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

Planning, Policy and Legislation Committee
Monday, September 8, 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 501 14th Street buildings, or via 11th Street just past Clay Street. To plan your trip to Alameda CTC visit www.511.org.

Accessibility

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

Meeting Schedule

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

Paperless Policy

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

Connect with Alameda CTC

www.AlamedaCTC.org  facebook.com/AlamedaCTC
@AlamedaCTC  youtube.com/user/AlamedaCTC
1. **Pledge of Allegiance**

2. **Roll Call**

3. **Public Comment**

4. **Consent Calendar**

   4.1. **July 14, 2014 PPLC Meeting Minutes**
       Recommendation: Approve the July 14, 2014 meeting minutes.
   
   4.2. **Congestion Management Program: Summary of 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. **2014 Update to the Alameda County Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment and Growth Strategy**
       Recommendation: Approve the 2014 update to the Alameda County PDA Investment and Growth Strategy
   
   6.3. **Multimodal Plans Update**
       Recommendation: Approve creation of an Ad Hoc Committee to provide focused input into the Countywide Transit Plan and receive an update on the Countywide Modal Plans
   
   6.4. **Alameda CTC Annual Report Including Vehicle Registration Fee**

7. **Committee Member Reports (Verbal)**

8. **Staff Reports (Verbal)**
9. Adjournment

**Next Meeting**: October 13, 2014

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

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

   Commissioner Kris Worthington was present as an alternate for Commissioner Keith Carson. Commissioner Pauline Cutter was present as the alternate for Commissioner Wilma Chan. Commissioner Don Biddle was present as an alternate for Commissioner Tim Sbranti.

   **Subsequent to the roll call**
   Commissioner Rebecca Kaplan arrived during Item 6.2

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

4. **Consent Calendar**
   4.1. June 09, 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 Worthington moved to approve the consent calendar. Commissioner Thorne seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (Kaplan, and Gregory absent).

5. **Legislation**

   5.1. **Legislative Update**
   Tess Lengyel updated the committee on state and federal legislative initiatives. At the state level, Tess updated the committee on cap and trade funds and the Governor’s budget. At the federal level, Tess covered actions associated with addressing the diminishing highway trust fund revenues and the debates associated with a short-term fix versus a full update and authorization of a six-year transportation bill. She also updated members on the 15th anniversary of the urban mass transit act, and the introduction of a new bill addressing funding from freight and goods movement. Tess concluded by stating that the Governor signed AB 1811, which was sponsored by the Commission to facilitate express lane implementation.

   *This item was for information only.*
Planning and Policy

6.1. Transportation Expenditure Plan Update
Tess Lengyel provided an update on the TEP. She stated that Alameda CTC received unanimous support from all cities in Alameda County and the Board of Supervisors, which acted to place the measure on the ballot on July 8. Tess stated that there was a press conference held on July 8, 2014 to cover details on the new measure and economic analysis of the TEP.

This item was for information only.

6.2. Countywide Goods Movement Performance Measures
Tess Lengyel recommended that the Commission approve the Goods Movement Plan performance measures. She noted that the performance measures support the goods movement plan development. She stated that the performance measures will be used to evaluate and prioritize strategies to improve goods movement and ongoing monitoring of goods movement system performance.

Tess introduced Michael Fischer who presented more detailed information on the performance measures. Michael provided an overview of the goods movement visions and goals and outlined the recommended performance measures.

Commission Peixoto wanted more details on the compatible land use measure. Michael stated that this measure works on strategies that mitigate impacts of freight movement.

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

6.3. Metropolitan Transportation Commission Resolution of Support for East Bay Greenway Project
Matthew Bromberg recommended that the Commission approve the Alameda CTC resolution of support for the East Bay Greenway Project, a bicycle and pedestrian facility that will improve access to transit hubs. Matthew stated that a resolution of support is required in addition to pre-existing authorization to pursue grant funding through the Legislative Program in order to meet requirements specific to the regional ATP program.

Commissioner Peixoto motioned to approve this item. Commissioner Cutter seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (Gregory absent)
6.4. **2014 Level of Service Monitoring Study Results**

Saravana presented the 2014 LOS monitoring study results. She covered benefits and challenges of commercial data as well as 2014 report result highlights. Saravana provided information on completed projects that improve network performance as well as trends and data collection methods. Saravana concluded by providing information on planned improvements and next steps.

Commissioner Kaplan wanted more information on the implementation of SB 743 and how it will affect cities and Alameda CTC’s work.

*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, September 8, 2014 @10:30 a.m.
- **Location:** Alameda CTC Offices, 1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

Attested by:

Vanessa Lee,
Clerk of the Commission
DATE: September 2, 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 update on July 7, 2014, the Alameda CTC reviewed one NOP, one DEIR, and four FEIRs. Comments were submitted for one of these documents and are attached below.

Fiscal Impact: There is no fiscal impact.

Attachments
A) Alameda CTC comments on Oakland Children’s Hospital Research Center Oakland DEIR

Staff Contact
Tess Lengyel, Deputy Director of Planning and Policy
Matthew Bomberg, Assistant Transportation Planner
This page intentionally left blank
August 18, 2014

Heather Klein
Planning and Building Department
250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza
Suite 3315
Oakland, CA 94612

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Children’s Hospital & Research Center Oakland Campus Master Plan Project

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Children’s Hospital & Research Center Oakland Campus Master Plan Project. The project site consists of the 11-acre Children’s Hospital & Research Center Oakland (CHRCO) main campus, located at 747 52nd Street. The proposed project would demolish a total of 66,582 square feet of existing uses on the campus and construct a total of 399,200 square feet of new building area. Upon project completion, total building area at the CHRCO campus would be 1,025,034 square feet.

The Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) respectfully submits the following comments:

- The Alameda County Congestion Management Program should be listed under the Regulatory Framework section of the Transportation and Circulation chapter of the DEIR (starting on page 291). Specifically, the Land Use Analysis element of the CMP should be referenced.
- The DEIR does not include analysis of bus travel times under 2035 conditions, and explains this omission in a footnote as follows:

  “This EIR does not evaluate bus travel times under 2035 conditions because bus travel times are affected by a variety of factors that can change in the long-term, such as route changes or bus frequencies, which cannot be known at this time. Thus, the results would not be very accurate or meaningful.”

The reasoning that bus travel times cannot be accurately analyzed in 2035 is inconsistent with other major planning projects in the City of Oakland (e.g. Lake Merritt Specific Plan DEIR) which have included analysis of impacts to transit travel times in 2035. Furthermore, bus routes, particularly major trunk line bus routes, are no more transitory or speculative in nature than levels of automobile traffic and automobile transportation system performance, for which 2035 conditions are studied in great detail in the DEIR. While bus routes may change configuration somewhat between the present and 2035, it is entirely reasonable to assert that there will be some form of higher frequency transit operations on streets such as Telegraph Avenue and Martin Luther King Jr. Way in 2035. Therefore, the DEIR should be revised to include analysis of impacts of the project on 2035 transit travel times.
Please contact me at (510) 208-7405 or Matthew Bomberg of my staff at (510) 208-7444 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Tess Lengyel
Deputy Director of Planning and Policy

cc: Matthew Bomberg, Assistant Transportation Planner
    Val Menotti, Planning Department Manager, BART
    Jim Cunradi, Manager of Long Range Planning, AC Transit

file: CMP/Environmental Review Opinions/2014
DATE: September 2, 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).

Highway Trust Fund: On July 31, by a vote of 81-13, the Senate passed a clean version of the original House bill to keep the Highway Trust Fund solvent through May 2015. This came hours after the House voted 272-150 for the same bill. President Obama signed the bill into law in August, averting a stoppage of the highway trust fund payments. If this stopgap funding measure did not pass, the U.S. Department of Transportation was expected to initiate significant cuts, beginning the first part of August, in reimbursements to states for highway
and transit programs. Passage of this bill came after several days of shuffling the bill back and forth between the House and Senate with various amendments.

The first move came from the Senate, which passed the original House bill (H.R. 5021) by a vote of 79-18, after attaching several amendments to it. One amendment, adopted 71-26, would have replaced some of the offsets in the House bill with slightly different offsets. Another amendment, adopted 66-31, would have reduced the length of the stopgap from lasting until May 2015 to lasting until mid-December 2015, which would have effectively forced lawmakers to vote on a longer-term measure during the lame duck session. Two amendments were rejected. An amendment by Senator Pat Toomey would have exempted some reconstruction projects damaged in declared emergencies from environmental reviews and permit requirements. Another amendment by Senator Mike Lee would have devolved almost all transportation funding responsibilities to the states.

On July 31, the House voted 272-150 to strip out the approved Senate amendments to H.R. 5021, in order to extend the HTF funding through May 2015, with $10.8 billion. The Senate was prepared to dig in for a fight until the Congressional Budget Office discovered a math error which made the Senate bill actually $2.8 billion short of what the patch required. Running out of time before the August recess, and with other issues left to be dealt with, Senate leaders reluctantly called for a vote on the House bill, which ultimately passed 81-13.

Members of Congress return to Washington from their five week break after Labor Day.

**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.

**Legislature End of Session**: The Legislature left town for Summer Recess on July 3rd and returned on August 4th. Recess was filled with negotiations on the water bond and proposals mandating the regulation of groundwater supplies and initial hearings on the development of various cap & trade program guidelines were held.

Since their return in early August, the Legislature has been addressing the fiscal committee deadline whereby all bills had to be out of the Appropriations Committees by August 16th. The remainder of the month included lengthy floor sessions, and the end of session actions that accompany the end of the two-year session. The Legislature adjourned the 2013-14 session by midnight on August 31st.

**Cap and Trade**: For the 2014-15 fiscal year, the budget appropriates $872 million of Cap and Trade funds. This amount includes a $100 million payment on the loan taken from the cap and trade account last year, which means the Governor assumes auction revenue will only generate approximately $772 million next year. Many expect Cap and Trade auction revenue in 2014-15 will far exceed $1 billion, particularly with the fuels on transportation coming on line in January 2015 as part of the Cap and Trade program. Table 1 summarizes FY 14-15 Cap and Trade amounts and future allocation percentages.
Table 1: 2014-15 Cap and Trade Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Administering Agency</th>
<th>FY 14-15</th>
<th>Future Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainable Communities and Clean Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Speed Rail</td>
<td>High Speed Rail</td>
<td>$250.0</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program</td>
<td>CalSTA</td>
<td>$25.0</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Carbon Transit Operations</td>
<td>Caltrans/California Air Resources Board (CARB)</td>
<td>$25.0</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities</td>
<td>Strategic Growth Council</td>
<td>$130.0</td>
<td>20% (split evenly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Carbon Transportation</td>
<td>CARB</td>
<td>$200.0</td>
<td>Annual appropriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Energy Efficiency and Clean Energy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy efficiency upgrades/Weatherization</td>
<td>Dept. of Community Services and Development</td>
<td>$75.0</td>
<td>Annual appropriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Energy and Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>Dept. of Food and Agriculture</td>
<td>$15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy efficiency for buildings</td>
<td>Energy Commission</td>
<td>$20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Resources and Waste Diversion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Action Plan - Water-Energy Efficiency (SB 103 has been appropriated)</td>
<td>Dept. of Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>$40.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Action Plan - Wetlands and Watershed Restoration</td>
<td>Dept. of Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>$25.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Prevention and Urban Forests</td>
<td>Dept. of Forestry and Fire Protection</td>
<td>$42.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Diversion</td>
<td>Cal Recycle</td>
<td>$25.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$872.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Year Cap and Trade Allocations: For the 2015/16 fiscal year and beyond the package would allocate all Cap and Trade revenue based on the percentages as shown in Table 1 and as described below. Each of these programs will be continuously appropriated except for the 40% pot of funds.

- **20% for housing and Sustainable Communities Strategies projects.** Half of these funds must be used for affordable housing projects. The remaining funds would be used to implement sustainable communities plans. The Strategic Growth Council (SGC) would administer these funds, and would be responsible for developing guidelines and selection criteria for this competitive grant program. The language also states that the SGC shall coordinate with metropolitan planning commissions to identify and recommend projects. This program has goal of expediting 50% of these funds on projects that benefit disadvantaged communities.

- **10% for transit capital and intercity rail projects.** The California Transportation Commission and the Transportation Agency would administer this competitive grant program for rail and bus capital funds. While bus transit projects are eligible, the emphasis is rail connectivity projects. The disadvantage community benefit goal for this program is 25%.

- **5% for public transit operations.** Each transit operator would receive a portion of these funds based on the State Transit Assistance (STA) formula. However, receipt of these funds will be dependent on Caltrans determination of whether the use of the funds meets criteria established by CalSTA and CARB to ensure that the funds result in GHG reductions.

- **25% for high speed rail.** This allocation will be a continuous appropriation which will allow the High Speed Rail Authority to securitize these revenues.

- **40% for various state programs.** These funds would be appropriated to various programs administered by CARB, such as the Low Carbon Transportation program, as well as programs administered by the Energy Commission and the Resources Agency. Unlike the other programs these funds will be annually appropriated as part of the Budget Act.

Strategic Growth Council: The SGC held a meeting in July to begin the process of developing the guidelines for the Affordable Housing & Sustainable Communities Program. The SGC plans to move forward with the following schedule:

- Mid-August three workshops will be held on the development of the draft guidelines. The workshops will be held in southern, central, and northern California.
- Early October the draft guidelines will be presented to the SGC.
- There will be three more workshops throughout the state in October.
- December the SGC will approve the final guidelines
- Funding Solicitation will be released in January 2015
• Application deadline in April 2015
• Awards to be announced in June 2015

Additional Cap and Trade hearings were held in August and a hearing on CalEnviroscreen will be held in the Bay Area in early September. Staff is working with partners on key messages for the CalEnviroscreen hearing to support changes that would allow the Bay Area to benefit more from Cap and Trade than it would if only CalEnviroscreen was used to determine disadvantaged communities. The Bay Area definition of communities of concern has been requested for consideration in the distribution of Cap and Trade funds.

**Legislation:** Alameda CTC sponsored and Assemblymember Buchanan carried AB 1811 which will authorize Alameda CTC the ability to require a high-occupancy vehicle to have an electronic transponder or other electronic device for law enforcement purposes. This bill was passed out of the Senate on June 26th and was signed by the Governor on July 7th.

**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

**Staff Contact**

Tess Lengyel, Deputy Director of Planning and Policy
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### 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 measurable 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>
</table>
| Transportation Funding | Increase transportation funding               | • Support efforts to lower the two-thirds-voter threshold for voter-approved transportation measures.  
• 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.                                                                                     |
|                        | Protect and enhance voter-approved funding    | • Support increased funding from new and/or flexible funding sources to Alameda County for operating, maintaining, restoring and improving transportation infrastructure and operations.  
• Support efforts that protect against transportation funding diversions.  
• Support increases in federal, state and regional funding to expedite delivery of Alameda CTC projects and programs.  
• Support efforts that give priority funding to voter-approved measures and oppose those that negatively affect the ability to implement voter-approved measures.  
• Support rewarding Self-Help Counties and states that provide significant transportation funding into transportation systems.  
• Seek, acquire and implement grants to advance project and program delivery.  
• Support Alameda County as the recipient of funds to implement grants and pilot programs. |
| Project Delivery        | Advance innovative project delivery            | • Support environmental streamlining and expedite project delivery.  
• Support contracting flexibility and innovative project delivery methods.  
• Support HOT lane expansion in Alameda County and the Bay Area, and efforts that promote effective implementation.  
• Support efforts to allow local agencies to advertise, award and administer state highway system contracts largely funded by locals. |
|                        | Ensure cost-effective project delivery          | • 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.  
• Support accelerating funding and policies to implement transportation projects that create jobs and economic growth. |
| Multimodal Transportation and Land Use | Reduce barriers to the implementation of transportation and land use investments | • Support legislation that increases flexibility and reduces technical and funding barriers to investments linking transportation, housing and jobs.  
• Support local flexibility and decision-making on land-use for transit oriented development and priority development areas.  
• Support innovative financing opportunities to fund TOD and PDA implementation. |
|                        | Expand multimodal systems and flexibility      | • 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.  
• Support investments in transportation for transit-dependent communities that provide enhanced access to goods, services, jobs and education.  
• Support parity in pre-tax fringe benefits for public transit/vanpooling and parking. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Strategy Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>Support climate change legislation</td>
<td>• Support funding for innovative infrastructure, operations, and programs that relieve congestion, improve air quality, reduce emissions and support economic development.&lt;br&gt;• Support the expansion of funding for housing that does not conflict with or reduce transportation funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support cap-and-trade expenditure plan</td>
<td>• Support cap and trade funds derived from transportation fuels for transportation purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support emerging technologies</td>
<td>• Support incentives for emerging technologies, such as alternative fuels and fueling technology, and research for transportation opportunities to reduce GHG emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods Movement</td>
<td>Expand goods movement funding and policy development</td>
<td>• Support a multi-modal goods movement system and efforts that enhance the economy, local communities and the environment, and reduce impacts.&lt;br&gt;• Support a designated funding stream for goods movement.&lt;br&gt;• Support goods movement policies that enhance Bay Area goods movement planning, funding, delivery, and advocacy.&lt;br&gt;• Ensure that Bay Area transportation systems are included in and prioritized in state and federal planning and funding processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>Expand partnerships at the local, regional, state and federal levels</td>
<td>• 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.&lt;br&gt;• Support policy development to influence transportation planning, policy and funding at the county, regional, state and federal levels.&lt;br&gt;• Support efforts to maintain and expand local-, women-, minority- and small-business participation in competing for contracts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: September 2, 2014

SUBJECT: 2014 Update to the Alameda County Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment and Growth Strategy

RECOMMENDATION: Approve the 2014 update to the Alameda County PDA Investment and Growth Strategy

Summary

As required by Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Resolution 4035, which established the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Program requirements for project selection and programming of federal transportation funds, the Alameda CTC as the county’s Congestion Management Agency (CMA) adopted a PDA Investment and Growth Strategy and submitted it to MTC and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) in May 2013. The purpose of the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy is to ensure that CMAs have a process in place for prioritizing OBAG transportation funds in a way that supports and encourages residential and commercial development in the region’s PDAs.

MTC Resolution 4035 further requires that CMAs update the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy annually. Alameda CTC has prepared an annual update and report on the Alameda County PDA Investment and Growth Strategy included in memo format to ABAG in Attachment A. The 2014 Update to the Alameda County PDA Investment and Growth Strategy contains the following elements:

- **Complete Streets and Housing Elements Status**: Provides updates on the status of all the cities in Alameda County in adopting Complete Streets Ordinances and updating their General Plan Housing Elements.

- **Priority Development Area Funding Allocations**: There were two types of funding provided to Alameda County’s PDAs:
  - **Supportive Transportation Capital Investments**: Describes the process and criteria used to select capital projects for funding and provides a list of funded projects.
  - **PDA Planning and Implementation Funds - The Sustainable Communities Technical Assistance Program (SCTAP)**: Alameda CTC used federal and local funds to create the Sustainable Communities Technical Assistance Program (SCTAP) to support activities such as PDA planning and implementation, implementation of Complete Streets policies, and smaller-scale bicycle and pedestrian technical projects in PDAs.
• **PDA Coordination with Other Planning Efforts:** The PDA Strategic Plan, Chapter 4 of the 2013 PDA IGS, described a series of additional efforts that the Alameda CTC would undertake to support PDA development. This section of this memo gives an update on how other Alameda County planning efforts coordinate with and support the PDA IGS.

• **Updated Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Housing Data:** ABAG collected information on the number and affordability of housing units produced by Alameda County jurisdictions in 2013 as well as information as to whether units were constructed within or outside of a PDA. ABAG also updated the inventory of housing policies for Alameda County jurisdictions with PDAs. This information updates that which was provided in Chapter 2 of the 2013 PDA IGS.

**Background**

Per MTC Resolution 4035, which requires that CMAs update the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy annually, the update requirements are listed in Appendix A-6 of the resolution and include the following language related to updating PDA Investment and Growth Strategies:

• Under Planning Objectives – Long-term: “Starting in May 2014 and for subsequent updates, PDA Investment & Growth Strategies will assess performance in producing sufficient housing for all income levels through the RHNA process and, where appropriate, assist local jurisdictions in implementing local policy changes to facilitate achieving these goals. The locally crafted policies should be targeted to the specific circumstances of each PDA. For example, if the PDA currently is mostly low-income housing, any needed policy changes should be aimed at community stabilization.”

• In Process/Timeline Table: “CMAs amend PDA Investment & Growth Strategy to incorporate follow-up to local housing production and policies (May 2014);” and “CMAs submit annual progress reports related to PDA Growth Strategies, including status of jurisdiction progress on development/adoption of housing elements and complete streets ordinances (May 2014, Ongoing).”

**Fiscal Impact:** There is no fiscal impact.
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SUBJECT: 2014 Update to the Alameda County Priority Development Area Investment and Growth Strategy, Final Draft

TO: Miriam Chion, ABAG/ Ken Kirkey, MTC

FROM: Tess Lengyel, Deputy Director of Planning and Policy

This is an update to the 2013 Alameda County Priority Development Area Investment and Growth Strategy (PDA IGS). It will be appended to the full document as an appendix once it is approved by the Alameda CTC.

Background

The One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Program, MTC Resolution 4035, was adopted by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) in July 2012\(^1\). OBAG provided guidance for the allocation of the Cycle 2 Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds for FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16. It also designated that Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) would be responsible for distribution of these funds and identified the associated reporting requirements. Full background on this process can be found in Chapter 1 of the full 2013 PDA IGS.

Appendix A-6 of the resolution includes the following language related to updating the PDA IGS:

- Under Planning Objectives – Long-term: “Starting in May 2014 and for subsequent updates, PDA Investment & Growth Strategies will *assess performance in producing sufficient housing for all income levels through the RHNA process* and, where appropriate, *assist local jurisdictions in implementing local policy changes to facilitate achieving these goals*. The locally crafted policies should be targeted to the specific circumstances of each PDA. For example, if the PDA currently is mostly low-income housing, any needed policy changes should be aimed at community stabilization.”

- In Process/Timeline Table: “CMAs *amend PDA Investment & Growth Strategy to incorporate follow-up to local housing production and policies* (May 2014);” and “CMAs submit annual progress reports related to PDA Growth Strategies, including

---

\(^1\) [http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/onebayarea/RES-4035_approved.pdf](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/onebayarea/RES-4035_approved.pdf)
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status of jurisdiction progress on development/adoption of housing elements and complete streets ordinances (May 2014, Ongoing).

This memorandum meets the objectives described above and provides updated information on several other aspects of the Alameda County PDA IGS. The information in this memorandum is consistent with the MTC PDA Investment and Growth Strategy Annual Report: Clarification Memorandum dated on April 25th, 2014.

Alameda CTC Efforts to Support PDA Development

This memo includes four sections, each pertaining to an element required in the PDA IGS update.

- **Complete Streets and Housing Elements Status**: Provides updates on the status of all the cities in Alameda County in adopting Complete Streets Ordinances and updating their General Plan Housing Elements.

- **Priority Development Area Funding Allocations**: There were two types of funding provided to Alameda County’s PDAs:
  - **Supportive Transportation Capital Investments**: Describes the process and criteria used to select capital projects for funding and provides a list of funded projects.
  - **PDA Planning and Implementation Funds - The Sustainable Communities Technical Assistance Program (SCTAP)**: Alameda CTC used federal and local funds to create the Sustainable Communities Technical Assistance Program (SCTAP) to support activities such as PDA planning and implementation, implementation of Complete Streets policies, and smaller-scale bicycle and pedestrian technical projects in PDAs.

- **PDA Coordination with Other Planning Efforts**: The PDA Strategic Plan, Chapter 4 of the 2013 PDA IGS, described a series of additional efforts that the Alameda CTC would undertake to support PDA development. This section of this memo gives an update on how other Alameda County planning efforts coordinate with and support the PDA IGS.

- **Updated Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Housing Data**: ABAG collected information on the number and affordability of housing units produced by Alameda County jurisdictions in 2013 as well as information as to whether units were constructed within or outside of a PDA. ABAG also updated the inventory of housing policies for Alameda County jurisdictions with PDAs. This information updates that which was provided in Chapter 2 of the 2013 PDA IGS.

Additional information beyond these four sections is also included to provide updates on specific elements as defined in the 2013 PDA IGS.

Complete Streets Ordinances and Housing Element Status

As of May 2014, all local jurisdictions in Alameda County have updated their Complete Streets ordinances. A full list of the updated ordinances can be found online at [http://www.alamedactc.org/app_pages/view/9753](http://www.alamedactc.org/app_pages/view/9753). In addition, nearly every city in Alameda County also has provided an updated Housing Element as part of their respective General Planning efforts. However, some are pending review by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) or local planning processes. Figure 1 provides
a summary of all Alameda County cities and status updates on Complete Streets ordinances and adoption of updated housing elements.

**Figure 1 Alameda County Cities: Complete Streets Ordinance and Housing Element Status**

*Note: Dates are hyperlinks to directly access the referenced ordinance or Housing Element.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alameda County Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Adoption of Complete Streets Ordinance</th>
<th>Adoption of Updated Housing Element (2007-2014)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>November 20, 2012</td>
<td>March 30, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda (City)</td>
<td>January 14, 2013</td>
<td>July 3, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>December 11, 2012</td>
<td>October 19, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>December 4, 2012</td>
<td>March 2, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeryville</td>
<td>January 15, 2013</td>
<td>June 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>June 30, 2013</td>
<td>July 14, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>March 19, 2013</td>
<td>June 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>January 28, 2013</td>
<td>March 8, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>March 14, 2013</td>
<td>February 25, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>February 5, 2013</td>
<td>December 21, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont</td>
<td>November 19, 2012</td>
<td>June 6, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>December 4, 2012</td>
<td>February 13, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro</td>
<td>February 4, 2013</td>
<td>April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union City</td>
<td>November 27, 2012</td>
<td>November 23, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Priority Development Area Funding Allocations**

**One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Supportive Transportation Capital Investment Funds**

This first category of funding was used for supportive transportation capital investments in a subset of the county’s PDAs that were determined to have more active development markets. Over 60% of Alameda County’s OBAG Program funds were used for these types of projects.

The Alameda CTC determined that Alameda County had 17 “Active” PDAs in fall 2012. These areas had completed necessary planning and regulatory updates to facilitate future housing and/or job growth and had a recent history of development activity as well as development activity currently underway. The screening process to select Active PDAs is fully described in Chapter 3 of the 2013 PDA IGS.

Active PDAs included the following:

- Berkeley: Downtown
- Berkeley: University Avenue
- Dublin: Downtown Specific Plan Area
- Dublin: Town Center
- Dublin: Transit Center/Dublin Crossing
- Emeryville: Mixed Use Core
- Fremont: Centerville
- Fremont: City Center
- Fremont: Irvington District
- Hayward: The Cannery
- Livermore: Downtown
- Oakland: Coliseum BART Station Area
- Oakland: Downtown and Jack London Square
- Oakland: Fruitvale & Dimond Areas
- Oakland: TOD Corridors
- Oakland: West Oakland
- Union City: Intermodal Station District

The county’s active PDAs (as of fall 2012) are also illustrated in Figure 4.

The Alameda CTC adopted OBAG Programming Guidelines at its December 2012 Board meeting. The guidelines included programming categories, program eligibility, and screening and selection criteria for the OBAG projects. The action also provided that additional fund sources allocated by Alameda CTC be considered in coordination with the OBAG programming process, with a focus on the PDA Supportive Transportation Investment and Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Categories.

In order to be eligible to receive federal funds through the OBAG Program, local agencies were required to:

- Adopt a Complete Streets Resolution (or compliant General Plan) by April 1, 2013
- Receive certification of agency housing element by the California Department of Housing and Community Development by January 31, 2013
- Complete the Local Agency Certification Checklist

In addition,

- Transportation projects were required to be consistent with the adopted Regional Transportation Plan, Alameda Countywide Transportation Plan and / or the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans
- Transportation projects were required to be eligible for funding from one or more of the fund programs incorporated into the coordinated program
- Transportation projects within or having proximate access to the 17 “Active” PDAs listed in Alameda CTC’s Priority Development Area Investment and Growth Strategy were eligible to apply for OBAG PDA Supportive category funds

Chapter 3 of the 2013 PDA IGS fully describes the process that was used to prioritize PDAs for transportation capital investments for this OBAG cycle. Since adoption of that plan, in 2013, Alameda CTC received 20 applications requesting $83.6 million of OBAG-PDA Supportive...
funds. The draft FY 2012-13 Coordinated Program includes approximately $38.7 million of federal funds towards ten (10) PDA Supportive Transportation Investment projects. The projects include bicycle, pedestrian, station improvements, station access, bicycle parking, Complete Streets improvements that encourage bicycle and pedestrian access, and streetscape projects focusing on high-impact, multi-modal improvements.

The selected projects are consistent with the goal of this program, which is to decrease automobile usage and thereby reduce both localized and area-wide congestion and air pollution. The selected ten projects are described in Figure 2.

**Figure 2  Alameda County OBAG Capital Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Development Area</th>
<th>Project/Description</th>
<th>Funding Amount (x$1,000)</th>
<th>Description / Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley: Downtown</td>
<td>Shattuck Reconfiguration and Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td>$2,777</td>
<td>This project will reconfigure Shattuck Avenue from Allston Way to the intersection of Shattuck and University Avenue to improve traffic safety, transit facilities, and the quality of public open space. At present the segment splits into two one-way streets which requires northbound traffic to turn left onto University Ave. for half a block and then right to continue on Shattuck Avenue. Due to this configuration the intersection is attributed with the highest number of auto/pedestrian collisions in the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley: Downtown</td>
<td>Berkeley BART Plaza and Transit Area Improvements</td>
<td>$4,066</td>
<td>This project will improve multimodal interconnectivity and enhance rider safety and comfort by reconstructing existing, and installing new transit structures to improve access and security at BART entries. In addition, the project will enhance waiting areas for buses, install new wayfinding signage, improve pedestrian safety, and provide new bicycle parking. The project will also include placemaking elements such as café uses, an information kiosk, public art, and a water feature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley: Downtown</td>
<td>Hearst Ave. Complete Streets</td>
<td>$1,150</td>
<td>This project includes bike, pedestrian, and ADA enhancements to improve multimodal access and safety between UC Berkeley and the Downtown Berkeley PDA. Key elements include: closing a sidewalk gap on the north side of the UC campus, extending bike lanes from Shattuck Avenue to Euclid Street, and improving multiple pedestrian crossings with flashing beacons and upgraded traffic signals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Development Area</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Funding Amount ($1,000)</td>
<td>Description / Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont: City Center</td>
<td>Fremont City Center Multimodal Improvements</td>
<td>$5,853</td>
<td>This project includes two components to promote the City’s vision to transition from an auto-oriented suburb to a more sustainable urban environment. The first is the extension of Capitol Avenue from State Street to Fremont Boulevard, employing Complete Streets practices such as bike lanes in each direction, diagonal parking, wide landscaped sidewalks, and landscaped medians. The second element is to improve and enhance bicycle and pedestrian connections between the Fremont BART station and local employment and residential nodes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland: West Oakland</td>
<td>7th Street W. Oakland Transit Village Phase II</td>
<td>$3,288</td>
<td>This project calls for a road diet of the three-block segment of 7th from Wood Street to Peralta Street, near the West Oakland BART station. In addition to removing travel lanes the project will add pedestrian amenities to the corridor such as new sidewalks, ADA-accessible curb ramps, corner bulb-outs, lighting, and landscaping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland: Downtown and Jack London Square</td>
<td>Lakeside Green Street Project</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>This Complete Streets project will install new bicycle and pedestrian facilities to connect the project area with multimodal access to local transit hubs, business, Lake Merritt, and Oakland’s greater bikeway network. The project will calm vehicular traffic along Harrison Street and Lakeside Drive between 19th Street and Grand Avenue, in addition to constructing .92 miles of Class II bike lanes and installing 13 new bike racks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland: West Oakland</td>
<td>Peralta Street Improvement Component</td>
<td>$2,979</td>
<td>This project will provide improvements for a two-mile segment of Peralta Street (a designated Class II bike route in Oakland’s Bicycle Master Plan) from 3rd to 36th Streets. Enhancements include: striping for bike lanes, new sidewalks and bulb-outs, relocated bus stops, improved crosswalks, ADA curb ramps, bicycle and pedestrian amenities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland: Transit-Oriented Development Corridors</td>
<td>Bike Lane Component (of Lake Merritt BART Bikeways App.)</td>
<td>$422</td>
<td>This project will install high quality bikeways serving the Lake Merritt BART station. Bike lanes will be installed on the one-way streets that serve the station from all directions. In addition, key roadway segments will be resurfaced to provide a path that is safe and supportive for cycling. Throughout the project area, travel lanes will be removed and new striping will be applied on streets to provide improved pedestrian safety at crossings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Priority Development Area

#### Project

**Oakland: MacArthur Transit Village**

- Martin Luther King Jr. Way Improvements Component
  - **Funding Amount (x$1,000):** $2,473
  - **Description / Update:** This project will provide multimodal and safety enhancements for 1.2 miles from West Grand to 40th Street. Enhancements will include: a road diet reducing the number of travel lanes, a Class II bike lane, sidewalk improvements, ADA curb ramps, and bike racks.

- UC BART Station Improvement and Railroad Pedestrian Crossing Component
  - **Funding Amount (x$1,000):** $8,692
  - **Description / Update:** This project will create a new entry to BART for an at-grade pedestrian pass-through to connect to a planned passenger rail station. The new entry will link over 50 acres of mixed-used development to transit. Specific enhancements include: reconfiguration of the BART station lobby, expanded vertical circulation and passenger platforms, and a new station interface to planned passenger rail and transit-oriented development.

### PDA Planning and Implementation Funds (SCTAP Funds)

As part of the One Bay Area Grant program, a portion of 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 refined a project’s scope of work.

A total of ten different projects were 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. The funded Alameda County SCTAP projects are described in Figure 3.
### Figure 3  Alameda County SCTAP Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Development Area</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Funding Amount (x$1,000)</th>
<th>Description / Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda: Northern Waterfront</td>
<td>Clement Avenue Complete Street Corridor</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>The project includes the development of conceptual designs, including community outreach, for developing a bikeway along Clement Avenue that provides a direct, commuter-oriented route linking central Alameda to the east end and beyond, including Oakland and Fruitvale BART.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany: San Pablo &amp; Solano Mixed Use Neighborhood</td>
<td>Citywide Parking Study and Plan</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>The parking study will examine existing conditions and develop a strategy for managing parking to support the city's land use objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerous Oakland PDAs</td>
<td>Bikeway Network 2.0</td>
<td>$270.5</td>
<td>This 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 six miles of these roadways and at seven additional intersections. Project would focus on &quot;next generation&quot; bikeway design. The project will develop a methodology to apply Assembly Bill No. 2245 to the analysis and environmental clearance of road diet projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland: Downtown and Jack London Square</td>
<td>Comprehensive Downtown Circulation Plan</td>
<td>$900</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 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. Included in the study/plan will be an evaluation of the feasibility of converting one-way streets in downtown Oakland to two-way operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerous Central County PDAs (Alameda County, San Leandro and Hayward)</td>
<td>Central County Complete Streets Implementation</td>
<td>$290</td>
<td>This project will develop needed procedural documents and facilitate implementation and staff training necessary for a successful Complete Streets program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward: Downtown</td>
<td>Hayward Downtown Specific Plan</td>
<td>$950</td>
<td>This project will develop 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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Priority Development Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Development Area</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Funding Amount (x$1,000)</th>
<th>Description / Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro: Downtown Transit Oriented Development</td>
<td>San Leandro Downtown Parking Management Plan</td>
<td>$145</td>
<td>This project will develop a strategy to better manage existing supply and demand and facilitate implementation of future land use and development objectives for the downtown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerous East County PDAs Tri-Valley Cities and LAVTA</td>
<td>Integrated Transit/Park and Ride Study</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>The overarching goal of the study is to reduce vehicle miles traveled 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 includes the following elements: 1) Tri-Valley Smart Parking Technology Study 2) Pleasanton Park &amp; Ride Study 3) LAVTA Onboard O-D, Modeling and Benchmarking Study 4) I-680 O-D Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin: Transit Center/Dublin Crossings</td>
<td>Iron Horse Connectivity to BART Feasibility Study</td>
<td>$300</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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide</td>
<td>SB 743 Implementation and other CEQA Streamlining Technical Assistance</td>
<td>$500</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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures 4-8 reflect maps of Alameda County Planning Areas and associated OBAG Capital Projects, SCTAP projects and Active and Non-Active PDAs.²

² Non-active PDAs include both “Near Active PDAs” and “PDAs in Need of Planning Support” as defined by the 2013 PDA IGS.
Figure 4  Countywide PDAs, Capital Projects, and SCTAP Funded Projects
Figure 5  North County PDAs, OBAG Capital Projects, and SCTAP Funded Projects
Figure 6 Central County PDAs, OBAG Capital Projects, and SCTAP Funded Projects
Figure 7  South County PDAs, OBAG Capital Projects, and SCTAP Fund Projects
Figure 8  East County PDAs, OBAG Capital Projects, and SCTAP Funded Projects
PDA Coordination with Other Planning Efforts

To ensure the success of the PDA IGS, efforts must span unilaterally across all Alameda CTC planning efforts. This section outlines other recent Alameda CTC planning efforts and their respective inclusion of PDA elements. Given the recent timing of the PDA IGS, some plans’ inclusion of PDA language is minimal. However, the specificity will increase in future years with progress in the development of Alameda County PDAs.

Countywide Transportation Plan (June 2012)

Integration of land use was taken into consideration throughout the Alameda Countywide Transportation Plan (CWTP) update process. The vision and goals explicitly address land use by stating that new transportation investments must be “supported by appropriate land uses” and that our transportation system will be “integrated with land use patterns and local decision making.” Further, coordination of land use and transportation in Alameda County will also help achieve other aspects of the county’s vision for sustainability, transit operations, public health, and economic opportunity. Land use was also incorporated into the performance measures that were used to evaluate transportation investments. The use of measures such as the share of low-income households with access to activity centers, schools and transit stops as well as transit ridership and riders per hour reflects the importance of land use in the CWTP. The following specific Land Use Objectives are defined within the CWTP:

- Encourage a land use pattern that provides a variety of destinations within walking and bicycling distance
- Encourage a built environment that provides an interesting and vibrant street environment, including interest and comfort for pedestrians and bicyclists as well as “eyes on the street” for improved safety
- Encourage a pattern of major employment centers and employment in general with convenient transit access and nearby mixed use and residential areas
- Support walkable residential neighborhoods in proximity to schools
- Support the creation and maintenance of housing, affordable to a range of households, with PDAs and other TOD opportunities
- Encourage preservation of valuable agricultural lands in the county to provide produce and other agricultural products within proximity of urban development
- Encourage the creation of a connected street network providing multiple and convenient routes for all modes within and between neighborhoods and centers, and for the regional transportation system

It is anticipated that future CWTP efforts will continue to build off the 2012 Plan and will utilize PDA locations to coordinate land use and transportation policies.
Congestion Management Plan Update  
(Fall 2013)

The Alameda County Congestion Management Plan (CMP) has a specific section dedicated to the Land Use Analysis Program. Among the program’s goals includes better integrating local land use and regional transportation investment decisions. A major component of the Alameda CTC Land Use Analysis Program is the legislatively required review of land use development projects. This review allows the Alameda CTC to assess impacts of individual development actions on the regional transportation system and that action can be taken to reduce the opportunity for any significant impacts. The most recent update of the CMP includes a goal of better coordinating transportation investments with the county’s land use patterns and incorporates the recommendations of the Alameda County Priority Development Investment and Growth Strategy adopted by the Commission in March 2013.

Alameda Countywide Pedestrian Plan (October 2012)

The 2012 Countywide Pedestrian Plan integrates the PDA process as part of the development of Countywide priorities for pedestrian improvements. The goals for the Pedestrian Plan dovetail with those of the PDA IGS, as many PDAs are located in infill, transit-accessible locations near or are adjacent to downtowns. As a result, these locations are also those with high priorities for pedestrian facilities improvements. PDAs are referenced frequently as part of the prioritization process and are incorporated into the implementation actions of the Plan.

Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan (October 2012)

Similar to the Pedestrian Plan, the Countywide Bicycle Plan frequently references the correlation between the types of locations where PDAs reside (infill, transit-accessible, adjacent to downtown) and locations that warrant improved bicycle infrastructure. The vast majority of PDAs in Alameda County are within areas covered by proposed bicycle improvements as part of the plan. Again, PDAs are referenced frequently as part of the prioritization process and are incorporated into the implementation actions of the Plan.
Updated ABAG Housing Data

According to data collected by ABAG, approximately 2,663 housing units were produced in Alameda County jurisdictions during 2013. Approximately 63% of these units were built within PDAs, and 23% of units (either built within or outside of a PDA) were affordable to very low income or low income households. This information is summarized in Figure 9.

Figure 9 Housing Permit Activity for Alameda County Jurisdictions with PDAs (Calendar Year 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>VLI</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Above Mod</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>In PDAs</th>
<th>Outside PDAs</th>
<th>Unknown (PDA/Non-PDA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeryville</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union City</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>569</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>128</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,914</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,663</strong></td>
<td><strong>62%</strong></td>
<td><strong>30%</strong></td>
<td><strong>8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
ABAG gathered permit data for jurisdictions with locally-designated Priority Development Areas (PDAs) for the calendar year 2013. All data provided by local jurisdiction staff unless noted otherwise.

*Information obtained from annual housing element progress report filed with the California Department of Housing and Community Development.

Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Legend:
- VLI: Number of units permitted affordable to very low income households (making less than 50% of Area Median Income)
- LI: Number of units permitted affordable to low income households (making between 50-80% of Area Median Income)
- Mod: Number of units permitted affordable to moderate income households (making between 80-120% of Area Median Income)
- Above Mod: Number of units permitted affordable to above moderate income households (making 120%+ of Area Median Income)
- Total Units: The total number of housing units permitted for the jurisdiction
- In PDAs: Number of housing units permitted within PDAs
- Outside PDAs: Number of housing units permitted outside of PDAs
- Unknown (PDA/Non-PDA): Unknown if permitted units were inside or outside of PDAs due to lack of
location data

N/A: Indicates that information was not available for the jurisdiction

Figure 10 provides an updated summary of housing policies for those Alameda County jurisdictions with PDAs. This information was collected by ABAG in summer 2014. Figure 11 defines the types of housing policies employed by local jurisdictions.
### Figure 10: Alameda County Housing Policies for Jurisdictions with PDAs (Compiled by the Association of Bay Area Governments, July 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affordable Housing Policies and Programs</th>
<th>Alameda*</th>
<th>Albany</th>
<th>Berkeley</th>
<th>Dublin</th>
<th>Emeryville</th>
<th>Fremont</th>
<th>Hayward</th>
<th>Livermore</th>
<th>Newark</th>
<th>Oakland</th>
<th>Pleasanton</th>
<th>San Leandro</th>
<th>Union City</th>
<th>Unincorporated Alameda County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Parking Requirements</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>UC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamlined Permitting Process</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>UC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated Density Bonus (parcel assembly)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form-based codes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use Zones</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Overlay Zone</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>UC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density Bonus Ordinances</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>UC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusionary/Below Market Rate Housing Policy</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominium Conversion Ordinance</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just Cause Evictions</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Stabilization</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition/Rehabilitation/Conversion Program</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of Mobile Homes (Rent Stabilization ordinances)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRO Preservation Ordinances</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner Rehabilitation program</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Anti-Displacement Strategies</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Fees or Waivers</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>UC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Allocation Incl. former RDA “Boomerang” Funds</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>UC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Lieu Fees (Inclusionary Zoning)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Development Impact Fee</td>
<td>UC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>UC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Development Impact Fee</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other taxes or fees dedicated to housing</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally Funded Homebuyer Assistance Programs</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant-Based Assistance</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home sharing programs</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has Public Housing?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has Group Homes?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a Second Unit Ordinance?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has an Emergency Shelter?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has Affordable Housing Complexes?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
ABAG tracked thirty housing policy and program types that represent the most prevalent and important strategies for fostering development of both market rate and affordable housing units. ABAG Staff compiled a summary of policies adopted by each jurisdiction based on the jurisdiction’s certified 2007-2014 housing element, and sent the summary to local staff for verification. We have indicated instances in which we were not able to verify or obtain information.

**Legend:**
- *: Data compiled by ABAG staff
- UC: The policy or program is currently under consideration by the jurisdiction
- N/A: Indicates information was unavailable for jurisdiction
### Figure 11: Housing Policy Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reduced Parking Requirements</td>
<td>Reduced parking requirements to facilitate housing development (market or affordable).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Streamlined Permitting Process</td>
<td>One-stop permitting or priority processing for certain kinds of housing developments (market or affordable).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Graduated Density Bonus</td>
<td>Under the same zoning designation allow greater density with greater lot size to facilitate parcel assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Form-Based Code</td>
<td>Zoning codes that specify development requirements to an extent that development proposal meeting the requirements can be speedily entitled without conditional use permitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mixed Use Zoning</td>
<td>Allows for compatible non-residential use on a given parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Housing Overlay Zone</td>
<td>Housing overlay zones describe areas where jurisdictions provide incentives for housing development on sites that are not zoned for residential use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Local Density Bonus Ordinance</td>
<td>A locally adopted density bonus ordinance that customizes state density bonus law to local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Inclusionary/Below Market Rate Housing</td>
<td>When a jurisdiction requires a certain percentage of housing units in market-rate developments to be affordably priced to income-specified households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Condominium Conversion</td>
<td>An ordinance that regulates conversion of apartment buildings into condominiums and generally provides tenant protections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Just Cause Eviction</td>
<td>An ordinance that allows evictions for legally delineated circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Rent Stabilization Ordinance</td>
<td>Ordinances that regulate the percentage of annual rent increases, but allow rent to be “reset” at market-rate upon vacancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Acquisition/Rehabilitation/Conversion</td>
<td>Programs to purchase, rehabilitate, and then convert properties from a past non-residential (or dilapidated residential) use to affordable (income-restricted) residential use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Preservation of Mobile Homes (Rent Stabilization Ordinance)</td>
<td>Typically rent stabilization ordinances applicable to mobile homes to preserve a source of affordable housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SRO Preservation Ordinance</td>
<td>Typically rent stabilization ordinances applicable to properties designated “single room occupancy.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Homeowner Repair or Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Grant or low-cost loan programs targeted to homeowners to make either minor or major repairs to their properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Other Anti-Displacement Strategies</td>
<td>Policies that discourage eviction or economic displacement of residents due to market pressures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Reduced Fees or Waivers</td>
<td>Reduced fees or permit waivers for affordable housing development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. General Fund Allocation Ind. Former RDA “Boomerang” Funds</td>
<td>An allocation of local funds for affordable housing development and preservation, for instance residual RDA funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. In-Lieu Fees (Inclusionary Zoning)</td>
<td>Fees charged to market rate developers “in-lieu” of the construction of income-restricted ownership or rental units in new developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Housing Development Impact Fee</td>
<td>A per square foot or per unit development fee levied on market rate residential development that is used to develop or preserve affordable housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Commercial Development Impact Fee</td>
<td>A per square foot development fee levied on non-residential development that is used to develop or preserve affordable housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Other Taxes or Fees dedicated to housing</td>
<td>A local tax or fee (not specified above) dedicated to affordable housing development or preservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Locally-Funded Homebuyer Assistance Programs</td>
<td>Locally-funded homebuyer assistance programs -- typically down payment assistance for first time buyers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Tenant-Based Assistance</td>
<td>Locally-funded monetary assistance to tenants on a one-time or ongoing basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Home Sharing Programs</td>
<td>Locally-funded programs that encourage homeowners with extra rooms to “share” or room with a pre-screened tenant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Public Housing</td>
<td>Number of public housing properties in the jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Group Homes</td>
<td>Number of group homes in the jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Second Units</td>
<td>Number of second units in the jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Emergency Shelters</td>
<td>Number of emergency shelters in the jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Affordable Housing Complexes</td>
<td>Number of affordable housing complexes in the jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**
- **RDA (Regional Development Agency)**: Funds allocated to specific projects or programs by regional development agencies.
- **SRO (Single Room Occupancy)**: Typically applies to small residential units that are owned and managed by nonprofit organizations.
- **RDA “Boomerang” Funds**: Funds returned to a jurisdiction after they have been used for specific purposes.”
PDA Monitoring

Alameda CTC conducted its first full PDA Inventory in 2012 and the agency intends to build on this Inventory to incorporate additional data that could not be collected for this initial PDA Investment and Growth Strategy (2013). As written in the 2013 Alameda County PDA IGS, it was noted that data would be updated annually or biannually as new data is generated by the jurisdictions and then compiled and released by ABAG or MTC. As of May 2014, there have been few significant updates, thus Alameda CTC has elected not to undergo a significant update of its PDA Inventory at this time.
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SUBJECT: Update on Countywide Modal Plans

RECOMMENDATION: Approve creation of an Ad Hoc Committee to provide focused input into the Countywide Transit Plan and receive an update on the Countywide Modal Plans

Summary

The 2012 Countywide Transportation Plan identified the need for more detailed countywide transportation planning efforts in three key areas: goods movement, transit and arterial roadways. Once completed, the Countywide Goods Movement, Transit and Multimodal Arterials Plans as well as the existing Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans, and the updated Community Based Transportation Plans will form the basis of the next Countywide Transportation Plan update. The updated Countywide Transportation Plan, which is planned for adoption in late spring 2016, will then feed into the next Regional Transportation Plan update which will be finalized in summer 2017.

The Commission approved the scope and budget for the Goods Movement Plan in June and October 2013, and for the Countywide Transit and Multimodal Arterials Plans in September 2013 and February 2014, respectively. In April 2014, the Commission approved partnering with AC Transit to add scope and budget for AC Transit’s Major Corridors study to the Countywide Transit Plan. This partnership has enabled greater coordination and collaboration between these two closely related transit planning efforts.

Subsequent to these approvals, staff has worked to select consultant teams and finalize consultant contracts. All three plans are now officially underway, and staff is working with the consultant teams to coordinate public and stakeholder outreach and participation, data sharing, and any overlapping areas for recommended projects and programs.

This memorandum provides an update on the development of each modal plan. In addition, the memorandum recommends that the Alameda CTC form an Ad Hoc Committee of Commission members to provide input into the Countywide Transit Plan development.
Background

Staff has finalized consultant contracts for the Goods Movement, Transit and Multimodal Arterials Plans, and work is underway for all three planning efforts. Over the next 15-18 months, all three plans will finalize goals and performance measures; identify needs, issues and opportunities; identify preferred networks (where applicable) and related projects and programs; and then evaluate and prioritize projects and programs using the adopted goals and performance measures for each plan. All three consultant teams and Alameda CTC staff are meeting regularly to align and coordinate public and stakeholder outreach and engagement, data collection and analysis, production and review of deliverables, and meeting schedules.

The Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee (ACTAC) will serve as the technical advisory committee for all three planning efforts. The Commission will make all policy decisions, provide overall direction, and will approve the final plans.

The public and other stakeholders will be engaged throughout all of these planning efforts. All three plans are conducting individual or small group meetings with key stakeholders, and the Goods Movement Plan is holding a number of roundtable meetings on specific issues and overall plan development and advocacy. Additionally, for all the modal plans two rounds of community workshops are being planned for 2015. The first round of workshops will occur in early 2015 and will focus on introducing the three planning efforts to the public and soliciting input on community needs, issues and priorities. The second round of workshops will likely take place in fall 2015 and will focus on presenting and soliciting feedback on different transit network alternatives and potential multimodal projects and programs for arterial roadways and on goods movement as applicable.

Goods Movement Plan

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 mega-region, and the nation. The Alameda CTC, in partnership with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is undertaking goods movement work including organizing a Goods Movement Collaborative that brings 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.

The Goods Movement Project Team has developed and adopted the project vision, goals, and performance measures; completed its first round of stakeholder outreach; and completed a baseline assessment technical analysis. Stakeholder outreach to date has
included over 25 meetings with groups representing environment/public health interests, businesses, shippers, carriers, labor, and local elected officials. The project team also hosted the first of six goods movement roundtables which was attended by 90 diverse stakeholders and affirmed the need for an ongoing forum to identify and advocate for goods movement system improvements.

Future work will include developing freight forecasts, identifying strategies (including capital projects, programs, and policies) to improve the goods movement system and evaluating these using project performance measures, and conducting a second round of stakeholder outreach to “ground-truth” the results of the technical strategy evaluation.

**Multimodal Arterial Plan**

The Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan will build on the previous corridor planning and Countywide Transportation Plan efforts of Alameda CTC to better understand the existing and future role and function of the countywide arterial roadway system, provide a framework for the integrated management of major arterial corridors to support all modes, improve overall mobility, connectivity, and safety on the countywide arterial system while better serving the adjacent land uses, and identify a priority of short and long term improvements. The plan development will be closely coordinated with local jurisdictions, Caltrans and bus transit operators.

The scope of work for the Multimodal Arterial Plan is divided into three components, summarized briefly below. The Plan will also develop a more detailed stakeholder engagement plan, a data collection plan, a travel demand forecasting white paper, and a specialized GIS-based tool that will be used to develop recommended improvements. Meetings with individual jurisdiction staff as well as other key stakeholders will occur at key points throughout plan development.

- **Milestone One:**
  - Create vision, goals and objectives
  - Develop performance measures
  - Identify arterial network
  - Create roadway typologies

- **Milestone Two:**
  - Identify modal priorities
  - Develop preferred cross-sections
  - Confirm performance measures

- **Milestone Three:**
  - Confirm and finalize preferred cross-sections
  - Identify short- and long-term improvements, including both projects and supportive programs

Once complete, these elements will be combined into a draft and final plan that will then be incorporated into the update of the Countywide Transportation Plan.
Transit Plan

The Countywide Transit Plan will enable Alameda County’s jurisdictions and transit providers to better align transit, land use and economic development goals and objectives and will ultimately identify near- and long-term transit capital and operating priorities in the county. It will also address ADA paratransit needs and services as they relate to future transit investment priorities. By developing consensus on a vision for future transit service in Alameda County as well as funding priorities, the Countywide Transit Plan will enable the Alameda CTC, its member jurisdictions and transit operators to leverage existing and advocate for additional resources to improve local, regional and inter-regional transit serving Alameda County.

The Countywide Transit Plan will build on recent transit planning efforts led by MTC as part of the Transit Sustainability Project (TSP) and will be closely coordinated with planning efforts being undertaken by individual transit operators, including AC Transit’s Major Corridors Study which will develop, analyze and rank capital improvements for AC Transit’s major corridors.

The scope of work for the Countywide Transit Plan can be divided into the following major elements:

- **Benchmarking:**
  - Existing conditions and inventory of existing plans, studies and data
  - Understand the market for future transit services: the consultant team will analyze future demand for transit service and determine key transit travel markets based on future socioeconomic and demographic conditions, and projected land use and transportation network conditions.

- **Visioning:**
  - Develop vision, goals and performance measures based on existing plans and policies

- **Assessment:**
  - Develop future network scenarios: the consultant team will develop three potential transit network scenarios that represent different “packages” of potential transit improvements
  - Analyze performance and prioritize corridors and investments
  - Develop final network recommendations, including projects and programs

- **Implementation:**
  - Develop plans and guidelines: based on the final network recommendation, the consultant team will develop a complementary ADA paratransit strategy, and will also develop design guidelines and identify transit-supportive infrastructure improvements
  - Implementation and financial plan
Similar to the Goods Movement and Multimodal Arterial Plans, these elements will be combined into a draft and final plan that will then be incorporated into the update of the Countywide Transportation Plan.

**Creation of Ad Hoc Committee for the Transit Plan**

To develop the Transit Plan, in-depth interviews of key transit interest groups and stakeholders will be conducted. These meetings will generally follow an open-ended interview style format and allow stakeholders to identify needs, issues and opportunities related to transit service in Alameda County.

Local elected officials are a key stakeholder group for the Countywide Transit Plan, and the Alameda CTC constitutes an existing body of local elected officials to offer input to the Countywide Transit Plan 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 transit issues in a focus group format.

**Fiscal Impact:** There is no fiscal impact at this time.

**Staff Contacts**

Tess Lengyel, Deputy Director of Planning and Policy  
Matthew Bomberg, Assistant Transportation Planner  
Saravana Suthanthira, Senior Transportation Planner  
Kara Vuicich, Senior Transportation Planner
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SUBJECT: Alameda CTC Annual Report Including the Vehicle Registration Fee Program

RECOMMENDATION: Receive the 2013 Alameda CTC Annual Report that includes reporting on the Vehicle Registration Fee Program.

Summary

Alameda CTC prepares an annual report each year that includes a message from the agency’s director, key activities the agency performed in the prior year, and financial statements. The 2013 Annual Report entitled “Transportation Matters” includes a message from Executive Director Arthur L. Dao and highlights key transportation programs and projects that Alameda CTC plans, funds, and delivers to foster a vibrant and livable Alameda County. These are the transportation investments that matter to commuters, students, seniors and people with disabilities, and residents and businesses in Alameda County. The investments spur job growth and economic development, facilitate efficient goods movement, and enrich communities by improving mobility and transportation accessibility.

Many of these transportation investments are funded largely through local, voter-approved Measure B sales tax dollars and local, voter-approved Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) funds. The annual report includes an audited financial statement for Measure B revenues and expenditures for the year ended June 30, 2013 as well as reporting on the VRF Program, including revenues and expenditures through June 30, 2014, the percentage programmed to date for the four planning areas of the county (Central, East, North, and South) and the VRF equity formula, which is a new element of the Alameda CTC Annual Report.

Attachment A presents the 2013 Alameda CTC Annual Report that includes reporting on the Vehicle Registration Program.

Fiscal Impact: There is no fiscal impact.

Attachments:

A. 2013 Alameda CTC Annual Report

Staff Contacts

Tess Lengyel, Deputy Director of Planning and Policy

Matt Todd, Principal Transportation Engineer
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