



# Meeting Notice

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• 510.208.7400

• [www.AlamedaCTC.org](http://www.AlamedaCTC.org)

**Commission Chair**  
Councilmember At-Large,  
Rebecca Kaplan, City of Oakland

**Commission Vice Chair**  
Mayor Bill Harrison,  
City of Fremont

**AC Transit**  
Director Elsa Ortiz

**Alameda County**  
Supervisor Scott Haggerty, District 1  
Supervisor Richard Valle, District 2  
Supervisor Wilma Chan, District 3  
Supervisor Nate Miley, District 4  
Supervisor Keith Carson, District 5

**BART**  
Director Rebecca Saltzman

**City of Alameda**  
Mayor Trish Spencer

**City of Albany**  
Mayor Peter Maass

**City of Berkeley**  
Councilmember Laurie Capitelli

**City of Dublin**  
Mayor David Haubert

**City of Emeryville**  
Councilmember Ruth Atkin

**City of Hayward**  
Mayor Barbara Halliday

**City of Livermore**  
Mayor John Marchand

**City of Newark**  
Councilmember Luis Freitas

**City of Oakland**  
Councilmember Dan Kalb

**City of Piedmont**  
Mayor Margaret Fujioka

**City of Pleasanton**  
Mayor Jerry Thorne

**City of San Leandro**  
Mayor Pauline Cutter

**City of Union City**  
Mayor Carol Dutra-Vernaci

**Executive Director**  
Arthur L. Dao

## Alameda County Transportation Commission

Thursday, June 30, 2016, 2:00 p.m.

1111 Broadway, Suite 800 Oakland, CA 94607

### Mission Statement

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

### Public Comments

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

### Recording of Public Meetings

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

### Reminder

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


### Glossary of Acronyms

A glossary that includes frequently used acronyms is available on the Alameda CTC website at [www.AlamedaCTC.org/app\\_pages/view/8081](http://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](http://bikelink.org)).



Garage parking is located beneath City Center, accessible via entrances on 14th Street between 1300 Clay Street and 505 14th Street buildings, or via 11th Street just past Clay Street. To plan your trip to Alameda CTC visit [www.511.org](http://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](http://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](http://www.AlamedaCTC.org/events/month/now).

## Connect with Alameda CTC

[www.AlamedaCTC.org](http://www.AlamedaCTC.org)



[facebook.com/AlamedaCTC](https://facebook.com/AlamedaCTC)

[@AlamedaCTC](https://twitter.com/AlamedaCTC)

[youtube.com/user/AlamedaCTC](https://youtube.com/user/AlamedaCTC)



# Commission Meeting Agenda

## Thursday, June 30, 2016, 2 p.m.

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• PH: (510) 208-7400

• [www.AlamedaCTC.org](http://www.AlamedaCTC.org)

### 1. Pledge of Allegiance

### 2. Roll Call

### 3. Public Comment

### 4. Chair and Vice Chair Report

### 5. Executive Director Report

### 6. Approval of Consent Calendar

On June 13, 2016 Alameda CTC standing committees approved all action items on the consent calendar, except Item 6.1.

**Chair:** Councilmember Rebecca Kaplan,  
City of Oakland

**Vice Chair:** Mayor Bill Harrison,  
City of Fremont

**Executive Director:** Arthur L. Dao

**Clerk:** Vanessa Lee

Page A/I\*

6.1.	<a href="#">Approval of May 26 2016 meeting minutes.</a>	1	A
6.2.	<a href="#">I-580 HOV/Express Lanes (PN 1373.002): Monthly Operation Update</a>	7	I
6.3.	<a href="#">Alameda CTC Proposed Consolidated Budget for FY2016-17</a>	25	A
6.4.	<a href="#">Delegation of Authority To Handle Claims Made Against Alameda County Transportation Commission</a>	41	A
6.5.	<a href="#">Congestion Management Program (CMP): Summary of Alameda CTC's Review and Comments on Environmental Documents and General Plan Amendments</a>	47	I
6.6.	<a href="#">Final Alameda Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan</a>	51	A
6.7.	<a href="#">Final Alameda Countywide Transit Plan</a>	55	A
6.8.	<a href="#">FY 2014-2015 Measure B/Measure BB and Vehicle Registration Fee Program Compliance Reports and Exemption Requests.</a>	61	A
6.9.	<a href="#">I-580 Express Lanes Project (PN 1373.000/1373.001): Approve Contract Amendments to Professional Services Agreements A09-007 and A13-0092 with Electronic Transaction Consultants Corporation.</a>	107	A
6.10.	<a href="#">I-680 Southbound Express Lane Operations (PN 1408.000): Approval of Contract Amendment No. 1 to Professional Services Agreement A15-0043 with Electronic Transaction Consultants Corporation.</a>	115	A

6.11.	<a href="#">I-680 Northbound Express Lane Project (PN 1369.000), including I-680 Southbound Express Lane Access Conversion (PN 1408.001): Approval of Professional Services Agreement A17-0001 with Kapsch TrafficCom Transportation NA, Inc.</a>	121	A
6.12.	<a href="#">Approval of Administrative Amendments to Various Project Agreements (A13-0001, A07-0058, A14-0032).</a>	129	A
6.13.	<a href="#">Approval of Alameda CTC Community Advisory Appointments.</a>	135	A
<b>7.</b>	<b>Community Advisory Committee Reports</b> (Time limit: 3 minutes per speaker)		
7.1.	<a href="#">Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee</a> - Midori Tabata, Chair	141	I
7.2.	<a href="#">Independent Watchdog Committee</a> – Murphy McCalley, Chair	143	I
7.3.	<a href="#">Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee</a> – Sylvia Stadmire, Chair	145	I
<b>8.</b>	<b>Planning, Policy and Legislation Committee Action Items</b> On June 13, 2016, the Planning, Policy and Legislation Committee approved the following action items, unless otherwise noted in the recommendations.		
8.1.	<a href="#">June Legislative Update</a>	159	A/I
<b>9.</b>	<b>Closed Session</b> - Closed Session pursuant to Government Code section 54956.9(d)(2): Potential exposure to litigation; one potential action		A/I
<b>10.</b>	<b>Member Reports</b>		
<b>11.</b>	<b>Adjournment</b>		

**Next meeting:** July 28, 2016

All items on the agenda are subject to action and/or change by the Commission.





# Alameda County Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes Thursday, May 26, 2016, 2:00 p.m.

6.1

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• PH: (510) 208-7400

• [www.AlamedaCTC.org](http://www.AlamedaCTC.org)

## 1. Pledge of Allegiance

## 2. Roll Call

A Roll call was conducted. All members were present with the exception of Commissioners Miley, Spencer, Marchand, Freitas, Chan, and Kalb.

Commissioner Worthington was present as an alternate for Commissioner Carson. Commissioner Peixoto was present as an alternate for Commission Halliday. Commissioner Biddle was present as an alternate for Commissioner Haubert. Commissioner Wieler was present as an alternate for Commissioner Fujioka. Commissioner Cox was present as an alternate for Commissioner Cutter.

### Subsequent to the roll call:

Commissioner Miley and Commissioner Kalb arrived during Item 5. Commissioner Valle left prior to the vote on Item 9.1.

## 3. Public Comment

There were no public comments.

## 4. Chair and Vice Chair Report

There were no Chair or Vice Chair Reports.

## 5. Executive Director Report

Art Dao stated his Executive Director report could be found on the Alameda CTC website as well as the in the Commissioners' folders. He stated that on May 11, 2016, he spent a day in Sacramento with legislative members from the East Bay leadership Council, East Bay Economic Development and the Tri-Valley Leadership Group. Art briefly discussed legislative initiatives as it relates to transportation and concluded his report by stating that the June Commission meeting was rescheduled to June 30, 2016.

## 6. Consent Calendar

6.1. Approval of April 28, 2016 meeting minutes.

6.2. I-580 HOV/Express Lanes (PN 1373.002) Monthly Operation Update.

6.3. Receive the 2015 Alameda CTC Annual Report that includes reporting on the Vehicle Registration Fee Program.

6.4. Approval of the Alameda CTC proposed consolidated budget for FY2016-17.

6.5. Approval of the Alameda CTC FY2015-16 Third Quarter Financial Report.

- 6.6. Approval of the Alameda CTC FY2015-16 Third Quarter Investment Report.
- 6.7. Approval of the Revised Alameda CTC Organizational Structure and Associated Salary Ranges for Job Classifications.
- 6.8. Summary of Alameda CTC's Review and Comments on Environmental Documents and General Plan Amendments.
- 6.9. 2015 Performance Report Update.
- 6.10. Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan Update.
- 6.11. Approval of the Draft Alameda Countywide Transit Plan
- 6.12. Approval of the Draft 2016 Countywide Transportation Plan
- 6.13. Approval of the Pilot Model Program Sites and Parameters and the Shortlist of Schools; authorize Alameda CTC to enter into all necessary agreements and contracts with transit agencies, school districts, schools, and Clipper for the Affordable Student Transit Pass Program.
- 6.14. Approval of Amendment No. 4 to Professional Services Agreement No. A11-0024 with URS Corporation, for an additional amount of \$175,000 for Construction Support Services and Toll System Integrator Coordination for the I-580 Express Lanes Project (PN 1373.001/1373.002).
- 6.15. Approval of Alameda CTC Community Advisory Appointments.

Commissioner Saltzman requested a correction to the report in Item 6.3, to state that construction on the Downtown Berkeley BART Plaza is scheduled to start this year. She then moved to approve the item. Commissioner Haggerty seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following vote:

Yes: Kaplan, Ortiz, Haggerty, Miley, Worthington, Saltzman, Maass, Capitelli, Biddle, Atkin, Peixoto, Kalb, Wieler, Thorne, Cox, Dutra-Vernaci, Harrison  
 No: None  
 Abstain: None  
 Absent: Chan, Spencer, Marchand, Freitas

There was a public comment made on Item 6.13 by Candi Clark from Castro Valley Unified School District. She stated that schools in Castro Valley should be included in the list of sites for the Affordable Transit Pass pilot program. Commissioner Miley encouraged staff at Castro Valley to discuss the issue with him since he represents the district.

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

Yes: Kaplan, Ortiz, Haggerty, Miley, Worthington, Saltzman, Maass, Capitelli, Biddle, Atkin, Peixoto, Kalb, Wieler, Thorne, Cox, Dutra-Vernaci, Harrison  
 No: None

Abstain: None  
Absent: Chan, Spencer, Marchand, Freitas

Commissioner Atkin moved to approve the remainder of the consent calendar.  
Commissioner. Commissioner Dutra-Vernaci seconded the motion. The motion passed  
with the following vote:

Yes: Kaplan, Ortiz, Haggerty, Miley, Worthington, Saltzman, Maass, Capitelli, Biddle,  
Atkin, Kalb, Thorne, Dutra-Vernaci, Harrison  
No: None  
Abstain: Wieler, Peixoto, Cox (Item 6.1)  
Absent: Chan, Spencer, Marchand, Freitas

## **7. Community Advisory Committee Reports**

### **7.1. Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)**

There was no one present from BPAC.

### **7.2. Independent Watchdog Committee (IWC)**

There was no one present from the IWC.

### **7.3. Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee (PAPCO)**

Sylvia Stadmire, Chair of PAPCO, stated that PAPCO met on May 23, 2016. They reviewed outcomes for the Program Plan Subcommittee and considered requests for Gap Grant funding extensions. She concluded by stating that PAPCO will have its annual business meeting in June and she reviewed vacancies on the committee.

## **8. Finance and Administration Committee Action Items**

### **8.1. Alameda CTC Investment Policy: Reaffirm the current Alameda CTC investment policy.**

Patricia Reavey recommended that the Commission review and reaffirm the currently adopted investment policy as it is best practice for an investment policy to be reviewed on an annual basis. She reviewed comments made by the Finance and Administration Committee (FAC) regarding socially responsible investments and stated that staff intends to monitor investment policy decisions at the state level, and if there are changes in best practices, bring this policy back to the Commission in the future for further review.

Commissioner Kalb encouraged the Commission to continue to review the possibility of adopting a policy with targeted information on socially responsible investments.

Commissioner Saltzman stated that BART follows the State's process for monitoring socially responsible investments and suggested that the agency use BART and other partner agencies as resources.

Commissioner Worthington gave examples of the types of companies the agency should not invest in and stated that narrowly tailored policy adjustments that have minimal financial impacts can be useful in sending a strong message.

Commissioner Valle informed the Commissioner that the FAC committee reviewed the policy and informed the Commission that there was discussion surrounding the costs that would be incurred for the investor to research the socially responsible investments. Patricia stated that the current investment policy has a small section of corporate investments but majority of investments are government backed. She stated that in general, if there is a suspicion of risk, the agency does not invest.

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

Yes:	<i>Kaplan, Harrison, Ortiz, Haggerty, Valle, Miley, Worthington, Saltzman, Maass, Capitelli, Biddle, Atkin, Peixoto, Kalb, Wieler, Thorne, Cox, Dutra-Vernaci</i>
No:	<i>None</i>
Abstain:	<i>None</i>
Absent:	<i>Chan, Spencer, Marchand, Freitas</i>

## **9. Planning, Policy and Legislation Committee Action Items**

### **9.1. Legislative Update:**

Tess Lengyel provided an update on state and federal legislative activities and recommended approval of positions on legislation. She reviewed the Governors May revise including increases on diesel tax, cap & trade funds, transit capital, Caltrans efficiencies and loan repayments. She informed the Commission that staff has drafted a letter for the Chair to sign that advocates for transportation funding. Staff will also make that letter available as a template for each jurisdiction to use. Tess then recommended that the Commission take the following bill positions:

AB 1780 –PPLC recommended that the Commission not to take a position on the bill.

AB 2170- support

AB 2289- support

Commissioner Ortiz wanted clarification on the position staff is recommending for AB 1780. Tess stated that the recommendation was for the Commission to follow PPLC's recommendation and not take a position on AB 1780.

Commissioner Kalb asked for more information on the impacts of deleting the Air Board Sustainable Freight Strategy from AB 2170. Tess stated that the deletion is to eliminate references to old documents that need to be update in the new plan.

Commissioner Ortiz moved to approve this item as recommended. Commissioner Saltzman seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following vote:

Yes: Kaplan, Harrison, Ortiz, Haggerty, Miley, Worthington, Saltzman,  
Maass, Capitelli, Biddle, Atkin, Peixoto, Kalb, Wieler, Thorne, Cox, Dutra-Vernaci  
No: None  
Abstain: None  
Absent: Chan, Spencer, Marchand, Freitas, Valle

## 9.2. Discussion of Regional Gas Tax for the Bay Area

Art Dao updated the Commission on regional gas tax for the Bay Area. He stated that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) released the preliminary results of a recently conducted voter survey to assess perception of issues related to Plan Bay Area 2040 and gauge support for a regional gas tax measure. He stated that while MTC has not officially decided whether it would move forward with the ballot measure, MTC staff has held informal discussions with Bay Area congestion management agencies. Art conclude by outlining the collective comments and issue from the Bay Area Congestion Management Agency's.

Commissioner Kaplan noted that when Alameda CTC was developing both Measure B and Measure BB, AC Transit opted out of going to the ballot with their measure so that the agencies could partner and garner more support for Alameda CTC's measures.

Commissioner Ortiz stated that AC Transit has concerns about a regional gas tax because AC Transit did not go the ballot in 2012 and 2014, to avoid competing with Alameda CT's sales tax measures. She stated that AC Transit has the same concerns regarding the regional gas tax being placed on the ballot at the same time as items that will go on the ballot for both AC Transit and BART.

Commissioner Dutra-Vernaci stated that Union City will be placing a public safety parcel tax on the November ballot and does not want to compete the the regional gas tax. She also expressed concerns regarding land use policy language related to single occupancy. Art stated that the statute is very broad but the intent of the language is to encourage infill development and reduce green house gas emissions.

Commissioner Saltzman informed the Commission that both AC Transit and BART have been working on measures for several years and are concerned with competition for the gas tax measure. She also expressed concerns for the limited amount of time the region allowed for a greates public process and discussion

Commissioner Haggerty stated that MTC has been discussing a gas tax for at least 15-years and this is the first time that there was a favorable polling response for the tax.

There was a public comment on this item by Preston Jordan from Alameda Strollers and Rollers. He stated that MTC should include complete street requirements and

require the consideration of active transportation and transit routes in the algorithms used to develop the pavement plan in the proposed gas tax.

There was a public comment by Dave Campbell of Bike East Bay. He stated that Bike East Bay wants to support BART and AC Transits measures on the ballot and stated that the funding for the Regional measure needs to support transportation priorities.

Commissioner Saltzman moved that the Commission send a message to MTC that the Commission supports the region increasing the gas tax but would encourage the region to wait until for an alternate election year. Commissioner Worthington seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following vote:

Yes:	<i>Kaplan, Ortiz, Haggerty, Campbell-Washington, Miley, Worthington, Saltzman, Maass, Capitelli, Biddle, Atkin, Peixoto, Kalb, Wieler, Thorne, Cox, Dutra-Vernanci, Harrison</i>
No:	<i>None</i>
Abstain:	<i>None</i>
Absent:	<i>Chan, Spencer, Marchand, Freitas, Valley</i>

#### **10. Closed Session**

The Commission went into Closed Session pursuant to Government Code section 54956.9(d)(2): Potential exposure to litigation; one potential action  
Chair Kaplan reported that no action was taken in Closed Session.

#### **11. Member Reports**

Commissioner Haggerty requested that the Commission discuss Alameda CTC's fiduciary obligation to BART for new BART cars.


Commissioner Atkin stated that May 12, 2016 was Bike to Work day and that Emeryville had a ribbon cutting for the Christie Avenue Bay Trail gap closure.

#### **12. Adjournment**

The next meeting is: June 30, 2016 @ 2:00 p.m

Location: Alameda CTC Offices, 1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

Attested by:





# Memorandum

6.2

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• PH: (510) 208-7400

• www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** June 23, 2016

**SUBJECT:** I-580 HOV/Express Lanes (PN 1373.002): Monthly Operation Update

**RECOMMENDATION:** Receive a status update on the operation of I-580 HOV/Express Lane

## Summary

The Alameda CTC is the project sponsor of the I-580 Corridor High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV)/Express Lane Projects along the I-580 corridor in the Tri-Valley that are now in operation, opened to traffic on February 19<sup>th</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> of 2016. See Attachment A – Project Location Map for express lane operational limits.

The April 2016 operations reports indicate that the new express lane facility is providing travel time savings and travel reliability throughout the day, with average hourly speeds in the westbound express lanes estimated at 3 to 20 mph higher than the average hourly speeds in the general purposes lanes during the morning peak hours in the most congested segment of the corridor, and average hourly speeds in the eastbound express lanes estimated at 14 to 34 mph higher than the average hourly speeds in the general purposes lanes during the afternoon peak hours in the most congested segment of the corridor.

## Background

The I-580 Corridor Express Lanes, extending from Hacienda Drive to Greenville Road in the eastbound direction and from Greenville Road to San Ramon Road/Foothill Road in the westbound direction, were opened to traffic on February 19<sup>th</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> of 2016, in the eastbound and westbound directions, respectively. Motorists who have been using the I-580 HOV/Express Lanes facility are enjoying travel time savings and travel reliability benefits, as the express lanes optimize the corridor capacity by providing a new choice to drivers. As anticipated, lane use continues to ramp up, and is expected to stabilize over time. Carpool, clean-air vehicles, motorcycles and transit vehicles are enjoying the benefits of toll-free travel in the HOV lanes, including in the two new HOV lanes, one each added in each direction of travel.

**April 2016 Operation Update:** The April update is included as Attachment B to this report. During the 21 days of operations in April, the express lanes accommodated over 570,000



trips, ; over 230,000 westbound trips and 340,000 eastbound trips. An estimated 26% of motorists in the express lanes were of HOV users with FasTrak® Flex toll tags, 39% were single-occupant vehicles with FasTrak® (standard or Flex) toll tags, and the remaining 34% failed to carry a toll tag or had an invalid tag. In these instances, pursuant to the Commission-adopted "Ordinance for Administration of Tolls and Enforcement of Toll Violations for the I-580 Express Lanes," our customer service representatives either assess tolls to the matching FasTrak accounts or issue notices of toll evasion violation to the registered vehicle owners. Of those motorists without a toll tag, approximately 35% of the trips were matched to existing FasTrak® by means of license plate information. The percentage of HOV users with FasTrak® Flex toll tags increased each month since inception, suggesting increased awareness of how the express lanes work.

During the morning commute hours, which appear to span between 5 am and 10 am, the motorists in the westbound express lane traveled with average speeds approximately 3 to 20 mph faster than the motorists traveling in the general purpose lanes in the vicinity of Hacienda Drive, which was observed to be the most congested segment of the corridor. During the afternoon/evening commute hours, which appear to span between 2:30 pm and 6:30 pm, the motorists in the eastbound express lanes traveled with average speeds between 14 and 34 mph faster than the motorists traveling in the general purpose lanes in the vicinity of N. First Street, a location of significant congestion in the general purpose lanes. A second area of eastbound congestion is at Hacienda Drive, where motorists in the eastbound express lane traveled with average speeds between 18 and 29 mph faster than the motorists traveling in the general purpose lanes during the afternoon/evening commute hours. In all sections of the corridor, the express lane are typically less congested than the general purpose lanes.

Even though the operational maximum toll rates to travel the entire length of the westbound and eastbound are set at \$13.00 and \$9.00, respectively, during the month of April the actual maximum posted toll rates did not exceed \$6.00 in the westbound direction and \$6.00 in the eastbound direction. During the month of April 2016, the average westbound posted toll rate to travel the entire corridor was \$2.31, with an average toll assessed to non-HOV users of \$1.33. The average eastbound posted toll rate to travel the entire corridor was \$2.48, with an average assessed toll to non-HOV users of \$2.41.

Minor construction activities are ongoing within the corridor and are expected to be completed in summer 2016.

Broad public outreach and education activities have been underway throughout the I-580 corridor commute shed, including paid and earned media, special events and employer and other stakeholder outreach. These efforts will continue through the end of Fiscal Year 2015/16 in order to promote the benefits of the lanes, emphasize proper use of the facility, and encourage the public to obtain FasTrak and FasTrak flex toll tags.

**Fiscal Impact:** There is no fiscal impact due to this item.

## Attachments

- A. I-580 Corridor Express Lane Projects – Location Map
- B. I-580 Corridor Express Lane April 2016 Operations Update
- C. I-580 HOV Lane Projects – Construction Update
- D. I-580 Corridor Express Lane – Outreach Update
- E. Summary of Toll System Construction Contract Change Orders

## Staff Contact


[Liz Rutman](#), Express Lanes Operation and Maintenance Manager

***This page intentionally left blank***



# I-580 Express Lanes Project Location Map

6.2A



Not to scale



## Two Eastbound Express Lanes

### Lanes begin at Hacienda



No entry/exit from eastbound express lanes from Hacienda to Fallon / El Charro.

**Please note:** For access to Santa Rita Road, do not enter express lanes.



## One Westbound Express Lane

### Lane begins at Greenville



No entry/exit from westbound express lane from Hacienda to end.

**Please note:** For access to I-680 or Dougherty, exit express lane before Hacienda.

***This page intentionally left blank***

## I-580 Express Lanes Monthly Operations Update



A Presentation for the  
**I-580 Express Lane Policy Committee**  
June 13, 2016













## I-580 Express Lanes – April 2016



- Over 570,000 total express lane trips in April 2016
  - 26% HOV (Toll Tag Setting)
  - 39% SOV (Toll Tag Setting)
  - 1% Invalid Toll Tag (negative balance, stolen tag, etc)
  - 33% No Toll Tag
    - Estimated 35% of these have been matched to existing accounts
- Westbound: Over 230,000 trips in April
- Eastbound: Over 340,000 trips in April















**ATTACHMENT C**  
**I-580 Corridor HOV Lane Projects**  
**Alameda CTC Projects 1368.004/1372.004/1372.005**  
**Monthly Progress Report**  
**April 2016**

6.2C

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

Completion of the construction of new HOV lanes in the I-580 Corridor in the Livermore Valley in the eastbound and westbound directions, and construction of auxiliary lanes.

The final I-580 Corridor HOV segments include:

- Eastbound (EB) Segment 3 Auxiliary (AUX) Lanes, between Hacienda Drive and Greenville Road.
- Westbound (WB) HOV Lane between Greenville Road and San Ramon Road

**CONSTRUCTION STATUS**

Construction activities began in March 2013 and opened to traffic in February 2016 with the commissioning of both the Eastbound and Westbound Express Lanes.

**Ongoing & Upcoming Activities**

Ongoing and upcoming work activities include:

- Maintain Express Lane operations as HOV contract work punch list items and final corrective work is completed outside of commute hours.
- Complete the installation of permanent power sources along the corridor.
- All construction work is expected to complete by early summer 2016.

A project website (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/projects/i580wbhov/>) is maintained by Caltrans.

**FUNDING AND FINANCIAL STATUS**

The I-580 Corridor HOV Projects are funded through federal, state and local funds. All projects are tracking to complete within established and available budget.

**SCHEDULE STATUS**

The I-580 Corridor HOV Lane Projects completed the construction of the final HOV segments and opened them to traffic in February 2016 as Express Lanes. Closeout activities and final accounting will continue in 2016.

***This page intentionally left blank***

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**I-580 Express Lane Public Outreach Update**  
**June 2016**

Extensive public outreach and education activities have been underway throughout the I-580 corridor commute shed since fall 2015 to create general awareness, promote the benefits of the lanes, emphasize proper use of the facility, and encourage the public to obtain FasTrak® and FasTrak® flex toll tags, which are required to use the lanes. Tools and efforts to date have generated significant positive media coverage, millions of impressions and have helped to support successful lane operations.

Public outreach and education has included a paid media effort and significant earned media, special events and employer and other stakeholder outreach including the development and distribution of collateral materials including banners, posters, informational cards and fact sheets, video and website and social media content for partners and stakeholders including for localities, transportation partner websites, local radio, television, businesses and civic organizations as well as responding to public inquiries via the express lane hotline and e-mails.

Post-opening advertising on the Waze app began April 16, 2016 and is continuing through June. These are targeted advertisements to carpoolers and all users when they are driving on the express lane corridor. Advertising on Tri-Valley Community Television will occur this summer.

More than 128,000 FasTrak flex tags have been activated through May 31, 2016 by retail locations and the BATA customer service center, as well as at stakeholder events. Staff is continuing to participate in outreach events, and work with partner agencies and media outlets with a focus on increasing FasTrak flex tag acquisition and supporting continued safe and appropriate express lane use.



***This page intentionally left blank***

## Summary of Toll System Construction Contract Change Orders:

CCO	CCO Budget	Description of CCO	CCO Amount	Remaining CCO Budget
Budget approved in July 2015	<b>\$936,000</b>			
No. 1		Additional scope and budget for ETCC to remobilize and provide increased traffic control to manage toll system installation	\$113,400	
No. 2		Additional three long-distance toll sites, based on field conditions that increased the labor and materials costs	\$70,500	\$752,100
No. 3		Additional staff and communication lease line costs, associated with delay in lane opening	\$567,200	\$184,900
No. 4		Additional scope for mobile enforcement	\$60,000	<b>\$124,900</b>

***This page intentionally left blank***



# Memorandum

6.3

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• PH: (510) 208-7400

• www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** June 23, 2016

**SUBJECT:** Alameda CTC Proposed Consolidated Budget for FY2016-17

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the Alameda CTC proposed consolidated budget for FY2016-17.

## Summary

The Alameda County Transportation Commission's (Alameda CTC) FY2016-17 Proposed Consolidated Budget demonstrates a sustainable, balanced budget utilizing projected revenues and fund balance to fund total expenditures. A budget is considered balanced when (1) total revenues equal total expenditures, (2) total revenues are greater than total expenditures, or (3) total revenues plus fund balance are greater than total expenditures. The overall consolidated Alameda CTC budget fits into the second category with total revenues greater than expenditures; however this varies by fund as some funds fit into the third category, as the accumulation of Measure B, Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) and Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) funds are utilized to fund capital projects and programs in Alameda County and the CMA Capital Projects Fund fits into the first category.

The proposed budget has been prepared based on the modified accrual basis of accounting, which is consistent with the basis of accounting utilized to prepare our audited financial statements. It has been segregated by fund type and includes an adjustment column to eliminate interagency revenues and expenditures on a consolidated basis. The fund types are comprised of General Funds, Enterprise Fund, Special Revenue Funds, Exchange Fund, Debt Service Fund and Capital Projects Funds. The Enterprise Fund was set up last fiscal year to record operating activities for the I-580 Express Lanes.

The proposed budget contains projected revenues totaling \$310.5 million of which sales tax revenues comprise \$276.7 million, or 89.1 percent, and VRF revenues comprise \$12.0 million, or 3.9 percent. In addition, the proposed budget also includes a projected FY2015-16 ending fund balance of \$276.0 million for total available resources of \$586.4 million. The projected revenues are offset by \$281.7 million in anticipated expenditures of which \$87.4 million, or 31.0 percent, are allocated to capital projects funds. These revenue and expenditure totals constitute a net increase in fund balance of \$28.7 million and a projected consolidated ending fund balance of \$304.7 million. The increase in fund balance is mostly due to increased receipts of sales tax funds related to Measure BB.

Approval of the Proposed Capital Projects budgets is requested for the amounts found in the "Proposed FY2016-17 Capital Budget with Estimated Roll Over" column on each of the capital budget sheets for the Congestion Management function, 2000 Measure B sales tax, 1986 Measure B sales tax and 2014 Measure BB sales tax. This column includes both the additional capital budget amount requested for FY2016-17 as well as an estimated roll over balance from FY2015-16. The capital amount carried forward to the consolidated Alameda CTC Proposed Budget sheet does not include the roll forward balances because these amounts are still included in the projected roll forward fund balance from the FY2015-16 adopted budget. During the mid-year budget update process, the roll forward fund balance will be updated to actual based on the audited financial statements. Therefore, the capital budget amount on the consolidated budget spreadsheet for the mid-year budget update will be for the full capital budget including both the actual roll forward balance from FY2015-16 and any additional requested capital budget for FY2016-17. This methodology is required to ensure accurate and reliable fund balance information in Alameda CTC budgets.

The proposed budget includes revenues and expenditures necessary to provide the following vital programs and planning projects for Alameda County:

- Measure B and Measure BB Discretionary Grants and Direct Local Distribution Programs
- Vehicle Registration Fee Programs
- Transportation Fund for Clean Air Programs
- Safe Routes to School (SR2S) and BikeMobile Programs
- Student Transit Pass Program
- Congestion Management Programs
- Sustainable Communities Technical Assistance Program
- Modal Plans Implementation
- Passenger and Freight Rail Study
- Countywide Transit Plan Update

In addition to the programs and planning projects listed above, the proposed budget also contains revenues and expenditures necessary to fund and deliver significant capital projects that expand access and improve mobility in Alameda County consistent with the 2016 Comprehensive Investment Plan update which was approved by the Commission in March 2016. Some of the more significant projects included in the proposed budget are as follows:

- Route 84 Expressway Project
- I-580 Corridor Improvements Projects
- I-880 to Mission Boulevard East-West Connector Project
- I-680 Express Lanes Projects
- Route 92 Clawiter-Whitesell Interchange
- BART Warm Springs Extension Project
- I-80 Integrated Corridor Mobility Project
- Isabel Avenue – Route 84/I-580 Interchange Project

- I-880 South Bound HOV Lane Project

The Alameda CTC has included General Fund balance reserve information based on the General Fund Balance Reserve Policy approved by the Commission in January 2014. In addition, an operational reserve has been established for the Enterprise Fund, or I-580 Express Lanes operations, in the amount of 25 percent of expenditures. The goal would be to grow this operational reserve up to 100 percent of annual projected expenditures in order to mitigate current and future risks and to ensure sufficient liquidity for operations.

In addition, the proposed budget allows for an additional inter-fund loan from the ACTA Capital Fund to the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACCMA) General Fund of \$5 million, if and when necessary during FY2016-17, which would bring the total authorized loan amount to \$15 million. The loan program was adopted by the Commission in March 2011 to help cash flow the ACCMA Capital Projects Fund.

## **Background**

Development of the proposed budget for FY2016-17 was focused on the mission and core functions of the Alameda CTC that will enable the Alameda CTC to plan, fund and deliver transportation programs and projects that expand access and improve mobility in Alameda County. The proposed budget helps meet these goals by assigning available resources in the budget to formulate strategies and solutions for transportation opportunities and needs identified in planning processes; assigning the funding necessary to evaluate, prioritize, and finance programs and projects; and programming funds in order to deliver quality programs and projects in Alameda County on schedule and within budget.

Staffing levels assumed in the proposed consolidated budget for FY2016-17 are based on the revised organizational structure proposed which allows for staffing of up to 37 full time equivalent (FTE) positions in 35 job classifications. Salaries and benefits account for 1.2 percent of budgeted expenditures including roll forward capital budget authority. The revised organizational structure is designed to prepare the agency to meet the many challenges and expanded responsibilities of administering the 2014 Measure BB sale tax, implementing the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and Capital Project Delivery Plan (CPDP), and managing and maintaining the I-580 Express Lanes in addition to the I-680 Southbound Express Lane.

### Major Line Item Detail

Sales Tax Revenues – Increase of \$6.7 million, or 2.5 percent, over the FY2015-16 Revised Budget of \$270.0 million to \$276.7 million.

Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) Revenues – There is no change in this projection.

Grant Revenues – Decrease of \$69.7 million, or 82.7 percent, from the FY2015-16 Revised Budget from \$84.3 million to \$14.6 million due to capital project roll forward balances accounted for in the budgeted fund balance rolled forward from FY2015-16.

Salaries and Benefits – Increase of \$1.2 million over the FY2015-16 Revised Budget to provide for funding for approximately 10 additional full-time equivalent (FTE) employees, from the current budgeted level of 23 FTEs to 32 FTEs.

General Office Expenses – Decrease of \$0.3 million, or 15.3 percent, from the FY2015-16 Revised Budget of \$1.9 million to \$1.6 million mostly due to a one time need in the prior year for computer equipment and software.

Other Administration – Decrease of \$0.4 million, or 14.5 percent, from the FY2015-16 Revised Budget of \$2.9 million to \$2.5 million mostly related to a one-time need in the prior year for planning and development of the Comprehensive Investment Plan, Capital Project Delivery Plan and a project controls system.

Operations – Increase of \$3.1 million, or 444.9 percent, over the FY2015-16 Revised Budget of \$0.7 million related to the ramp up for operations of the I-580 Express Lanes which opened in February 2016.

Planning Expenditures – Decrease of \$2.1 million, or 50.6 percent, from the FY2015-16 Revised Budget of \$4.2 million to \$2.1 million due to the completion of long-range planning documents in the prior year, such as the Countywide Transportation Plan, Countywide Goods Movement Plan, Countywide Transit Plan, and Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan, as well as the elimination of internal funding sources in planning projects.

Programs Expenditures – Increase of \$4.9 million, or 2.7 percent, from the FY2015-16 Revised Budget of \$181.3 million to \$186.3 million mostly related to additional Direct Local Distributions due to higher projected sales tax revenues.

Capital Projects Expenditures – Decrease of \$137.4 million, or 72.0 percent, from the FY2015-16 Revised Budget of \$190.9 million to \$53.4 million due to the capital budget roll forward balances accounted for in the budgeted fund balance rolled from FY2015-16.

#### Limitation Ratios

The 2000 Measure B and 2014 Measure BB Salary and Benefits Limitation ratio and the Administrative Cost Limitation ratio were calculated based on the proposed budgeted revenues and expenditures and were found to be in compliance with requirements in the Transportation Expenditure Plans and the Public Utility Code.

#### **Fiscal Impact**

The fiscal impact of the FY2016-17 Proposed Consolidated Budget would be to provide resources of \$310.5 million and authorize expenditures of \$281.7 million, with an overall increase in fund balance of \$28.7 million for a projected ending fund balance of \$304.7 million.



## Attachments

- A. Alameda CTC FY2016-17 Proposed Consolidated Budget
- B. Congestion Management FY2016-17 Proposed Capital Projects Budget
- C. 1986 Measure B Sales Tax FY2016-17 Proposed Capital Projects Budget
- D. 2000 Measure B Sales Tax FY2016-17 Proposed Capital Projects Budget
- E. 2014 Measure BB Sales Tax FY2016-17 Proposed Capital Projects Budget

## Staff Contact

[Patricia Reavey](#), Director of Finance and Administration

[Seung Cho](#), Contracting, Administration and Fiscal Resource Manager

***This page intentionally left blank***

**Alameda County Transportation Commission  
Fiscal Year 2016-17 Proposed Budget**

	<b>General Funds</b>	<b>Enterprise Fund</b>	<b>Special Revenue Funds</b>	<b>Exchange Fund</b>	<b>Debt Service Fund</b>	<b>Capital Project Funds</b>	<b>Inter-Agency Adjustments/ Eliminations</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Projected Beginning Fund Balance</b>	\$ 36,934,023	\$ 981,250	\$ 47,075,326	\$ 4,929,549	\$ 9,165,442	\$ 176,897,808	\$ -	\$ 275,983,398
<b>Revenues:</b>								
Sales Tax Revenues	\$ 11,756,500	\$ -	\$ 168,682,809	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 96,260,691	\$ -	\$ 276,700,000
Investment Income	115,000	-	175,000	25,000	75,000	585,000	-	975,000
Member Agency Fees	1,394,819	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,394,819
VRF Funds	-	-	12,000,000	-	-	1,715,000	(1,715,000)	12,000,000
Toll Revenues	-	4,800,000	-	-	-	-	-	4,800,000
Other Revenues	13,166	-	31,250	-	20,770,000	1,463	(20,801,250)	14,629
Regional/State/Federal Grants	7,434,749	-	2,211,266	-	-	(962,257)	(161,279)	8,522,479
Local and Other Grants	2,980,525	-	7,763	7,851,791	-	8,083,953	(12,866,498)	6,057,533
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>23,694,759</b>	<b>4,800,000</b>	<b>183,108,088</b>	<b>7,876,791</b>	<b>20,845,000</b>	<b>105,683,850</b>	<b>(35,544,028)</b>	<b>310,464,460</b>
<b>Expenditures:</b>								
<u>Administration</u>								
Salaries and Benefits	1,729,383	-	-	-	-	78,564	-	1,807,948
General Office Expenses	1,442,464	-	3,000	-	-	146,234	(3,000)	1,588,698
Travel Expense	31,500	-	-	-	-	3,500	-	35,000
Debt Service	-	-	-	-	26,471,350	20,770,000	(20,770,000)	26,471,350
Other Administration	2,328,051	-	-	-	-	168,453	-	2,496,504
Commission and Community Support	247,050	-	28,250	-	-	-	(28,250)	247,050
Contingency	190,000	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	200,000
<u>Enterprise</u>								
Salaries and Benefits	-	224,174	-	-	-	-	-	224,174
Project Management and Support	-	315,000	-	-	-	-	-	315,000
Other Operating Expenditures	-	3,485,000	-	-	-	-	-	3,485,000
<u>Planning</u>								
Salaries and Benefits	939,123	-	-	-	-	-	-	939,123
Planning Management and Support	631,949	-	-	-	-	-	-	631,949
Transportation Planning	2,883,776	-	-	-	-	-	(1,805,419)	1,078,357
Congestion Management Program	455,000	-	-	-	-	-	(100,083)	354,917
Other Planning Projects	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Programs</u>								
Salaries and Benefits	395,116	-	1,431,672	62,643	-	-	(176,152)	1,713,279
Programs Management and Support	246,447	-	2,898,000	37,357	-	-	-	3,181,804
Safe Routes to School Programs	3,164,945	-	-	-	-	-	(402,372)	2,762,573
VRF Programming	-	-	12,680,000	-	-	-	-	12,680,000
Measure B/BB Direct Local Distribution	-	-	142,966,573	-	-	-	-	142,966,573
Grant Awards	-	-	11,766,288	-	-	-	-	11,766,288
Programming	135,000	-	5,192,806	7,751,791	-	-	(169,042)	12,910,554
<u>Capital Projects</u>								
Salaries and Benefits	-	-	-	-	-	488,601	(55,659)	432,942
Project Management and Support	-	-	-	-	-	2,364,643	-	2,364,643
Capital Project Expenditures	-	-	-	-	-	63,334,602	(12,265,862)	51,068,741
<u>Indirect Cost Recovery/Allocation</u>								
Indirect Cost Recovery from Capital, Spec Rev & Exch Funds	(231,811)	-	-	-	-	-	231,811	-
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>14,587,994</b>	<b>4,024,174</b>	<b>176,966,589</b>	<b>7,851,791</b>	<b>26,471,350</b>	<b>87,364,597</b>	<b>(35,544,028)</b>	<b>281,722,467</b>
<b>Net Change in Fund Balance</b>	<b>9,106,765</b>	<b>775,826</b>	<b>6,141,499</b>	<b>25,000</b>	<b>(5,626,350)</b>	<b>18,319,253</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>28,741,993</b>
<b>Projected Ending Fund Balance</b>	<b>46,040,788</b>	<b>1,757,076</b>	<b>53,216,825</b>	<b>4,954,549</b>	<b>3,539,092</b>	<b>195,217,061</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>304,725,391</b>
<b>Fund Balance/Operational Reserves</b>	<b>45,597,366</b>	<b>1,006,043</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>46,603,409</b>
<b>Available Fund Balance</b>	<b>\$ 443,422</b>	<b>\$ 751,033</b>	<b>\$ 53,216,825</b>	<b>\$ 4,954,549</b>	<b>\$ 3,539,092</b>	<b>\$ 195,217,061</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$ 258,121,982</b>

***This page intentionally left blank***

**Congestion Management  
FY2016-17  
Proposed Capital Project Budget**

Project Name	(A)	(B)	(A) - (B) = (C)	(D)	(C) + (D) = (E)	Funding Sources			
	Adopted FY 2015-16 Capital Budget	Estimated Expenditures	Estimated FY 2015-16 Rollover to FY 2016-17	Proposed FY 2016-17 Capital Budget	Proposed FY 2016-17 Capital Budget w/ Estimated Rollover	Total Local Funding Sources	Total Regional Funding Sources	Total State Funding Sources	Total Federal Funding Sources
I-580 San Leandro Soundwall/Landscape	\$ 37,822	\$ -	\$ 37,822	\$ -	\$ 37,822	\$ 26,288	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,534
Grand MacArthur	21,519	-	21,519	-	21,519	20,519	-	-	1,000
I-680 HOT Lane	2,990,954	133,292	2,857,662	-	2,857,662	2,259,646	-	5,692	592,324
I-680 Northbound HOV / Express Lane	7,105,005	4,189,002	2,916,002	6,000,000	8,916,002	6,892,897	-	2,023,105	-
I-80 Gilman Interchange Improvements	586,902	262,355	324,547	1,613,098	1,937,645	446,251	-	-	1,491,395
I-580 PSR at 106th Eastbound Off-Ramp	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Smart Corridors Operation and Maintenance	1,341,772	497,625	844,147	1,715,000	2,559,147	2,559,147	-	-	-
Smart Corridors Operation and Maintenance/Tri-Valley	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Caldecott Tunnel	3,571,660	1,200,000	2,371,660	250,000	2,621,660	2,621,660	-	-	-
Center to Center	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
I-880 North Safety & Op Improv 23rd&29th	5,702,218	1,615,950	4,086,267	-	4,086,267	2,651,528	1,404,270	26,189	4,280
I-580 Eastbound HOV Lane	2,667	-	2,667	-	2,667	-	2,667	-	-
I-580 Enviromental Mitigation	197,196	-	197,196	-	197,196	-	197,196	-	-
I-580 Eastbound Express (HOT) Lane	7,889,686	8,731,148	(841,463)	3,000,000	2,158,537	1,579,761	358,032	796,803	(576,059)
I-580 Eastbound Auxiliary (AUX) Lane	6,075,156	1,105,878	4,969,278	-	4,969,278	4,074,030	855,952	-	39,295
I-580 Right of Way Preservation	585,330	-	585,329.74	-	585,330	578,373	-	6,957	-
I-580 Westbound HOV Lane	2,816,482	823,557	1,992,924	303,993	2,296,918	2,178,917	-	118,000	-
I-580 Westbound HOT Lane	17,861,290	10,014,603	7,846,687	-	7,846,687	6,784,389	-	1,062,298	-
Altamont Commuter Express Operations	10,666	1,350	9,316	30,000	39,316	39,316	-	-	-
Altamont Commuter Express	1,613,148	1,463,602	149,546	1,550,862	1,700,408	1,248,578	-	451,830	-
I-880 Southbound HOV Lane	8,735,356	307,244	8,428,112	-	8,428,112	8,428,112	-	-	-
I-880 Southbound HOV Lane Landscaping/Hardscaping	670,320	18,401	651,919	-	651,919	15,787	-	-	636,132
Webster Street Smart Corridor	166,938	99,985	66,952	-	66,952	27,772	-	-	39,180
Marina Boulevard/I-880 PSR	9,677	-	9,677	-	9,677	9,677	-	-	-
I-680/880 Cross Connector PSR	340,493	-	340,493	-	340,493	340,493	-	-	-
I-680 SB HOV Lane	3,853,637	-	3,853,637	-	3,853,637	143,529	-	3,541,749	168,359
Route 84 Widening Project - Pigeon Pass to Interstate 680	2,547,979	785,211	1,762,768	-	1,762,768	1,762,768	-	-	-
I-80 Integrated Corridor Mobility	10,522,688	2,947,142	7,575,546	-	7,575,546	177,899	-	7,334,366	63,281
Project Management / Closeout	90,985	90,985	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<u>\$ 85,347,544</u>	<u>\$ 34,287,331</u>	<u>\$ 51,060,213</u>	<u>\$ 14,462,953</u>	<u>\$ 65,523,166</u>	<u>\$ 44,867,337</u>	<u>\$ 2,818,118</u>	<u>\$ 15,366,990</u>	<u>\$ 2,470,721</u>

***This page intentionally left blank***

**1986 Measure B Sales Tax  
Fiscal Year 2016-17  
Proposed Capital Project Budget**

	(A)	(B)	(A) - (B) = (C)	(D)	(C) + (D) = (E)
	Adopted FY 2015-16 Capital Budget	Estimated Expenditures	Estimated FY 2015-16 Rollover to FY 2016-17	Proposed FY 2016-17 Capital Budget	Proposed FY 2016-17 Capital Budget w/ Estimated Rollover
Project Name					
I-880 to Mission Blvd. Route 262 Interchange Reconstruction	\$ 556,499	\$ 58,000	\$ 498,499		\$ 498,499
I-880 to Mission Blvd. and East-West Connector	22,386,332	1,052,296	21,334,036		21,334,036
Route 238/Mission-Foothill-Jackson Corridor Improvement	142,000	-	142,000		142,000
I-580 Interchange Improvements Project in Castro Valley	13,696,924		13,696,924		13,696,924
Central Alameda County Freeway System Operational Analysis	630,596	2,000,000	(1,369,404)	2,370,000	1,000,596
Castro Valley Local Area Traffic Circulation Improvement	1,981,941		1,981,941		1,981,941
Project Closeout	231,030	83,200	147,830	1,149,007	1,296,837
	<u>\$ 39,625,323</u>	<u>\$ 3,193,497</u>	<u>\$ 36,431,826</u>	<u>\$ 3,519,007</u>	<u>\$ 39,950,834</u>

***This page intentionally left blank***



2000 Measure B Sales Tax  
FY2016-17  
Proposed Capital Project Budget

Project Name	(A)	(B)	(A) - (B) = (C)	(D)	(C) + (D) = (E) Proposed FY 2016-17 Capital Budget w/ Estimated Rollover	Funding Sources			
	Adopted FY 2015-16 Capital Budget	Estimated Expenditures	Estimated FY 2015-16 Rollover to FY 2016-17	Proposed FY 2016-17 Capital Budget		Total Local Funding Sources	Total Regional Funding Sources	Total State Funding Sources	Total Federal Funding Sources
ACE Capital Improvements	\$ 4,023,508	\$ 1,453,355	\$ 2,570,153	\$ -	\$ 2,570,153	\$ 2,570,152	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
BART Warm Springs Extension	10,450,000	6,836,473	3,613,527	-	3,613,527	3,613,527	-	-	-
BART Oakland Airport Connector	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Downtown Oakland Streetscape	3,128,945	-	3,128,945	-	3,128,945	3,128,945	-	-	-
Telegraph Avenue Bus Rapid Transit	131,449	131,449	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
I-680 Express Lane	14,113,745	3,420,930	10,692,815	-	10,692,815	10,692,815	-	-	-
Iron Horse Trail	3,000,000	-	3,000,000	3,267,000	6,267,000	6,267,000	-	-	-
I-880/Broadway-Jackson Interchange	2,383,594	1,400,000	983,594	-	983,594	983,594	-	-	-
I-580/Castro Valley Interchanges Improvements	(1,007,035)	871,805	(1,878,840)	1,878,840	-	-	-	-	-
Lewelling/East Lewelling	560,380	-	560,380	-	560,380	560,380	-	-	-
I-580 Auxiliary Lanes	1,230	-	1,230	-	1,230	1,230	-	-	-
I-580 Auxiliary Lanes - Westbound Fallon to Tassajara	7,210	-	7,210	-	7,210	7,210	-	-	-
I-580 Auxiliary Lanes - Westbound Airway to Fallon	1,887,000	507,955	1,379,045	-	1,379,045	1,379,045	-	-	-
I-580 Auxiliary Lanes - E/B El Charro to Airway	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rte 92/Clawiter-Whitesell Interchange	10,900,000	7,200,000	3,700,000	-	3,700,000	3,700,000	-	-	-
Hesperian/Lewelling Widening	599,622	-	599,622	-	599,622	599,622	-	-	-
Westgate Extension	470,400	47,432	422,968	-	422,968	422,968	-	-	-
E. 14th/Hesperian/150th Improvements	2,024,773	4,197	2,020,576	-	2,020,576	2,020,577	-	-	-
I-238 Widening	79,838	-	79,838	-	79,838	79,838	-	-	-
I-680/I-880 Cross Connector Study	371,500	-	371,500	-	371,500	371,499	-	-	-
Isabel - Route 84/I-580 Interchange	2,132,000	455,000	1,677,000	-	1,677,000	1,676,999	-	-	-
Route 84 Expressway	24,577,544	11,853,073	12,724,471	-	12,724,471	12,724,471	-	-	-
Dumbarton Corridor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dumbarton Corridor - Central Avenue Overpass	2,900,000	250,000	2,650,000	-	2,650,000	2,650,000	-	-	-
I-580 Corridor Improvements	12,763,946	19,129,513	(6,365,567)	12,000,000	5,634,433	5,634,433	-	-	-
I-80 Integrated Corridor Mobility	166,026	987	165,040	-	165,040	165,040	-	-	-
I-880 Corridor Improvements in Oakland and San Leandro	2,461,551	759,433	1,702,119	-	1,702,119	1,702,119	-	-	-
CWTP/TEP Development	48,689	48,689	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Studies at Congested Segments/Locations on CMP	275,812	-	275,812	-	275,812	275,812	-	-	-
Project Management / Closeout	6,257,201	6,257,201	0	190,046	190,046	190,046	-	-	-
	<u>\$ 104,708,927</u>	<u>\$ 60,627,490</u>	<u>\$ 44,081,437</u>	<u>\$ 17,335,886</u>	<u>\$ 61,417,323</u>	<u>\$ 61,417,321</u>	<u>\$ -</u>	<u>\$ -</u>	<u>\$ -</u>

***This page intentionally left blank***

**2014 Measure BB Sales Tax  
FY2016-17  
Proposed Capital Project Budget**

Project Name	(A)	(B)	(A) - (B) = (C)	(D)	(C) + (D) = (E)	Funding Sources			
	Adopted FY 2015-16 Capital Budget	Estimated Expenditures	Estimated FY 2015-16 Rollover to FY 2016-17	Proposed FY 2016-17 Capital Budget	Proposed FY 2016-17 Capital Budget w/ Estimated Rollover	Total Local Funding Sources	Total Regional Funding Sources	Total State Funding Sources	Total Federal Funding Sources
Telegraph Ave/East 14th/International Blvd Project	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Alameda to Fruitvale BART Rapid Bus	100,000	-	100,000	-	100,000	100,000	-	-	-
Grand/MacArthur BRT	100,000	-	100,000	-	100,000	100,000	-	-	-
College/Broadway Corridor Transit Priority	100,000	-	100,000	-	100,000	100,000	-	-	-
Irvington BART Station	100,000	-	100,000	-	100,000	100,000	-	-	-
Bay Fair Connector/BART METRO	100,000	-	100,000	-	100,000	100,000	-	-	-
BART Station Modernization and Capacity Program	100,000	-	100,000	-	100,000	100,000	-	-	-
BART to Livermore Extension, Phase 1	25,000	-	25,000	-	25,000	25,000	-	-	-
Dumbarton Corridor Area Transportation Improvements	100,000	-	100,000	-	100,000	100,000	-	-	-
Union City Intermodal Station	100,000	-	100,000	-	100,000	100,000	-	-	-
Railroad Corridor Right of Way Preservation and Track Improvements	100,000	-	100,000	-	100,000	100,000	-	-	-
Oakland Broadway Corridor Transit	100,000	-	100,000	-	100,000	100,000	-	-	-
Capitol Corridor Service Expansion	100,000	-	100,000	-	100,000	100,000	-	-	-
Congestion Relief, Local Bridge Seismic Safety	1,500,000	-	1,500,000	18,600,000	20,100,000	20,100,000	-	-	-
Countywide Freight Corridors	250,000	-	250,000	4,500,000	4,750,000	4,750,000	-	-	-
I-80 Gilman Street Interchange Improvements	1,500,000	68,462	1,431,538	270,000	1,701,538	1,701,538	-	-	-
I-80 Ashby Interchange Improvements	100,000	-	100,000	-	100,000	100,000	-	-	-
SR-84/I-680 Interchange and SR-84 Widening	4,000,000	-	4,000,000	-	4,000,000	4,000,000	-	-	-
SR-84 Expressway Widening (Pigeon Pass to Jack London)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
I-580/I-680 Interchange Improvements	100,000	-	100,000	-	100,000	100,000	-	-	-
I-580 Local Interchange Improvement Program	300,000	-	300,000	-	300,000	300,000	-	-	-
I-680 HOT/HOV Lane from SR-237 to Alcosta	2,000,000	-	2,000,000	-	2,000,000	2,000,000	-	-	-
I-880 NB HOV/HOT Extension from A Street to Hegenberger	100,000	-	100,000	-	100,000	100,000	-	-	-
I-880 Broadway/Jackson Multimodal Transportation and Circulation Improvements	25,000	-	25,000	-	25,000	25,000	-	-	-
I-880 Whipple Road/Industrial Parkway Southwest Interchange Improvements	100,000	-	100,000	-	100,000	100,000	-	-	-
I-880 Industrial Parkway Interchange Improvements	100,000	-	100,000	-	100,000	100,000	-	-	-
I-880 Local Access and Safety Improvements	2,550,000	-	2,550,000	7,500,000	10,050,000	10,050,000	-	-	-
Gap Closure on Three Major Trails	3,676,525	236,634	3,439,892	-	3,439,892	2,325,196	-	-	1,114,695
	<u>\$ 17,426,525</u>	<u>\$ 305,095</u>	<u>\$ 17,121,430</u>	<u>\$ 30,870,000</u>	<u>\$ 47,991,430</u>	<u>\$ 46,876,735</u>	<u>\$ -</u>	<u>\$ -</u>	<u>\$ 1,114,695</u>

***This page intentionally left blank***



# Memorandum

6.4

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• 510.208.7400

• www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** June 23, 2016

**SUBJECT:** Delegation of Authority To Handle Claims Made Against Alameda County Transportation Commission

**RECOMMENDATION:** Adopt a resolution Delegating To The Executive Director Certain Authority To Handle Claims Made Under The Government Claims Act Against Alameda County Transportation Commission.

## Summary

Tort claims against Alameda CTC and other California government entities are governed by the Government Claims Act (Act). The Act allows the Commission to delegate authority to an agency employee to review, reject, allow, settle, or compromise tort claims pursuant to a resolution adopted by the Commission. If the authority is delegated to an employee, that employee can only reject claims or allow, settle, or compromise claims \$50,000 or less. The decision to allow, settle, or compromise claims over \$50,000 must continue to go before the Commission for review and approval.

California Government Code section 935.4 states:

"A charter provision, or a local public entity by ordinance or resolution, may authorize an employee of the local public entity to perform those functions of the governing body of the public entity under this part that are prescribed by the local public entity, but only a charter provision may authorize that employee to allow, compromise, or settle a claim against the local public entity if the amount to be paid pursuant to the allowance, compromise or settlement exceeds fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000). A Charter provision, ordinance, or resolution may provide that, upon the written order of that employee, the auditor or other fiscal officer of the local public entity shall cause a warrant to be issued upon the treasury of the local public entity in the amount for which a claim has been allowed, compromised, or settled."

It is in Alameda CTC's best interest to act expeditiously on claims. Therefore staff is recommending that the Commission exercise its right under section 935.4 of the California Government Code to facilitate timely resolution of claims and delegate authority to the Executive Director to reject baseless claims, and to take appropriate action on other claims that do not exceed \$50,000.

This item was unanimously approved by the Finance and Administration Committee with the additional requirement for staff to bring reports back to the Commission on a quarterly basis regarding actions taken by the Executive Director in relation to the delegation of authority for claims submitted in amounts up to \$50,000 during each quarter.

## **Background**

There have only been a small handful of claims filed against Alameda CTC and its predecessors over the years, and many of these claims were erroneously filed, and should have been filed with other agencies (such as Alameda County, AC Transit, and Caltrans). As staff moves forward with the implementation of Measure BB, Alameda CTC may experience an increase in claims against the agency as Alameda CTC puts more projects on the streets and highways of Alameda County and as Alameda CTC's name is recognized as a funding agency on these projects. Staff desires the ability to work directly with the agency's insurance provider, the Special District Risk Management Authority (SDRMA), when claims are received so that responsibility may be determined promptly and they might be resolved expediently or referred to the appropriate agency. This can save Alameda CTC money because when working with the SDRMA directly, much of the legal costs to address these claims will be covered by insurance.

In addition, the Act provides fairly short timeframes within which an agency must evaluate and act on claims. For example, if Alameda CTC does not respond to a claim within 45 days, the claim is deemed rejected by operation of law. It would be difficult to determine validity of a claim, conduct due diligence, and present the matter to the Commission for review and approval prior to the 45-day deadline for taking action.

As noted above, many of the claims received by Alameda CTC have been filed in error. To address this issue, staff has created a claim form that is posted on our website that requires the claimant to provide a significant amount of detailed information that will help the agency to quickly determine if the claim is truly Alameda CTC's responsibility. As such, it would be more efficient if the Commission were to implement section 935.4 of the Government Code so that the Executive Director could quickly reject these types of mistakenly filed claims without having to go before the Commission for approval to have them rejected. It also would expedite the process of working with the SDRMA if staff could directly address smaller claims, those \$50,000 and under. Any claim in an amount above \$50,000 would continue to be brought before the Commission for review and approval before a settlement or compromise could take place.

## **Fiscal Impact**

There is no fiscal impact to the approval of this item.

## **Attachments**

- A. Resolution Delegating To The Executive Director Certain Authority To Handle Claims Made Under The Government Claims Act Against The Alameda County Transportation Commission

## **Staff Contact**

[Patricia Reavey](#), Director of Finance and Administration

***This page intentionally left blank***





## ALAMEDA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

### RESOLUTION 16-007

#### Commission Chair

Vice Mayor Rebecca Kaplan,  
City of Oakland

#### Commission Vice Chair

Mayor Bill Harrison,  
City of Fremont

#### AC Transit

Director Elsa Ortiz

#### Alameda County

Supervisor Scott Haggerty, District 1  
Supervisor Richard Valle, District 2  
Supervisor Wilma Chan, District 3  
Supervisor Nate Miley, District 4  
Supervisor Keith Carson, District 5

#### BART

Director Rebecca Saltzman

#### City of Alameda

Mayor Trish Spencer

#### City of Albany

Mayor Peter Maass

#### City of Berkeley

Councilmember Laurie Capitelli

#### City of Dublin

Mayor David Haubert

#### City of Emeryville

Councilmember Ruth Atkin

#### City of Hayward

Mayor Barbara Halliday

#### City of Livermore

Mayor John Marchand

#### City of Newark

Councilmember Luis Freitas

#### City of Oakland

Councilmember Dan Kalb

#### City of Piedmont

Mayor Margaret Fujioka

#### City of Pleasanton

Mayor Jerry Thorne

#### City of San Leandro

Mayor Pauline Cutter

#### City of Union City

Mayor Carol Dufra-Vernaci

#### Executive Director

Arthur L. Dao

### DELEGATING TO THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CERTAIN AUTHORITY TO HANDLE CLAIMS MADE UNDER THE GOVERNMENT CLAIMS ACT AGAINST ALAMEDA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

**WHEREAS**, the Government Claims Act (California Government Code sections 810-996.6) (the "Act") sets forth the procedures for the presentation and handling of any claims made pursuant to the Act against the Alameda County Transportation Commission ("Alameda CTC"); and

**WHEREAS**, Government Code section 935.4 permits Alameda CTC to delegate certain authority with respect to handling claims presented to Alameda CTC pursuant to the Act; and

**WHEREAS**, Alameda CTC desires to fully utilize all available procedures set forth in the Act to ensure that claims presented to Alameda CTC are handled in accordance with current laws and are processed in a timely manner; and

**WHEREAS**, Alameda CTC staff has proposed that Alameda CTC's governing body (the "Commission") delegate to the Executive Director the authority to timely reject, accept, compromise, or settle certain claims as permitted by the Act.

### NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

Section 1: The Commission hereby authorizes the Executive Director to exercise his or her authority to reject any claim presented to Alameda CTC pursuant to the Act, which the Executive Director determines is not a proper claim against Alameda CTC.

Section 2: The Commission hereby authorizes the Executive Director to exercise his or her authority to allow, compromise, or settle any claim presented to Alameda CTC pursuant to the Act, which the Executive Director determines is a proper claim against Alameda CTC, if the amount of the claim does not exceed \$50,000.00.

Section 3: An action taken by the Executive Director pursuant to Sections 1 or 2 of the resolution shall have the same force and effect as if it were taken by the Commission.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Commission of the Alameda County

Transportation Commission on June 30, 2016, by the following vote:

AYES:            NOES:            ABSTAIN:        ABSENT:

**SIGNED:**

**ATTEST:**

---

Rebecca Kaplan  
Chair, Alameda CTC

---

Vanessa Lee  
Clerk of the Commission



# Memorandum

6.5

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• 510.208.7400

• www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** June 23, 2016

**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 in May 2016, the Alameda CTC reviewed a Draft Environmental Impact Report. Comments were submitted on this document and the comment letter is included as Attachment A.

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

## Attachments:

- A. Response to Draft Environmental Impact Report for City of Fremont's Ardenwood Technology Park Planned District Amendment

## Staff Contact

[Tess Lengyel](#), Deputy Director of Planning and Policy

[Daniel Wu](#), Assistant Transportation Planner

***This page intentionally left blank***



April 21, 2016

Steve Kowalski  
City of Fremont, Planning Division  
39550 Liberty Street  
Fremont, CA 94538

SUBJECT: Response to Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for City of Fremont's Ardenwood Technology Park Planned District Amendment

Dear Mr. Kowalski,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Ardenwood Technology Park Planned District Amendment. The project site is 32 parcels totaling approximately 147.7 acres bounded generally by Paseo Padre Parkway to the southwest, Kaiser Drive to the northwest, Ardenwood Boulevard to the northeast and State Route 84 (SR 84) to the southeast in the City of Fremont. The proposed project would rezone the 32 existing industrial parcels located within a portion of the Ardenwood Technology Park to allow the current maximum allowable Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for those parcels to be increased from a range of 0.35 to 0.45 to a range of 0.55 to 0.75. This would result in a net increase in building area of 1,722,754 square feet from currently allowed proposed FAR, and a net increase in building area of 2,587,560 square feet from existing building area.

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

- The Alameda CTC's CMP requires that the DEIR address potential impacts to not only roadways on the Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS) network, but also potential impacts of the project on MTS transit operators (AC Transit in this case), Countywide Bicycle Network, and Pedestrian Areas of Countywide Significance. The language in page 4.D-11 should incorporate this multimodal nature of Alameda CTC's CMP requirement.
- The Alameda CTC's CMP does not establish significance analysis thresholds for designated roadways. Please modify the language on page 4.D-14, Appendix E – page 1, and Appendix E-page 3 to reflect that.
- The CMP requires studying impacts to roadways on the 2002 Metropolitan Transportation System, which includes the following roadways around the project site: I-880, SR-84, Ardenwood Boulevard, Decoto Road, and Paseo Padre Parkway.
  - Please modify the language on page 4.D-15 and Appendix-page 3 to reflect that arterial segments are also part of the Alameda CTC CMP analysis.
  - Please include segments of Ardenwood Boulevard and Paseo Parkway in all segment Levels of Service (LOS) analyses.
- Alameda CTC noted that the DEIR used the traffic model prepared for the City of Fremont's General Plan 2035 adopted in 2011. For the purpose of the CMP's land use analysis, the most recent Alameda CTC travel model (updated in 2014) should be used. Please note that since 2011, Alameda CTC has updated its travel model to reflect the land use and transportation

assumptions updated in the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Plan Bay Area. For more information about this updated model, please visit Alameda CTC's Travel Demand Model webpage: [http://www.alamedactc.org/app\\_pages/view/8079](http://www.alamedactc.org/app_pages/view/8079).

- One of Alameda CTC's policy for mitigation measures to be considered adequate is full funding. Alameda CTC noted that:
  - The DEIR's cumulative conditions assumed that mitigation measures identified in the City of Fremont's General Plan Mitigation Monitoring Program would be implemented by 2035.
  - In the cumulative plus project scenario, the EIR proposed mitigation measures that would have to be funded by project applicants.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this DEIR. Please contact me at (510) 208-7428 or Daniel Wu of my staff at (510) 208-7453 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Tess Lengyel  
Deputy Director of Planning and Policy

cc: Daniel Wu, Assistant Transportation Planner  
file: CMP/Environmental Review Opinions/2016



# Memorandum

6.6

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• 510.208.7400

• www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** June 23, 2016

**SUBJECT:** Final Alameda Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approve Final Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan

## Summary

Arterial roadways are the backbone of Alameda County's transportation system, moving people and goods within the county and the region. These roadways provide regional and local mobility for multiple transportation modes, access to surrounding land uses, and connectivity between employment and activity centers that is essential for Alameda County's economy and quality of life. Alameda CTC has been working since Fall 2014 developing a Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan (MAP), a first of its kind that will provide a framework for addressing needs for all modes on the county's arterials.

The MAP development has been closely coordinated with local jurisdictions, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), transit operators, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and non-agency members representing all modes. It developed typology, a classification of the arterials based on the modes they support and the land uses they serve, for the major arterials and identified modal priorities, and ultimately provides recommendations for potential short and long-term multimodal transportation infrastructure improvements, based on the multimodal needs estimated to accommodate the multimodal travel demand growth in Alameda County. This staff report presents the Final Multimodal Arterial Plan, including short- and long-term multimodal improvements and complementary operational and demand management strategies.


## Discussion

The Arterials Plan that studied 1,200 miles of major arterials, essentially provides a high-level framework for a Complete Streets Network that the jurisdictions can use and build upon to meet the state and regional complete streets requirements. In February 2015, the Commission approved the vision, goals, and multimodal performance measures for the MAP. The Vision of the MAP aims to develop a network of efficient, safe and accessible arterials that facilitate the multimodal movement of people and goods, and help create a strong economy, healthy environment and vibrant communities, considering local context. The Plan

ultimately intends to provide a connected and continuous countywide network for all modes.


The Plan development adopted a bottom-up approach (see Figure 1) by building on the existing related efforts locally and at the county level and by closely working with the stakeholders throughout the Plan development process. This Plan coordinates with and supports the outcome of the Countywide Goods Movement and Transit Plans.

Figure 1 – Building on Existing Efforts



After adoption of the Vision and Goals, the project team worked with agency and non-agency stakeholders to develop a typology framework (Figure 2) – a classification of the arterials that reflected the surrounding land use context and identified the role and needs of various modes on these roads. This typology framework informed prioritization of various modes on the arterials. The Typology and Modal Priority development process received about 700 comments from the stakeholders strengthening the value of the Plan for the local agencies. The Commission approved the MAP's typology framework and modal priorities in October 2015.


Figure 2 – Typology – A Review of All Modes and Integrating Land Use





Using the adopted performance measures and the modal priorities for the arterials, the project team identified needs of various modes on the arterial roadways. This needs assessment informed the development of draft proposed improvements for various modes on 510 miles of core arterials, known as the Arterial Network. The plan development process including the improvements identification are illustrated in Figure 3 below.

**Figure 3 – Arterial Plan Development Process**



These draft proposed improvements were discussed and reviewed during a series of small group and one-on-one meetings with the jurisdictions, transit agencies, and Caltrans from February 29<sup>th</sup> through March 7<sup>th</sup>. Agency stakeholders provided more than 300 comments regarding the MAP's draft proposed improvements. The project team addressed these comments and updated the draft improvements (grouped into short- and long-term improvements) that are being presented to the Commission for approval as part of the final Multimodal Arterial Plan in June 2016. The following are the highlights of the proposed multimodal improvements in the Final Plan on the 510 miles of the arterial network:

- Transit Network improvements primarily focused on the AC Transit and LAVTA major corridors. About 38 miles of transit lanes and 52 miles of Rapid Bus improvements are proposed that will support the Transit outcomes as described above in the Countywide Transit Plan.
- About half of the Arterial Network (230 miles) was identified as having high bicycle priority, and over 140 miles of separated or protected bicycle lanes are proposed, advancing connections to transit, improving safety and increasing non-motorized share of transportation.
- Over 230 miles of pedestrian improvements are proposed including new sidewalk or widening of existing sidewalks, streetscape improvements for improved safety, and crosswalk enhancements. These improvements focus on high-pedestrian emphasis areas (downtowns and large commercial districts) and around BART station areas and high capacity transit corridors to increase safety and improve access to transit and activity centers.
- Advanced Intelligent Transportation System including connected vehicles option has been identified for nearly 150 miles, which will support goods movement and transit improvements described above, and improve travel efficiency and reliability.

- Accommodation of truck traffic proposed on top tier arterial goods movement routes, supporting innovative goods movement delivery identified in the Goods Movement Plan.

The Plan also presents operational and demand management strategies regarding Transportation Demand Management (TDM), parking, and climate change and resiliency. Finally, the Plan is one of - if not the first - plan in the Bay Area and beyond to suggest strategies for responding to technological changes such as connected and autonomous vehicles and Transportation Network Companies.

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

**Attachments:**

- A. [Final Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan](#) *(hyperlinked to the website)*

**Staff Contact**

[Tess Lengyel](#), Deputy Director of Planning and Policy

[Saravana Suthanthira](#), Senior Transportation Planner

[Daniel Wu](#), Assistant Transportation Planner



# Memorandum

6.7

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

510.208.7400

www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** June 23, 2016

**SUBJECT:** Final Alameda Countywide Transit Plan

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approve the Final Alameda Countywide Transit

Plan.

## Summary

The first stand-alone Countywide Transit Plan identifies a vision for a comprehensive countywide transit network designed to support Alameda County's needs now and in 2040. The Countywide Transit Plan provides a framework for bringing a fast, frequent, and reliable transit network to fruition. This framework will allow Alameda CTC to target future transit programs, policies, and investments to better capture the growing demand for transit throughout the County.

Alameda County has a mature transit network, with robust service coverage to most of Alameda County communities. Therefore, Transit Plan network recommendations were not intended to focus on identifying new routes; rather, based on market analyses, these recommendations intend to identify a framework to guide investments in the transit corridors that have the potential to capture the greatest market share of transit riders throughout the county.

The Transit Plan targets a set of improvements in 14 corridors that are most likely to carry some of the strongest future demand for transit. The identification of these corridors was based upon a market analyses and is intended to serve primarily as a guidepost for maximizing future transit investments in the county. The Transit Plan also outlines a set of network recommendations with the types of improvements that can enable fast, frequent, and reliable service to capture ridership demand and address the unique needs of each corridor. All recommendations will require extensive further development and evaluation by operating agencies and local jurisdictions before implementation.

The Plan has been informed by ongoing interagency coordination, stakeholder input, and extensive public outreach efforts. The Countywide Transit Plan is designed to build upon and relate to a variety of recent and ongoing planning activities in the county and region.

On May 26, 2016 the Commission unanimously adopted the Draft plan.

## Background

Alameda County's mature transit network is critical to supporting the economy, the environment and the quality of life. To strengthen this transit network the Countywide Transit Plan employed a market-based approach to identify the most critical needs, challenges and opportunities for our existing and future transit network.

Since March 2014, when development of the plan got underway, Alameda CTC has:

- (1) Identified transit needs and opportunities through an assessment of existing trends and forecasted future conditions;
- (2) Defined a vision and goals for the plan;
- (3) Identified transit service tiers and corridors for transit investments through performance-based planning and evaluation;
- (4) Approved Draft Network Recommendations and performance measures;
- (5) Completed a quantitative and qualitative evaluation of network recommendations using adopted performance measures;
- (6) Developed a complementary paratransit strategy;
- (7) Developed complementary guidelines for building transit-oriented communities; and finally
- (8) Developed a financial plan and a set of strategies for moving the Final Network Recommendations forward.

The Countywide Transit Plan will position the county, its jurisdictions and transit operators to pursue upcoming funding opportunities, including the FAST Act, Cap and trade grants, and other funding opportunities that may become available in the planning horizon to support the network recommendations, fulfilling the vision and goals of the Transit Plan.

## Vision and Goals

Alameda CTC adopted a focused transit vision: *Create an efficient and effective transit network that enhances the economy and the environment while improving the quality of life in Alameda County.* This vision led to the development of seven goals focused on the issues that are central to creating an effective transit system. These goals are also intended to help Alameda CTC determine where transit investments will go farthest in serving transit needs. The goals include:

- **Increase Transit Mode Share:** The goal supports increasing per capita transit ridership, and reducing dependence on auto travel on a per capita basis.
- **Increase System Effectiveness:** This goal supports achieving a more financially sustainable transit system whereby supply matches demand by location, service type, frequency, time of day and day of week.
- **Increase the Effectiveness of Inter-Regional Transit Travel:** Alameda County is a key gateway to and from the San Francisco Bay Area with a significant portion of inter-regional trips beginning or ending in, or passing through Alameda County. This goal supports more effective inter-regional transit service to shift some of these inter-

regional trips from roads and highways onto rail, bus and shuttle transit services by making transit more competitive.

- **Increase Cost Efficiency:** The cost of transit service is outpacing service and ridership growth. This goal supports using funds as efficiently as possible to maintain current transit service levels, as well as to increase frequency and service hours.
- **Improve Access to Work, Education, Services, and Recreation:** The transit system should make it easy for all people to travel without reliance on private automobiles. This goal supports improving transit with development of a coordinated transit network that integrates modes, routes, schedules, service periods, fares and fare payment types to provide fast, reliable connections between major residential populations and activity centers. Additionally, the potential to capture more trips on transit can be improved by promoting land use patterns that provide a mix of uses and greater density around transit hubs and or activity centers. A focus on improving pedestrian and bicycle access from the catchment area of transit stops and stations is also important in improving access.
- **Reduce Emissions:** Transportation is the single largest contributor to emissions (greenhouse gases and air pollutants<sup>1</sup>). This goal supports creating an accessible, reliable, safe and efficient transit network, so that transit can capture a larger mode share, resulting in less reliance on SOV driving. Shifting travel from cars to transit can help reduce emissions, provide a more environmentally sustainable transportation system, and enhance the quality of life and the environment in Alameda County.
- **Achieve a State of Good Repair:** To provide a safe and reliable transit experience for the user, the transit system needs to be in good working condition. This goal support both the maintenance of existing transit facilities and fleets.

## Regional and County Planning Context

The Countywide Transit Plan is designed to build upon planning efforts in the county and region. Among the most relevant efforts are:

- Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) Transit Sustainability Project (TSP)
- AC Transit's Major Corridors Study (MCS)
- LAVTA/Wheels' Comprehensive Operations Analysis
- Alameda CTC's Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan
- Alameda CTC's Countywide Goods Movement Collaborative and Plan

In addition, the Countywide Transit Plan recognizes that there are many other transit studies and plans underway, including those sponsored by MTC (e.g., Core Capacity Study), Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART), Altamont Corridor Express (ACE), San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA), Capitol Corridor and WETA. The Countywide Transit Plan acknowledges these efforts, but will not make recommendations on these specific studies, because independent detailed analyses of these potential improvements

---

<sup>1</sup> Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008.

are underway.

## Challenges and Opportunities

The county's land use characteristics, population density, economic vitality, and travel patterns provide strong market conditions for transit. The robust and mature transit network, and the presence of strong transit markets, however, has not translated to high transit ridership. More than half of all trips take place in transit competitive markets, yet only 14 percent of commute trips currently take place on transit. Trends of population and employment growth point towards an increasing demand for transit in future. Increasing transit mode share will be critical for accommodating forecasted growth and for serving mobility needs in an environmentally sustainable manner.

While Alameda County has market conditions supportive of a greater share of transit trips, there are significant obstacles to overcome. The following indicate that improvements are necessary system-wide:

- **Transit mode share is not consistent with market analysis of demand:** Despite the high overall transit competitive markets identified in the plan, transit currently captures only 11% of commute trips in the county.
- **Transit ridership has remained flat for intra-county trips:** Where transit markets are strong and transit service is frequent, reliable, and highly competitive with vehicle travel times, such as the East Bay-San Francisco Transbay corridor, transit ridership has grown significantly. However, bus ridership within Alameda County declined between 2006 and 2012 and then remained relatively flat through 2015.
- **System-wide operating costs are increasing faster than ridership:** This trend will inevitably result in a lack of sustainability for operators to continue to provide high levels of service. However, the county's ability to accommodate new residents and support environmental goals requires that transit stay competitive and grow its share of the overall transportation market.
- **Congestion affects on-time performance and bus operating speeds:** Buses stuck in traffic causes longer travel times and unreliable service for customers; this affects both ridership and the financial sustainability of the bus operators. As operating speeds get slower, more vehicles and drivers are required merely to maintain current frequencies. Simultaneously the service becomes less attractive, resulting in lower ridership and worse productivity. Close coordination between local jurisdictions and transit operators is critical to address this challenge.

## Transit Network Recommendations

The Countywide Transit Plan's network recommendations and strategies were developed based on an extensive assessment of the underlying market conditions and location characteristics and are intended to address the challenges described above. The

resulting recommendations identify a network of transit corridors throughout the county that have the potential to capture the greatest market share of transit riders.

The 14 corridors that are included in the Vision Network were developed in response to the evaluation of current transit service, current and forecasted transit market conditions. The evaluation was also informed by other on-going planning studies. It is important to note that Alameda County is a mature transit network, with robust service coverage to most of Alameda County communities. Therefore, Transit Plan network recommendations were not intended to focus on identifying new routes; rather, based on market analyses, these recommendations intend to identify a framework to guide investments in the transit corridors that have the potential to capture the greatest market share of transit riders throughout the county. This information helps to inform where transit funding investments can be made to capture increases in the transit rideshare market.

Further, network capital improvements are identified that can facilitate improved frequency and reliability of services. These recommendations focus on a network of corridors, and this plan recognizes that a critical next step to moving forward will be to focus on specific corridor improvements that can be linked to arterials improvements as identified in Alameda CTC's Multi-modal Arterial Plan and to projects identified in the 2014 Transportation Expenditure Plan. Agency partnerships and public and business outreach will be essential for moving forward any of the recommendations included in this plan. The Plan includes complementary strategies for addressing needs of paratransit services, and design guidelines for transit oriented communities.

In order to accommodate anticipated population and job growth in Alameda County and achieve greenhouse gas emission goals, the efficient and effective transit network envisioned by the Transit Plan is an absolute necessity. Achieving this will require ongoing efforts and partnerships to address the following topics as detailed in the Plan:

- **Improve the efficiency** so that cost increases do not exceed the rate of inflation and that the benefit of dollars invested in transit operations and capital is maximized.
- **Increase investment in transit** to fully develop the corridors identified in the Countywide Transit Plan and to provide the highest levels of service (frequency, span, and coverage) that population and employment densities can support throughout the County.
- **Improve integration of transit service among operators** to provide a truly seamless travel experience for all transit customers regardless of their origin or destination. This includes coordinated routes and schedules, easy to access information of all services provided regardless of operator or mode, and a single payment system using smart cards and mobile payment that do not penalize a customer who needs to transfer between vehicles or providers.
- **Improve integration between transit providers and local, regional, and state**

**government** to construct and maintain infrastructure that provides for fast and reliable transit service supported by high quality pedestrian and bicycle access to transit stations and stops.

The Alameda County transit market shows potential for transit use that is significantly higher than actual ridership. Population and employment growth will only make this potential higher. The Transit Plan has outlined transit improvements that allow transit to fulfill its promised potential. This approach is fundamental to meeting Alameda CTC and the region's economic and environmental goals.

Staff recommends approval of the Final Countywide Transit Plan.

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

### **Attachments**

- A. [Final Countywide Transit Plan](#) *(hyperlinked to the website)*

### **Staff Contacts**

[Tess Lengyel](#), Deputy Director of Planning and Policy





# Memorandum

6.8

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• PH: (510) 208-7400

• www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** June 26, 2016

**SUBJECT:** FY 2014-2015 Measure B/Measure BB and Vehicle Registration Fee Program Compliance Reports and Exemption Requests

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approve FY 2014-2015 Measure B/Measure BB and Vehicle Registration Fee Program Compliance Reports and the exemption requests from the Timely Use of Funds Policy.

## Summary

Each year, Alameda CTC requires recipients of Measure B, Measure BB, and Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) Direct Local Distribution (DLD) funds to submit audited financial statements and program compliance reports to document the receipt and use of DLD funds. Alameda CTC, in conjunction with the Independent Watchdog Committee, reviews these reports to verify DLD funds are expended in compliance with the voter approved transportation expenditure plans and Alameda CTC's Master Programs Funding agreement (MPFA) requirements. Alameda CTC prepares Program Compliance Reports which includes a review of the fiscal year's DLD investments, fund balances and a compliance determination.

This year's compliance reporting period is for Fiscal Year 2014-15 (FY14-15). All DLD recipients submitted the required audited financial statements and compliance reports that complied with the reporting requirements. Two DLD recipients requested exemptions from the Timely Use of Funds Policy as a result of project delays. Upon the Commission's approval of the exemption requests, all Measure B/Measure BB/VRF Direct Local Distribution recipients are found to be in compliance with the DLD requirements.

## Background

Alameda CTC is responsible for administering the Measure B, Measure BB and the VRF Programs. Annually, Alameda CTC distributes over half of all revenues generated by these programs to twenty eligible recipients as Direct Local Distributions (DLD) for local transportation improvement programs. From the beginning of each program to the end of FY14-15, Alameda CTC distributed approximately \$818.0 million in combined DLD funds to eligible recipients (\$775.6 million in Measure B, \$13.4 million in Measure BB, and \$29.0 million in VRF) for local transportation (streets and road), bicycle/pedestrian, transit, and paratransit programs. The eligible recipients include twenty jurisdictions consisting of the

fourteen cities, the County, and five transit agencies providing transportation improvements and services in Alameda County.

For FY14-15, Alameda CTC distributed approximately \$90.3 million in total DLD funds for the respective programs identified in the table below.

<b>Total FY14-15 Distributions By Program (\$ in Millions)</b>				
<b>DLD Program</b>	<b>Measure B</b>	<b>Measure BB</b>	<b>VRF</b>	<b>Total</b>
Local Transportation (Local Streets and Roads)	\$ 27.6	\$ 5.0	\$7.4	\$40.0
Transit	\$ 26.2	\$ 5.4		\$31.6
Paratransit	\$ 11.1	\$ 2.2		\$13.3
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$ 4.6	\$ 0.8		\$5.4
<b>Total FY 14-15 DLD</b>	<b>\$ 69.5</b>	<b>\$13.4</b>	<b>\$7.4</b>	<b>\$90.3</b>

*Note: Measure BB collections began on April 1, 2015 and distributions represent the last quarter of FY 14-15 only.*

The Master Programs Funding Agreements (MPFAs) between Alameda CTC and the recipients authorizes the distribution of formula funds to the recipients and specifies expenditure requirements. Each year, recipients are required to submit audited financial statements and program compliance reports to confirm DLD annual receipts, expenditures and the completion of reporting obligations. This year's compliance reporting period is for FY14-15 from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015.

The reports capture DLD recipients' annual reporting deliverables including:

- Annual revenues, interest, expenditures and fund balances
- Publication of a newsletter article, website coverage, and signage
- Current Pavement Condition Index for the agency's roadways
- Documentation of current Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plans
- Documentation of Measure BB Local Streets and Roads investments on bicycle/pedestrian improvements
- Adherence to Timely Use of Funds and Reserve Policies
- Program implementation plans of available fund balances

For the FY14-15 reporting year, all DLD recipients submitted the required compliance reports and audited financial statements by the required deadlines in December 2015. Alameda CTC staff, in collaboration with the Independent Watchdog Committee, reviewed the recipients' expenditures to determine eligibility and program compliance. The Program Compliance Reports summarize the recipients' FY 14-15 DLD investments, fund balances and compliance determination (*Attachment A and B*).

#### FY 14-15 Fund Balances and Monitoring

Through the program compliance process, Alameda CTC monitors the recipients' end of year fund balances to ensure DLD funds are used expeditiously on transportation improvements so that more immediate benefits may be realized by the public. The FY14-15 ending fund balance across all DLD recipients by program is as follows:

- Measure B: \$42.1 million; this represents a \$1.3 million decrease from the prior year.
- VRF: \$9.3 million; this represents a \$0.2 million increase from the prior year.
- Measure BB: \$12.5 million; due to the timing of initial distributions, recipients reported limited expenditures in FY14-15.

Alameda CTC uses the DLD Reserve Policies and Monitoring Procedures to guide the administration and review of the fund balances. Per the requirements, recipients are required to 1) identify a plan to use the balances within the upcoming fiscal year, or 2) establish fund reserves that must be expended within four years. For the annual implementation plan, Alameda CTC requires that the recipient meet an actual expenditure threshold of 70 percent or greater of the plan identified. Recipients who do not meet these requirements must seek an exemption approved by the Commission.

For the FY14-15 reporting year, Alameda CTC received exemption requests from the Cities of Albany and Emeryville, both whom are seeking exemptions from the Timely Use of Funds Policy that requires recipients to expend 70 percent or greater of the annual implementation plan (*Attachment C*). As required, each agency has provided a Request for Exemption Letter (*Attachment D*) that explains their fund balances and provides a corrective plan to use the funds in the following fiscal year (FY 2015-16). The cities cited project delays and revised plans that resulted in actual expenditures that were less than originally planned. The cities indicated the issues have been resolved and expenditures on the unspent balances are being incurred in FY 15-16. Thus, staff recommends the Commission approve the exemption requests from the Timely Use of Funds Policy.

Upon the approval of the exemption requests, all Measure B/Measure BB/VRF Direct Local Distribution recipients are found to be in compliance with the programs' requirements.

**Fiscal Impact:** There is no significant fiscal impact expected to result from the recommended action.

## Attachments

- A. Measure B/Measure BB Program Compliance Report FY 2014-15
- B. Vehicle Registration Fee Program Compliance Report FY 2014-15
- C. Summary of Exemptions for Agencies with balances of greater than 30 percent
- D. Timely Use of Funds Policy Exemption Request Letters

## Staff Contact

[John Nguyen](#), Senior Transportation Planner

***This page intentionally left blank***





## Measure B/Measure BB

### Direct Local Distributions

### Program Compliance Report

Fiscal Year 2014-2015



Alameda County Transportation Commission  
1111 Broadway Suite 800  
Oakland, CA 94607  
[www.AlamedaCTC.org](http://www.AlamedaCTC.org)

DRAFT JUNE 2016



Table of Contents



Introduction . . . . . 3

Direct Local Distribution Program Revenues . . . . . 4

Direct Local Distribution Program Expenditures . . . . . 5

Revenues and Expenditure Trends . . . . . 7

Expenditures by Transportation Mode . . . . . 8

Expenditures by Project Phase . . . . . 9

Expenditures by Project Type . . . . . 11

Timely Use of Funds and Reserve Policy . . . . . 14

Program Compliance Determination and Future Reports . . . . . 16

Program Fund Balances by Recipient . . . . . 17



## Introduction



In 1986, Alameda County voters approved the Measure B Transportation Expenditure Plan, which authorized the collection of a half-cent transportation sales tax to finance transportation improvements throughout the county. With the revenue generated through the sales tax, Alameda County became one of the first “self-help” counties in California. As the 1986 expenditure plan neared expiration, in November 2000, approximately 81.5 percent of Alameda County voters reauthorized the Measure B Transportation Expenditure Plan to continue sales tax collections through 2022. Alameda CTC distributes approximately 60 percent of net Measure B revenues to local Alameda County jurisdictions on a monthly basis as Direct Local Distributions (DLDs).

In 2014, Alameda County voters approved the Measure BB Transportation Expenditure Plan, which authorized the collection of a half-cent transportation sales tax to augment the existing 2000 Measure B sale tax program. Collections of this new sales tax began April 1, 2015 and will continue through March 30, 2045. Approximately 54 percent of net Measure BB revenues is returned

to source, as DLD funds to local cities, the county and transit operators for use on locally prioritized transportation improvements.

Alameda County jurisdictions rely on Measure B and Measure BB DLD funds to support numerous types of projects including bikeways, bicycle parking facilities, pedestrian crossing improvements, intersection and signal improvements, guardrails, street resurfacing and maintenance, bus and ferry operations, rail services, shuttle and fixed transit operations, and programs for seniors and people with disabilities.

In Fiscal Year 2014-15 (FY 14-15), Alameda CTC distributed approximately \$69.5 million in Measure B and \$13.4 million in Measure BB DLD funds to the twenty local jurisdictions in Alameda County. The combined Measure B and Measure BB DLD funds provide local agencies with the financial means to invest in transportation improvements and services that improve the mobility, access, and long-term infrastructure substantiality of Alameda County's diverse transportation system. Each fiscal year, Alameda CTC requires these recipients to report on their Measure B and Measure BB expenditures.

This Compliance Report provides a summary of FY 14-15 revenues and expenditures reported by Measure B and Measure BB recipients, as required by Master Programs Funding Agreements (MPFA) that were executed between Alameda CTC and the local jurisdictions in 2012 and 2015. The MPFA outlines the funding distribution to the recipients, eligible expenditures, and reporting requirements pertaining to the use of the transportation sales tax dollars.

Recipients are required to submit annual audited financial statements and compliance reports that captures the recipients use of DLD funds to Alameda CTC. The audited financial statements are completed by an independent auditor who reviews and provides an auditor's opinion on the recipient's compliance with standard accounting practices and the financial reporting requirements of the master agreement. The compliance reports include detailed reports on the recipient's use of funds and reporting deliverables such as the following:

- **Newsletter:** Documentation of a published article that highlights the Measure B funded improvements.
- **Website:** Documentation of program information on the agency's website including a link to Alameda CTC's website.
- **Signage:** Documentation of the public identification of the program improvements as a benefit of Measure B.
- **Pavement Condition Index:** Documentation of the agency's Pavement Condition Index (PCI) to provide a frame of reference for the condition of their local streets and roads as applicable to the Local Streets and Road Program.
- **Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plans Update:** Confirm local Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plans are updated regularly.
- **Bicycle/Pedestrian Investments:** Documentation of 15 percent of Measure BB Local Streets and Roads funds went towards bicycle and pedestrian benefits.
- **Planned Use of Funds:** Provide an implementation plan using available fund balances.

## Measure B and Measure BB Direct Local Distribution Program Revenues

Alameda CTC disburses Measure B and Measure BB DLD funds on a monthly basis to local Alameda County jurisdictions for their transportation programs based on distribution formulas identified in the 2000 Measure B Transportation Expenditure Plan, and 2014 Measure BB Transportation Expenditure Plan. This report summarizes the total Alameda CTC Measure B and Measure BB allocations and recipient expenditures for fiscal year 2014-2015 (FY 14-15), from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015.

The data within this report is based on information included in compliance reports and audited financial statements that the jurisdictions submitted. The individual reports and audits are available for review online at [http://www.alamedactc.org/app\\_pages/view/4135](http://www.alamedactc.org/app_pages/view/4135).

### Measure B Direct Local Distributions

Over the last five years, Measure B sales tax collections have increased gradually from approximately \$100 million in net collections in 2010 to \$126 million in 2015. Approximately 60 percent of the revenues are distributed by formula to the eligible recipients for local transportation programs. In FY 14-15, Alameda CTC provided approximately \$69.5 million in Measure B Direct Local Distributions funds to four transportation programs:

The FY 14-15 Measure B distributions are approximately \$3 million more than the prior fiscal year. In the audited financial statements and compliance reports, the agencies confirmed the receipt of the \$69.5 million in DLD funds distribute by Alameda CTC and reported a total expenditures of \$71.0 million. Recipients are drawing from prior fund balances in addition to their annual distributions to implement projects and programs.

### Measure BB Direct Local Distributions

As the first year of Measure BB sales tax collections, beginning April 1, 2015, the Measure BB program collected \$25.1 million in the last quarter of FY 14-15. Approximately 54 percent of the revenues were distributed as formula DLD funds to eligible local recipients. This amounted to approximately \$13.4 million in Measure BB DLD funds four transportation programs. Due to the timing of receipt, most recipients report no expenditures of Measure BB DLD funds in FY 14-15.

### FY 14-15 Measure B and Measure B Distributions By Program

DLD Program	Measure B	Measure BB	Total
Local Streets and Roads	\$27,569,470	\$5,015,620	\$32,585,090
Mass Transit	\$26,187,294	\$5,404,331	\$31,591,625
Paratransit	\$11,131,451	\$2,257,029	\$13,388,480
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$4,627,821	\$752,343	\$5,380,164
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$69,516,036</b>	<b>\$13,429,323</b>	<b>\$82,945,359</b>






## Measure B and Measure BB Direct Local Distribution Program Expenditures

Each fiscal year, local jurisdictions utilize DLD funds to implement their projects and programs. In FY 14-15, jurisdictions expended a combined total of \$72.0 million in Measure B (\$71.0 million) and Measure BB (\$1.0 million) DLD funds on transportation improvements in Alameda County.

For Measure B, recipients have increased their expenditures from the prior year by approximately \$1.4 million, and are collectively drawing down fund balances.

By program type, agencies spent 42 percent of total Measure B funds on local streets and roads, 34 percent on mass transit, 15 percent on paratransit, and 9 percent on bicycle and pedestrian projects.

See the chart below for more information on Measure B FY 14-15 Direct Local Distribution balances, annual revenue distributions, and expenditures.



**Total Measure B Funds Expended**

Dollars in millions

<b>1</b>	Local Streets and Roads	\$29.6	42%
<b>2</b>	Mass Transit	\$24.3	34%
<b>3</b>	Paratransit	\$10.5	15%
<b>4</b>	Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$6.6	9%
<b>Total Expended</b>		<b>\$71.0</b>	<b>100%</b>

### FY 14-15 Measure B Expenditures and Fund Balances


Jurisdiction	14-15 Starting MB Balance	14-15 MB Revenue	14-15 MB Interest	14-15 MB Expended	14-15 Ending MB Balance
AC Transit	\$3,064,267	\$26,446,452	\$0	\$22,936,770	\$6,573,949
BART	\$0	\$1,838,787	\$0	\$1,838,787	\$0
LAVTA	\$0	\$1,009,539	\$0	\$1,009,539	\$0
WETA	\$3,446,424	\$962,587	\$1,183	\$2,111,539	\$2,298,655
ACPWA	\$2,256,162	\$3,148,065	\$18,262	\$3,083,383	\$2,339,106
ACE	\$2,168,442	\$2,616,261	\$5,720	\$2,614,119	\$2,176,303
City of Alameda	\$2,755,714	\$2,087,429	\$11,009	\$1,784,718	\$3,069,434
City of Albany	\$129,178	\$474,686	\$144	\$225,366	\$378,642
City of Berkeley	\$2,562,623	\$3,400,115	\$1,886	\$4,018,190	\$1,946,435
City of Dublin	\$869,099	\$545,626	\$6,425	\$752,945	\$668,205
City of Emeryville	\$416,800	\$326,816	\$2,542	\$73,877	\$672,281
City of Fremont	\$3,284,761	\$3,703,121	\$10,516	\$4,797,741	\$2,200,657
City of Hayward	\$2,040,253	\$3,445,636	\$7,169	\$3,885,068	\$1,607,990
City of Livermore	\$1,930,332	\$1,194,122	\$6,998	\$1,905,080	\$1,226,372
City of Newark	\$475,201	\$758,605	\$998	\$628,243	\$606,561
City of Oakland	\$11,447,976	\$12,547,359	\$33,218	\$12,956,161	\$11,072,392
City of Piedmont	\$393,762	\$426,636	\$327	\$705,141	\$115,585
City of Pleasanton	\$1,686,098	\$1,103,473	\$14,407	\$1,273,201	\$1,530,777
City of San Leandro	\$3,420,388	\$1,852,294	\$12,552	\$1,938,335	\$3,346,899
City of Union City	\$1,142,339	\$1,628,429	\$5,000	\$2,473,651	\$302,117
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$43,489,820</b>	<b>\$69,516,036</b>	<b>\$138,356</b>	<b>\$71,011,854</b>	<b>\$42,132,358</b>

#### Notes:

1. The table above reflects Measure B financials reported on the Audited Financial Statements and Compliance Reports.
2. Revenue and expenditure figures may vary due to number rounding.
3. The Starting MB Balance may vary from the prior year due to restatement of fund balances in FY 14-15.
4. The Ending MB Balance includes interest on Measure B funds.

## Measure B and Measure BB Expenditures

### Measure B and Measure BB Direct Local Distribution Program Expenditures



**Total Measure BB Funds Expended**

Dollars in millions

<b>1</b> Mass Transit	\$0.5	50%
<b>2</b> Paratransit	\$0.5	50%
<b>Total Expended</b>	<b>\$1.0</b>	<b>100%</b>

For Measure BB, the primary expenditures were among the transit providers for bus and rail transit operations and paratransit services. In general, city and county recipients were unable to program Measure BB funds into their capital improvement plans for the bicycle and pedestrian, and local streets and roads programs due to the timing of receiving the Measure BB distributions at the end of the fiscal year.

By program type, of the \$1.0 million in Measure BB expenditures incurred in FY 14-15, transit agencies expended half within the transit program and the other half within the paratransit program. Expenditures supported transit operations, facilities maintenance and paratransit services.

See the chart below for more information on Measure BB FY 14-15 DLD balances, annual revenue distributions, and expenditures.

#### FY 14-15 Measure BB Expenditures and Fund Balances

Jurisdiction	14-15 Starting MBB Balance	14-15 MBB Revenue	14-15 MBB Interest	14-15 MBB Expended	14-15 Ending MBB Balance
AC Transit	\$0	\$5,843,198	\$0	\$0	\$5,843,198
BART	\$0	\$501,562	\$0	\$501,562	\$34,890
LAVTA	\$0	\$176,311	\$0	\$176,311	\$0
WETA	\$0	\$125,391	\$0	\$0	\$125,391
ACPWA	\$0	\$506,146	\$0	\$0	\$506,146
ACE	\$0	\$250,781	\$0	\$215,891	\$34,890
City of Alameda	\$0	\$389,207	\$0	\$0	\$389,207
City of Albany	\$0	\$88,307	\$0	\$0	\$88,307
City of Berkeley	\$0	\$634,434	\$0	\$0	\$634,434
City of Dublin	\$0	\$95,140	\$0	\$0	\$95,140
City of Emeryville	\$0	\$61,006	\$0	\$0	\$61,006
City of Fremont	\$0	\$599,542	\$0	\$0	\$599,542
City of Hayward	\$0	\$610,287	\$0	\$0	\$610,287
City of Livermore	\$0	\$209,473	\$0	\$0	\$209,473
City of Newark	\$0	\$123,198	\$0	\$0	\$123,198
City of Oakland	\$0	\$2,343,116	\$0	\$0	\$2,343,116
City of Piedmont	\$0	\$79,133	\$0	\$0	\$79,133
City of Pleasanton	\$0	\$208,325	\$0	\$0	\$208,325
City of San Leandro	\$0	\$327,542	\$0	\$0	\$327,542
City of Union City	\$0	\$257,226	\$0	\$97,342	\$159,884
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$13,429,323</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$991,106</b>	<b>\$12,473,107</b>

**Notes:**

1. The table above reflects Measure BB financials reported on the Audited Financial Statements and Compliance Reports.
2. Revenue and expenditure figures may vary due to number rounding.

## Measure B and Measure BB Revenue and Expenditure Trends

### Measure B DLD Net Revenue Trends

Each year, the state of the economy directly affects the amount of transportation sales tax revenue generated in Alameda County. Since the events in 2007 that precipitated an economic downturn, the annual net sales tax revenue has steadily increased, as shown in the table to the right.

The progressive growth in sales tax revenues has resulted in an increase of overall Measure B program distributions to the jurisdictions.

### Measure B DLD Expenditure Trends

In FY 14-15, Measure B expenditures by the jurisdictions increased from the prior fiscal year by approximately \$7.2 million. Each of the four transportation programs contributed to the overall increase in expenditures in FY 14-15 from the prior fiscal year, as shown in the table to the right.

The largest expenditures were from the local streets and roads, and bicycle/pedestrian programs for capital improvements and road maintenance operations.


### Measure BB DLD Revenue and Expenditure Trends

For the Measure BB program, FY 14-15 is the inaugural year of sales tax collections and distributions. Although trends have yet to be established, future Measure BB revenues and expenditures are expected to follow a similar pattern to the current Measure B annual distributions and expenditures.

### Measure B Net Revenue Trends

FY 08-09 through FY 14-15


Dollar in millions



### Measure B DLD Expenditures Trends

FY 08-09 through FY 14-15

Dollar in millions



### Transportation Modes: Transit, Local Streets, and Bicycle and Pedestrian



In FY 14-15, jurisdictions combined Measure B and Measure BB expenditures amounted to \$72.0 million for transportation improvements. By fund source, approximately \$71.0 million in Measure B and \$1.0 million in Measure BB funds supported the following transportation modes within each program:

- **Bicycle and pedestrian:** Of the \$6.6 million used, local agencies spent:
  - 52 percent on bicycle and pedestrian improvements;
  - 35 percent on direct pedestrian improvements; and
  - 13 percent on direct bicycle improvements.
- **Local streets and roads:** Of the \$29.6 million used, local agencies spent:
  - 77 percent on local road improvement projects;
  - 12 percent on various projects including paratransit services, bus facilities improvements, general program administration, traffic management, engineering, and maintenance; and
  - 11 percent on bicycle and pedestrian projects.
- **Mass transit:** Of the \$24.8 million used, local agencies spent:
  - 80 percent on bus operations;
  - 12 percent on rail operations; and
  - 8 percent on ferry operations.
- **Paratransit:** Of the \$11.0 million used, local agencies spent
  - 54 percent on services for people with disabilities;
  - 45 percent on services for seniors and people with disabilities;
  - 1 percent on other senior transportation services.

#### Measure B and Measure BB Expenditures by Transportation Mode

	Bicycle and Pedestrian Fund	Local Streets and Roads Fund	Mass Transit Fund	Paratransit Fund	Total Expenditures
Bicycle	\$863,852	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$863,852
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$3,438,742	\$807,623	\$0	\$0	\$4,246,365
Pedestrian	\$2,327,613	\$2,377,938	\$0	\$0	\$4,705,551
Local Streets and Roads	\$0	\$22,814,857	\$0	\$0	\$22,814,857
Bus	\$0	\$0	\$19,765,295	\$0	\$19,765,295
Ferry	\$0	\$0	\$2,111,539	\$0	\$2,111,539
Rail	\$0	\$2,599	\$2,955,400	\$0	\$2,957,999
Disabled Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,960,723	\$4,960,723
Meals on Wheels	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$31,813	\$31,813
Seniors and Disabled Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,967,702	\$5,967,702
Other	\$0	\$3,576,683	\$0	\$581	\$3,577,264
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$6,630,206</b>	<b>\$29,579,699</b>	<b>\$24,832,234</b>	<b>\$10,960,820</b>	<b>\$72,002,960</b>

## Measure B and Measure BB Expenditures by Project Phase

Alameda County's sales tax dollars are invested in a wide variety of projects across the county to improve and maintain the transportation infrastructure. By project phase, the twenty DLD fund recipients reported 49 percent of total expenditures on operations to improve and maintain roadways, bicycle trails, and transit operations that enable greater access, safety and travel convenience to commuters and residents. This level of investment by phase is consistent with the prior year expenditures for operations.

Other top expenditures by phase include:

- Construction (\$20.7 million)
- Project Completion / Closeout (\$6.4 million)
- Scoping, Feasibility and Planning (\$3.8 million)
- Maintenance (\$3.4 million)

### Local Streets and Roads Expenditures by Project Phase

Alameda CTC distributes local streets and roads fund to fourteen cities and the county for local transportation expenditures including ongoing pavement rehabilitation programs, bicycle/pedestrian improvements, transit operations, and capital infrastructure investments. In FY 14-15, agencies expended \$29.6 million in Measure B funds for local transportation related activities. No expenditures in this program were tied to Measure BB funds due to the timing of receipt of the newly collected distributions at the end of FY 14-15. Of the total expenditures, \$22.8 million was spent on projects that directly improved road and bicycle/pedestrian facilities, while the remaining \$6.8 million funded transit infrastructure and services.


By Project Phase, 48 percent of expenses were reported in the Construction Phase totaling \$14.1 million. Construction projects include street resurfacing, street reconstruction and overlay, drainage improvements, turn lanes, curb ramps, and stair repairs. An additional \$5.6 million (19 percent) was spent on the Project Completion / Closeout Phase.

Other top local streets and roads expenditures by phase include:

- Maintenance (\$3.3 million)
- Scoping, Feasibility and Planning (\$3.3 million)

#### FY 14-15 Program Highlights:


- The City of Oakland resurfaced and performed maintenance on over twenty lane miles of pavement to prolong the life of the roadways.
- The City of San Leandro's Annual Slurry Seal program repaired approximately eleven lane miles of street surfaces.



**Total Measure B/BB Expenditures by Phase**

Dollars in millions

<b>1</b> Operations	\$35.5	49%
<b>2</b> Construction	\$20.7	29%
<b>3</b> Project Completion / Closeout	\$6.4	9%
<b>4</b> Scoping, Feasibility and Planning	\$3.8	5%
<b>5</b> Maintenance	\$3.4	5%
<b>6</b> Other	\$1.2	2%
<b>7</b> PS&E	\$1.0	1%
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$72.0</b>	<b>100%</b>




**Local Streets & Roads Expenditures by Phase**

Dollars in millions

<b>1</b> Construction	\$14.1	48%
<b>2</b> Project Completion/Closeout	\$5.6	19%
<b>3</b> Maintenance	\$3.3	11%
<b>4</b> Scoping, Feasibility & Planning	\$3.3	11%
<b>5</b> Operations	\$2.2	8%
<b>6</b> PS&E	\$0.6	2%
<b>7</b> Other	\$0.5	1%
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$29.6</b>	<b>100%</b>


## Expenditures by Project Phase



**Mass Transit Expenditures by Phase**

Dollars in millions


<b>1 Operations</b>	<b>\$22.7</b>	<b>90%</b>
<b>2 Other</b>	<b>\$2.1</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$24.8</b>	<b>100%</b>



**Paratransit Expenditures by Phase**

Dollars in millions

<b>1 Operations</b>	<b>\$11.0</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$11.0</b>	<b>100%</b>



**Bicycle and Pedestrian Expenditures by Phase**

Dollars in millions

<b>1 Construction</b>	<b>\$4.5</b>	<b>68%</b>
<b>2 Project Completion/Closeout</b>	<b>\$0.8</b>	<b>12%</b>
<b>3 Scoping, Feasibility &amp; Planning</b>	<b>\$0.5</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>4 PS&amp;E</b>	<b>\$0.4</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>5 Other</b>	<b>\$0.4</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$6.6</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Mass Transit Expenditures by Project Phase

Transit agencies expended 90 percent of Measure B and Measure BB Transit funds on service operations in the amount of \$22.7 million. Additional expenditures are tied to construction related improvements including ferry maintenance and transit facility repairs.

#### *FY 14-15 Program Highlights:*

- Measure B funds supported AC Transit's fixed route transit operations to provide over 47 million one-way trips.
- LAVTA used a combination of Measure B and Measure BB Direct Local Distributions to provide 1.6 million one-way trips for Tri-Valley residents.
- San Francisco Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA) performed mid-life refurbishments on the Bay Breeze and Peralta ferry, as well as capital improvements to ferry facilities.

### Paratransit Expenditures by Project Phase

Agencies spent 100 percent of the \$11.0 million in Measure B and Measure BB paratransit funds on operations and services for transportation, meal delivery, and travel training to seniors and people with disabilities.

#### *FY 14-15 Program Highlights:*

- The City of Albany provided over 6,000 group recreational trips as part of the city's effort to improve the quality of life for seniors and people with disabilities.
- The City of Hayward provided 10,000 trips through the same-day taxi program.
- BART's ADA mandated service operations provided over 225,000 passenger trips using Measure B and Measure BB funds.

### Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Expenditures by Project Phase

Agencies reported total Measure B and Measure BB expenditures of \$6.6 million on bicycle and pedestrian projects. The majority of these expenditures funded construction of capital projects such as gap closures, sidewalk improvements, and pathway maintenance. These improvements help achieve a more reliable and more connected bicycle/pedestrian network that makes walking and biking safer and more accessible throughout the county.

#### *FY 14-15 Program Highlights:*

- The City of Oakland's Skyline Boulevard Bikeway project repaved, restriped and marked 1.6 lane miles of new bicycle facilities.
- The City of Piedmont implemented the Highland Avenue and Parkway Drainage improvements that replaced 700 linear feet of curb


## Measure B Expenditures by Project Type

### Local Streets and Roads Expenditures by Project Type

Jurisdictions reported a total of \$29.6 million in local street and road expenditures for transportation improvements. By project type, approximately \$16.7 million went to street resurfacing and maintenance, \$4.8 million supported staffing program administration, and \$2.3 million was used for sidewalk and ramp improvements. The investments in these expenditures are consistent with the prior year's expenditures by type. The other expenditures including financing a wide variety of improvements such as traffic calming improvements, complete street and streetscaping enhancements, and bicycle/pedestrian outreach and safety training.

#### FY 14-15 Program Highlights:

- The City of Alameda resurfaced six lane miles on various streets to replace striping, reseal surfaces, and to upgrade curb ramps.
- The City of Berkeley expended \$576,000 on its street maintenance program to provide pothole and street repairs.
- The City of Hayward reconstructed 550,000 square feet of pavement to repair deteriorated streets and roads.
- Union City's Huntwood Avenue / Whipple Road Intersection Drainage Improvement replaced 4,800 square feet of sidewalk, curb and gutter.



**Local Streets & Roads Expenditures by Type**

Dollars in millions


<b>1</b>	Street Resurfacing & Maintenance	\$16.7	56%
<b>2</b>	Staffing	\$4.8	16%
<b>3</b>	Sidewalk and Ramps	\$2.3	8%
<b>4</b>	Bridges and Tunnels	\$2.0	7%
<b>5</b>	Signals	\$1.1	4%
<b>6</b>	Complete Streets	\$1.0	3%
<b>7</b>	Other	\$1.0	3%
<b>8</b>	Traffic Calming	\$0.3	1%
<b>9</b>	Pedestrian Crossing Improvements	\$0.2	1%
<b>10</b>	Bikeways and Paths	\$0.2	1%
<b>Total Expenditures</b>		<b>\$29.6</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Mass Transit Expenditures by Project Type

Of the \$24.8 million Mass Transit Program expenditures by transit agencies, approximately 91 percent of funds went to operations and the remaining amount was used for equipment purchases and facilities maintenance.

#### FY 14-15 Program Highlights:

- The Altamont Corridor Express transported over 1.2 million passengers to the Vasco, Livermore, Pleasanton, and Fremont stations.
- WETA expended funds on its refurbishment projects at the Alameda Main Street and Oakland Jack London Square terminals.




**Mass Transit Expenditures by Type**

Dollars in millions

<b>1</b>	Operations	\$22.7	91%
<b>2</b>	Equipment	\$2.1	9%
<b>Total Expenditures</b>		<b>\$24.8</b>	<b>100%</b>



## Expenditures by Project Type



Paratransit Expenditures by Type

Dollars in millions

1 ADA-mandated Services	\$7.4	66%
2 City-Based Door to Door	\$1.1	10%
3 Program Administration	\$0.9	8%
4 Same Day Taxi Program	\$0.6	6%
5 Shuttle or Fixed Route Trips	\$0.3	3%
6 Customer Service/Outreach	\$0.3	3%
7 Group Trips	\$0.2	2%
8 Meal Delivery	\$0.1	1%
9 Other	\$0.1	1%
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$11.0</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Paratransit Expenditures by Project Type

By project type, agencies reported \$10.5 million in Measure B and \$0.5 million in Measure BB expenditures for paratransit related activities. The majority of the combined \$11.0 million in Paratransit program expenditures went towards Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) mandated services, which includes approximately \$6.9 million in AC Transit and BART ADA-mandated paratransit services provided through the East Bay Paratransit Consortium. Other paratransit expenditures by type include \$1.1 million for city-based door-to-door programs and \$584,000 for same-day taxi programs.

#### FY 14-15 Program Highlights:

- The City of Alameda's Paratransit Shuttle provided over 5,100 one-way trips funded exclusively with Measure B funds.
- The City of Albany's taxi subsidy program provided 380 trips using \$4,700 in Measure B funds.
- Measure BB supported ADA mandated services provided by BART, LAVTA and Union City in the amount of \$0.5 million.
- The City of Fremont provided approximately 17,000 one-way trips for local door-to-door medical, grocery, and recreational trips for seniors and people with disabilities.
- The City of San Leandro transported over 13,000 passengers as part of its Flex Shuttle Paratransit Program funded with \$245,000 in Measure B funds.
- The City of Newark delivered 14,000 meals as part of its Meal Delivery Program.






### Bicycle and Pedestrian Expenditures by Project Type

By project type, a total of \$6.6 million in Measure B funds was expended in FY 14-15 to implement countywide bicycle/pedestrian improvements. No Measure BB expenditures were incurred during this period due to the timing of receipt of funds. The majority of Measure B expenditures were for sidewalk and ramp improvements (\$2.2 million), safety improvements (\$1.0 million), and bikeway enhancements (\$0.9 million).

#### FY 14-15 Program Highlights:

- The City of Dublin added a rectangular rapid flashing beacon at two intersections which provided safer crossing for pedestrians in the downtown area on Amador Valley Blvd.
- The City of Hayward relocated a pedestrian and bicycle bridge on Industrial Blvd as part of the County's Floodwater Improvement project.
- The City of Piedmont performed safety improvements on a bridge on Oakland Avenue which included upgrades to the pedestrian ramps and installation of safety rails across the bridge.
- The City of San Leandro implemented railroad safety crossing improvements at two sidewalks locations approaching the Union Pacific Railroad pedestrian crossings.
- Union City installed eight-six wheelchair ramps and truncated domes as part of an effort to retrofit existing sidewalk ramps to ADA standards.



**Bicycle and Pedestrian Expenditures by Type**

Dollars in millions


<b>1</b> Sidewalk and Ramps	\$2.2	33%
<b>2</b> Safety Improvements	\$1.0	15%
<b>3</b> Bikeways (non-Class 1)	\$0.9	14%
<b>4</b> Multiuse Paths	\$0.6	9%
<b>5</b> Other	\$0.4	6%
<b>6</b> Traffic Calming	\$0.4	6%
<b>7</b> Streetscape/Complete Streets	\$0.4	6%
<b>8</b> Pedestrian Crossing Improv.	\$0.3	5%
<b>9</b> Education and Promotion	\$0.1	2%
<b>10</b> Signals	\$0.1	2%
<b>11</b> Master Plan	\$0.1	1%
<b>12.</b> Staffing	\$0.1	1%
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$6.6</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Measure B and Measure BB Program Administration

Per the MPFA, Measure B and Measure BB funds are eligible to support activities that include the implementation and construction of transportation related improvements. Each year Measure B and Measure BB recipients expend funds not only on construction activities, but also on staffing activities associated with program administration and project development.

In FY 14-15, approximately 8 percent of Measure B and Measure BB expenditures supported the following program administration activities:

- Engineering development
- Transportation planning
- Street resurfacing and maintenance, traffic operations services, electrical services, pavement rehabilitation, pothole repair, and preventative maintenance
- Information technology services
- Customer service and outreach
- Bicycle/pedestrian planning
- Paratransit program management



### Timely Use of Funds and Reserve Policy



In order to ensure agencies are expending Measure B and Measure BB funds expeditiously on local transportation improvements, the Alameda CTC's Timely Use of Funds Policy requires jurisdictions to report anticipated use of all Measure B and Measure BB funds for each of their programs. As part of the annual compliance reporting process, jurisdictions provide information on planned uses of these funds on anticipated projects.

Per the MPFA's Fund Reserve Policy, jurisdictions can establish certain fund reserves to account for unexpended balances. The types of fund reserves and their eligibilities are noted in the following chart.

#### Fund Reserve Categories

Reserve Category	Maximum Funding Allotment	Timely Use of Funds Requirement
<b>Capital Fund Reserve</b> Recipients may establish a specific capital fund reserve to fund specific large capital project(s) that could otherwise not be funded with a single's year revenue of Measure B/BB funds.	None.	(1) Recipients shall expend all reserve funds by the end of three fiscal years following the fiscal year during which the reserve was established.
<b>Operations Fund Reserve</b> Recipients may establish and maintain a specific reserve to address operational issues, including fluctuations in revenues, and to help maintain transportation operations.	50 percent of anticipated annual Measure B/BB Direct Local Distribution revenue	(1) Revolving fund (2) Unexpended funds may be reassigned in the subsequent fiscal year.
<b>Undesignated Fund Reserve</b> Recipients may establish and maintain a specific reserve for transportation needs over a fiscal year for grants, studies, contingency, etc.	10 percent of anticipated annual Measure B/BB Direct Local Distribution revenue	(1) Unexpended funds may be reassigned in the subsequent fiscal year.



## Monitoring Timely Use of Funds and Reserves

As part of the annual compliance report, Measure B/BB recipients are required to provide an implementation plan using uncommitted fund balances and anticipated annual revenue. Alameda CTC utilizes the reported information to track reported expenditures and to monitor the implementation plans for compliance with the MPFA's Timely Use of Funds Policy. This policy began as part of the reporting on FY 11-12 expenditures in 2012.

As part of the FY 11-12 Annual Compliance Report, Alameda CTC implemented the first year of monitoring and tracking fund reserves. Jurisdictions identified implementation plans using remaining fund balances per the Timely Use of Funds Policy. Each subsequent fiscal year, jurisdictions are required to provide updated implementation plans using uncommitted fund balances at the end of the fiscal year (i.e. funds not already identified in a previous plan). Alameda CTC monitors the reports for compliance with the requirements of the policy.

Alameda CTC's compliance reporting evaluation includes the following:

1. Monitor jurisdictions' implementation plans to ensure jurisdictions are actively expending Measure B and Measure BB funds and enhancing the local transportation system throughout Alameda County.
2. Review jurisdictions' updated implementation plans which include the identification of uncommitted fund balances and anticipated annual revenue for the next fiscal year.

For FY 14-15, all Measure B and Measure BB DLD fund recipients are found to be in compliance with the Timely Use of Funds Policies for reserves. Recipients have demonstrated a commitment to expending reserve balances and fulfilled the commitments of the policy. The individual program compliance reports and the recipient's implementation plans can be found on the website: [http://www.alamedactc.org/app\\_pages/view/4135](http://www.alamedactc.org/app_pages/view/4135).

In December 2015, Alameda CTC adopted a new Timely Use of Funds Policy that will replace the existing Timely Use of Funds Policy to facilitate greater oversight and compliance administration of DLD funds. This new policy states that a recipient may not carry a end of year fund balance greater than 40 percent of their annual revenue received for four consecutive years in a row. Alameda CTC will implement this policy on FY 16-17 funds as part of updated Master Programs Funding Agreements starting on July 1, 2016.

As such, this FY 14-15 reporting period will be the last year of implementing and monitoring the Timely Use of Funds and Reserve Policies.





## FY 14-15 Program Compliance Determination and Future Reporting



### FY 14-15 Measure B and Measure BB Compliance Determination

For the FY 14-15 reporting year, all Measure B and Measure BB recipients submitted compliance reports and audited financial statements that complied with the 2000 Measure B and 2014 Measure BB Transportation Expenditure Plans and funding agreement requirements. From these reports and follow-up correspondences with the individual recipients, Alameda CTC has determined that the Measure B and Measure BB DLD recipients are in compliance with the reporting, expenditure requirements, and Timely Use of Funds and Reserve policies for expenses incurred in FY 14-15.



### Future Reporting and Performance Monitoring

Alameda CTC will continue to monitor the recipients compliance with the 2000 Measure B and 2014 Measure BB Transportation Expenditure Plans and funding agreement requirements through future compliance reporting processes. In an effort to streamline the compliance administration and recipient reporting on all Measure B and Measure BB DLD funds, Alameda CTC and the recipients entered into new Master Programs Funding Agreements effective July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2026. The updated agreements includes new timely use of funds policies and performance monitoring requirements that are to be applied to fiscal year 2016-17 funds and will be monitored in future compliance reports and other agency performance reports.

Next year's compliance reporting on fiscal year 2015-16 Measure B and Measure BB expenditures will establish a baseline of reporting expectations and performance data that will be monitored. The focus of future reports will include:

- Monitoring the draw down of existing fund balances
- Performance monitoring of the use of funds
- Monitoring consistency with Expenditure Plan requirements
- Verifying compliance with the updated timely use of fund requirements
- Verifying recipient's completion of general reporting obligations
- Monitoring Measure BB Local Street and Road expenditures on Bicycle and Pedestrian benefits



## Measure B and Measure BB Fund Balances

### Measure B and Measure BB FY 14-15 Program Fund Balances By Recipient

#### AC Transit

Measure B Program	FY 14-15 Starting MB Balance	FY 14-15 MB Revenue	FY 14-15 MB Interest	FY 14-15 MB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MB Balance
Mass Transit	\$2,272,711	\$21,337,338	\$0	\$18,306,102	\$5,303,947
Paratransit	\$791,556	\$5,109,114	\$0	\$4,630,668	\$1,270,002
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$3,064,267</b>	<b>\$26,446,452</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$22,936,770</b>	<b>\$6,573,949</b>

Measure BB Program	FY 14-15 Starting MBB Balance	FY 14-15 MBB Revenue	FY 14-15 MBB Interest	FY 14-15 MBB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MBB Balance
Mass Transit	\$0	\$4,714,683	\$0	\$0	\$4,714,683
Paratransit	\$0	\$1,128,515	\$0	\$0	\$1,128,515
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$5,843,198</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$5,843,198</b>



#### Altamont Corridor Express (ACE)

Measure B Program	FY 14-15 Starting MB Balance	FY 14-15 MB Revenue	FY 14-15 MB Interest	FY 14-15 MB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MB Balance
Mass Transit	\$2,168,441	\$2,616,261	\$5,720	\$2,614,119	\$2,176,303
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,168,441</b>	<b>\$2,616,261</b>	<b>\$5,720</b>	<b>\$2,614,119</b>	<b>\$2,176,303</b>

Measure BB Program	FY 14-15 Starting MBB Balance	FY 14-15 MBB Revenue	FY 14-15 MBB Interest	FY 14-15 MBB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MBB Balance
Mass Transit	\$0	\$250,781	\$0	\$215,891	\$34,890
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$250,781</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$215,891</b>	<b>\$34,890</b>



#### SF Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)

Measure B Program	FY 14-15 Starting MB Balance	FY 14-15 MB Revenue	FY 14-15 MB Interest	FY 14-15 MB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MB Balance
Paratransit	\$0	\$1,838,787	\$0	\$1,838,787	\$0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,838,787</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,838,787</b>	<b>\$0</b>

Measure BB Program	FY 14-15 Starting MBB Balance	FY 14-15 MBB Revenue	FY 14-15 MBB Interest	FY 14-15 MBB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MBB Balance
Paratransit	\$0	\$376,172	\$0	\$376,172	\$0
Mass Transit	\$0	\$125,390	\$0	\$125,390	\$0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$501,562</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$501,562</b>	<b>\$0</b>



## Measure B and Measure BB FY 14-15 Program Fund Balances By Recipient

### Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority (LAVTA)

Measure B Program	FY 14-15 Starting MB Balance	FY 14-15 MB Revenue	FY 14-15 MB Interest	FY 14-15 MB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MB Balance
Mass Transit	\$0	\$851,519	\$0	\$851,519	\$0
Paratransit	\$0	\$158,020	\$0	\$158,020	\$0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,009,539</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,009,539</b>	<b>\$0</b>

Measure BB Program	FY 14-15 Starting MBB Balance	FY 14-15 MBB Revenue	FY 14-15 MBB Interest	FY 14-15 MBB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MBB Balance
Mass Transit	\$0	\$125,391	\$0	\$125,391	\$0
Paratransit	\$0	\$50,920	\$0	\$50,920	\$0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$176,311</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$176,311</b>	<b>\$0</b>



### SF Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA)

Measure B Program	FY 14-15 Starting MB Balance	FY 14-15 MB Revenue	FY 14-15 MB Interest	FY 14-15 MB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MB Balance
Mass Transit	\$3,446,424	\$962,587	\$1,183	\$2,111,539	\$2,298,655
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$3,446,424</b>	<b>\$962,587</b>	<b>\$1,183</b>	<b>\$2,111,539</b>	<b>\$2,298,655</b>

Measure BB Program	FY 14-15 Starting MBB Balance	FY 14-15 MBB Revenue	FY 14-15 MBB Interest	FY 14-15 MBB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MBB Balance
Mass Transit	\$0	\$125,391	\$0	\$0	\$125,391
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$125,391</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$125,391</b>

### Alameda County Public Works Association (ACPWA)

Measure B Program	FY 14-15 Starting MB Balance	FY 14-15 MB Revenue	FY 14-15 MB Interest	FY 14-15 MB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$1,904,433	\$2,718,293	\$14,171	\$2,872,870	\$1,764,027
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$351,729	\$429,772	\$4,091	\$210,513	\$575,079
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,256,162</b>	<b>\$3,148,065</b>	<b>\$18,262</b>	<b>\$3,083,383</b>	<b>\$2,339,106</b>

Measure BB Program	FY 14-15 Starting MBB Balance	FY 14-15 MBB Revenue	FY 14-15 MBB Interest	FY 14-15 MBB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MBB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$0	\$436,278	\$0	\$0	\$436,278
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$0	\$69,868	\$0	\$0	\$69,868
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$506,146</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$506,146</b>



## Measure B and Measure BB FY 14-15 Program Fund Balances By Recipient



### City of Alameda

Measure B Program	FY 14-15 Starting MB Balance	FY 14-15 MB Revenue	FY 14-15 MB Interest	FY 14-15 MB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$2,543,158	\$1,691,252	\$10,210	\$1,402,727	\$2,841,893
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$61,638	\$224,498	\$133	\$250,000	\$36,269
Paratransit	\$150,918	\$171,679	\$666	\$131,991	\$191,272
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,755,714</b>	<b>\$2,087,429</b>	<b>\$11,009</b>	<b>\$1,784,718</b>	<b>\$3,069,434</b>

Measure BB Program	FY 14-15 Starting MBB Balance	FY 14-15 MBB Revenue	FY 14-15 MBB Interest	FY 14-15 MBB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MBB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$0	\$316,897	\$0	\$0	\$316,897
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$0	\$36,497	\$0	\$0	\$36,497
Paratransit	\$0	\$35,813	\$0	\$0	\$35,813
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$389,207</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$389,207</b>

### City of Albany

Measure B Program	FY 14-15 Starting MB Balance	FY 14-15 MB Revenue	FY 14-15 MB Interest	FY 14-15 MB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$51,965	\$385,280	\$12	\$118,123	\$319,134
Paratransit	\$10,741	\$34,336	\$2	\$41,330	\$3,749
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$66,472	\$55,070	\$130	\$65,913	\$55,759
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$129,178</b>	<b>\$474,686</b>	<b>\$144</b>	<b>\$225,366</b>	<b>\$378,642</b>

Measure BB Program	FY 14-15 Starting MBB Balance	FY 14-15 MBB Revenue	FY 14-15 MBB Interest	FY 14-15 MBB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MBB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$0	\$72,192	\$0	\$0	\$72,192
Paratransit	\$0	\$7,163	\$0	\$0	\$7,163
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$0	\$8,953	\$0	\$0	\$8,953
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$88,307</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$88,307</b>

### City of Berkeley

Measure B Program	FY 14-15 Starting MB Balance	FY 14-15 MB Revenue	FY 14-15 MB Interest	FY 14-15 MB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$1,881,862	\$2,775,644	\$1,198	\$3,369,472	\$1,289,232
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$523,848	\$345,758	\$553	\$388,207	\$481,952
Paratransit	\$156,914	\$278,713	\$135	\$260,511	\$175,251
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,562,624</b>	<b>\$3,400,115</b>	<b>\$1,886</b>	<b>\$4,018,190</b>	<b>\$1,946,435</b>

Measure BB Program	FY 14-15 Starting MBB Balance	FY 14-15 MBB Revenue	FY 14-15 MBB Interest	FY 14-15 MBB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MBB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$0	\$520,084	\$0	\$0	\$520,084
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$0	\$56,210	\$0	\$0	\$56,210
Paratransit	\$0	\$58,141	\$0	\$0	\$58,141
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$634,434</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$634,434</b>



## Measure B and Measure BB FY 14-15 Program Fund Balances By Recipient

### City of Dublin

Measure B Program	FY 14-15 Starting MB Balance	FY 14-15 MB Revenue	FY 14-15 MB Interest	FY 14-15 MB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$816,319	\$396,556	\$5,899	\$682,726	\$536,048
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$52,780	\$149,070	\$526	\$70,219	\$132,157
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$869,099</b>	<b>\$545,626</b>	<b>\$6,425</b>	<b>\$752,945</b>	<b>\$668,205</b>

Measure BB Program	FY 14-15 Starting MBB Balance	FY 14-15 MBB Revenue	FY 14-15 MBB Interest	FY 14-15 MBB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MBB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$0	\$70,906	\$0	\$0	\$70,906
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$0	\$24,234	\$0	\$0	\$24,234
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$95,140</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$95,140</b>

### City of Emeryville

Measure B Program	FY 14-15 Starting MB Balance	FY 14-15 MB Revenue	FY 14-15 MB Interest	FY 14-15 MB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$255,796	\$271,146	\$2,347	\$15,457	\$513,832
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$142,615	\$30,685	\$178	\$31,331	\$142,147
Paratransit	\$18,389	\$24,985	\$17	\$27,089	\$16,302
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$416,800</b>	<b>\$326,816</b>	<b>\$2,542</b>	<b>\$73,877</b>	<b>\$672,281</b>

Measure BB Program	FY 14-15 Starting MBB Balance	FY 14-15 MBB Revenue	FY 14-15 MBB Interest	FY 14-15 MBB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MBB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$0	\$50,806	\$0	\$0	\$50,806
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$0	\$4,988	\$0	\$0	\$4,988
Paratransit	\$0	\$5,212	\$0	\$0	\$5,212
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$61,006</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$61,006</b>

### City of Fremont

Measure B Program	FY 14-15 Starting MB Balance	FY 14-15 MB Revenue	FY 14-15 MB Interest	FY 14-15 MB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$1,146,691	\$2,201,320	\$2,651	\$2,458,645	\$892,017
Paratransit	\$349,275	\$844,602	\$1,388	\$1,003,802	\$191,463
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$1,788,795	\$657,199	\$6,477	\$1,335,294	\$1,117,177
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$3,284,761</b>	<b>\$3,703,121</b>	<b>\$10,516</b>	<b>\$4,797,741</b>	<b>\$2,200,657</b>

Measure BB Program	FY 14-15 Starting MBB Balance	FY 14-15 MBB Revenue	FY 14-15 MBB Interest	FY 14-15 MBB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MBB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$0	\$393,607	\$0	\$0	\$393,607
Paratransit	\$0	\$99,094	\$0	\$0	\$99,094
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$0	\$106,841	\$0	\$0	\$106,841
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$599,542</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$599,542</b>





## Measure B and Measure BB FY 14-15 Program Fund Balances By Recipient

### City of Hayward



Measure B Program	FY 14-15 Starting MB Balance	FY 14-15 MB Revenue	FY 14-15 MB Interest	FY 14-15 MB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$691,370	\$2,219,270	\$332	\$2,543,211	\$367,761
Paratransit	\$932,812	\$781,846	\$4,249	\$829,387	\$889,520
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$416,071	\$444,520	\$2,588	\$512,470	\$350,709
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,040,253</b>	<b>\$3,445,636</b>	<b>\$7,169</b>	<b>\$3,885,068</b>	<b>\$1,607,990</b>

Measure BB Program	FY 14-15 Starting MBB Balance	FY 14-15 MBB Revenue	FY 14-15 MBB Interest	FY 14-15 MBB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MBB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$0	\$396,817	\$0	\$0	\$396,817
Paratransit	\$0	\$141,205	\$0	\$0	\$141,205
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$0	\$72,265	\$0	\$0	\$72,265
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$610,287</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$610,287</b>

### City of Livermore



Measure B Program	FY 14-15 Starting MB Balance	FY 14-15 MB Revenue	FY 14-15 MB Interest	FY 14-15 MB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$1,113,781	\$945,123	\$3,678	\$1,464,357	\$598,225
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$816,551	\$248,999	\$3,320	\$440,723	\$628,147
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,930,332</b>	<b>\$1,194,122</b>	<b>\$6,998</b>	<b>\$1,905,080</b>	<b>\$1,226,372</b>

Measure BB Program	FY 14-15 Starting MBB Balance	FY 14-15 MBB Revenue	FY 14-15 MBB Interest	FY 14-15 MBB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MBB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$0	\$168,993	\$0	\$0	\$168,993
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$0	\$40,480	\$0	\$0	\$40,480
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$209,473</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$209,473</b>

### City of Newark

Measure B Program	FY 14-15 Starting MB Balance	FY 14-15 MB Revenue	FY 14-15 MB Interest	FY 14-15 MB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$399,960	\$460,866	\$629	\$447,243	\$414,212
Paratransit	\$63,183	\$168,221	\$183	\$181,000	\$50,587
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$12,058	\$129,518	\$186	\$0	\$141,762
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$475,201</b>	<b>\$758,605</b>	<b>\$998</b>	<b>\$628,243</b>	<b>\$606,561</b>

Measure BB Program	FY 14-15 Starting MBB Balance	FY 14-15 MBB Revenue	FY 14-15 MBB Interest	FY 14-15 MBB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MBB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$0	\$82,405	\$0	\$0	\$82,405
Paratransit	\$0	\$19,737	\$0	\$0	\$19,737
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$0	\$21,056	\$0	\$0	\$21,056
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$123,198</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$123,198</b>

## Measure B and Measure BB FY 14-15 Program Fund Balances By Recipient

### City of Oakland

Measure B Program	FY 14-15 Starting MB Balance	FY 14-15 MB Revenue	FY 14-15 MB Interest	FY 14-15 MB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$9,262,519	\$10,333,520	\$27,573	\$10,303,203	\$9,320,409
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$2,185,457	\$1,193,286	\$5,645	\$1,898,193	\$1,486,195
Paratransit	\$0	\$1,020,553	\$0	\$754,765	\$265,788
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$11,447,976</b>	<b>\$12,547,359</b>	<b>\$33,218</b>	<b>\$12,956,161</b>	<b>\$11,072,392</b>

Measure BB Program	FY 14-15 Starting MBB Balance	FY 14-15 MBB Revenue	FY 14-15 MBB Interest	FY 14-15 MBB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MBB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$0	\$1,936,233	\$0	\$0	\$1,936,233
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$0	\$193,992	\$0	\$0	\$193,992
Paratransit	\$0	\$212,891	\$0	\$0	\$212,891
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,343,116</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,343,116</b>



### City of Piedmont

Measure B Program	FY 14-15 Starting MB Balance	FY 14-15 MB Revenue	FY 14-15 MB Interest	FY 14-15 MB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$223,972	\$394,094	\$300	\$593,437	\$24,930
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$169,790	\$32,542	\$27	\$111,704	\$90,655
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$393,762</b>	<b>\$426,636</b>	<b>\$327</b>	<b>\$705,141</b>	<b>\$115,585</b>

Measure BB Program	FY 14-15 Starting MBB Balance	FY 14-15 MBB Revenue	FY 14-15 MBB Interest	FY 14-15 MBB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MBB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$0	\$73,843	\$0	\$0	\$73,843
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$0	\$5,290	\$0	\$0	\$5,290
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$79,133</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$79,133</b>



### City of Pleasanton

Measure B Program	FY 14-15 Starting MB Balance	FY 14-15 MB Revenue	FY 14-15 MB Interest	FY 14-15 MB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$357,189	\$787,564	\$4,640	\$786,513	\$362,880
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$1,328,909	\$214,771	\$9,767	\$385,550	\$1,167,897
Paratransit	\$0	\$101,138	\$0	\$101,138	\$0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,686,098</b>	<b>\$1,103,473</b>	<b>\$14,407</b>	<b>\$1,273,201</b>	<b>\$1,530,777</b>

Measure BB Program	FY 14-15 Starting MBB Balance	FY 14-15 MBB Revenue	FY 14-15 MBB Interest	FY 14-15 MBB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MBB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$0	\$140,820	\$0	\$0	\$140,820
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$0	\$34,915	\$0	\$0	\$34,915
Paratransit	\$0	\$32,590	\$0	\$0	\$32,590
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$208,325</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$208,325</b>

## Measure B and Measure BB FY 14-15 Program Fund Balances By Recipient



### City of San Leandro

Measure B Program	FY 14-15 Starting MB Balance	FY 14-15 MB Revenue	FY 14-15 MB Interest	FY 14-15 MB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$2,504,041	\$1,289,161	\$10,452	\$1,190,764	\$2,612,890
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$793,366	\$258,983	\$2,100	\$502,286	\$552,163
Paratransit	\$122,981	\$304,150	\$0	\$245,285	\$181,846
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$3,420,388</b>	<b>\$1,852,294</b>	<b>\$12,552</b>	<b>\$1,938,335</b>	<b>\$3,346,899</b>

Measure BB Program	FY 14-15 Starting MBB Balance	FY 14-15 MBB Revenue	FY 14-15 MBB Interest	FY 14-15 MBB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MBB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$0	\$230,509	\$0	\$0	\$230,509
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$0	\$42,102	\$0	\$0	\$42,102
Paratransit	\$0	\$54,931	\$0	\$0	\$54,931
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$327,542</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$327,542</b>

### City of Union City / Union City Transit

Measure B Program	FY 14-15 Starting MB Balance	FY 14-15 MB Revenue	FY 14-15 MB Interest	FY 14-15 MB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$636,103	\$700,382	\$1,627	\$1,330,951	\$7,161
Mass Transit	\$0	\$419,589	\$0	\$419,589	\$0
Paratransit	\$0	\$295,308	\$0	\$295,308	\$0
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$506,236	\$213,150	\$3,373	\$427,803	\$294,956
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,142,339</b>	<b>\$1,628,429</b>	<b>\$5,000</b>	<b>\$2,473,651</b>	<b>\$302,117</b>

Measure BB Program	FY 14-15 Starting MBB Balance	FY 14-15 MBB Revenue	FY 14-15 MBB Interest	FY 14-15 MBB Expenditures	FY 14-15 Ending MBB Balance
Local Streets and Roads	\$0	\$125,232	\$0	\$0	\$125,232
Mass Transit	\$0	\$62,695	\$0	\$62,695	\$0
Paratransit	\$0	\$34,647	\$0	\$34,647	\$0
<b>Bicycle and Pedestrian</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$34,651</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$34,651</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$257,226</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$97,342</b>	<b>\$159,884</b>








[alamedactc.org](http://alamedactc.org)








## Vehicle Registration Fee

Direct Local Distributions  
Program Compliance Report

Fiscal Year 2014-2015



Alameda County Transportation Commission  
1111 Broadway Suite 800  
Oakland, CA 94607  
[www.AlamedaCTC.org](http://www.AlamedaCTC.org)

DRAFT JUNE 2016

Table of Contents

Introduction . . . . . 3

Direct Local Distribution Program Revenues . . . . . 4

Direct Local Distribution Program Expenditures . . . . . 5

    Expenditures by Project Phase . . . . . 6

    Expenditures by Project Type . . . . . 6

Revenue and Expenditure Trends . . . . . 7

Timely Use of Funds and Reserve Policy . . . . . 8

Program Compliance Determination and Future Reports . . . . . 10


Program FY 14-15 Highlights. . . . . 11

## Introduction

In November 2010, Alameda County voters approved the Measure F Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) to authorize the annual collection of a \$10 per vehicle registration fee. Vehicles subject to the VRF include all motorized vehicles (unless vehicles are expressly exempt). Six months after the Measure's approval, VRF fee collection began and in spring 2012, the first VRF distributions were allocated to eligible recipients.

The VRF Program allocates 60 percent of net fund receipts to local road improvements and repairs in Alameda County. The goal of this program is to support transportation investments to sustain the County's transportation network and reduce traffic congestion and vehicle-related pollution. The VRF's Local Road and Repair Program is part of an overall strategy to finance transportation capital improvements intended to maintain and improve local streets and roads as well as a broad range of facilities in Alameda County (from local to arterial facilities).

The Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) maintains Master Programs Funding Agreements with fifteen jurisdictions eligible to receive VRF funds known as "Direct Local Distribution" (DLD) funds. Through the Master Program Funding Agreement (MPFA), Alameda CTC outlines specific requirements tied to eligible usage of VRF funds, and reporting requirements. This Compliance Report provides a summary of fiscal year 2014-15 (FY 14-15) revenues and expenditures reported by VRF recipients.



VRF recipients are required to submit an audited financial statement and complete a compliance reporting process, including submitting the following deliverables annually to Alameda CTC:

- **Road miles:** The number of maintained road miles within the city's jurisdiction.
- **Population:** The number of people the jurisdiction's transportation program serves in the fiscal year.
- **Newsletter:** Documentation of a published article that highlights the VRF funded improvements.
- **Website:** Documentation of program information on a local agency website with a link to Alameda CTC's website.
- **Signage:** Documentation of public identification of program improvements as a benefit of using the VRF program.
- **Pavement Condition Index:** Documentation of the agency's Pavement Condition Index (PCI) to provide a frame of reference for the conditions of their local streets and roads.
- **Timely Use of Funds and Reserve Policy:** Provide an implementation plan using unexpended fund balances. Per the MPFA, local jurisdictions must expend VRF funds in an expeditious manner, and no unexpended funds beyond those included in specified reserve categories may be permitted. If VRF recipients do not meet the timely use of funds requirements, unspent funds may be subject to rescission.



## Vehicle Registration Fee Direct Local Distribution Revenues

### VRF Direct Local Distributions

Dollars in millions

<b>1</b> Local Streets and Roads	\$7.4	100%
<b>Total Distributions</b>	<b>\$7.4</b>	<b>100%</b>

The Alameda CTC disburses VRF DLD funds on a monthly basis to the eligible jurisdictions for their local road improvement and repair programs. This report summarizes the total Alameda CTC VRF fund allocations and agency expenditures for FY 14-15.

The data within this report is based on information included in compliance and audited financial statement reports submitted by jurisdictions at the end of the calendar year. The individual reports and audits are available for review online at [http://www.alamedactc.org/app\\_pages/view/9863](http://www.alamedactc.org/app_pages/view/9863).

### VRF Direct Local Distributions

From the start of the VRF Program distributions in spring 2012, program receipts and Alameda CTC's funding distributions have been consistent each year. Annually, Alameda CTC collects approximately \$12.0 million in VRF receipts. Approximately 60 percent of net VRF program funds are allocated to local jurisdictions as DLD funds.

In FY 14-15 Alameda CTC provided approximately \$7.4 million in VRF DLD funds to jurisdictions for their local streets and roads programs. In turn, the jurisdictions used the VRF funds in tandem with other revenue streams such as the Measure B and Measure BB transportation sales tax programs to implement projects and programs that support the growth and longevity of the transportation system.






## Vehicle Registration Fee Direct Local Distribution Expenditures

The VRF program is in its fourth full fiscal year of implementation. In FY 14-15, approximately \$7.2 million in VRF funds were spent on local road improvements and maintenance activities. This is \$0.3 million less than the prior fiscal year due to fluctuating maintenance and implementation schedules. VRF funded improvements include pavement rehabilitation programs, street overlays, traffic signals improvements, and curb ramp enhancements. These improvements maintain the transportation system in Alameda County to make travel safer for motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians. VRF funds continue to be an instrumental source of revenues to maintain a state of good repair of Alameda County's roadways.

See the chart below for more information on VRF DLD fund balances, revenue, and expenditures in FY 14-15.




### FY 14-15 VRF Expenditures and Fund Balances

Jurisdiction	14-15 Starting VRF Balance	14-15 VRF Revenue	14-15 VRF Interest	14-15 VRF Expended	14-15 Ending VRF Balance
ACPWA	\$201,734	\$728,272	\$1,668	\$616,913	\$314,761
City of Alameda	\$775,835	\$331,984	\$3,025	\$400,000	\$710,844
City of Albany	\$19,932	\$81,436	\$46	\$17,961	\$83,453
City of Berkeley	\$1,115,599	\$511,302	\$1,136	\$568,129	\$1,059,908
City of Dublin	\$85,478	\$252,863	\$847	\$165,000	\$174,188
City of Emeryville	\$42,257	\$45,376	\$416	\$650	\$87,399
City of Fremont	\$695,116	\$1,069,527	\$1,082	\$1,231,140	\$534,585
City of Hayward	\$552,802	\$753,205	\$296	\$847,524	\$458,779
City of Livermore	\$558,359	\$422,370	\$3,043	\$208,858	\$774,914
City of Newark	\$423,072	\$210,779	\$844	\$155,000	\$479,695
City of Oakland	\$2,976,536	\$1,764,613	\$9,860	\$1,728,416	\$3,022,593
City of Piedmont	\$141,876	\$48,122	\$555	\$160,100	\$30,453
City of Pleasanton	\$174,602	\$364,309	\$1,996	\$382,578	\$158,329
City of San Leandro	\$499,093	\$438,826	\$1,843	\$320,010	\$619,752
City of Union City	\$849,671	\$346,881	\$6,126	\$397,746	\$804,932
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$9,111,962</b>	<b>\$7,369,866</b>	<b>\$32,783</b>	<b>\$7,200,025</b>	<b>\$9,314,585</b>

#### Notes:

1. The table above reflects total VRF revenue and expenditures reported by the jurisdictions.
2. Revenue and expenditure figures throughout this report may vary due to number rounding.
3. The Ending VRF balance includes interest on VRF funds.



### Vehicle Registration Fee Direct Local Program Distribution Expenditures


#### Total VRF Funds Expended

Dollars in millions

<b>1 Local Streets and Roads</b>	<b>\$7.2</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$7.2</b>	<b>100%</b>

Per the VRF Local Streets and Roads Implementation Guidelines, the VRF Local Road Improvement and Repair Program funds are eligible for capital improvements for surface streets and arterial roads, including maintenance and upkeep efforts of local streets. VRF funding may be also used for improving, maintaining, and rehabilitating local roadways and traffic signals. Projects and activities designed to incorporate a Complete Streets practice that makes local roads safe for all modes, including bicyclists, pedestrians, and accommodation for transit are also eligible VRF expenses.

In FY 14-15, the jurisdictions reported \$7.2 million in VRF expenditures that supported local roadway and complete streets improvements. Of those total expenditures, \$6.8 million directly funded street and roads projects and the remaining \$0.4 million funded bicycle and pedestrian improvements related to streets and roads.



Total VRF Expenditures by Phase

Dollars in millions

<b>1 Construction</b>	<b>\$4.5</b>	<b>63%</b>
<b>2 Project Closeout</b>	<b>\$2.0</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>3 Maintenance</b>	<b>\$0.4</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>4 Scoping/Planning</b>	<b>\$0.2</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>5 Other</b>	<b>\$0.1</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$7.2</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Total VRF Expenditures by Project Phase

VRF funds support local transportation improvements through various project phases. This includes initial planning/project scoping, environmental review, construction, maintenance and operational activities, and project close-out. The jurisdictions perform ongoing road maintenance and safety enhancements to provide residents with improved roadway conditions.

In FY 14-15, \$4.5 million in VRF funds supported construction projects throughout Alameda County. These improvements included road rehabilitation projects, slurry seals, and other maintenance activities to maintain and improve local roadways. An additional \$2.0 million encompassed close-out activities from the prior fiscal year. The remaining \$0.7 million in VRF expenditures included general maintenance on roadway infrastructure improvements, as well as initial planning/project scoping for the next fiscal year's improvements. These expenditures help improve Alameda County's transportation infrastructure by improving, maintaining, and rehabilitating local roads.

#### Total VRF Expenditures by Project Type

By project type, VRF funds were expended on improvements that not only directly benefit the roadway infrastructure, but also on subsidiary elements such as safety improvements for bicyclists and pedestrians as part of an overall complete streets program to make transportation safe and accessible to all modes. In FY 14-15, by project type jurisdictions expended the majority of the \$7.2 million in expenditures on street resurfacing and maintenance (\$6.2 million). This is consistent with the prior year's expenditures. The remaining \$1.0 million in expenditures included bicycle safety enhancements, new sidewalks, upgraded curb ramps, and pedestrian crossing improvements.



## Vehicle Registration Fee Revenue and Expenditure Trends

Alameda CTC has distributed approximately \$29.0 million in DLD funds to eligible cities and Alameda County since the start of the VRF program in 2011. Each year, Alameda CTC receives approximately \$12.0 million in receipts, of which approximately \$7.0 million (60 percent) is allocated directly to the cities and Alameda County. The VRF program currently contains four fiscal years of funding distributions and jurisdictions are beginning to expend more VRF funds as part of their annual program plans.

In FY 14-15, VRF expenditures amounted to \$7.2 million, which is \$0.3 million less than the prior year and indicative of the fluctuations between construction schedules and project closeout. Expenditures in the next fiscal year are expected to increase based on implementation plans submitted by the recipients. The chart below details the VRF program's annual revenues and expenditures since the start of the VRF program.

### VRF Annual Revenue and Expenditure Trends FY 10-11 through FY 14-15

Dollar in millions



### Timely Use of Funds and Reserves Policy



In order to ensure agencies are expending VRF funds expeditiously on local road improvements, the MPFA's Timely Use of Funds Policy requires jurisdictions to report anticipated use of all VRF funds for their VRF local road improvement and repair program. As part of the annual compliance reporting process, jurisdictions provide detailed information regarding planned uses of VRF funds and preliminary information regarding anticipated project deliverables.

Per the MPFA's Fund Reserve Policy, jurisdictions can establish certain fund reserves to account for unexpended balances. The types of fund reserves and their eligibilities are noted in the following chart.

#### Fund Reserve Categories

Reserve Category	Maximum Funding Allotment	Timely Use of Funds Requirement
<b>Capital Fund Reserve</b> Recipients may establish a specific capital fund reserve to fund specific large capital project(s) that could otherwise not be funded with a single's year revenue of VRF funds.	None.	(1) Recipients shall expend all reserve funds by the end of three fiscal years following the fiscal year during which the reserve was established.
<b>Operations Fund Reserve</b> Recipients may establish and maintain a specific reserve to address operational issues, including fluctuations in revenues, and to help maintain transportation operations.	50 percent of anticipated annual VRF Direct Local Distribution revenue.	(1) Revolving fund (2) Unexpended funds may be reassigned in the subsequent fiscal year.
<b>Undesignated Fund Reserve</b> Recipients may establish and maintain a specific reserve for transportation needs over a fiscal year for grants, studies, contingency, etc.	10 percent of anticipated annual VRF Direct Local Distribution revenues.	(1) Unexpended funds may be reassigned in the subsequent fiscal year.





### Monitoring Timely Use of Funds and Reserves

As part of the annual compliance report, VRF recipients are required to provide an implementation plan using all available VRF funds. Over the subsequent annual compliance reports, Alameda CTC will utilize the reported information to track reported expenditures and to monitor the implementation plans for compliance with the MPFA's Timely Use of Funds Policy.


As part of the FY 11-12 Annual Compliance Report, Alameda CTC implemented the first year of monitoring and tracking fund reserves. In that report, jurisdictions provided implementation plans using remaining fund balances per the Timely Use of Funds Policy. Each subsequent fiscal year, jurisdictions are required to provide updated implementation plans using uncommitted fund balances at the end of the fiscal year (i.e. funds not already identified in a previous fiscal year). Alameda CTC continues to monitor these implementation plans for expenditure compliance.

Alameda CTC's compliance reporting evaluation includes the following:

1. Monitor jurisdictions' implementation plans to ensure jurisdictions are actively expending VRF funds and enhancing the local transportation system throughout Alameda County.
2. Review jurisdictions' updated implementation plans which include the identification of uncommitted fund balances and anticipated annual revenue for the next fiscal year.

For FY 14-15, all VRF DLD fund recipients are found to be in compliance with the Timely Use of Funds Policies for reserves. Recipients have demonstrated a commitment to expending reserve balances and fulfilled the commitments of the policy. The individual program compliance reports and the recipient's implementation plans can be found on the website: [http://www.alamedactc.org/app\\_pages/view/4135](http://www.alamedactc.org/app_pages/view/4135).

In December 2015, Alameda CTC adopted a new Timely Use of Funds Policy that will replace the existing Timely Use of Funds Policy to facilitate greater oversight and compliance administration of DLD funds. This new policy states that a recipient may not carry a end of year fund balance greater than 40 percent of their annual revenue received for four consecutive years in a row. Alameda CTC will implement this policy on FY 16-17 funds as part of an updated MPFA starting on July 1, 2016. As such, this FY 14-15 reporting period will be the last year of implementing and monitoring the Timely Use of Funds and Reserve Policies.



### Vehicle Registration Fee FY 14-15 Program Compliance Determination and Future Reporting



#### FY 14-15 VRF Compliance Determination

For the FY 14-15 reporting year, all VRF recipients submitted compliance reports and audited financial statements that complied with the Measure F (VRF) Expenditure Plan and agreement requirements. From these reports and follow-up correspondences with the individual recipients, Alameda CTC has determined that the VRF DLD recipients are in compliance with the reporting, expenditure requirements, and Timely Use of Funds and Reserve policies for expenses incurred in FY 14-15.

#### Future Reporting and Performance Monitoring

Alameda CTC will continue to monitor the recipients compliance with the Measure F (VRF) Expenditure Plan and funding agreement requirements through future compliance reporting processes. In an effort to streamline the compliance administration and recipient reporting on all DLD funds from Measure B, Measure BB, and VRF programs, Alameda CTC and the recipients entered into new Master Programs Funding Agreements effective July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2026. The updated agreements includes new timely use of funds policies and performance monitoring requirements that are to be applied to fiscal year 2016-17 funds and will be monitored in future compliance reports and other agency performance reports.

Next year's compliance reporting on fiscal year 2015-16 VRF expenditures will establish a baseline of reporting expectations and performance data that will be monitored. The focus of future reports will include:

- Monitoring the draw down of existing fund balances
- Performance monitoring of the use of funds
- Monitoring consistency with Expenditure Plan requirements
- Verifying compliance with the updated timely use of fund requirements
- Verifying recipient's completion of general reporting obligations


### Vehicle Registration Fee Local Road Improvement and Repair Program FY 14-15 Program Highlights

In FY 14-15, jurisdictions implemented approximately \$7.2 million in local road improvements and repairs to make Alameda County's transportation system safer, accessible, and maintained.

- **Alameda County:** Resurfaced five lane miles of pavement to extend pavement life and reliability.
- **City of Alameda:** Resurfaced six lane miles including upgrading ADA ramps, replacing striping and pavement crack sealing.
- **City of Albany:** Completed Striping and Signage Project on Washington Avenue Bicycle Boulevard, including 3,150 linear feet of striping.
- **City of Berkeley:** Constructed Oxford St./Berkeley Way Pedestrian Crossing Improvements to shorten the crossing distance and to increase pedestrian visibility with new crosswalks.
- **City of Dublin:** Upgraded citywide signal communications and signal maintenance to aid in traffic congestion and real time monitoring of vehicle circulation.
- **City of Emeryville:** Initiated work for the Hollis Street rehabilitation project.
- **City of Fremont:** Design work initiated on Quiet Zones on Nursery Avenue.
- **City of Hayward:** Rehabilitated 202,000 square feet of streets.
- **City of Livermore:** Repaired, sealed and rehabilitated 2.6 million square feet of roadway and pavement.
- **City of Newark:** Performed overlay of various streets with asphalt concrete on over 523,000 square feet.
- **City of Oakland:** Resurfaced 12 lane miles of city streets to improve vehicular, bike and pedestrian safety.
- **City of Piedmont:** Improved Highway Avenue and Park Way with drainage improvements and replacement of sidewalks.
- **City of Pleasanton:** Implemented Annual Curb and Gutter Replacement spanning over 2,100 linear feet as part of street resurfacing projects.
- **City of San Leandro:** Performed street sealing, repair and resurfacing on over 14 lane miles of city streets.
- **City of Union City:** Intersection improvements at 4th Street/L Street and First Street/Old Street to remove aging signal infrastructure.







[alamedactc.org](http://alamedactc.org)





**Summary of Exemptions for Agencies with  
Balances of Greater than 30 percent**  
(Cumulatively Across the Programs)

**MEASURE B****City of Albany**

Program	Planned Expenditures FY 14-15	Actual Expenditures FY 14-15	Unspent Amount FY 14-15	Unspent Percentage	Reason Code
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	-	
Local Streets and Roads	\$ 385,334	\$ 118,123	\$ 267,211	69%	1, 2
Paratransit					
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$ 385,334</b>	<b>\$ 118,123</b>	<b>\$ 267,211</b>	<b>69%</b>	

**City of Emeryville**

Program	Planned Expenditures FY 14-15	Actual Expenditures FY 14-15	Unspent Amount FY 14-15	Unspent Percentage	Reason Code
Bicycle and Pedestrian	\$ 54,904	\$ 15,841	\$ 39,063	71%	1, 2
Local Streets and Roads					
Paratransit					
<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$ 54,904</b>	<b>\$ 15,841</b>	<b>\$ 39,063</b>	<b>71%</b>	

**VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEE****City of Albany**

Program	Planned Expenditures FY 14-15	Actual Expenditures FY 14-15	Unspent Amount FY 14-15	Unspent Percentage	Reason Code
Local Streets and Roads	\$ 85,483	\$ 17,961	\$ 67,522	79%	1, 2
<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$ 85,483</b>	<b>\$ 17,961</b>	<b>\$ 67,522</b>	<b>79%</b>	

**City of Emeryville**

Program	Planned Expenditures FY 14-15	Actual Expenditures FY 14-15	Unspent Amount FY 14-15	Unspent Percentage	Reason Code
Local Streets and Roads	\$ 84,371	\$ 650	\$ 83,721	99%	1, 2
<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$ 84,371</b>	<b>\$ 650</b>	<b>\$ 83,721</b>	<b>99%</b>	

**Reason/Justification Code**

- (1) Project Delays
- (2) Revised Implementation Plan to implement other future projects
- (3) Expenditures incurred, but not accrued, in FY 14-15 and will be expended in FY 15-16.
- (4) Project Savings
- (5) Project scope reduced due to unforeseen issues i.e. funding issues, staffing shortages, community concern, etc.

***This page intentionally left blank***

*Urban Village by the Bay*

# ALBANY CALIFORNIA

CITY OF ALBANY



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

1000 SAN PABLO AVENUE

ALBANY, CA 94706

510 528-5760

[www.AlbanyCA.org/cd](http://www.AlbanyCA.org/cd)

May 13, 2016

Mr. John Nguyen  
Alameda County Transportation Commission  
1111 Broadway, Suite 800  
Oakland CA, 94607

Dear Mr. Nguyen,


The City of Albany is kindly requesting an exemption to the Alameda County Transportation Commission for the Measure B and Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) Master Agreements because it did not meet its unspent balance requirements during the FY 14/15 reporting period. According to this requirement, the unspent fund balance for each of the programs must be less than 30% and the City's unspent balance was 59% for the Measure B programs and 79% for the VRF Program.

The main reason for not meeting this requirement is that the City did not receive any construction bids for its Phase I of the 2015 Pavement Rehabilitation Program in the spring of 2015. This may be due to the fact that the Phase I of this project was a small scale construction project and contractors were already busy with summer contracts last year. This obviously delayed the timely use of funds for Fiscal Year 14/15 as the City's Pavement Rehabilitation Program is mainly funded by Measure B Local Streets and Roads funds. Likewise, the City had allocated VRF funds to the Albany Active Transportation Plan (ATP) Class II and Class III Striping and Signage bicycle projects (ATP Striping and Signage), but this project was to be implemented in coordination with the Pavement Program as well.

The City rebid the Pavement Project and the ATP Striping and Signage project later in the fall of 2015. This time Phases I and II of the Pavement Program were bid at the same time in order to make this project larger in scale and more attractive to contractors. As a result, the City was successful in obtaining bids and awarded the project in the fall of 2015. The construction of the Pavement Rehabilitation is currently underway and the City expects to use its available allocation of Measure B Local Streets and Roads and Vehicle Registration Fee funds for the 2015 Pavement Rehabilitation Program phases I and II and in the ATP Striping and Signage Projects.

Should you have further questions, please feel free to contact me at (510) 528-5759 or by email at [achavez@albanyca.org](mailto:achavez@albanyca.org).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Aleida', with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Aleida Andrino-Chavez, AICP  
Transportation Planner



# CITY OF EMERYVILLE

INCORPORATED 1896

1333 PARK AVENUE  
EMERYVILLE, CALIFORNIA 94608-3517

TEL: (510) 596-4330 FAX: (510) 596-4389

Alameda County Transportation Commission  
1111 Broadway, Suite 800  
Oakland, CA 94607

Attn: John Nguyen  
510-208-7400

December 10, 2015

Subject: Letter of Exemption-Measure B/BB

Mr. Nguyen;

The City of Emeryville hereby requests exemption from the Master Programs Funding Timely Use of Funds Policy. It is necessary for the City to aggregate multiple years of Measure B/BB revenue in order to produce a cost effective project the size of which creates a beneficial economy of scale. In the future it is likely that the City will establish Measure B/BB capital fund reserves to accomplish this.

The entire Local Streets and Roads Measure B/BB fund balance has been expended on the FY 15/16 Hollis Street Rehabilitation Project which is part of the City of Emeryville's Capital Improvement Program's Ongoing Street Rehabilitation Project.

Additionally, it is expected that the Ongoing Bicycle Pedestrian Plan Implementation Project will begin using an increased amount of Bicycle/Pedestrian Program funding in FY 15/16.

Please feel free to contact me at 510-596-4333 if you have any questions or require any additional information.

Sincerely,

Michael Roberts  
Senior Civil Engineer  
Public Works Department  
City of Emeryville



# CITY OF EMERYVILLE

INCORPORATED 1896

1333 PARK AVENUE  
EMERYVILLE, CALIFORNIA 94608-3517

TEL: (510) 596-4330 FAX: (510) 596-4389

Alameda County Transportation Commission  
1111 Broadway, Suite 800  
Oakland, CA 94607

Attn: John Nguyen  
510-208-7400

December 10, 2015

Subject: Letter of Exemption-VRF

Mr. Nguyen;

The City of Emeryville hereby requests exemption from the Master Programs Funding Agreement Timely Use of Funds Policy. It is necessary for the City to aggregate multiple years of VRF revenue in order to produce a cost effective project the size of which creates a beneficial economy of scale. In the future it is likely that the City will establish VRF capital fund reserves to accomplish this.

The City's entire VRF fund balance has been expended on the FY 15/16 Hollis Street Rehabilitation Project which is part of the City of Emeryville's Capital Improvement Program's Ongoing Street Rehabilitation Project.

Please feel free to contact me at 510-596-4333 if you have any questions or require any additional information.

Sincerely,

Michael Roberts  
Senior Civil Engineer  
Public Works Department  
City of Emeryville



# Memorandum

6.9

1333 Broadway, Suites 220 & 300, Oakland, CA 94612 • PH: (510) 208-7400 • www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** June 23, 2016

**SUBJECT:** I-580 Express Lanes Project (PN 1373.000/1373.001): Approve contract amendments to Professional Services Agreements A09-007 and A13-0092 with Electronic Transaction Consultants Corporation.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Authorize the Executive Director to:

1. Execute Amendment No. 4 to Agreement No. A09-007 with Electronic Transaction Consultants Corporation (ETCC) to include additional budget in the amount of \$900,000 for a total not-to-exceed amount of \$14,527,135 and extend the term of the Agreement to June 30, 2017 for additional scope of services necessary for operating the I-580 Eastbound Express Lanes; and
2. Execute Amendment No. 3 to Agreement No. A13-0092 with ETCC to include additional budget in the amount of \$800,000 for a total not-to-exceed amount of \$4,137,500 and extend the term of the Agreement to June 30, 2017 for additional scope of services necessary for operating the I-580 Westbound Express Lane

## Summary

The Alameda CTC, in cooperation with Federal, State, and Regional agencies and the cities of Dublin, Pleasanton, and Livermore, implemented various near-term strategic investments on the I-580 corridor in the Tri-Valley to address existing and forecasted traffic congestion, improve regional mobility, and provide travel reliability on this regionally significant corridor. The last of such near-term investments is the implementation of the I-580 Express Lanes Project which opened to traffic in mid-February 2016. The Project provides High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV)/Express Lanes on the I-580 corridor from Hacienda Drive to Greenville Road in the eastbound direction and from Greenville Road to San Ramon Road/Foothill Road in the westbound direction as shown in Attachment A – Project Location Map. In support of the overall Project delivery strategy, Alameda CTC retained the services of Electronic Transaction Consultants Corporation (ETCC) to plan, develop, procure, install, and operate the toll system, including interfacing with the Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA) and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

The I-580 Express Lanes employ newer technologies to collect tolls electronically and automate the enforcement of toll evasion violations. To support the automated toll evasion violation enforcement process, Alameda CTC advocated new legislation that

requires all users of the I-580 Express Lanes to carry toll tags, FasTrak® or FasTrak flex® for solo drivers and FasTrak flex for the HOV/HOV Eligible users and, at its July 2015 meeting, adopted a local toll ordinance for enacting the automated toll evasion violation enforcement process.

Since the opening of the Express Lanes, the facility has experienced a significant percentage of lane users not carrying toll tags as required by State statutes. Continuing public outreach efforts have increased the percentage of toll tag usage; however, this increase has reached a plateau of approximately 70%. Additionally, though it was anticipated that the continuous access would increase lane access opportunities and therefore a high number of trips should be expected, the actual number of trips continues to be significantly higher than initially projected. The combination of the larger than anticipated number of trips and no-toll tag use have resulted in a significant increase to the level of effort required by ETCC to perform the manual license plate reviews necessary to properly establish trip tolls and enforce violations.

The Project is currently in the 90-day toll system test period and, upon successful completion of these tests, it will move into the 270-day warranty period. At the completion of the warranty period, which is expected to conclude in early 2017, Alameda CTC anticipates accepting the final toll systems and moving into the full operation and maintenance phase. The recommended action would provide ETCC with the additional budgets detailed in Tables A and B of this report and authorize a seven-month time extension to June 30, 2017, to provide transitional operation and maintenance support services for the I-580 Express Lanes until a new agreement is established for the full operation and maintenance phase services beginning July 1, 2017.

## **Background**

The recently completed I-580 Corridor projects provide increased capacity, safety and efficiency for commuters and freight along the primary I-580 Corridor which connects the Bay Area with the Central Valley. In its role as project sponsor, the Alameda CTC worked closely with the Federal Highway Administration, Caltrans, the California Highway Patrol, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Alameda County, and the cities of Livermore, Dublin, and Pleasanton to deliver the projects in the corridor. The last of such improvements in the corridor is the I-580 HOV/Express Lanes Project that was opened to traffic in February 2016.

Carpool, clean-air vehicles, motorcycles, and transit vehicles are enjoying the benefits of toll-free travel in the two new HOV lanes (one lane in each direction). The express lanes optimize the corridor capacity by providing a new choice to drivers while maintaining acceptable levels of service in the carpool lanes. As a result, solo drivers using the Project facility are enjoying travel time savings and travel reliability benefits without impeding the benefits of carpooling. As anticipated, lane use continues to ramp up and is expected to stabilize over time.



In 2009, under a competitive selection process, ETCC was selected by Alameda CTC to develop and design software and hardware, procure and install toll equipment, test and open the toll system, including interfaces with BATA and Caltrans to the general public, and provide warranty period services for a restricted access express lane in the eastbound direction. In late 2012, in compliance with updated federal, state and regional requirements, Alameda CTC adopted the continuous access (also known as open access) concept for implementation on the I-580 corridor. The changes in operational concepts resulted in major changes to the toll system development and design. To accommodate these changes, the Commission authorized amending ETCC's Agreement (No. A09-007) to add the new and/or augmented scope of services and budget. Additionally, to capture project efficiencies and avoid costly coordination and implementation risks, the eastbound and westbound infrastructure were approved to be designed and constructed as one bid package. The inclusion of similar services for the implementation of the I-580 Westbound Express Lane toll system integration was reflected as a separate agreement with ETCC (Agreement No. A13-0092). These two agreements were subsequently amended to include automated toll violation enforcement processes, including manual license plate image review to meet the updated project business rules and BATA interface requirements. Manual review of the license plate images are required when the plates are obscured, deformed, or mounted incorrectly such that they fail the confidence level of an automated electronic review process.

Pursuant to State statutes, which require all lane users to carry toll tags, FasTrak® or FasTrak flex® for solo drivers and FasTrak flex for the HOV/HOV Eligible users, and the Commission's local toll ordinance, Alameda CTC has been employing automated toll evasion violation enforcement on the I-580 Express Lanes. The enforcement process involves the following steps:

1. When no toll tag is read at the toll gantries, the license plate images captured by the Vehicle Enforcement System cameras will be used to form trips.
2. These image-based trips will be used to either charge tolls to matching customer accounts or mail toll evasion violation notices to registered vehicle owners.
3. The notices will include toll evasion penalties and follow an escalation process similar to a process that has been employed on the Bay Area Toll Bridge operation.

To meet or beat a maximum 2% error criteria, nearly 80% of these license plate images are sorted through an automated process utilizing sophisticated software, and the rest through manual reviews, to form toll trips. Due to a large number of drivers not carrying toll tags and a larger than anticipated number of initial trips, the need for manual image review has substantially increased. The additional budget will allow ETCC to perform the manual license plate reviews necessary to properly establish trip tolls and enforce violations.

Currently the Project is in the 90-day toll system test period. Upon successful completion of these tests, it will move into the 270-day warranty period which is expected to conclude in early 2017. At the completion of the warranty period, Alameda CTC is expected to

accept the final toll systems and move into the full operation and maintenance phase. ETCC's agreements currently expire on November 30, 2016. In order to ensure uninterrupted operations of the Express Lanes, a seven-month time extension from November 30, 2016 to June 30, 2017, with a corresponding budget adjustment, will provide for the continued operation of the Express Lanes until a new agreement is established for operations and maintenance services beginning July 1, 2017.

Staff has negotiated the scope of services and budget for these amendments with ETCC based on the level of effort anticipated to conduct the additional work scope and has reached agreement that this negotiated amount is fair and reasonable to both Alameda CTC and ETCC. Tables A & B below summarize the contract actions related to Agreement No. A09-007 and A13-0092.

<b>TABLE A - Summary of Agreement No. A09-007</b>			
<b>Agreement Status</b>	<b>Work Description</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Total Contract Not-to-Exceed Value</b>
Original Agreement with ETCC (A09-007) <i>March 2010</i>	System integration for five limited ingress/egress access configurations, including system interaction with regional customer service center.	\$6,319,027	\$6,319,027
Amendment No. 1 <i>July 2013</i>	Revised toll system implementation (system integration) scope of services, based on near continuous access configuration.	\$3,413,059	\$9,732,086
Amendment No. 2 <i>September 2014</i>	Include new scope for automated toll violation enforcement, spare parts and warranty period services. Time extension to November 30, 2016.	\$2,760,000	\$12,492,086
Amendment No. 3 <i>July 2015</i>	Include scope to address new Interface Control Document, manual image review and Business Rule.	\$324,000	\$12,816,086
Construction Change Orders (CCO Nos. 1-4)	Installation delay costs, additional remobilization and lane closure costs, long-distance toll sites, enforcement strategy. (Commission approved a \$936,000 budget at its July 2015 meeting.)	\$811,049	\$13,627,135

<i>Proposed Amendment No. 4* (This Agenda Item)</i>	<i>Additional manual image review. Time extension from November 30, 2016 to June 30, 2017.</i>	<i>\$900,000*</i>	<i>\$14,527,135*</i>
<b>Total Amended Agreement Not-to-Exceed Amount</b>			<b>\$14,527,135*</b>

\* Subject to Commission's approval in June 2016

<b>TABLE B - Summary of Agreement No. A13-0092</b>			
<b>Agreement Status</b>	<b>Work Description</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Total Contract Not-to-Exceed Value</b>
Original Agreement with ETCC (A13-0092) <i>July 2013</i>	System integration for near continuous access implementation, including system interaction with regional customer service center.	\$2,764,405	\$2,764,405
Amendment No. 1 <i>September 2014</i>	Include new scope for automated toll violation enforcement, spare parts and warranty period services. Time extension to November 30, 2016.	\$533,095	\$3,297,500
Amendment No. 2 <i>July 2015</i>	Include scope to address changed construction sequencing and image review.	\$40,000	\$3,337,500
<i>Proposed Amendment No. 3* (This Agenda Item)</i>	<i>Additional manual image review. Time extension from November 30, 2016 to June 30, 2017.</i>	<i>\$800,000*</i>	<i>\$4,137,500*</i>
<b>Total Amended Agreement Not-to-Exceed Amount</b>			<b>\$4,137,500*</b>

\* Subject to Commission's approval in June 2016

**Action No. 1:** Approve and authorize the Executive Director to execute Amendment No. 4 to Professional Services Agreement No. A09-007 with ETCC to include additional budget in the amount of \$900,000 for a total not-to-exceed amount of \$14,527,135 and extend the term of the Agreement from November 30, 2016 to June 30, 2017 for additional scope of services necessary for operating the I-580 Eastbound Express Lanes.

**Action No. 2:** Approve and authorize the Executive Director to execute Amendment No. 3 to Professional Services Agreement No. A13-0092 with ETCC to include additional budget in the amount of \$800,000 for a total not-to-exceed amount of \$4,137,500 and extend the term of the Agreement from November 30, 2016 to June 30, 2017 for additional scope of services necessary for operating the I-580 Westbound Express Lane.

**Levine Act Statement:** ETCC did not report a conflict in accordance with the Levine Act.

**Fiscal Impact:** The fiscal impact of approving these two items is \$1,700,000. The actions will authorize the encumbrance of toll revenue funds to be used for subsequent expenditure. The budget is included in the appropriate project funding plans and has been included in the Alameda CTC Adopted FY2015-16 Operating and Capital Program Budget.

### **Attachments**

A. Project Location Map


### **Staff Contact**

[Liz Rutman](#), Express Lanes Operations and Maintenance Manager



# I-580 Express Lanes Project Location Map

6.9A



Not to scale



## Two Eastbound Express Lanes

### Lanes begin at Hacienda



No entry/exit from eastbound express lanes from Hacienda to Fallon / El Charro.

**Please note:** For access to Santa Rita Road, do not enter express lanes.



## One Westbound Express Lane

### Lane begins at Greenville



No entry/exit from westbound express lane from Hacienda to end.

**Please note:** For access to I-680 or Dougherty, exit express lane before Hacienda.

***This page intentionally left blank***



# Memorandum

6.10

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• PH: (510) 208-7400

• www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** June 23, 2016

**SUBJECT:** I-680 Southbound Express Lane Operations (PN 1408.000): Approval of Contract Amendment No. 1 to Professional Services Agreement A15-0043 with Electronic Transaction Consultants Corporation.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approve and authorize the Executive Director to execute Amendment No. 1 to the Professional Services Agreement No. A15-0043 with Electronic Transaction Consultants Corporation for an additional amount of \$2,000,000 for a total not-to-exceed amount of \$3,000,000 and a two-year time extension to June 30, 2018 for operations and maintenance support services.

## Summary

The I-680 Southbound Express Lane facility spans over 14 miles from SR 84 near Pleasanton to SR 237 in the City of Milpitas. In addition to carpoolers who use the lane at no cost, it allows toll-paying solo drivers to benefit from optimized capacity, reduced congestion, and increased travel time reliability. The Alameda CTC, acting as the managing agency for the I-680 Sunol Smart Carpool Lane Joint Powers Authority (Sunol JPA), has been operating the express lane facility since it opened to traffic in Fall 2010. See Attachment A – Project Location Map.

Per the direction of the Sunol JPA, the existing I-680 Southbound Express Lane will be modified to incorporate continuous access and enforcement technology similar to the I-580 Express Lanes. The selection of a Toll System Integrator (TSI) for this project is underway and will include system modifications and the associated operations and maintenance (O&M) support services. Until the system modifications are completed and/or O&M support services are activated under the new TSI contract, it is necessary to maintain the current system.

Electronic Transaction Consultants Corporation's (ETCC) contract to provide O&M support services will expire on June 30, 2016. A time and budget extension is needed to ensure uninterrupted field operations and maintenance support services are available for the toll operations. The estimated cost for the two additional years' of services is \$2,000,000.



The recommended action would increase the contract not-to-exceed amount as shown in Table A of this report and authorize a two-year time extension to June 30, 2018 to provide continued operation and maintenance support services.

## **Background**

Electronic Transaction Consultants Corporation (ETCC) was selected by Alameda CTC to provide electronic toll system (ETS)/system integration services, including planning, design, and development/installation of software and hardware to implement the toll system for the I-680 Southbound Express Lane under a competitive selection process in 2008. Since the express lane opened to traffic in September 2010, ETCC, as the agency's toll integrator, has been providing O&M support services that include field preventive and routine maintenance services for the ETS equipment, back office technical support for hardware and software, and software licensing to operate the express lane.

Effective July 1, 2015, the original contract, which had utilized a mixture of federal, state, and local funding, was terminated and Alameda CTC entered into a new professional services agreement with ETCC for O&M support services through June 30, 2016. Continuous O&M support services are required for the operation of the existing toll system operations beyond current fiscal year.

Per the direction of the Sunol JPA, the existing I-680 Southbound Express Lane will be modified to incorporate continuous access and enforcement technology similar to the I-580 Express Lanes. The modification will be concurrent with the implementation of the new I-680 Northbound Express Lane Project, anticipated to open to traffic in early 2019. The selection of a TSI for this project is underway, with award pending approval of the Commission. Until the system modifications are such that O&M support services fall within the scope of the new TSI contract, it is prudent to extend the current O&M support services contract with ETCC to support the on-going toll operations.

The draft FY 2016/17 annual operating budget for the I-680 Southbound Express Lane is fully funded by toll revenues and includes a line item for O&M support services.

The proposed amendment is for a value of \$2,000,000 for a contract total not-to-exceed amount of \$3,000,000 and to extend the term of the agreement for two years. With the proposed modifications, the contract would continue to meet the Local Business Contract Equity goals set by the Alameda CTC.

Staff has negotiated the contract amendment with ETCC based on the level of effort required to effectively maintain and operate the I-680 Southbound Express Lane. Staff has determined that this negotiated amount is fair and reasonable to both Alameda CTC and ETCC. Table A below summarizes the contract actions related to Agreement No. A15-0043.

Table A: Summary of Agreement No. A15-0043			
Contract Status	Work Description	Value	Total Contract Not-to-Exceed Value
Original Professional Services Agreement with Electronic Tolling Consultant Corporation (A15-0043) <i>July 2015</i>	Operations and Maintenance Support Services for FY 2015-2016.	NA	\$ 1,000,000
<i>Proposed Amendment No. 1 June 2015 (This Agenda Item)</i>	Provide additional budget and two-year time extension to June 30, 2018.	\$2,000,000	\$3,000,000
<b>Total Amended Contract Not-to-Exceed Amount</b>			\$3,000,000

**Levine Act Statement:** Electronic Transaction Consultants Corporation did not report a conflict in accordance with the Levine Act.

**Fiscal Impact:** The fiscal impact of approving this item is \$2,000,000. The action will authorize the encumbrance of toll revenue funds to be used for subsequent expenditure, subject to the approval of the Sunol JPA's FY 2016-17 and FY 2017-18 Operating Budgets.

#### Attachment


A. Project Location Map

#### Staff Contact

[Liz Rutman](#), Express Lanes Operations and Maintenance Manager

***This page intentionally left blank***

## I-680 Southbound Express Lane Project Location Map



***This page intentionally left blank***



# Memorandum

6.11

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• 510.208.7400

• www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** June 23, 2016

**SUBJECT:** I-680 Northbound Express Lane Project (PN 1369.000), including I-680 Southbound Express Lane Access Conversion (PN 1408.001):  
Approval of Professional Services Agreement A17-0001 with Kapsch TrafficCom Transportation NA, Inc.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approve and authorize:

1. The allocation of \$15,000,000 of 2014 Measure BB funds for the System Integration Phase;
2. The Executive Director to execute Professional Services Agreement A17-0001 with Kapsch TrafficCom Transportation NA, Inc. for a not-to-exceed budget of \$15,000,000 to provide Toll System Integration Services.

## Summary

The Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) is the implementing agency for the I-680 Northbound Express Lane Project (PN 1369.000) including the I-680 Southbound Express Lane Access Conversion Project (PN 1408.001). The I-680 Corridor is included in both the 2000 Measure B and 2014 Measure BB capital programs and has long been a critical element of the Alameda County transportation network.

Recognizing the recurring and prolonged levels of traffic congestion experienced by travelers and communities in this segment of the I-680 Corridor, Alameda CTC has embarked on a phased construction approach by expediting the construction of a fundable first phase (Phase 1 Modified) project to provide immediate traffic relief. The Phase 1 Modified Project proposes to add a new continuous access type HOV/Express Lane between Auto Mall Parkway and SR 84, spanning a distance of approximately nine miles. The express lane will provide a new choice for solo drivers to access the lane for a fee when time saving is a value to them, without impeding the benefits of carpooling. The lane is expected to provide congestion relief, travel time savings, and travel reliability on the I-680 Corridor which connects the Silicon Valley businesses with the Tri-valley and beyond. In addition, the project will convert the existing restricted access I-680 Southbound Express Lane facility to a continuous access facility to provide increased lane access opportunities and create a single toll operating system within the corridor. The

Project is currently in the design phase with commencement of construction anticipated in Spring/Summer of 2017. See Attachment A – Project Location Map.

Following the Commission's approval to release a request for proposals (RFP) for toll system integration services in April 2015, Alameda CTC released RFP #R16-0004 in September 2015. The selected consultant will be required to provide very specialized services such as toll system development, design, software development, equipment procurement and installation, testing, and open the toll lanes for toll operation. Upon successful completion of initial system testing, the selected consultant is also required to provide warranty period services.

Proposals were received from two firms, and an independent selection panel composed of representatives from the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (SCVTA), Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA), and Alameda CTC reviewed the proposals and shortlisted both firms. Interviews were conducted on January 20, 2016, and the selection panel established preliminary scores for the two firms. Alameda CTC then entered into a Best and Final Offer (BAFO) process with both proposers. As part of this process, Alameda CTC staff met with both proposers, provided additional scope clarifications, and offered both proposers the opportunity to revise their technical and cost proposals based on the clarifications and/or new information provided. The selection panel then reviewed the revised/best and final offer technical and cost proposals and established final rankings. In the panel's final rankings, Kapsch TrafficCom Transportation NA, Inc. (Kapsch) was selected as the top-ranked firm.

An allocation of \$15,000,000 of 2014 Measure BB funds from the current remaining Measure BB Programmed Balance of \$55,000,000 for Project Commitment: I-680 HOT/HOV Lane from SR-237 to Alcosta, is requested to allow for the award of the Professional Services Agreement A17-0001 with Kapsch for a not-to-exceed amount of \$15,000,000 to provide Toll System Integration services. The estimated duration is four (4) years to complete the toll system development, design, installation, and testing and warranty period services.

## **Background**

The I-680 Corridor is included in both the 2000 Measure B and 2014 Measure BB capital programs and has long been a critical element of the Alameda County transportation network. Alameda CTC is the implementing agency for the I-680 Northbound Express Lane Project (PN 1369.000). I-680 from SR 237 to SR 84 is the one of the most congested freeways in the San Francisco Bay Area and according to a recent MTC study, it ranks as the sixth most congested corridor in the Bay Area. With the recent economic upturn, which has revitalized commute and goods movement in this corridor, the level of traffic congestion and delays has increased. Traffic forecasts indicate that traffic congestion is expected to worsen in the coming years. Given the magnitude of delays that motorists currently experience, a conceptual plan has been developed and environmentally cleared to deliver an initial construction phase (Phase 1 Modified Project), which will provide operational benefits within the limited available construction funds and expedite congestion relief. The Phase 1 Modified Project scope would:



- Add a new northbound HOV/Express Lane between Auto Mall Parkway and SR 84, which will eliminate the two bottlenecks near Washington Boulevard and at the lane drop at the truck scales (located between Sheridan Road and Andrade Road),
- Incorporate a Caltrans pavement rehabilitation project (from Auto Mall Parkway to SR 84) into the project,
- Convert the existing southbound express lanes to continuous access,
- Implement an enhanced automated toll evasion violation enforcement system, and
- Create a single toll operating system within the corridor.

The project is currently in the design (also known as plans, specification and estimate or PS&E) phase. In addition to the improvements proposed in the northbound direction, the project will also include the I-680 Southbound Express Lane access conversion (PN 1408.001) to provide increased lane access opportunity by changing the lane access from restricted to continuous type.

The toll system design needs to be integrated into the final roadway design for the successful implementation of toll operations on I-680. Kapsch will design the toll system, develop software and hardware, conduct factory acceptance tests, install toll equipment, integrate the toll systems with the roadway infrastructure, conduct site acceptance tests, including testing interfacing requirements with the toll collection and customer services provider and Caltrans, and open the facility to the travelling public. Once the lanes are open, Kapsch, as the toll system integrator (TSI), will test the systems and enter into a warranty period which is expected to last to a full year from lane opening.

The Alameda CTC selection process to procure consultant services for the TSI services began in April 2015 with the Commission's approval to release the RFP. RFP #R16-0004 was released in September 2015. A pre-proposal meeting was held on October 13, 2015, and was attended by three (3) firms. Alameda CTC received two (2) proposals on November 2, 2015, from the following firms:

- Electronic Transaction Consulting Corporation
- Schneider Electric (subsequently Kapsch TrafficCom Transportation NA, Inc.)

An independent selection panel composed of representatives from the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (SCVTA), Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA), and Alameda CTC reviewed the proposals and shortlisted both firms. Interviews were conducted on January 20, 2016, and the selection panel established preliminary scores for the two firms. Alameda CTC then entered into a Best and Final Offer (BAFO) process with both proposers. As part of this process, Alameda CTC staff met with both proposers, provided additional scope clarifications, and offered both proposers the opportunity to revise their technical and cost proposals based on the clarifications and/or new information provided. The selection panel then reviewed the revised/best and final offer technical and cost proposals and established final rankings. In the panel's final rankings, Kapsch was selected as the top-ranked firm.

In the preliminary ranking, Electronic Transaction Consultants Corporation (ETC) had been the top-ranked firm with an aggregate score of 85.0 points, and Kapsch was the second ranked firm, with an aggregate score of 80.5 points. After the BAFO process was complete, the selection panel adjusted the aggregate score for ETC to 81.1 points (50.3 for technical evaluation, 17.1 for cost proposal, 8.7 for interview, and 5 points under the LBCE Program based on the fact that ETC had opened a local office to accommodate their existing work on the I-680 SB Express Lane) and the panel's adjusted score for Kapsch to a total of 82.6 points (54.5 for technical evaluation, 20 for cost proposal, and 8.1 for interview)

ETC filed a Notice of Protest with Alameda CTC after being informed that Kapsch was selected as the top-ranked firm after the BAFO protest, and has asked Alameda CTC for a number of documents related to the RFP and BAFO protest to help them understand why they were no longer the top-ranked firm after the BAFO process was completed. In their letter, ETC noted that they may withdraw the protest after receiving and reviewing the information they have requested. Staff has now provided ETC with most, if not all, of the requested documents subject to release under the Public Records Act, and anticipates holding discussions with ETC prior to the date of the Committee meeting regarding the basis for the selection panel's determination that Kapsch should be awarded this contract. Staff will provide a verbal update regarding the protest at the Committee meeting.

Staff anticipates that a professional services agreement based on the scope and cost estimate resulting from the BAFO process will be ready for execution in July 2016. The requested budget of \$15,000,000 includes \$11,330,000 for the toll system development, design, software development, and warranty period services and an additional \$3,670,000 in contingency budget for handling any unforeseen changes. The requested budget represents 12.5 % of the estimated construction capital cost and is well within the normal range of costs for similar toll system projects.

As outlined in the approved project financial plans, Measure BB funds will be used for the toll system integration services. The recommended allocation will increase the total amount allocated for this project to \$20,000,000 as further detailed in Table 1 below.

<b>Table 1: Summary of 2014 Measure BB Commitment for I-680 HOT/HOV Lane from SR-237 to Alcosta</b>		
<b>Contract Status Work Description</b>	<b>Allocation Amount</b>	<b>Remaining Measure BB Programmed Balance (Un-Allocated)</b>
Total Measure BB Commitment	NA	\$ 60,000,000
Previously Allocated (June 2015)	\$5,000,000	\$ 55,000,000
Recommended Allocation (This Agenda Item)	\$15,000,000	\$ 40,000,000
<b>Remaining 2014 Measure BB Programmed Balance</b>		<b>\$ 40,000,000</b>

Kapsch is a well-established international firm, and its team is comprised of several certified local and small local firms and is expected to meet a 21% LBE/SLBE goal for the contract, which is lower than the set Local Business Contract Equity Program goals.

Staff recommends that the Commission approve and authorize the Executive Director to execute a Professional Services Agreement A17-0001 with Kapsch for a not-to-exceed budget in the amount of \$15,000,000 to provide Toll System Integration services. The estimated duration to complete the scope of services is four (4) years.

**Levine Act Statement:** The Kapsch Team did not report a conflict in accordance with the Levine Act.

**Fiscal Impact:** The action will authorize the allocation, encumbrance, and subsequent expenditure of \$15,000,000 of 2014 Measure BB funds for the System Integration Phase. This amount is included in the appropriate project funding plans, and sufficient budget has been included in the Alameda CTC Adopted FY 2016-17 Operating and Capital Program Budget.

#### **Attachment**

A. Project Location Map


#### **Staff Contact:**



[Liz Rutman](#), Express Lanes Operations and Maintenance Manager

***This page intentionally left blank***



**Exist. I-680 SB EL  
(No change south of  
SR 262)**



 EXISTING EXPRESS LANE  
 NEAR TERM EXPRESS LANE PROJECTS (BY 2020)  
 MID TERM EXPRESS LANE PROJECTS (BY 2025)  
 LONG TERM EXPRESS LANE PROJECTS (BY 2035)

***This page intentionally left blank***



# Memorandum

6.12

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• PH: (510) 208-7400

• www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** June 23, 2016

**SUBJECT:** Approval of Administrative Amendments to Various Project Agreements (A13-0001, A07-0058, A14-0032)

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approve and authorize the Executive Director to execute administrative amendments to various project agreements in support of the Alameda CTC's Capital Projects and Program delivery commitments.

## Summary

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

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

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

## Background

Amendments are considered "administrative" if they do not result in an increase to the existing encumbrance authority approved for use by a specific entity for a specific project. Examples of administrative amendments include time extensions and project task/phase budget realignments which do not require additional commitment beyond the total amount currently encumbered in the agreement, or beyond the cumulative total amount encumbered in multiple agreements (for cases involving multiple agreements for a given project or program).

Agreements are entered into based upon estimated known project needs for scope, cost, and schedule. Throughout the life of a project, situations may arise that warrant the need for a time extension or a realignment of project phase/task budgets.



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

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

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

**Levine Act Statement:** No firms reported a conflict in accordance with the Levine Act.

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

#### **Attachments**

- A. Table A: Administrative Amendment Summary
- B. City of Livermore Request

#### **Staff Contact**

[Trinity Nguyen](#), Sr. Transportation Engineer

Table A: Administrative Amendment Summary

Index No.	Firm/Agency	Project/Services	Agreement No.	Contract Amendment History and Requests	Reason Code	Fiscal Impact
1	Alta Planning + Design Inc.	Safe Routes to Schools Program	A13-0001	A1: Budget increase A2: 12-month time extension from 6/30/2016 to 6/30/2017 (current request)	1	None
2	City of Livermore	Isabel Avenue-Route 84/I-580 Interchange Project/R/W phase	A07-0058	A1: Phase shift and time extension A2: Phase shift A3: Budget increase A4: 36-month time extension from 6/30/2016 to 6/30/2019 (current request - see Attachment B for details)	2	None
3	PlaceWorks, Inc.	Cities of Albany and San Leandro Parking Management Plans	A14-0032	A1: Time Extension A2: 12-month time extension from 9/9/2016 to 9/9/2017 (current request)	1	None

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

***This page intentionally left blank***



May 24, 2016

Trinity Nguyen  
Alameda County Transportation Authority  
1111 Broadway, Suite 800  
Oakland, California 94607

Re: Isabel Avenue (SR84)/I-580 Interchange Improvements  
ACTC Project No. 23 PSFA No. A07-0058, City Project No. 199238  
Request for Contract Time Extension

Dear Trinity:

The City herewith requests to extend the expiration date in Project Specific Funding Agreement No. A07-0058 from June 30, 2016 to June 30, 2019 to complete the Right-of-Way Capital and Support Phases.

The City, its consultants and Caltrans staff made progress related to reimbursements of utility agreements, completion of the exchange of properties between the City and BART to acquire the Isabel/I-580 Interchange property acquisition and environmental mitigation related work over the last year. The right-of-way properties along the Isabel Avenue corridor from Jack London Boulevard to the Isabel interchange are currently owned by the City. However, the City needs more time to complete the transfer of the newly acquired BART properties from the City to the State for the Isabel Avenue/I-580 Interchange improvements. The project team will continue to work to primarily clear parcel encumbrances, grant easements to relocated utilities in City properties, and vacate old easements through the project limits. We are working with Caltrans to finalize the transfer deeds and related document, clear encumbrances and expect to record the main transfer document in the next 12-18 months. A separate transfer document will be prepared for the Portola Avenue/I-580 overcrossing right-of-way, since the City is still working on resolving a right-of-way issue related to a take from the Lin property. This pending acquisition affects an easement for a relocated Sprint facility and requires legal proceedings. The City is also working on completing compliance with environmental mitigations for the Isabel Interchange. Our landscape maintenance contractors will continue to maintain the native plantings for the on-site and off-site mitigation sites until end of 2019. Our consultants are working on developing a seasonal wetland and wetland enhancements at East Bay Park District property acquired in the Doolan Canyon area for off-site mitigation. A Habitat Management Plan is being prepared at this property to implement a 50-acre conservation easement. We expect to record the conservation easement and complete the design of the seasonal wetland and enhancements next year in order to start construction in summer of 2017 and start the

Trinity Nguyen  
May 24, 2016  
Page 2 of 2

maintenance period for the wetland habitat native plantings for a couple years until the native plantings are self-sufficient.

The City appreciates your attention to this contract time extension. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at 925-960-4532 or [rjescobar@cityoflivermore.net](mailto:rjescobar@cityoflivermore.net).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Roberto Escobar".

Roberto Escobar  
Associate Civil Engineer  
CDD/Engineering Division

CC: Cheri Sheets, Mike Cavalieri

**Attachment A**  
**Alameda CTC Community Advisory Committee Appointment Detail for**  
**Mayor Trish Spencer, City of Alameda**

Check the box(es) and date and sign this form to approve reappointment of members whose terms are expiring or to appoint new members.

**Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee (PAPCO)**



**Reappoint**

**(action required)**

Harriette Saunders

**Term Began:** October 2012

**Term End:** October 2014

June 6, 2014

Date

Trish Spencer

Mayor Trish Spencer, City of Alameda

To fill a vacancy, submit a committee application and corresponding resume to the Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) for each new member. Return the form(s) by mail, email, or fax to:

Alameda CTC  
Attn: Angie Ayers  
1111 Broadway, Suite 800  
Oakland, CA 94607  
Email: [ayers@alamedactc.org](mailto:ayers@alamedactc.org)  
Fax: (510) 893-6489

**Attachment A**  
**Alameda CTC Community Advisory Committee Appointment Detail for**  
**Supervisor Keith Carson, Alameda County, District 5**

Check the box(es) and date and sign this form to approve reappointment of members whose terms are expiring or to appoint new members.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Planning Committee (BPAC)**

**Current Appointment:**  
(no action required)

Preston Jordan




**Term Began:** October 2014

**Term Ends:** October 2016

**Independent Watchdog Committee (IWC)**

☒ **Reappoint**  
(action required)

Hale Zukas



Home Phone: (510) 848-5215

**Term Began:** May 2014

**Term Ends:** May 2016

**Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee (PAPCO)**

☒ **Reappoint**  
(action required)

Will Scott



**Term Began:** May 2014

**Term Ends:** May 2016

5/24/16

Date

Supervisor Keith Carson, Alameda County, District 5

To fill a vacancy, submit a committee application and corresponding resume to the Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) for each new member. Return the form(s) by email, mail, or fax to:

Alameda CTC  
Attn: Angie Ayers  
1111 Broadway, Suite 800  
Oakland, CA 94607  
Email: [ayers@alamedactc.org](mailto:ayers@alamedactc.org)  
Fax: (510) 893-6489



**Attachment A**  
**Alameda CTC Community Advisory Committee Appointment Detail for**  
**Mayor David Haubert, City of Dublin**

Check the box(es) and date and sign this form to approve reappointment of members whose terms are expiring or to appoint new members.

**Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee (PAPCO)**


☒ **Reappoint**  
(action required)

Shawn Costello

**Term Began:** May 2014

**Term Expires:** May 2016

5/23/16  
Date

  
VICE Mayor ~~David Haubert~~, City of Dublin  
Abe Gupta

To fill a vacancy, submit a committee application and corresponding resume to the Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) for each new member. Return the form(s) by email, mail, or fax to:

Alameda CTC  
Attn: Angie Ayers  
1111 Broadway, Suite 800  
Oakland, CA 94607  
Email: [aaayers@alamedactc.org](mailto:aaayers@alamedactc.org)  
Fax: (510) 893-6489

**Attachment A**  
**Alameda CTC Community Advisory Committee Appointment Detail for**  
**Executive Director Michael Tree, LAVTA**

Check the box(es) and date and sign this form to approve reappointment of members whose terms are expiring or to appoint new members.

**Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee (PAPCO)**



**Reappoint**

**(action required)**

Esther Ann Waltz



**Term Began:** May 2014

**Term Expires:** May 2016

8/1/2016  
Date

Executive Director Michael Tree, LAVTA

To fill a vacancy, submit a committee application and corresponding resume to the Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) for each new member. Return the form(s) by mail, email, or fax to:

Alameda CTC  
Attn: Angie Ayers  
1111 Broadway, Suite 800  
Oakland, CA 94607  
Email: [aaayers@alamedactc.org](mailto:aaayers@alamedactc.org)  
Fax: (510) 893-6489


**Attachment A**  
**Alameda CTC Community Advisory Committee Appointment Detail for**  
**Mayor Jerry Thorne, City of Pleasanton**

*Check the box(es) and date and sign this form to approve reappointment of members whose terms are expiring or to appoint new members.*

**Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee (PAPCO)**

☒ **Reappoint**  
**(action required)**

Carmen Rivera-Hendrickson



Phone: (925) 223-8898

**Term Began:** February 2014

**Term Expires:** February 2016

6/14/2014

Date

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jerry Thorne".  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor Jerry Thorne, City of Pleasanton

*To fill a vacancy, submit a committee application and corresponding resume to the Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) for each new member. Return the form(s) by mail, email, or fax to:*

Alameda CTC  
Attn: Angie Ayers  
1111 Broadway, Suite 800  
Oakland, CA 94607  
Email: [ayers@alamedactc.org](mailto:ayers@alamedactc.org)  
Fax: (510) 893-6489

***This page intentionally left blank***

**Alameda County Transportation Commission  
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee  
Roster and Attendance Fiscal Year 2015-2016**

	Suffix	Last Name	First Name	City	Appointed By	Term Began	Re-apptmt.	Term Expires	Mtgs Missed Since Jul '15
1	Ms.	Tabata, Chair	Midori	Oakland	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-4	Jul-06	Dec-15	Dec-17	0
2	Mr.	Turner, Vice Chair	Matt	Castro Valley	Alameda County Supervisor Nate Miley, District 4	Apr-14		Apr-16	1
3	Mr.	Fishbaugh	David	Fremont	Alameda County Supervisor Scott Haggerty, District 1	Jan-14	Jan-16	Jan-18	0
4	Ms.	Gigli	Lucy	Alameda	Alameda County Supervisor Wilma Chan, District 3	Jan-07	Oct-12	Oct-14	2
5	Mr.	Johansen	Jeremy	San Leandro	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-3	Sep-10	Dec-15	Dec-17	0
6	Mr.	Jordan	Preston	Albany	Alameda County Supervisor Keith Carson, District 5	Oct-08	Oct-14	Oct-16	1
7	Ms.	Marleau	Kristi	Dublin	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-1	Dec-14		Dec-16	0
8	Mr.	Murtha	Dave	Hayward	Alameda County Supervisor Richard Valle, District 2	Sep-15		Sep-17	0
9	Mr.	Schweng	Ben	Alameda	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-2	Jun-13	Jul-15	Jul-17	0
10	Ms.	Shaw	Diane	Fremont	Transit Agency (Alameda CTC)	Apr-14		Apr-16	1
11	Ms.	Zimmerman	Sara	Berkeley	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-5	Apr-14		Apr-16	2

***This page intentionally left blank***

**Alameda County Transportation Commission  
Independent Watchdog Committee  
Roster - Fiscal Year 2015-2016**

7.2

	Title	Last	First	City	Appointed By	Term Began	Re-apptmt.	Term Expires	Mtgs Missed Since July '15
1	Mr.	McCalley, Chair	Murphy	Castro Valley	Alameda County Supervisor Nate Miley, D-4	Feb-15		Feb-17	0
2	Ms.	Brown	Cheryl	Oakland	Alameda Labor Council (AFL-CIO)	Apr-15		N/A	3
3	Mr.	Dominguez	Oscar	Oakland	East Bay Economic Development Alliance	Dec-15		N/A	0
4	Ms.	Dorsey	Cynthia	Oakland	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-5	Jan-14	Jan-16	Jan-18	1
5	Mr.	Hastings	Herb	Dublin	Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee	Jul-14		N/A	0
6	Mr.	Jones	Steven	Dublin	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-1	Dec-12	Jan-15	Jan-17	2
7	Mr.	Lester	Brian	Pleasanton	Alameda County Supervisor Scott Haggerty, D-1	Sep-13	Jan-16	Jan-18	4
8	Ms.	Lew	Jo Ann	Union City	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-2	Oct-07	Dec-15	Dec-17	0
9	Mr.	Naté	Glenn	Union City	Alameda County Supervisor Richard Valle, D-2	Jan-15		Jan-17	1
10	Ms.	Piras	Pat	San Lorenzo	Sierra Club	Jan-15		N/A	0
11	Ms.	Price	Barbara	Alameda	Alameda County Taxpayers Association	Oct-15		N/A	1
12	Ms.	Saunders	Harriette	Alameda	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-3	Jul-09	Jul-14	Jul-16	2
13	Mr.	Tucknott	Robert A.	Livermore	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-4	Jun-14		Jun-16	2
14	Mr.	Zukas	Hale	Berkeley	Alameda County Supervisor Keith Carson, D-5	Jun-09	May-14	May-16	0
15		Vacancy			Alameda County Supervisor Wilma Chan, D-3				



**Alameda County Transportation Commission**  
**Independent Watchdog Committee**  
**Roster - Fiscal Year 2015-2016**

16		Vacancy			Bike East Bay				
17		Vacancy			League of Women Voters				



Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
Monday, March 28, 2016, 1:00 p.m.

7.3

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

510.208.7400

www.AlamedaCTC.org

## MEETING ATTENDEES

Attendance Key (A = Absent, P = Present)

### Members:

P Sylvia Stadmire,  
Chair

A Will Scott,  
Vice-Chair

P Kevin Barranti

P Larry Bunn

P Shawn Costello

P Herb Hastings

P Joyce  
Jacobson

P Sandra  
Johnson-Simon

P Jonah Markowitz

A Rev. Carolyn Orr

A Vanessa Proee

P Carmen Rivera-  
Hendrickson

P Michelle Rousey  
A Harriette

Saunders

P Cimberly Tamura

P Esther Waltz

P Hale Zukas

### Staff:

P Jacki Taylor, Program Analyst

P Naomi Armenta, Paratransit Coordinator

P Krystle Pasco, Paratransit Coordination Team

P Terra Curtis, Paratransit Coordination Team

P Gladys Parmelee, Administration Team

### Guests:

Arnold Brillinger, Public Member; Catherine Callahan, Center for Independent Living (CIL); Ron Halog, Community Resources for Independent Living (CRIL); Rashida Kamara Transdev; Rebeca Servin, Center for Independent Living (CIL); Laura Timothy, BART

## MEETING MINUTES

### 1. Welcome and Introductions

Sylvia Stadmire, PAPCO Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m. and confirmed a quorum. The meeting began with introductions and a review of the meeting outcomes.

### 2. Public Comment

There were no comments from the public.

### **3. Administration**

#### **3.1. January 25, 2016 PAPCO Meeting Minutes**

*Member Markowitz moved to approve the January 25, 2016 PAPCO Meeting minutes as written. Member Waltz seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following votes (8-0-1):*

Yes:        *Barranti, Hastings, Jacobson, Johnson-Simon,  
Markowitz, Stadmire, Tamura, Waltz*

No:         *None*

Abstain: *Costello*

Absent: *Bunn, Orr, Proee, Rivera-Hendrickson, Rousey,  
Saunders, Scott, Zukas*

#### **3.2. February 22, 2016 Joint PAPCO and ParaTAC Meeting Minutes**

*Member Markowitz moved to approve the February 22, 2016 Joint PAPCO and ParaTAC Meeting minutes as written. Member Waltz seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following votes (8-0-1):*

Yes:        *Barranti, Hastings, Jacobson, Johnson-Simon,  
Markowitz, Stadmire, Tamura, Waltz*

No:         *None*

Abstain: *Costello*

Absent: *Bunn, Orr, Proee, Rivera-Hendrickson, Rousey,  
Saunders, Scott, Zukas*

#### **3.3. Convene Program Plan Review Subcommittees**

Committee members had the opportunity to volunteer for appointment to the Program Plan Review subcommittees.

#### **3.4. FY 2015-16 PAPCO Meeting Calendar**

Committee members received the updated FY 2015-16 PAPCO meeting calendar.

#### **3.5. FY 2015-16 PAPCO Work Plan**

Committee members received the updated FY 2015-16 PAPCO work plan.

### **3.6. PAPCO Appointments**

Committee members received the current PAPCO appointments.

## **4. Quarterly Paratransit Strategic Planning Workshop Feedback (Verbal)**

Terra Curtis gave an overview of the Paratransit Strategic Planning Workshop that took place on February 22, 2016. The workshop focused on Alameda CTC's Countywide Transit Plan and needs assessment efforts. PAPCO members had the opportunity to provide feedback on the workshop.

Questions and feedback from PAPCO members:

- A Committee member thought the workshop went really well. The presentation was very clear and she also enjoyed the planning area break outs and discussion.
- Another Committee member found the workshop presentation and small group discussion very helpful.
- A Committee member liked the overall discussion in her small group as it brought to light more of the details surrounding senior and disabled transportation.
- A Committee member brought up a concern regarding two different services that are offered in the East County. She liked the level of detail that was brought up in the smaller group discussions.
- A Committee member thought the time for small group discussions was not long enough but he liked the overall format of the workshop.

## **5. Gap Grant Cycle 5 Extension and Progress Reports (Verbal)**

Naomi Armenta gave an update on the Gap Grant Cycle 5 extension and status of the progress reports.

Questions and feedback from PAPCO members:

- A Committee member appreciated the data and how it was organized. They applauded staff on doing a great job of making the information more clear and consistent over the years.

## **6. East Bay Paratransit Report (Verbal)**

Rashida Kamara and Laura Timothy gave a status report on East Bay Paratransit's ridership, customer service and recent broker's office activities.

Questions and feedback from PAPCO members:

- A Committee member noted that he appreciates the calls that he receives the night before his scheduled trip. However, he cautioned that the program making the calls does not always leave the detailed ride information when leaving a voicemail. East Bay Paratransit staff will follow up on this issue.
- Committee members volunteered to provide information about wheelchair users during East Bay Paratransit's driver sensitivity trainings.

## **7. PAPCO Member Reports and Outreach Update**

Jonah Markowitz shared information on the Berkeley Mental Health Commission's next meeting and the Lions Center for the Blind's upcoming baseball fundraiser.

Herb Hastings shared information on the Developmental Disabilities Council's annual fundraiser.

Michelle Rousey shared information on the Disability Capitol Action Day. She noted that it has been cancelled this year due to landscaping at the Capitol.

Shawn Costello shared that he is now the Vice Chair for the Regional Center advisory committee.

Sylvia Stadmire shared that she is the Chair for the Public Utilities Committee for Disabilities. They are currently looking to outreach to veterans and others who are unaware of their services and might need a computer, cell phone or other devices. Staff will send out more information on these services.

Esther Waltz shared that this is her last year working with the Alameda County Fair. Krystle Pasco noted that Alameda CTC will have a table at the County Fair on June 30, 2016 from 12:00 to 5:00 p.m.

### **7.1. Paratransit Outreach Calendar**

Krystle Pasco gave an update on the following outreach events:

- 3/1/16 – Mobility and Transit Workshop and Fair, San Leandro Senior Community Center from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.
- 3/12/16 – Transition Information Faire, College of Alameda from 9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
- 3/17/16 – Transit Fair, Pleasanton Senior Center from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.
- 4/21/16 – Senior Resource Expo, Albany Senior Center from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.
- 4/21/16 – Senior Health Fair, North Berkeley Senior Center from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.
- 4/29/16 – USOAC Annual Convention, St. Mary's Center from 9:00 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.
- 5/4/16 – Oakland Older Americans Month Event: "Blaze a Trail", Frank Ogawa Plaza, Oakland City Hall from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.
- 5/5/16 – Senior Health and Wellness Resource Fair, Kenneth Aitken Senior Center from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.
- 5/20/16 – Senior Resource Fair, San Leandro Senior Community Center from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

## **8. Committee and Transit Reports**

### **8.1. Independent Watchdog Committee (IWC)**

Herb Hastings gave an update on the IWC and noted that the last meeting took place on Monday, March 14<sup>th</sup>. They discussed and signed up for projects for the annual review. They also discussed the Annual Report.

### **8.2. East Bay Paratransit Service Review Advisory Committee (SRAC)**

Esther Waltz gave an update on the SRAC and noted that the last meeting took place on Tuesday, March 1<sup>st</sup>. They discussed emergency preparedness and received the broker's report.

### **8.3. Other ADA and Transit Advisory Committees**

Committee members received meeting minutes from other ADA and transit advisory committees.

## **9. Information Items**

### **9.1. Mobility Management – The Complete Trip: Helping Customers Make a Seamless Journey**

Naomi Armenta reviewed the mobility management attachment in the meeting agenda packet.

### **9.2. Other Staff Updates**

There were no other staff updates.

## **10. Draft Agenda Items for May 23, 2016 PAPCO Meeting**

**10.1.** Quarterly Paratransit Strategic Planning Workshop Feedback

**10.2.** FY 2016-17 Paratransit Direct Local Distribution (DLD) Program Plans Recommendation

**10.3.** FY 2016-17 Gap Grant Cycle 5 Extension Recommendation

## **11. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m. The next PAPCO meeting is scheduled for May 23, 2016 at the Alameda CTC's offices located at 1111 Broadway, Suite 800, in Oakland.



Joint Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee  
and Paratransit Technical Advisory Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
Monday, April 25, 2016, 1:00 p.m.

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

510.208.7400

www.AlamedaCTC.org

## MEETING ATTENDEES

Attendance Key (A = Absent, P = Present)

### PAPCO Members:

P Sylvia Stadmire,  
Chair  
A Will Scott,  
Vice-Chair  
P Kevin Barranti  
P Larry Bunn  
P Shawn Costello  
P Herb Hastings

A Joyce  
Jacobson  
P Sandra  
Johnson-Simon  
P Jonah Markowitz  
A Rev. Carolyn Orr  
A Vanessa Proee

P Carmen Rivera-  
Hendrickson  
P Michelle Rousey  
A Harriette  
Saunders  
P Cimberly Tamura  
P Esther Waltz  
P Hale Zukas

### ParaTAC Members:

P Diane Atienza  
P Dana Bailey  
P Jessica Cutter  
A Pam Deaton  
P Shawn Fong  
A Brad  
Helfenberger  
A Rashida Kamara  
A Jackie Krause

A Kadri Klm  
A Isabelle Leduc  
A Wilson Lee  
P Hakeim McGee  
A Scott Means  
A Mallory Nestor  
P Julie Parkinson  
A Gail Payne  
P Kim Ridgeway

A Sandra Rogers  
A Sid Schoenfeld  
A Leah Talley  
A Laura Timothy  
A Jonathan Torres  
A Rochelle  
Wheeler  
A David Zehnder

### Staff:

P Jacki Taylor, Program Analyst  
P Naomi Armenta, Paratransit Coordinator  
P Terra Curtis, Paratransit Coordination Team  
P Krystle Pasco, Paratransit Coordination Team  
P Richard Weiner, Paratransit Coordination Team  
P David Koffman, Paratransit Coordination Team  
P Dora Royster, Project Controls Team

### Guests:



Ken Bukowski, Public Member; Monica Davis, City of Hayward; Sara Escalante, Public Member; Jon Gaffney, Marin Transit; Kevin Ito, Friendly Transportation; John Sanderson, SamTrans; Rebeca Servin, Center for Independent Living (CIL); Victoria Williams, Mobility Matters; Greg Jurin, City of Piedmont

## **MEETING MINUTES**

### **1. Welcome and Introductions**

Naomi Armenta, Paratransit Coordinator, called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. and confirmed a quorum. The meeting began with introductions and a review of the meeting outcomes.

### **2. Public Comment**

There were no comments from the public.

### **3. Taxi Card Feasibility Study Update and Discussion**

Terra Curtis and David Koffman gave a presentation on the taxi card feasibility study. PAPCO, ParaTAC and members of the public had the opportunity to discuss the feasibility study and provide input.

Dana Bailey, Shawn Fong, and Hakeim McGee provided additional information regarding their programs and next steps. The Paratransit Coordination Team provided an update for Berkeley.

Questions and feedback from PAPCO, ParaTAC and members of the public:

- A Committee member recommended using the Clipper Card system to pay for paratransit related taxi trips. Staff noted that they researched that option and using the Clipper Card is not feasible at the moment, as that system is still working on other technological issues including identifying what Clipper 2.0 may look like. Also since paratransit vehicles have lower capacities than buses it may be difficult to justify the higher costs for installing the equipment necessary to use the Clipper Card than another card system altogether.

- A Committee member noted that the debit card system is better for those with dexterity issues than paying with vouchers and scrips. Staff agreed with this comment.
- A Committee member and study participant noted that the group that came together to explore this payment option intended for this effort to start out as a pilot project that would then expand to other areas in the County.
- A member of the public asked if any of the debit card systems that were a part of the study reflected any of the same problems that Clipper users sometimes experience. Staff responded that there were certainly similar complaints with other debit card systems that were a part of the study and beyond.
- A member of the public asked a question regarding the impact on cost estimates and decision making given that technology that is rapidly changing. Staff responded that mobile applications and technology in general is certainly changing rapidly. A new pilot program has the potential to be cost-effective if the card and taxi companies continue to be in business for the long term (at least five years), even as technology evolves.
- A Committee member asked who will be covering the surcharge that is usually included in these types of payments. Staff responded that usually the drivers are the ones that take on this surcharge.
- A Committee member noted that senior and disabled consumers are not all using smartphones, which the planning committee is taking into consideration.
- A Committee member recommended that a phone line be created for consumers who don't have smartphones and who would rather call in for a ride request.
- A Committee member recommended that the new cards contain the smart chip technology to avoid fraud.
- A Committee member noted that there is a bill currently in Sacramento to implement a single transportation card for use in the state of California.

#### **4. Taxi Program Incentives Discussion**

Naomi Armenta and Terra Curtis gave a presentation on taxi program incentives. PAPCO, ParaTAC and members of the public had the opportunity to discuss these potential taxi program incentives.

Questions and feedback from PAPCO, ParaTAC and members of the public:

- A Committee member expressed his concern about the potential incentives and their effects on fares. Staff noted that any incentives should be paid for by the local jurisdictions and not through fares to consumers.
- A member of the public shared information regarding these taxi program incentives and how much they cost in their respective County. They shared their experiences surrounding the severe lack of accessible taxis and the overall effects on consumers' abilities to access same day taxi services. Staff noted that the issue of accessible taxis is a national issue that has yet to be resolved.
- A Committee member recommended using the same company/provider for ADA and taxi trips so that consumers can travel on a regional level with less transfers.
- A Committee member shared that their local taxi ordinance requires local taxi companies to have accessible vehicles when they reach a certain number of vehicles. Unfortunately, no local taxi companies have enough vehicles to reach that requirement. The City of Fremont is hoping that the local taxi companies continue to grow and provide one another competition for better overall customer service and availability of accessible vehicles. They are also looking for ways to incentivize short distance trips so that consumers are not stranded.
- A member of the public shared his recommendation for pairing high level incentives with service delivery incentives for taxi programs. He noted that the more immediate you can make the incentives for the drivers the better the response that is received. Longer term incentives are not as appealing or successful. Also, auditing or verifying your incentives when they are cash based or cash equivalent can be a larger issue as time goes on. Self-reporting versus customer based reporting can generate different reporting compliance. He also questioned whether the

agency purchasing vehicles directly changed anything from a risk management perspective if an incident were to occur in the field. Does the agency get exposed to the liability? Staff expressed similar concerns regarding liability and will provide more information on this issue as it becomes available. Staff also noted that in order to implement a robust incentives program, more information regarding day-to-day operations would need to be provided. A card system, as discussed in the previous agenda item, can provide that.

## **5. Information Items**

### **5.1. Member Announcements**

Member announcements were heard from Jonah Markowitz, Sylvia Stadmire, Herb Hastings and Shawn Fong.

### **5.2. Staff Updates**

There were no staff updates.

## **6. Draft Agenda Items for May 23, 2016 PAPCO Meeting**

**6.1.** Quarterly Paratransit Strategic Planning Workshop Feedback

**6.2.** Paratransit Direct Local Distribution (DLD) FY 2016-17 Program Plans Recommendation

**6.3.** Cycle 5 Gap Grant FY 2016-17 Extension Recommendation

## **7. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m. The next PAPCO meeting is scheduled for May 23, 2016. The next ParaTAC meeting is scheduled for June 14, 2016. Both meetings will take place at Alameda CTC's offices located at 1111 Broadway, Suite 800, in Oakland.

***This page intentionally left blank***

**Alameda County Transportation Commission  
Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee  
Roster - Fiscal Year 2015-2016**

	Title	Last	First	City	Appointed By	Term Began	Re-apptmt.	Term Expires	Mtgs Missed Since July '15
1	Ms.	Stadmire, Chair	Sylvia J.	Oakland	Alameda County Supervisor Wilma Chan, D-3	Sep-07	Jan-13	Jan-15	1
2	Mr.	Scott, Vice Chair	Will	Berkeley	Alameda County Supervisor Keith Carson, D-5	Mar-10	May-14	May-16	3
3	Mr.	Barranti	Kevin	Fremont	City of Fremont Mayor Bill Harrison	Feb-16		Feb-18	0
4	Mr.	Bunn	Larry	Union City	Union City Transit Wilson Lee, Transit Manager	Jun-06	Jan-16	Jan-18	2
5	Mr.	Costello	Shawn	Dublin	City of Dublin Mayor David Haubert	Sep-08	May-14	May-16	0
6	Ms.	Escalante	Elizarah	Union City	Pending Approval City of Union City Mayor Carol Dutra-Vernaci	May-16		May-18	0
7	Mr.	Hastings	Herb	Dublin	Alameda County Supervisor Scott Haggerty, D-1	Mar-07	Jan-16	Jan-18	0
8	Ms.	Jacobson	Joyce	Emeryville	City of Emeryville Mayor Ruth Atkin	Mar-07	Jan-16	Jan-18	6
9	Ms.	Johnson-Simon	Sandra	San Leandro	Alameda County Supervisor Nate Miley, D-4	Sep-10	Dec-13	Dec-15	0
10	Mr.	Markowitz	Jonah	Berkeley	City of Albany Mayor Peter Maass	Dec-04	Oct-12	Oct-14	2
11	Rev.	Orr	Carolyn M.	Oakland	City of Oakland Vice Mayor Rebecca Kaplan	Oct-05	Jan-14	Jan-16	8
12	Ms.	Proee	Vanessa	Hayward	City of Hayward Mayor Barbara Halliday	Mar-10	Jan-16	Jan-18	8

	Title	Last	First	City	Appointed By	Term Began	Re-apptmt.	Term Expires	Mtgs Missed Since July '15
13	Ms.	Rivera-Hendrickson	Carmen	Pleasanton	City of Pleasanton Mayor Jerry Thorne	Sep-09	Feb-14	<b>Feb-16</b>	4
14	Ms.	Rousey	Michelle	Oakland	BART Director Tom Blalock	May-10	Jan-16	<b>Jan-18</b>	1
15	Ms.	Saunders	Harriette	Alameda	City of Alameda Mayor Trish Spencer	Jun-08	Oct-12	<b>Oct-14</b>	3
16	Ms.	Smith	Linda	Berkeley	City of Berkeley Councilmember Laurie Capitelli	Apr-16		<b>Apr-18</b>	0
17	Ms.	Tamura	Cimberly	San Leandro	City of San Leandro Mayor Pauline Cutter	Dec-15		<b>Dec-17</b>	1
18	Ms.	Waltz	Esther Ann	Livermore	LAVTA Executive Director Michael Tree	Feb-11	May-14	<b>May-16</b>	1
19	Mr.	Zukas	Hale	Berkeley	A. C. Transit Director Elsa Ortiz	Aug-02	Feb-16	<b>Feb-18</b>	0
20		<b>Vacancy</b>			<b>Alameda County Supervisor Richard Valle, D-2</b>				
21		<b>Vacancy</b>			<b>City of Livermore Mayor John Marchand</b>				
22		<b>Vacancy</b>			<b>City of Newark Councilmember Luis Freitas</b>				
23		<b>Vacancy</b>			<b>City of Piedmont Mayor Margaret Fujioka</b>				



# Memorandum

8.1

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

510.208.7400

www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** June 23, 2016

**SUBJECT:** June Legislative Update

**RECOMMENDATION:** Receive an update on federal, state, and local legislative activities and approve legislative positions.

## Summary

The June 2016 legislative update provides information on federal, state, and local legislative activities including an update on federal appropriations activities, an update on the state budget and current legislation, as well as an update on local legislative activities to date. This is an action item.

## Background

The Commission unanimously approved the 2016 Legislative Program in January 2016. The final 2016 Legislative Program is divided into six sections: Transportation Funding, Project Delivery, Multimodal Transportation and Land Use, Climate Change, Goods Movement, and Partnerships (Attachment A). The program is 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.

## Federal Update

At the federal level, appropriations activities continue. According to Alameda CTC's lobbyist team (CJ Lake/Len Simon), the full Senate has packaged its fiscal year 2017 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies (THUD) appropriations and Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies (MilCon) appropriations bills that were marked up in April. Final passage occurred at the end of May and the House also adopted their THUD bills at the end of May. Attachment B includes additional information of federal activities.



## State Update

Governor Brown released his May Budget Revise on May 13, 2016, which reiterates his support for a transportation funding proposal that would generate \$3.6 billion annually and, if adopted, would provide \$1.6 billion for transportation projects in the 2016-17 fiscal year. The governor's proposal includes \$2 billion from a new Road Improvement Charge fee of \$65 on all vehicles, including hybrids and electrics. Other sources of revenue include stabilizing the gasoline excise tax (\$500 million), the diesel excise tax (\$500 million), and the Cap-and-Trade Program (\$500 million). The budget also factors in California Department of Transportation efficiencies, State and Local Partnership dollars for matching grants, and a loan repayment. The Governor's transportation proposal was re-referred from the budget committees to the transportation policy committees of both the Senate and Assembly. As of this writing, a hearing has not yet been set to address these funding proposals.

The Governor's proposal is a smaller amount than Senate (Beall SBX1-1) and Assembly proposals (Frazier AB 1591), both of which were amended in May to try to address Republican interests and to serve as an alternative, higher funding amount opportunity for legislators to address the state's pressing transportation needs. The outcomes of these policy committee hearings and debates, and special session hearings, if scheduled, will be presented at the Commission meeting.

## Local Update

Alameda CTC has taken the following actions to address transportation funding needs that the state budget and the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act fund formula may not meet:

- Wrote and distributed to all partner agencies a transportation funding advocacy letter from the Alameda CTC chair that they could customize to advocate for transportation funding increases in the state.
- Coordinated on transportation funding support letters and advocacy with partners including the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, the Self-Help Counties in California's Self-Help Counties Coalition, and the San Francisco Bay Area congestion management agencies, Port of Oakland and business organization partners.
- Visited Sacramento in May to participate in the Assembly Bill 1919 hearing, the East Bay EDA Legislative meeting, statewide coordination meetings, and scheduled meetings in Sacramento in June to support state transportation funding increases.
- Coordinated statewide efforts on the draft California Sustainable Freight Action Plan, which supports goods movement funding and relates to the May Revise.

Attachment C provides information on activities and issues at the state level from Alameda CTC's state lobbyist, Platinum Advisors.

**State Legislation Recommendation:** The following legislative recommendations support Alameda CTC Legislative Priorities as adopted in January 2016 and shown in Attachment A. The following legislative recommendations reflect recommended bill positions on specific categories.

Bill Number	Bill Information	Staff Recommendation
<b>Project Delivery</b>		
<a href="#">AB 1964</a> ( <a href="#">Bloom</a> , D; <a href="#">Linder</a> , R) High-occupancy vehicle lanes: vehicle exceptions.	Existing federal law authorizes, until September 30, 2019, a state to allow low-emission and energy-efficient vehicles, as specified, to use lanes designated for high-occupancy vehicles (HOVs). Federal law also authorizes, until September 30, 2025, a state to allow alternative fuel vehicles and new qualified plug-in electric drive motor vehicles (PHEVs) to use HOV lanes. Existing law also authorizes super ultra-low-emission vehicles, ultra-low-emission vehicles, partial zero-emission vehicles, or transitional zero-emission vehicles, as specified, that display a valid identifier issued by the Department of Motor Vehicles to use HOV lanes.  This bill creates a new program (on expiration of the existing program) to allow PHEVs access to HOV lanes for a three-year period, regardless of vehicle occupancy level. It removes the limit of 85,000 identifiers issued for partial or transitional zero-emission vehicles and would instead prohibit the Department of Motor Vehicles from issuing identifiers if the sale of new vehicles of that category reaches at least 8.6 percent of the total new car market share for two consecutive years.	Alameda CTC's 2016 legislative program supports "high-occupancy vehicle/toll lane expansion in Alameda County and the Bay Area and efforts that promote effective implementation."  Staff recommends an <b>OPPOSE unless AMENDED</b> position on this bill, because allowing more low-emission vehicles to use the lanes could reduce lane efficiency, limit access, and not achieve the intent of the lanes. Amendments would support placing caps on the number of stickers, studies to ensure there is no lane degradation, and an eventual phasing out of the sticker program.  Los Angeles Metro Rail and San Francisco County Transportation Authority have taken an oppose position on this bill. MTC has taken an oppose unless amended position on this

		bill regarding amendments noted above.
<a href="#">SB 1259</a> (Runner, R) Vehicles: toll payment: veterans.	<p>Under existing law, a vehicle that enters into or upon a vehicular crossing, as defined, is liable for tolls and other charges prescribed by the California Transportation Commission. Under existing law, it is unlawful to refuse to pay, or to evade or attempt to evade the payment of tolls or other charges on any vehicular crossing, as defined, or toll highway. A violation of those provisions is subject to civil penalties. Existing law exempts authorized emergency vehicles from payment of a toll and related fines under specified conditions.</p> <p>This bill would exempt vehicles occupied by and registered to a veteran, and displaying a specialized veterans license plate from payment of a toll or related fines on a toll road, high-occupancy toll (HOT) lane, toll bridge, toll highway, a vehicular crossing, or any other toll facility.</p>	<p>Alameda CTC's 2016 legislative program supports "high-occupancy vehicle/toll lane expansion in Alameda County and the Bay Area and efforts that promote effective implementation."</p> <p>Staff recommends an <b>OPPOSE</b> position on this bill, because the HOV lanes could become more congested if solo drivers are allowed to use them for free.</p> <p>Supporting veterans is important and Alameda CTC's recommendation focuses on the potential impact on HOV lane operations as well as the precedent setting nature of the proposed bill for other groups to access the lanes for free.</p> <p>MTC, Los Angeles  Metropolitan Transportation Authority and San Francisco County Transportation Authority have taken oppose positions on this bill.</p>

Historically, Alameda CTC and its former agencies have opposed legislation that would result in HOV degradation, congestion, and access limitations and legislation that conflicts with toll revenue collections and expenditures according to Alameda County's voter-approved Transportation Expenditure Plans.

For example, on June 24, 2010, the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACCMA) took an oppose position on AB 1500 (Lieu) that would have extended the sunset date of certain clean air vehicles from HOV lane occupancy requirements.

On April 22, 2010, ACCMA and on June 16, 2010, the Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority also took oppose positions on AB 2620 (Eng), which would have authorized an unspecified amount of tolls from HOT lanes to be used for State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) purposes instead of as already designated in an approved memorandum of understanding and as specifically stated in ACTIA's Expenditure Plan for use within the I-680 corridor on transportation needs that are outside of SHOPP.

Therefore, staff recommends an **OPPOSE** position on the above bills, AB 1964 and SB 1259.

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

#### **Attachments**

- A. Alameda CTC 2016 Legislation Program
- B. Federal Update
- C. State Information Update

#### **Staff Contact**

[Tess Lengyel](#), Deputy Director of Planning and Policy

***This page intentionally left blank***



## 2016 Alameda County Transportation Commission Legislative Program

The legislative program herein supports Alameda CTC's transportation vision below adopted for the 2016 Countywide Transportation Plan:

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

510.208.7400

[www.AlamedaCTC.org](http://www.AlamedaCTC.org)

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

Issue	Priority	Strategy Concepts
Transportation Funding	Increase transportation funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support efforts to lower the two-thirds-voter threshold for voter-approved transportation measures.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Support efforts that protect against transportation funding diversions and overall increase transportation funding.</li> <li>Support new funding sources for transportation.</li> </ul>
	Protect and enhance voter-approved funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support legislation and increased funding from new and/or flexible funding sources to Alameda County for operating, maintaining, restoring, and improving transportation infrastructure and operations.</li> <li>Support increases in federal, state, and regional funding to expedite delivery of Alameda CTC projects and programs.</li> <li>Support efforts that give priority funding to voter-approved measures and oppose those that negatively affect the ability to implement voter-approved measures.</li> <li>Support efforts that streamline financing and delivery of transportation projects and programs.</li> <li>Support rewarding Self-Help Counties and states that provide significant transportation funding into transportation systems.</li> <li>Seek, acquire, and implement grants to advance project and program delivery.</li> </ul>
Project Delivery	Advance innovative project delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support environmental streamlining and expedited project delivery.</li> <li>Support contracting flexibility and innovative project delivery methods.</li> <li>Support high-occupancy vehicle/toll lane expansion in Alameda County and the Bay Area and efforts that promote effective implementation.</li> <li>Support efforts to allow local agencies to advertise, award, and administer state highway system contracts largely funded by local agencies.</li> </ul>
	Ensure cost-effective project delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support efforts that reduce project and program implementation costs.</li> <li>Support accelerating funding and policies to implement transportation projects that create jobs and economic growth.</li> </ul>
Multimodal Transportation and Land Use	Reduce barriers to the implementation of transportation and land use investments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support legislation that increases flexibility and reduces technical and funding barriers to investments linking transportation, housing, and jobs.</li> <li>Support local flexibility and decision-making on land-use for transit oriented development (TOD) and priority development areas (PDAs).</li> <li>Support innovative financing opportunities to fund TOD and PDA implementation.</li> </ul>
	Expand multimodal systems and flexibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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, including addressing parking placard abuse, and do not create unfunded mandates.</li> <li>Support investments in transportation for transit-dependent communities that provide enhanced access to goods, services, jobs, and education.</li> </ul>

Issue	Priority	Strategy Concepts
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support parity in pre-tax fringe benefits for public transit/vanpooling and parking.</li> </ul>
<b>Climate Change</b>	Support climate change legislation to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support funding for innovative infrastructure, operations, and programs that relieve congestion, improve air quality, reduce emissions, and support economic development.</li> <li>• Support cap-and-trade funds to implement the Bay Area's Sustainable Communities Strategy.</li> <li>• Support rewarding Self-Help Counties with cap-and-trade funds for projects and programs that are partially locally funded and reduce GHG emissions.</li> <li>• Support emerging technologies such as alternative fuels and fueling technology to reduce GHG emissions.</li> </ul>
<b>Goods Movement</b>	Expand goods movement funding and policy development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support a multimodal goods movement system and efforts that enhance the economy, local communities, and the environment.</li> <li>• Support a designated funding stream for goods movement.</li> <li>• Support goods movement policies that enhance Bay Area goods movement planning, funding, delivery, and advocacy.</li> <li>• Ensure that Bay Area transportation systems are included in and prioritized in state and federal planning and funding processes.</li> <li>• Support rewarding Self-Help Counties that directly fund goods movement infrastructure and programs.</li> </ul>
<b>Partnerships</b>	Expand partnerships at the local, regional, state and federal levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support efforts that encourage regional and mega-regional cooperation and coordination to develop, promote, and fund solutions to regional transportation problems and support governmental efficiencies and cost savings in transportation.</li> <li>• Support policy development to advance transportation planning, policy, and funding at the county, regional, state, and federal levels.</li> <li>• Partner with community agencies and other partners to increase transportation funding for Alameda CTC's multiple projects and programs and to support local jobs.</li> <li>• Support efforts to maintain and expand local-, women-, minority- and small-business participation in competing for contracts.</li> </ul>

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Art Dao  
Alameda County Transportation Commission

**FROM:** CJ Lake, LLC

**DATE:** May 26, 2016

**RE:** Federal Legislative Update

---

**Introduction**

During the month of May, Congress made progress on several legislative fronts to include a number of appropriations bills, Water Resources Development Act (WRDA), and Defense policy. Given the absence of a budget resolution in the House, appropriations bills were not considered on the House floor until mid-May but House Republican leadership still continue to work with the Conference to see if a budget resolution can be taken up by the full House.

**Budget and Appropriations**

After the Senate returned from the Spring Recess, Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) committed the full Senate to taking up FY17 appropriations bills until the Senate adjourns for the August recess on July 15. The Senate Appropriations Committee has now approved seven bills: Energy & Water, MilCon-VA, Transportation-HUD, Commerce-Justice-Science, Agriculture-FDA, Defense, Department of Homeland Security, and Legislative Branch, and the full Senate has approved Energy & Water, MilCon-VA, and Transportation-HUD. The Senate Appropriations Committee is currently considering the Defense Appropriations Bill and the Homeland Security Appropriations Bill today. This is the first time in many years that the Senate is actually moving out in front of the House on appropriations bills.

As reported previously, the House is moving at a much slower pace on its FY17 bills since the Republican Conference has been unable to reach an agreement on top line budget numbers for FY17. Because of this disagreement and inability to take up a budget resolution, the House did not take any bills to the floor until after May 15. At this point, the House Appropriations Committee has approved several bills (Energy & Water, MilCon-VA, Legislative Branch, Transportation-HUD, Agriculture-FDA, and Defense), and held Subcommittee markup sessions to approve the Financial Services and Interior and Environment bills to the full Committee.

**Administration Update*****TIGER***

Alameda CTC applied for the Department of Transportation's TIGER grant with their I-680 Sunol Northbound Express Lanes Project application. The Department of Transportation (DOT)



recently announced that they had received \$9.5 billion in applications for the \$600 million available in the TIGER grant program, totaling more than 15 times the amount DOT can award. DOT received 797 eligible applications from 49 states, U.S. territories, and the District of Columbia. Last year, there were 585 submitted during the same TIGER process.

As a reminder, CJ Lake was able to obtain letters of support on behalf of Alameda CTC's application from Reps. Swalwell (led the Letter), Honda, DeSaulnier, Lofgren, and Mike Thompson. CJ Lake continues to work with Senator Boxer and Senator Feinstein's offices to obtain additional letters of support.

### ***FASTLANE***

Alameda CTC applied for the Department of Transportation's newly created FASTLANE grant program with their Ground Operations at the Port of Oakland (GoPort!) application. DOT announced on May 20th that it had received 212 applications totaling nearly \$9.8 billion for grants through the newly created FASTLANE grant program. In the first year of this program, states and localities requested more than 13 times more funding than was made available through FASTLANE.

As a reminder, CJ Lake was able to obtain letters of support on behalf of Alameda CTC's application from Reps. Swalwell, Lee, Honda, DeSaulnier, and Garamendi. CJ Lake continues to work with Senator Boxer and Senator Feinstein's offices to obtain additional letters of support.

### ***FY17 Senate THUD Bill***

#### ***Bill Highlights:***

##### ***Transportation***

The bill provides \$16.9 billion in discretionary appropriations for the Department of Transportation; \$1.7 billion below the FY2016 enacted level and \$2.5 billion below the President's request. The bill's funding levels are consistent with the increases included in the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST) of 2015.

- **Highways** – \$44 billion from the Highway Trust Fund to be spent on the Federal-aid Highways Program, consistent with the FAST Act. The bill continues to allow state departments of transportation to repurpose old, unused earmarks for other infrastructure projects.
- **Transit** – \$12.3 billion for the Federal Transit Administration, \$575 million above FY16 enacted level. The bill provides \$9.7 billion for transit formula grants, consistent with the FAST Act. The bill does include a one-time infusion of \$199 million for positive train control installation grants to commuter and intercity passenger railroads.
  - The bill provides \$2.33 billion for Capital Investment Grants (New Starts), an increase from \$2.177 billion in FY16, and exceeds the FAST Act authorization target of \$2.302 billion.

- There are currently four California projects with signed FFGAs. Under the Senate bill they would receive the following: Los Angeles Regional Connector (\$100 million), Los Angeles Westside Subway Ext (\$100 million), San Francisco Third Street Phase 2 (\$150 million), San Jose Berryessa Extension (\$100 million).
- There are currently three California Proposed New Starts FFGAs. Under the Senate bill they would receive the following: Los Angeles Westside Section 2, San Diego Mid-Coast Corridor, and Santa Ana Garden Grove Streetcar (The three California projects are to share \$250 million between them (the appropriators did not allocate specific amounts to any individual California project))
- \$333 million is provided for core capacity projects, a \$283 million increase compared to FY16 enacted levels. **The Senate bill does not allocate money to any specific projects.**
- \$241 million for small starts projects, a reduction of \$112 million compared to FY16 enacted levels.
- \$20 million for the expedited delivery pilot program.

An amendment was accepted during full committee mark up requiring that the FTA allocate no more than \$100 million for any individual core capacity, small start or expedited project delivery project.

The Senate committee report also requires a GAO study “regarding the construction costs of transit capital projects in the United States in comparison to other developed G–20 nations, such as South Korea, Japan, Spain, France, Italy and Germany.”

- **TIGER Grants** – \$525 million for TIGER grants (also known as National Infrastructure Investments), \$25 million above the FY16 enacted level. Maximum grant size would shrink – when the TIGER program started in 2009, the maximum grant size was \$200 million. This dropped to \$100 million in FY16 and is down to just \$25 million in the Senate bill. (However, this may be just a reflection of reality – USDOT has not given out a TIGER grant in excess of \$25 million since FY 2011). In addition, the Senate bill increases the minimum set-aside for TIGER projects in rural areas from 20 percent of the total to 30 percent and also decreases the maximum amount of grants that can go to projects in any single state from 20 percent of the total awards to 10 percent.
- **FRA** -- The FAST Act made significant changes in the structure of federal passenger rail programs. The law transformed the way that federal subsidies for Amtrak are structured – instead of the traditional division of the subsidy between operating and capital, the subsidy is now split between a Northeast Corridor account and an “everything else” account (National Network).

- The Senate appropriators did manage to allocate some funds to each of the three new FRA grant programs in the FY17 bill.
  - The Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety Improvement program would receive \$50 million (the FAST Act authorized up to \$190 million). This may be intended to replace the \$50 million appropriated in 2016 for rail safety grants – the committee report says that “While the Committee is sympathetic to the need for funding for projects that improve the efficiency and reliability of passenger and freight rail transportation systems, under current budget constraints the Committee is committed to prioritizing projects that improve railroad safety.”
  - The Senate bill also provides \$20 million for the Federal-State Partnership for State of Good Repair grant program. The Administration wanted 20 times that amount, and the FAST Act authorized almost ten times as much. The Senate report says, “The Committee directs FRA to take into consideration the needs of the entire national rail network when awarding funding for this program.”
  - The Senate bill appropriates \$15 million for the Restoration and Enhancement grant program established by the FAST Act, but the proposed bill would also rewrite the FAST Act and refocus the program. Section 151 of the Senate bill amends the underlying FAST Act language establishing the Restoration and Enhancement Grants so as to focus the program towards operating assistance.

### ***FY17 House THUD Bill***

#### ***Transportation***

Just like the Senate, the bill’s funding levels are consistent with the increases included in the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST) of 2015.

- **Highways** – \$44 billion from the Highway Trust Fund to be spent on the Federal-aid Highways Program, consistent with the FAST Act.
- **Transit** – The House bill includes \$12.5 billion for the Federal Transit Administration, an increase over the Senate’s bill that provides \$12.33 billion. The House bill provides \$9.7 billion for transit formula grants, consistent with the FAST Act. The big winner in the House bill is the Capital Investment Grant program.
  - The bill provides \$2.5 billion for Capital Investment Grants (New Starts), an increase from \$2.177 billion in FY16, and exceeds the FAST Act authorization target of \$2.302 billion, and the Senate bill’s funding level of \$2.34 billion.
    - There are currently four California projects with signed Full Funding Grant Agreements (FFGAs). Under the House bill they would receive the following: Los Angeles Regional Connector (\$100 million – same as Senate bill), Los Angeles Westside Subway Extension (\$100 million –

same as Senate bill), San Francisco Third Street Phase 2 (\$150 million – same as Senate bill), San Jose Berryessa Extension (\$125 million – an increase of \$25 million from Senate bill).

- There are currently three California Proposed New Starts FFGAs. Under the House bill they would receive the following: Los Angeles Westside Section 2 (\$100 million), San Diego Mid-Coast Corridor (\$100 million), and Santa Ana Garden Grove Streetcar (\$75 million). The Senate bill simply states that the three California projects are to share \$250 million among them.
- \$333 million is provided for core capacity projects (the same as the Senate bill), a \$283 million increase compared to FY16 enacted levels. The House bill allocates money to specific projects and includes \$100 million for the Caltrain Electrification project. The Senate bill does not allocate money to any specific projects.
- The big difference between the House and Senate versions is in Small Starts. The House bill provides \$408 million; this is \$167 million more than the Senate level of \$241 million for Small Starts projects. The House bill provides funds for every project proposed by the Administration to include \$50 million for the Sacramento Street Car project.
- The House bill provides \$5 million for the Technical Assistance and Training account; this is the same as the Senate bill.
- Funds for the expedited delivery pilot program are not included in the House bill, but the Senate bill includes \$20 million for the expedited delivery pilot program.

The House bill also contains a general provision that would prohibit the execution of any new FFGAs with a federal cost share above 50 percent. This has been proposed by the House before but never enacted into law (a 60 percent maximum federal share has been imposed previously).

- **TIGER Grants** – The House Subcommittee draft currently includes \$450 million for TIGER, a significant decrease from the Senate bill’s level of \$525 million for TIGER grants (also known as National Infrastructure Investments). Recall the FY16 enacted level was \$500 million.
- **FRA** – The FAST Act made significant changes in the structure of federal passenger rail programs. The law transformed the way that federal subsidies for Amtrak are structured – instead of the traditional division of the subsidy between operating and capital, the subsidy is now split between a Northeast Corridor account and an “everything else” account (National Network).
  - Just like the Senate, the House appropriators did manage to allocate funds to each of the three new FRA grant programs in the FY17 bill.
    - The Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety Improvement program would receive \$25 million in the House bill, while the Senate would provide \$50 million (the FAST Act authorized up to \$190 million).
    - The House bill provides \$25 million for the Federal-State Partnership for the State of Good Repair grant program, while the Senate bill would provide \$20 million for the Federal-State Partnership for State of Good

Repair grant program. The Administration wanted 20 times that amount, and the FAST Act authorized almost ten times as much.

- The House bill does not include any funds for the Restoration and Enhancement grant program established by the FAST Act. However, the Senate bill appropriates \$15 million for the Restoration and Enhancement grant program established by the FAST Act, but the Senate bill would also rewrite the FAST Act and refocus the program. Section 151 of the Senate bill amends the underlying FAST Act language establishing the Restoration and Enhancement Grants so as to focus the program towards operating assistance.

As in previous years, the House bill prohibits any federal funds for California High Speed Rail (CHSR) and also prohibits the FRA from administering a grant agreement with California that has a “tapering match requirement”. As you may recall, FRA amended the CHSR grant agreement in December 2012 to allow the ARRA stimulus money to be spent first (a tapered match) in order to meet the ARRA deadline of September 30, 2017.

#### **Amendments of Note:**

Transportation HUD Ranking Member David Price (D-NC) offered an amendment that would strike 6 out of 20 legislative riders, but ultimately failed by a partisan vote of 19-28. These riders will likely be addressed when the bill goes to conference. The amendment would have struck the following 3 riders:

- Section 134 – language preempting states from setting meal and rest break laws for commercial truck drivers. The language would impact California and 21 other states and territories that guarantee meal and rest breaks. This language was first included in the House STRR Act but was ultimately removed in conference for the FAST Act. The language was also included in the House FAA bill.
- Section 132 – language addressing trucker hours of service.
- Section 192 – language prohibiting funds for California High Speed Rail.



May 26, 2016

TO: Art Dao, Executive Director  
Alameda County Transportation Commission

Tess Lengyel, Deputy Director of Policy, Public Affairs & Legislation  
Alameda County Transportation Commission

FR: Steve Wallaach  
Platinum Advisors

**RE: Legislative Update**

---

**Conference Commencement:** The Budget Committees in both houses have completed their actions on the changes proposed in the May Revise and closed any open items. Now the negotiations head to the Budget Conference Committee which is expected to begin its review by the end of next week. In the next few days Leadership will announce the Conference Committee members. However, the appointees are likely to include Senators Mark Leno, Jim Nielsen, and either Ricardo Lara or Holly Mitchell, and Assembly members Phil Ting, Jay Obernolte, and Lorena Gonzalez. The Legislature has until June 15<sup>th</sup> to adopt a budget.

**Suspense:** The fate of hundreds of bills placed on with the Senate Appropriations or the Assembly Appropriations Suspense Files will be determined tomorrow. Any bill that remains on the Suspense File after tomorrow is essentially dead, and many of those that are removed will be substantially amended by the Committee to address any cost concerns.

**The Budgets:** The purpose of the Budget Conference Committee is to resolve any differences between the Senate and Assembly spending proposals. The budget in both houses largely adopts the Governor's spending proposal with some key differences around the edges. The Assembly accepted the Governor's revenue estimates included in the May Revise. While the Senate adopted the Governor's number for income and sales tax revenue, the Senate adopted the LAO's forecast for local property tax revenue, which provided the Senate and extra \$385 million. In other areas, the Senate and Assembly adopted very differing expenditure plans for cap & trade auction revenues. On housing both houses adopted the proposal to securitize a portion of Prop 63 mental health funding revenues, but the Assembly added an additional \$650 million for various affordable housing programs.

**Governor's Transportation Proposal:** Both the Senate and the Assembly rejected, without prejudice, the Governor's transportation funding proposal. This is the funding proposal that would generate \$3.6 billion annually for transportation and transit projects. Both the Senate and Assembly felt that this is an issue that would be better addressed through the transportation special session and not the budget process.

**FAST Act:** Both the Senate and Assembly Budget Subcommittees took action to approve the Governor's May Revise proposal to allow the CTC allocate up to \$120 million in state and federal funds to match any awards under the FASTLANE program. FASTLANE is a competitive federal program that can fund up to 60% of eligible projects.

However, both Subcommittees rejected the May Revise budget trailer bill language that would have directed the CTC to allocate the state's formula share of National Freight Highway Program funds with 50% to corridor projects selected by local agencies and 50% to projects nominated by Caltrans. Both Subcommittees directed this issue to the normal policy committee process, where Assemblyman Jim Frazier has already introduced AB 2170.

**STA Fix:** Both the Senate and Assembly budgets include budget trailer bill placeholder language that takes the first step in addressing changes the State Controller's Office made in allocating the revenue portion of State Transit Assistance (STA) funds.

The trailer bill language would put a freeze on how the revenue portion of STA funds is allocated. The language would direct the Controller's Office to allocate the remaining 2015-16 funds and all of the 2016-17 and 2017-18 funds pursuant to the formula used to allocate the STA revenue funds in the 2014-15 fiscal year. This "timeout" would provide time for transit operators to work with the Controller on implementing any needed statutory changes next year.

**Cap & Trade:** While both the Senate and the Assembly adopted markedly different spending priorities for cap & trade auction revenue, both houses agreed that negotiations will continue and that it is imperative that an agreement will be reached as part of the budget. The spending plans largely incorporate the core spending priorities proposed by the Governor, such as allocating \$500 million to CARB for Low Carbon Transportation program.

The Assembly redirects \$100 million proposed by the Governor for complete streets projects to the Active Transportation Program, while the Senate deletes \$400 million the Governor proposed for the Transit & Intercity Rail Program, and instead allocates these funds to a new program for transformational climate communities. At the Senate Budget Committee hearing Senators Beall and Allen expressed strong concerns about deleting the funds for transit capital projects, and even the Senate Budget Chairman, Mark Leno, also expressed he would likely not vote for the final expenditure plan if transit funding is not addressed. Below is a chart comparing the expenditure plans for the transportation related items:

<b>Continuously Appropriated Programs (60%)</b>			
	<u>Governor</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Assembly</u>
High Speed Rail Authority	\$500 million	\$500 million	\$500 million
Low Carbon Transit Operations	\$100 million	\$100 million	\$100 million
Transit & Intercity Rail Capital	\$200 million	\$200 million	\$200 million
Affordable Housing & Sustainable Communities	\$400 million	\$400 million	\$400 million
<b>Annually Appropriated Program (40%)</b>			
Low Carbon Transportation & Fuels (CARB Programs)	\$500 million	\$500 million Clarifies that biofuels, such as biomethane and others are eligible uses.	Low Carbon Vehicle Rebates --\$230 M Low Carbon Vehicles Other - \$195 M Biofuels Production Subsidy - \$40 M Biofuels Facility Capital - \$25 M  Total -- \$490 million
Transit & Intercity Rail Capital – Supplemental Appropriation	\$400 million	\$0.00 Senate transferred these funds to Transformational Climate Communities Program	\$400 million Assembly proposed to fund specific grade separation projects from these funds.
Low Carbon Roads	\$100 million	\$0.00	\$0.00 Assembly allocates these funds to the Active Transportation Program
Transformative Climate Communities	\$100 million	\$400 million	\$100 million Earmarks 25% of funds for the City of Fresno
Active Transportation Program	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$100 million

**Housing by Right:** The May Revise provides a brief outline of several policy provisions being added to the budget aimed at easing the approval process and reducing development costs of housing projects. In addition to stating the Governor’s support for existing legislation, the May Revise includes budget trailer bill language to include a “by right” standard for housing projects that meet specified requirements. Both the Senate and Assembly adopted budget trailer bill placeholder language to implement the Governor’s by right proposal. The following briefly summarizes the conditions a project must meet to be granted a permit by right:



- The development applicant or development proponent has submitted to the local government its intent to utilize this authority, and certifying under penalty of perjury that, to the best of its knowledge and belief, it conforms with all other provisions identified.
- The development is consistent with objective general plan and zoning standards in effect at the time that the subject development is submitted to the local government pursuant to this section.
- The development is located on a site that is either immediately adjacent to parcels that are developed with urban uses or at least 75 percent of the perimeter of the site adjoins parcels that are developed with urban uses.
- The development must be an attached housing development, for which the development applicant or development proponent already has recorded, or is required by law to record, a land-use restriction meeting specified number of affordable units.

The May Revise also mentioned the Governor's support for legislation pending in the Legislature. These include SB 1069 (Wieckowski) and AB 2299 (Bloom) which would require local governments to enact ordinances allowing for the construction of secondary housing units. SB 1069 was approved by the Senate on a vote of 29-3, and AB 2299 is currently pending on the Assembly Floor. Support was also mentioned to legislation that would make changes to the existing density bonus law. AB 2501 (Bloom), which is pending on the Assembly Floor, would streamline to density bonus process for developers.