



# Meeting Notice

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• 510.208.7400

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

## Alameda County Transportation Commission

Thursday, July 28, 2016, 2:00 p.m.

1111 Broadway, Suite 800 Oakland, CA 94607

### 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

Acting Mayor Jeffery Wieler

### City of Pleasanton

Mayor Jerry Thome

### City of San Leandro

Mayor Pauline Cutter

### City of Union City

Mayor Carol Dutra-Vernaci

### Executive Director

Arthur L. Dao

### 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, July 28, 2016, 2 p.m.

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607 • PH: (510) 208-7400 • 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 July 11, 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 the June 30, 2016 Commission Meeting Minutes.</a>	1	A
6.2.	<a href="#">Receive a status update on the operation of I-580 HOV/Express Lane.</a>	5	I
6.3.	<a href="#">Approval of the Alameda CTC Debt Policy.</a>	25	A
6.4.	<a href="#">Receive an update on the Alameda CTC's Review and Comments on Environmental Documents and General Plan Amendments.</a>	37	I
6.5.	<a href="#">Receive an update on federal, state and local legislative activities.</a>	39	I
6.6.	<a href="#">Approval of the One Bay Area Grant Cycle 2 Programming Principles for Alameda County.</a>	51	A
6.7.	<a href="#">Approval of Funding Strategy for City of Berkeley's Hearst Avenue Complete Streets Project included in the OBAG Cycle 1 Program.</a>	65	A
6.8.	<a href="#">Approve and authorize the Executive Director to negotiate and execute Professional Services Agreement A16-0075 with HNTB Corporation for a not-to-exceed amount of \$1,000,000 to provide System Manager Services.</a>	71	A
6.9.	<a href="#">Approve and authorize the Executive Director to negotiate and execute Professional Services Agreement A17-0004 with Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. for a not-to-exceed amount of \$13,000,000 to provide Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Services.</a>	77	A

\*(A = Action Item; I = Information Item)

- |   |   |     |     |
|---|---|-----|-----|
| 6.10.   | <a href="#">Approve and authorize the Executive Director to execute amendment No. 4 to the Professional Services Agreement No. A10-0008 with S&amp;C Engineers, Inc. for an additional amount of \$35,000 for a total not-to-exceed amount of \$2,025,750 and a one-year time extension to provide construction management services through the project completion.</a> | 83  | A   |
| 6.11.   | <a href="#">Approval of Alameda CTC Community Advisory Appointments.</a>  | 87  | A   |
| <b>7. Community Advisory Committee Reports</b>  |   |     |     |
| (Time limit: 3 minutes per speaker)   |   |     |     |
| 7.1.  | <a href="#">Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee</a> – Matthew Turner, Chair   | 89  | I   |
| 7.2.  | <a href="#">Independent Watchdog Committee</a> – Murphy McCalley, Chair   | 97  | I   |
| 7.3.  | <a href="#">Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee</a> – Sylvia Stadmire, Chair  | 115 | I   |
| <b>8. Programs and Projects Committee Action Items</b>  |   |     |     |
| On July 11, 2016, the Programs and Projects Committee approved the following action items, unless otherwise noted in the recommendations. |   |     |     |
| 8.1.  | <a href="#">Approve Alameda CTC's Comprehensive Investment Plan Update 2016 Update.</a>   | 125 | A   |
| 9.  | <b>Closed Session</b> - Closed Session pursuant to Government Code section 54956.9(d)(2): Potential exposure to litigation; one potential action  |     | A/I |

**10. Member Reports**

**11. Adjournment**

**Next meeting:** September 22, 2016

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



# Alameda County Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes Thursday, June 28, 2016, 2:00 p.m.

6.1

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607 • PH: (510) 208-7400 • www.AlamedaCTC.org

## 1. Pledge of Allegiance

## 2. Roll Call

A roll call was conducted. All members were present with the exception of Commissioner Kalb, Commissioner Spencer, Commissioner Halliday, Commissioner Harrison and Commissioner Miley.

Commissioner Biddle was present as an alternate for Commissioner Haubert. Commissioner Campbell-Washington was present as an alternate for Commissioner Chan. Commissioner Donohue was present as an alternate for Commissioner Atkin.

### Subsequent to the roll call:

Commissioner Kalb, Commissioner Spencer, Commissioner Halliday and Commissioner Harrison arrived during Item 4. Commissioner Miley arrived during Item 9.

Commissioner Freitas, Commissioner Valle, Commissioner Ortiz, Commissioner Carson and Commissioner Haggerty left during Item 9.

## 3. Public Comment

There were no public comments.

## 4. Chair and Vice Chair Report

Chair Kaplan stated that the City of Oakland unanimously voted to ban coal shipments through the Port of Oakland.

## 5. Executive Director Report

Art Dao stated his Executive Director report could be found on the Alameda CTC website as well as in the Commissioners' folders. He also stated that he testified at the joint Assembly Transportation Committee and Select committee on Ports and informed the Commission that the I-80 ICM project was being turned on over the next two weeks.

Commissioner Capitelli asked how the I-80 ICM project would be monitored. Art stated that monitoring is a key component of the project and is coordinated between several city jurisdictions and Caltrans.

## 6. Consent Calendar

- 6.1. Approval of May 26 2016 meeting minutes.
- 6.2. I-580 HOV/Express Lanes (PN 1373.002): Monthly Operation Update.
- 6.3. Alameda CTC Proposed Consolidated Budget for FY2016-17.

\*(A = Action Item; I = Information Item)

- 6.4. Delegation of Authority To Handle Claims Made Against Alameda County Transportation Commission.
- 6.5. Congestion Management Program (CMP): Summary of Alameda CTC's Review and Comments on Environmental Documents and General Plan Amendments.
- 6.6. Final Alameda Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan.
- 6.7. Final Alameda Countywide Transit Plan.
- 6.8. FY 2014-2015 Measure B/Measure BB and Vehicle Registration Fee Program Compliance Reports and Exemption Requests.
- 6.9. 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.
- 6.10. 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.
- 6.11. 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.
- 6.12. Approval of Administrative Amendments to Various Project Agreements (A13-0001, A07-0058, A14-0032).
- 6.13. Approval of Alameda CTC Community Advisory Appointments.

Commissioner Ortiz motioned to move the Consent Calendar. Commissioner Halliday seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following vote:

Yes: *Kaplan, Harrison, Ortiz, Haggerty, Valle, Campbell-Washington, Carson, Saltzman, Spencer, Maass, Capitelli, Biddle, Donahue, Halliday, Marchand, Freitas, Kalb, Wieler, Thorne, Cutter, Dutra-Vernaci*

No: *None*

Abstain: *None*

Absent: *Miley*

## 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 IWC.

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

Sylvia Stadmire, Chair of PAPCO stated that the committee met on June 27, 2016. The committee held elections and received a program update on the Hospital Discharge Transportation Service and Wheelchair Scooter Breakdown Transportation Service programs. She concluded by reviewing vacancies on the committee.

## 8. Planning, Policy and Legislation Committee Action Items

### 8.1. Legislative Update:

Tess Lengyel provided 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. She updated the Commission on the Fast Act Grant and then recommended that the Commission take the following bill positions:

AB 1964: Oppose unless amended

SB1259: Oppose position

Commissioner Kaplan asked if the transportation funding issues from the State will be dealt with in August. Tess stated that there is no definitive schedule determined for an extraordinary session.

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

Yes:	<i>Kaplan, Harrison, Ortiz, Haggerty, Valle, Campbell-Washington, Carson, Saltzman, Spencer, Maass, Capitelli, Biddle, Donahue, Halliday, Marchand, Freitas, Kalb, Wieler, Thorne, Cutter, Dutra-Vernaci</i>
No:	<i>None</i>
Abstain:	<i>None</i>
Absent:	<i>Miley</i>

## 9. 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.


## 10. Member Reports

## 11. Adjournment

The next meeting is: July 28, 2016 @ 2:00 p.m

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

Attested by:



*This page intentionally left blank*





**DATE:** July 21, 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 May 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 10 to 23 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 12 to 33 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.

**May 2016 Operation Update:** The May update is included as Attachment B to this report. During the 22 days of operations in May, we documented over 647,000 trips in the express

lanes; over 272,000 westbound trips and 375,000 eastbound trips. An estimated 27% of motorists in the express lanes were of HOV users with FasTrak® flex toll tags, 40% were single-occupant vehicles with FasTrak® (standard or flex) toll tags, and the remaining 33% 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 40% of the trips were matched to existing FasTrak® by means of license plate information. The percentage of HOV users with FasTrak® flex toll tags has increased each month since inception, suggesting increased awareness of how the express lane works.

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 10 to 23 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 7:00 pm, the motorists in the eastbound express lane traveled with average speeds between 12 and 33 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.

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 May, the actual maximum posted toll rates did not exceed \$7.25 in the westbound direction and \$6.50 in the eastbound direction. The average westbound posted toll rate to travel the entire corridor in May 2016 was \$2.54, with an average toll assessed to non-HOV users of \$1.55; the average eastbound posted toll rate to travel the entire corridor was \$2.60, with an average assessed toll to non-HOV users of \$2.40.

Through May 2016, the I-580 Express Lanes have recorded nearly 1.9 million total trips and generated over \$2.031 million in toll revenues.

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 are planned to continue through the end of Fiscal Year 2016/17 in order to promote the benefits of the lanes, emphasize proper use of the facility, and encourage the public to carpool and 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 May 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  
July 11, 2016

TOLL-PAYING  
VEHICLES


TRANSIT



ALAMEDA  
County Transportation  
Commission

## I-580 Express Lanes – May 2016

- Over 647,000 total express lane trips in May 2016
  - 27% HOV (*Toll Tag Setting*)
  - 40% SOV (*Toll Tag Setting*)
  - 1% Invalid Toll Tag (*negative balance, stolen tag, etc*)
  - 32% No Toll Tag
    - Estimated 50% require violation notices to be sent
- Westbound: Over 270,000 trips in April
- Eastbound: Over 375,000 trips in April


I-580 Express Lane Policy Committee Meeting | July 2016


2





## Speed/Density Data Location Westbound @ Hacienda Road




I-580 Express Lane Policy Committee Meeting | July 2016



5

## Average Travel Speed

May 2016, Tuesday – Thursday  
Westbound @ Hacienda Road



Speed Differential 10 - 23 mph during morning commute


I-580 Express Lane Policy Committee Meeting | July 2016



6

## Average Lane Density

May 2016, Tuesday - Thursday  
Westbound @ Hacienda Road




I-580 Express Lane Policy Committee Meeting | July 2016



7

## Average Daily Toll Rate

Westbound: Greenville Road to San Ramon Road (Full Corridor)  
May 2016




I-580 Express Lane Policy Committee Meeting | July 2016



8

## Speed/Density Data Location Eastbound @ North First Street




I-580 Express Lane Policy Committee Meeting | July 2016



9

## Average Travel Speed

May 2016, Tuesday - Thursday  
Eastbound @ N First Street





Speed Differential 12 - 33 mph during evening commute

I-580 Express Lane Policy Committee Meeting | July 2016



10




# Gross Revenue

Fiscal Year 2015-16

FY 2015-16 Gross Revenue  
(Feb 2016 – May 2016)

\$2,031,000



# Questions & Answers



*This page intentionally left blank*

**ATTACHMENT C**  
**I-580 Corridor HOV Lane Projects**  
**Alameda CTC Projects 1368.004/1372.004/1372.005**  
**Monthly Progress Report**  
**June 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.
- Minor punchlist work is in progress. All construction is expected to complete in 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**  
**July 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 express 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. Efforts to date have generated significant positive media coverage, millions of impressions and have helped to support successful lane operations.

The communications plan was designed to effectively communicate about the opening of the I-580 Express Lanes to key stakeholders, local, Bay Area and San Joaquin County media outlets, local residents, businesses, transportation providers and commuters throughout the Tri-Valley corridor and larger commute shed - reaching the target audiences in English, Spanish and Chinese. The initial launch of the campaign generated more than 40 million impressions between January 4 and March 31, 2016 with some of the media vehicles extending beyond the scheduled opening date to maintain awareness in the marketplace.

Stakeholder outreach included the development and distribution of collateral materials including banners, posters, informational cards and fact sheets, video and website and social media content for localities, transportation partner websites, local radio, television, businesses and civic organizations.

Post-opening advertising on the Waze app began April 16, 2016. These targeted advertisements to carpoolers and all users when they are driving on the express lane corridor are ongoing. Advertising on Tri-Valley Community Television will occur later this summer. Information about the I-580 Express Lanes continues to be on the [alamedactc.org](http://alamedactc.org) homepage, [bayareafastrak.org](http://bayareafastrak.org) homepage, [bayareaexpresslanes.org](http://bayareaexpresslanes.org) homepage, [commuteconnection.com](http://commuteconnection.com) homepage (San Joaquin Valley's TDM program) and on [511.org](http://511.org).

More than 140,000 FasTrak flex tags have been activated through June 20, 2016 by retail locations and the BATA customer service center, as well as at stakeholder events.

Staff is now refining a post-opening public outreach and education plan for FY16-18 and will continue to participate in outreach events, and work with partner agencies, stakeholders, and media outlets with a focus on increasing FasTrak flex tag acquisition, encouraging carpooling, and supporting continued safe and appropriate express lane use. Staff continues to respond to public inquiries via the express lane hotline, social media and direct e-mails.

*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

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

**DATE:** July 21, 2016

**SUBJECT:** Alameda CTC Debt Policy

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the Alameda CTC Debt Policy.

## Summary

The Alameda CTC Debt Policy establishes guidelines for the issuance and management of Alameda CTC debt and confirms the commitment of the Commission, management and staff to adhere to sound financial management practices. The proposed Debt Policy was developed to define parameters and guide staff and financial advisors in developing Alameda CTC's plans for issuing debt. The policy was originally approved in July 2013 and is being updated to:

- Incorporate changes in the way the agency plans for and approves capital investments;
- Clarify the appropriate use of debt financing and how the cost of debt financing will be distributed;
- Add information on additional short-term financing options; and
- Clean up other minor items.

This Debt Policy will govern the issuance and management of all debt funded through the capital markets, including the selection and management of related financial and advisory services and products. Priorities of the Debt Policy include:

- Effectively manage and mitigate financial risk;
- Maintain strong credit ratings and good investor relations;
- Achieve the lowest cost of capital;
- Preserve future program flexibility; and
- Maintain ready and cost-effective access to the capital markets.

Responsibility for implementation of the Debt Policy and day-to-day responsibility and authority for structuring, implementing, and managing the Alameda CTC debt and finance program, shall reside with the Executive Director and Deputy Executive Director of Finance

and Administration. This Debt Policy requires that the Commission specifically authorize each debt financing.

The Alameda CTC's Capital Investment Plan (CIP), which programs and allocates all fund sources administered by Alameda CTC, shall be used in combination with the Alameda CTC's Debt Policy to ensure proper allocation and financing of Measure BB eligible projects. The CIP sets priorities and strategies for allocating Measure BB and other funds under its guiding principles, while the Debt Policy provides policy direction and limitations for proposed financings. Debt issuance for capital projects shall not be recommended for Commission approval unless such issuance has been incorporated into the CIP.

## **Background**

The Alameda CTC currently has one Measure B Sales Tax Revenue Bond outstanding in the amount of \$137.1 million par value, with a final maturity of March 2022. Alameda CTC will most likely need to issue debt on a programmatic basis in relation to the Measure BB capital program within the next few years. This Debt Policy sets standards for appropriate use of debt financing, defines the purposes for which debt financing can be used, and describes the types of debt financing allowed by the Alameda CTC. It describes terms and structural considerations, various credit enhancements and methods of sale available when issuing debt. It also sets parameters around the investment of bond proceeds and describes the relationships with rating agencies, investors and the Commission.

This Debt Policy requires contracts with the financing team to be competitively bid and for staff to receive Commission approval before soliciting these services. It also requires continuing disclosure for the benefit of the bond holders in compliance with Title 17 Code of Federal Regulations §240 15c2-12, Municipal Securities.

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

## **Attachments**

- A. Alameda CTC Debt Policy – July 2016

## **Staff Contact**

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

**Alameda County Transportation Commission**  
**Debt Policy**  
July 2016

**I. Introduction**

The purpose of the Debt Policy is to establish guidelines for the issuance and management of Alameda CTC debt. This Debt Policy confirms the commitment of the Commission, management, staff, and other decision makers to adhere to sound financial management practices. Priorities of the Debt Policy are as follows:

- Effectively manage and mitigate financial risk
- Maintain strong credit ratings and good investor relations
- Achieve the lowest cost of capital
- Preserve future program flexibility
- Maintain ready and cost-effective access to the capital markets

**II. Scope and Authority**

This Debt Policy shall govern the issuance and management of all debt funded through the capital markets, including the selection and management of related financial and advisory services and products.

This Policy shall be reviewed periodically and updated as required. Any changes to the policy are subject to approval by the Commission at a legally noticed and conducted public meeting. Overall policy direction of this Debt Policy shall be provided by the Commission. Responsibility for implementation of the Debt Policy and day-to-day responsibility and authority for structuring, implementing, and managing ~~the~~ Alameda CTC debt and finance program, shall reside with the Executive Director and Deputy Executive Director of Finance and Administration. This Debt Policy requires that the Commission specifically authorize each debt financing.

While adherence to this Debt Policy is required in applicable circumstances, ~~the~~ Alameda CTC recognizes that changes in the capital markets, Alameda CTC programs and other unforeseen circumstances may from time to time produce situations that are not covered by the Debt Policy and require modifications or exceptions to achieve policy goals. In these cases, management flexibility is appropriate, provided specific authorization from the Commission is obtained.

**III. Capital Budgeting and Planning for Debt Issuance**

~~The~~ Alameda CTC's Capital Investment Plan (CIP) Strategic Plan/Congestion Management Program, which programs and allocates all of the fund sources which are Measure B Sales Tax funds as well as all other funds administered by ~~the~~ Alameda CTC, shall be used in combination with ~~the~~ Alameda CTC's Debt Policy to ensure proper allocation and financing of Alameda CTC sponsored Measure B eligible projects. The CIP Strategic Plan sets priorities and strategies for allocating Alameda CTC administered Measure B funds under its guiding principles, while the Debt Policy provides policy direction and limitations for proposed financings. Debt issuance for capital projects shall not be

Alameda CTC Debt Policy July 2016

recommended for Commission approval unless such issuance has been incorporated and approved by the Commission in the CIP Strategic Plan.



**IV. Standards For and Appropriate Use of Debt Financing**

The philosophy of the Alameda CTC carried over from its predecessor agency is to fund all projects and programs in the Transportation Expenditure Plan on a pay-as-you-go basis for as long as feasibly possible. This strategy minimizes borrowing costs and maximizes tax dollars for projects. However, the agency will consider the issuance of debt when capital program cash flow demand exceeds projected annual revenue capacity over a specified period of time, current funding sources are insufficient. The use-issuance of debt will be considered only on a programmatic basis and will not be driven by an individual project. The agency has limited debt capacity and as broad-based borrowing needs arise, they will be evaluated in terms of their impact on remaining borrowing capacity and the agency's ability to deliver the full program in a reasonable timeframe.

Additionally, as the issuer of bonds the agency has the responsibility to manage the expenditure of bond proceeds in a manner that satisfies state and federal regulations, including IRS regulations, as well as industry best practices. The agency is best positioned to manage the expenditure of bond proceeds on projects for which the Alameda CTC is the project sponsor. For those projects, the agency can manage all aspects of project delivery that can impact the timely spend-down of bond proceeds; an issue of significant importance to the IRS. If Alameda CTC is not the project sponsor and therefore not the project manager, the agency would not have control over project cash flow and would have no mechanism to control the drawdown of bond funds. In general, it is the agency's policy to issue bonds for broad-based program needs and on projects for which the Alameda CTC is the project sponsor. This is consistent with both the economic as well as the program management objectives of the agency.

As borrowing needs are identified, Alameda CTC will evaluate the nature of the capital investment (e.g., the purpose and useful life of the asset) to decide if ensure that either long or short-term debt is the appropriate financing mechanism to meet the funding need. Standards for the appropriate use of debt financing will include those described below.

- A. Long--Term Capital Projects: ~~Long-term d~~Debt should be used to finance ~~essential~~ capital projects on a programmatic basis where it is cost effective and fiscally prudent. The debt repayment period should not exceed 120% of the useful life of the project being financed or the term of the ~~pledged current~~ sales tax Measure. The ability or need to expedite or maintain the programmed schedule of approved capital projects will be a factor in the decision to issue ~~long-term~~ debt.
- B. Debt Financing Mechanism: Alameda CTC will evaluate the use of financial alternatives available including, but not limited to, long-term debt, short-term debt, commercial paper, direct bank loan, line of credit and inter-fund borrowing. Alameda CTC will utilize the most cost advantageous financing alternative consistent with limiting ~~the~~ Alameda CTC's risk exposure.
- C. Credit Quality: Credit quality is an important consideration for ~~the~~ Alameda CTC. All Alameda CTC debt management activities for new debt issuances will be conducted in a manner conducive to receiving the highest credit ratings possible consistent with ~~the~~ Alameda CTC's debt management and project delivery objectives.

**V. Purpose of Financing**

The general purpose of ~~debt~~ financing falls into three general categories: (1) to finance new capital infrastructure, (2) to refinance existing bonds to reduce financing costs, risk or both, or (3) to reimburse an agency for eligible capital expenditures made within the last 18 months. These purposes are described in more detail below.

- A. New Money Financing: New money issues can be long or short-term in nature and are those financings that generate additional funding to be available for expenditure on capital projects. These funds may be used for right-of-way acquisition, design, construction and the acquisition of construction materials, construction support, major rehabilitation of capital assets and utility relocation. New money issues will be proposed in the context of ~~the~~ Alameda CTC's CIP Strategic Plan and will be consistent with the related Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) and Measure B or Measure BB Ordinance.
- B. Refunding Bonds: Refunding bonds are issued to retire all or a portion of an outstanding bond issue. Most typically this is done to refinance at a lower interest rate to reduce debt service costs. Alternatively, some refundings are executed for a reason other than to achieve cost savings, such as to restructure the repayment schedule of the debt, to change the type of debt instruments being used, or to retire an indenture in order to remove undesirable covenants. In any event, a present value analysis must be prepared that identifies the economic effects of any refunding being proposed to the Commission.

~~The~~ Alameda CTC has established a minimum debt service savings threshold goal of 3.0% of the refunded bond principal amount, on a maturity-by-maturity basis, unless there are other compelling reasons for defeasance. As an exception to this target savings threshold, ~~the~~ Alameda CTC may elect to include bonds maturing in the next 24 months into a larger refunding if those maturities provide some positive savings. The present value savings will be calculated net of all costs related to the refinancing.

- C. Reimbursement Bonds: A reimbursement bond is a tax-exempt bond, the proceeds of which are allocated to prior expenditures originally paid from sources other than bond proceeds. A proper reimbursement allocation results in the proceeds being treated as spent for the governmental purpose of the original expenditures even though the actual moneys are used to replenish the funds originally used to pay the expenditures.

Under federal tax regulations, the proceeds of bonds may be allocated to a prior capital expenditure, but only if a formal declaration of reasonable intention to reimburse the expenditure with the proceeds of a borrowing (a "declaration of official intent") had been properly made within sixty (60) days after the date the expenditure was paid. This declaration of official intent is commonly made via a reimbursement resolution adopted by the Commission. If a declaration of official intent has been made, bond proceeds may be allocated to expenditures previously paid for a period of up to 18 months after the date the expenditures were paid.

## VI. Types of Debt

The market for municipal finance is well developed and provides numerous products or types of debt that ~~the~~ Alameda CTC will evaluate on a case-by-case basis. Some of the types of debt – long-term, short-term and variable rate – available to ~~the~~ Alameda CTC are described in this section.

**A. Long Term Debt**

1. Current Coupon Bonds: are bonds that pay interest periodically and principal at maturity. They may be used for both new money and refunding transactions. Bond features may be adjusted to accommodate market conditions at the time of sale, including changing dollar amounts for principal maturities, offering discount and premium bond pricing, modifying call provisions, utilizing bond insurance, and determining how to fund the debt service reserve fund.
2. Zero Coupon and Capital Appreciation Bonds: -pay interest that is compounded and paid only when principal matures. Interest continues to accrue on the unpaid interest at rates that are typically higher than rates on current-coupon bonds, therefore representing a more expensive funding option. In the case of zero-coupon bonds, principal paid at maturity is discounted back to the initial investment amount received at issuance. In the case of Capital Appreciation Bonds, the value of the bond accretes until maturity.
3. Transportation Infrastructure Finance Innovation Act (TIFIA) Loan: is a loan provided by the United States Department of Transportation for certain transportation projects of regional importance. A TIFIA loan may contain comparatively flexible repayment provisions and an interest rate that is tied to the prevailing 30-year US Treasury Bond yield. ~~The~~ Alameda CTC may elect to apply for a TIFIA loan if it is determined that a project is eligible and it is the most cost effective debt financing option available for the project.

**B. Short-Term Debt**

1. Commercial Paper Notes: may be issued as an alternative to fixed rate debt, particularly when the timing of funding requirements is uncertain. ~~The~~ Alameda CTC may maintain an ongoing commercial paper program to ensure flexibility and immediate access to capital funding when needed.  
~~1.~~
2. Grant Anticipation Notes (GANs): are short-term notes that are repaid with the proceeds of State or Federal grants of any type. ~~The~~ Alameda CTC shall generally issue GANs only when there is no other viable source of funding for the project.
- ~~2.~~3. Bond Anticipation Notes (BANs): are short-term notes that are repaid by the proceeds of a future bond issuance. Alameda CTC shall generally issue BANs as part of an overall financing strategy when it is beneficial to do so.
- ~~3.~~4. Lines of Credit or Bank Loans: shall be considered as an alternative to or credit support for other short term borrowing options.
- ~~4.~~5. Grant Anticipation Revenue Vehicle Financing (GARVEE): are bonds issued by the State and enable entities to fund transportation projects that are secured by certain federal grants. ~~The~~ Alameda CTC may consider the issuance of GARVEEs to meet cash flow shortfalls of grant revenues.

C. Variable Rate Debt

1. Variable Rate Debt: It is sometimes appropriate to issue short-term or long-term variable rate debt to diversify the debt portfolio, reduce interest costs, provide interim funding for capital projects and improve the match of variable rate assets to variable rate liabilities. The amount of unhedged variable rate debt will generally not exceed 20% of all outstanding or planned debt for the program. Under no circumstances will variable rate debt be issued solely for the purpose of earning interest through arbitrage.

VII. **Terms and Structure of Bonds**

The terms and structure of a specific bond issuance will be developed within a prudent legal framework and with the objective of minimizing risk to Alameda CTC, maintaining strong credit ratings, addressing investor concerns, and preserving future flexibility in a cost-effective manner. Some of the terms and structural considerations are discussed below.

A. Term: All capital improvements financed through the issuance of debt will be financed for a period not to exceed 120% of the expected average useful life of the assets being financed, and in no event shall exceed the expiration date of the ~~current~~ sales tax measure pledged to repay the debt.

B. Lien Levels: Senior and Junior Liens for each revenue source may be utilized in a manner that will maximize the most critical constraint -- typically either cost or capacity -- thus allowing for the most beneficial use of the revenue source securing the bond.

C. Debt Service Structure: Alameda CTC will examine debt service structures in the context of program needs. Combined principal and interest payments for any particular bond issue will first be examined as a level payment structure. Deferred principal can create increased program and project delivery capacity and will also be examined. Alameda CTC's debt service structure will be sized within conservative revenue constraints and with the objective of maintaining strong credit ratings.

~~C.~~ Debt service and other financing costs will be paid from the capital project funding category of the TEP, which will require each project to pay its fair share of the cost. Each project sponsor must understand that when the decision is made to issue debt on a programmatic basis, some of the funding committed to each project in the TEP will go towards paying for debt service and other financing costs, reducing the amount of sales tax dollars directly available to fund project costs.

D. Capitalized Interest: Unless otherwise required, capitalized interest will not be employed. This avoids unnecessarily increasing the bond size. Certain types of financings, such as toll revenue bonds, may require that interest on the bonds be paid from capitalized interest until Alameda CTC has constructive use of the project and project related revenues are expected to be available to pay debt service.

E. Additional Bonds Test: Any new senior lien debt issuance must not cause Alameda CTC's debt service to exceed the level at which prior year revenues are less than one and a half times (1.5x)

the maximum annual debt service (MADS) (or maximum annual principal and interest) for the aggregate outstanding senior lien bonds including the debt service for the new issuance.

- F. Call Provisions: In general, fixed rate, tax-exempt bonds will be issued with a provision that allows Alameda CTC to call outstanding bonds 10-years after the bond delivery date at par (i.e., no call premium).

#### VIII. Credit Enhancement

~~The~~ Alameda CTC will consider the cost and benefit of credit enhancements, including the potential funding of a debt service reserve fund, on a case-by-case basis with each separate bond issuance.

- A. Bond insurance: ~~The~~ Alameda CTC shall have the authority to purchase bond insurance when such purchase is deemed prudent and advantageous. The predominant determination shall be based on such insurance being less costly than the present value of the difference in the interest expense on insured bonds versus uninsured bonds.

- ~~B.~~ Debt Service Reserves: When beneficial to ~~the~~ Alameda CTC, a reserve fund may be funded at an amount appropriate to the associated financing and market conditions at that time. Any reserve fund equal to the lesser of:

- ~~1. Ten percent (10%) of the original principal amount of the bonds~~
- ~~2. Maximum annual debt service, or~~
- ~~3. One hundred and twenty-five percent (125%) of average annual debt service (the "Reserve Requirement")~~

~~Shall~~ be funded from the proceeds of each series of bonds, subject to federal tax regulations and in accordance with the requirements of credit enhancement providers and/or rating agencies.

~~The~~ Alameda CTC shall have the authority to purchase reserve equivalents (i.e., the use of a reserve fund surety) when such purchase is deemed prudent and advantageous. Such equivalents shall be evaluated in comparison to cash funding of reserves on a net present value basis.

- ~~C.B.~~ Letters of Credit: ~~[PRI]~~ ~~The~~ Alameda CTC shall have the authority to enter into a letter-of-credit agreement when such an agreement is deemed prudent and advantageous. The long-term and short-term credit ratings of those financial institutions offering letters of credit will be a critical consideration before procuring any letter of credit.

#### IX. Method of Bond Sale

~~The~~ Alameda CTC will determine, on a case-by-case basis, whether to sell its bonds competitively or through negotiation. Generally, there are three methods of sale: competitive, negotiated and private placement. Each type of bond sale has advantages and the potential to provide the lowest cost given the right conditions.

- A. Competitive Sale:** A competitive bond sale is used by established issuers, with strong credit ratings during times in which there are stable market conditions. With a competitive sale, an underwriter is not selected prior to the date of sale. The issuer works with their financial advisor and legal counsel to prepare documents, rating strategies and to notify market participants of the coming bond sale according to a published Notice of Sale. Industry accepted information outlets as well as phone calls made directly to the desks of underwriting firms are used to notify underwriters of the upcoming sale. The underwriter is selected based solely on price on the day of sale when bids are accepted.

A competitive sale allows an issuer to control bidding parameters and select the winning underwriter solely on the lowest True Interest Cost (TIC) submitted during a 30-minute bid process. No input on credit, structure or other matters is received from underwriters under a competitive sale.

- B. Negotiated Sale:** In a negotiated bond sale the issuer selects the underwriter several months before the sale of the bonds through a competitive Request for Proposals (RFP) or Request for Qualifications (RFQ) process. The underwriter is selected based upon relevant experience, recent bond sale performance and fees, among other factors. The final pricing of the bonds is directly negotiated with the underwriter based upon investor demand and orders received on the day of sale. The issuer generally relies upon the financial advisor during the negotiation process.

A negotiated sale is common for a new or infrequent issuer or an issuer with a weak bond rating. A negotiated sale can be advantageous during high volatility in the financial markets or during periods of low investor demand. Issuers who desire the underwriter's input on credit rating strategies, deal structure, document preparation, etc., will elect to sell bonds through a negotiated sale.

- C. Private Placement:** A Private Placement is a sale that is structured specifically for one purchaser such as a commercial bank. A direct purchase agreement or revolving credit facility is a form of a private placement. Such placement shall only be considered if this method is likely to result in a cost savings to ~~the~~ Alameda CTC relative to other methods of debt issuance.

**X. Investment of Bond Proceeds**

When bonds are issued, proceeds are deposited in various accounts, such as a ~~project construction~~ fund, debt service fund and debt service reserve fund, if applicable. Monies deposited in these funds are invested until needed. The investment strategy for each fund depends on federal/state statutes and regulations governing the types of instruments permitted to be used, the yield goals for the fund, requirements from rating agencies or credit enhancement providers, and the anticipated drawdown of bond proceeds.

The primary objectives for the investment activities of these funds will mirror that of ~~the~~ Alameda CTC's investment policy, in order of priority, ~~of~~ safety, liquidity and yield. The investment strategy for these funds will incorporate steps to minimize credit risk, market risk and opportunity risk by establishing guidelines for permitted investments, developing good cash flow estimates and integrating knowledge of prevailing and expected future market conditions with cash flow requirements. The investment of

bond proceeds will be made in a manner that ensures legal and regulatory requirements are met, fair market value bids and offers are received and objectives for the uses of proceeds are attained. An evaluation will be conducted of investment alternatives including individual securities or portfolio of securities, investment agreements and mutual or pooled investment funds.

Investments will be permitted for bond proceeds as defined in the bond indenture document which will list an array of allowable options such as nonmarketable U.S. Treasury securities sold to state and local governments (SLGS), the Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) and various other investment alternatives as allowed in the California Government Code with the goal of earning the maximum arbitrage yield. Arbitrage calculations will be completed on a regular basis to monitor arbitrage rebate liabilities, if any, and a reserve for liabilities will be established for future remittance to the Internal Revenue Service, when required.

**XI. Market Relationships**

As an issuer who values cost-effective market-access, ~~the~~ Alameda CTC will actively provide requested information and maintain relationships with rating agencies, investors and other market participants, as needed.

- A. Rating Agencies: The Executive Director and the Deputy Executive Director of Finance and Administration shall be primarily responsible for maintaining our relationships with those rating agencies (i.e., ~~Standard & Poor's~~ Global Ratings, Moody's Investors Service and Fitch Ratings) from whom ~~the~~ Alameda CTC requests and holds ratings. ~~The~~ Alameda CTC may, from time-to-time, choose to deal with only one or two of these agencies as circumstances dictate. In addition to general communication, the Executive Director and the Deputy Executive Director of Finance and Administration shall offer conference calls and/or meetings with agency analysts in connection with a planned sale.
- B. Investor Relations: Timely and accurate information shall be provided in response to inquiries from investors in order to maintain positive ongoing investor relations.
- C. Board Communication: As a means of providing feedback from rating agencies and/or investors regarding our financial strengths and weaknesses as perceived by the marketplace, information will be provided to the Commission when material information develops.

**XII. Continuing Disclosure**

It is Alameda CTC's policy to remain in compliance with Title 17 Code of Federal Regulations §240 15c-12, Municipal Securities Disclosure, by filing ~~our~~ annual financial statements and other financial information for the benefit of ~~our~~ bondholders within 270 days of the close of the fiscal year and filing material event notices in a timely manner.

**XIII. Consultants**

~~The~~ Alameda CTC shall select its primary financial consultant(s) viaby a competitive qualifications-based process through Request for Proposals (RFP) or Request for Qualifications (RFQ).

A. Selection of Financing Team Members: The Executive Director and the Deputy Executive Director of Finance and Administration will request authorization from the Commission to issue RFPs or RFQs, enter into negotiations with the top ranked firms and execute contracts for the following services.

1. Financial Advisor: ~~The~~ Alameda CTC shall utilize a financial advisor to assist in its debt issuance and debt administration processes. Selection of ~~the~~ Alameda CTC's financial advisor(s) shall be based on, but not limited to, the following criteria: (a) experience in providing consulting services to complex issuers, (b) knowledge and experience in structuring and analyzing complex issues, (c) experience and reputation of assigned personnel, and (d) fees and expenses.

2. Bond Counsel: Transaction documentation for debt issues shall include a written opinion by legal counsel affirming Alameda CTC is we are authorized to issue the proposed debt, that Alameda CTC has we have met all constitutional and statutory requirements necessary for issuance, and a determination of the proposed debt's federal income tax status. A nationally recognized bond counsel firm with extensive experience in public finance and tax issues will prepare this approving opinion and other documents relating to the issuance of debt. ~~The B~~ bond counsel will be selected through a competitive RFP or RFQ process.

3. Disclosure Counsel: When undertaking a bond sale, disclosure counsel may be retained to prepare the official statement if additional independence or expertise is needed. Disclosure counsel will be responsible for ensuring that the official statement complies with all applicable rules, regulations and guidelines. Disclosure counsel will be a nationally recognized firm with extensive experience in public finance. The disclosure counsel will be selected through a competitive RFP or RFQ process.

4. Underwriter: ~~The~~ Alameda CTC shall have the right to select a senior manager and co-managers for a proposed negotiated sale. The Commission may establish a pool of eligible underwriters, or select firms on an as-needed basis. In either case, underwriters for a particular negotiated transaction will be selected through a competitive RFP or RFQ process.

5. Underwriter Counsel: In any negotiated sale of Alameda CTC debt in which legal counsel is required to represent the underwriter, the lead underwriter will make the appointment, subject to Alameda CTC approval.

**XIV. Post-Issuance Compliance Procedures**

~~The~~ Alameda CTC has will established and documented procedures which were approved by the Commission in January 2014 to ensure that Alameda CTC is in compliance with requirements of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, that must be satisfied with respect to tax-exempt bonds and other obligations after the bonds are issued so that interest on the bonds is and will remain tax-exempt.





# Memorandum

6.4

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607 • PH: (510) 208-7400 • www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** July 21, 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 on June 13, 2016, the Alameda CTC has not reviewed any environmental documents.

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

## Staff Contact

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

[Daniel Wu](#), Assistant Transportation Planner

*This page intentionally left blank*



# Memorandum

6.5

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

**DATE:** July 21, 2016

**SUBJECT:** July Legislative Update

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

## Summary

The July 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 an update on local legislative activities to date.

## 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.

## State Update

Platinum Advisors, Alameda CTC's state lobbying firm, provided the following summary of the State Budget Approval process as it relates to the overall budget and transportation.

On June 15, 2016, the California state legislature passed the 2016-17 budget which totals just over \$122 billion in General Fund. The governor's January Budget proposal to augment the Proposition 2 Rainy Day Fund by an additional \$2 billion dollars was preserved.

Governor Brown signed the \$167 billion 2016-17 budget the last week of June. This includes approximately \$122 billion in general fund spending and \$45 billion in special fund spending. Although the spending package reflected the Governor's priorities, it was still unusual that the Governor made zero line item vetoes. You have to go back to Governor Brown's first tour as Governor to find a budget that contained no line item vetoes. While the Budget and several of the implementing trailer bills were signed, there are several key areas where negotiations continue, and will not be resolved until the Legislature returns from its Summer Recess in August.

**Transportation Trailer Bills:** Both the Senate and Assembly adopted similar, but not identical, budget trailer bills. Both houses adjourned without concurring with either bill; ultimately, these bills were not advanced to the Governor. The following compares the contents of both bills, but the only difference between the proposals pertains to changes to the program that exempts specified vehicles from HOV lanes occupancy requirements. Regarding this difference, Alameda CTC submitted a letter to members opposing the lift on the cap for clean air vehicle stickers, per action taken at the June 13 PPLC meeting.

**Governor's Transportation Proposal:** Both the Senate and the Assembly rejected 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:** The budget allows the CTC allocate up to \$120 million in state and federal funds to be used as a match for any award the state receives under the FASTLANE program. FASTLANE is a competitive federal program that can fund up to 60% of eligible projects.

**Cap & Trade:** The budget does not appropriate any cap & trade funds. While funding for High Speed Rail, Low Carbon Transit Operations, Transit Capital & Intercity Rail, and Sustainable Communities & Affordable Housing programs are continuously appropriated and do not require legislative approval, the funding outlook for these programs is questionable.

The biggest wrinkle facing cap & trade funds is the paltry results from the most recent auction. The May auction was expected to generate over \$500 million in auction revenue, but it only generated \$10 million. The reason for this dramatic drop is not clearly understood, but many factors likely played a part, such as a glut of

credits on the market and the litigation cloud on the legality of the auction. Given the uncertainty of future auction returns, the Legislature will wait until after the August auction, before deciding how much money will be available for an expenditure plan.

The focus now will be on the \$1.4 billion in auction revenue the state has in the bank that can be appropriated to any cap & trade program. Given that the Governor's proposed expenditure plan has \$3 billion in cap & trade revenue, this reflects a 50% reduction in available funds. Many within the Legislature want to appropriate the \$1.4 billion as soon as possible, while the Administration appears interested in using these funds to leverage support for the Governor's priorities, such as enacting legislation extending the AB 32 goals with a 2/3 vote and other priorities. In addition, the Legislature appears intent on providing more direction on how cap & trade funds are spent. The Administration's preference to use these funds as a bargaining chip and the Legislature's interest in exerting more control on these funds raises the specter that some or all of the \$1.4 billion could be appropriated through earmarks.

## 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, as well as to support goods movement, support the efficiency of AC Transit service delivery, and protect the efficiency of express lanes:

- Sent a letter to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission in support of a regional gas tax measure to fund transportation in the future, after the November 2016 election and with adequate time to develop an expenditure plan.
- Participated in the Assembly Bill 1919 hearing in Sacramento on June 14, 2016 to recommend an update in the Public Utilities Code language to allow for all proceeds from the issuance of premium bonds to be used for the purposes for which the debt is incurred: to deliver projects to the public. The bill passed out of committee and will go to the Senate Floor.
- Provided comments on the draft California Sustainable Freight Action Plan that support in a joint Assembly Committee on Transportation and Select Committee on Ports informational hearing in Sacramento on June 20, 2016: "Update on the Administration's Effort to Develop an Integrated Freight Plan."
- Coordinated with partner agencies on legislative advocacy including sending a letter in support of Senate Bill 1051 that offers increased efficiency for AC Transit service delivery by allowing parking violation enforcement through video evidence. Testified in support of SB1051 at the Assembly Transportation hearing on June 20.
- Sent a letter to oppose AB 1964 and Senate Bill 838 (budget trailer bill), which propose to repeal the limit on the number of green stickers allowing free

access to express lanes that can be issued for specified vehicles. Repealing the limit could further degrade the operation of our high-occupancy vehicle lanes and impact the incentive to carpool or use public transit as a commute alternative.

Attachment B provides information on activities and issues at the federal level from Alameda CTC's federal lobbyist, CJ Lake. Alameda CTC is not recommending any positions on bills this month.

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

### **Attachments**

- A. Alameda CTC 2016 Legislation Program
- B. Federal Update

### **Staff Contact**

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



**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
<b>Transportation Funding</b>	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>
<b>Project Delivery</b>	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>
<b>Multimodal Transportation and Land Use</b>	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
<b>Climate Change</b>	Support climate change legislation to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support parity in pre-tax fringe benefits for public transit/vanpooling and parking.</li> <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:** June 20, 2016

**RE:** Federal Legislative Update

---

**Introduction**

The House and Senate have continued work on the FY17 appropriation process this month by acting on a series of bills in the Subcommittees, full Committees, and the floors of their respective chambers. As has been reported in prior updates, the full House was unable to act on appropriation bills until May 15 due to the absence of a formal budget resolution that would provide the overall spending allocations for each Subcommittee. Since that time has passed, the House has approved three bills with several more waiting in the queue. The Senate has also approved three bills with several more that have passed Committee and are waiting floor action. We expect both Chambers to approve one more bill each before they adjourn this Friday for the July 4 district work period.

In addition to appropriations, Congress has taken up opioid abuse prevention legislation, toxic substances reform legislation, and several Committee actions on legislation within their respective jurisdictions to include, changes to mandatory spending programs of the Department of Agriculture, ozone standard implementation reform, supplemental funding to combat the Zika virus, the disapproval of executive action on establishing new rules for fiduciaries with respect to insurance and retirement planning, and the FY17 Defense Authorization bill.

As of June 20, Congress has 13 workdays remaining before July 15, when both chambers will break before the national nominating conventions as well as the August District Work Period. Congress will not return until September 6.

**Budget and Appropriations**

The Senate Appropriations Committee has now approved all of its annual Appropriations bills, except for State-Foreign Operations. The House Appropriations Committee, however, has only approved eight of twelve appropriations bills. This is the first time in many years that the Senate is actually moving out in front of the House on appropriations bills.

Regardless, because there are so few work days remaining, we expect the House and Senate to return from the August recess in September and begin to focus on an FY17 Continuing

Resolution at that time that would fund most federal agencies to include Transportation at current level funding into the new fiscal year that will begin on October 1, through the November elections. Congress would then likely take up some type of FY17 omnibus spending package during a lame duck session that would occur in November and likely through December.

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

As reported previously, the full Senate passed its FY17 bill on May 19, by an overwhelming vote of 89-8. Below are some highlights from the 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***

As reported previously, the House Appropriations Committee reported its bill out of Committee on May 24. However, the House leadership has not yet scheduled floor time for the bill. House leadership could bring up the bill the week of July 4 or 11, however this will depend on whether the House may have some free days during that time period that are not taken up by more time-sensitive items (like a potential conference report on opioid abuse or a potential FAA reauthorization extension).

Below are highlights of the FY17 House THUD Appropriations 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.

***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 20, 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. At the same time, we are currently working with staff to place follow up calls to the Secretary’s office to reiterate support for the project at this critical time in the process.



# Memorandum

6.6

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607 • PH: (510) 208-7400 • www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** July 21, 2016

**SUBJECT:** One Bay Area Grant Program Cycle 2 Programming Principles for Alameda County

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approve the One Bay Area Grant Cycle 2 Programming Principles for Alameda County.

## Summary

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Program provides federal funding to the county congestion management agencies (CMAs) for programming to projects, programs and planning activities that advance the goals and objectives of Plan Bay Area. In November 2015, MTC adopted Resolution 4202 (Attachment A), the Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policy for the OBAG Cycle 2 (OBAG 2) Program.

Alameda County's estimated share of OBAG 2 is approximately \$70.2 million of federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds spread over five fiscal years (FYs 2017-18 through 2021-22). Similar to OBAG 1, 70 percent of OBAG 2 funding must be programmed to transportation projects that support Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and 30 percent may be programmed for transportation projects anywhere within the county.

MTC is scheduled to adopt an updated Resolution 4202 in July 2016. The County CMAs will be required to provide a final program of projects to MTC by summer 2017. The proposed programming principles for Alameda County's OBAG 2 program are outlined in this memo and are intended to be consistent with the goals and objectives of MTC's Resolution 4202, the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) and Alameda CTC's Comprehensive Investment Plan (CIP).

At the July 11<sup>th</sup> Programs and Projects Committee meeting, staff provided a verbal update on the additional federal revenue that is estimated to be available during the OBAG 2 program period and MTC's proposal to increase the OBAG 2 fund estimate. Alameda County is proposed to receive an additional \$6.4 million, which is reflected in the staff report.

## **Background**

The OBAG program is intended to support the implementation of Plan Bay Area, the region's first Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). In November 2015, MTC adopted Resolution 4202, the Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policy for OBAG 2 (Attachment A) which outlines the proposed revenue estimates, funding approach, programming policies, project guidance, and program timeline for both the Regional and County programs. Through MTC's OBAG 2 county distribution formula, included in Attachment A, counties receive approximately 40% of the total funding available. Alameda County's estimated share of OBAG 2 funding is approximately \$70.2 million of federal STP and CMAQ spread over five fiscal years (FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22). Similar to OBAG 1, 70 percent of the OBAG funding must be programmed to transportation projects that support Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and 30 percent may be programmed for transportation projects anywhere in the county.

### ***Revised OBAG 2 Fund Estimate***

As a result of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST), the Bay Area's share of federal STP and CMAQ funds is estimated to increase approximately \$72 million through the end of the OBAG 2 cycle (FY17-18 to FY21-22). Due to this augmentation in revenues, MTC has increased the funding levels of several OBAG 2 programs, while also addressing emerging regional priorities. MTC proposes to direct \$32 million (45%) of the additional revenue to the County OBAG 2 Program, of which Alameda County's portion is estimated to be \$6.4 million. In July 2016, the MTC Commission is scheduled to consider revisions to MTC Resolution 4202, as reflected in Attachment A.

### **OBAG 2 Eligibility**

The programming of OBAG 2 funding is constrained to transportation projects that conform to the eligibility requirements of federal STP and CMAQ funds. In addition, projects receiving OBAG funds will need to comply with MTC's OBAG 2 requirements (MTC Resolution 4202) as well as any local criteria that will be used by Alameda CTC to evaluate projects in Alameda County.

#### *Local Agency/Sponsor eligibility requirements*

Pursuant to MTC Resolution 4202, OBAG 2 eligibility is limited to public agencies qualified to receive federal funds. In addition, there are two key requirements that must be met in order for local jurisdictions to receive OBAG 2 funds: (1) adoption of a complete streets resolution and (2) certification of the general plan's housing element.

To meet the complete streets requirement, jurisdictions must adopt a complete streets resolution by the date the CMAs submit their OBAG 2 project recommendations to MTC that incorporates the required complete streets elements as outlined in MTC's Complete Streets Guidance. Alternatively, a jurisdiction may adopt a significant revision to the



circulation element of the general plan that complies with the Act after January 1, 2010 and before the date the CMAs submit their OBAG 2 project recommendations to MTC.

To meet the Housing Element requirement, jurisdictions must have a general plan housing element adopted and certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for 2014-2022 Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) by May 31, 2015. Jurisdictions that have failed to meet this deadline must have their housing elements certified by HCD by June 30, 2016 in order to be eligible to receive OBAG 2 funding. Furthermore, under state statute, jurisdictions are required to submit Housing Element Annual Reports by April 1 every year. All cities and counties receiving OBAG 2 funding must comply with this requirement during the entire OBAG 2 funding period or their OBAG 2 funding may be deprogrammed.

The complete streets and housing requirements are not required for jurisdictions without a general plan or land use authority such as Caltrans, CMAs or transit agencies under a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) or district (not under the governance of a local jurisdiction). However, in such instances the jurisdiction in which the project is physically located must meet these requirements, except for transit/rail agency property such as, track, rolling stock or a maintenance facility.

### OBAG 2 County Program Categories

The OBAG 2 County Program fund estimate makes funds available for programming to the following categories:

County Program Category	Total	% Share	Revised based on additional FAST revenue (MTC July 2016 action)	
			Total	% Share
CMA Planning	\$8,489,000	12%	\$8,489,000	11.1%
Local Streets and Roads State of Good Repair	\$18,000,000	26%	\$20,000,000	26.1%
PDA Supportive Transportation Investment: <i>-Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements and -Transportation for Livable Communities</i>	\$35,985,000	51%	\$40,397,000	52.7%
Safe Routes to School (SR2S)	\$5,990,000	8.5%	\$5,990,000	7.8%
Federal Aid Secondary (FAS) <i>(To County of Alameda for unincorporated areas)</i>	\$1,779,000	2.5%	\$1,779,000	2.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$70,243,000</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$76,655,000</b>	<b>100%</b>

## **Principles for the Alameda County OBAG 2 Program**

Key features of each County Program category are described below. In addition to MTC's requirements for each of these programs, which are detailed in Attachment A, staff recommends additional programming principles be applied, as follows:

### ***OBAG 2 Planning, Programming and Outreach***

In order to maintain compliance with various federal, State and regional requirements, CMAs are required to perform a mix of countywide planning and programming, monitoring and outreach functions. Although the "traditional" CMA functions include the programming of federal STP and CMAQ funds, because MTC requires CMAs to perform additional planning, programming, monitoring and outreach efforts through the OBAG program, as with OBAG 1, CMAs may choose to designate additional funding from their County Program to augment their efforts. The Alameda CTC's "traditional" and OBAG responsibilities are listed below:

#### *Traditional:*

- Congestion Management Program (CMP)
- Countywide Transportation Plan (CWTP)
- Countywide Bike and Pedestrian Plans
- Countywide modal plans and corridor planning
- Community Based Transportation Plan (CBTP)
- Travel Demand Model Support
- Evaluation of Transportation and Land Use Policies
- State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Programming
- Federal STP and CMAQ Programming
- Lifeline Transportation Program (LTP)
- Performing ongoing Monitoring Tasks

#### *OBAG 2:*

- Updating the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy
- Preparing the PDA Strategic Plan and/or programs to provide PDA technical assistance to local agencies
- Enhanced monitoring due to PDA Investment and Growth Strategy and Complete Streets
- Multi-jurisdictional PDA Coordination
- Updating the Comprehensive Investment Plan
- Countywide Bike and Pedestrian Plan related Planning efforts

- Complete Streets Policy Planning efforts (Ensuring local compliance with MTC's Complete Streets policy) and complete streets policy implementation
- Outreach efforts (Expanding public outreach and communication with stakeholders) to meet Title VI requirements
- Priority Conservation Areas related Planning / Programming efforts
- Development of a Comprehensive Multi-modal Strategic Plan with Bus, Rail, Parking, TDM, land use and Bike and Pedestrian elements
- Enhanced OBAG project monitoring/ compliance with MTC's Regional Project Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution 3606) and Annual Obligation Plan requirements

These additional planning and programming efforts are eligible only for the STP funds made available through OBAG, not CMAQ. Staff recommends a total of \$8,489,000 of OBAG 2 STP funds be programmed for Alameda CTC planning and programming activities related to OBAG 2.

### ***Local Streets and Roads Preservation/State of Good Repair***

This category is for the preservation of local streets and roads on the federal-aid system to support a state of good repair. To be eligible for funding of any Local Streets and Roads (LSR) preservation project, the jurisdiction must have a certified Pavement Management Program (StreetSaver® or equivalent). In addition, selected pavement projects should be based on the needs analysis resulting from the established Pavement Management Program (PMP) for the jurisdiction. This requirement ensures that streets selected for investment are cost effective. MTC is responsible for verifying the certification status of jurisdictions. The certification status of area jurisdictions can be found at <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/services/pmp/>.

Under MTC Resolution 4202, LSR projects may be included in the PDA Supportive Transportation Investments category based on the location of the project. Staff recommends \$20,000,000 be made available to jurisdictions within Alameda County for eligible LSR projects.

This programming will support the "fix it first" strategy as well as address the maintenance shortfall in Alameda County. The LSR funding is proposed to be sub-allocated cities/ County based on 50% Population and 50% Lane Miles formula. The target numbers generated as a result of this formula will be the maximum LSR funds that may be received by a jurisdiction (Attachment B). The minimum LSR funds a jurisdiction may receive is \$100,000 which is consistent with MTC's minimum amount for OBAG 2 programming. Additional information on LSR project eligibility is included in MTC Resolution 4202.

### ***PDA Supportive Transportation Investments***

PDA supportive projects are anticipated to include bicycle, pedestrian, and Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) projects.

A wide range of bicycle and pedestrian improvements are eligible for federal STP and CMAQ funding, including bicycle facilities, bicycle education, outreach, sharing and parking programs, sidewalks, ramps, pathways and pedestrian bridges, user safety and supporting facilities, and traffic signal actuation.

The purpose of Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) projects is to support community based transportation projects that bring new vibrancy to downtown areas, commercial cores, high density neighborhoods, and transit corridors, enhancing their amenities and ambiance and making them places where people want to live, work and visit. The TLC program supports the RTP/SCS by investing in improvements and facilities that promote alternative transportation modes rather than the single-occupant automobile. This category may include projects within the geographic boundaries of a PDA as well as projects located outside of a PDA that provide proximate access to a PDA. *As with Cycle 1, staff proposes to define Proximate Access as follows:*

*Transportation improvements not physically located within the boundaries of a PDA but providing benefits of travel to or from a PDA, between PDAs, or between a PDA and a job center or other important community services or areas.*

Currently, there are 43 PDAs in Alameda County that have been voluntarily nominated by local jurisdictions and approved by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) as part of the FOCUS program (Attachment C). Staff recommends all PDAs within Alameda County be eligible to receive OBAG 2 funds. Additional information on PDA Supportive Transportation Investment project eligibility is included in MTC Resolution 4202.

### **Safe Routes to School (SR2S)**

MTC has identified about \$5.34 million of SR2S funding within the county share of OBAG 2 funds for Alameda County. MTC guidelines stipulate, if additional resources are required, OBAG 2 funds are eligible to supplement the funding already identified. The current Alameda Countywide SR2S program has an annual budget of about \$1.3 million. Staff recommends \$5,990,000 be made available of OBAG 2 funds for the SR2S program, to sustain and provide strategic expansion opportunities. Additional information on SR2S project eligibility is also included in MTC Resolution 4202.

### **Federal Aid Secondary (FAS) Shares**

The Federal Aid Secondary (FAS) program, which directed funding to rural roads, was eliminated in 1991 with the passage of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA). However, California statutes provide for the continuation of minimum funding levels to counties, guaranteeing their prior FAS shares for rural county roads.

Under the OBAG 2 program, \$1,779,000 will be available to the County of Alameda based on the funding amounts determined by California's Federal-Aid Secondary Highways Act (California Code § 2200-2214). This FAS funding is not subject to the minimum PDA investment requirement.

## **Regional Priority Conservation Areas (PCA) Program**

The Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Program is available through MTC's OBAG 2 Regional Program and provides funding for the development of plans and projects to assist in the preservation and enhancement of rural lands and open space. Generally, eligible projects include PCA planning activities, bicycle and pedestrian access to open space and parklands, visual enhancements, and habitat/environmental enhancements. Specifically, projects must support Plan Bay Area by preserving and enhancing the natural, economic and social value of rural lands amidst a growing population across the Bay Area, for residents and businesses.

The PCA Program includes \$16.4 million that is regionally competitive and Alameda County projects can compete for up to \$8.2 million (the other \$8.2 million is reserved for the North Bay counties). A 2:1 match is required for all projects outside of the North Bay Counties. Staff recommends that PCA project proposals should partner with agencies such as the East Bay Regional Park District and other organizations such as the Tri Valley Conservancy for this regional competitive program.

## **Role of Fund Exchanges**

In the past, fund exchanges have been used to fund large projects with a more restrictive funding source, allowing for the funding of multiple smaller projects with a local fund source. The OBAG 2 program has characteristics that make it a potential fit for an exchange scenario, which will be considered as part of the programming approach. If an exchange candidate is identified that is eligible to expend the federal funds within the required schedule, the final program of projects could benefit with more flexibility in the types of projects selected for the OBAG program. This is based on the assumption that OBAG 2 requirements would still need to be met for the exchanged funds.

## **Action Summary**

The recommended programming principles for Alameda County's OBAG 2 program are intended to be consistent with the goals and objectives of MTC's Resolution 4202 as well as the Alameda CTC's CTP and CIP. The below table summarizes the recommended Principles:

Program Category	Recommended Programming Principles
CMA Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Program a total of \$8,489,000 of OBAG 2 STP funds for Alameda CTC planning and programming activities related to OBAG 2.</li> </ul>
Local Streets and Roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make available approximately \$20,000,000 to LSR-eligible jurisdictions within Alameda County for eligible LSR projects.</li> <li>Sub-allocate the available LSR funding to LSR eligible cities/County based on a 50% Population and 50% Lane Miles formula.</li> </ul>
PDA Supportive Transportation Investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make available approximately \$40,397,000 to eligible projects for PDA Supportive projects.</li> <li>Define Proximate Access as, "Transportation improvements not physically located within the boundaries of a PDA but providing benefits of travel to or from a PDA, between PDAs, or between a PDA and a job center or other important community services or areas."</li> <li>All 43 PDAs within Alameda County eligible to receive OBAG 2 funds.</li> </ul>
SR2S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Program \$5,990,000 OBAG 2 funds for the SR2S program to sustain and provide strategic expansion opportunities.</li> </ul>
Federal Aid Secondary (FAS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Program \$1,779,000 FAS to County of Alameda for eligible projects in unincorporated areas. <i>(The County is the only agency eligible for these funds)</i></li> </ul>
Regional Priority Conservation Areas (PCA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PCA project proposals should partner with agencies such as the East Bay Regional Park District and other organizations such as the Tri Valley Conservancy for this regional competitive program.</li> </ul>

### Next Steps

In late July 2016, MTC is scheduled to adopt an updated Resolution 4202, including a revised fund estimate for the OBAG 2 County Program. The County CMAs will be required to provide a final program of projects to MTC by summer 2017. The OBAG 2 program of

projects will be evaluated and recommended as a part of the Alameda County's Comprehensive Investment Plan (CIP) 2018 programming process.

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

#### **Attachments**

- A. [MTC Resolution 4202 \(hyperlinked to the website\)](#)
- B. OBAG Cycle 2 – Alameda County LSR Shares
- C. List of PDAs in Alameda County

#### **Staff Contacts**

[Vivek Bhat](#), Director of Programming and Project Controls

[Jacki Taylor](#), Associate Program Analyst

*This page intentionally left blank*



## OBAG 2 - Local Streets and Roads

## 50% Population + 50% Lane Miles

Jurisdiction in Alameda County	Population	% Population	Lane Mileage	% Lane Mileage	50 % Population + 50% Lane Miles	OBAG-2 LSR Share	OBAG-2 LSR Share (Rounded)
County of Alameda**	146,787	9.21%	995	12.51%	10.86%	\$ 2,171,274	\$ 2,171,300
Alameda	76,638	4.81%	275	3.46%	4.13%	\$ 826,573	\$ 826,600
Albany	18,565	1.16%	59	0.74%	0.95%	\$ 190,752	\$ 190,800
Berkeley	118,780	7.45%	453	5.69%	6.57%	\$ 1,314,185	\$ 1,314,100
Dublin	55,844	3.50%	247	3.11%	3.31%	\$ 661,042	\$ 661,000
Emeryville	10,570	0.66%	47	0.59%	0.63%	\$ 125,489	\$ 125,500
Fremont	226,551	14.21%	1,065	13.39%	13.80%	\$ 2,759,501	\$ 2,759,500
Hayward	152,889	9.59%	629	7.91%	8.75%	\$ 1,749,836	\$ 1,749,800
Livermore	85,990	5.39%	670	8.43%	6.91%	\$ 1,381,889	\$ 1,381,900
Newark	44,204	2.77%	250	3.14%	2.96%	\$ 591,690	\$ 591,700
Oakland	410,603	25.75%	1,964	24.69%	25.22%	\$ 5,044,387	\$ 5,044,300
Piedmont	11,113	0.70%	78	0.99%	0.84%	\$ 168,257	\$ 168,300
Pleasanton	74,850	4.69%	498	6.26%	5.47%	\$ 1,094,985	\$ 1,095,000
San Leandro	88,441	5.55%	392	4.93%	5.24%	\$ 1,047,873	\$ 1,047,900
Union City	72,744	4.56%	331	4.16%	4.36%	\$ 872,266	\$ 872,300
<b>COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>1,594,569</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>7,954</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$ 20,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 20,000,000</b>

\*\* County of Alameda information includes Planning Area 2 and 4  
Population Source - Department of Finance 01/01/2015

*This page intentionally left blank*

## List of PDAs in Alameda County

Planning Area	Priority Development Area	Sponsoring Jurisdiction
1	Naval Air Station	City of Alameda
	Northern Waterfront	City of Alameda
	San Pablo Avenue/Solano Avenue Mixed Use Neighborhood	City of Albany
	Adeline Street	City of Berkeley
	Downtown	City of Berkeley
	San Pablo Avenue	City of Berkeley
	South Shattuck	City of Berkeley
	Telegraph Avenue	City of Berkeley
	University Avenue	City of Berkeley
	Mixed Use Core	City of Emeryville
	Coliseum BART station area	City of Oakland
	Downtown and Jack London Square	City of Oakland
	Eastmont Town Center	City of Oakland
	Fruitvale and Dimond areas	City of Oakland
	MacArthur Transit Village	City of Oakland
	West Oakland	City of Oakland
TOD Corridors	City of Oakland	
2	Castro Valley BART	Alameda County
	E 14th St and Mission Blvd Mixed Use Corridor	Alameda County
	Hesperian Blvd	Alameda County
	Meekland Avenue Corridor	Alameda County
	Downtown	City of Hayward
	South Hayward BART Mixed Use Corridor	City of Hayward
	South Hayward BART Urban Neighborhood	City of Hayward
	The Cannery	City of Hayward
	Mission Boulevard Corridor	City of Hayward
	Bay Fair BART Transit Village	City of San Leandro
	Downtown TOD	City of San Leandro
East 14th Street	City of San Leandro	
3	Centerville	City of Fremont
	City Center (Central Business District)	City of Fremont
	Irvington District	City of Fremont
	South Fremont/Warm Springs	City of Fremont
	Dumbarton Transit Area TOD	City of Newark
	Old Town Mixed Use Area	City of Newark
	Intermodal Station District	City of Union City
4	Town Center	City of Dublin
	Transit Center/Dublin Crossing	City of Dublin
	Downtown Specific Plan Area	City of Dublin
	Downtown	City of Livermore
	East Side Priority Development Area	City of Livermore
	Isabel Avenue/BART Station Planning Area	City of Livermore
	Hacienda	City of Pleasanton

*This page intentionally left blank*



# Memorandum

6.7

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607 • PH: (510) 208-7400 • www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** July 21, 2016

**SUBJECT:** One Bay Area Grant Cycle 1 Program: Funding Strategy for City of Berkeley's Hearst Avenue Complete Streets Project

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approve the funding strategy for City of Berkeley's Hearst Avenue Complete Streets Project included in the OBAG Cycle 1 Program.

## Summary

In 2013 the City of Berkeley received federal One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 1 funds to implement the Hearst Avenue Complete Streets project. The City recently received bids for the construction contract with the lowest bidder approximately \$800,000 above the engineer's estimate, creating a significant funding shortfall. Alameda CTC along with City of Berkeley staff has developed a funding strategy to partially address the shortfall through a combination of reprogramming of OBAG Cycle 1 and Alameda CTC Local Exchange Program (CMA TIP) funds and programming of FY 2016-17 Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) funds.

The Commission is recommended to approve the below listed actions intended to partially address the funding shortfall for the Hearst Avenue Complete Streets project:

1. Reprogram \$100,000 of unused OBAG Cycle 1-Local Streets and Roads (LSR) funds from the City of Emeryville's Hollis Street project to the Hearst Avenue project;
2. Reprogram \$228,000 of CMA TIP funds programmed from two (2) other City of Berkeley projects to the Hearst Avenue project; and
3. Program \$88,000 of FY 2016-17 TFCA funds to the bike lanes component of the Hearst Avenue project.

The City of Berkeley will be responsible for securing any additional funds needed to eliminate the shortfall and fully fund the project. Approval of this request will allow the City of Berkeley to proceed with the construction phase of the project.

## Background

Through OBAG Cycle 1, the Alameda CTC programmed \$2.156 million of federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds for the City of Berkeley's Hearst Avenue Complete Streets project. The City obligated the federal funds and advertised the construction contract in May 2016. The City recently received bids for the construction contract with the lowest bidder approximately \$800,000 above the engineer's estimate, creating a significant funding shortfall. The City is able to cover approximately half of the shortfall with its own local

funds, but has requested the assistance of the Alameda CTC to help identify a funding strategy for the remaining balance.

Proposed Funding Strategy

The funding strategy proposes a combination of reprogramming of federal OBAG Cycle 1 and CMA TIP funds and programming of FY 2016-17 TFCA funds to the Hearst Avenue project.

*Reprogramming of OBAG Cycle 1 funds*

The OBAG Cycle 1 program included \$100,000 of federal STP funds for the City of Emeryville's Hollis Street LSR Preservation project. Subsequent to the programming of the OBAG funds the Hollis project was delivered using local funds, which created \$100,000 of unused capacity within the OBAG Cycle 1 program. Alameda CTC staff proposes to reprogram these funds to the City of Berkeley's Hearst Avenue project and to also account for this change by crediting the City of Emeryville through the LSR component of the upcoming OBAG Cycle 2 program. Alameda CTC has received concurrence on the proposal from both cities and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). The proposed reprogramming is summarized below:

<b>OBAG Funding Cycle</b>	<b>Emeryville</b>	<b>Berkeley</b>
OBAG Cycle 1 (LSR component)	(\$100,000)	\$100,000
OBAG Cycle 2 (LSR component)	\$100,000	(\$100,000)
Net Change	\$0	\$0

*Reprogramming of CMA TIP funds*

A total of \$228,000 of CMA TIP funds are currently programmed to the City of Berkeley for the following two LSR projects, (1) Spruce Street Safety (CMA TIP project No. 20-002) and (2) Piedmont Circle Pedestrian Safety (CMA TIP Project No. 20-003). Berkeley staff has submitted a letter to the Alameda CTC requesting the deprogramming of the CMA TIP funds from these projects for the purpose of reprogramming the funds to the Hearst Avenue Complete Streets project (Attachment A). The CMA TIP funds are proposed to be reprogrammed as follows:

<b>CMA TIP Funding</b>	<b>Spruce Street Safety</b>	<b>Piedmont Circle Safety</b>	<b>Hearst Avenue Complete Streets</b>	<b>Total</b>
Current CMA TIP	\$100,000	\$128,000	\$0	\$228,000
Proposed CMA TIP	\$0	\$0	\$228,000	\$228,000
Net Change	(\$100,000)	(\$128,000)	\$228,000	\$0

### *Programming of FY 2016-17 TFCA funds*

The City of Berkeley's share of the FY 2016-17 TFCA fund estimate is \$112,000. The Hearst Avenue Complete Streets project includes the installation of Class 2 and Class 4 bike lanes which are eligible for TFCA funding. Based on the information received to date from Berkeley staff, the project is cost-effective for up to \$88,000 of FY 2016-17 TFCA funds. Revisions to the information provided may affect the project evaluation and result in a revised (lower) TFCA funding recommendation. The \$88,000 is proposed to be programmed out of Berkeley's \$112,000 share.

### **Next Steps**

The proposed programming actions are reflected in the Comprehensive Investment Plan 2016 Update, which is scheduled for approval by the Commission in July 2016. Subsequent to Commission approval, the MTC will amend the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to reflect the approved reprogramming of federal OBAG Cycle 1 LSR funds from the City of Emeryville to the City of Berkeley. Berkeley staff will then need to work directly with Caltrans Local Assistance to obligate the federal funds. The Alameda CTC will enter into funding agreements directly with the City of Berkeley for the CMA TIP and TFCA funding. The City of Berkeley will be responsible for securing any additional funds needed to eliminate the shortfall and fully fund the project. With approval of this request, the City of Berkeley anticipates to be in a position to proceed with the construction phase of the project.

**Fiscal Impact:** The \$88,000 of TFCA funds is already accounted for in the Alameda CTC's FY 2016-17 budget. The \$228,000 of CMA TIP funds will be added to the Alameda CTC's FY 2016-17 budget during the mid-year budget update.

### **Attachments**

- A. City of Berkeley's CMA TIP Letter


### **Staff Contacts**

[Vivek Bhat](#), Director of Programming and Project Controls

[Jacki Taylor](#), Associate Program Analyst

*This page intentionally left blank*





Department of Public Works  
Transportation Division

6.7A

June 23, 2016

Vivek Bhat, P.E.  
Director of Programming  
Alameda County Transportation Commission  
1111 Broadway, Suite 800  
Oakland, CA 94607

Re: Deprogramming of CMA TIP Projects 20-002 and 20-003

Dear Vivek:

The City of Berkeley hereby requests that the following projects be deprogrammed from the CMA TIP for the purpose of reprogramming their remaining funds to the Hearst Avenue Complete Streets Project:

- Spruce St Safety Project (CMA TIP project No. 20-002)
- Piedmont Circle Pedestrian Safety Project (CMA TIP Project No. 20-003)

Please contact me if you have any further questions regarding this request.

Sincerely,

Farid Javandel  
Transportation Manager

*This page intentionally left blank*



# Memorandum

6.8

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

510.208.7400

www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** July 21, 2016

**SUBJECT:** I-580/I-680 Express Lanes (1373.002, 1369.000, 1408.001):  
Professional Services Agreement A16-0075 with HNTB Corporation

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approve and authorize the Executive Director to negotiate and execute Professional Services Agreement A16-0075 with HNTB Corporation for a not-to-exceed amount of \$1,000,000 to provide System Manager Services.

## Summary

Since February 2016, the Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) has been operating the I-580 Express Lanes (PN 1373.002), which offer the users travel time savings and travel reliability on this major commute and freight corridor that connects the Bay Area businesses and the Port of Oakland with the Sacramento Valley and beyond. In addition, as the Managing Agency of the I-680 Sunol Smart Carpool Lane Joint Powers Authority (Sunol JPA), Alameda CTC has been implementing express lanes on I-680, including the I-680 Northbound Express Lane Project (PN 1369.000) and I-680 Southbound Express Lane Access Conversion Project (PN 1408.001). By providing a new choice for solo drivers to utilize the unused lane capacity in carpool lanes for a fee without impeding the benefits of carpooling, the express lanes improve the efficiency of the transportation system, resulting in improved corridor throughput and traffic congestion relief.

Following the Commission's approval to release a request for proposals (RFP) for system manager services in February 2016, Alameda CTC released RFP #R16-0010 in April 2016. Five proposals were received by the proposal due date, May 11, 2016. The selection panel reviewed the proposals and shortlisted three firms. Interviews were held on June 2<sup>nd</sup> and, at the conclusion of its evaluation, the selection panel selected HNTB Corporation (HNTB) as the top-ranked firm.

Staff recommends that the Commission approve and authorize the Executive Director to negotiate and execute a Professional Services Agreement A16-0075 with HNTB for a not-to-exceed budget of \$1,000,000 to provide system manager services for toll system implementation on the I-580 and I-680 corridors, as shown in Attachment A – Project Location Map. The term of the agreement will be from July 2016 through June 2020.

## Background

Alameda CTC is the operating/managing agency for the I-580 and I-680 Express Lanes and is responsible for the implementation of improvements and operations and maintenance of these facilities.

Improvements are currently planned for Alameda CTC's toll facilities. To deliver these improvements, in February 2016 the Commission approved the release of a request for proposals (RFP) for system manager services to support the Alameda CTC in its management of the Toll System Integrator (TSI) that will be providing express lane implementation. Subsequently, Alameda CTC released RFP #R16-0010 in April 2016 to procure the System Manager for the following projects:

I-580 Express Lanes: Over the last two decades, the I-580 corridor has consistently been rated as one of the most congested freeway segments within the San Francisco Bay Area region. Alameda CTC in partnership with Caltrans, the California Highway Patrol, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Alameda County, and the cities of Livermore, Dublin, and Pleasanton implemented various strategic investments in this corridor. The last of such near-term investments is the implementation of the express lanes that have been in operation since February 2016, from Hacienda Drive to Greenville Road in the eastbound direction and from Greenville Road to San Ramon Boulevard in the westbound direction. The express lanes include the implementation of an Electronic Toll System (ETS) that provide a new choice to single occupancy vehicle (SOV) users, enabling them to make use of the unused capacity in the HOV lane for a fee, if they choose to use the lanes. Tolls have been collected through All Electronic Toll (AET) collection method by the use of FasTrak®/FasTrak flex® toll tags. The toll system also includes a Vehicle Enforcement System (VES) to implement automated toll evasion violation enforcement which is expected to curtail toll evasions.

I-680 Northbound Express Lane: 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. It has recently moved up the list of the most congested corridors in the Bay Area. Currently, there is heavy afternoon congestion on I-680 Northbound from Scotts Creek Boulevard to Andrade Road. Traffic studies have confirmed that this heavy congestion is caused by two bottleneck locations affecting northbound I-680 between SR 237 and SR 84 on weekday afternoon/evening commutes between 1:30 pm and 7:30 pm. The first bottleneck is located near Washington Boulevard. The second is at the lane drop near the truck scales located between Sheridan Road and Andrade Road. The congestion on the freeway has spilled onto local streets that parallel the freeway causing significant congestion along local streets in the area. The initial phase of construction, the 9-mile long Phase 1 Modified Project, will add a new HOV/Express Lane from south of Auto Mall Parkway to SR 84, eliminate the two bottlenecks, and alleviate the congestion on the freeway and local streets.

The Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA&ED) for the overall project was completed in July 2015 and final design is progressing on an expedited project delivery

schedule. The final roadway design will be completed by the end of this calendar year with construction activities expected to commence in summer 2017.

I-680 Southbound Express Lane Conversion: To improve access opportunities, the northbound I-680 improvements, as cited above, will also include the conversion of the existing southbound express lanes from a restricted to a continuous access facility from SR 84 to SR 262. The Project implementation schedule is expected to coincide with the northbound improvements.

A pre-proposal meeting was held on April 27, 2016, and was attended by ten (10) firms. By the May 11, 2016 proposal due date, five (5) proposals were received from the interested proposers. The independent selection panel evaluated the proposals and shortlisted three teams. Interviews were conducted on June 2, 2016.

Proposers were evaluated and scored based on the following criteria:

- ✓ Knowledge and Understanding: Methods of approach, work plan, and experience with similar projects related to type of services,
- ✓ Management Approach and Staffing Plan: Qualifications of project staff, particularly the project manager and other key staff, and key personnel's level of involvement in performing related work,
- ✓ Qualifications of the Proposer Firm: Technical experience in performing work related to the type of services; experience working with public agencies; record of completing work on schedule; strength and stability of the firm; technical experience and strength and stability of proposed subconsultants; and assessments by client references,
- ✓ Schedule: Capacity and ability to provide quality personnel in a timeframe that meets the needs of the Alameda CTC, and
- ✓ Ability to meet or exceed applicable LBE and SLBE Goals: Business Contract Equity Program established by Alameda CTC.

At the conclusion of its evaluation, the selection panel ranked the three teams in the following order:

1. HNTB Corporation (HNTB)
2. TJKM Transportation Consultants (TJKM)
3. CDM Smith (CDM)

A budget of \$1,000,000 has been established for the system manager scope of services which includes the following elements:

- ✓ Complete Concept of Operations & Systems Engineering Management Plan,
- ✓ Provide technical oversight for Toll Systems Integrator (TSI) management, and
- ✓ Provide task-order based optional express lane operations support services.

HNTB, the top-ranked firm, is a well-established firm. Its team is comprised of several certified local and small local firms and is expected to meet the LBE/SLBE/VSLBE goals for the contract. It is anticipated that a contract will be ready for execution by July 2016.

In the event Alameda CTC does not reach agreement with HNTB, negotiations will proceed with the second highest ranked proposer from the ranking list, shown above, and so forth until a proposer is selected. Last month the Commission authorized the Executive Director to proceed with negotiations and execute an agreement with Kapsch TrafficCom Transportation NA, Inc. (Kapsch), the top-ranked Toll System Integrator (TSI) team for the I-680 Southbound Express Lane Conversion Project. TJKM is a part of the Kapsch team. If Kapsch enters into an agreement with Alameda CTC, with TJKM included as one of its subconsultants, then TJKM will be conflicted out to perform the system manager services.

Staff recommends that the Commission approve and authorize the Executive Director to negotiate and execute a Professional Services Agreement A16-0075 with HNTB to provide System Manager Services for a not-to-exceed budget in the amount of \$1,000,000. Toll revenue, 2000 Measure B and 2014 Measure BB funds will be used to procure the system manager services. The estimated duration to complete the scope of services is four (4) years.

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

**Fiscal Impact:** The action will authorize an encumbrance of \$1,000,000 for subsequent expenditure. This amount is included in the appropriate project funding plans and sufficient budget has been and will be included in the Alameda CTC Adopted FY 2016-17 Operating and Capital Program Budget and future FY Operating and Capital Program Budget.

## **Attachment**



- A. Project Location Map

## **Staff Contact**

[Kanda Raj](#), Express Lanes Program Manager (Project Controls Team)

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

# Bay Area Express Lane Network



**LEGEND**

- 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

6.9

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• 510.208.7400

• www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** July 21, 2016

**SUBJECT:** 7<sup>th</sup> Street Grade Separation and Port Arterial Improvements Project (PN 1442.000): Professional Services Agreement A17-0004 with Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approve and authorize the Executive Director to negotiate and execute Professional Services Agreement A17-0004 with Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. for a not-to-exceed amount of \$13,000,000 to provide Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Services.

## Summary

The Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) is the project sponsor and implementing agency for the 7<sup>th</sup> Street Grade Separation and Port Arterial Improvements Project (PN 1442.000). As shown in Attachment A – Project Location Map, the Project consists of three components including the 7<sup>th</sup> Street Grade Separation, Middle Harbor Road Improvements, and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) and Technology Master Plan. Together, the three Project components will dramatically improve the efficiency and reliability of truck and rail access and circulation within the Port of Oakland. It will greatly reduce shipping costs and improve the competitiveness of the Port while also generating benefits that extend beyond the Port area, such as reduced regional congestion and emissions and substantial job creation. It will also provide connectivity to the Bay Trail system.

In March 2016, the Commission allocated a total of \$33,000,000 of Measure BB funds for the Project and authorized commencement of the plan to advance the delivery of the Project. With this authorization, Alameda CTC embarked on an aggressive delivery schedule to position the Project to be competitive for the recently announced federal funding opportunity: Fostering Advancements in Shipping and Transportation for the Long-term Achievement of National Efficiencies (FASTLANE) grant, established by the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act) and other future grants by obtaining environmental clearance as soon as possible.

In order to provide the consultant resources necessary for the successful delivery of the Project, Request for Proposals (RFP) #R16-0012 for Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Services with optional Final Design/Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E), was released in April 2016. Five proposals were received by the proposal due date, May 31, 2016. The selection panel, consisting of representatives from the Port of Oakland and

Alameda CTC reviewed the proposals and shortlisted three firms. Interviews were held on June 29<sup>th</sup> and, at the conclusion of its evaluation, the selection panel selected Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. (Jacobs) as the top-ranked firm.

Staff recommends that the Commission approve and authorize the Executive Director, to negotiate and execute Professional Services Agreement A17-0004 with Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. for a not-to-exceed amount of \$13,000,000 to provide Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Services. It is anticipated that environmental phase activities will be completed by Fall 2018.

## **Background**

Alameda CTC is the implementing agency for the 7<sup>th</sup> Street Grade Separation and Port Arterial Improvements Project (PN 1442.000). The Port of Oakland is the fifth busiest container port in the nation and a critical global gateway providing access to the Pacific Rim, however it has significant infrastructure deficiencies that, if not addressed, will limit the economic competitiveness of the Port. The Port's roadway network is greatly strained by arrivals of increasingly large ocean liners, and drayage truckers report "turn times" of multiple hours. Two critical at-grade roadway-rail crossings within the Port result in train blockages of up to 30 minutes and truck queues that can take 60 minutes or longer to clear. Significant truck traffic congestion and idling lead to shipping delays, increased emissions, and unsafe truck maneuvers. In addition, the Port lacks modern ITS systems and backbone infrastructure to respond to incidents or implement operational strategies.

Alameda CTC, in partnership with the Port of Oakland, is implementing the Project to address the growing freight infrastructure mobility needs for the Port. The Project includes three distinct components which work in concert to improve operational conditions, including:

- **7<sup>th</sup> Street Grade Separation Project** – Reconstruct the existing railroad underpass and replace the three-legged junction of 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Maritime Street, and Navy Road with an elevated, signalized T-intersection and provide a grade separation for a realigned railroad spur;
- **Middle Harbor Road Improvements Project** – Identify and implement solutions to the traffic operational problems at Middle Harbor Road including signalization improvements, reconfiguration of terminal gates, dedicated queue/turn lanes; and
- **Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) and Technology Master Plan** – Applying ITS, Freight Advanced Traveler Information System (FRATIS) and other technologies in a port environment to create a safer, stronger, and more efficient system for moving people and goods in, out, and around the Port and the region.

Together, the three Project components will dramatically improve the efficiency and reliability of truck and rail access and circulation within the Port. It will greatly reduce shipping costs and improve the competitiveness of the Port, while also generating benefits that extend beyond the Port area such as reduced regional congestion and

emissions and substantial job creation. It will also provide connectivity to the Bay Trail system through both the 7<sup>th</sup> Street and Middle Harbor Road.

In March 2016, as part of the Comprehensive Investment Plan 2016 Update process, the Commission allocated a total of \$33,000,000 of Measure BB funds for the environmental and design phases of the Project components (CIP ID#00128 through 00130) and authorized commencement of the plan to advance delivery of the Project. On April 13, 2016, Alameda CTC submitted its application for Fostering Advancements in Shipping and Transportation for the Long-term Achievement of National Efficiencies (FASTLANE) grant, established by the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act) funding to supplement the construction funding for the Project. The FAST Act requires that a project must begin construction within 18 months of obligation of FASTLANE funds. To meet this funding requirement and to position the Project for other future funding opportunities, Alameda CTC has identified an aggressive delivery schedule to obtain environmental clearance meeting both California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) by the end of 2017 and be construction ready by early 2019.

In order to provide the consultant resources necessary for the successful delivery of the Project, Alameda CTC released RFP #R16-0012 in April 2016. A pre-proposal meeting was held on May 4, 2016 and was attended by 77 firms. Alameda CTC received five proposals on May 31, 2016 from the following firms:

- AECOM
- HDR
- Jacobs
- Parsons
- WSP/Parsons Brinckerhoff

An independent selection panel composed of representatives from the Port of Oakland and Alameda CTC reviewed the proposals and shortlisted three (3) firms. Consultant interviews were conducted on June 29, 2016.

Proposers were evaluated and scored based on the following criteria:

- ✓ Knowledge and Understanding of the required services and scope of work,
- ✓ Management Approach and Staffing Plan: The ability to perform the work efficiently and effectively. The ability and willingness to work within a managed contract budget, scope of work, and schedule of deliverables,
- ✓ Qualifications of the Proposer Firm: Technical experience and ability of the consultant team and key staff in performing the scope of work,
- ✓ Effectiveness of Interview: Overall interview discussions and presentation; and
- ✓ Ability to meet or exceed applicable LBE and SLBE Goals: This RFP and the resulting Contract are subject to the Local Business Contract Equity Program established by Alameda CTC.

At the conclusion of the evaluation process, the selection panel ranked the three teams in the following order:

1. Jacobs
2. AECOM
3. HDR

The Professional Services Agreement scope will include:

- ✓ Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Clearance, including CEQA and NEPA clearance for the West and possibly the East Segment of the 7<sup>th</sup> Street Grade Separation and Middle Harbor Road improvements.
- ✓ Evaluation of alternative project delivery method such as design-build and construction manager/general contractor before completion of 35% design.
- ✓ Expand the 2015 preliminary Concept of Operations (ConOps) to include all feasible systems into an ITS and Technology master plan for the Port, a System Engineering Management Plan (SEMP), and meet environmental clearance requirements.
- ✓ Final design of the West Segment, Middle Harbor Road, and Basic ITS infrastructure (optional task).

Jacobs is a well-established local firm and its team is comprised of several Alameda CTC certified local, small local, and very small local firms. In the event Alameda CTC does not reach agreement with Jacobs, negotiations will proceed with the second highest ranked proposer from the ranking list, shown above, and so forth until a proposer is selected.

Time is of the essence for the successful delivery of this Project. Staff recommends that the Commission approve and authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to negotiate and execute Professional Services Agreement A17-0004 with Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. for a not-to-exceed amount of \$13,000,000 to provide Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Services. It is anticipated that environmental phase activities will be completed by Fall 2018.

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

**Fiscal Impact:** The action will authorize the encumbrance of \$13,000,000 in previously allocated Project funds (Measure BB) for subsequent expenditure. This amount is included in the Project Funding Plan, and sufficient budget has been included in the Alameda CTC Adopted FY2016-17 Operating and Capital Program Budget.

## Attachment

- A. Project Location Map

## Staff Contact:

[Trinity Nguyen](#), Director of Project Delivery

PROJECT LOCATION MAP



*This page intentionally left blank*



# Memorandum

6.10

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• PH: (510) 208-7400

• www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** July 21, 2016

**SUBJECT:** I-80 Integrated Corridor Mobility (ICM) Project (PN 1387.001-6): Contract Amendment to Professional Services Agreement No. A10-0008 with S&C Engineers, Inc.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approve and authorize the Executive Director to execute amendment No. 4 to the Professional Services Agreement No. A10-0008 with S&C Engineers, Inc. for an additional amount of \$35,000 for a total not-to-exceed amount of \$2,025,750 and a one-year time extension to provide construction management services through the project completion.

## Summary

The I-80 ICM Project will reduce congestion and delays in the 22-mile I-80 corridor and San Pablo Avenue from Emeryville to the Carquinez Bridge through the deployment of intelligent transportation system (ITS) and transportation operation system (TOS), without physically adding capacity through widening of the corridor. This \$93 million project is funded with the Statewide Proposition 1B bond funds (\$76.7 million), and a combination of funding from Alameda and Contra Costa counties sales tax programs, as well as federal and other local and regional funds. The I-80 ICM Project has been divided into seven sub-projects as follows:

- Project #1: Software & Systems Integration
- Project #2: Specialty Material Procurement
- Project #3: Traffic Operations Systems (TOS)
- Project #4: Adaptive Ramp Metering (ARM)
- Project #5: Active Traffic Management (ATM)
- Project #6: San Pablo Corridor Arterial and Transit Improvement Project
- Project #7: Richmond Parkway Transit Center

Under an agreement with Caltrans, the Alameda CTC is responsible for the construction administration and management of Projects 1, 2, 3, and 6. In March 2011, S&C Engineers, Inc. was contracted to provide construction management services in support of the Project. During the course of construction, several unforeseen issues arose that have caused a delay in the completion of the project thus requiring additional construction management services

for a longer period of time than originally anticipated. Construction issues include problems encountered with the functionality of signs installed on the San Pablo Corridor Arterial and Transit Improvement Project which required troubleshooting and repairs, and longer than anticipated construction of the Active Traffic Management which requires support from the Specialty Material Procurement project. The costs associated with the required additional construction management services to complete the project exceeds the current construction support budget. In order to complete the Project, it is estimated that an additional \$35,000 will be required to fund the construction support costs.

The recommended action would increase the contract not-to-exceed amount as shown in Table A of this report and authorize a one-year time extension to June 30, 2017 to provide construction management services through the completion of the Project.

## **Background**

The I-80 ICM Project will reduce congestion and delays in the 22-mile I-80 corridor and San Pablo Avenue from Emeryville to the Carquinez Bridge through the deployment of intelligent transportation system (ITS) and transportation operation system (TOS), without physically adding capacity through widening of the corridor. The status of the seven (7) sub projects are as follows:

- Project #1: Software & Systems Integration – on going. Software development is complete and system testing is underway.
- Project #2: Specialty Material Procurement –complete. Project close-out activities on-going.
- Project #3: Traffic Operations Systems (TOS) - complete
- Project #4: Adaptive Ramp Metering (ARM) - complete
- Project #5: Active Traffic Management (ATM)- complete
- Project #6: San Pablo Corridor Arterial and Transit Improvement Project – substantially complete. Providing on-going support during subsystem testing.
- Project #7: Richmond Parkway Transit Center - inactive

During the course of construction, various unforeseen issues have delayed completion of the projects including: issues with the functionality of signs on Project #6 encountered during subsystem testing which required troubleshooting and repairs and longer than anticipated construction for Project #5.

Alameda CTC is responsible for the construction administration and management of Projects 1, 2, 3, and 6. In March 2011, S&C Engineers, Inc. was contracted to provide construction management services in support of the Project. Due to the unanticipated delays, additional construction management services in the amount of \$35,000 and contract time is needed in



order to complete the Project. The project funding plan for the Projects includes a combination of local, regional, state, and federal funds. Specifically, state funds from the Traffic Light Synchronization Program (TLSP) have been identified and are available from the project contingency for this additional work.

Staff has negotiated the contract amendment with S&C Engineers, Inc. and determined that this negotiated amount is fair and reasonable for the anticipated level of effort. Table A below summarizes the contract actions related to Agreement No. A10-0008.

<b>Table A: Summary of Agreement No. A10-0008</b>			
<b>Contract Status</b>	<b>Work Description</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Total Contract Not-to-Exceed Value</b>
Original Professional Services Agreement with S&C Engineers (A10-0008) <i>March 2011</i>	Construction Management Services for I80 ICM Project	\$1,890,750	\$1,890,750
Amendment No. 1 <i>December 2013</i>	Provide a 12 month time extension to December 31, 2014	\$0	\$1,890,750
Amendment No. 2 <i>December 2014</i>	Provide a 12 month time extension to December 31, 2015	\$0	\$1,890,750
Amendment No. 3 <i>June 2015</i>	Provide additional budget and 6 month time extension to June 30, 2016 to complete construction of the project	\$100,000	\$1,990,750
<i>Proposed Amendment No. 4, July 2016 (This agenda item)</i>	Provide additional budget and 1 year time extension to June 30, 2017 to complete construction of the project	\$35,000	\$2,025,750
<b>Total Amended Contract Not-to-Exceed Amount</b>			<b>\$2,025,750</b>

**Levine Act Statement:** S&C Engineers, Inc. did not report a conflict in accordance with the Levine Act.

**Fiscal Impact:** The fiscal impact of approving this item is \$35,000. The action will authorize \$35,000 of previously allocated project funds (State-TLSP) to be used for subsequent


expenditure. This budget is included in the project funding plan and has been included in the Alameda CTC Adopted FY 2016-2017 Operating and Capital Program Budget.

**Staff Contact**

[Trinity Nguyen](#), Director of Project Delivery

**Independent Watchdog Committee (IWC)**

**Current Appointment:** D1 Steven Jones  
*(no action required)*



**Term Began:** January 2015  
**Term Ends:** January 2017


**Current Appointment:** D2 Jo Ann Lew  
*(no action required)*



**Term Began:** December 2015  
**Term Ends:** December 2017

**Reappoint**  
*(action required)*


D3 Harriette Saunders



**Term Began:** July 2014  
**Term Ends:** July 2016

**Reappoint**  
*(action required)*

D4 Robert A. Tucknott



**Term Began:** June 2014  
**Term Ends:** June 2016

**Current Appointment:** D5 Cynthia Dorsey  
*(no action required)*



**Term Began:** January 2016  
**Term Ends:** January 2018

7/14/16  
Date

Nancy Ortenblad, Alameda County Mayors' Conference

To fill a vacancy, submit a committee application and corresponding resume to 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

6-13-16  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor David Haubert, City of Dublin

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



# Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes Thursday, April 7, 2016, 5:30 p.m.

7.1

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

## 1. Welcome and Introductions

BPAC Chair Midori Tabata called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. The meeting began with introductions, and the chair confirmed a quorum. All BPAC members were present, except for Sara Zimmerman.

## 2. Public Comment

There were no public comments.

## 3. Approval of January 7, 2016 Minutes

Requests were made to make the following corrections to the January 7, 2016 minutes:

- Page 1 last sentence in first bullet modify to "Amber noted potential..."
- Page 4 the fourth bullet modify to "Hazardous, a slipping hazard due to low friction on..."

*Preston Jordan moved to approve the January 7, 2016 minutes with the above changes. Matt Turner seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following votes:*

Yes: Fishbaugh, Gigli, Johansen, Jordan, Marleau, Murtha, Schweng, Shaw, Tabata, Turner

No: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Zimmerman

## 4. Review of I-80/Gilman Interchange Improvements Project

Matt Bomberg informed the committee that the I-80/Gilman Interchange Improvements is one of the signature projects in 2014 Measure BB Transportation Expenditure Plan. Alameda CTC is the project sponsor and the project is currently in the environmental phase. He noted that Alameda CTC is working closely with the City of Berkeley, East Bay Regional Parks, adjacent property owners and other interested parties.

The project team has two proposed designs to improve the intersection for both vehicle operations and bicycle and pedestrians access through the intersection and over the freeway. Matt introduced Rodney Pimentel of Parsons Brinckerhoff who presented the committee on overall project context and the proposed design alternatives.

See Attachment 3.1A for a detailed log of BPAC comments on the project and responses from Rodney Pimentel.

## 5. Bicycle/Pedestrian Count Program Update

Matt Bomberg provided input on the future bicycle/pedestrian count program design. He reviewed the goals of the count program, manual versus automatic count data, current Alameda CTC count program, current program shortcomings and the current program

history. Matt discussed the overall design and sought input from the committee on the manual count program.

Questions/feedback from the committee:

- A member mentioned that ongoing operational costs will be difficult to maintain and it's a good idea for Alameda CTC to speak with the cities, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and Alameda County to see what they are doing.
- A suggestion was made for Alameda CTC to discuss the count program with the City of Fremont, since they are currently focusing on bicycles and pedestrians as part of their Vision Zero Plan.
- A suggestion was made to consider performing intercept surveys instead of manual counts. It was noted that the City of Albany employed a Parking Consultant to perform a study and they did intercept surveys on the two main commercial streets to figure out how people got there and the results were that 45% of the people got there by walking, cycling, or transit.
- A suggestion was made to install videos to perform counts. Matt noted that Alameda CTC employed a consultant to produce counts for FY2016-2017. The consultant deployed a few videos around the county. Matt stated that the downside of video is it's difficult to determine the gender.
- A member prioritized the following goals for the count program:
  - Track trend
  - Safety analysis
  - Model validation
  - Ground truthing surveys
- Discussion took place on why counts are needed by gender and video analytics using retail videos. It was suggested that in order to determine gender consider performing manual counts a couple days during the process to extrapolate gender of the cyclists and pedestrians.
- A member stated that to the extent that manual counts are being employed it may be beneficial to not perform manual counts annually, but to expand site locations. It was suggested that if the data from bicycle loops can be accessed it will expand the number of locations for data collection.
- A member stated that the City of San Leandro is interested in data on helmet usage and targeted areas where a need is for safety and data on jay walking.
- A member suggested to look at what's already in place and consider using those sources

Matt stated that in July he will bring the BPAC a draft set of locations for review that will include the member's comments.

## **6. Transportation Development Act Article 3 Projects**

Matt Bomberg informed the committee that BPAC is to review and provide input on Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 projects in Alameda County, on request by local jurisdictions. Alameda CTC BPAC has been requested to review projects by two local jurisdictions, Alameda County Public Works Agency (ACPWA) and the City of Hayward. The ACPWA is proposing to spend its funds on bicycle and pedestrian improvements at various locations, pedestrian ramps at various locations and bicycle and pedestrian safety education program. The City of Hayward is proposing to spend its TDA

Article 3 allocation on Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant wheelchair accessible ramps in various locations citywide.

Questions/feedback from members:

- Suggestions regarding curb ramps:
  - Ramps must be outside the width of the sidewalk
  - Detectable warning surfaces that are commonly used is a slipping hazard and should be changed to composite concrete, which is better than hard plastic
  - Why are there two Alameda County projects with pedestrian ramps?
- A suggestion was made regarding Alameda County bicycle lanes to have standard details in order to not place a lane in a door zone.
- It was noted that the City of Fremont has expanded their bicycle lanes and an additional buffer bicycle lane to provide additional protection from traffic. This is the first city in Alameda County to provide a skinny traffic lane.
- A comment was made that it appears that the City of Hayward has ADA ramps already citywide.
- Discussion took place on the detectable warning surfaces being a slipping hazard. A member stated that the hard plastic is perfect for people with vision impairment. It was noted that the dome provides a resonance to help the vision impaired. Matt stated that he will email the Ped/Bike Working Group for input on this topic.

## **7. Staff Reports**

### **7.1. BPAC Agenda Topic Suggestions**

Matt Bomberg provided an update on BPAC agenda topic suggestions. He performed research and reviewed a list of resources that covered a number of topics discussed during the January 2016 meeting. Matt reviewed the list of agenda topic suggestions from BPAC and provided suggestions on how to address each topic.

### **7.2. Capital Project Delivery Plan Update**

Matt Bomberg stated that in March 2016, the Commission adopted the Capital Project Delivery plan that is also known as the Community Development Investments Program (CDIP). The CDIP looks at the projects specifically named in the 2014 Transportation Expenditure Plan that Alameda CTC is responsible for sponsoring and implementing. The CDIP will support existing and new transportation infrastructure improvements. Matt stated that as the CDIP moves forward he will continue to bring updates to the BPAC.

### **7.3. Multimodal Plan Update**

Matt Bomberg gave an update on the Multimodal Plans. He informed the committee that the Goods Movement Plan was adopted by the Commission in February 2016. He mentioned that Alameda CTC is moving forward into the implementation of the Goods Movement Plan includes grant writing for sizable federal grants. The Transit Plan will go to the committees in May, 2016. The Multimodal Arterial Plan proposed improvements are being reviewed by the cities and the goal is for it to go before the committees in June 2016. Tess Lengyel stated that Alameda CTC is going forward with the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) and the draft CTP will go before the committees in May 2016.

## **8. BPAC Member Reports**

Matt Turner informed the committee that he met with Assemblymember Bill Quirk's office to discuss creating a Master Trails Plan for Alameda County. He stated that his office is looking at creating a plan that is as comprehensive as Contra Costa County Trails Plan.

Kristi Marleau informed the committee that the City of Livermore is working on its Active Transportation Plan. The city is hosting an active transportation open house on April 18, 2016. Kristi mentioned that the committee can visit [www.WalkBikeLivermore.net](http://www.WalkBikeLivermore.net) for more information.

Diane Shaw stated that Fremont's Vision Zero Plan is very interesting and they are working with technology companies to implement technology around vehicle and bicycles avoidance. Fremont has finished their Bicycle Plan and they are working on their Pedestrian Plan.

Midori Tabata invited the committee to attend the May 18, 2016 meeting for the Fruitvale GAP Closure Streetscape project.

Midori Tabata informed the committee that the San Leandro Creek Trail held their first Community Advisory Committee meeting on April 6, 2016 and the committee was very excited about the East Bay Greenway improvements having a positive aspect for schools in the area, because absenteeism has gone down since the improvements.

### **8.1. BPAC Roster**

The committee roster is in the agenda packet for review purposes.

## **9. Meeting Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for July 7, 2016 at the Alameda CTC offices.



**Project:** I-80/Gilman Interchange Improvements

**Project Manager:** Dave Caneer ([dcaneer@alamedactc.org](mailto:dcaneer@alamedactc.org))

Comment	Response
How does project relate to Gilman Street railroad grade separation?	The grade separation is a separate project proceeding on a different timeline. The design has been coordinated with a potential future undercrossing of the railroad tracks to ensure that the two could conform to each other.
Why was the clearance under the freeway chosen?	The clearance is slightly more than required, to enable a cast-in-place structure, which is cheaper to construct.
Gilman Street is mismatched with an overcrossing structure. Gilman Street is a high traffic roadway whereas an overcrossing provides a trail-like experience. The northside of the interchange would be a better placement as users coming from Codornices Path could access overcrossing without using Gilman if this path is extended.	A northside placement of the overcrossing structure was explored during scoping phase but discarded due to lack of available right-of-way.
Will there be stairs connecting directly into sports field?	Yes, these are proposed as part of the project.
What is the difference in travel time between crossing at-grade and using an overcrossing?	Difference in travel time would depend on precise origin and destination, difficult to generalize.
Area is heavily parked, parking should be retained along Eastshore highway	
Could width of path be more generous at curves? This would enable cyclists to lean into curves when turning from ramps onto straightaway section of overcrossing and would also reduce conflicts from users as the round the corner.	This can be explored.
How will project slow drivers coming from freeway speed as they approach roundabout?	Splitter islands and reversing curves will be used. The roundabout has a design speed of 15 to 20 mph.
Could rough pavement be used to slow cars down?	A textured pavement will be used in the roundabout inner circles so that trucks can mount it. No textured pavements are contemplated to slow vehicle on ramps.
Explain how bicyclists or pedestrians on Gilman Street heading westbound access the overcrossing structure	<p>Access would be by crossing at 2<sup>nd</sup> street or by using a crosswalk just east of the roundabout.</p> <p>A short section of Class IV bikeway between 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and Eastshore Highway is being studied. This would enable bicyclists to cross over to the south side of Gilman, where the overcrossing ramp is, in advance of the roundabout. There is also potential to move the crosswalk from the roundabout back to 2<sup>nd</sup> Street.</p>

Comment	Response
Will there be yield control?	Yes, all approaches to the roundabouts have yield control.
At-grade pedestrian access needs to be included as part of the project; the overcrossing is potentially a large deviation from shortest path for pedestrians	An at-grade multi-use pathway on the south side of Gilman is proposed as part of the project.
What is the width in the roundabout? Could a cyclist and a truck fit side-by-side?	The roundabout will be 17-18 feet wide
Cyclists are required to merge across NB freeway on-ramp to ride through the roundabout. This will be a difficult maneuver for many cyclists.	
Does the right-turn pocket for the northbound on-ramp need to be included?	Yes, this is a heavy traffic on-ramp. The right-turn pocket helps enable the roundabout to be designed as a single lane roundabout, rather than a two lane roundabout.
Consider raised cross-walks to calm vehicles entering the roundabout; Fremont has these in at least one location	
Consider advance yield markings	
Some cyclists heading southbound on Eastshore may continue to ride straight through the roundabout. Consider designing to accommodate this.	
Consider encampment and drainage issues associated with railroad undercrossing	

**Alameda County Transportation Commission  
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee  
Roster and Attendance Fiscal Year 2016-2017**

	Suffix	Last Name	First Name	City	Appointed By	Term Began	Re-apptmt.	Term Expires	Mtgs Missed Since Jul '16
1	Mr.	Turner, Chair	Matt	Castro Valley	Alameda County Supervisor Nate Miley, District 4	Apr-14		Apr-16	0
2	Ms.	Marleau, Vice Chair	Kristi	Dublin	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-1	Dec-14		Dec-16	0
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	1
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	Mr.	Murtha	Dave	Hayward	Alameda County Supervisor Richard Valle, District 2	Sep-15		Sep-17	0
8	Mr.	Schweng	Ben	Alameda	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-2	Jun-13	Jul-15	Jul-17	0
9	Ms.	Shaw	Diane	Fremont	Transit Agency (Alameda CTC)	Apr-14		Apr-16	1
10	Ms.	Tabata	Midori	Oakland	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-4	Jul-06	Dec-15	Dec-17	0
11	Ms.	Zimmerman	Sara	Berkeley	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-5	Apr-14		Apr-16	1

*This page intentionally left blank*



# Independent Watchdog Committee Meeting Minutes Monday, November 9, 2015, 6:30 p.m.

7.2

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

## 1. Welcome and Call to Order

Independent Watchdog Committee (IWC) Vice Chair Deborah Taylor called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. The meeting began with introductions, and the vice chair confirmed a quorum. All IWC members were present, except the following: Cheryl Brown, Cynthia Dorsey, Brian Lester, and Robert Tucknott. Deborah welcomed new member Barbara Price.

Cynthia Dorsey arrived after agenda item 3.1. Cheryl Brown arrived during agenda item 4.

Deborah Taylor was excused after the action was taken for agenda item 5.

## 2. Public Comment

There were no public comments.

## 3. CWC Meeting Minutes

### 3.1. Approval of July 13, 2015 IWC Regular Meeting Minutes

Harriette Saunders moved to approve the July 13, 2015 minutes. Jo Ann Lew seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following votes:

Yes: Hastings, Hawley, Lew, Nate, Saunders, Taylor  
No: McCalley, Piras, Zukas  
Abstain: Jones, Price  
Absent: Brown, Dorsey, Lester, Tucknott

Public comment: Jason Bezis made a comment regarding the July 13, 2015 minutes not acknowledging the details of his public comments.

### 3.2. Approval of August 10, 2015 IWC Special Meeting Minutes

Herb Hastings moved to approve the August 10, 2015 minutes. Jo Ann Lew seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following votes:

Yes: Dorsey, Hastings, Hawley, Lew, Nate, Saunders, Taylor  
No: McCalley, Piras, Zukas  
Abstain: Jones, Price  
Absent: Brown, Lester, Tucknott

### **3.3. Approval of August 17, 2015 Special Meeting Minutes**

*Miriam Hawley moved to approve the August 17, 2015 minutes. Jo Ann Lew seconded the motion. Per the Chair, the motion did not pass with the following votes:*

Yes: Hawley, Jones, Lew, Nate, Saunders, Taylor  
No: McCalley, Piras, Zukas  
Abstain: Dorsey, Hastings, Price  
Absent: Brown, Lester, Tucknott

*Murphy McCalley changed his vote and the vote was taken again and passed with the following votes:*

Yes: Hawley, Lew, McCalley, Nate, Saunders, Taylor, Jones  
No: Piras, Zukas  
Abstain: Dorsey, Hastings, Price  
Absent: Brown, Lester, Tucknott

### **4. Chair and Vice Chair Report**

Deborah Taylor presented this agenda item. She discussed the issue the IWC received during the public comment agenda item from a member of the public at the July 13, 2015 meeting to investigate all expenditures of Measure B sales tax dollars and to see if any were spent on the Measure BB campaign. She reiterated the steps the committee has taken to date and informed the member of the public that the committee did not take action to initiate an independent review of the issue originally presented at the January 12, 2015 meeting.

Deborah requested the IWC adopt a motion to create a process to address issues of concern brought to the IWC from members of the public. Alameda CTC staff noted that a process is already in place, and staff will make updates to the current issues identification process to ensure that issues of concern from members of the public are explicitly spelled out.

Bylaws: Deborah Taylor explained the occurrences that took place regarding the IWC bylaws during August and September 2015. She noted that the Finance and Administration Committee adopted the bylaws at the September 14, 2015 meeting, and the full Commission adopted the bylaws at the September 24, 2015 meeting after she and Murphy McCalley had the opportunity to discuss IWC comments with the Alameda CTC Chair. The IWC discussed the final bylaws going before the Commission without being presented to the IWC beforehand. The IWC would have preferred having input prior to the Commission approval. Members also discussed a six-month review of the bylaws as part of the Commission approval process.

Public comments: Ken Bukowski stated that the committee should clarify roles and responsibilities of the IWC for the public to understand, and the public will know what the committee is doing if the link to his video is in the minutes. Jason Bezis reiterated that the July 13, 2015 minutes do not acknowledge the details of his public comments.

## 5. Election of IWC Officers for FY2015-16

*JoAnn Lew nominated Deborah Taylor for chair. Deborah Taylor declined the nomination. Pat Piras moved to nominate Murphy McCalley for chair, and he accepted the nomination. Cheryl Brown seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following votes:*

Yes: Brown, Dorsey, Hastings, Hawley, Jones, Lew, McCalley, Nate, Piras, Price, Saunders, Taylor, Zukas  
No: None  
Abstain: None  
Absent: Lester, Tucknott

*Deborah Taylor moved to nominate Miriam Hawley for vice chair, and she accepted the nomination. Harriette Saunders seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following votes:*

Yes: Brown, Dorsey, Hastings, Hawley, Jones, Lew, McCalley, Nate, Piras, Price, Saunders, Taylor, Zukas  
No: None  
Abstain: None  
Absent: Lester, Tucknott

## 6. Presentation of Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Year Ended June 30, 2015

Ahmad Gharaibeh with Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co (VTD) presented the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the year ended June 30, 2015. The auditor reviewed Alameda CTC's financial highlights. The audit covered Measure B and Measure BB funds, as well as the limitation ratios required by the Transportation Expenditure Plans, which require that the total costs of salaries and benefits for administrative employees do not exceed 1 percent of sales tax revenues. The administration costs cannot exceed 4.5 percent of Measure B sales tax revenues and 4 percent of Measure BB sales tax revenues. The auditor reported that Alameda CTC received what is referred to as an unmodified, or clean, audit opinion for the year ended June 30, 2015 and Alameda CTC does not consider consultants to be staff.

Questions/feedback from members:

- How much growth occurred in Measure B revenues from last year? Measure B sales tax revenue in fiscal year 2015 was \$132.5 million; in the prior year the sales tax revenue was \$127.1 million.
- When is the principal due for the bonds? Principal payments were deferred in the bond structure and the first principal payment is scheduled for fiscal year 2017.
- Do salaries and benefits include contract employees? No, salary and benefit expenses only include staff. The consultants' time is charged to the task or projects they work on directly, regardless of the consultants' function. Alameda CTC does not have contract employees and does not consider consultants to be staff.
- If the full 1 percent allowed is not used in a fiscal year for salaries and benefits, what happens to the difference? Any unused funds goes into the fund balance. The Commission ultimately decides if the remaining fund balance will continue to fund administrative expenses or will go towards a project or program.
- In any given year, could the 1 percent be exceeded using the carryover funds? Yes, Alameda CTC may use the carryover balance of those funds, but that would not be sustainable. Collection of the Measure B sales tax expires in 2022, and the

excess funds will be needed to fund staff to administer the remaining balance of the funds collected.

- Do the unused administrative funds make up the balance in the “unrestricted fund balance?” Yes.

Public comment: Jason Bezis made a comment stating his concerns regarding the independent audit in particular Measure B funds being used to campaign and generate campaign materials for Measure BB.

Additional questions:

- The Commission Audit Committee meeting did not have an agenda on the Alameda CTC website as required by the Brown Act, because the Audit Subcommittee is a subset of the Commission and is not a public meeting. More information regarding this committee was requested and will be brought back at the next IWC meeting.
- JoAnn Lew inquired about the list of questions she submitted via email. Staff let JoAnn know that an email response to the questions will be sent before the December 3, 2015 Commission meeting.
- What is the sample size VTD used for testing the Direct Local Distribution funds? VTD looked at the reports for all of the agencies who received DLD funds, and they were in compliance.
- Discussion took place on how VTD is reviewing the agencies' compliance and audit reports. It was reiterated that the auditor looked at the audit reports of all the agencies receiving DLD funds to determine if the agencies are in compliance with the Master Programs Funding Agreements. The committee will hear more about the compliance reports in the January 2016 meeting.

Ahmad noted that the auditor is engaged to audit the fair presentation of Alameda CTC's financial statements. He stated that additional testing outside of what is in their current contract may be done if IWC members and Alameda CTC staff agree it's necessary.

## **7. IWC Annual Report Outreach Summary and Publication Cost Update**

### **7.1. Update on Outreach and Costs**

The committee requested staff explain the Google Analytics on page 161 in the packet. Tess Lengyel said that the Alameda CTC website has different pages with annual report content such as: What's New and Reports with Chinese and Spanish versions of the flyer and the actual annual report. Starting on page 161, the Google Analytics report shows the number of views and the number of click-throughs for each of those pages. The chair wanted to know if a review is done to determine if the outreach of the IWC annual report is cost effective. Tess mentioned that this has been done in the past by the committee, and it was determined that we should use the publications that appear in Attachment A.

## **8. IWC Member Reports/Issues Identification**

### **8.1. IWC Issues Identification Process and Form**

Alameda CTC staff agreed to review and update the IWC issues identification process and form to include the process on handling issues of concern from members of the public, including Measure BB issues.

Member reports: Herb Hastings stated that as of November 1, 2015, the Clipper Card can be used on Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority transportation. The intermodal



project for Dublin/Pleasanton began 60 days ago to make that section of the Dublin/Pleasanton BART station Americans with Disabilities Act compliant.

## **8.2 Issues Discussion**

Pat Piras said that it was suggested that her concerns with the follow-up to the bylaws process be discussed here, which she decided not to do; however, Pat requested that staff and the IWC communicate with each other to ensure the bylaws process will work for all parties involved in the future and distributed a handout summarizing her concerns.

A request was made for Alameda CTC staff to look into the ability of IWC members to teleconference at the January 11, 2016 meeting.

## **9. Staff Reports/Board Actions (Verbal)**

### **9.1. IWC Calendar**

The committee calendar of meetings and activities is in the agenda packet for review purposes.

### **9.2. IWC Roster**

The committee roster is in the agenda packet for review purposes.

Tess Lengyel provided responses to the following IWC requests for information:

- Performance measures – Tess stated that Alameda CTC has started initial work on performance measures and will take them to the Commission in February or March 2016.
- BART's plan for a ballot measure to fund maintenance needs – Tess informed the committee that this is not under Alameda CTC's IWC purview.
- Job opportunities through Measure BB – Tess stated that job and contracting opportunities are posted on the Alameda CTC website under the "Opportunities" heading. Cheryl Brown said that the job opportunities in the original question were not related to Alameda CTC jobs, but related to the jobs mentioned in the 2014 Transportation Expenditure Plan. How will the IWC report to the public and show how many jobs are being created and for which projects? Tess said that Alameda CTC is still working on the jobs reporting aspect of Measure BB and will include information in the agency's annual report.

Patricia Reavey provided responses to the following IWC requests:

- IWC Application Form – Patricia stated that the form hasn't changed. Staff will update the current application to clean up the wording.
- Training needs and requests – Patricia said that she guessed the question is related to training members on how to review financial information. The goal is for the Commissioners to appoint people with the right skill set.
- Express Lanes planning and development – Patricia said that express lane projects will be addressed at the January meeting during the overall projects and programs update. Miriam Hawley said that the 2014 Transportation Expenditure Plan specified that Measure BB revenues will go toward improvements, and she would like to know what improvements mean.

## **10. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for January 11, 2016 at the Alameda CTC offices.

*This page intentionally left blank*



## INDEPENDENT WATCHDOG COMMITTEE November 9, 2015 ROSTER OF MEETING ATTENDANCE

Present	IWC Member	Appointed By
CB	Brown, Cheryl (waive)	Alameda Labor Council AFL-CIO
CD	Dorsey, Cynthia	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, District 5
	<del>Hamlat, Sandra</del>	<del>Bike East Bay</del>
HH	Hastings, Herb	Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee
MH	Hawley, Miriam	League of Women Voters
<del>sj</del>	Jones, Steven	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, District 1
	Lester, Brian	Alameda County, District 1 Supervisor Scott Haggerty
JLew	Lew, Jo Ann	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, District 2
MM	McCalley, Murphy	Alameda County, District 4 Supervisor Nate Miley
GN	Nate, Glenn	Alameda County, District 2 Supervisor Richard Valle
P.	Piras, Pat (waive)	Sierra Club
<del>BB</del>	Price, Barbara	Alameda County Taxpayers Association
<del>HT</del>	Saunders, Harriette	Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee
	Taylor, Deborah, <b>Vice Chair</b>	Alameda County, District 3 Supervisor Wilma Chan
	Tucknott, Robert	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, District 4
HZ	Zukas, Hale	Alameda County, District 5 Supervisor Keith Carson

### STAFF

Present	Staff/Consultants	Title
	Arthur L. Dao	Executive Director
P	Tess Lengyel	Deputy Director of Planning and Policy
P	Patricia Reavey	Director of Finance
	John O'Brien	Interim Deputy Director of Programming and Allocations
	John Nguyen	Senior Transportation Planner
	Trinity Nguyen	Senior Transportation Engineer
P	Angie Ayers	Public Meeting Coordinator

NAME	JURISDICTION/ ORGANIZATION	PHONE #	E-MAIL
1. Ahmad Ghazalbeh	VTD	650 462 0400	
2. Jason Bezis	—	(925) 962-9643	jbezis@yahoo.com
3. Ed Burowski	Videographer		
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			
13.			
14.			
15.			
16.			
17.			
18.			
19.			
20.			
21.			
22.			
23.			
24.			
25.			
26.			



# Independent Watchdog Committee Meeting Minutes Monday, March 14, 2016, 5:30 p.m.

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

510.208.7400

www.AlamedaCTC.org

## Special Annual Compliance Review

### 1. Measure B and Measure BB Audit Report and Program Compliance Report Review Orientation Workshop

The Independent Watchdog Committee (IWC) members received an orientation on the compliance report review process from staff. Members agreed to review the audited financial statements and compliance reports in further detail on their own and submit comments to Alameda CTC via email.

### 2. Measure B and Measure BB FY2014-15 Audit Report and Program Compliance Report Review

Staff reviewed a sample audited financial statement and compliance report with the IWC. This review served as a training tool for new members and was a refresher for existing members. Staff requested comments from IWC members by April 1, 2016.

## Regular Meeting Minutes

### 1. Welcome and Call to Order

IWC Chair Murphy McCalley called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. The meeting began with introductions, and the chair confirmed a quorum. All IWC members were present, except the following: Cheryl Brown, Brian Lester, Glenn Nate, and Harriette Saunders.

### 2. Public Comment

Jason Bezis made a comment requesting the IWC review all expenditures related to Alameda CTC agreement No. L12-0008 with Clifford Moss LLC of Oakland.

### 3. IWC Meeting Minutes

#### 3.1. Approval of November 9, 2015 IWC Meeting Minutes

The members commented that they did not understand the requested updates from IWC members that were made to the revised November minutes.

*Steve Jones moved to approve the November 9, 2015 minutes. Herb Hastings seconded the motion. The motion failed with the following votes.*

Yes: Hastings, Hawley, Jones, Lew, McCalley

No: None

Abstain: Dominguez, Dorsey, Piras, Price, Tucknott, Zukas

Absent: Brown, Lester, Nate, Saunders

#### 3.2. Approval of January 11, 2016 IWC Meeting Minutes

Pat Piras commented that she objected to staff's responses to her questions being appended to the minutes, since they were not discussed previously.

Public comment: Jason Bezis stated that the minutes were incorrect, that they don't state that the chair welcomed Dave Campbell with Bike East Bay as a new member. He requested a change to his public comment under agenda item 5.1 to read "... Dumbarton Rail Bridge should be re-opened, as the buses now get stuck in traffic."

Murphy McCalley stated that Dave Campbell is not a new member of IWC, and the minutes are accurate as they are.

*Herb Hastings moved to approve the January 11, 2016 minutes. Oscar Dominguez seconded the motion.*

*Hale Zukas made a motion to amend the first motion to approve the minutes with the correction to the public comment under agenda item 5.1. Pat Piras seconded the amended motion.*

*Pat Piras requested to have staff's responses to her questions removed from the minutes. Hale Zukas amended the motion to include Pat Piras's request. Bob Tucknott seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following votes:*

Yes: Dominguez, Dorsey, Hastings, Hawley, Lew, McCalley, Piras, Tucknott, Zukas  
No: None  
Abstain: Jones, Price  
Absent: Brown, Lester, Nate, Saunders

#### **4. Establishment of IWC Annual Report Ad Hoc Subcommittee**

Murphy McCalley informed the IWC that the IWC Annual Report Subcommittee's primary mission is to develop an annual report for the public each year. The following committee members volunteered to serve on the Annual Report Subcommittee:

- Cheryl Brown
- Oscar Dominguez
- Miriam Hawley
- Murphy McCalley
- Pat Piras
- Barbara Price
- Hale Zukas

Murphy stated that staff will contact the subcommittee members with possible meeting dates. A member provided an example of a report from a similar committee for IWC members to review and consider changing the report format.

Public comment: Jason Bezis made a comment regarding an error on the report last year, which he brought to the attention of the committee during the public hearing.

#### **5. Projects and Programs Watchlist**

Murphy McCalley requested members review the projects and programs list and return the list with their choices to Angie Ayers after the meeting or via email. Staff informed the committee that the watch list is an opportunity for members to watch projects and programs of interest to them. Annually, a letter is sent to project sponsors requesting them to notify the IWC members that signed up to watch projects and programs in their city of any upcoming meetings for the projects/programs.

## 6. IWC Member Reports/Issues Identification

### 6.1. Chair Report

Murphy McCalley informed the committee that he attends the Commission meeting and reports on what is discussed at the IWC meeting. He said that at the January meeting, the IWC discussed the Issues process for issues submitted by the public, and the outcome was the Commission directed staff to establish an email address that the public can access. He also mentioned the issues form submitted by Robert Tucknott which is discussed in item 6.3 below.

### 6.2 IWC Issues Identification Process and Form

Patricia Reavey informed the committee that staff brought the updated issues identification process and form to the IWC in January. Patricia noted that the updates included how to handle issues and concerns submitted by the public. At the January meeting, the committee agreed to discuss and vote on the updated procedures at the March 2016 meeting. Patricia mentioned that Murphy suggested she follow up with legal counsel to find out if the IWC can discuss an issues form it receives, if the issue is not on the agenda. Legal said it should be on the agenda for discussion. This rule will apply also if the IWC receives an issues form during a meeting. Murphy talked through the procedure with the committee.

Public comment: Jason Bezis said that the issues process is frustrating as a member of the public. The process and form is not on, nor is it explained on the website.

*Barbara Price moved to approve the updated Issues Identification Process and Form. Herb Hastings seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following votes.*

Yes: Dominguez, Dorsey, Hastings, Hawley, Jones, Lew, McCalley, Piras, Price, Tucknott, Zukas  
No: None  
Abstain: None  
Absent: Brown, Lester, Nate, Saunders

### 6.3 Issues Discussion: Issues Form Submitted for IWC Review to Investigate the Use of Measure B Funds for “Consider the Future” Outreach and Legal Invoices from Wendel Rosen

Robert Tucknott discussed the issues form submitted for IWC review. He stated that Jason Bezis brought many issues to his attention, and he placed them in an issues form for the IWC to discuss. Bob requested the IWC to establish a subcommittee to address the issues listed in the form to either finish addressing the issues or take them to the next level.

Questions/feedback from the committee:

- A member suggested that instead of establishing a subcommittee, have staff respond to the issues listed in the form.
- It was noted that a subcommittee can address the issues in a timely manner by creating an independent list of questions for staff to respond to.

Murphy McCalley shared that Jason Bezis' issues were discussed at the January Commission meeting. The Commission proposed to hire an independent legal counsel, outside of Wendel Rosen, to review his complaints. Murphy suggested the IWC work with the Commission and the independent legal counsel to oversee the effort.

Additional questions/feedback from the committee:

- A member informed the committee that Jason Bezis filed a complaint with the Fair Political Practices Commission, and a case file has been created. Murphy stated that it's important that the IWC does not duplicate others' efforts.
- Murphy asked if the IWC wants to form a subcommittee to oversee and coordinate with the independent legal counsel or have the independent legal counsel provide a report to the full committee.
- Can the IWC provide input to the independent legal counsel? Murphy suggested that the IWC share the information received from the public with the firm selected.
- What is the Commission's time frame to locate an independent legal counsel? Staff stated that the exact schedule is not known. The Commission is taking the allegations from Jason Bezis seriously. It's a matter between the Commission and the independent legal counsel. Murphy requested that the IWC be made aware of the independent legal counsel selected.
- The IWC is requesting a report on this matter at the IWC July 2016 meeting, if possible.
- A member suggested the chair discuss with the Commission that a small number of IWC members are interested in working with the independent legal counsel.
- Has the Commission identified a law firm that deals with these types of issues? Staff stated that the selection process is between the Commission and the independent legal counsel.

Public comment: Jason Bezis raised concerns regarding staff speaking to the Commission and stating that the IWC decided there was no merit to his concerns.

*JoAnn Lew moved to have the independent legal counsel provide a final report to the full IWC for review. Miriam Hawley seconded the motion. Murphy McCalley amended the motion as follows:*

- *Provide the documentation that the IWC received from Jason Bezis to the independent legal counsel.*
- *Provide the IWC with the name of the firm(s) selected along with its qualifications.*
- *Provide the IWC with a scope of work and a date that a final report is scheduled for release from the investigation of the allegations.*
- *Allow Murphy McCalley and Robert Tucknott to have direct involvement with the independent legal firm.*
- *Make clear to the legal counsel that the IWC does not endorse the Jason Bezis allegations.*

*JoAnn Lew moved to approve the original motion with the amendments. Miriam Hawley seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following votes:*

Yes: Dominguez, Dorsey, Hastings, Hawley, Jones, Lew, McCalley, Piras, Price, Tucknott, Zukas

No: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Brown, Lester, Nate, Saunders



## **7. Staff Reports/Board Actions**

### **7.1. Staff Responses to IWC Requests for Information: New Email Address for IWC**

Patricia Reavey said the new IWC email ([IndependentWatchdog@AlamedaCTC.org](mailto:IndependentWatchdog@AlamedaCTC.org)) is on the website to allow the public to submit emails to the IWC that will go to the Chair for the Chair to share with the rest of the IWC. The committee requested to include the email address in the 2016 IWC Annual Report.

### **7.2. IWC Calendar FY2015-16**

The calendar is in the agenda packet for review purposes. It was suggested for members to email the chair if they have items for the July 2016 agenda. The committee requested that the Fiscal Year 2016-17 IWC Calendar show items from July 2016 through July 2017.

The committee inquired when the Commission will adopt the performance measures and when the IWC will be informed. Tess informed the committee that the Commission adopted the performance measures for the direct local distributions (DLDs) in February 2016. She said that those measures will not apply until next year.

The committee stated that the IWC was tasked in the 2014 Transportation Expenditure Plan with reviewing performance measures. Staff let the committee know that the IWC will review the expenditures against the performance measures. IWC members asked what other performance actions are anticipated for the Commission. Staff noted that it's challenging to have blanket performance measures for capital projects, because the projects are very different. Performance measures for capital projects may be done on a project-by-project bases. Whereas on DLDs, for example with transit funding for operations, there are very specific measures such as on-time performance and reliability to really look at the accountability of those projects to be able to measure performance. Staff encouraged the members to review the DLD performance measure on the website in the February 25, 2016 Commission folder.

### **7.3. IWC Roster**

The committee roster is in the agenda packet for review purposes.

## **8. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for July 11, 2016 at the Alameda CTC offices.

*This page intentionally left blank*



## INDEPENDENT WATCHDOG COMMITTEE

### March 14, 2016

### ROSTER OF MEETING ATTENDANCE

Present	IWC Member	Appointed By
	Brown, Cheryl (waive)	Alameda Labor Council AFL-CIO
	Dominguez, Oscar	East Bay Economic Development Alliance
	Dorsey, Cynthia	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, District 5
	Hastings, Herb	Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee
	Hawley, Miriam, <b>Vice Chair</b>	League of Women Voters
	Jones, Steven	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, District 1
	Lester, Brian	Alameda County, District 1 Supervisor Scott Haggerty
	Lew, Jo Ann	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, District 2
	McCalley, Murphy, <b>Chair</b>	Alameda County, District 4 Supervisor Nate Miley
	Nate, Glenn	Alameda County, District 2 Supervisor Richard Valle
	Piras, Pat (waive)	Sierra Club
	Price, Barbara	Alameda County Taxpayers Association
	Saunders, Harriette	Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee
	Taylor, Deborah <i>(Resigned)</i>	Alameda County, District 3 Supervisor Wilma Chan
	Tucknott, Robert	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, District 4
	Zukas, Hale	Alameda County, District 5 Supervisor Keith Carson

### STAFF

Present	Staff/Consultants	Title
	Tess Lengyel	Deputy Director of Planning and Policy
	Patricia Reavey	Director of Finance
	John Nguyen	Senior Transportation Planner
	Richard Carney	Program Manager
	Trinity Nguyen	Senior Transportation Engineer
	Angie Ayers	Public Meeting Coordinator

NAME	JURISDICTION/ ORGANIZATION	PHONE #	E-MAIL
1. Jason Hyde		510-879-4327	jhyde17@Yahoo.com
2. Jason Bozic		(925) 962-9043	jbozic@yahoo.com
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			
13.			
14.			
15.			
16.			
17.			
18.			
19.			
20.			
21.			
22.			
23.			
24.			
25.			
26.			

**Alameda County Transportation Commission  
Independent Watchdog Committee  
Roster - Fiscal Year 2016-2017**

	Title	Last	First	City	Appointed By	Term Began	Re-apptmt.	Term Expires	Mtgs Missed Since July '16
1	Mr.	McCalley, Chair	Murphy	Castro Valley	Alameda County Supervisor Nate Miley, D-4	Feb-15		Feb-17	0
2	Mr.	Hastings, Vice Chair	Herb	Dublin	Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee	Jul-14		N/A	0
3	Ms.	Brown	Cheryl	Oakland	Alameda Labor Council (AFL-CIO)	Apr-15		N/A	1
4	Mr.	Dominguez	Oscar	Oakland	East Bay Economic Development Alliance	Dec-15		N/A	0
5	Ms.	Dorsey	Cynthia	Oakland	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-5	Jan-14	Jan-16	Jan-18	0
6	Mr.	Jones	Steven	Dublin	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-1	Dec-12	Jan-15	Jan-17	0
7	Mr.	Lester	Brian	Pleasanton	Alameda County Supervisor Scott Haggerty, D-1	Sep-13	Jan-16	Jan-18	1
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	0
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	0
13	Mr.	Tucknott	Robert A.	Livermore	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-4	Jun-14		Jun-16	1
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 2016-2017

16		Vacancy			Bike East Bay				
17		Vacancy			League of Women Voters				



**MEETING ATTENDEES**

Attendance Key (A = Absent, P = Present)

Members:

- P Sylvia Stadmire,  
Chair
- P 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
- A Carmen Rivera-  
Hendrickson

- A Michelle Rousey
- P Harriette  
Saunders
- P Linda Smith
- P Cimberly Tamura
- A Esther Waltz
- P Hale Zukas

Staff:

- P Jacki Taylor, Program Analyst
- P Naomi Armenta, Paratransit Coordinator
- P Krystle Pasco, Paratransit Coordination Team
- P Christina Ramos, Project Controls Team

Guests:

Arnold Brillinger, Alameda Commission on Disability Issues; Ken Bukowski, Public Member; Jennifer Cullen, Senior Support Program of the Tri-Valley; Pam Deaton, City of Pleasanton Paratransit Program; Shawn Fong, City of Fremont Paratransit Program; Hakeim McGee, City of Oakland Paratransit Program; Julie Parkinson, City of Pleasanton Paratransit Program; Kim Ridgeway, AC Transit; Rebeca Servin, Center for Independent Living (CIL); Victoria Williams, Mobility Matters

**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. March 28, 2016 PAPCO Meeting Minutes**

Member Zukas requested to change the committee for which Sylvia Stadmire reported that she is the Chair during the PAPCO Member Reports and Outreach Update item on the agenda. The correct committee name should read "Equipment Program Advisory Committee (EPAC)."

*Member Zukas moved to approve the March 28, 2016 PAPCO Meeting minutes with the noted correction. Member Barranti seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following votes (12-0-1):*

Yes:        *Barranti, Costello, Hastings, Jacobson, Johnson-Simon, Markowitz, Saunders, Scott, Smith, Stadmire, Tamura, Zukas*  
No:         *None*  
Abstain:   *Bunn*  
Absent:    *Orr, Proee, Rivera-Hendrickson, Rousey, Waltz*

### **3.2. April 25, 2016 Joint PAPCO and ParaTAC Meeting Minutes**

*Member Johnson-Simon moved to approve the April 25, 2016 Joint PAPCO and ParaTAC Meeting minutes as written. Member Hastings seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following votes (11-0-2):*

Yes:        *Barranti, Bunn, Costello, Hastings, Johnson-Simon, Markowitz, Scott, Smith, Stadmire, Tamura, Zukas*  
No:         *None*  
Abstain:   *Jacobson, Saunders*  
Absent:    *Orr, Proee, Rivera-Hendrickson, Rousey, Waltz*

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



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

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

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

### **3.5. PAPCO Appointments**

Committee members received the current PAPCO appointments.

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

Naomi Armenta gave an overview of the Paratransit Strategic Planning Workshop that took place on April 25, 2016. The workshop focused on Alameda CTC's Taxi Card Feasibility Study and taxi program incentives discussion. PAPCO members had the opportunity to provide feedback on the workshop.

Questions and feedback from PAPCO members:

- A Committee member thought the information was good and she liked the way the panel and discussion was set up.
- A Committee member noted that she also enjoyed the setup of the workshop and discussion.
- A Committee member noted that he also liked the more informal setup as well as the engaging discussion that took place. He felt that PAPCO was more unified as a group at the workshop.
- A Committee member appreciated the information about the feasibility of the taxi debit card program including the pros and cons of the two software companies potentially providing their services.

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

Naomi Armenta reviewed the FY 2016-17 Paratransit Direct Local Distribution (DLD) program plans recommendation. She discussed the background and reviewed a summary of the recommendations. The subcommittee recommended approval of all plans with conditional approval for the City of Newark. The condition would be for a mid-year report to PAPCO on the status of reserves and outreach.

Questions and feedback from PAPCO members:

- A Committee member asked for clarification on the City of Newark's working relationship with the City of Fremont's paratransit program. Staff clarified that most of the city-based paratransit programs have contracted out for the delivery of their specific programs. The working relationship between the City of Newark and Fremont is not unheard of.
- A Committee member noted that she appreciated the new bound format for the program plan packets for the subcommittees. They were much easier to handle.
- A Committee member noted that he felt that the program plan review process was less tedious this year.

*Member Saunders moved to approve the PAPCO Program Plan Review Subcommittees' recommendations for FY 2016-17 Paratransit DLD program plans. Member Costello seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following votes (13-0-0):*

Yes: *Barranti, Bunn, Costello, Hastings, Jacobson, Johnson-Simon, Markowitz, Saunders, Scott, Smith, Stadmire, Tamura, Zukas*

No: *None*

Abstain: *None*

Absent: *Orr, Proee, Rivera-Hendrickson, Rousey, Waltz*

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

Naomi Armenta reviewed the FY 2016-17 Gap Grant Cycle 5 extension recommendation. She discussed the background, the extension requests, funds for capital purchases and grant matching, and next steps.

Questions and feedback from PAPCO members:

- A Committee member asked a question regarding the funding process and how subcontracting programs are able to get their funds reimbursed. Staff responded that the primary organization's project managers have to submit requests for

reimbursements for Measure B funds they use towards their programs, and then reimburse their subcontractors.

- A Committee member asked a question regarding the amount of last year's extension allocation for all programs. Staff noted that the information regarding the last extension allocation is not explicitly on the attachment provided with the memo but that the information can be determined by looking at the percentage increase in the notes section.
- A Committee member asked a question regarding a program with indicated high reserves. She asked why they are allowed to apply for Gap Grant funding if they have an abundance of reserve funding and that Gap funding might be better allocated to a different program. Staff responded that each program is evaluated individually and although reserves are taken into consideration, each program has various needs and funding restrictions on other funding they are receiving. Staff also noted that for Gap Grant Cycle 6 funding, reserves will be taken into more of a consideration for prioritizing programs.
- A Committee member expressed concern regarding CIL's past performance. She asked whether their performance has improved since the last funding extension. Staff responded that CIL has improved their performance and will be hitting their targets for this funding extension. Staff also noted that CIL has presented a variety of new initiatives for this coming year to support their planned increase in performance.
- A Committee member asked a question regarding the City of Oakland's Taxi Up and Go (TUGO) funding request and why only a portion of that funding is being recommended. Staff noted that TUGO requested more funding than last year's allocation even though they are proposing to provide less service. Also their performance is about 50% below target. As a result staff recommended they receive partial funding.
- A Committee member expressed concern for Mobility Matters (formerly Senior Helpline Services) and their inability to meet their targets. He is proposing that their program receive further deductions to their requested funding. Staff generally agreed with the sentiments but recommended to only reduce their funding request by 20% consistent with the other

recommendations. Staff also noted that PAPCO members can further reduce any funding recommendations if they choose to do so.

*Member Bunn moved to approve the Gap Grant Cycle 5 extension funding recommendation for FY 2016-17. Member Hastings seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following votes (13-0-0):*

Yes:        *Barranti, Bunn, Costello, Hastings, Jacobson, Johnson-Simon, Markowitz, Saunders, Scott, Smith, Stadmire, Tamura, Zukas*  
No:         *None*  
Abstain: *None*  
Absent:    *Orr, Proee, Rivera-Hendrickson, Rousey, Waltz*

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

Member Johnson-Simon shared that she attended the Senior Resource Fair at the San Leandro Senior Community Center last Friday. It was well attended. She also attended the City of Oakland Older Americans Month event at Frank Ogawa Plaza

Member Stadmire shared that she also attended the Senior Resource Fair at the San Leandro Senior Community Center as well as a mobility management fundraising luncheon. She really enjoyed the event. She also noted that she attended the City of Oakland Older Americans Month event at Frank Ogawa Plaza and will be attending the Senior Injury Prevention Program (SIPP) conference on May 25<sup>th</sup> at the Hilton Garden Inn in Emeryville.

Member Costello shared that he is currently the Vice Chair for the Regional Center Consumer Advisory Committee and they meet every month.

Member Saunders shared that she went to Sacramento last week with United Seniors of Oakland and Alameda County (USOAC).

Member Tamura shared that she also attended the Senior Resource Fair at the San Leandro Senior Community Center last Friday.

## **7.1. Paratransit Outreach Calendar**

Krystle Pasco gave an update on the following outreach events:

- 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.
- 6/3/16 – Four Seasons of Health Expo, Fremont Senior Center from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.
- 6/30/16 – Senior Day at the Alameda County Fair, Alameda County Fairgrounds from 12:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

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

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

Member Hastings noted that the next meeting will take place on July 11<sup>th</sup>.

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

Member Saunders shared that at the last SRAC meeting they discussed utilizing credit and debit cards for purchasing tickets, updates on the Interactive Voice Response (IVR) system and the emergency preparedness draft plan.

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

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

Member Hastings and Costello shared that at the last Wheels Accessible Advisory Committee (WAAC) meeting they discussed the Board's approval of the updated Wheels routes. WAAC members are very concerned with the impacts these changes will have on seniors and people with disabilities.

Member Bunn shared that he is a member of the Union City Paratransit Advisory Committee and they meet jointly with the City of Newark and Fremont every quarter. He noted that there were some changes in the Tri-City Taxi Voucher program which affected ridership. Committee members will continue to monitor these changes and the affects they have on ridership.

## **9. Information Items**

### **9.1. Mobility Management – Attention Paid to Equity in the Shared-Use Transportation World**

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 June 27, 2016 PAPCO Meeting**

**10.1.** FY 2016-17 PAPCO Officer Elections

**10.2.** FY 2016-17 PAPCO Meeting Calendar Approval

**10.3.** FY 2016-17 PAPCO Work Plan Approval

## **11. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m. The next PAPCO meeting is scheduled for June 27, 2016 at the Alameda CTC's offices located at 1111 Broadway, Suite 800, in Oakland.

**Alameda County Transportation Commission  
Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee  
Roster - Fiscal Year 2016-2017**

	Title	Last	First	City	Appointed By	Term Began	Re-apptmt.	Term Expires	Mtgs Missed Since July '16
1	Ms.	Stadmire, Chair	Sylvia J.	Oakland	Alameda County Supervisor Wilma Chan, D-3	Sep-07	Jan-13	Jan-15	0
2	Ms.	Johnson-Simon, Vice Chair	Sandra	San Leandro	Alameda County Supervisor Nate Miley, D-4	Sep-10	Dec-13	Dec-15	0
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	0
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	0
9	Mr.	Markowitz	Jonah	Berkeley	City of Albany Mayor Peter Maass	Dec-04	Oct-12	Oct-14	0
10	Rev.	Orr	Carolyn M.	Oakland	City of Oakland Vice Mayor Rebecca Kaplan	Oct-05	Jan-14	Jan-16	0
11	Ms.	Proee	Vanessa	Hayward	City of Hayward Mayor Barbara Halliday	Mar-10	Jan-16	Jan-18	0
12	Ms.	Rivera-Hendrickson	Carmen	Pleasanton	City of Pleasanton Mayor Jerry Thorne	Sep-09	Feb-14	Feb-16	0

	Title	Last	First	City	Appointed By	Term Began	Re-apptmt.	Term Expires	Mtgs Missed Since July '16
13	Ms.	Rousey	Michelle	Oakland	BART Director Tom Blalock	May-10	Jan-16	Jan-18	0
14	Ms.	Saunders	Harriette	Alameda	City of Alameda Mayor Trish Spencer	Jun-08	Oct-12	Oct-14	0
15	Mr.	Scott	Will	Berkeley	Alameda County Supervisor Keith Carson, D-5	Mar-10	May-14	May-16	0
16	Ms.	Smith	Linda	Berkeley	City of Berkeley Councilmember Laurie Capitelli	Apr-16		Apr-18	0
17	Ms.	Tamura	Cimberly	San Leandro	City of San Leandro Mayor Pauline Cutter	Dec-15		Dec-17	0
18	Ms.	Waltz	Esther Ann	Livermore	LAVTA Executive Director Michael Tree	Feb-11	May-14	May-16	0
19	Mr.	Zukas	Hale	Berkeley	A. C. Transit Director Elsa Ortiz	Aug-02	Feb-16	Feb-18	0
20		Vacancy			Alameda County Supervisor Richard Valle, D-2				
21		Vacancy			City of Livermore Mayor John Marchand				
22		Vacancy			City of Newark Councilmember Luis Freitas				
23		Vacancy			City of Piedmont Mayor Margaret Fujioka				





# Memorandum

8.1

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607 • PH: (510) 208-7400 • www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** July 21, 2016

**SUBJECT:** Alameda CTC's Comprehensive Investment Plan Update 2016 Update

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approve Alameda CTC's Comprehensive Investment Plan 2016 Update

## Summary

Alameda CTC's Comprehensive Investment Plan (CIP) integrates existing planning and programming practices performed by the agency into a streamlined planning and programming effort, where feasible and appropriate. The CIP consolidates multiple planning and programming efforts, at both the local and countywide level, to create a strategic near-term transportation planning and programming tool that local agencies and Alameda CTC can use to direct staffing and financial resources to further the delivery of significant countywide transportation projects. The CIP also establishes the framework for policies, guidelines and procedures that guide Alameda CTC's programming and allocations decisions, project selection, and the subsequent funding administration.

Alameda CTC updates the CIP annually, as needed, to reflect changes to the current programming and allocations approved throughout the fiscal year, and to incorporate new programming recommendations for projects and programs. Projects outside Alameda CTC's five-year CIP period will be considered for inclusion in a future biennial CIP update, for which the five-year programming window will be shifted two years into the future to provide an opportunity for project sponsors to nominate projects for available funding.

The CIP 2016 Update includes a programming and allocation period from fiscal year 2015/16 through 2019/20, and reflects updates to the current CIP approved in June 2015. Approval of the programming recommendations for projects and programs included in the CIP 2016 Update will result in a total of \$1.5 billion programmed from FY 2015/16 to FY 2019/20, and \$755 million allocated over the first two fiscal years.

On July 11, 2016, Alameda CTC's Programs and Projects Committee (PPC) reviewed and approved the CIP, with the amendments requested by Chair Kaplan to adjust the timing of funds programmed and allocated among specific City of Oakland projects. As summarized in the table below, \$2.5 million in FY 16/17 allocations is proposed to be moved from Oakland projects (CIP IDs 00132, 00133, 00134, 00135) and reprogrammed to FY 18/19. As a result, this allows other Oakland projects (CIP 00064, 00121, 00122) to receive a FY 16/17 allocation of \$2.5 million of future programmed funds for more immediate use for project delivery and

development. The proposed adjustments only impacts the timing of funds programmed and allocated to the Oakland projects, with no net change to the CIP's total programming and allocations for FY 15/16 to FY 19/20.

CIP ID	Project Name (\$ x 1,000)	ORIGINAL FY 16/17 Commission Approved Allocations March 2016	REVISOR	REVISED FY 16/17 Allocations presented to PPC July 2016	Chair Kaplan's Requested Adjustments at PPC July 2016	FINAL PROPOSED FY 16/17 Allocations
00132	San Pablo Avenue (SR-123) Multi-Modal Corridor	\$ 4,000	De-allocation	\$ 4,000	\$ (1,000)	\$ 3,000
00133	Telegraph Avenue Multi-Modal Corridor	\$ 3,000		\$ 3,000	\$ (750)	\$ 2,250
00134	University Avenue Multi-Modal Corridor	\$ 2,000		\$ 2,000	\$ (500)	\$ 1,500
00135	Ashby (SR13) Avenue Multi-Modal Corridor	\$ 1,000		\$ 1,000	\$ (250)	\$ 750
<b>Subtotal:</b>		<b>\$ 10,000</b>		<b>\$ 10,000</b>	<b>\$ (\$2,500)</b>	<b>\$ 7,500</b>
00064	Oakland Broadway Corridor Transit	\$ 500	Re-allocation	\$ 0	\$ 500	\$ 500
00121	Oakland Army Base Roadway Infrastructure	\$ 0		\$ 15,500	\$ 1,000	\$ 16,500
00122	Oakland Army Base Infrastructure – Truck Parking	\$ 5,000		\$ 0	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000
00137	I-880 42 <sup>nd</sup> /High Street Access Improvements	\$ 10,000		\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
<b>Subtotal:</b>		<b>\$ 15,500</b>		<b>\$ 15,500</b>	<b>\$ \$2,500</b>	<b>\$ 18,000</b>
<b>Total:</b>		<b>\$ 25,500</b>	<b>\$ 25,500</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 25,500</b>	

Attachment A includes the original CIP Five-Year Programming and Allocation presented to the PPC, with the highlighted adjustments requested by Chair Kaplan. The final CIP Five-Year Programming and Allocations for FY 15/16 to FY 19/20, as revised, is included as Appendix G of the CIP, and attached separately as Attachment B for reference.

This summer, Alameda CTC will begin the biennial update process for the CIP 2018, FY 2017/18 through FY 2021/22 based on the framework of programming principles and selection methodology previously approved by the Commission, and described in the CIP. A nomination window will open September 2016 for sponsors to submit project information and funding requests for programming consideration in CIP 2018.

## Discussion

Alameda CTC updates the CIP annually, as needed, to incorporate programming and allocation adjustments that reflect project schedule modifications, changes in priorities, policies and procedure updates, new regulations, and funding adjustments.

The CIP 2016 Update is available here: [http://www.alamedactc.org/files/managed/Document/19303/AlaCTC-CIP-2016-Update\\_20160719.pdf](http://www.alamedactc.org/files/managed/Document/19303/AlaCTC-CIP-2016-Update_20160719.pdf)

The CIP 2016 Update includes additional programming and allocations, and technical adjustments to the current five-year programming and allocation window, from FY 2015/16 to FY 2019/20, to be approved concurrently with the CIP 2016 Update. The CIP 2016 Update includes \$118.9 million of programming and allocation adjustments over the five-year programming window for projects in each of the four planning areas of the County, for multiple modes, and for multiple project delivery phases. These modifications are detailed in Appendix F of the CIP 2016 Update – Changes to Current Programming and Allocations.

A final five-year program summary is available in Appendix G of the CIP 2016 Update, which represents the combination of previous funding actions made prior to the CIP 2016 Update and the \$118.9 million of adjustments to be approved concurrently with this update. Approval of the programming recommendations for projects and programs included in the CIP 2016 Update will result in a total of \$1.5 billion programmed from FY 2015/16 to FY 2019/20, and \$755 million in allocations over the first two fiscal years.

The recommended programming and allocations will fund a combination of projects nearing the final phase of implementation and the initial phases of programs and projects to establish a pipeline of programs and projects for future implementation. The pipeline established by the CIP 2016 Update will be the means by which the Alameda CTC will identify investments of transportation funding to provide benefits to the traveling public while infusing much needed funding into the sectors of the economy related to the transportation system. Additionally, the CIP includes priority programming and allocations recommendations to further the implementation of the Alameda CTC's Measure BB Capital Project Delivery Plan, which includes larger countywide-significant projects implemented directly by the Alameda CTC.

The CIP programming principles and program guidelines established within the CIP 2016 Update provide a framework for programming and allocation decisions made by Alameda CTC. Projects must satisfy the following programming requirements to be considered for programming and allocation by Alameda CTC.

1. Projects must be included in and consistent with the most current adopted Regional Transportation Plan and Alameda CTC's Countywide Transportation Plan.
2. Projects must demonstrate a public benefit towards building and maintaining the transportation infrastructure in Alameda County.
3. Projects must be publicly accessible and provide direct benefits to public transportation infrastructure and operations.
4. Projects must meet the goals and objectives of the funding sources and programs that are ultimately recommended by Alameda CTC.
5. Projects funded with 1986 Measure B, 2000 Measure B, 2014 Measure BB, and VRF must be consistent with requirements and priorities of their respective expenditure plans.

The CIP programming principles and guidelines are not intended to replace existing programming requirements of individual fund sources. Instead, the principles are intended to create a uniform consolidation of historically separate programming practices, where applicable, to more effectively coordinate funding towards highly beneficial transportation projects that address congestion, state of good repair, economic development, access, safety, and connectivity of a multimodal transportation system.

Alameda CTC's programming capacity is limited to the funding anticipated during the period of delivery for projects included in the five-year programming and allocation horizon to establish a fiscally constrained plan. Projects beyond the programming horizon of a given

CIP are to be considered in future updates. For the CIP 2016 and CIP 2016 Update, Alameda CTC used an abbreviated project selection process to begin initial programming and allocations of Alameda CTC funds. The CIP considers all available fund sources and prioritizes, evaluates and recommends funding to critical transportation infrastructure and operations needs that build and maintain the county's transportation system.

Next year, the CIP 2018 will be the first shift of the programming window to include FY 2017/18 through FY 2021/22. Alameda CTC will initiate a project nomination process starting September 1, 2016 that will open the CIP to new programming and allocation recommendations. Projects will be evaluated using previously adopted Commission approved criteria for the CIP which includes an evaluation of project merits, readiness, leveraging and countywide transportation priorities further described in the CIP's programming principles and program guidelines in Appendix C of the CIP 2016 Update. Alameda CTC will program funds to projects phase by phase to establish a pipeline of countywide project delivery from project initiation and development to construction, where feasible. The schedule for the CIP 2018 development is described below. Additional information pertaining to the CIP Nomination will be provided with the application release.

<b>Schedule for CIP 2018 (FY 2017/18 to FY 2021/22)</b>	
<b>Month</b>	<b>Milestone</b>
September 1, 2016	Open CIP Nomination Window and Release Application
Mid-September 2016	CIP Application Workshop
October 31, 2016	CIP Nominations Due to Alameda CTC
March-April 2017	CIP 2018 DRAFT Program Recommendations
June 2017	CIP 2018 FINAL Program Recommendations

\* Schedule subject to change.

**Fiscal Impact:** The recommended actions will result in the allocation, encumbrance and subsequent expenditure of the funds allocated by the Commission. The corresponding encumbrance amounts will be included in the annual budget of the Alameda CTC for the applicable fiscal year.

**Attachment:**

- A. Original CIP Five-Year Programming and Allocations – with City of Oakland's proposed adjustments
- B. Final CIP Five-Year Programming and Allocations table(Appendix G of the CIP)

**Staff Contact**

[Vivek Bhat](#), Director of Programming and Project Controls

[John Nguyen](#), Senior Transportation Planner

Alameda CTC FY 2015-16 CIP - 2016 Update										Programming and Allocations (\$ x 000)								
5-Year Programming Horizon with 2-Year Allocation Plan																		
Approved July 2016																		
CIP ID	PA	Funding Type	Funding Agency	Fund Source	Fund Subset	Sponsor	Project Title	Mode	Phase	Programmed Amount	Allocations		FY2017-18	FY2018-19	FY2019-20	Later	Total Allocated Amount (Thru FY 16-17)	
											Prior To FY2015-16	2-Year Allocation Plan						
00001	Multiple	State	CTC	STIP	RIP	MTC	Planning, Programming and Monitoring	Multi	CON-CAP	532		126	131	135	140	0	257	
00002	Multiple	State	CTC	STIP	RIP	AlaCTC	Planning, Programming and Monitoring	Multi	CON-CAP	2,201			886	750	565	0	886	
00003							Funding deprogrammed - project deleted											
00004	Multiple	Federal	MTC	Lifeline	JARC	AC Transit	Preservation of Existing Services in Communities of Concern	TR	O&M	1,417		1,417				0	1,417	
00004	Multiple	State	MTC	Lifeline	STA	AC Transit	Preservation of Existing Services in Communities of Concern	TR	O&M	3,583		3,583				0	3,583	
00005	Multiple	Federal	MTC	Lifeline	STA	BART	A Quicker, Safer Trip to the Library to Promote Literacy (Oakland Public Library)	TR	O&M	250		250				0	250	
00006	Multiple	Federal	MTC	Lifeline	STA	AC Transit	Ashland and Cherryland Transit Access Improvements (Ala. County)	TR	CON-CAP	450		450				0	450	
00007	Multiple	Federal	MTC	Lifeline	STA	AC Transit	Additional Preservation of Existing Services in Communities of Concern	TR	O&M	1,741		1,741				0	1,741	
00008	4-East	Federal	MTC	Lifeline	JARC	LAVTA	WHEELS Route 14 Operating Assistance	TR	O&M	129		129				0	129	
00008	4-East	Federal	MTC	Lifeline	STA	LAVTA	WHEELS Route 14 Operating Assistance	TR	O&M	388		388				0	388	
00009	1-North	Federal	MTC	Lifeline	JARC	AC Transit	City of Oakland Broadway Shuttle	TR	O&M	405		405				0	405	
00010	3-South	Federal	MTC	Lifeline	STA	UC Transit	Operations Support for Route 2	TR	O&M	220		220				0	220	
00011	Multiple	Federal	MTC	Lifeline	STA	TBD	Lifeline Cycle 5 (Estimated)	TR	Var.	8,500			8,500			0	0	
00012	1-North	State	CTC	STIP	RIP	MTC	Improved Bike/Ped Access to East Span of SFOBB (Alameda Share)	BP	CON-CAP	0						0	0	
00013	Multiple	Regional	BAAQMD	TFCA	Prog Mgr	AlaCTC	FY 15-16 Program Manager Funds - Cities/County Shares	Multi	Var.	0						0	0	
00014	Multiple	Regional	BAAQMD	TFCA	Prog Mgr	Var.	FY 16-17 Through FY 19-20 Program Manager Funds - Cities/County Share	Multi	Var.	6,840		1,710	1,710	1,710	1,710	0	1,710	
00015	Multiple	Regional	BAAQMD	TFCA	Prog Mgr	Var.	FY 16-17 Through FY 19-20 Program Manager Funds - Transit Discretionary	TR	Var.	0						0	0	
00016	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	DLD	Var.	2000 MB Local Streets and Roads - Direct Local Distributions	LSR	Var.	140,870		27,506	27,836	28,171	28,507	28,850	0	55,342
00017	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	DLD	Var.	2000 MB Bicycle/Pedestrian - Direct Local Distributions	BP	Var.	24,142		4,714	4,770	4,828	4,886	4,944	0	9,484
00018	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-BP	Var.	2000 MB Bicycle/Pedestrian - Discretionary Program	BP	Var.	7,832		1,516	1,430	1,609	1,629	1,648	0	2,946
00019	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-BP	Var.	Countywide Bicycle Pedestrian Planning/Promotion	BP	Var.	235		75	160				0	235
00020	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	DLD	Var.	2000 MB Paratransit - Direct Local Distributions	PT	Var.	58,067		11,338	11,474	11,612	11,751	11,892	0	22,812
00021	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	ASEB	Special Transportation Services for Individuals with Dementia	PT	O&M	400	200	100	100				0	400
00022	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	BORP	Accessible Group Trip Transportation for Youth and Adults with Disabilities	PT	O&M	568	272	148	148				0	568
00023	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	CIL	Mobility Matters Project	PT	O&M	679	350	140	189				0	679

Alameda CTC FY 2015-16 CIP - 2016 Update 5-Year Programming Horizon with 2-Year Allocation Plan Approved July 2016									Programming and Allocations (\$ x 000)															
									CIP ID	PA	Funding Type	Funding Agency	Fund Source	Fund Subset	Sponsor	Project Title	Mode	Phase	Programmed Amount	Allocations				
																				Prior To FY2015-16	FY2015-16	FY2016-17	FY2017-18	FY2018-19
00024	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	Emeryville	8-To-Go Demand Response Door to Door Shuttle	PT	O&M	174	106	34	34		0	174								
00025	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	Fremont	Tri-City Mobility Management and Travel Training Program	PT	O&M	450	200	125	125		0	450								
00026	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	Fremont	Tri-City Volunteer Driver Programs	PT	O&M	550	250	150	150		0	550								
00027	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	Fremont	Tri-City Taxi Voucher Program	PT	O&M	450	150	150	150		0	450								
00028	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	Oakland	Taxi-Up & Go Project	PT	O&M	362	185	93	84		0	362								
00029	4-East	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	Pleasanton	Downtown Route Shuttle (DTR)	PT	O&M	173	86	42	45		0	173								
00030	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	SHS	Rides for Seniors	PT	O&M	278	150	60	68		0	278								
00031	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	SSPTV	Volunteer Assisted Senior Transportation Program	PT	O&M	331	150	75	106		0	331								
00032	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	TBD	Gap funds for Capital Purchases and Grant Matching	PT	Var.	300	100	100	100		0	300								
00033	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	AlaCTC	Transportation Services for Hospital Discharge and Wheelchair/Scooter Breakdown	PT	O&M	420	140		70	70	70	70	0	210						
00034	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	Var.	2000 MB Paratransit - Discretionary (Estimated)	PT	Var.	4,200				1,400	1,400	1,400	0	0						
00035	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	DLD	Var.	2000 MB Mass Transit - Direct Local Distributions	TR	Var.	136,610		26,674	26,994	27,318	27,646	27,978	0	53,668						
00036	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-EB	Var.	2000 MB Express Bus - Discretionary	TR	Var.	4,406		880	790	901	912	923	0	1,670						
00037	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-TCD	Var.	2000 MB Transit Center Development - Discretionary Program	TR	Var.	1,225		239	242	245	248	251	0	481						
00038	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	VRF	DLD	Var.	2010 VRF Local Streets and Roads - Direct Local Distributions	LSR	Var.	34,200		6,840	6,840	6,840	6,840	6,840	0	13,680						
00039	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	VRF	Disc-Transit	Var.	2010 VRF Transit - Discretionary	TR	Var.	13,950		2,850	2,550	2,850	2,850	2,850	0	5,400						
00040	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	VRF	Disc-BP	Var.	2010 VRF Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety - Discretionary Funds	BP	Var.	2,850		570	570	570	570	570	0	1,140						
00041	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	VRF	Disc-Tech	Var.	2010 VRF Local Transportation Technology - Discretionary	TECH	Var.	5,700		1,140	1,140	1,140	1,140	1,140	0	2,280						
00042	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	DLD	Var.	2014 MBB Local Streets and Roads - Direct Local Distributions	LSR	Var.	130,025		25,388	25,693	26,001	26,314	26,629	0	51,081						
00043	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	DLD	Var.	2014 MBB Mass Transit Services - Direct Local Distributions	TR	Var.	141,604		27,650	27,980	28,317	28,657	29,000	0	55,630						
00044	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	Disc-Transit	Var.	2014 MBB Transit Innovative Grants - Discretionary	TR	All	14,865		2,903	2,937	2,973	3,008	3,044	0	5,840						
00045	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	DLD	Var.	2014 MBB Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety - Direct Local Distributions	BP	Var.	19,712		3,849	3,895	3,942	3,989	4,037	0	7,744						
00046	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	Disc-BP	Var.	2014 MBB Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety - Discretionary	BP	All	13,273		2,592	2,623	2,654	2,686	2,718	0	5,215						
00047	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	DLD	Var.	2014 MBB Transit - Direct Local Distributions	TR	Var.	140,101		27,356	27,683	28,016	28,353	28,693	0	55,039						
00048	Multiple	State	CTC	STIP	RIP	TBD	2016 STIP - Alameda County Share (Estimated)(50% for 1-Year)	Multi	Var.	0							0	0						

Alameda CTC FY 2015-16 CIP - 2016 Update									Programming and Allocations (\$ x 000)								
5-Year Programming Horizon with 2-Year Allocation Plan																	
Approved July 2016																	
CIP ID	PA	Funding Type	Funding Agency	Fund Source	Fund Subset	Sponsor	Project Title	Mode	Phase	Programmed Amount	Allocations		FY2017-18	FY2018-19	FY2019-20	Later	Total Allocated Amount (Thru FY 16-17)
											Prior To FY2015-16	2-Year Allocation Plan					
											FY2015-16	FY2016-17					
00049	Multiple	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP/CMAQ	TBD	OBAG Cycle 2 (Estimated)	Multi	Var.	38,000			10,000	14,000	14,000	0	0
00050	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	07A	AC Transit	AC Transit: East Bay Bus Rapid Transit	TR	Var.	11,510	11,510					0	11,510
00050	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	013	AC Transit	AC Transit: East Bay Bus Rapid Transit	TR	CON-CAP	10,000		10,000				0	10,000
00050	Multiple	State	CTC	STIP	RIP	AC Transit	AC Transit: East Bay Bus Rapid Transit	TR	CON-CAP	7,995		7,995				0	7,995
00050	Multiple	Regional	BAAQMD	TFCA	Prog Mgr	AC Transit	AC Transit: East Bay Bus Rapid Transit	TR	CON-CAP	925	925					0	925
00051	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	01	SJRRRC	ACE Capital	TR	Var.	13,184	11,184	2,000				0	13,184
00052	4-East	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	09	Dublin	Iron Horse Transit Route - Dougherty Road	Multi	CON-CAP	6,267		6,267				0	6,267
00053	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	008	AlaCTC	Affordable Student Transit Pass Programs	TR	O&M	15,000		2,000	13,000			0	15,000
00054	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	012	AlaCTC	Affordable Transit for Seniors and People with Disabilities - Needs Assessment	PT	Scoping	500		500				0	500
00055	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	014	Alameda	Alameda to Fruitvale BART Rapid Bus	TR	Scoping	100		100				0	100
00056	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	015	AC Transit	Grand/MacArthur BRT	TR	Scoping	100		100				0	100
00057	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	016	AC Transit	College/Broadway Corridor Transit Priority	TR	Scoping	100		100				0	100
00058	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	017	BART	Irvington BART Station	TR	Sco	2,760		100	2,660			0	2,760
00059	2-Central	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	018	BART	Bay Fair Connector/BART METRO	TR	Scoping	100		100				0	100
00060	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	019	BART	BART Station Modernization and Capacity Program - Scoping	TR	Scoping	100		100				0	100
00060	Multiple	State	CTC	STIP	RIP	BART	BART Station Modernization and Capacity Program - Scoping	TR	Con Cap	3,726			3,726			0	0
00061	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	021	Multi	Dumbarton Corridor Area Transportation Improvements - Scoping	Multi	Scoping	100		100				0	100
00062	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	022	Union City	Union City Intermodal Station	TR	Scoping	100		100				0	100
00063	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	023	AlaCTC	Railroad Corridor Right of Way Preservation and Track Improvements - Scoping	TR	Scoping	100		100				0	100
00064	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	024	Oakland	Oakland Broadway Corridor Transit	TR	Sco	600		100	500	500		0	600 100
00065	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	025	CCJPA	Capitol Corridor Service Expansion	TR	Scoping	100		100				0	100
00066	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	Multi	Congestion Relief, Local Bridge Seismic Safety - Scoping	LSR	Scoping	1,350		1,350				0	1,350
00067	2-Central	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	San Leandro	San Leandro Streets Rehabilitation	LSR	Con Cap	30,000		3,000	6,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	3,000
00068	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	027	Multi	Countywide Freight Corridors - Scoping	FR	Scoping	44		44				0	44
00069	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	029	AlaCTC	I-80 Gilman Street Interchange Improvements	HWY	PA-ED	3,000		3,000				0	3,000

Alameda CTC FY 2015-16 CIP - 2016 Update									Programming and Allocations (\$ x 000)									
5-Year Programming Horizon with 2-Year Allocation Plan											Allocations					Total Allocated Amount		
Approved July 2016											Allocated	2-Year Allocation Plan				(Thru FY 16-17)		
CIP ID	PA	Funding Type	Funding Agency	Fund Source	Fund Subset	Sponsor	Project Title	Mode	Phase	Programmed Amount	Prior To FY2015-16	FY2015-16	FY2016-17	FY2017-18	FY2018-19	FY2019-20	Later	Total Allocated Amount
00070	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	030	AlaCTC	I-80 Ashby Interchange Improvements	HWY	Env	4,000		4,000					0	4,000
00070	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	030	TBD	I-80 Ashby Interchange Improvements	HWY	Scoping	100		100					0	100
00071	4-East	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	031	AlaCTC	SR-84/I-680 Interchange and SR-84 Widening	HWY	PA-ED	4,000		4,000					0	4,000
00072	4-East	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	032	AlaCTC	SR-84 Expressway Widening (Pigeon Pass to Jack London)	HWY	CON-CAP	10,000			10,000				0	10,000
00073	4-East	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	033	AlaCTC	I-580/I-680 Interchange Improvements (Study Only)	HWY	Sco	1,000		1,000					0	1,000
00074	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	034	Multi	I-580 Local Interchange Improvement Program - Scoping	HWY	Scoping	300		300					0	300
00075	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	08B	AlaCTC	I-680 Sunol NB Express Lane	HWY	Con Cap	100,000			100,000				0	100,000
00075	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	035	AlaCTC	I-680 HOT/HOV Lane from SR-237 to Alcosta	HWY	Con Cap	15,000		15,000					0	15,000
00075	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	035	AlaCTC	I-680 HOT/HOV Lane from SR-237 to Alcosta	HWY	Design	5,000		5,000					0	5,000
00076	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	036	AlaCTC	I-880 NB HOV/HOT Extension from A Street to Hegenberger	HWY	Scoping	100		100					0	100
00077	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	038	AlaCTC	I-880 Whipple Road/Industrial Parkway Southwest Interchange Improvements	HWY	Sco	925		925					0	925
00078	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	039	AlaCTC	I-880 Industrial Parkway Interchange West Improvements	HWY	Sco	825		825					0	825
00079	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	040	Multi	I-880 Local Access and Safety Improvements - Scoping	HWY	Scoping	300		300					0	300
00080	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	042	Multi	Gap Closure on Three Major Trails - Scoping	BP	Scoping	550		550					0	550
00081	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	042	AlaCTC	Eastbay Greenway	BP	PA-ED	3,500		3,500					0	3,500
00081	Multiple	Federal	CTC	ATP	State	AlaCTC	East Bay Greenway	BP	PA-ED	2,656	2,656						0	2,656
00082	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	045	Multi	Community Investments That Improve Transit Connections to Jobs and Schools - Scoping	CI	Scoping	1,400		1,400					0	1,400
00083	1-North	State	CTC	STIP	RIP	BART	Downtown Berkeley BART Plaza/Transit Area Improvements	TR	Con Cap	0							0	0
00084	3-South	State	CTC	STIP	RIP	AlaCTC	East-West Connector in Fremont & Union City	LSR	CON-CAP	12,000					12,000		0	0
00085	4-East	State	CTC	STIP	RIP	Caltrans	SR 84 Expressway Widening	HWY	CON-CAP	39,480	39,480						0	39,480
00086	4-East	State	CTC	STIP	RIP	Caltrans	SR 84 Expressway Widening	HWY	CON-SUPP	7,550	7,550						0	7,550
00087	1-North	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Alameda	Alameda City Complete Streets	BP	CON-CAP	505	505						0	505
00088	Multiple	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Ala. County	Alameda Co-Variou Streets and Roads Preservation	LSR	CON-CAP	1,565	1,565						0	1,565
00089	1-North	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Berkeley	Shattuck Complete Streets and De-couplet	BP	CON-CAP	2,777	2,777						0	2,777
00090	4-East	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Dublin	Dublin Boulevard Preservation	LSR	CON-CAP	470	470						0	470



Alameda CTC FY 2015-16 CIP - 2016 Update									Programming and Allocations (\$ x 000)									
5-Year Programming Horizon with 2-Year Allocation Plan																		
Approved July 2016																		
CIP ID	PA	Funding Type	Funding Agency	Fund Source	Fund Subset	Sponsor	Project Title	Mode	Phase	Programmed Amount	Allocations		2-Year Allocation Plan				Total Allocated Amount (Thru FY 16-17)	
											Allocated Prior To FY2015-16		FY2015-16	FY2016-17	FY2017-18	FY2018-19		FY2019-20
00091	3-South	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Fremont	Fremont City Center Multi-Modal Improvements	Multi	CON-CAP	1,288	1,288						0	1,288
00092	2-Central	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Hayward	Hayward - Industrial Boulevard Preservation	LSR	CON-CAP	1,265	1,265						0	1,265
00093	1-North	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Oakland	Lake Merritt BART Bikeways	BP	CON-CAP	571	571						0	571
00094	1-North	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Oakland	Oakland Complete Streets	LSR	CON-CAP	3,384	3,384						0	3,384
00095	1-North	Federal	MTC	OBAG	CMAQ	Oakland	Lakeside Complete Streets and Road Diet	BP	CON-CAP	2,554	2,554						0	2,554
00095	1-North	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Oakland	Lakeside Complete Streets and Road Diet	BP	CON-CAP	4,446	4,446						0	4,446
00096	1-North	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	San Leandro	San Leandro Boulevard Preservation	LSR	CON-CAP	804	804						0	804
00097	1-North	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Berkeley	Hearst Avenue Complete Streets	BP	CON-CAP	2,256		2,256					0	2,256
00098	1-North	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Emeryville	Emeryville - Hollis Street Preservation	LSR	CON-CAP	0							0	0
00099	3-South	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Newark	Enterprise Drive Complete Streets and Road Diet	BP	CON-CAP	454		454					0	454
00100	1-North	Federal	MTC	OBAG	CMAQ	Oakland	Oakland - Peralta and MLK Blvd Streetscape Phase I	BP	CON-CAP	5,452		5,452					0	5,452
00101	1-North	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Piedmont	Piedmont Complete Streets (CS)	BP	CON-CAP	129		129					0	129
00102	Multiple	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	MTC	Regional Planning Activities and PPM - Alameda	Multi	PA-ED	1,034			1,034				0	1,034
00103	1-North	Federal	MTC	OBAG	CMAQ	Oakland	7th Street West Oakland Transit Village, Phase II	BP	CON-CAP	3,288			3,288				0	3,288
00104	4-East	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Pleasanton	Pleasanton Complete Streets	BP	CON-CAP	832			832				0	832
00105	1-North	Federal	CTC	ATP	Reg	Alameda	Cross Alameda Trail (includes SRTS component)	BP	CON-CAP	2,005		2,005					0	2,005
00105	1-North	State	CTC	ATP	Reg	Alameda	Cross Alameda Trail (includes SRTS component)	BP	Design	226	226						0	226
00106	1-North	Federal	CTC	ATP	Reg	Ala. County	Be Oakland, Be Active	BP	CON-CAP	988	988						0	988
00107	1-North	Federal	CTC	ATP	Reg	Berkeley	LeConte Elementary Safe Routes to School Improvements	BP	Design	82	82						0	82
00108	1-North	Federal	CTC	ATP	Reg	Berkeley	LeConte Elementary Safe Routes to School Improvements	BP	CON-CAP	600		600					0	600
00109	4-East	Federal	CTC	ATP	Reg	Livermore	Livermore Marylin Avenue Safe Routes to School	BP	Design	83	83						0	83
00110	4-East	Federal	CTC	ATP	Reg	Livermore	Livermore Marylin Avenue Safe Routes to School	BP	CON-CAP	275		275					0	275
00111	1-North	Federal	CTC	ATP	Reg	Oakland	Lake Merritt to Bay Trail Bike/Ped Bridge	BP	Design	2,885		2,885					0	2,885
00112	1-North	Federal	CTC	ATP	Reg	Oakland	Lake Merritt to Bay Trail Bike/Ped Bridge	BP	ROW-CAP	325		325					0	325
00113	1-North	Federal	CTC	ATP	State	Albany	Complete Streets for San Pablo Ave/Buchanan St.	BP	Design	335		335					0	335

Alameda CTC FY 2015-16 CIP - 2016 Update									Programming and Allocations (\$ x 000)								
5-Year Programming Horizon with 2-Year Allocation Plan																	
Approved July 2016																	
CIP ID	PA	Funding Type	Funding Agency	Fund Source	Fund Subset	Sponsor	Project Title	Mode	Phase	Programmed Amount	Allocations		FY2017-18	FY2018-19	FY2019-20	Later	Total Allocated Amount (Thru FY 16-17)
											Allocated Prior To FY2015-16	2-Year Allocation Plan					
											FY2015-16	FY2016-17					
00114	1-North	Federal	CTC	ATP	State	Oakland	International Boulevard Improvement Project	BP	CON-CAP	2,481		2,481				0	2,481
00115	1-North	Federal	CTC	ATP	State	Oakland	Laurel Access to Mills, Maxwell Park and Seminary	BP	CON-CAP	3,598		3,598				0	3,598
00116	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	025	Newark	Central Avenue Overpass	LSR	CON-CAP	13,289			13,289			0	0
00116	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	025	Newark	Central Avenue Overpass	LSR	Design	2,765	2,765					0	2,765
00117	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	08A	AlaCTC	I-680 Sunol S/B Express Lane	HWY	Con Cap	20,000			20,000			0	20,000
00117	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	08A	AlaCTC	I-680 Sunol S/B Express Lane	HWY	O&M	4,500	4,500					0	4,500
00118	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	08B	AlaCTC	I-680 Sunol N/B Express Lane	HWY	Design	4,500	4,500					0	4,500
00119	4-East	Regional	MTC	RM2	Reg	TBD	I-580 Transit Improvements	TR	Var.	12,000		12,000				0	12,000
00120	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	027	AlaCTC	Alameda County Rail Strategy Study	Rail	Sco	250		250				0	250
00121	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	Oakland	Oakland Army Base Roadway Infrastructure Improvements	FR	Con Cap	41,000		16,500	3,000	4,500		0	16,500
												15,500	2,000	6,500	17,000		15,500
00122	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	Oakland	Oakland Army Base Infrastructure Improvements - Truck Parking	FR	Con Cap	5,000		1,000	4,000			0	1,000
												5,000					0
00123	4-East	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	Dublin	Dougherty Rd Widening (from 4 to 6 Lns) (Dublin - CCC line)	LSR	Con Cap	11,200		11,200				0	11,200
00124	4-East	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	Dublin	Dublin Blvd Widening, WB from 2 to 3 Lns (Sierra Ct-Dougherty Rd)	LSR	Con Cap	3,000			3,000			0	3,000
00125	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	Oakland	14th Ave Streetscape (3 phases) from E. 8th to Highland Hospital	LSR	Con Cap	5,300			5,300			0	0
00125	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	Oakland	14th Ave Streetscape (3 phases) from E. 8th to Highland Hospital	LSR	PSE	1,300			1,300			0	1,300
00126	2-Central	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	Hayward	Mission Blvd. Phases 2 & 3 (Complete Streets)	LSR	Con Cap	21,500			9,500	12,000		0	9,500
00126	2-Central	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	Hayward	Mission Blvd. Phases 2 & 3 (Complete Streets)	LSR	Util Relocation	0						0	0
00127	2-Central	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	Ala. County	Hesperian Blvd Corridor Improvement (A St - I880)	LSR	Con Cap	7,000		7,000				0	7,000
00128	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	041	AlaCTC	Port - Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) and Technology Plan	FR	Env	0						0	0
00129	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	027	AlaCTC	Middle Harbor Road Improvements	FR	Env	0						0	0
00130	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	027	AlaCTC	7th Street Grade Separation, West and East	FR	Env	0						0	0
00130	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	027	AlaCTC	7th Street Grade Separation, West and East	FR	PSE	0						0	0
00131	4-East	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	AlaCTC	I-580 Freeway Corridor Management System (FCMS)	HWY	Sco	5,000			5,000			0	5,000
00132	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	AlaCTC	San Pablo Avenue (SR 123) Multi-Modal Corridor Project	LSR	Sco	4,000			3,000	1,000		0	3,000
												4,000					4,000
00133	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	AlaCTC	Telegraph Avenue Multi-Modal Corridor Project	LSR	Sco	3,000			2,250	750		0	2,250
												3,000					3,000

Alameda CTC FY 2015-16 CIP - 2016 Update									Programming and Allocations (\$ x 000)								
5-Year Programming Horizon with 2-Year Allocation Plan																	
Approved July 2016																	
CIP ID	PA	Funding Type	Funding Agency	Fund Source	Fund Subset	Sponsor	Project Title	Mode	Phase	Programmed Amount	Allocations		FY2017-18	FY2018-19	FY2019-20	Later	Total Allocated Amount (Thru FY 16-17)
											Prior To FY2015-16	2-Year Allocation Plan					
00134	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	AlaCTC	University Avenue Multi-Modal Corridor Project	LSR	Sco	2,000		1,500 2,000		500		0	1,500 2,000
00135	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	AlaCTC	Ashby (SR 13) Avenue Multi-Modal Corridor Project	LSR	Sco	1,000		750 1,000		250		0	750 1,000
00136	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	040	AlaCTC	I-880/23rd-29th Operations Improvements	HWY	Con Cap	5,000		5,000				0	5,000
00137	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	040	Oakland	I-880/42nd-High Street Access Improvements	HWY	Con Cap	10,000				10,000		0	0
00138	2-Central	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	040	AlaCTC	I-880/Winton Avenue Interchange	HWY	Sco	1,500			1,500			0	1,500
00139	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	040	AlaCTC	South County Access (SR 262/Mission Blvd Cross Connector)	HWY	Sco	1,500		1,500				0	1,500
00140	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	045	Fremont	Warm Springs BART Station - West Side Access	TR	Con Cap	25,000				25,000		0	25,000
00141	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	044	Emeryville	South Bayfront Bridge	BP	Con Cap	2,000				2,000		0	0
00142	4-East	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	Alameda CTC	Scoping: I-580 ICM	Multi	Sco	50		50				0	50
00143	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	Fremont	Scoping: Route 84 Relinquishment and Centerville Streetscape on Fremont Blvd.	Multi	Sco	50		50				0	50
00144	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	Port	Scoping: Airport Drive Overlay	Multi	Sco	50		50				0	50
00145	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	027	Port	Scoping: Port Terminal Seismic Monitoring Program	FR	Sco	8		8				0	8
00146	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	027	Port	Scoping: Port Area ITS Deployment	Multi	Sco	50		50				0	50
00147	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	027	Port	Scoping: Middle Harbor Road Improvements	Multi	Sco	30		30				0	30
00148	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	027	Port	Scoping: Port Terminal Lighting Upgrade	Multi	Sco	8		8				0	8
00149	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	027	Port	Scoping: Outer Harbor Intermodal Terminal (OHIT) Phase 2	Multi	Sco	50		50				0	50
00150	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	027	Port	Scoping: Airport Perimeter Dike	Multi	Sco	50		50				0	50
00151	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	027	Port	Scoping: 7th Street Grade Separation East	Multi	Sco	10		10				0	10
00152	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	042	Fremont	Scoping: Union Pacific Railroad Trail Corridor (South Portion of East Bay Greenway)	Multi	Sco	50		50				0	50
00153	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	045	Fremont	Scoping: Fremont BART Station West Side Enhancement	TR	Sco	50		50				0	50
00154	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	045	Fremont	Scoping: I-880 Bike and Ped Bridge and Trail Connector to Warm Springs BART Station to Bay Trail	BP	Sco	50		50				0	50
00155	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	027	AlaCTC	7th Street Grade Separation and Port Arterial Improvement Project	FR	Env	15,000		15,000				0	15,000
00155	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	027	AlaCTC	7th Street Grade Separation and Port Arterial Improvement Project	FR	PSE	18,000				18,000		0	18,000
00156	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	AlaCTC	Modal Plans Implementation (inc. Oakland Corridors such as Grand/MacArthur, E. 14th/Mission & MLK)	Multi	Var.	1,500				1,500		0	1,500
00157	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	041	AlaCTC	Modal Plans Implementation (inc. Oakland Corridors such as Grand/MacArthur, E. 14th/Mission & MLK)	FR	Var.	300				300		0	300

Alameda CTC FY 2015-16 CIP - 2016 Update									Programming and Allocations (\$ x 000)									
5-Year Programming Horizon with 2-Year Allocation Plan																		
Approved July 2016																		
CIP ID	PA	Funding Type	Funding Agency	Fund Source	Fund Subset	Sponsor	Project Title	Mode	Phase	Programmed Amount	Allocations		2-Year Allocation Plan			Total Allocated Amount (Thru FY 16-17)		
											Allocated Prior To FY2015-16		FY2015-16	FY2016-17	FY2017-18		FY2018-19	FY2019-20
00158	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	VRF	Disc-Transit	AlaCTC	Modal Plans Implementation (inc. Oakland Corridors such as Grand/MacArthur, E. 14th/Mission & MLK)	TR	Var.	300			300				0	300
00159	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	046	AlaCTC	Matching Program for Last Mile Connection Technology Programs	TEC	Var.	200			200				0	200
00160	4-East	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-EB	LAVTA	Pilot Transit Program for Last Mile Connections	TR	Var.	100			100				0	100
00161	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	046	AlaCTC	Overall Planning/Monitoring Services	TEC	Var.	100			100				0	100
00162	4-East	Regional	BAAQMD	TFCA	Prog Mgr	Ala County	East Castro Valley Boulevard Class II Bike Lanes	BP	Var.	62			62				0	62
00163	Multiple	Regional	BAAQMD	TFCA	Prog Mgr	AlaCTC	Countywide Bicycling, Transit and Carpool Promotion Programs	Multi	Var.	210			210				0	210
00164	1-North	Regional	BAAQMD	TFCA	Prog Mgr	Albany	Marin Ave Class 2 Bike Lane Gap Closure	BP	Var.	95			95				0	95
00165	1-North	Regional	BAAQMD	TFCA	Prog Mgr	Berkeley	Berkeley Citywide Bicycle Parking Program	BP	Var.	137			137				0	137
00166	4-East	Regional	BAAQMD	TFCA	Prog Mgr	Dublin	San Ramon Road Arterial Mgmt	LSR	Var.	146			146				0	146
00167	1-North	Regional	BAAQMD	TFCA	Prog Mgr	Oakland	Broadway "B" Shuttle - Non-Peak (10am-3pm) Operations, FY 15/16	TR	Var.	210			210				0	210
00168	1-North	Regional	BAAQMD	TFCA	Prog Mgr	Oakland	CityRacks, Phase 12	BP	Var.	124			124				0	124
00169	4-East	Regional	BAAQMD	TFCA	Prog Mgr	Pleasanton	Pleasanton Trip Reduction Program, Fys 15/16 & 16/17	TR	Var.	53			53				0	53
00170	2-Central	Regional	BAAQMD	TFCA	Prog Mgr	San Leandro	San Leandro LINKS shuttle, Fys 15/16 and 16/17	TR	Var.	50			50				0	50
00171	Multiple	Regional	BAAQMD	TFCA	Prog Mgr	AC Transit	Line 97 Corridor Improvements (Signal timing component)	TR	Var.	228			228				0	228
00172	1-North	Regional	BAAQMD	TFCA	Prog Mgr	BART	BART West Oakland Bike Locker Plaza	TR	Var.	55			55				0	55
00173	2-Central	Regional	BAAQMD	TFCA	Prog Mgr	CSU East Bay	CSUEB Campus Shuttle II, Fys 15/16 (non-peak) & 16/17 (all hrs)	TR	Var.	123			123				0	123
00174	Multiple	Regional	BAAQMD	TFCA	Prog Mgr	Alameda CTC	Alameda County Guaranteed Ride Home and Countywide TDM Information Services Program	TR	Var.	270			270				0	270
00175	4-East	Regional	BAAQMD	TFCA	Prog Mgr	LAVTA	LAVTA Rte 30 BRT Operations, Fys 15/16 and 16/17	TR	Var.	275			275				0	275
<b>Totals</b>										<b>1,577,710</b>	<b>108,417</b>	<b>318,513</b>	<b>436,855</b>	<b>246,141</b>	<b>225,597</b>	<b>235,187</b>	<b>7,000</b>	<b>863,785</b>
<b>2-Year Allocation Plan (FY 2015-16 &amp; FY 2016-17) Total</b>												<b>\$755,368</b>						
<b>5-Year Programming Window (Fy 2015-16 - FY 2019-20) Total</b>															<b>\$1,462,293</b>			

Alameda CTC CIP - 2016 Update 5-Year Programming Horizon with 2-Year Allocation Plan July 2016									Programming and Allocations (\$ x 000)															
									CIP ID	PA	Funding Type	Funding Agency	Fund Source	Fund Subset	Sponsor	Project Title	Mode	Phase	Programmed Amount	Allocations				
																				Prior To FY2015-16	2-Year Allocation Plan		FY2017-18	FY2018-19
00001	Multiple	State	CTC	STIP	RIP	MTC	Planning, Programming and Monitoring	Multi	CON-CAP	532		126	131	135	140	0	257							
00002	Multiple	State	CTC	STIP	RIP	AlaCTC	Planning, Programming and Monitoring	Multi	CON-CAP	2,201			886	750	565	0	886							
00003	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Funding deprogrammed - project deleted	N/A	N/A							0	0							
00004	Multiple	State	MTC	Lifeline	STA	AC Transit	Preservation of Existing Services in Communities of Concern	TR	O&M	3,583		3,583				0	3,583							
00004	Multiple	Federal	MTC	Lifeline	JARC	AC Transit	Preservation of Existing Services in Communities of Concern	TR	O&M	1,417		1,417				0	1,417							
00005	Multiple	Federal	MTC	Lifeline	STA	BART	A Quicker, Safer Trip to the Library to Promote Literacy (Oakland Public Library)	TR	O&M	250		250				0	250							
00006	Multiple	Federal	MTC	Lifeline	STA	AC Transit	Ashland and Cherryland Transit Access Improvements (Ala. County)	TR	CON-CAP	450		450				0	450							
00007	Multiple	Federal	MTC	Lifeline	STA	AC Transit	Additional Preservation of Existing Services in Communities of Concern	TR	O&M	1,741		1,741				0	1,741							
00008	4-East	Federal	MTC	Lifeline	STA	LAVTA	WHEELS Route 14 Operating Assistance	TR	O&M	388		388				0	388							
00008	4-East	Federal	MTC	Lifeline	JARC	LAVTA	WHEELS Route 14 Operating Assistance	TR	O&M	129		129				0	129							
00009	1-North	Federal	MTC	Lifeline	JARC	AC Transit	City of Oakland Broadway Shuttle	TR	O&M	405		405				0	405							
00010	3-South	Federal	MTC	Lifeline	STA	UC Transit	Operations Support for Route 2	TR	O&M	220		220				0	220							
00011	Multiple	Federal	MTC	Lifeline	STA	TBD	Lifeline Cycle 5 (Estimated)	TR	Var.	8,500			8,500			0	0							
00012	1-North	State	CTC	STIP	RIP	MTC	Improved Bike/Ped Access to East Span of SFOBB (Alameda Share)	BP	CON-CAP							0	0							
00013	Multiple	Regional	BAAQMD	TFCA	Prog Mgr	AlaCTC	FY 15-16 Program Manager Funds - Cities/County Shares	Multi	Var.							0	0							
00014	Multiple	Regional	BAAQMD	TFCA	Prog Mgr	Var.	FY 16-17 Through FY 19-20 Program Manager Funds - Cities/County Share	Multi	Var.	6,840		1,710	1,710	1,710	1,710	0	1,710							
00015	Multiple	Regional	BAAQMD	TFCA	Prog Mgr	Var.	FY 16-17 Through FY 19-20 Program Manager Funds - Transit Discretionary	TR	Var.							0	0							
00016	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	DLD	Var.	2000 MB Local Streets and Roads - Direct Local Distributions	LSR	Var.	140,870		27,506	27,836	28,171	28,507	28,850	0	55,342						
00017	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	DLD	Var.	2000 MB Bicycle/Pedestrian - Direct Local Distributions	BP	Var.	24,142		4,714	4,770	4,828	4,886	4,944	0	9,484						
00018	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-BP	Var.	2000 MB Bicycle/Pedestrian - Discretionary Program	BP	Var.	7,832		1,516	1,430	1,609	1,629	1,648	0	2,946						
00019	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-BP	Var.	Countywide Bicycle Pedestrian Planning/Promotion	BP	Var.	235		75	160				0	235						
00020	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	DLD	Var.	2000 MB Paratransit - Direct Local Distributions	PT	Var.	58,067		11,338	11,474	11,612	11,751	11,892	0	22,812						
00021	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	ASEB	Special Transportation Services for Individuals with Dementia	PT	O&M	400	200	100	100				0	400						
00022	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	BORP	Accessible Group Trip Transportation for Youth and Adults with Disabilities	PT	O&M	568	272	148	148				0	568						
00023	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	CIL	Mobility Matters Project	PT	O&M	679	350	140	189				0	679						

Alameda CTC CIP - 2016 Update 5-Year Programming Horizon with 2-Year Allocation Plan July 2016									Programming and Allocations (\$ x 000)									
									Phase	Programmed Amount	Allocations		FY2017-18	FY2018-19	FY2019-20	Later	Total Allocated Amount (Thru FY 16-17)	
											Prior To FY2015-16	2-Year Allocation Plan						
CIP ID	PA	Funding Type	Funding Agency	Fund Source	Fund Subset	Sponsor	Project Title	Mode				FY2015-16	FY2016-17					
00024	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	Emeryville	8-To-Go Demand Response Door to Door Shuttle	PT	O&M	174	106	34	34				0	174
00025	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	Fremont	Tri-City Mobility Management and Travel Training Program	PT	O&M	450	200	125	125				0	450
00026	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	Fremont	Tri-City Volunteer Driver Programs	PT	O&M	550	250	150	150				0	550
00027	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	Fremont	Tri-City Taxi Voucher Program	PT	O&M	450	150	150	150				0	450
00028	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	Oakland	Taxi-Up & Go Project	PT	O&M	362	185	93	84				0	362
00029	4-East	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	Pleasanton	Downtown Route Shuttle (DTR)	PT	O&M	173	86	42	45				0	173
00030	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	SHS	Rides for Seniors	PT	O&M	278	150	60	68				0	278
00031	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	SSPTV	Volunteer Assisted Senior Transportation Program	PT	O&M	331	150	75	106				0	331
00032	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	TBD	Gap funds for Capital Purchases and Grant Matching	PT	Var.	300	100	100	100				0	300
00033	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	AlaCTC	Transportation Services for Hospital Discharge and Wheelchair/Scooter Breakdown	PT	O&M	420	140		70	70	70	70	0	210
00034	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-PT	Var.	2000 MB Paratransit - Discretionary (Estimated)	PT	Var.	4,200				1,400	1,400	1,400	0	0
00035	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	DLD	Var.	2000 MB Mass Transit - Direct Local Distributions	TR	Var.	136,610		26,674	26,994	27,318	27,646	27,978	0	53,668
00036	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-EB	Var.	2000 MB Express Bus - Discretionary	TR	Var.	4,406		880	790	901	912	923	0	1,670
00037	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-TC	Var.	2000 MB Transit Center Development - Discretionary Program	TR	Var.	1,225		239	242	245	248	251	0	481
00038	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	VRF	DLD	Var.	2010 VRF Local Streets and Roads - Direct Local Distributions	LSR	Var.	34,200		6,840	6,840	6,840	6,840	6,840	0	13,680
00039	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	VRF	Disc-Transit	Var.	2010 VRF Transit - Discretionary	TR	Var.	13,950		2,850	2,550	2,850	2,850	2,850	0	5,400
00040	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	VRF	Disc-BP	Var.	2010 VRF Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety - Discretionary Funds	BP	Var.	2,850		570	570	570	570	570	0	1,140
00041	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	VRF	Disc-Tech	Var.	2010 VRF Local Transportation Technology - Discretionary	TECH	Var.	5,700		1,140	1,140	1,140	1,140	1,140	0	2,280
00042	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	DLD	Var.	2014 MBB Local Streets and Roads - Direct Local Distributions	LSR	Var.	130,025		25,388	25,693	26,001	26,314	26,629	0	51,081
00043	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	DLD	Var.	2014 MBB Mass Transit Services - Direct Local Distributions	TR	Var.	141,604		27,650	27,980	28,317	28,657	29,000	0	55,630
00044	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	Disc-Transit	Var.	2014 MBB Transit Innovative Grants - Discretionary	TR	All	14,865		2,903	2,937	2,973	3,008	3,044	0	5,840
00045	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	DLD	Var.	2014 MBB Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety - Direct Local Distributions	BP	Var.	19,712		3,849	3,895	3,942	3,989	4,037	0	7,744
00046	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	Disc-BP	Var.	2014 MBB Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety - Discretionary	BP	All	13,273		2,592	2,623	2,654	2,686	2,718	0	5,215
00047	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	DLD	Var.	2014 MBB Transit - Direct Local Distributions	TR	Var.	140,101		27,356	27,683	28,016	28,353	28,693	0	55,039
00048	Multiple	State	CTC	STIP	RIP	TBD	2016 STIP - Alameda County Share (Estimated)(50% for 1-Year)	Multi	Var.								0	0

Alameda CTC CIP - 2016 Update 5-Year Programming Horizon with 2-Year Allocation Plan July 2016									Programming and Allocations (\$ x 000)															
									CIP ID	PA	Funding Type	Funding Agency	Fund Source	Fund Subset	Sponsor	Project Title	Mode	Phase	Programmed Amount	Allocations				
																				Prior To FY2015-16	2-Year Allocation Plan		FY2017-18	FY2018-19
00049	Multiple	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP/CMAQ	TBD	OBAG Cycle 2 (Estimated)	Multi	Var.	38,000			10,000	14,000	14,000	0	0							
00050	Multiple	Regional	BAAQMD	TFCA	Prog Mgr	AC Transit	AC Transit: East Bay Bus Rapid Transit	TR	CON-CAP	925	925					0	925							
00050	Multiple	State	CTC	STIP	RIP	AC Transit	AC Transit: East Bay Bus Rapid Transit	TR	CON-CAP	7,995		7,995				0	7,995							
00050	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	07A	AC Transit	AC Transit: East Bay Bus Rapid Transit	TR	Var.	11,510	11,510					0	11,510							
00050	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	013	AC Transit	AC Transit: East Bay Bus Rapid Transit	TR	CON-CAP	10,000		10,000				0	10,000							
00051	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	01	SJRRRC	ACE Capital	TR	Var.	13,184	11,184	2,000				0	13,184							
00052	4-East	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	09	Dublin	Iron Horse Transit Route - Dougherty Road	Multi	CON-CAP	6,267		6,267				0	6,267							
00053	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	008	AlaCTC	Affordable Student Transit Pass Programs	TR	O&M	15,000		2,000	13,000			0	15,000							
00054	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	012	AlaCTC	Affordable Transit for Seniors and People with Disabilities - Needs Assessment	PT	Scoping	500		500				0	500							
00055	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	014	Alameda	Alameda to Fruitvale BART Rapid Bus	TR	Scoping	100		100				0	100							
00056	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	015	AC Transit	Grand/MacArthur BRT	TR	Scoping	100		100				0	100							
00057	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	016	AC Transit	College/Broadway Corridor Transit Priority	TR	Scoping	100		100				0	100							
00058	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	017	BART	Irvington BART Station	TR	Sco	2,760		100	2,660			0	2,760							
00059	2-Central	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	018	BART	Bay Fair Connector/BART METRO	TR	Scoping	100		100				0	100							
00060	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	019	BART	BART Station Modernization and Capacity Program - Scoping	TR	Scoping	100		100				0	100							
00060	Multiple	State	CTC	STIP	RIP	BART	BART Station Modernization and Capacity Program - Scoping	TR	Con Cap	3,726				3,726		0	0							
00061	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	021	Multi	Dumbarton Corridor Area Transportation Improvements - Scoping	Multi	Scoping	100		100				0	100							
00062	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	022	Union City	Union City Intermodal Station	TR	Scoping	100		100				0	100							
00063	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	023	AlaCTC	Railroad Corridor Right of Way Preservation and Track Improvements - Scoping	TR	Scoping	100		100				0	100							
00064	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	024	Oakland	Oakland Broadway Corridor Transit	TR	Sco	600		100	500			0	600							
00065	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	025	CCJPA	Capitol Corridor Service Expansion	TR	Scoping	100		100				0	100							
00066	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	Multi	Congestion Relief, Local Bridge Seismic Safety - Scoping	LSR	Scoping	1,350		1,350				0	1,350							
00067	2-Central	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	San Leandro	San Leandro Streets Rehabilitation	LSR	Con Cap	30,000			3,000	6,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	3,000						
00068	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	027	Multi	Countywide Freight Corridors - Scoping	FR	Scoping	44		44				0	44							
00069	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	029	AlaCTC	I-80 Gilman Street Interchange Improvements	HWY	PA-ED	3,000		3,000				0	3,000							

Alameda CTC CIP - 2016 Update 5-Year Programming Horizon with 2-Year Allocation Plan July 2016									Programming and Allocations (\$ x 000)																	
									CIP ID	PA	Funding Type	Funding Agency	Fund Source	Fund Subset	Sponsor	Project Title	Mode	Phase	Programmed Amount	Allocations		FY2017-18	FY2018-19	FY2019-20	Later	Total Allocated Amount (Thru FY 16-17)
																				Prior To FY2015-16	2-Year Allocation Plan					
00070	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	030	TBD	I-80 Ashby Interchange Improvements	HWY	Scoping	100		100				0	100									
00070	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	030	AlaCTC	I-80 Ashby Interchange Improvements	HWY	Env	4,000		4,000				0	4,000									
00071	4-East	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	031	AlaCTC	SR-84/I-680 Interchange and SR-84 Widening	HWY	PA-ED	4,000		4,000				0	4,000									
00072	4-East	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	032	AlaCTC	SR-84 Expressway Widening (Pigeon Pass to Jack London)	HWY	CON-CAP	10,000			10,000			0	10,000									
00073	4-East	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	033	AlaCTC	I-580/I-680 Interchange Improvements (Study Only)	HWY	Sco	1,000		1,000				0	1,000									
00074	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	034	Multi	I-580 Local Interchange Improvement Program - Scoping	HWY	Scoping	300		300				0	300									
00075	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	035	AlaCTC	I-680 HOT/HOV Lane from SR-237 to Alcosta	HWY	Design	5,000		5,000				0	5,000									
00075	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	035	AlaCTC	I-680 HOT/HOV Lane from SR-237 to Alcosta	HWY	Con Cap	15,000		15,000				0	15,000									
00076	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	036	AlaCTC	I-880 NB HOV/HOT Extension from A Street to Hegenberger	HWY	Scoping	100		100				0	100									
00077	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	038	AlaCTC	I-880 Whipple Road/Industrial Parkway Southwest Interchange Improvements	HWY	Sco	925		925				0	925									
00078	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	039	AlaCTC	I-880 Industrial Parkway Interchange West Improvements	HWY	Sco	825		825				0	825									
00079	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	040	Multi	I-880 Local Access and Safety Improvements - Scoping	HWY	Scoping	300		300				0	300									
00080	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	042	Multi	Gap Closure on Three Major Trails - Scoping	BP	Scoping	550		550				0	550									
00081	Multiple	Federal	CTC	ATP	State	AlaCTC	East Bay Greenway	BP	PA-ED	2,656	2,656					0	2,656									
00081	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	042	AlaCTC	Eastbay Greenway	BP	PA-ED	3,500		3,500				0	3,500									
00082	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	045	Multi	Community Investments That Improve Transit Connections to Jobs and Schools - Scoping	CI	Scoping	1,400		1,400				0	1,400									
00083	1-North	State	CTC	STIP	RIP	BART	Downtown Berkeley BART Plaza/Transit Area Improvements	TR	Con Cap							0	0									
00084	3-South	State	CTC	STIP	RIP	AlaCTC	East-West Connector in Fremont & Union City	LSR	CON-CAP	12,000				12,000		0	0									
00085	4-East	State	CTC	STIP	RIP	Caltrans	SR 84 Expressway Widening	HWY	CON-CAP	39,480	39,480					0	39,480									
00086	4-East	State	CTC	STIP	RIP	Caltrans	SR 84 Expressway Widening	HWY	CON-SUPP	7,550	7,550					0	7,550									
00087	1-North	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Alameda	Alameda City Complete Streets	BP	CON-CAP	505	505					0	505									
00088	Multiple	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Ala. County	Alameda Co-Variou Streets and Roads Preservation	LSR	CON-CAP	1,565	1,565					0	1,565									
00089	1-North	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Berkeley	Shattuck Complete Streets and De-couplet	BP	CON-CAP	2,777	2,777					0	2,777									
00090	4-East	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Dublin	Dublin Boulevard Preservation	LSR	CON-CAP	470	470					0	470									
00091	3-South	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Fremont	Fremont City Center Multi-Modal Improvements	Multi	CON-CAP	1,288	1,288					0	1,288									



Alameda CTC CIP - 2016 Update 5-Year Programming Horizon with 2-Year Allocation Plan July 2016									Programming and Allocations (\$ x 000)																	
									CIP ID	PA	Funding Type	Funding Agency	Fund Source	Fund Subset	Sponsor	Project Title	Mode	Phase	Programmed Amount	Allocations		FY2017-18	FY2018-19	FY2019-20	Later	Total Allocated Amount (Thru FY 16-17)
																				Prior To FY2015-16	2-Year Allocation Plan					
00092	2-Central	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Hayward	Hayward - Industrial Boulevard Preservation	LSR	CON-CAP	1,265	1,265					0	1,265									
00093	1-North	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Oakland	Lake Merritt BART Bikeways	BP	CON-CAP	571	571					0	571									
00094	1-North	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Oakland	Oakland Complete Streets	LSR	CON-CAP	3,384	3,384					0	3,384									
00095	1-North	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Oakland	Lakeside Complete Streets and Road Diet	BP	CON-CAP	4,446	4,446					0	4,446									
00095	1-North	Federal	MTC	OBAG	CMAQ	Oakland	Lakeside Complete Streets and Road Diet	BP	CON-CAP	2,554	2,554					0	2,554									
00096	1-North	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	San Leandro	San Leandro Boulevard Preservation	LSR	CON-CAP	804	804					0	804									
00097	1-North	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Berkeley	Hearst Avenue Complete Streets	BP	CON-CAP	2,256		2,256				0	2,256									
00098	1-North	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Emeryville	Emeryville - Hollis Street Preservation	LSR	CON-CAP							0	0									
00099	3-South	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Newark	Enterprise Drive Complete Streets and Road Diet	BP	CON-CAP	454		454				0	454									
00100	1-North	Federal	MTC	OBAG	CMAQ	Oakland	Oakland - Peralta and MLK Blvd Streetscape Phase I	BP	CON-CAP	5,452		5,452				0	5,452									
00101	1-North	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Piedmont	Piedmont Complete Streets (CS)	BP	CON-CAP	129		129				0	129									
00102	Multiple	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	MTC	Regional Planning Activities and PPM - Alameda	Multi	PA-ED	1,034			1,034			0	1,034									
00103	1-North	Federal	MTC	OBAG	CMAQ	Oakland	7th Street West Oakland Transit Village, Phase II	BP	CON-CAP	3,288			3,288			0	3,288									
00104	4-East	Federal	MTC	OBAG	STP	Pleasanton	Pleasanton Complete Streets	BP	CON-CAP	832			832			0	832									
00105	1-North	State	CTC	ATP	Reg	Alameda	Cross Alameda Trail (includes SRTS component)	BP	Design	226	226					0	226									
00105	1-North	Federal	CTC	ATP	Reg	Alameda	Cross Alameda Trail (includes SRTS component)	BP	CON-CAP	2,005		2,005				0	2,005									
00106	1-North	Federal	CTC	ATP	Reg	Ala. County	Be Oakland, Be Active	BP	CON-CAP	988	988					0	988									
00107	1-North	Federal	CTC	ATP	Reg	Berkeley	LeConte Elementary Safe Routes to School Improvements	BP	Design	82	82					0	82									
00108	1-North	Federal	CTC	ATP	Reg	Berkeley	LeConte Elementary Safe Routes to School Improvements	BP	CON-CAP	600		600				0	600									
00109	4-East	Federal	CTC	ATP	Reg	Livermore	Livermore Marylin Avenue Safe Routes to School	BP	Design	83	83					0	83									
00110	4-East	Federal	CTC	ATP	Reg	Livermore	Livermore Marylin Avenue Safe Routes to School	BP	CON-CAP	275		275				0	275									
00111	1-North	Federal	CTC	ATP	Reg	Oakland	Lake Merritt to Bay Trail Bike/Ped Bridge	BP	Design	2,885		2,885				0	2,885									
00112	1-North	Federal	CTC	ATP	Reg	Oakland	Lake Merritt to Bay Trail Bike/Ped Bridge	BP	ROW-CAP	325		325				0	325									
00113	1-North	Federal	CTC	ATP	State	Albany	Complete Streets for San Pablo Ave/Buchanan St.	BP	Design	335		335				0	335									
00114	1-North	Federal	CTC	ATP	State	Oakland	International Boulevard Improvement Project	BP	CON-CAP	2,481		2,481				0	2,481									

Alameda CTC CIP - 2016 Update 5-Year Programming Horizon with 2-Year Allocation Plan July 2016									Programming and Allocations (\$ x 000)									
									Phase	Programmed Amount	Allocations		FY2017-18	FY2018-19	FY2019-20	Later	Total Allocated Amount (Thru FY 16-17)	
											Prior To FY2015-16	2-Year Allocation Plan						
CIP ID	PA	Funding Type	Funding Agency	Fund Source	Fund Subset	Sponsor	Project Title	Mode				FY2015-16	FY2016-17					
00115	1-North	Federal	CTC	ATP	State	Oakland	Laurel Access to Mills, Maxwell Park and Seminary	BP	CON-CAP	3,598		3,598					0	3,598
00116	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	025	Newark	Central Avenue Overpass	LSR	Design	2,765	2,765						0	2,765
00116	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	025	Newark	Central Avenue Overpass	LSR	CON-CAP	13,289				13,289			0	0
00117	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	08A	AlaCTC	I-680 Sunol SB Express Lane	HWY	O&M	4,500	4,500						0	4,500
00118	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	08B	AlaCTC	I-680 Sunol NB Express Lane	HWY	Design	4,500	4,500						0	4,500
00119	4-East	Regional	MTC	RM2	Reg	TBD	I-580 Transit Improvements	TR	Var.	12,000		12,000					0	12,000
00120	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	027	AlaCTC	Alameda County Rail Strategy Study	Rail	Sco	250		250					0	250
00121	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	Oakland	Oakland Army Base Roadway Infrastructure Improvements	FR	Con Cap	41,000			16,500	3,000	4,500	17,000	0	16,500
00122	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	Oakland	Oakland Army Base Infrastructure Improvements - Truck Parking	FR	Con Cap	5,000			1,000	4,000			0	1,000
00123	4-East	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	Dublin	Dougherty Rd Widening (from 4 to 6 Lns) (Dublin - CCC line)	LSR	Con Cap	11,200		11,200					0	11,200
00124	4-East	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	Dublin	Dublin Blvd. Widening, WB from 2 to 3 Lns (Sierra Ct-Dougherty Rd)	LSR	Con Cap	3,000			3,000				0	3,000
00125	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	Oakland	14th Ave Streetscape (3 phases) from E. 8th to Highland Hospital	LSR	PSE	1,300			1,300				0	1,300
00125	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	Oakland	14th Ave Streetscape (3 phases) from E. 8th to Highland Hospital	LSR	Con Cap	5,300				5,300			0	0
00126	2-Central	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	Hayward	Mission Blvd. Phases 2 & 3 (Complete Streets)	LSR	Util Relocation								0	0
00126	2-Central	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	Hayward	Mission Blvd. Phases 2 & 3 (Complete Streets)	LSR	Con Cap	21,500			9,500	12,000			0	9,500
00127	2-Central	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	Ala. County	Hesperian Blvd Corridor Improvement (A St - I880)	LSR	Con Cap	7,000		7,000					0	7,000
00128	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	041	AlaCTC	Port - Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) and Technology Plan	FR	Env								0	0
00129	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	027	AlaCTC	Middle Harbor Road Improvements	FR	Env								0	0
00130	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	027	AlaCTC	7th Street Grade Separation, West and East	FR	Env								0	0
00130	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	027	AlaCTC	7th Street Grade Separation, West and East	FR	PSE								0	0
00131	4-East	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	AlaCTC	I-580 Freeway Corridor Management System (FCMS)	HWY	Sco	5,000			5,000				0	5,000
00132	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	AlaCTC	San Pablo Avenue (SR 123) Multi-Modal Corridor Project	LSR	Sco	4,000			3,000		1,000		0	3,000
00133	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	AlaCTC	Telegraph Avenue Multi-Modal Corridor Project	LSR	Sco	3,000			2,250		750		0	2,250
00134	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	AlaCTC	University Avenue Multi-Modal Corridor Project	LSR	Sco	2,000			1,500		500		0	1,500
00135	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	AlaCTC	Ashby (SR 13) Avenue Multi-Modal Corridor Project	LSR	Sco	1,000			750		250		0	750

Alameda CTC CIP - 2016 Update 5-Year Programming Horizon with 2-Year Allocation Plan July 2016									Programming and Allocations (\$ x 000)															
									CIP ID	PA	Funding Type	Funding Agency	Fund Source	Fund Subset	Sponsor	Project Title	Mode	Phase	Programmed Amount	Allocations				
																				Prior To FY2015-16	2-Year Allocation Plan		FY2017-18	FY2018-19
00136	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	040	AlaCTC	I-880/23rd-29th Operations Improvements	HWY	Con Cap	5,000		5,000				0	5,000							
00137	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	040	Oakland	I-880/42nd-High Street Access Improvements	HWY	Con Cap	10,000				10,000		0	0							
00138	2-Central	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	040	AlaCTC	I-880/Winton Avenue Interchange	HWY	Sco	1,500			1,500			0	1,500							
00139	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	040	AlaCTC	South County Access (SR 262/Mission Blvd Cross Connector)	HWY	Sco	1,500		1,500				0	1,500							
00140	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	045	Fremont	Warm Springs BART Station - West Side Access	TR	Con Cap	25,000			25,000			0	25,000							
00141	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	044	Emeryville	South Bayfront Bridge	BP	Con Cap	2,000				2,000		0	0							
00142	4-East	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	Alameda CTC	Scoping: I-580 ICM	Multi	Sco	50		50				0	50							
00143	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	Fremont	Scoping: Route 84 Relinquishment and Centerville Streetscape on Fremont Blvd.	Multi	Sco	50		50				0	50							
00144	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	026	Port	Scoping: Airport Drive Overlay	Multi	Sco	50		50				0	50							
00145	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	027	Port	Scoping: Port Terminal Seismic Monitoring Program	FR	Sco	8		8				0	8							
00146	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	027	Port	Scoping: Port Area ITS Deployment	Multi	Sco	50		50				0	50							
00147	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	027	Port	Scoping: Middle Harbor Road Improvements	Multi	Sco	30		30				0	30							
00148	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	027	Port	Scoping: Port Terminal Lighting Upgrade	Multi	Sco	8		8				0	8							
00149	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	027	Port	Scoping: Outer Harbor Intermodal Terminal (OHIT) Phase 2	Multi	Sco	50		50				0	50							
00150	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	027	Port	Scoping: Airport Perimeter Dike	Multi	Sco	50		50				0	50							
00151	1-North	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	027	Port	Scoping: 7th Street Grade Separation East	Multi	Sco	10		10				0	10							
00152	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	042	Fremont	Scoping: Union Pacific Railroad Trail Corridor (South Portion of East Bay Greenway)	Multi	Sco	50		50				0	50							
00153	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	045	Fremont	Scoping: Fremont BART Station West Side Enhancement	TR	Sco	50		50				0	50							
00154	3-South	Local	AlaCTC	2014 MBB	045	Fremont	Scoping: I-880 Bike and Ped Bridge and Trail Connector to Warm Springs BART Station to Bay Trail	BP	Sco	50		50				0	50							
00075	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	08B	AlaCTC	I-680 Sunol NB Express Lane	HWY	Con Cap	100,000			100,000			0	100,000							
00117	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	08A	AlaCTC	I-680 Sunol SB Express Lane	HWY	Con Cap	20,000			20,000			0	20,000							
00155	1-North	2014 MBB	027	2014 MBB	027	AlaCTC	7th Street Grade Separation and Port Arterial Improvements Project	FR	Env	15,000		15,000				0	15,000							
00155	1-North	2014 MBB	027	2014 MBB	027	AlaCTC	7th Street Grade Separation and Port Arterial Improvements Project	FR	PSE	18,000			18,000			0	18,000							
00156	Multiple	2014 MBB	026	2014 MBB	026	AlaCTC	Modal Plans Implementation (inc. Oakland Corridors such as Grand/MacArthur, E. 14th/Mission & MLK)	Multi	Var.	1,500			1,500			0	1,500							
00157	Multiple	2014 MBB	041	2014 MBB	041	AlaCTC	Modal Plans Implementation (inc. Oakland Corridors such as Grand/MacArthur, E. 14th/Mission & MLK)	FR	Var.	300			300			0	300							

Alameda CTC CIP - 2016 Update 5-Year Programming Horizon with 2-Year Allocation Plan July 2016									Programming and Allocations (\$ x 000)									
									Phase	Programmed Amount	Allocations		FY2017-18	FY2018-19	FY2019-20	Later	Total Allocated Amount (Thru FY 16-17)	
											Prior To FY2015-16	2-Year Allocation Plan						
CIP ID	PA	Funding Type	Funding Agency	Fund Source	Fund Subset	Sponsor	Project Title	Mode										
00158	Multiple	Local	AlaCTC	VRF	Disc-Transit	AlaCTC	Modal Plans Implementation (inc. Oakland Corridors such as Grand/MacArthur, E. 14th/Mission & MLK)	TR	Var.	300		300				0	300	
00159	Multiple	2014 MBB	046	2014 MBB	046	AlaCTC	Matching Program for Last Mile Connection Technology Programs	TEC	Var.	200		200				0	200	
00160	4-East	Local	AlaCTC	2000 MB	Disc-EB	LAVTA	Pilot Transit Program for Last Mile Connections	TR	Var.	100		100				0	100	
00161	Multiple	2014 MBB	046	2014 MBB	046	AlaCTC	Overall Planning/Monitoring Services	TEC	Var.	100		100				0	100	
00162	4-East	TFCA	Prog Mgr	TFCA	Prog Mgr	Ala County	East Castro Valley Boulevard Class II Bike Lanes	BP	Var.	62		62				0	62	
00163	Multiple	TFCA	Prog Mgr	TFCA	Prog Mgr	AlaCTC	Countywide Bicycling, Transit and Carpool Promotion Programs	Multi	Var.	210		210				0	210	
00164	1-North	TFCA	Prog Mgr	TFCA	Prog Mgr	Albany	Marin Ave Class 2 Bike Lane Gap Closure	BP	Var.	95		95				0	95	
00165	1-North	TFCA	Prog Mgr	TFCA	Prog Mgr	Berkeley	Berkeley Citywide Bicycle Parking Program	BP	Var.	137		137				0	137	
00166	4-East	TFCA	Prog Mgr	TFCA	Prog Mgr	Dublin	San Ramon Road Arterial Mgmt	LSR	Var.	146		146				0	146	
00167	1-North	TFCA	Prog Mgr	TFCA	Prog Mgr	Oakland	Broadway "B" Shuttle - Non-Peak (10am-3pm) Operations, FY 15/16	TR	Var.	210		210				0	210	
00168	1-North	TFCA	Prog Mgr	TFCA	Prog Mgr	Oakland	CityRacks, Phase 12	BP	Var.	124		124				0	124	
00169	4-East	TFCA	Prog Mgr	TFCA	Prog Mgr	Pleasanton	Pleasanton Trip Reduction Program, FYs 15/16 & 16/17	TR	Var.	53		53				0	53	
00170	2-Central	TFCA	Prog Mgr	TFCA	Prog Mgr	San Leandro	San Leandro LINKS shuttle, FYs 15/16 and 16/17	TR	Var.	50		50				0	50	
00171	Multiple	TFCA	Prog Mgr	TFCA	Prog Mgr	AC Transit	Line 97 Corridor Improvements (Signal timing component)	TR	Var.	228		228				0	228	
00172	1-North	TFCA	Prog Mgr	TFCA	Prog Mgr	BART	BART West Oakland Bike Locker Plaza	TR	Var.	55		55				0	55	
00173	2-Central	TFCA	Prog Mgr	TFCA	Prog Mgr	CSU East Bay	CSUEB Campus Shuttle II, FYs 15/16 (non-peak) & 16/17 (all hrs)	TR	Var.	123		123				0	123	
00174	Multiple	TFCA	Prog Mgr	TFCA	Prog Mgr	Alameda CTC	Alameda County Guaranteed Ride Home and Countywide TDM Information Services Program	TR	Var.	270		270				0	270	
00175	4-East	TFCA	Prog Mgr	TFCA	Prog Mgr	LAVTA	LAVTA Rte 30 BRT Operations, FYs 15/16 and 16/17	TR	Var.	275		275				0	275	
									<b>Totals</b>	<b>1,577,710</b>	<b>108,417</b>	<b>318,513</b>	<b>436,855</b>	<b>246,141</b>	<b>225,597</b>	<b>235,187</b>	<b>7,000</b>	<b>863,785</b>
									<b>2-Year Allocation Plan (FY 2015-16 &amp; FY 2016-17) Total</b>			<b>\$755,368</b>						
									<b>5-Year Programming Window (FY 2015-16 - FY 2019-20) Total</b>						<b>\$1,462,293</b>			