
2. Project Management Oversight;
3. Project Delivery Support;
4. Operations Management and Operations of the Alameda County Express Lanes;
5. Construction Management;
6. Utility Coordination;
7. Right of Way Services;
8. Programming and Grants Support; and

On August 5, 2016, Alameda CTC released a Request for Qualifications (RFQ R17-0001) for “Project Management, Project Management Oversight/Project Controls & Programming Support Services” to support the delivery and management of both internally and externally delivered projects funded by a combination of federal, state, regional, other local, and Alameda CTC administered funds. A summary of the 14 responsive and qualified proposals received in response to the RFQ are shown in Attachment B. An
independent selection panel composed of representatives from Caltrans, the City of Dublin, Contra Costa County Transportation Authority, and Alameda CTC have been selected to review and rank the proposals.

In order to support the direct implementation or management by Alameda CTC of the projects (refer to Attachment C) and programs supported by the 2-year $755 million allocation plan contained within the CIP 2016 Update and provide flexibility to implement and support future project needs critical to the success of Alameda CTC and its work in delivering high quality transportation programs and projects in Alameda County, staff recommends that the Commission:

A. Approve and authorize a not-to-exceed multi-year budget of $19.5 million (representative of an average annual budget of $6.5 million) for Project Management, Project Management Oversight/Project Controls & Programming Support Services.

B. Authorize the Executive Director to enter into negotiations and execute professional services contracts with eligible prime consultant proposers, as shown in Attachment B, for the required services commencing October 1, 2016 for an initial period of up to 21 months ending in June 30, 2018, with an option to extend in one-year increments for up to a total of three additional years in the event of project schedule delay or subsequent phase continuity is necessary.

Background

Since the initiation of the 1986 Measure B sales tax measure to present day, Alameda CTC and its predecessor agencies, have contracted with numerous engineering consultant firms to provide support services in the area of project management (when the Agency leads the implementation and delivery of a project) and project management oversight (when the Agency provides funding to projects delivered by others). These engineering consultant contracts provide Alameda CTC with the quality resources necessary to support staff during the work program “peaks” and eliminates the need for staff reductions during the work program “valleys”. Alameda CTC staff periodically conducts assessments of its consultant resource plan to ensure that the Agency is adequately supported to administer and deliver its projects and programs.

The passage of Measure BB in November 2014 which provides for an estimated $8 billion in funding for the projects and programs in the 2014 Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) was the first in a series of significant events that have greatly impacted the level of consultant resources necessary to deliver Alameda CTC’s capital projects and programs. Most recently, several key events have triggered the need for a more comprehensive assessment of the consultant resource plan. In March 2016, the Commission approved the Capital Program Delivery Plan (CPDP) that identified 20 regionally significant capital projects to be implemented by Alameda CTC, and in May
2016, the Commission approved a revised organizational structure which included the additional positions of Director of Project Delivery, Director of Programming and Project Controls, and two additional project staff. Furthermore, in July 2016, the Commission approved the Comprehensive Investment Plan (CIP) 2016 Update which provided for a two-year allocation plan totaling $755 million for projects and programs in Alameda County.

In consideration of the significant increase to workload and the shift in staff responsibilities resulting from these actions, staff reevaluated the existing consultant resource plan. Two primary changes were made as a result of the evaluation. The first change was the decision to re-compete the Project Management and Project Controls contract with Mott MacDonald. The second change was the addition of the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for Project Scoping and Project Approval and Environmental Document for various Capital Projects in Alameda County. Both changes are reflected in the Programming and Projects FY 16/17 Consultant Resource Plan (CRP) as presented in Attachment A.

Mott MacDonald, Alameda CTC’s current project and program management consultant, was the result of solicitations authorized by the Commission in July 2012. In its first year, the contract expended $4.5 million and has now increased to an estimated annual expenditure of $6.5 million. The 44% increase is most notably from the attrition of seasoned staff and the set-up work (e.g. policy development, selection criteria, funding estimates, and project evaluations) required with the passage of Measure BB.

Alameda CTC’s policy is to authorize up to five years for non-project specific contract opportunities. In recognition that the current contract with Mott MacDonald has been in place for approximately four years and the projects and programs resulting from Measure BB would go well beyond the five year period, staff investigated options to re-compete the Project Management and Project Controls services contract. Of particular concern to staff, was the fact that prior solicitations for these services received minimal interest. The 2012 solicitation, which resulted in the selection of the Mott MacDonald team, received only one other proposal with many of the same subconsultants on both teams. Throughout May/June 2016, staff met with the consultant community to better understand the motivations and reservations with pursuing the Project Management/Project Controls work with Alameda CTC. A common response centered around being conflicted out of project delivery work for projects funded by Alameda CTC grant funds and the financial ability and liability to manage a large subconsultant team given the wide range of expertise required.

In consideration of the responses received from the consultant community and after an intense review of contracting strategies employed by other similar agencies, it was determined that the RFQ process would provide the framework to provide the flexibilities required to bring on the most qualified consulting firms specific to the work
elements and in the shortest timeframe to successfully support the implementation of the Measure BB program. The RFQ process allows for the establishment of multiple on-call contracts or lists of pre-qualified consultants through a single solicitation. Additionally, the specific work categories listed below were defined, creating opportunities for consultants to submit for one or multiple disciplines depending upon their capabilities and teaming arrangements and in turn providing Alameda CTC more qualified choices:

1. Project Delivery Management;
2. Project Management Oversight;
3. Project Delivery Support;
4. Operations Management and Operations of the Alameda County Express Lanes;
5. Construction Management;
6. Utility Coordination;
7. Right of Way Services;
8. Programming and Grants Support; and


A pre-submittal meeting was held on August 11, 2016 to provide potential proposers with an opportunity to ask questions about the RFQ process and network with other interested local firms. The event was attended by 47 individuals representing 38 firms. On August 23, 2016 a total of 14 proposals were received by the proposal deadline; an indicator that the RFQ strategy was the right approach. A summary of the responsive and qualified proposals eligible to obtain a contract for various work categories under the Project Management and Project Management Oversight /Project Controls and Programming Support Services is provided in Attachment B.

An independent selection panel composed of representatives from Alameda CTC, Caltrans, the City of Dublin, and the Contra Costa Transportation Authority will review the proposals and score the proposals based on the following criteria identified in the SOQ:

- Qualifications of the Proposer Firm: Technical experience and ability of the consultant team and key staff in performing the scope of work,
- Staffing Plan: Qualifications of key personnel, availability, and depth of resources.
- Management Approach: The ability to perform the work efficiently and effectively. The ability and willingness to work within a managed contract budget, scope of work, and schedule of deliverables,
At the conclusion of the evaluation process, the panel will establish a ranked qualification list for each of the service categories. These qualification lists will be valid for up to three years. As work tasks are identified, a detailed request will be provided to the firms based upon the work category required and the appropriate utilization goals (e.g. Local Business Contract Equity or the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise) program will be applied depending upon the funding. Selection for subsequent contracts will evaluate cost, availability, and past experience against the specific task. Contracts resulting from this RFQ will be for an initial period of up to 21 months ending in June 30, 2018. This period generally coincides with the estimated length of most project initiation phases. An option will be incorporated to allow Alameda CTC to extend in one-year increments, for up to a total of three additional years, in the event of project schedule delay or subsequent phase continuity is necessary.

The RFQ strategy employed for the Project Management and Project Controls Services is also proposed to be used to procure Project Scoping and Project Approval and Environmental Document for various Capital Projects in Alameda County. A qualification list will be established for a three-year period for work requiring very similar skill sets. As projects are identified, the most qualified and cost efficient team will be selected to perform the project delivery work.

In order to support the direct implementation or management by Alameda CTC of the projects (refer to Attachment C) and programs contained in the CIP 2016 Update, inclusive of a two-year allocation plan totaling $755 million for projects and programs in Alameda County, and provide flexibility to implement and support future project needs critical to the success of Alameda CTC and its work in delivering high quality transportation programs and projects in Alameda County, staff recommends that the Commission:

A. Approve a not-to-exceed multi-year budget of $19.5 million (representative of a historical average annual budget of $6.5 million) for consultant support contracts to provide project management, project controls, and programming support services for the delivery of Alameda CTC’s capital projects and programs.

B. Authorize the Executive Director to enter into negotiations and execute professional services contracts with eligible prime consultant proposers, as shown in Attachment B, for the required services commencing October 1, 2016 for an initial period of up to 21 months ending in June 30, 2018, with an option to extend in one-year increments for up to a total of three additional years in the event of project schedule delay or subsequent phase continuity is necessary.
**Levine Act Statement**

There are no reported conflicts.

**Fiscal Impact**

Contracts resulting from RFQ R17-0001 for Project Management, Project Management Oversight/Project Controls & Programming Support Services will be negotiated and the final budget will be included in the Alameda CTC’s consolidated fiscal year 2016-2017 budget update for Commission approval.

**Attachment**

A. Programming and Project Management FY 2016-17 Consultant Resource Plan

B. List of Qualified Firms For Project Management & Project Management Oversight / Project Controls & Programming Support Services (R17-0001)

C. Capital Projects Inventory

**Staff Contact**

Trinity Nguyen, Director of Project Delivery

Vivek Bhat, Director of Programming and Project Controls
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Contracting Method</th>
<th>Contract Duration</th>
<th>Estimated Value</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Scoping and Project Approval and Environmental Document for various Capital Projects in Alameda County. Deliverables may include Scoping Studies, Project Study Reports, Project Reports, and all engineering, traffic and environmental studies necessary to complete the Project Study Reports, Project Reports &amp; Environmental Documents to achieve CEQA and NEPA approvals. Community outreach, public meetings, and stakeholder coordination services may also be required.</td>
<td>RFQ</td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>$8 M</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>RFQ-September 2016 RFP’s- Various Fall 2016: I-80/Ashby Avenue Interchange with Bicycle and Pedestrian Ramps, I-880/Industrial Parkway West &amp; I-880 at Whipple Rd/Industrial Parkway Southwest Interchanges Winter 2017: State Route 262 Mission Boulevard Cross Connector, I-880/Winton Avenue Interchange Spring 2017: I-580 Freeway Corridor Management System (FCMS), I-580/I-680 Interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay Greenway Maintenance: 75th Avenue to 85th Avenue, Oakland</td>
<td>IFB</td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>September 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Request for Qualification (RFQ), Invitation For Bid (IFB)
2. Estimate is for an initial 3-year period.
## List of Qualified Firms

### Project Management and Project Management Oversight / Project Controls and Programming Support Services

(R17-0001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Management/Project Management Oversight Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axis Consulting Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BayPac Consult Inc. (LBE/SLBE/VSLBE/DBE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chwen C. Siripocanont, Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMR Management Consultants, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iRAM [VSCE Inc. (LBE/SLBE/VSLBE/DBE), Zoon Engineering (LBE/SLBE/VSLBE), and PMA Consultants] ¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luster National, Inc. (DBE) ²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Transportation and Management Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mott MacDonald (LBE) ²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK Engineering (DBE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidhu Consulting, LLC (LBE/SLBE/VSLBE/DBE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Delivery Support Services ³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Delivery Support Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associated Right of Way Services, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axis Consulting Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BayPac Consult Inc. (LBE/SLBE/VSLBE/DBE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghirardelli Associates, Inc. (LBE/DBE) ²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interwest Consulting Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iRAM [VSCE Inc. (LBE/SLBE/VSLBE/DBE), Zoon Engineering (LBE/SLBE/VSLBE), and PMA Consultants] ¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luster National, Inc. (DBE) ²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Transportation and Management Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mott MacDonald (LBE) ²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overland, Pacific &amp; Cutler, Inc. (LBE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK Engineering (DBE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Programming and Grants Support & Project Control and Funding/Financial Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programming and Grants Support &amp; Project Control and Funding/Financial Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iRAM [VSCE Inc. (LBE/SLBE/VSLBE/DBE), Zoon Engineering (LBE/SLBE/VSLBE), and PMA Consultants] ¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mott MacDonald (LBE) ²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

1. Subconsultant team includes certification of LBE.
2. Subconsultant team includes certification of LBE, SLBE, and DBE.
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### PROJECT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Construction Value/Range</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Route 80 Widening Project - Parkway Plaza to Interstate 580</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>Apr 2021 - Mar 2022</td>
<td>$100M - $200M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Route 80 Expressway - South Segment</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>Oct 2015 - Oct 2017</td>
<td>$200M - $300M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>580/680 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hwy</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Overpass Projects**

- **580/680 Interchange**
  - East to West Connector - South to West 80
  - South to West Connector - West 80 to 580
  - East to West Connector - West 80 to 580

### Additional Projects

- **Dublin Widening, WB from 2 to 3 Lns (Sierra Ct-Dougherty Rd)**
  - East LSR
  - Con: City of Dublin

- **Alameda to Fruitvale BART-Rapid Bus**
  - South to North
  - Con: AC Transit

- **Iron Horse Transit Route**
  - East LSR
  - Con: City of Dublin

- **Newark Army Base Infrastructure Improvements**
  - East LSR
  - Con: City of Newark

- **Oakland Army Base Infrastructure Improvements**
  - East LSR
  - Con: City of Oakland

- **East 14th Street/Hesperian Boulevard/150th Street Intersection Improvement**
  - Central LSR
  - Con: City of Oakland

- **Lake Merritt to South Hayward**
  - Various
  - Env: City of Oakland

- **Lake Merritt to South Hayward**
  - Various
  - Env: City of Oakland

- **Lake Merritt to South Hayward**
  - Various
  - Env: City of Oakland
This page intentionally left blank
DATE: September 6, 2016

SUBJECT: Approval of Administrative Amendment to Project Agreement (A12-0028)

RECOMMENDATION: Approval of Administrative Amendment to Project Agreement (A12-0028)

Recommendation

It is recommended the Programs and Projects Committee approve and authorize the Executive Director to execute administrative amendment to project agreement in support of Alameda CTC’s Capital Projects and Program delivery commitments.

Summary

Alameda CTC enters into agreements/contracts with consultants and local, regional, state, and federal entities, as required, to provide the services, or to reimburse project expenditures incurred by project sponsors, necessary to meet the Capital Projects and Program delivery commitments. Agreements are entered into based upon estimated known project needs for scope, cost, and schedule.

The administrative amendment request shown in Table A has been reviewed and it has been determined that the requests will not compromise the project deliverables.

Staff recommends the Commission approve and authorize the administrative amendment request as listed in Table A attached.

Background

Amendments are considered “administrative” if they do not result in an increase to the existing encumbrance authority approved for use by a specific entity for a specific project. Examples of administrative amendments include time extensions and project task/phase budget realignments which do not require additional commitment beyond the total amount currently encumbered in the agreement, or beyond the cumulative total amount encumbered in multiple agreements (for cases involving multiple agreements for a given project or program).
Agreements are entered into based upon estimated known project needs for scope, cost, and schedule. Throughout the life of a project, situations may arise that warrant the need for a time extension or a realignment of project phase/task budgets.

The most common justifications for a time extension include (1) project delays and (2) extended project closeout activities.

The most common justifications for project task/phase budget realignments include 1) movement of funds to comply with timely use of funds provisions; 2) addition of newly obtained project funding; and 3) shifting unused phase balances to other phases for the same project.

Requests are evaluated to ensure that the associated project deliverable(s) are not compromised. The administrative amendment requests identified in Table A have been evaluated and are recommended for approval.

**Levine Act Statement:** Aegis ITS, Inc. did not report a conflict in accordance with the Levine Act.

**Fiscal Impact:** There is no significant fiscal impact to the Alameda CTC budget due to this item.

**Attachments**

A. Table A: Administrative Amendment Summary

**Staff Contact**

Trinity Nguyen, Director of Project Delivery

Angelina Leong, Assistant Transportation Engineer
Table A: Administrative Amendment Summary

|-----------|----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| 1         | Aegis ITS, Inc.| East Bay SMART Corridors Program and the I-680 Sunol Express Lane – ATMS Maintenance | A12-0028      | A1: 12-month time extension from 9/30/2013 to 9/30/2014  
A2: Budget increase and 24-month time extension from 9/30/2014 to 9/30/2016  
A3: 9-month time extension from 9/30/2016 to 6/30/2017  
(current request) | 1            | None                        |

(1) Project delays.
(2) Extended project closeout activities.
(3) Movement of funds to comply with timely use of funds provisions.
(4) Addition of newly obtained project funding.
(5) Unused phase balances to other project phase[s].
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