Meeting Notice

Planning, Policy and Legislation Committee

Monday, March 10, 2014, 10:30 a.m.
1111 Broadway, Suite 800
Oakland, CA 94607

Mission Statement

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

Public Comments

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

Recording of Public Meetings

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

Reminder

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

Glossary of Acronyms

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

📍 Alameda CTC
1111 Broadway, Suite 800
Oakland, CA  94607

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

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
Planning, Policy and Legislation Committee
Meeting Agenda
Monday, March 10, 2014, 10:30 a.m.*

*Or immediately following the I-580 Express Lane Policy Committee

1. Pledge of Allegiance
   Chair: Mayor Tim Sbranti, City of Dublin
   Vice Chair: Supervisor Keith Carson, Alameda County District 5
   Commissioners: Wilma Chan, Michael Gregory, John Marchand, Elsa Ortiz, Marvin Peixoto, Jerry Thorne
   Ex-Officio Members: Scott Haggerty, Rebecca Kaplan
   Staff Liaison: Tess Lengyel
   Executive Director: Arthur L. Dao
   Clerk: Vanessa Lee

2. Roll Call

3. Public Comment

4. Consent Calendar
   Page A/I
   4.1. February 3, 2014 PPLC Meeting Minutes
        Recommendation: Approve the February 3, 2014 meeting minutes.
   4.2. Congestion Management Program: Summary of the Alameda CTC’s Review and Comments on Environmental Documents and General Plan Amendments

5. Legislation
   5.1. Legislative Update

6. Planning and Policy
   6.1. Transportation Expenditure Plan Update (Verbal)
   6.2. Sustainable Communities Technical Assistance Program (SCTAP) Draft Projects Recommendation
        Recommendation: Approve SCTAP funding of $4,544,892.
   6.3. Goods Movement Collaborative and Plan Update

7. Committee Member Reports (Verbal)

8. Staff Reports (Verbal)

9. Adjournment

Next Meeting: April 14, 2014

All items on the agenda are subject to action and/or change by the Commission.
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Planning, Policy and Legislation Committee
Meeting Minutes
Monday, February 3, 2014, 10:30 a.m.

1. Pledge of Allegiance

2. Roll Call
   The Clerk conducted a roll call. All members were present, except the following:
   Commissioner Michael Gregory.

   Commissioner Pauline Cutter was present as the alternate for Commissioner Wilma Chan.

3. Public Comment
   There were no public comments.

4. Consent Calendar

   4.1. January 13, 2014 PPLC Meeting Minutes
   4.2. Congestion Management Program: Summary of the Alameda CTC’s Review and Comments on Environmental Documents and General Plan Amendments

   Commissioner Marchand moved to approve the consent calendar. Commissioner Thorne seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (Gregory absent).

5. Legislation

   5.1. Legislative Update
   Tess Lengyel provided an update on state and federal initiatives. On the state side, Tess covered Governor Brown’s budget proposal, which includes $850 million if funding from cap and trade revenues, including $100 million for sustainable communities. She also noted that the proposed budget allows for the creation of infrastructure financing districts that allow a lower threshold to be created and expands the eligible uses of the funds. Tess requested that the Commission send a letter to the Senate Budget Committee to request a modification to the proposed Cap-and-Trade Budget urging that funding be administered at the regional level.

   On the federal side, Tess stated that there were several hearings on MAP 21 reauthorization and updated the committee on these efforts as well as the postponement of the President’s budget release to March, rather than the

   Commissioner Cutter asked if it would be effective if individual jurisdictions also wrote letters to the Budget Committee. Tess stated that Alameda CTC staff would provide each jurisdiction with a sample letter should they decide to send one to the committee.

   Commission Cutter moved to approve the requested action. Commissioner Marchand seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (Gregory absent).
6. Planning and Policy

6.1. Transportation Expenditure Plan Update
Tess Lengyel provided the committee with an update on the Transportation Expenditure Plan. She stated that the plan was now available on the Alameda CTC website in addition to the calendar of City Council Presentations for TEP approval. She concluded by stating that the final action for the plan will come to the full Commission in June.

Commissioner Kaplan wanted to know when each jurisdiction will receive fact sheets with information specific to each city. Tess stated that staff is working on getting the fact sheets to each city to be included either as a handout or in their city council agenda packets.

This item was for information only.

6.2. Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan Scope of Work
Saravana Suthanthira recommended that the Commission approve the scope of work and authorize the release of a Request for Proposals (RFP) for development of a Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan and authorize the Executive Director, or a designee of the Executive Director, to negotiate and execute one or more professional services agreements with consultants or consultant teams selected as a result of the RFP process in accordance with procurement procedures. Saravana provided an overview of the arterials including planning of the overall system, key benefits and challenges and needs. She concluded by updating the committee on work tasks, the scope of work in the plan and next steps.

Commissioner Peixoto stated that this analysis will produce a plan that helps the I-238 corridor specifically through Hayward.

Commissioner Kaplan wanted to know what the expected outcome of the plan was. Tess stated that goal of the plan will be to do an initial baseline assessment, establish a network, assess growth and demand and finally, provide a list of short- and long- term projects which will feed into the long-range countywide transportation plan and the regional transportation plan.

Commissioner Kaplan moved to approve this item. Commissioner Cutter seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (Gregory absent).

6.3. Countywide Multimodal Plans Update (Verbal)
Tess Lengyel provided an update on the countywide multimodal plans. She stated that staff is working on three comprehensive plans. Regarding goods movement, Tess stated that ACTC is initiating the advocacy effort, performing baseline assessment work, and holding stakeholder interviews. Tess concluded by stating that staff is also working on scheduling the roundtable discussions.
Commissioner Carson wanted to know how the different ports throughout the county will be integrated into the goods movement plan. Tess stated that there is a California Freight Advisory Committee (CFAC) which includes members of the Port of Oakland that meets and makes decisions at the state level, as well as other ports in the Bay Area. She also stated that there is a representative from the Port of Oakland who sits on the Alameda CTC leadership team.

Commissioner Kaplan wanted to make sure that staff analyzes the CFAC Freight Plan and wanted to know if the outcome of the plan would be a comprehensive project list. Art Dao stated that the Commission already approved a proposed project list and that CFAC will be forwarding recommendations for policy considerations before a list of projects is created.

Commissioner Kaplan requested that this report come back to the full Commission with information on state and Federal schedules. Art stated that staff would bring that information back to the Commission.

*This item was for information only.*

7. **Committee Member Reports**
   There were no committee member reports.

8. **Staff Reports**
   There were no staff reports.

9. **Adjournment/ Next Meeting**
   The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m. The next meeting is:

   **Date/Time:** Monday, March 10, 2014 @10:30 a.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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DATE: March 3, 2014

SUBJECT: Congestion Management Program (CMP): Summary of the Alameda CTC’s Review and Comments on Environmental Documents and General Plan Amendments

RECOMMENDATION: Receive an update on the Alameda CTC’s Review and Comments on Environmental Documents and General Plan Amendments

Summary

This item fulfills one of the requirements under the Land Use Analysis Program (LUAP) element of the Congestion Management Program (CMP). As part of the LUAP, Alameda CTC reviews Notices of Preparations (NOPs), General Plan Amendments (GPAs), and Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) prepared by local jurisdictions and comments on them regarding the potential impact of proposed land development on the regional transportation system.

Since the last monthly update on February 3, 2014 the Alameda CTC has not reviewed any environmental documents.

Fiscal Impact:

There is no fiscal impact.

Staff Contact

Tess Lengyel, Deputy Director of Planning and Policy

Matthew Bomberg, Assistant Transportation Planner
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DATE: March 3, 2014

SUBJECT: Legislative Update

RECOMMENDATION: Receive an update on state and federal legislative activities

Summary

This memo provides an update on federal, state and local legislative activities including an update on the federal budget, federal transportation issues, legislative activities and policies at the state level, as well as an update on local legislative activities.

Alameda CTC’s legislative program was approved in December 2014 establishing legislative priorities for 2014 and is included in summary format in Attachment A. The 2014 Legislative Program is divided into six sections: Transportation Funding, Project Delivery, Multi-Modal Transportation and Land Use, Climate Change, Goods Movement and Partnerships. The program was designed to be broad and flexible to allow Alameda CTC the opportunity to pursue legislative and administrative opportunities that may arise during the year, and to respond to political processes in Sacramento and Washington, DC. Each month, staff brings updates to the Commission on legislative issues related to the adopted legislative program, including recommended positions on bills as well as legislative updates.

Background

Federal Update

The following updates provide information on activities and issues at the federal level within each category of Alameda CTC Legislative Program and include information contributed from Alameda CTC’s lobbyist team (CJ Lake/Len Simon).

Federal Budget Update

President Obama will submit his FY15 budget request to Congress on March 4th. On February 26th, he announced new funding for the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) competitive grant program, as well as his four year proposal for the federal surface transportation bill. As released by the White House press secretary,
the following summarizes the President’s priorities for the TIGER program as well as the federal transportation bill: MAP-21 sequel.

**$600 million TIGER competitive grants program:** The U.S. Department of Transportation is making available $600 million in TIGER competitive grants to fund transportation projects. The TIGER grant program, which was initially funded as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, was recently funded in the bipartisan Consolidated Appropriations Act, signed by the President on January 17th, 2014. This represents the sixth round of the highly competitive TIGER grant program. During the previous five rounds, the U.S. Department of Transportation received more than 5,300 applications requesting nearly $115 billion for transportation projects across the country. The four focus areas of the TIGER program are listed below:

- **Support High-Value Transportation Projects Across the Country.** The TIGER program supports a range of projects, including roads, bridges, transit, rail, and ports, and offers one of the few Federal funding sources that integrate different modes of transportation. The TIGER program invests in projects that will have a significant impact on the nation or a region, and Federal funds are used to make projects possible and leverage additional funding from private sector partners, States, local governments, metropolitan planning organizations, and transit agencies.

- **Encourage Improved Job Access and Increased Economic Opportunity.** In an effort to expand economic opportunities for all Americans, the 2014 TIGER program will place an emphasis on projects that support reliable, safe, and affordable transportation options that improve connections for urban, suburban, and rural communities. While continuing to support projects of all types, a priority will be placed in this 6th round of applications on projects that make it easier for Americans to get to jobs, school, and other opportunities, promote neighborhood revitalization and business expansion, and reconnect neighborhoods that are unnaturally divided by physical barriers such as highways and railroads.

- **Prioritizing Transformative Projects.** Successful projects in the TIGER process will be those with the potential to improve economic competitiveness and create jobs, improve the condition of existing transportation systems, improve quality of life by increasing transportation options, improve energy efficiency, reduce fuel consumption and encourage resiliency, and/or improve the safety of our transportation systems.

- **$35 Million to Help Communities Design Economic Development Plans.** In addition to supporting capital grants, Congress provided the U.S. Department of Transportation with the flexibility to use up to $35 million of the 2014 TIGER funds for planning grants for the first time since 2010. These funds can be used to support the planning of innovative transportation solutions, as well as regional transportation planning, freight and port planning, housing and land use development, and resiliency efforts that improve efficiency and sustainable community development.
President Obama’s Vision for 21st Century Transportation Infrastructure (the next surface transportation bill): The following summarizes the proposed four-year transportation program and priorities that will be released in the President’s budget the first week in March. The President’s Budget will outline his proposal to dedicate $150 billion in one-time transition revenue from pro-growth business tax reform to address the funding crisis facing our surface transportation programs and increase infrastructure investment. This proposal is expected to fill the current funding gap in the Highway Trust Fund, and increase surface transportation investment over current projected levels by nearly $90 billion over the next four years, totally a $302 billion investment package. The President will work with Congress to support a bi-partisan approach to funding the nation’s transportation needs.

• Proposing a $302 billion, Four Year Transportation Reauthorization Bill, Providing States, Local Governments, and Construction Workers with Certainty. The President’s proposal for a $302 billion, four year transportation reauthorization focus on the following.

  o $63 billion to fill the funding gap in the Highway Trust Fund. The proposal will meet our nation’s essential highway, bridge, and transit needs in the near term by providing $63 billion to address the insolvency of the Highway Trust Fund for four years.

  o Prioritizing “Fix-it-First” investments. The proposal will include policies and reforms to prioritize investments for much needed repairs and to improve the safety of highways and bridges, subways and bus services, with particular attention to improving roads and bridges in rural and tribal areas.

• Matching Transportation Infrastructure Investments to the Current and Future Needs of American Communities. The proposed one-time infusion of investments are focused on addressing the diverse needs of American communities, including the following:

  o $206 billion to invest in our nation’s highway system and road safety. The proposal will increase the amount of highway funds by 22 percent annually, for a total of about $199 billion over the four years. The proposal would also provide more than $7 billion to improve safety for all users of our highways and roads.

  o $72 billion to invest in transit systems and expand transportation options. The proposal increases average transit spending by nearly 70 percent annually, for a total program of $72 billion over four years, which will enable the expansion of new projects (e.g., light rail, street cars, bus rapid transit, etc.) in suburbs, fast-growing cities, small towns, and aging rural communities, while still maintaining existing transit systems.

  o $19 billion in dedicated funding for rail programs. The proposal also includes nearly $5 billion annually for high performance and passenger rail programs with
a focus on improving the connections between key regional areas and high traffic corridors throughout the country.

- **$9 billion in competitive funding to spur innovation.** The proposal will make permanent and provide $5 billion over four years, an increase of more than 100 percent, for the highly successfully TIGER competitive grant program and propose $4 billion of competitively awarded funding over four years to incentivize innovation and local policy reforms to encourage better performance, productivity, and cost-effectiveness in our transportation systems.

- **Coordination and local decision making.** The proposal includes policy reforms to incentivize improved regional coordination and strengthen local decision making in allocating Federal funding so that local communities can better realize their vision for improved mobility.

- **Expanding Economic Growth, Jobs, and Opportunity.** The proposal focuses on transportation projects that better connect communities to centers of employment, education, and services.

  - **More than $2.6 billion and policy reforms to support the creation of ladders of opportunity.** The proposal will include policy reforms to enhance existing highway and transit programs that help to create ladders of opportunity. Within the overall transit spending, the proposal provides $2.2 billion for a new bus rapid transit program for rapidly growing regions. It also includes $400 million to enhance the size, diversity, and skills of our nation’s construction workforce, while providing support for local hiring efforts and encouraging States to use their On-the-Job training funds more effectively.

  - **$10 billion for a new freight program to strengthening America’s exports and trade.** Recognizing the importance of efficient and reliable freight networks to support trade and economic growth, the President’s proposal will also create a new $10 billion multimodal freight grant program – in partnership with State and local officials and private sector and labor representatives – for rail, highway, and port projects that address the greatest needs for the efficient movement of goods across the country and abroad.

- **Boosting Efficiency and Taxpayers Return on Transportation Investments.** The proposal includes a number of measures to ensure that the American public is getting most out of Federal transportation infrastructure investments that lead to better outcomes for all Americans.

  - **Improving project delivery and the Federal permitting and regulatory review process.** The proposal will further advance and introduce new reforms to the project delivery system through a range of activities that institutionalize best practices and insights from the President’s previous Executive Orders and
Presidential Memorandums to cut project timelines in half for major infrastructure projects by modernizing the Federal government’s infrastructure permitting and regulatory review process.

- **Building more resilient communities.** Building on the Sandy Task Force recommendations, the proposal will also encourage more resilient designs for highway, transit, and rail infrastructure, and smarter transportation planning to reduce fuel use and conserve energy.

- **Encouraging and incentivizing cost effective investments.** The proposal will strengthen the performance incentives to maintain safety and conditions of good repair, and expand research and technology activities in order to improve the productivity of our transportation systems, thereby increasing taxpayer return on investment.

- **Attracting private investment in transportation infrastructure.** The proposal calls for continued funding of $1 billion in annual credit subsidy for the successful TIFIA loan program that aim to facilitate increased private investment in transportation infrastructure while protecting taxpayer interests.

**Policy**

**Highway Trust Fund**

On February 4th, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) released its projections for the Highway Trust Fund revenue. The analysis suggests that the Trust Fund will become insolvent in 2015. The analysis also suggests that if the federal government wants to continue baseline obligations into the future, the Fund will need $19 billion in additional revenue, or transfers, for one year and $101 billion for six years. Both Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Chair Boxer and House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Chair Shuster have spoken out against providing additional general fund revenue to supplement the Highway Trust Fund.

**Senate EPW Hearing**

The Senate EPW Committee held a hearing on February 12th, focused on “MAP-21 Reauthorization: The Economic Importance of Maintaining Federal Investments in our Transportation Infrastructure.” Chair Boxer stated during the hearing she plans for the EPW Committee to produce a bill by April and pursue floor action shortly after that. House T&I Committee Chairman Shuster has set a similar timeline for his committee. All the witnesses expressed the need for a long-term policy that would allow industry and government to plan transportation projects and a sustainable revenue stream, including some advocacy for increasing the gas tax.
House Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Highways and Transit

The Subcommittee on Highways and Transit, chaired by Representative Tom Petri (R-WI), held a roundtable policy discussion on February 26th, with representatives of the transportation community in preparation for the development of a surface transportation reauthorization bill.

This roundtable served as part of the Committee’s process for developing the next surface transportation authorization bill, expected to be released in draft form in spring 2014. The roundtable included representative from the American Trucking Associations, American Highway User Alliance, Transportation for America, Retail Industry Leaders Association, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, National Steel Bridge Alliance, National Association of Manufacturers, AFL-CIO

State Update

The following update provides information on activities and issues at the state level and includes information contributed from Alameda CTC’s state lobbyist, Platinum Advisors.

Budget

STATE BUDGET

Legislature’s Budget Review: Both the Assembly Budget and Senate Budget Committees convened for an overview of the Governor’s Budget proposal following its release. According to Legislative Analyst Mac Taylor, “the budget is great for the schools, not so much for the rest of the budget.” Democrats are particularly concerned that the Governor did not include more restorations to safety net services for the poor. Concerns from Republicans include funding for high-speed rail, a lack of emphasis on job creation, and the need to do more to build reserves and pay down debt.

Cap & Trade Proposal: The full Senate Committee on Budget & Fiscal Review held a hearing on February 13th to review the Governor’s Cap & Trade budget proposal. Alameda CTC submitted a letter recommending four principles for consideration in the Cap & Trade programs, which were adopted by the Commission, including: Administer funding for transportation’s GHG reduction program at the regional level; ensure sufficient funding is available now to implement transportation investments that reduce GHG emissions; direct significant cap-and-trade revenues to transportation investments that reduce GHG emissions; support the successful planning and investment strategies developed and delivered by the regions and local agencies. This letter is included in Attachment B. Alameda CTC also led the effort for the nine-county Congestion Management Agencies to submit a similar letter as well as provided a template to all Alameda County jurisdictions to support the same principles. In addition, Alameda CTC testified at the hearing along with members of the Transportation Coalition for Livable Communities supporting similar proposals. This hearing was the first opportunity for the
growing mass of interests groups to queue-up and express their thoughts on how Cap &
Trade funds should be allocated. The Assembly Budget Subcommittee #3 has scheduled
a hearing on the Cap & Trade budget for March 5th, and the Senate Budget
Subcommittee #2 will hold another cap & trade hearing in March. Alameda CTC will also
submit letters to these committees.

Other Cap & Trade Efforts: On February 20th, Senate President Pro Tem Steinberg
announced a four point proposal on how to address Cap & Trade funding allocations in
California that is detailed in Senate Bill 1156, including:

1. Set aggressive targets in statute, beyond 2020, to break our fossil fuel addiction
and reinforce the climate goals of AB32 through 2030 and 2050.

2. Continue Cap and Trade for polluting industrial plants but replace Cap and Trade’s
current 2015 expansion into the transportation fuel economy with a broader, more
stable and more flexible Carbon Tax of a similar amount on these same fuels

3. Return two-thirds of the Carbon Tax revenues to poor and middle-income
Californians through a state Earned Income Tax Credit for families making less than
$75,000 per year

4. Inject the remaining Carbon Tax revenues into a multi-billion dollar 21st Century
development of California’s mass transit infrastructure to reduce traffic and
pollution from cars using fossil fuels.

This proposal, along with the many recommendations by interest groups will be debated
in the coming months as part of the budget negotiations and legislative process.

POLICY

Climate Change: On February 10th, the California Air Resources Board released the
proposed update to the AB 32 Scoping Plan. The Scoping Plan guides development and
implementation of California’s greenhouse gas emission (GHG) reduction programs and is
required to be updated every five years.

The Scoping Plan update focuses on the need to build on the AB 32 framework over the
coming decades and on the programs already established. The update also includes
both near- and long-term actions to address GHG reductions. The update identifies eight
key sectors for ongoing action:

- Energy
- Transportation, fuels, land use and infrastructure
- Agriculture
- Water
- Waste management
Natural lands
Short-Lived Climate Pollutants (such as methane and black carbon)
Green Buildings

The update also includes the need for establishment of a midterm statewide greenhouse gas reduction target, between the current 2020 and 2050, most likely a 2030 target that would address specific reduction targets for each of the key sectors to guide California’s GHG reduction efforts to meet the 80 percent reduction target by 2050. Public hearings will be held in the coming months on the plan update and to address a mid-term target.

Republican Transportation Proposal: In February, the Assembly Republican Caucus unveiled an ambitious proposal to direct $11 billion to transportation projects. The central component of the proposal is placing a measure on the ballot that would direct the remaining High Speed Rail bonds to transportation projects. The proposal would also pay back $2.5 billion in highway account loans made to the general fund, and redirect funds being used to pay for transportation bond debt back to transportation projects. Legislation is expected to be introduced soon to carry out the following:

Loan Repayment: The proposal would require up to $2.5 billion in unanticipated revenue to be used to repay all remain debts owed to transportation accounts. Unanticipated revenue would be what remains after schools and other mandated programs receive their allotment.

High Speed Rail Bonds: Place a measure on the ballot redirecting remaining high speed rail bond to transportation projects. These funds would be split 40% to highway maintenance, 40% to highway construction, and 20% to port and freight infrastructure projects. The $995 million in the bond act dedicate to regional rail projects would not be touched, as well as funding currently programmed for the bookend projects.

Gas-Tax-Swap: Since pieces remain missing, such as actual language, the mechanics of how this proposal redistributes $1.5 billion annually is murky. It appears to keep in place the Swaps’ exchange of sales tax for an excise tax, but the funding calculations appear to revert to the pre-Swap formulas. It does not reverse the Swap, and it maintains the allocation of funds whereby 44% is dedicated to the STIP, 44% is dedicated to city and county roads, and 12% is dedicated the SHOPP. The proposal appears to reinstate the “spillover” calculation, but these funds are directed to local streets and roads – not public transit. It also appears that transit operating allocations made through the State Transit Assistance program would be significantly reduce, if not eliminated.

Weight Fees: The proposal would end the roundabout use of truck weight fee as the source of debt payments for transportation bonds. This would free-up about $900 million for transportation projects.
**Caltrans Reform:** In January three sets of reports were released addressing how Caltrans could operate to address the current and future needs of the State. The reports are listed below:

**SSTI Report:** The California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) released the findings and recommendation of the State Smart Transportation Initiative (SSTI). SSTI is an independent management auditing organization consisting of transportation policy experts from across the country. SSTI’s report is harsh at times in its assessment of Caltrans’ operations, and makes several recommendations both statutorily and culturally. While the cultural changes urge Caltrans to switch from its highways first mentality to one focused on mobility, there are a few proposals that could affect local transportation planning efforts. These include:

- End the practice of imposing state rules on the development of bicycle facilities located on local streets and roads.
- Provide CalSTA and Caltrans more time to review projects submitted in Regional Transportation Improvement Plans (RTIPs) before they are acted on by the CTC.
- Allow the CTC to approve projects included in an RTIP on a project by project basis as a condition adding a project to the STIP.

The Senate Transportation & Housing held an informational hearing on February 11th to review the findings of the report.

**Caltrans Program Review:** The Program Review was a top-to-bottom assessment of the Department’s role in transportation. It assessed the Department’s functional areas and organizational structure to identify opportunities to eliminate redundancies and inconsequential activities in order to increase the delivery of projects, products, and services and decrease the cost of doing business. The purpose of the Program Review was to identify opportunities to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of Department operations and also to identify opportunities to improve the Department’s relationships with local agencies. The Program Review is expected to advance Caltrans efforts in more effectively accomplishing its mission, improving partnerships, becoming better stewards of state transportation resources, and establishing a professional, continuous improvement culture.

**CTIP Report:** In addition, the CalSTA established the California Transportation Infrastructure Priorities Workgroup (CTIP) last spring. The CTIP Workgroup consists of over 50 transportation related representative, which have been meeting regularly over the past year. The initial report from the CTIP Workgroup has been released. It includes general findings that will guide future work of the group, but also identifies several near and long term issues. Many of the near term issues such as highway account loan repayments, Prop 1B appropriations, Cap & Trade funding to implement Sustainable
Communities Strategies, and funding for rail modernization are already beginning to be addressed in the Governor's 2014-15 budget proposal.

The longer term issues that the CTIP will continue to explore include lowering the voter threshold for enacting local sales taxes, exploring the use of a mileage based user fee, expanding the use of express lanes, and reforming the STIP process to address the changing role of transportation. The report suggests any effort to lower the vote threshold for transportation sales taxes should be tied to improved coordination between the local agency and Caltrans on state highway improvement, such as including maintenance costs in the expenditure plan.

**Transportation Initiative on Hold:** Transportation California and the California Alliance for Jobs have decided not to proceed at this time with their initiative proposal to impose a vehicle license fee dedicated to transportation projects. In November, the backers submitted a proposal to phase in a 1% VLF charge that would be dedicated to transportation and transit capital projects, which would generate up to $4 billion annually. With the recent release of the title and summary, additional polling was done to gage voter support. While passage of this proposal would be difficult, lingering economic worries have made the chance of success unlikely. Both Transportation California and the Alliance for Jobs will continue to work with stakeholders to find a long term solution to our transportation funding needs.

**Legislation**

The final date for submission of new legislation was February 21st. Staff will be reviewing bills related to the Alameda CTC legislative program and bring recommendations on bill positions in the coming months.

In an effort to ensure that express lanes can operate efficiently in Alameda County, Alameda CTC sponsored, and Assemblymember Buchanan has carried a bill to support express lane implementation in Alameda County.

**AB 1811(Buchanan). High-occupancy vehicle lanes.** Existing law authorizes the Sunol Smart Carpool Lane Joint Powers Authority to conduct, administer, and operate a value pricing high-occupancy vehicle program, on specified highway corridors, that may authorize the entry and use of high-occupancy vehicle lanes by single-occupant vehicles for a fee. Existing law requires that the implementation of the program ensure that specified levels of service be maintained at all times in the high-occupancy vehicle lanes and that unrestricted access to the lanes by high-occupancy vehicles be available at all times. This bill would instead require that access to the lanes by high-occupancy vehicles be available at all times.

Implementation of the express lanes on I-580 will necessitate the use of transponders for single occupant express lane users to pay toll to use the designated express lanes. Carpools will not have to pay a toll; however, to ensure that carpools are identified
correctly and not ticketed while using the lanes, the proposed operations of the I-580 express lanes will require the use of transponders for all users in the lanes. Carpoolers will have access to the lanes at all times and will not be charged a fee. If the lanes are highly utilized, the price for single occupant vehicles will rise to ensure operational efficiency of the lane, but carpools will continue to use the lanes without a fee. The transponder that will be used by FasTrak is anticipated to have the ability for users to self-identify if they are a single occupant or a carpool. Electronic enforcement will be used on the lanes to determine if a fee will be charged. In addition, the CHP will also enforce the occupancy requirements for carpools using the lanes. The Alameda CTC legislative platform includes language to “Support express lane expansion in Alameda County and the Bay Area, and efforts that promote effective implementation.” This bill supports effective implementation of the lanes and, therefore, staff recommends a SUPPORT position on this bill.

Legislative coordination efforts: Alameda CTC is leading and participating in many legislative efforts at the local, regional, state and federal levels, including coordinating with other agencies and partners as well as seeking grant opportunities to support transportation investments in Alameda County.

**Fiscal Impact:** There is no fiscal impact.

**Attachments**

A. Alameda CTC 2014 Legislation Program
B. Cap & Trade letter submitted to Senate Budget Committee

**Staff Contact**

Tess Lengyel, Deputy Director of Planning and Policy
2014 Alameda County Legislative Program

The legislative program herein supports Alameda CTC’s transportation vision adopted in the 2012 Countywide Transportation Plan described below:

“Alameda County will be served by a premier transportation system that supports a vibrant and livable Alameda County through a connected and integrated multimodal transportation system promoting sustainability, access, transit operations, public health and economic opportunities. Our vision recognizes the need to maintain and operate our existing transportation infrastructure and services while developing new investments that are targeted, effective, financially sound and supported by appropriate land uses. Mobility in Alameda County will be guided by transparent decision-making and measureable performance indicators. Our transportation system will be: Multimodal; Accessible, Affordable and Equitable for people of all ages, incomes, abilities and geographies; Integrated with land use patterns and local decision-making; Connected across the county, within and across the network of streets, highways and transit, bicycle and pedestrian routes; Reliable and Efficient; Cost Effective; Well Maintained; Safe; Supportive of a Healthy and Clean Environment.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Strategy Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Funding</td>
<td>Increase transportation funding</td>
<td>• Support efforts to lower the two-thirds-voter threshold for voter-approved transportation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support increasing the buying power of the gas tax and/or increasing transportation revenues through vehicle license fees, vehicle miles traveled or other reliable means.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protect and enhance voter-approved funding</td>
<td>• Support increased funding from new and/or flexible funding sources to Alameda County for operating, maintaining, restoring and improving transportation infrastructure and operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support efforts that protects against transportation funding diversions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support increases in federal, state and regional funding to expedite delivery of Alameda CTC projects and programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support efforts that give priority funding to voter-approved measures and oppose those that negatively affect the ability to implement voter-approved measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support rewarding Self-Help Counties and states that provide significant transportation funding into transportation systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Seek, acquire and implement grants to advance project and program delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support Alameda County as the recipient of funds to implement grants and pilot programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Delivery</td>
<td>Advance innovative project delivery</td>
<td>• Support environmental streamlining and expedite project delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support contracting flexibility and innovative project delivery methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support HOT lane expansion in Alameda County and the Bay Area, and efforts that promote effective implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support efforts to allow local agencies to advertise, award and administer state highway system contracts largely funded by locals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure cost-effective project delivery</td>
<td>• Support efforts that reduce project and program implementation costs by reducing or eliminating the requirements for state or other agency reimbursements to implement projects on state/regional systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support accelerating funding and policies to implement transportation projects that create jobs and economic growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimodal Transportation and Land Use</td>
<td>Reduce barriers to the implementation of</td>
<td>• Support legislation that increases flexibility and reduces technical and funding barriers to investments linking transportation, housing and jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transportation and land use investments</td>
<td>• Support local flexibility and decision-making on land-use for transit oriented development and priority development areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support innovative financing opportunities to fund TOD and PDA implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expand multimodal systems and flexibility</td>
<td>• Support policies that provide increased flexibility for transportation service delivery through innovative, flexible programs that address the needs of commuters, youth, seniors, people with disabilities and low-income people and do not create unfunded mandates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support investments in transportation for transit-dependent communities that provide enhanced access to goods, services, jobs and education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support parity in pre-tax fringe benefits for public transit/vanpooling and parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Strategy Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Climate Change**  | Support climate change legislation            | • Support funding for innovative infrastructure, operations, and programs that relieve congestion, improve air quality, reduce emissions and support economic development.  
                              | Support cap-and-trade expenditure plan      | • Support the expansion of funding for housing that does not conflict with or reduce transportation funding. |
|                     | Support emerging technologies                | • Support cap and trade funds derived from transportation fuels for transportation purposes. |
| **Goods Movement**  | Expand goods movement funding and policy development | • Support a multi-modal goods movement system and efforts that enhance the economy, local communities and the environment, and reduce impacts.  
                              |                                                                 | • Support goods movement policies that enhance Bay Area goods movement planning, funding, delivery, and advocacy.  
                              |                                                                 | • Ensure that Bay Area transportation systems are included in and prioritized in state and federal planning and funding processes. |
| **Partnerships**    | Expand partnerships at the local, regional, state and federal levels | • Support efforts that encourage regional cooperation and coordination to develop, promote and fund solutions to regional transportation problems and that support governmental efficiencies and cost savings in transportation.  
                              |                                                                 | • Support policy development to influence transportation planning, policy and funding at the county, regional, state and federal levels.  
                              |                                                                 | • Support efforts to maintain and expand local-, women-, minority- and small-business participation in competing for contracts. |
February 10, 2014

Senator Mark Leno, Chair
Senate Committee on Budget & Fiscal Review
State Capitol, Room 5100
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Request for modification of Governor Brown’s 2014-15 Proposed
Cap-and-Trade Budget and Implementation

Dear Senator Leno:

The Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) is writing to request changes in implementation of Governor Brown’s proposed budget to appropriate $850 million to a wide range of projects critical to achieving the State’s greenhouse gas reduction goals. In particular, we recommend that the appropriation of $100 million for implementation of Sustainable Community Strategies (SCS) be done at the regional level, where the SCSs have been developed to meet the State’s mandate to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. We urge you to increase this appropriation to support resources commensurate with the GHG reduction mandate.

Alameda CTC invests in projects and programs that create accessible, convenient, equitable, and sustainable transportation to move people and goods, spur economic growth, and enrich communities. Alameda CTC plans, funds, and delivers approximately $160 million each year for projects and programs that support Alameda County’s economy and help move over 1.5 million people each day. Our agency, along with fourteen cities and Alameda County as local jurisdictions are also responsible for assisting with the implementation of the Bay Area’s SCS that supports implementation of Senate Bill 375.

Alameda CTC supports the State’s Cap and Trade Expenditure Plan recommendations that support multimodal investments and advanced technologies in passenger and freight systems. Our long-range plans similarly support multimodal systems to address the transportation needs of Bay Area travelers, and we are embarking on efforts to address regional goods movement needs and priorities. Toward these efforts, Alameda CTC makes the following overall comments on the appropriation of Cap and Trade revenue with the goal of reducing GHG emissions from transportation:

Administer funding for transportation’s GHG reduction program at the regional level.

Regional planning and local leadership in developing and implementing SCSs is critical in the efforts to implement these plans both locally and regionally. In keeping with this key recommendation, we recommend that State funding for GHG reductions related to SCS implementation be administered at the regional
level, and trailer bill language should direct the Strategic Growth Counsel to allocate funds directly to regions for implementing SCS projects. The mandate for SCS implementation needs to have adequate resources to ensure its goals can be achieved.

**Ensure sufficient funding is available now to implement transportation investments that reduce GHG emissions.**

Key recommendations for transportation focus on planning, changes to funding and market strategies, and new regulations. These priorities support investments that expand clean passenger and freight technologies and equipment, low carbon fuels, and implementation of adopted SCSs. As the largest contributor to GHG emissions, the transportation sector has the highest requirement for GHG reductions, per Governor Brown’s Executive Order B-16-2012, which specifically requires an 80 percent GHG reduction.

For the transportation industry to achieve its GHG reduction target, significant and reliable funding sources are needed now to move the Bay Area SCS from a plan into implementation. The strategies included in the SCS will result in long-term shifts in travel and land use patterns, but require an up-front investment in infrastructure and development incentives to realize their GHG emission reductions.

Without a significant commitment of funds this work cannot be implemented in a timely way to support the GHG reduction timelines and targets.

**Direct significant cap-and-trade revenues to transportation investments that reduce GHG emissions.**

The State’s new Cap and Trade Program represents one of the most promising opportunities for investing in transportation strategies that support GHG reductions. Given that the transportation sector accounts for 40 percent of State GHG emissions, the Alameda CTC supports directing at least 40 percent of Cap and Trade revenues to transportation investments. Additionally, starting in 2015, Alameda CTC supports the California Air Resources Board working with the California State Transportation Agency and other regional and local transportation agencies to direct the additional revenues generated from transportation fuels to investments in the transportation sector. Directing fuel-based revenue to transportation programs that achieve GHG reductions will fulfill Assembly Bill 32 goals and provide a “user fee” link between increased fuel prices and transportation investments that benefit those paying.

**Support the successful planning and investment strategies developed and delivered by the regions and local agencies.**

Alameda CTC is Alameda County’s congestion management agency. In partnership with MTC and the other Bay Area congestion management agencies, we deliver projects and programs each year that support the Bay Area’s economy and mobility and reduce GHG emissions through cutting-edge transportation efforts such as:

- Bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and programs
- Clean fuels and new technologies
- Express bus service
- Highway/roadway improvements to reduce congestion and support goods movement
- Mass transit operations and capital investments
- Transportation Demand Management programs
- Transit oriented development
- Transportation for seniors and people with disabilities

Bay Area voters have approved local transportation measures that fund these investments. Alameda CTC is held accountable to strict delivery timelines through open and public processes, and we report regularly to the public on how funds are expended. This accountability has resulted in significant investments that reduce congestion, improve access and efficiencies, and create safe, efficient, and clean transportation systems.

Recognizing and rewarding the efficiency and effectiveness of our delivery processes by directing funds and administration authority to regions and local agencies will enable the State to advance its GHG reduction goals.
Alameda CTC appreciates your efforts to appropriate Cap and Trade funds on projects that will result in immediate and near-term reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. How these funds are allocated will greatly influence transportation, fuels, and infrastructure in California and change the way we perceive and address energy efficiency, waste, water, and agriculture, as well as protect our natural resources and enrich communities throughout California. We see investment in the transportation sector as a key strategy to meet the State’s ambitious GHG reduction goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed appropriation of Cap and Trade revenue.

Sincerely,

Alameda CTC Chair Scott Haggerty
Alameda County Supervisor, District 1

Cc:
Members and consultant to the Senate Committee on Budget & Fiscal Review
Members of the Bay Area Legislative Delegation
Steve Heminger, MTC Executive Director
Ezra Rapport, ABAG Executive Director
League of California Cities
CALCOG
CSAC
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DATE: March 3, 2014

SUBJECT: Sustainable Communities Technical Assistance Program (SCTAP) Draft Projects Recommendation

RECOMMENDATION: Approve SCTAP funding of $4,544,892.

Summary

As part of the One Bay Area Grant program, a portion of Priority Development Area (PDA) planning and implementation funds was allocated to the Congestion Management Agencies for local PDA planning and implementation projects. Alameda CTC combined $3.9 M of federal funds with local Measure B funds to create the Sustainable Communities Technical Assistance Program (SCTAP). The purpose of this funding program is to support PDA planning and implementation, implementation of complete streets policies, and smaller-scale bicycle and pedestrian technical projects. This program is also designed to advance PDAs through planning processes so that they may become ready and eligible for future OBAG funding.

A call for projects was issued on June 4, 2013, and applications were due on September 17, 2013. A total of 22 applications totaling $5.9 million in requested funds were received from ten different jurisdictions, AC Transit and LAVTA. Alameda CTC staff as well as two additional staff members from MTC and ABAG reviewed applications. Alameda CTC staff then met with project sponsors to address any outstanding questions and in some cases refine a project’s scope of work.

The projects recommended for funding are listed in Attachment A. A total of ten different projects are recommended for funding under the PDA planning and implementation and complete streets portion of the program for a requested funding amount of $4,230,500. Three additional projects are recommended under the bicycle and pedestrian planning and engineering technical support portion of the program for a recommended total funding amount of $94,600. Projects that were not recommended for funding are listed in Attachment B.

Once the recommended list of projects and funding amounts is approved by the Commission, Alameda CTC staff will then work with project sponsors to select consultants from the qualified list using an RFP process. Work on the recommended projects is expected to commence by summer 2014.
Background

The SCTAP provides significant support to Alameda County jurisdictions in the form of consultant expertise for Priority Development Area (PDA) and Growth Opportunity Area (GOA) planning and implementation, complete streets policy implementation, and bicycle and pedestrian planning and engineering technical support. The program also includes support for bicycle and pedestrian planning and engineering technical support both within and outside of PDAs and GOAs.

In February 2013, the Commission approved the program guidelines and the allocation of funds for the SCTAP. An RFQ was released in March 2013 to solicit statements of qualifications from consultants, and a list of qualified consultants has been finalized. Once the recommended projects are approved by the Commission, Alameda CTC staff will work with project sponsors to develop and release RFPs to this list.

Fiscal Impact

The recommended funding allocation and available source of funds is summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Allocation:</th>
<th>Funding Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDA and Complete Streets Projects</td>
<td>$4,230,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle and Pedestrian Technical Assistance Projects</td>
<td>$94,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal:</td>
<td>$4,325,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda CTC Administrative Costs (for duration of program)</td>
<td>$219,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,544,892</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available Funding:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDA Planning and Implementation Funds (Federal Surface Transportation Program funds)</td>
<td>$3,905,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure B Transit Center Development funds</td>
<td>$545,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure B Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety discretionary funds</td>
<td>$94,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,544,892</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following chart summarizes the projects and funding amounts by planning area for PDA Planning and Implementation and Complete Streets Implementation projects:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Number of PDAs</th>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Recommended Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North County</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>• City of Alameda Clement Ave. Complete Street Corridor</td>
<td>$1,345,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• City of Albany Citywide Parking Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• City of Oakland Bikeway Network 2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• City of Oakland Comprehensive Downtown Circulation Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central County</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>• Central County Complete Streets Implementation</td>
<td>$1,385,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• City of Hayward Downtown Specific Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• City of San Leandro Downtown Parking Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>• Tri-Valley Integrated Transit/Park and Ride Study</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• City of Dublin Iron Horse Connectivity to BART Feasibility Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No applications were received.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total PDA Planning and Implementation and Complete Streets Funding:** $4,230,500

**Attachments**

A. SCTAP Draft Projects Recommendation  
B. SCTAP Projects not Recommended for Funding

**Staff Contacts**

- **Tess Lengyel**, Deputy Director of Planning and Policy  
- **Kara Vuicich**, Senior Transportation Planner
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### Priority Development Area (PDA) Planning and Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>SCTAP Funding</th>
<th>Additional Match</th>
<th>Project Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>North County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Alameda</td>
<td>Clement Avenue Complete Street Corridor</td>
<td>The project includes the development of conceptual designs, including community outreach, for developing a bikeway along Clement Ave that provides a direct, commuter-oriented route linking central Alameda to the east end and beyond, including Oakland and Fruitvale BART. <strong>Reason for funding:</strong> The review panel recommended this project due to its location and impact on future PDA development and its potential to serve as a model for similar corridors.</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Albany</td>
<td>Citywide Parking Study and Plan</td>
<td>The parking study will examine existing conditions and develop a strategy for managing parking to support the city's land use objectives. <strong>Reason for funding:</strong> Currently, Albany has a voter-mandated parking requirement of 2 spaces per unit. This is a huge impediment to infill development, and the study would specifically seek to address this issue.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Additional Match</td>
<td>SCTAP Funding</td>
<td>Project Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>Bikeway Network 2.0</td>
<td>Project addresses major network gaps in four bikeway corridors that extend across Oakland as well as gaps on three additional bikeways. These seven corridors comprise 37 miles of the city’s bikeway network and connect all of Oakland PDAs. The scope addresses gaps along 6 miles of these roadways and at 7 additional intersections. The project would focus on “next generation” bikeway design. The project will develop a methodology to apply Assembly Bill No. 2245 to the analysis and environmental clearance of road diet projects. The project would improve multimodal access in Oakland’s PDAs and has the potential to serve as a model for other bikeway projects in the county.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$270,500</td>
<td>$270,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>Comprehensive Downtown Circulation Plan</td>
<td>The Comprehensive Downtown Circulation Plan is aimed not only at solving current traffic problems but also to take into consideration traffic generated from significant new planned developments in Oakland and Alameda. The plan will include a comprehensive traffic study for Downtown Oakland that will take into account the changing land use as well as the traffic patterns in the area. The analysis, results, and mitigations proposed as part of the traffic study will help shape the final implementation plan. Downtown area will be an evaluation of the feasibility of converting</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>SCTAP Funding</td>
<td>Additional Match</td>
<td>Project Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central County (Alameda County, San Leandro and Hayward)</td>
<td>Central County Complete Streets Implementation</td>
<td>Develop needed procedural documents and facilitate implementation and staff training necessary for a successful complete streets program. <strong>Reason for funding:</strong> Both the cities of San Leandro and Hayward submitted applications for complete streets implementation. Because many of the major corridors in Central County traverse all three jurisdictions (San Leandro, Alameda County and Hayward), Alameda CTC requested that the three jurisdictions work together jointly on a Central County complete streets implementation project. This work may also serve as a model for other Alameda County jurisdictions pursuing</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reason for funding:</td>
<td>SCTAP Funding</td>
<td>Additional Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hayward</td>
<td>Hayward Downtown Specific Plan</td>
<td>Development of a new Downtown Specific Plan. The new Downtown Plan will replace six Downtown planning and zoning documents that were adopted between 1987 and 2002.</td>
<td>The review panel recommended this project because it strongly meets the objectives for PDA planning and implementation. Furthermore, Hayward is projected to take on a significant amount of housing growth under Plan Bay Area. A larger CTC funding is recommended to more comprehensively address multimodal circulation and access in the downtown area.</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td>$169,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Leandro</td>
<td>San Leandro Downtown Parking Management Plan</td>
<td>Develop a strategy to better manage existing supply and demand and facilitate implementation of future land use and development objectives for the downtown.</td>
<td>The City of San Leandro recently completed its Downtown TOD strategy and has updated its zoning code to implement the strategy. Developing and implementing a parking management plan will facilitate the full implementation of the strategy and potential development in the downtown TOD area. This project also leverages a smaller technical assistance grant from MTC.</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>SCTAP Funding</td>
<td>Additional Match</td>
<td>Project Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| East County                          | Tri-Valley Cities and LAVTA               | The overarching goal of the study is to reduce VMT and single-occupancy vehicle trips by developing a coordinated transit and park-and-ride strategy for the Tri-Valley. The strategy will also address multimodal travel options, particularly first- and last-mile strategies within the Tri-Valley’s PDAs, as well as better management of parking and access to the region’s two BART stations. The scope of work has been revised from the original application, but retains the following elements from the original application: 1) Tri-Valley Smart Parking Technology Study 2) Pleasanton Park & Ride Study 3) LAVTA Onboard O-D, Modeling and Benchmarking Study 4) I-680 O-D Study  
**Reason for funding:** This project is a coordinated effort between LAVTA and the cities of Pleasanton, Dublin and Livermore to improve transit and first- and last-mile multimodal connections to regional transit facilities within PDAs and park-and-ride lots. Automobile traffic related to BART parking is a significant issue in Tri-Valley PDAs, and better parking management and improvement of first- and last-mile multimodal options will help mitigate the negative impacts of automobile traffic on other travel modes in these areas. | $700,000       | $217,035         | $917,035       |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>SCTAP Funding</th>
<th>Additional Match</th>
<th>Project Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Dublin</td>
<td>Iron Horse Connectivity to BART Feasibility Study</td>
<td>The study will examine the feasibility of crossing and trail improvements on the Iron Horse Trail (IHT) from Dougherty Road to the Dublin/Pleasanton BART Station, in order to decrease barriers, reduce parking demand at BART, and increase bike/walk mode share to the BART Station from the surrounding activity centers. <strong>Reason for funding:</strong> This project will address a significant barrier to IHT users and potentially increase bicycling and walking access to the BART Station. It also complements the Tri-Valley Integrated Transit/Park and Ride Study.</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$64,400</td>
<td>$364,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>SCTAP Funding</td>
<td>Additional Match</td>
<td>Project Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide</td>
<td>SB 743 Implementation and other CEQA Streamlining Technical Assistance</td>
<td>Provide technical assistance to assist in implementing changes to CEQA required under SB 743 as well as other efforts to streamline CEQA review to facilitate development within PDAs. <strong>Reason for funding:</strong> The Governor's Office of Planning and Research will issue revised draft CEQA Guidelines this summer that will significantly change how transportation analyses are performed. Jurisdictions are likely to need technical support to implement these changes as well as other CEQA streamlining efforts to facilitate PDA development. Alameda CTC will work with local jurisdictions once the draft CEQA Guidelines are issued to determine technical assistance needs related to implementation.</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $4,230,500 $480,435 $4,710,935
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>MB Funding</th>
<th>Additional Match</th>
<th>Project Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Albany</td>
<td>Kains St. and Adams St. Bicycle Facility Study</td>
<td>Evaluate the type of bicycle facilities, including contra-flow bicycle lanes, suitable for implementation along Kains and Adams streets in Albany. These streets serve as parallel facilities to San Pablo Ave. Reason for Funding: This project is exploring various design strategies to address the need for bicycle facilities along the San Pablo corridor. It has the potential to serve as a model for other jurisdictions faced with similar issues.</td>
<td>$32,800</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$32,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Emeryville</td>
<td>Horton St Bicycle and Complete St Design Project</td>
<td>Project #1 is on Horton Street between 45th Street and 53rd Street and involves traffic calming and speed reduction of motor vehicles to increase bicycle and pedestrian safety. Project #2 is on Horton Street adjacent to the Amtrak station covering the area from Powell Street to 62nd Street. This part of Horton Street is designated as both Bicycle Priority and a Transit Priority Streets. There are commercial and residential uses in the area that have motor vehicle loading and parking needs that are not currently being met legally with the existing street configuration. Reason for Funding: Potential design solutions could serve as a model for other jurisdictions. Additionally, this project has</td>
<td>$36,800</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$36,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pleasanton has a system of trails adjacent to waterways. The lack of bridges at key locations prevents connectivity and access to destinations, however. Project will develop a prioritized list of bicycle and pedestrian bridges.

**Reason for Funding:** By improving connectivity, the trails system has the potential to expand its role in serving commute and other trips in addition to recreational users.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Pleasanton</th>
<th>Feasibility Study for Pedestrian and Bicycle Bridges</th>
<th>$25,000</th>
<th>$25,000</th>
<th>$50,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TOTAL:** $94,600 $25,000 $119,600
### Item 5.1 Attachment B: SCTAP Projects not Recommended for Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Funding Requested</th>
<th>Additional Match</th>
<th>Project Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC Transit</td>
<td>Major Corridors Study</td>
<td>Study to improve transit on nine corridors that serve and/or link PDAs. <strong>Reason for not funding:</strong> Alameda CTC is currently working with AC Transit to incorporate the Major Corridors Study into the Countywide Transit Plan.</td>
<td>$236,000</td>
<td>$514,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Transit</td>
<td>Update of Designing with Transit</td>
<td>Comprehensive revision of current Designing with Transit manual. Will focus on key design aspects for PDAs and complete streets. <strong>Reason for not funding:</strong> Some if not many of the elements of the update will be addressed in the Countywide Transit Plan.</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>Solano Ave Concept Design for Complete Streets</td>
<td>Develop a concept design to better address the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, transit, and autos on Albany's primary commercial corridor. <strong>Reason for not funding:</strong> This is primarily a pedestrian safety project and consequently did not score as well as other complete streets implementation projects.</td>
<td>$55,600</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$55,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>C St Complete Streets Improvements Project Design</td>
<td>Apply complete streets criteria to C St between Grand and Filbert, connecting the Downtown PDA with the Cannery PDA. The project will reduce the number of travel lanes and make improvements to bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, including bike lanes. <strong>Reason for not funding:</strong> Elements of this project will be incorporated into the Downtown Hayward Specific Plan.</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Funding Requested</td>
<td>Additional Match</td>
<td>Project Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>Main St Complete Streets Improvements Project Design</td>
<td>Apply complete streets design to Main St between A and C Sts. in the Downtown PDA. The project will reduce the number of travel lanes and make improvements to bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, including bike lanes.</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>Complete Streets Implementation Procedures</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Downtown PDA Parking Management Program (PMP)</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>Downtown PDA Parking Management Program (PMP)</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>Complete Streets Implementation Procedures</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reason for not funding: Elements of this project will be incorporated into the Downtown Hayward Specific Plan.

Reason for not funding: This project has been incorporated into the Central County Complete Streets Implementation project.

Reason for not funding: The City of Livermore has already contracted with a consultant to carry out the scope of work for this project. Under the SCTAP, Alameda CTC is unable to substitute funds for a project that is already underway.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Funding Requested</th>
<th>Additional Match</th>
<th>Project Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont</td>
<td>Complete Streets Policy Implementation</td>
<td>Develop revised street standards and complete streets policy implementation tools and processes. <strong>Reason for not funding:</strong> Piedmont does not have a PDA and is therefore ineligible for PDA planning and implementation funds. Because of the funding source, Complete Streets Implementation projects completed under SCTAP are restricted to jurisdictions with PDAs.</td>
<td>$46,300</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$46,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>CEQA Streamlining for PDA and Infill Development</td>
<td>The CEQA streamlining program developed through this project will apply to projects Citywide. However, the focus of the streamlining efforts will be to increase opportunities for infill development, particularly in Oakland’s Priority Development Areas (PDAs). <strong>Reason for not funding:</strong> Because the revised CEQA Guidelines have not yet been drafted, it is premature to move forward with this project at this time. To address these needs, $500,000 is being set aside countywide to address SB 743 implementation and CEQA streamlining needs during the following fiscal year.</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Funding Requested</td>
<td>Additional Match</td>
<td>Project Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Downtown Oakland PDA Parking Plan</td>
<td>This project seeks to propose changes to the management of downtown parking in order to allow infill development to proceed while maintaining the availability of parking for those who need it. The goal is to increase the efficient use of the existing parking supply, encourage “park-once” behavior, and incent walking, biking, and transit use in truly multimodal systems for getting to and around downtown Oakland. <strong>Reason for not funding:</strong> Some parking analysis will be conducted as part of the Comprehensive Downtown Oakland Circulation Plan. Alameda CTC is recommending that this project be funded with regional PDA planning funds. This is consistent with MTC and ABAG’s emphasis on providing support for areas taking on significant growth under Plan Bay Area.</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Funding Requested</td>
<td>Additional Match</td>
<td>Project Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>RFP for a Transportation Impact Fee Program and a Complete Streets Capital Projects List or Plan</td>
<td>The RFP and Complete Streets Capital Projects list developed through this project will apply Citywide, but especially to development within the PDAs. The focus of the effort will be to increase infill development by addressing transportation impacts without discouraging development. This project works hand-in-hand with the proposed CEQA streamlining program. <strong>Reason for not funding:</strong> The City of Oakland has already committed $500,000 from its general fund for development of a transportation impact fee. The review panel recommended that this project receive a low priority because of its focus on developing an RFP as opposed to conducting a study or completing a plan.</td>
<td>$124,250</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$124,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Equitable Transportation Infrastructure Investment Tool</td>
<td>The project intent is to build upon our existing transportation project prioritization tool (funded by ACTC in 2012/13) to develop equity criteria that can be used to recommend City investments and Capital Improvement Program activities of all kinds into Oakland PDAs that show the greatest social need and greatest neglect. These areas are located throughout the Potential and Priority Development Areas of Oakland. <strong>Reason for not funding:</strong> Many of the objectives of this project will be addressed through the forthcoming Community Based Transportation Plans update.</td>
<td>$229,250</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$229,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DATE: March 3, 2014

SUBJECT: Goods Movement Collaborative and Plan Update

RECOMMENDATION: Receive an update on the Goods Movement Collaborative and Plan development

Approve creation of an Ad Hoc Committee to provide focused input into Goods Movement Collaborative and Plan

Summary

Goods movement is an essential part of a thriving economy and has important environmental and community benefits as well as impacts. Alameda County’s geography and transportation system assets make it critical to the goods movement system in the Bay Area, the Northern California megaregion, and the nation. The Alameda CTC, in partnership with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the Port of Oakland, Caltrans, and the East Bay Economic Development Alliance, is undertaking goods movement work including organizing a Goods Movement Collaborative that will bring together key partners and stakeholders to advocate for freight and goods movement. In addition, Alameda CTC is developing a Countywide Goods Movement Plan to identify short- and long-term needs, strategies, and priorities for investing in the goods movement system. These efforts are being closely coordinated with the development of a regional goods movement plan and will in turn inform state and federal freight planning efforts currently underway.

This memorandum provides an update on the Goods Movement Collaborative and Plan development. In addition, the memorandum recommends that the Alameda CTC form an Ad Hoc Committee in order to participate as an interest group of local elected officials (who are a key goods movement stakeholder) in the Goods Movement Collaborative.

Background

Freight and goods movement planning is underway at the local, regional, state and federal levels. Alameda CTC and its partners have engaged at all levels of these processes.
Federal and State Processes

The Federal surface transportation act, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21), was signed into law in 2012 and included the development of a national freight policy that will establish a national freight network and create a national freight strategic plan. The development of the network and strategic plan will be done with a National Freight Advisory Committee (NFAC). NFAC representatives from California include: Kristin Decas, CEO & Port Director, Port of Hueneme; Genevieve Giuliano, Professor, Director and Senior Associate Dean, University of Southern California; Fran Inman, Senior Vice President, Majestic Realty Company and Member, California Transportation Commission; Randy Iwasaki, Executive Director, Contra Costa Transportation Authority; and Bonnie Lowenthal, State Assembly Member.

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has established a California Freight Advisory Committee (CFAC), including Art Dao as a member, to assist with the development of a California Freight Mobility Plan. This plan will provide input into the national plan and will be incorporated into the overall California Transportation Plan which will be completed in 2015. The state is guiding its effort using the same strategic goals and definitions as those that are included in MAP-21.

The federal process requires the establishment of an initial primary freight network (PFN) of 27,000 centerline miles of existing roadway that are most critical to the movement of freight. The United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) released a Draft Highway Primary Freight Network in November 2013. USDOT developed both a Primary Freight Network which includes critical corridors using statutory criteria and respects the 27,000 mile statutory cap and a Comprehensive Freight Network which uses the statutory criteria but ignores the mileage cap, resulting in a 41,000 mile network. The 27,000 mile Primary network results in many gaps at the state level, however critical freeway routes in Alameda County including I-80, I-880, I-580 (east of I-238), I-238, and I-680 (south of I-580) are included in both the Primary and Comprehensive networks, as shown in Attachment A.

The State of California’s comments on the NPFN were submitted on February 14, 2014. The State’s comments were developed with input from the California Freight Advisory Committee (CFAC) and are included as Attachment B.

In addition to the NPFN, MAP-21 requires that USDOT develop the national freight strategic plan within three years of the bill’s passage. The strategic plan will be updated thereafter every five years. MAP-21 encourages states to develop freight plans that address immediate and long-range freight needs. In California, the development of a California Freight Mobility Plan (CFMP) was initiated in spring 2013. The state plans to develop a set of policy principles to influence the federal strategic plan development. A draft of these policy principles was presented to the CFAC in January and is included as Attachment C.
MTC also adopted its federal freight advocacy principles in January. These principles are included as Attachment D.

The current timeline for development of the CFMP is that a preliminary draft version of the document will be ready by for review by the CFAC by March 2014, with the document made ready for a draft release in July for a 60-day comment period from July through August 2014. The final plan is expected to be completed by October 2014 and will be approved by the California State Transportation Agency Secretary by the end of the year. The CFMP will rely on Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) level goods movement plans, including the Caltrans District 4 plan discussed below.

Also at the state level, the California Air Resources Board approved a resolution in January directing staff to develop a Sustainable Freight Strategy. The Strategy document will include elements including stakeholder engagement forums, technology assessments, criteria for freight transportation projects, criteria for new freight facilities, and actions needed over the next 5 years.

Regional and Local Processes

Caltrans District 4 and MTC are finalizing a short-term Bay Area Freight Mobility Planning effort that feed into the CFMP. The Bay Area Freight Mobility Plan will be completed by Spring 2014 and will serve as a basis for both the update of the Regional Goods Movement Plan and for part of the Alameda County Goods Movement Plan.

In addition, MTC is updating its Regional Goods Movement Plan, and this effort will be conducted as a task in the consultant contract for the Alameda Countywide Goods Movement Collaborative and Plan effort. Because of Alameda County’s central role in the regional goods movement system and the fact that goods movement markets and commodity flows cross geographic boundaries, the integration and simultaneous work on the regional and the countywide plans is an efficient use of the consultant contract to deliver high quality data, outreach with stakeholders and develop the advocacy portion of this work through the development of the Goods Movement Collaborative. The regional goods movement plan and the Alameda Countywide Goods Movement Plan are intended to inform the next updates of the Regional Transportation Plan and Countywide Transportation Plan, respectively.

Update on Alameda CTC Goods Movement Collaborative and Plan

Work on the Alameda Countywide Goods Movement Collaborative and Plan commenced in October 2013. The scope of this effort is being further refined to include the development of a closely coordinated regional goods movement plan update. This work will build on the analysis already completed through the District 4 freight plan. While the regional and county level efforts will proceed simultaneously, the most in-depth analysis will be conducted within
Alameda County, including detailed assessment of goods movement performance on arterial and local roads, detailed assessment of specific goods movement strategies, and a greater depth and breadth of stakeholder interviews. Close coordination with Northern California mega-region partners will also be done through the joint MTC and Alameda CTC planning efforts.

The Goods Movement Collaborative is governed by a Leadership Team which includes the Alameda CTC, East Bay Economic Development Agency, MTC, Caltrans District 4, and the Port of Oakland. In recognition of the regional goods movement plan update, the Leadership team will be expanded to include additional partners for regional representation.

The Goods Movement Collaborative Leadership Team is supported by a Technical Team of city and agency staff which can provide an initial review of work products. ACTAC is being used as the county-level Technical Team, and the Alameda County Public Health Department and Air District are also invited to these meetings. An initial survey of ACTAC members to identify local goods movement issues and data available at the local level has been conducted, and ACTAC members have received a detailed briefing on the project scope and timeline. At the regional level, the CMA Planning and Project Delivery Directors, supplemented with staff from the BAAQMD and Port of Oakland, will serve the Technical Team function. The regional Technical Team is comprised of planning and project delivery directors in all nine counties.

The Goods Movement Collaborative efforts also include interviews of key interest groups. Several rounds of interviews will be conducted throughout the project, and the first round of interviews is underway. The project team has completed an interview of trucking industry representatives. Interviews are scheduled with the Alameda Labor Council, with business stakeholders, and with the Ditching Dirty Diesel coalition which includes community and environmental justice interests. Interviews are tentatively scheduled with maritime businesses, railroad and goods movement dependent industries.

Six roundtables scheduled throughout the project will bring together various parties from the Collaborative. The first roundtable, which is envisioned as a full-day kick-off event is targeted for May 2014. The project team is working to develop the agenda and invite speakers.

As part of the Goods Movement Plan, a number of work products are under development. These include an advocacy white paper, draft vision and goals, and technical memoranda on existing policies and plans and on infrastructure trends.

An updated project timeline is included as Attachment E.
**Creation of Ad Hoc Committee**

As part of the Goods Movement Collaborative efforts, in-depth interviews of key goods movement interest groups are being conducted. These meetings generally follow an open-ended interview style format and allow stakeholders to identify issues and opportunities in the goods movement system.

Local elected officials are a key goods movement stakeholder, and the Alameda CTC is a natural body of local elected officials to offer input to the Countywide Goods Movement Collaborative about issues in their respective jurisdictions. However, the typical Commission meeting structure is not well-matched to the focus group structure. Therefore, it is recommended that the Alameda CTC approve the creation of an ad hoc committee to offer more targeted input about goods movement issues in a focus group format.

**Fiscal Impact:**

There is no fiscal impact.

**Attachments**

A. Bay Area Draft National Primary Freight Network
B. State of California Comments on Draft National Primary Freight Network
C. California Federal Freight Policy Principles
D. [MTC Federal Freight Policy Principles](#) (hyperlinked)
E. Alameda Countywide Goods Movement Collaborative and Plan Project Timeline

**Staff Contact**

Tess Lengyel, Deputy Director of Planning and Policy

Matt Bomberg, Assistant Transportation Planner
While the data on this map has been examined for accuracy, Caltrans disclaims any responsibility for the accuracy or completeness of the data. In no event shall Caltrans become liable to users of this map, or to any other party, for any loss or damages, consequential or otherwise, including but not limited to time, money, or goodwill, arising from the use of this map product.
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February 14, 2014

Docket Management Facility  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE, W12-140  
Washington, D.C. 20590-0001

RE: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), [Docket No. FHWA-2013-0050]; Designation of the Primary Freight Network

Dear Sir or Madam:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Primary Freight Network (PFN) and for extending the comment period to enable more extensive consultations with our freight stakeholders. Identifying the nation’s primary freight corridors is an important step in providing more resources to improving the United States (U.S.) freight system and our international competitiveness. I commend the work done by the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) given the constrained circumstances provided under the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21).

California is the nation’s international trade leader in terms of value and quantity of goods that are handled by its seaports, airports, railroads, and roadways. It is essential to California’s future that we ensure the continued strength of the State’s freight industry, and the larger national economy it supports, in ways that are more efficient and that minimize impacts to communities and the environment. The USDOT’s freight program can help to accomplish this goal in California and other states. Despite the statutory limitations governing the extent of the proposed PFN, the USDOT has envisioned a rational highway network that can serve as the foundation for the eventual designation of a more expansive PFN that fully represents California’s and the nation’s full multi-modal freight system.

Although this letter represents the views of the State of California, the State has had extensive consultations with its diverse, 62-member California Freight Advisory Committee (CFAC) regarding the proposed PFN. Additionally, many of our CFAC member organizations submitted their own comments to the Federal Register to convey their particular needs and interests. Given the enormous scale of California’s freight industry, it is important that regional and local issues are fully considered. In reviewing the entire set of comments submitted by California’s freight stakeholders, the USDOT will find an overall consistency in the identification of the major needs of the PFN, including:
Inclusion of all freight modes – not just highways – as part of the PFN.
Creation of a national freight funding program.
Description of how the PFN will guide policy at USDOT and other federal agencies.
Substantial expansion of the proposed 27,000 centerline-mile PFN.
Flexibility to adjust the PFN within the states based on state and local knowledge.
Closure of critical first- and last-mile gaps in the PFN.
Recognition of environmental and community impact mitigation as an eligible project funding category and as part of the overall freight program.

In addition, I would like to provide the following comments on funding and the timing for updates to the PFN:

- The PFN focuses attention on the nation’s most important freight highway routes, thereby increasing the likelihood that additional funding will be directed to these vital corridors through a new, dedicated national freight funding program. Absent a new freight funding program, the designation of the PFN may have little impact, as there is insufficient funding capacity within existing transportation programs to support additional demands. Substantial and sustainable funding will be critical to the success of the national freight program.

- There is some concern that updating the PFN on a ten-year cycle is inadequate; therefore, I recommend at least a minimum five-year update cycle. With the metropolitan transportation planning process based on a four-year cycle, and freight and rail plans updated on five-year cycles, it is impractical to have the PFN updated only every ten years. Global trade is dynamic and will certainly experience significant change much more frequently than a ten-year update cycle can address. The update process should also include the ability for states to amend their designated network between update cycles as changing circumstances necessitate.

The Request for Comments listed five areas to address. Responses to each are detailed below.

1. **Specific route deletions, additions, or modifications to the draft initial designation of the PFN:**

   Expansion of the PFN is necessary to create a unified national highway freight network rather than a set of disconnected regional networks. It is not possible to create a truly national PFN under the 27,000 centerline-mile restriction.

   California’s portion of the proposed PFN has numerous gaps and missing segments that, if closed, would create a coherent, continuous, linked freight network within the State. Key among these missing and vital network segments are highways and local roads that make up the “first- and last-mile” connections to seaports, cargo airports, intermodal
yards, and commercial border ports of entry. It is essential that the PFN not abruptly terminate a few miles from these critical freight facilities, which the proposed PFN often does.

In addition, states should be granted authority to reallocate PFN miles within their state. Due to the limitations of national data sets used to designate the PFN, the USDOT has insufficient local knowledge to identify which PFN reallocations are the most important and strategic for a given locale. As such, I recommend that states be authorized to effect any of the following reallocations of PFN miles:

1. A portion of a proposed PFN route to another portion of that same route.
2. A portion of a proposed PFN route to a different proposed PFN route.
3. A portion of a proposed PFN route to a more critical non-PFN route that may have been overlooked during the initial PFN designation process, so long as the replacement segment has been determined by the state to be of higher priority.

Furthermore, states would be required to provide a technically supported justification for any reallocation and the total PFN centerline miles for a state would not change. Final approval for reallocations would be made by the USDOT.

(2) The methodology for achieving a 27,000-mile final designation:

I applaud the USDOT’s utilization of a data-supported approach to identifying routes under this restriction. California’s portion of the proposed PFN is largely consistent with the State’s own analysis and largely represents California’s highest-volume and most important highway freight routes, which are also critical routes serving the entire country.

If, however, adjustments are made to the methodology, the adjustments should consider freight routes that have high seasonal peak truck traffic, such as in the often overlooked agricultural and extractive industry regions. Averaged over an entire year, many of these critical routes do not reach the PFN threshold, but still accommodate high numbers of trucks during the planting, harvesting, extraction, and processing seasons. This is particularly true for California’s Central Valley, the Central Coast, and the North State, each of which are nationally and internationally significant exporters of agricultural, forest, and mineral products. For example, the Central Coast’s Salinas Valley, often referred to as the “salad bowl of the nation,” does not have an extension of the PFN that reaches the Salinas Valley under the proposed 27,000- or conceptual 41,518-mile PFN; this omission should be remedied.

(3) How the National Freight Network (NFN) and its components could be used by freight stakeholders in the future:
As previously noted, absent a new freight funding program, the designation of the PFN may have little practical application, as there is no funding capacity within existing transportation programs to absorb new freight program needs. Further, the freight program must be funded in a way that creates a reasonable level of certainty that funding will be available when freight projects are ready for construction. This assurance is particularly important when private funding is being devoted to freight projects through public-private partnerships. Moreover, new funding opportunities must not eliminate current freight funding options.

In addition, designation of the NFN and PFN highlights the need to address community and environmental impacts along freight corridors at the time projects are initially proposed. Impacts from diesel emissions and freight activities are well-documented and particularly concentrated along the highest-volume freight corridors and hubs. Within any funding program that is targeted to serve freight, addressing air quality and public health impacts in the project selection process must be a priority. Freight projects also must address greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

I recommend that funding be made available to projects within 1,000 feet of a PFN route, and that it addresses and prioritizes air quality and public health benefits. Such prioritization has been successfully implemented through public-private collaboration, via both regulatory and voluntary means, to reduce environmental and public health impacts throughout California, as demonstrated by the use of more-efficient and lower-polluting engines, fuels, and operations strategies. These actions dramatically reduced diesel particulates and other pollutants emitted by the State’s freight industry. Expanding such efforts to also apply to the NFN and PFN would be an appropriate and needed initiative.

(4) How the NFN may fit into a multimodal National Freight System:

MAP-21’s highway-centric NFN is inadequate to meet the needs of the complex, dynamic intermodal national freight system. The NFN highway component is a good beginning, but the other freight modes must be added before the NFN can be considered a complete, integrated freight network. The NFN should be expanded to include the nation’s major maritime ports and navigation channels, transcontinental railroad mainlines, major intermodal facilities, major air cargo airports, and major commercial border ports of entry. It is important that the connections to such facilities are on the PFN and not relegated to the more extensive NFN. I urge the USDOT to consult with states, regional agencies, and local freight interest prior to expanding the NFN to be multimodal.

(5) Suggestions for an urban-area route designation process:

I appreciate that the USDOT is specifically requesting input regarding the designation of urban-area freight routes. The tremendous amount of urban-based transloading, consolidation, packaging, warehousing, final assembly, manufacturing, and other freight-
related activities does not occur directly on the PFN, but these activities take place in facilities located near the PFN that are accessed by local roads. Thus, increased demand placed on these local roads and the needs of surrounding communities require that designation decisions be made at the local level.

Without knowing the implications of an urban-area route designation, it is challenging to recommend a unified national approach. Many local roads in California handle truck volumes that rival the volumes of most national PFN routes. Help is needed for communities where such roads exist, such as improving the routes and mitigating related impacts so the costs of accommodating the nation’s international trade does not disproportionately burden low income communities. Therefore, I recommend that states be given the ability to work with their regional and local partners to designate urban-area freight routes. These routes should be eligible for enhanced pavement preservation, operational improvement, and impact-mitigation funding.

Although this initial effort to establish a national freight program and designate a national freight network does not address all issues that need attention, it is an important turning point for the nation’s transportation program. The efficient movement of freight is essential to the United States’ international competitiveness, and addressing the impacts that freight has on communities and the environment is essential to the nation’s sustainability.

Sincerely,

BRIAN P. KELLY
Secretary
California’s National Freight Policy Recommendations

The national transportation program, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21), encourages states to develop state freight plans that are consistent with national guidance. Such guidance was needed and now that the plan development process is underway, states and the Federal Government can plan for coordinated actions to improve the efficiency, reliability, sustainability, and safety of the entire freight system while working toward eliminating impacts to communities and the environment.

In an increasingly competitive world, it is vital that the United States have an integrated, continually improving freight transportation system that is well maintained and operated. However, without a long-term, dedicated funding mechanism that generates new revenue and does not appropriate transportation funds from other programs, the state and national freight plans cannot be implemented, regardless of how innovative they may be. The reauthorization of MAP-21 must create a freight program that includes substantial new funding that is allocated on performance-based criteria.

California is the unparalleled trade gateway to the Nation, which is evidenced by the State having the highest concentration of goods movement dependent industries and associated employment in the country (e.g., transportation and warehousing, retail trade, manufacturing, construction and wholesale trade). The State is one of the 10 largest economies in the world with a gross state product of over $2 trillion. As a global trade leader, freight is critical to the State’s economy and by extension, California’s freight based economy is critical to the national economy. Federal freight policies must be responsive to California’s position as an international trade leader that:

- handles more than 40 percent of all the waterborne, containerized cargo entering the nation;
- processes more than $665 billion in two-way trade value annually;
- has the most extensive supply chain in the nation, encompassing manufacturing, retail and wholesale trade, construction, transportation, and warehousing sectors;
- generates 600,000 direct jobs at our seaports, airports and border crossings, and 1.6 million logistics jobs in the Southern California region alone; and
- supports more than 3 million logistics jobs throughout the nation from containerized trade.
California’s commitment to improving its freight system is unmatched in the U.S. In 2006, voters approved a set of transportation state bond programs that included the $2 billion Trade Corridors Improvement Fund (TCIF). The TCIF program is implementing approximately 70 high priority freight projects with a value in excess of $6 billion in total private and public funding along key trade corridors that serve State, national, and international trade. These investments include seaport, railroad, international land border crossing, and highway truck projects. California is already heavily investing its funds to improve the State’s freight transportation system and attracting substantial private and public matching funds. We strongly encourage the Federal Government to follow our example and invest more in the national freight transportation system.

Despite the critical importance of freight movement to our country’s economy, there are impacts to local and regional economies, environment, and communities that must be mitigated simultaneously when making freight system improvements. Therefore, improving and sustaining the freight system is not only about system reliability, efficiency, safety, and job creation, it is also about stewardship of communities and the environment as freight is processed in and moved through those communities and the State.

Impacts from an inadequately funded and maintained freight transportation system have broad consequences from damage to vehicles using highways with poor pavement quality, travel time delays, lost productivity, higher greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, reduced delivery time reliability, increased transportation costs, reduced competitiveness, loss of business investments, and an extensive list of additional negative impacts that compound over time. Without a program of strategic investments to adequately fix and maintain the existing freight system, expand capacity, employ new technologies, increase efficiency, and reduce impacts to communities and the environment, U.S. productivity and global competitiveness will suffer, consumer costs will increase, and trade investments will lag. A new Federal funding program must be established to address freight mobility, on all modes. The new funding program would incentivize state and local investment and leverage the widest array of public and private financing. The program must focus on the freight system as a whole, rather than viewing the Nation’s transportation infrastructure as several different systems that occasionally interact.
Create a Federal Freight Funding Program

Under the next transportation reauthorization, it is critical that a dedicated, sustainable, and flexible freight funding program that includes a firewall against off-system uses be established. This should be in addition to, not in lieu of, existing transportation funding programs. Below are recommendations on funding sources and principles for the Federal freight program.

- **Potential Funding Sources**

  - A dedicated funding stream, linked with a new Freight Trust Fund, paid for by all users of the freight system.
  - Explore options to incentivize private investment. Some possibilities are increased use of public-private partnerships or offering special-purpose tax credit bonds.
  - Support and explore all potential sources of funding, innovative financing tools (like credit programs, qualified tax credit bonds, and tax code incentives), and leveraging opportunities at all levels and sectors.

- **Principles for the Federal Freight Program**

  - Utilize performance-based criteria for allocating funds. Funding should be allocated efficiently, in a way that guarantees the highest return on each dollar spent, and ensures that allocation intended to improve goods movement and reduce its impacts are actually directed towards that purpose. Funds should be dispersed through a competitive, performance-based process, rather than by formula.
  - Target funding to key national priority freight corridors and the full set of multi-modal facilities associated with the corridor.
  - Environmental and community impact reduction projects should be eligible for funding under the freight program.
  - Priority should be given to zero-emission and near zero-emission freight projects and projects that mitigate both regional and local environmental impacts from freight.
- Priority should be given to projects which will maintain and utilize existing infrastructure to sustain and grow the throughput, velocity, efficiency, and economy of freight movement. Prioritizing in this manner will build upon critical investments already made by states, local agencies, and their private sector partners.

- Priority should be given to projects which are located in states and local jurisdictions that have adopted rules, regulations, incentives, and operating agreements which will necessarily provide for higher levels of environmental benefits, particularly with respect to air quality and GHG emissions. Prioritizing in this manner will encourage broader adoption of such measures and reward states and local jurisdictions that have taken a leadership role in addressing impacts from freight movement.

- To the maximum extent possible, expend revenues generated from any new user fees in the corridors where they are collected.

- To ensure that the Freight Program is sustainable for the long term, funding sources should ensure that alternative fuel vehicles also pay a fair amount for using the freight system.
General Funding Recommendations

- Balance the Highway Trust Fund. Whether through user fees, enhanced, and/or indexed fuel tax increase, tolls, pricing, or any combination of measures. Do not continue to deficit finance our nation’s transportation infrastructure.

- The California Freight Advisory Committee echoes the National Freight Advisory Committee’s unanimously approved recommendation to pass legislation that will ensure that the Harbor Maintenance Tax is utilized for its intended purpose - to keep the nation's harbors and channels dredged and maintained at their maximum authorized depth for the safe shipping of commerce. In recent years, more fees have been collected than expended and the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund contains a significant surplus. At the same time, there is a growing backlog of dredging needs throughout the nation's harbors, including California harbors.

- Identify options for levying user fees on those beneficiaries of trust fund investments who do not currently contribute to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. These include commercial fishing vessels and private recreational craft that pay no fees, as well as domestic freight carriers.

- Evaluate the potential benefits of altering the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund tax in such a way that a portion of the tax would be levied based on ship volume instead of only cargo value, thereby adapting to the costs associated with larger ships. Currently, only port authorities and governments cover these costs, as they alone are responsible for channel deepening, equipment replacement, and dock renovations.

- Preserve and build upon the Projects of National and Regional Significance program, which has been a significant source of funding for freight movement infrastructure improvements.

- Replace the 12% Federal Excise Tax on the purchase of new freight equipment with an equivalent increase in Federal Diesel Fuel Taxes so that the funding shift is revenue neutral. Transitioning freight equipment and truck fleets to low emission and zero-emission models is expensive on an individual unit and fleet basis. Adding the 12% Federal Excise Tax substantially
increases the purchase cost and discourages private investment in deploying new technologies. For the equipment or truck operator, it is often more economical to continue using old, higher polluting models for their full life-cycle, then to turnover the equipment for new, low emission models. The tax structure should support, not hinder the transition to a cleaner, more efficient freight industry.

- Allow revenue generating activities at publicly owned rest and truck stops on the National Highway System (NHS) with generated funding reinvested in maintenance, operations, rehabilitation, mitigation, and expansion of rest and truck stops in the state on the NHS.

- Create a funding program for shortline railroads for capital improvements such as improved grade crossings, track gauge upgrades, locomotive retrofits to meet air quality requirements, and other improvements.

- Specify that federally recognized Native American tribal governments are eligible recipients of federal freight transportation funds.
**National Freight Network Recommendations**

The parameters for the National and Primary Freight Network (PFN) set by MAP-21 are not adequate to identify the nation’s complex, dynamic, and connected freight network. Below are recommendations for consideration during the next reauthorization.

- Do not set a mileage limit for the next iteration of the PFN. Forcing the network to adhere to an arbitrary mileage limit leads to significant network gaps and leaves out vital freight corridors and facilities. Goods move across the country on a complex, interconnected network which should be reflected in the PFN, without gaps. For the highway system, the result would be similar to the 41,518 centerline mile network identified in the draft released on November 19, 2013.

- Use a corridor focus that identifies the full set of associated multi-modal facilities. It is important, not only to California but to the entire nation, that the PFN adequately reflect the intermodal movement of freight trucked from docks to rail for long haul to the rest of the nation. For the cargo, each mode is a component of a multi-national, multi-state linked trip.

- Update the National Freight Network every five years. Given the complexity of the movement of goods and its dynamic nature, it would be prudent to re-evaluate the Primary Freight Network more frequently than every ten years.

- Create an amendment process for the PFN that enables states to make interim adjustments. With the approval of the U.S. Department of Transportation, enable states to address necessary changes between the 10-year updates. Nationally, there will likely be numerous instances where a previously designated PFN segment is no longer appropriate due to highway relocation or shifts freight travel patterns.

- Establish a methodology to establish urban freight corridors and network segments that puts states in the lead role of making such determinations.

- Either eliminate the 25% threshold for truck volumes for the designation of Critical Rural Freight Corridors or create an additional measure that uses Average Annual Daily Truck Traffic (AADTT).
California has many rural highways with high truck counts and also high automotive counts. The large number of automobiles dilute the truck percentage even though AADTT may exceed 3,000 – 5,000 but not reach the 25% threshold. With California’s extensive agricultural sector and focus on row and tree crops, there are large numbers of agriculture related trucks on rural highways.

- Create a Critical Rural Freight Corridor designation mechanism that takes into account seasonal truck volumes. Many rural highways have very high truck counts and percents at certain times of the year serving the agricultural, forestry, and extractive industries. But during other times, truck counts and percents are quite low on those same highways. Averaged over a year, the highway does not meet minimum thresholds, though the thresholds may be met for many months of the year.

- Add a component to the Critical Rural Freight Corridor designation that addresses the need to provide freight access to federally recognized Native American Tribal Government lands.

- Expand the Primary Freight Network to reflect all its modes. Include major seaports, maritime navigation channels connecting to seaports included in the PFN, railroads and major intermodal yards, air cargo airports, commercial border ports of entry, and other key freight facilities.
Community and Environmental Impact Reduction Recommendations

The freight industry, while providing essential jobs for community residents and being a critical component of the larger economy, generates negative community and environmental impacts in terms of health, noise, glare, vibrations, air quality, water quality, traffic congestion, and infrastructure degradation. Freight planning and funding must address these issues as part of developing a sustainable freight transportation system on a project-by-project basis and at the programmatic level.

- In addition to the existing national air quality requirements, include GHG reductions as a goal of the national freight program and make projects that achieve a specified level of GHG reduction eligible for an enhanced federal funding share.

- Create a separate federal railroad grade separation program targeted to rail lines on a newly-designated primary freight rail network. Focus on crossings with the highest vehicle delays and crashes.

- Create a truck parking program to increase parking opportunities so that trucks do not have to park in neighborhoods, on freeway ramps, and other locations that impact communities and create various social and environmental problems.
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Notes:
- Alameda CTC Commission meetings occur the 4th Thursday of every month.
- Alameda CTC Planning Policy Legislative Committee meets 2nd Monday of every month.
- There are no Alameda CTC commission / committee meetings in August.
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