



Memorandum

5.1

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

510.208.7400

www.AlamedaCTC.org

DATE: November 2, 2020

TO: Planning, Policy and Legislation Committee

FROM: Carolyn Clevenger, Deputy Executive Director of Planning and Policy
Cathleen Sullivan, Director of Planning
Kristen Villanueva, Senior Transportation Planner

SUBJECT: Adoption of 2020 Countywide Transportation Plan and companion documents, Community-Based Transportation Plan and New Mobility Roadmap

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Commission adopt the 2020 Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) and its companion documents, the Community-Based Transportation Plan and the New Mobility Roadmap.

Summary

The 2020 CTP is the culmination of nearly two years of technical analysis, engagement with partner agencies, members of the public, and Commissioners to articulate a vision and goals for the county's transportation system that supports vibrant and livable communities. The 2020 CTP establishes near-term priorities and guides the long-term vision and decision-making of the Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC). The Commission has provided regular input to guide the development of the CTP and the content of the final document largely reflects materials previously presented to Commissioners. Since the last presentation in July, the final round of public engagement was completed (summarized below) and staff fully integrated the recommendations of the Community-Based Transportation Plan and the New Mobility Roadmap into the 2020 CTP, which were shared with the Commission over the course of several recent Committee and Commission meetings.

The Draft Final 2020 CTP and companion documents – the Community-Based Transportation Plan and the New Mobility Roadmap – are posted here:

www.alamedactc.org/countywidetransportationplan

This memo provides a summary of the contents of the 2020 CTP and a detailed summary of findings from engagement efforts conducted over the last three months (August-October). Outreach findings largely re-affirm core recommendations of the 2020 CTP as previously presented and will be used by staff to inform which strategies are prioritized for early

implementation. Formal comment letters, survey results, and a summary of emails and open-ended survey comments are included in Attachment A.

There are a few revisions to the CTP project lists that were presented to the Commission in July that are recommended based on recent engagement and comments received. These include:

- Howard Terminal Gondola project:
 - Remove Gondola Phase 1 Washington Street (\$350M)
 - Remove Gondola Phase 2 Alameda Connection Segment (\$569M)
- Bundled grade separation projects into a new programmatic category for Railroad Grade Separations across the County (includes submissions for Gilman Street in Berkeley, Oakland waterfront, and San Leandro and could include other grade separations projects)
- Move Dumbarton Rail/Group Rapid Transit (\$3.25B) from the 10-year list to the 30-year list
- Move Bayside TOD PDA Transit Station and Pedestrian Overcrossing (\$12M) to Decoto Road Complete Streets Corridor project bundle and rename this bundle: Decoto Road Complete Streets/Dumbarton Corridor project bundle
- Move segment 5 of the Quarry Lakes Parkway project from the 10-year list into the 30-year list; project name in 10-year list is now Quarry Lakes Parkway (Segments 1-4) with cost of \$208M; project name in 30-year list is now Quarry Lakes Parkway (Segment 5) with cost of \$60M
- Project list clean-up: Minor cost clean-up based on updated information from project sponsors and updating programmatic categories.

The draft final CTP Project List is included in Attachment B.

It is recommended that the Commission approve the 2020 CTP, as well as the Final Community-Based Transportation Plan and the New Mobility Roadmap.

Background

Every four years, Alameda CTC prepares and updates the CTP, which is a 30-year, long-range planning and policy document that guides future transportation decisions for all modes and users in Alameda County. Development on the 2020 CTP has been underway since the beginning of 2019; CTP items have been brought to Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, PPLC, and the Commission regularly throughout the development of the plan. In addition, public engagement was conducted throughout the development of the plan, including surveys, pop-up events, focus groups, and virtual engagement.

Staff presented the contents of the Draft CTP to the Commission in July. The core recommendations of the CTP remain largely unchanged. The 2020 CTP contains:

- **Core Recommendations.** The core recommendations of the 2020 CTP will guide Alameda CTC decision-making and help achieve the ambitious transportation Vision and Goals adopted by the Commission:
 - **10-Year Priority Projects and Programs.** These projects and programs will be prioritized for support from Alameda CTC in the form of funding, advocacy, and partnership over the next 10 years to help address identified needs and work towards the Vision and Goals.
 - **Strategies and Near-Term Actions.** A set of strategies complement the priority projects and programs. The strategies were drawn from applying industry best practices to Alameda County and identifying efforts beyond building infrastructure and delivering transportation services that are needed to fully achieve the transportation Vision and Goals and address the identified needs. These include policies, legislative advocacy efforts, technical assistance, funding, and project implementation guidance. A set of initial near-term actions have been identified to advance the strategies. This list will continue to evolve in coming years as opportunities arise.
- **Long-Term Projects and Programmatic Investments.** The full range of projects and programs submitted to the 2020 CTP with a 30-year time horizon.
- **Needs Assessment.** An assessment of existing transportation needs in the county, based on previous countywide modal plans, countywide evaluations such as for Safe Routes to School, the biennial traffic level of service monitoring, and annual performance data, as well as discussions with local stakeholders.
- **Community-Based Transportation Plan.** An assessment of transportation needs in the county's low-income communities and communities of color with a focus on community input collected via public engagement activities.
- **New Mobility Roadmap.** Document that provides a foundation for agency policy, advocacy, and funding decisions as Alameda CTC and partner agencies, as well as the private sector, advance new mobility technologies and services. The outcome of the New Mobility Roadmap is a set of seven initiatives, each of which has a comprehensive list of potential actions that could be taken to address and implement new mobility technologies and services in Alameda County. They are a resource as agencies seek to identify actions to support new technologies. The highest priority near-term actions have been incorporated into the CTP near-term actions list.

Draft Final Countywide Transportation Plan

The 2020 CTP sets a long-range vision and establishes near-term priorities for transportation in Alameda County. The Draft Final Plan consists of six chapters:

1. Chapter 1 – 2020 and Beyond

A comprehensive vision for the future of transportation in Alameda County and goals reflecting core values to help guide the achievement of that vision as well as an overview of core recommendations in the 2020 CTP.

2. Chapter 2 – Partnering with Communities

An overview of engagement activities and findings informing the development of the plan, including focused engagement and analysis in low-income communities and communities of color, as captured in a companion Community-Based Transportation Plan.

3. Chapter 3 – Mobility and Access Needs

A description of existing transportation needs at a countywide and local level and a look at trends that will influence planning in Alameda County for years to come.

4. Chapter 4 – Priority Projects and Programs

Identification of projects to be prioritized over the next 10 years, priority programs representing long-standing agency commitments, and long-term projects and programmatic investments.

5. Chapter 5 – Strategies and Near-Term Actions

A set of strategies to be undertaken by Alameda CTC that complements the 10-year priority projects and programs, as well as near-term actions to implement the strategies over the next four years. Strategies responding to effects of the COVID-19 pandemic are also included.

6. Chapter 6 – Performance and Implementation

An assessment of how the core recommendations advance the goals of the 2020 CTP and regional targets, as well as a description of funding and implementation.

The Draft Final 2020 CTP and companion documents – the Community-Based Transportation Plan and the New Mobility Roadmap – are posted here:

www.alamedactc.org/countywidetransportationplan

After Commission adoption, all final materials related to the 2020 CTP, including the Final project lists, Community-Based Transportation Plan, New Mobility Roadmap, Needs Assessment, and Outreach Summary Report will be posted to the CTP webpage by December.

Final Outreach for the 2020 CTP

Significant outreach has been conducted throughout development of the CTP including: a countywide poll in 2019, survey and community group discussions and pop-up events for the Community-Based Transportation Plan, and significant agency coordination. Since August 2020, staff has undertaken one final round of outreach and engagement for the 2020 CTP, modified to be virtual due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Several engagement channels were used:

- A short survey to solicit input on the draft final core recommendations distributed through Alameda CTC and partner agencies via social media, email, and e-newsletter channels.
- Focus group discussions (virtual).

- A “virtual open house” on the Alameda CTC website where all materials developed for the 2020 CTP were made available online and general comment was solicited on these materials.

This section provides a summary of findings, how they relate to the core CTP recommendations, and recommended changes to the project list that was presented to the Commission in July. The summary of these outreach findings in the Draft Final CTP document are still under development but will reflect the contents of this memo. These placeholders will be removed in the final CTP document. A full Outreach Summary Report is currently under development and will be posted on the CTP website by December. Formal organizational comment letters, survey results, and a summary of comments received during the final outreach period are included as Attachment A.

Across the survey and focus groups, staff heard a re-affirmation of the CTP priorities related to system safety, higher-quality multimodal facilities, access to more travel options, better transit service, improved pavement condition, and improvements to air quality and safety within low-income communities and communities of color. This is consistent with previous input received for the CTP, since the first poll and discussion at the Commission retreat in May 2019, and shaped the approach to the CTP development throughout.

Survey

A short survey was developed to solicit feedback on priorities related to core recommendations in the draft 2020 CTP and two open-ended comments for general transportation ideas and impacts related to COVID-19. Over a period of 6 weeks, approximately 1,600 people opened the survey and over 1,300 people provided complete responses. The survey generated approximately 600 open-ended comments on general transportation suggestions and nearly 500 open-ended comments related to COVID-19. Full survey results and a summary of these open-ended responses are summarized later in this memo and in Attachment A.

Overall, the survey responses revealed support for multimodal strategies and an emphasis on equity. When asked to rank different categories of investment, the survey respondents provided the following priority order:

1. Walking and biking access and safety
2. Public transit connections and quality
3. Stronger consideration of the environmental impacts of our transportation system
4. Better driving conditions
5. New mobility services and more use of technology in cities

Survey responses related to strategies

The survey responses provide an opportunity to understand what are the highest priority CTP strategies for residents and people who work and travel in Alameda County. Respondents were asked to choose up to three of their highest priority strategies within six categories. The highest priority choices provided by survey respondents are shown in Table 1 with notes on

which strategies and programs they relate to in the 2020 CTP. These findings, as well as the detail provided in discussions during focus groups (described below), will be used to inform which strategies are prioritized for early implementation.

Table 1 High Priority Survey Results and Relevant CTP Strategies

Topic Area	Highest Priority Strategies (one of top 3 choices for more than 50% of responses)	CTP strategies to Implement these priorities (equity strategies indicated with **)
Walking and Biking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better walking routes along streets with high-quality features (61%) More trails or greenways for walking and biking (59%) More separation/protection for bicyclists on roadways (58%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ** Improve Safety on the High-Injury Network, with an eye towards community disparities. ** Build the Low-Stress Walking and Biking Network, including low-stress facilities on arterials and/or alternative routes. ** Plan and Deliver Urban Greenways and Trails.
Public Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More convenient connections between different transit services (80%) Priority for buses on major arterials to enhance bus frequency and reliability (54%) Cheaper fares or free transit options for low-income residents (51%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ** Provide Seamless Transit Connections. ** Improve Bus Service Frequency, Reliability, Quality and Travel Time. ** Improve Fare Integration and Explore Affordable Fare Options.
Roads and Freeways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better pavement with fewer potholes (79%) Prioritizing bicyclists and buses in roadway improvements to better serve public transit and support more walking and bicycling (62%) More coordinated traffic signals (58%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Streets and Roads Program (part of priority projects and programs). ** Improve Bus Service Frequency, Reliability, Quality and Travel Time. ** Build the Low-Stress Walking and Biking Network, including low-stress facilities on arterials and/or alternative routes. Support Modern Traffic Signals that Operate Seamlessly Across Jurisdictions and Deliver Robust Transit Signal Priority.
New Mobility and Technology Improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A universal app or card to pay for transportation, including all mobility options such as public transit, rideshare, bikeshare, paratransit, and others (69%) Equitable and affordable access to new mobility services and technologies, especially in historically underserved communities (59%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ** Improve Fare Integration and Explore Affordable Fare Options. New Mobility Roadmap: ** Equity and Accessibility Initiative and Transportation Demand Management Initiative.

Topic Area	Highest Priority Strategies (one of top 3 choices for more than 50% of responses)	CTP strategies to Implement these priorities (equity strategies indicated with **)
Environmental Considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More low- or zero-emission vehicles for shipping and goods movement (66%) • Improved air quality in disadvantaged and low-income communities through infrastructure and policy changes (65%) • Shifting more freight and goods movement to rail to reduce the number of trucks on freeways and local roads (56%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Mobility Roadmap: Electric Mobility Initiative. • **Advance zero- and near-zero emissions goods movement initiatives, with a focus on impacted communities. • Incentivize Non-Single Occupant Vehicle Use and efforts to reduce vehicle miles traveled. • ** Improve Priority Freight Routes and Shift More Freight to Rail.
Equitable Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safer streets for walking and bicycling in low-income communities (60%) • Better access to public transportation in low-income communities (58%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ** Improve Safety on the High-Injury Network, with an eye towards community disparities. • ** Support Context-Appropriate Speed Limit Setting and Automated Speed Enforcement Policies. • ** Improve Bus Service Frequency, Reliability, Quality and Travel Time. • ** Expand First/Last-Mile Options and Improve Access to Major Transit Hubs. • Explore Innovative, Agile Solutions to Supplement Transit, e.g. in low density settings or to serve older adults; consider potential impacts of innovative strategies.

Notes: 1) Numbers here reflect all responses received, which includes mostly Alameda County residents and some out-of-county residents (mostly from San Francisco and Contra Costa Counties). 2) Percentage values (%) denote the share of respondents for which this strategy was a high priority out of 5-6 options. For example, 61% of respondents chose "Better walking routes along streets with high-quality features" when asked "What are your top three priorities for walking and biking safety"

Focus Groups

To dive deeper into the draft recommendations, the CTP team conducted virtual focus groups across the county and one follow up call with community members. Despite limitations of COVID-19, staff was able to set up four focus groups, consisting of discussions with: a group of seniors and staff from the Senior Support Program of the Tri-Valley, a group of residents from East Oakland, a group of residents from Southern Alameda County (Fremont, Newark, and Union City), and the Alameda CTC BPAC. The East Oakland focus group was conducted in partnership with OakDOT and its East Oakland Mobility Action Plan.

Across the focus groups, discussion centered on particular transportation needs in each area as well as discussion on highest priority strategies. Key themes include:

- **Safety:** Need for safer pedestrian crossings particularly along high-volume/high-speed roadways that access transit stops and at medical clinics (especially for more vulnerable groups like older adults and people with disabilities). Support for higher level protection for walking and biking facilities at interchanges. Need to address multimodal safety needs in high traffic/demand areas.
- **Designing multimodal roadways:** Need to re-design major roadways in industrial areas for safer access by a range of modes as they become more mixed-use. Need for improved connectivity of sidewalks, bicycle routes, and transit/shuttles, as well as balancing multimodal safety with high-traffic areas.
- **Services for seniors and people with disabilities:** Need for a range of transportation services for seniors beyond just ADA Paratransit, such as for trips to medical appointments and volunteer driver programs that offer much-needed human connection.
- **Trail access:** Need to access the waterfront and Bay Trail.
- **Affordable transit fares:** Need for affordable fares, especially for adults on fixed income who are neither students nor senior age.
- **Transit coverage:** Need for better transit coverage in more suburban areas of the county, and for transit service to be faster and more coordinated. Desire for shuttle services to connect major activity centers to community amenities and transit.
- **BPAC feedback:** Strong support for automated speed enforcement, safety on the High-Injury Network, advancing multimodal corridors with design standards, coordinating with Caltrans to expedite multimodal projects, and advancing greenways and trails. Opposition to roadway widening projects and express lanes achieved through adding freeway capacity; instead they should be achieved through lane conversion.

Letters, Emails, and Open-Ended Survey Comments

Over the course of this outreach period, people submitted comments via email, a form on the CTP webpage, the open-ended questions in the survey, and formal comment letters. Formal comment letters, as well as a summary of comments are included in Attachment A.

The two letters are from the East Oakland Stadium Alliance and the Pacific Merchant Shipping Association (PMSA). These provided support for goods movement strategies in the CTP and recommendations to remove projects related to Howard Terminal/A's Ballpark.

Themes that are prominent in the comments include: need for safer facilities and higher quality infrastructure for walking and biking; need for improving public transit connections, more affordable fares and concerns around the lack of competitive transit options making driving more attractive; concerns around air quality, especially in disadvantaged communities; desire for reducing single-occupant vehicle trips and their related impacts; desire for more use of electric vehicles; concerns around potholes on roads and freeways and need for better pavement condition; and need for better planning for aging adults and people with disabilities.

Comments on Projects

While the vast majority of the comments and feedback received on the Draft 2020 CTP were on overarching needs and priorities, a handful of comments were submitted on specific projects. Based on initial analysis, out of around 600 comments on general transportation priorities, fourteen comments were submitted regarding concern with spending public funds on projects that support a ballpark at Howard Terminal (twelve open-ended comments via survey and website and 2 letters). A few other projects were mentioned in comments such as concern for specific highway projects, changes to Capitol Corridor service, and tolls/express lanes. Comments in support of projects included support for construction of the East Bay Greenway and Valley Link. Staff will finalize analysis of the comments and document the full summary in the Outreach Summary Report.

Changes to Draft Final 2020 CTP

As described, the outreach largely reaffirmed the core recommendations of the CTP as presented to the Commission in draft form in July and provided detail that staff will use in prioritizing implementation of the projects, programs, strategies, and actions in the CTP.

Based on feedback received during public outreach and from the Commission, discussions with partner agencies and updated project information, staff is recommending the following revisions to the project list:

1. Howard Terminal Gondola project:
 - a. Remove Gondola Phase 1 Washington Street (\$350M) – due to uncertainty around project and comments received.
 - b. Remove Gondola Phase 2 Alameda Connection Segment (\$569M) – due to uncertainty around project and comments received.
2. Bundle grade separation projects into a new programmatic category for Railroad Grade Separations across the County (includes submissions for Gilman Street in Berkeley, Oakland waterfront, and San Leandro and could include other grade separations projects) – to reflect strategy of bundling similar projects that was applied in other parts of project list and uncertainty around these high-cost and challenging projects.

3. Move Dumbarton Rail/Group Rapid Transit (\$3.25B) from the 10-year list to the 30-year list – due to uncertainty around project scope, schedule and funding plan, and desire to align with the region's Plan Bay Area 2050, which currently shows the project in the 2035-2050 timeframe.
4. Move Bayside TOD PDA Transit Station and Pedestrian Overcrossing (\$12M) to Decoto Road Complete Streets Corridor project bundle and rename this bundle: Decoto Road Complete Streets/Dumbarton Corridor project bundle – better reflects intent of Decoto Corridor projects and TOD projects in area, and highlights the importance of the Dumbarton Corridor.
5. Move segment 5 of the Quarry Lakes Parkway project from the 10-year list into the 30-year list; project name in 10-year list is now Quarry Lakes Parkway (Segments 1-4) with cost of \$208M; project name in 30-year list is now Quarry Lakes Parkway (Segment 5) with cost of \$60M – updated to reflect timing of project delivery.
6. Project list clean-up: Minor cost clean-up based on updated information from project sponsors and updating programmatic categories.

The draft final project lists in Attachment B reflects these changes.

COVID-19

There was an open-ended comment in the survey related to impacts from COVID-19. Out of nearly 500 responses, approximately 200 people provided comments related to concerns around the safety of travel and disease transmission, in particular related to using public transit. Respondents also noted adjusting commute hours based on availability of transit service and using transit less in order to reserve space for essential workers. Other survey respondents noted safety concerns while engaging in physical activity in their neighborhoods and cities due to a surge in vehicle speeds and reckless driving observed during the pandemic.

Pandemic impacts have highlighted the importance of a resilient transportation system that meets the needs of all residents and workers, especially the most vulnerable, the importance of safe streets, and supporting our transit system in weathering and emerging from the current crisis.

Alameda CTC has a key strategic role to play in the very near-term, particularly in terms of supporting jurisdictions and transit agencies in weathering the immediate crisis and contributing to economic stabilization and recovery. Beyond this CTP, Alameda CTC will continue to listen to the needs of local agencies and the public, evaluate the changing landscape for delivering projects and programs, and stay flexible and nimble to respond as conditions necessitate.

Next Steps

The projects, programs, strategies and actions of the core recommendations represent an ambitious undertaking for Alameda County over the next 10 years. Implementation of these core recommendations are critical to achieving the plan vision and goals, and charting the path forward for Alameda County's transportation system out to 2050. Implementation efforts will require substantial funding, technical and policy analysis, and collaboration and engagement with the public and local and regional partners. After plan adoption, staff will begin work on implementation of the high priority strategies and continue support for the priority projects and programs. The CTP is generally updated every four years, between now and then staff will provide updates to the Commission on implementation of the 2020 CTP, particularly focused on the core recommendations.

Fiscal Impact: There is no fiscal impact for this item associated with this item.

Attachments:

- A. 2020 CTP Fall Outreach Survey and Comments Summary (August-October 2020)
- B. Draft Final 2020 Countywide Transportation Plan Project Lists

2020 CTP

Fall 2020 Outreach Survey and Comments Summary

August – October 2020

Introduction

In August 2020, a short online survey was distributed and promoted across the county for feedback on priorities and a chance to provide input on the Draft 2020 Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP). The survey started with a question on respondent's zip code then included six questions that asked respondents to prioritize among 5-6 strategy ideas within six key issue areas: Walking and Bicycling, Public Transportation, Roads and Freeway, Mobility and Technology, Environmental Considerations, and Equitable Transportation System. Respondents were then asked to rank among the key issue areas (Question 8). The final two questions (Questions 9 and 10) provided the opportunity to submit general comments on transportation in Alameda County and mobility-related impacts of COVID-19.

Across a roughly six-week period, 1,645 people opened the survey, 1,487 people engaged with the survey (meaning they partially answered the survey), and 1,322 people completed the survey. These values include one person who requested a paper copy and submitted a written version of the survey by mail. The large majority of responses are from Alameda County residents; roughly 10 percent of respondents had zip codes outside of Alameda County. Over 1,000 open-ended comments were submitted: 594 comments were left in response to Question 9, and 491 responses were left in response to Question 10.

This document includes a full accounting of survey results that are summarized in the body of the memo, as well as an initial assessment of the over 1,000 comments received through engagement activities in fall 2020. As described previously, most of these comments were submitted in response to the two open-ended questions at the end of the survey. Comments were also submitted via several emails, two letters, and five comments submitted on a form on the CTP webpage. A copy of the survey and the two letters are included at the end of this document. Staff will continue to evaluate these comments and provide a more detailed accounting in the full Outreach Summary Report of the 2020 CTP which will be posted by December 2020.

Survey Results Questions 2-8

Overall, the survey responses revealed support for multimodal strategies and an emphasis on equity. When asked to rank different categories of investment (Question 8), the survey respondents provided the following ranking:

1. Walking and biking access and safety
2. Public transit connections and quality

3. Stronger consideration of the environmental impacts of our transportation system
4. Better driving conditions
5. New mobility services and more use of technology in cities

The following table provides survey results in order of priority for Questions 2-7. The number/percent of responses reflect the number/share of people for which a particular strategy was selected as one of their top three priorities. Note that responses of those who partially completed the survey are included in results up until the point that they closed the survey and that respondents did not have to select three, they could select 1, 2, or 3.

2. What are your top three priorities for walking and bicycling improvements in Alameda County?	Percent	Number of Responses
Better walking routes along streets with high-quality features (e.g., street lighting, benches, street trees, etc.)	61%	867
More trails or greenways for walking and bicycling	59%	826
More separation/protection for bicyclists on roadways	58%	814
Safer routes to schools to provide more opportunities for parents and students to walk or bicycle to school	36%	513
Reduced driving speeds in neighborhoods to make it safer to walk or bicycle	35%	490
Increased safety at freeway ramps for people walking and bicycling	32%	451
3. What are your top three priorities for public transportation improvements in Alameda County?	Percent	Number of Responses
More convenient connections between different transit services (e.g., AC Transit to BART)	80%	1108
Priority for buses on major arterial streets to enhance bus frequency and reliability	54%	743
Cheaper fares or free transit options for low-income residents	51%	703
More express bus services for commuters	43%	589
Better transportation options for seniors and people with mobility issues	43%	598
4. What are your top three priorities for road and freeway improvements in Alameda County?	Percent	Number of Responses
Better pavement with fewer potholes	79%	1077
Prioritizing bicyclists and buses in roadway improvements to better serve public transit and to support more walking and bicycling	62%	846
More coordinated traffic signals	58%	791
Building express lanes and high occupancy lanes paired with express buses to move people and goods more efficiently on freeways	39%	534
More automated speed limit enforcement	27%	367

5. What are your top three priorities for new mobility and technology improvements in Alameda County?	Percent	Number of Responses
A universal app or card to pay for transportation, including all mobility options such as public transit, rideshare, bikeshare, paratransit, and others	69%	934
Equitable and affordable access to new mobility services and technologies, especially in historically underserved communities	59%	797
Technology that prioritizes public transit vehicles at traffic signals	49%	665
More shared-mobility services such as rideshare, bike/scooter share to get around town	33%	445
More electric charging stations for privately owned electric vehicles	32%	428
Infrastructure to accommodate self-driving vehicles alongside traditional vehicles	16%	221
6. What are your top three priorities for environmental considerations in Alameda County?	Percent	Number of Responses
More low- or zero-emission vehicles for shipping and goods movement	66%	882
Improved air quality in disadvantaged and low-income communities through infrastructure and policy changes	65%	865
Shifting more freight and goods movement to rail to reduce the number of trucks on freeways and local roads	56%	744
More investments to protect the region's coastal areas and infrastructure from rising sea levels	49%	656
Stronger measures to reduce the use of single-occupancy vehicles, including pricing or other charges	35%	464
7. What are your top three priorities for creating a more equitable transportation system in Alameda County?	Percent	Number of Responses
Safer streets for walking and bicycling in low-income communities	60%	795
Better access to public transportation in low-income communities	58%	768
Better pavement with fewer potholes in low-income communities	45%	597
Improved air quality in disadvantaged and low-income communities through infrastructure and policy changes	43%	569
Cheaper fares or free transit options for low-income residents	43%	571
Better transportation options for seniors and people with mobility issues	33%	432

Initial Analysis of Open-Ended Comments

The final two questions (Questions 9 and 10) provided the opportunity to make general comments on transportation in Alameda County and mobility-related impacts of COVID-19:

- **Question 9.** Do you have any comments or suggestions about transportation in Alameda County?
- **Question 10.** Do you have any comments on how the COVID-19 pandemic has impacted your travel options or mobility needs that you would like to share with us?

In total, the survey generated 594 comments in response to Question 9 and 491 comments in response to Question 10. This section presents an initial qualitative assessment of these open-ended comments and incorporates comments staff received via email and through a form on the CTP webpage during the outreach period. This is an initial assessment of the key themes of the comments; a more detailed evaluation of comments will be included in the full Outreach Summary Report that will be finalized by December. Comments have been included mostly verbatim with minor corrections for clarity.

This section contains the following:

- 1) Key themes for general transportation comments (Question 9)
- 2) Summary of comments that specifically mention a project or set of projects in the Draft 2020 CTP project list
- 3) Key themes from COVID-19 mobility impacts (Question 10)

General Transportation Key Themes (Question 9)

Question 9 received approximately 590 open-ended responses. Key themes are presented in this section along with representative comments for illustration. An accounting of comments related to each theme is provided for a sense of scale between themes, but given the nature of these comments, there is some overlap between themes.

Safety and Active Transportation

Over 100 responses related to issues of safety and better walking and biking facilities. Commenters noted concerns around high vehicle speed, which impacts safety while walking and biking, and the lack of high-quality active transportation infrastructure to support safe biking, walking and accessing transit.

Similar to the theme of safety, survey respondents noted a desire for comprehensive active transportation infrastructure so people of all abilities can walk and bike safely. Respondents also noted the importance of having well-connected active transportation infrastructure between jurisdictions and to transit stops and stations.

“Our town needs to be more walkable. We have very narrow old sidewalks, bushes on major streets that prevent easily walking on sidewalks with a stroller, lots of cracks in the sidewalks, big intersections that are scary to cross with kids. I would love to walk more but it needs to be improved in West Dublin.” – Dublin

"There are some really great bike lanes that have been put in over the last few years, and I would love to see more of those, especially near BART stations and express bus areas. Additionally, I appreciate that there are increased methods to get around Alameda County in sustainable ways that are not BART, and would appreciate even more connectivity of bike lanes, buses, etc." – Emeryville

"Implement design standards for active transportation facilities that separate, elevate and protect active transportation users. We need grade separation between motor vehicles and active transportation users." – Hayward

"Stop planning and start building the EAST BAY GREENWAY." – Oakland

Better Connections for Public Transportation and Affordable Public Transportation

Approximately 73 responses dealt with better public transit connections and cheaper fares. Survey respondents noted a desire for better public transit options, including better coordination between transit operators, higher frequency transit and more bus shelters around transit stations. Some respondents noted the challenges older adults face around accessing public transportation options.

Affordable public transportation options also emerged as a key theme in the comments. Several respondents noted a desire for more affordable fares and policies to make public transportation more affordable and convenient than driving.

"I'd like to see better coordination among all regional transit agencies, such that a passenger only has to wait ~10 minutes when connecting between different lines." – Oakland

"Better syncing of BART and AC Transit connections and increased service would be great. Reduce AC transit fare." – Berkeley

"We need seamless transit connections and fare collections across agencies, including neighboring and regional agencies. You should be able to pay one fare at the beginning of your trip and easily get anywhere in the Bay Area." – Fremont

"Tempo is a great start - now, bring more BRT routes and high-frequency local bus service to Alameda County to get people out of their cars! AC Transit bus service should also be better integrated with the BART schedule to provide easier transfers." – San Francisco

"Cheaper fares will bring more attention to take public transportation. I am currently saving \$100 a month by driving into work." – San Pablo

Air Quality, Climate Change and Reducing Driving

Upwards of 60 people commented on their concerns around air quality and climate change, noting transportation as way to reduce impacts, as well as concerns related to the impacts of single-occupant vehicles and the desire for better transportation options to reduce environmental impacts. Encouraging the use of electric vehicles was also mentioned.

"I believe that dense-coverage, highly flexible, low-emissions public transportation must be the top priority - for commuters, for low-income folks, for anyone going to work or to run errands, for kids wanting to get around without needing to be driven, for communities near major arteries that struggle with air and noise pollution. Access to such a system will make the whole region more livable for everyone. Furthermore, although the governor's new zero-emissions vehicle commitment is amazing, it will only deepen the divide between the wealthy and regular people who don't have the money for a new car - public transportation is the only real way to address climate change." - Oakland

"We must take action to address climate change, and it must be proportionate to the magnitude of the crisis. And we need to be sure not to make disadvantaged communities bear the brunt of it." - Emeryville

"We can reduce traffic and the impact of cars on our air by making it difficult and expensive for people to use their cars. Please invest in making it more appealing for people to bike, walk, and use public transit." - Alameda

Fixing Potholes

Approximately 45 responses were on the state of pavement. Comments focused on a desire to repave the roads and highlighted too many potholes on freeways and on local streets.

"I think there are a lot of good public transit options. I wish the streets had fewer potholes, were cleaner and had more safety measures for pedestrians" - Emeryville

"Fix all potholes & bumpy roads. Hwy 680 North & South from Dublin Blvd to Contra Costa County Line is very bumpy. Please fix." - Dublin

"Ensure our safety by immediately fixing the potholes, improving lighting, improving sidewalks and bike lanes, improving safety at bus and bart stops" - Oakland

"Fix potholes, install sidewalks where there are none before doing anything else" - Castro Valley

Traffic, Congestion and Driving

Around 30 people commented on concerns regarding driving in Alameda County. Some respondents noted that driving is more convenient compared to other transportation modes and that there should be more affordable parking. While other respondents noted lack of existing public transportation options make driving more desirable.

"You need to consider that not everyone can take public transportation to work. That driving is more easily accessible to them, especially in the event of a family emergency, child care, etc. AFFORDABLE and ACCESSIBLE parking should also be considered priority when discussing transportation." - San Leandro

"If public transportation was improved, it would reduce the need for driving." – Oakland

"Please do NOT consider penalizing single occupancy vehicles. Many people, including the economically disadvantaged, and people with certain conditions have no other option. This would be a well intentioned move environmentally but a discriminatory move nonetheless." – Fremont

"The new traffic lights along International that control the rapid transit lanes have been very difficult for the past couple of weeks since BRT started. We waited 5+ minutes at an intersection (near 57th Avenue) for a left turn signal, with a line of cars; it never went green and no buses passed the intersection during that time. Same thing coming home." – Oakland

"Analyze bottlenecks during rush hour to identify areas to target efforts to improve traffic flow. Reducing driveways and intersections along major routes to allow higher speed limits, coordinated traffic lights. Expand lanes where possible." – Fremont

Transportation Needs of Seniors and People with Disabilities

Eighteen people provided comments related to better planning for aging adults and people with disabilities. A few comments are included:

"Since I am 87 yrs. old, I would appreciate easier, closer access to public transportation, and more benches for seniors who are waiting. Closer connection between BART and AC Buses would be helpful." – Oakland

"There is no transportation available to me in Livermore, a senior and a widow, whose vision is failing. I have Kaiser medical insurance from the LLNL retirement and now have to drive to many different cities for specialized care. At 86 I do not have any choices. I have signed up for transportation offered from Sr. Support in Pleasanton but it is very limited to time and days. I have yet to use it but my driving days are quickly coming to an end and I am worried about getting around." – Livermore

"Seniors and people with mobility issues need a transportation system that is reliable and meets a variety of needs from shopping to medical appointments to visiting with friends" – Livermore

Equitable Transportation

Across all themes, responses included mention of prioritization for low-income and disadvantaged communities.

"Need to prioritize investments in low income communities" – Oakland

"Please invest in low-income neighborhoods first." – Berkeley

"We need more investment in low income BIPOC [Black, Indigenous, People of Color] communities that doesn't result in gentrification displacement while also

ensuring they are the primary beneficiaries as leaders, partners, jobs, workers, contracts, etc. We also need to meet people's transportation needs where they live, particularly for disabled people, seniors, and students, not the opposite". – San Leandro

"Have more trail connections through low income communities as an option for bicycling and walking." – San Leandro

"Please prioritize underserved and low-income communities for bus service, especially direct connections to BART, Hospitals, and other high use destinations." – Berkeley

"I strongly urge you to see age/disability/income/equity considerations fully integrated into EV and mobility options/new tech; EG free or super low-cost charging for wheelchairs and tiny EV cars, and last mile Very low-cost options For 3 wheel scooters with A small rack for walkers with self-driving return to station or On street Parking for gig cars. Ideally we'd use Quieter EV buses and all buses would be congenial for wheelchair users, folks with shopping carts and strollers easy use for EV bikes; that all Bart stations and bus stops near Community health centers and adult schools would have fully safe ADA drop off and pickup Platforms on the same block. Please design your stations and bus stops as community amenities in themselves connecting us to other basic community services. Thank you." – Berkeley

"Prioritize infrastructure for zero-emission vehicles, equitable access to all mobility and technology options, and improved transit/ access" – San Leandro

"Due to COVID-19 pandemic, seasonal fires, the pollution levels and climate change, there is a need to rethink the bike lanes and walkability. This survey as written is contributing to the health impacts to overall communities which many have disparities in health. ACTC planners, engineers and other such staff should be in the mindset thinking how to develop public health for planning purposes for bike lanes and walkability." – Oakland

Survey Design

Approximately 25 people commented on the survey design, noting that they would not have chosen any of the priority ideas provided, that the survey was missing transportation solutions that they expected, or that this survey doesn't represent their values. Within first few days, the survey was adjusted to address some complaints about the forced choice of three to all of for a choice of up to three.

"In places in this survey I had to choose 3 options when the third wasn't my priority. I think that will yield skewed results." – Berkeley

"Survey should include "none of the above". It is a little presumptuous of you to think the few solutions I have to choose from is what I would like done." – Castro Valley

"Nowhere was the question asked about personal safety on public transportation. I think that should be a priority choice in this survey." – Alameda

"Survey seems to be geared to bikes, pedestrians and transit. Completely one sided. You won't learn much from this, just the answers you want to hear." – Pleasanton

Comments on Projects (Question 9)

While the vast majority of the comments and feedback received on the Draft 2020 CTP were on overarching needs and priorities, a handful of comments were submitted on specific projects. Out of around 600 general comments on transportation priorities, 14 comments were received that expressed concern with spending public dollars on a ballpark at Howard Terminal (twelve comments through the survey and form on the website, and two letters included at the end of this attachment). The other projects listed here were mentioned in 2-4 comments.

Concerns raised about the following projects or project themes (preliminary list):

- Howard Terminal investments
- Including specific highway projects in CTP list
- Capitol Corridor service changes
- Tolls/express lanes

Support raised for projects or project themes mentioned (preliminary list):

- East Bay Greenway
- Valley Link
- Safe Routes to School
- I-580/680 Interchange

Staff will continue to review comments specifically for mention of projects and project ideas and will document in more detail in the Outreach Summary Report.

COVID-19 and Mobility Impacts Key Themes (Question 10)

Survey Question 10 asked respondents how the COVID-19 pandemic has impacted their travel options or mobility needs. Initial analysis of responses revealed almost 200 comments out of a total of 491 related to the pandemic's impact on their use of public transportation including concerns about potential for disease transmission in transit vehicles. Relatedly, comments noted adjusting commute hours based on availability of transit service and using transit less in order to reserve space for essential workers. Other survey respondents noted safety concerns while engaging in physical activity in their neighborhoods and cities due to a surge in vehicle speeds and reckless driving observed during the pandemic.

These key themes are elaborated below.

Public Transportation Impacts due to COVID-19

Almost two hundred (192) respondents provided comments on the impact of COVID-19 on their mobility related to public transportation. Several survey respondents noted that they have stopped using public transportation due to COVID-19 or have adjusted their schedules. Some survey respondents noted the passenger limits that have been implemented by transit agencies as part of their comprehensive safety measures for both buses and train cars. Some of these respondents noted that their mobility has been impacted due to the reduced public transit services, while other respondents noted they are not using public transit so essential workers can use public transit.

"I don't really ride transit any more, but I'll be back, and I hope we can keep our transit systems operating through this crisis so they'll be there for all of us when it's over." – Emeryville

"I have reduced my transit use to reserve the service for essential workers. But I still want frequent and fast transit service in Alameda County and the Bay Area to be available when it's safe for me to ride again! Please work to maintain the level of transit service in Alameda County in the face of falling fare revenue and declining tax funding. We need to dedicate road space to buses so they're not stuck behind cars. We also need to make it safer to bike and walk by dedicating more road space to pedestrians and bicyclists". – Emeryville

"Due to COVID-19 I have to adjust my commute hours based on the availability of BART. Longer wait times on the platforms, less trains, leaving earlier to catch a specific train, leaving later so not to wait too long, avoiding peak commute times, etc." – San Leandro

Safety Concerns due to COVID-19

Over 120 comments noted some type of concerns related to traveling safely due to COVID-19 (these comments have some overlap with those in the previous section). Comments ranged from concerns around riding public transit due to fears of potential transmission of COVID-19 to the increase of vehicular speeds observed during shelter-in place. Comments that speak to safety are noted below.

"I'm nervous to take any public transit during COVID19. I haven't taken anything, but would hope there are strict guidelines for safety protocols and deep cleaning." – Berkeley

"I was too scared to bike to work through north and downtown Oakland in the past, as there's a lack of bike lanes, and often bike lanes cross major streets with no stop lights. When my office reopens I'd rather bike than use BART, but my traffic safety concerns remain." – Berkeley

Work from Home/Remote Work

The advent of COVID-19 has significantly shifted the work environment for some people. A total of 66 of respondents noted/volunteered information that they are now either

partially or full time working remotely. Comments that speak to the shift in transportation needs due to remote work are noted below.

"I am blessed to be able to work remote so personally I use public transit less (but originally a week-long bus commuter) so the need is less crucial, but as a per diem essential worker when I am called in, the bus service is key." – Oakland

"I'm home now, for work and family, so no longer driving as much, but walking more. Would like to see the promotion of social distancing on our sidewalks, at bus stops, bus signage, etc." – Albany

This page intentionally left blank

Transportation Priorities Survey

1. The CTP is a planning effort for all of Alameda County, and it is important that we receive input from all communities. To help us understand transportation needs and priorities in your community, please enter your zip code below: *

Walking and Bicycling

2. What are your top three priorities for **walking and bicycling** improvements in Alameda County?

CHOOSE UP TO THREE: *

- Increased safety at freeway ramps** for people walking and bicycling
- More separation/protection for bicyclists** on roadways
- Safer routes to schools** to provide more opportunities for parents and students to walk or bicycle to school
- Better walking routes along streets** with high-quality features (e.g., street lighting, benches, street trees, etc.)
- More trails or greenways** for walking and bicycling
- Reduced driving speeds** in neighborhoods to make it safer to walk or bicycle

Public Transportation

3. What are your top three priorities for **public transportation** improvements in Alameda County?

CHOOSE UP TO THREE: *

- More convenient, connections between different transit services** (e.g., AC Transit to BART)
- Cheaper fares or free transit options** for low-income residents
- Better transportation options for seniors and people with mobility issues**
- More express bus services for commuters**
- Priority for buses on major arterial streets** to enhance bus frequency and reliability

Roads and Freeways

4. What are your top three priorities for **road and freeway** improvements in Alameda County?

CHOOSE UP TO THREE: *

- Better pavement** with fewer potholes
- Prioritizing bicyclists and buses in roadway improvements** to better serve public transit and support more walking and bicycling
- More automated speed limit enforcement**
- More coordinated traffic signals**
- Building express lanes and high occupancy lanes** paired with express buses to move people and goods more efficiently on freeways

New Mobility and Technology

5. What are your top three priorities for **new mobility and technology** improvements in Alameda County?

CHOOSE UP TO THREE: *

- More shared-mobility services** such as rideshare, bike/scooter share to get around town
- Infrastructure to accommodate self-driving vehicles** alongside traditional vehicles
- Equitable and affordable access to new mobility services** and technologies, especially in historically underserved communities
- A universal app or card to pay for transportation**, including all mobility options such as public transit, rideshare, bikeshare, paratransit, and others
- Technology that prioritizes public transit vehicles at traffic signals**
- More electric charging stations** for privately owned electric vehicles

Environmental Considerations

6. What are your top three priorities for **environmental considerations** in Alameda County?

CHOOSE UP TO THREE: *

- More low- or zero-emission vehicles for shipping and goods movement**
- Stronger measures to reduce the use of single-occupancy vehicles, including pricing or other charges**
- More investments to protect the region's coastal areas and infrastructure from rising sea levels**
- Improved air quality in disadvantaged and low-income communities through infrastructure and policy changes**
- Shifting more freight and goods movement to rail** to reduce the number of trucks on freeways and local roads

Equity Considerations

7. What are your top three priorities for creating **a more equitable transportation system** in Alameda County?

CHOOSE UP TO THREE: *

- Better transportation options for seniors and people with mobility issues**
- Improved air quality in disadvantaged and low-income communities through infrastructure and policy changes**
- Safer streets** for walking and bicycling in low-income communities
- Cheaper fares or free transit options** for low-income residents
- Better access to public transportation** in low income communities
- Better pavement** with fewer potholes in low-income communities

General Transportation Priorities

8. Now that you've seen the types of strategies we are considering, we would like to know how much of a priority different categories of transportation improvements should be in the next 10 years for Alameda County.

Please rank the following in order of your priorities (1=highest to 5=lowest) *

	1	2	3	4	5
Walking and biking access and safety	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Public transit connections and quality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Better driving conditions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
New mobility services and more use of technology in cities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Stronger consideration of the environmental impacts of our transportation system	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Feedback and Comments

9. Do you have any comments or suggestions about transportation in Alameda County?

10. Do you have any comments on how the COVID-19 pandemic has impacted your travel options or mobility needs that you would like to share with us?



September 30, 2020

Cathleen Sullivan
Director of Planning
1111 Broadway, Suite 800
Oakland, CA 94607

Kristen Villanueva
Senior Transportation Planner
1111 Broadway, Suite 800
Oakland, CA 94607

RE: 2020 Countywide Transportation Plan Draft Recommendations

Dear Ms. Sullivan and Ms. Villanueva,

As a coalition of Oakland community members, workers, businesses, and advocates, the East Oakland Stadium Alliance is deeply concerned with the recently published Draft 2020 Alameda Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP), particularly in regards to its planned infrastructure developments associated with the proposed Oakland A's Howard Terminal project. The CTP has identified nearly \$1.5 billion in future project costs for a gondola, grade separations, and various other projects that appear to exclusively serve the A's luxury development – a speculative prioritization of taxpayer resources that is out of touch with the interests of Oakland residents, serving a project which is at odds with ACTC policy goals and should not be foisted upon the County's taxpayers which have already invested in the transportation infrastructure at the Coliseum.

The A's have claimed repeatedly that they will privately finance a new ballpark, yet they have neglected to provide a transparent, comprehensive cost of the project at Howard Terminal. With respect to transportation infrastructure, these projects highlight how much more expensive it will be for the A's to move from the current Coliseum location to an unworkable industrial site on the Oakland Estuary – and apparently the A's and the City of Oakland want County taxpayers to subsidize the transportation infrastructure that would be needed to build the stadium at this new location as well. It had been publicly speculated that the City's infrastructure investment associated with a new waterfront development could reach [upwards of \\$200 million](#), the same amount as what the city offered to the Raiders in [2017](#), but the CTP shows the A's actually want to saddle taxpayers with a financial burden nearly 8 times that initial estimate – and for a "privately-financed" stadium using public money the team has said it would not require.

Given the current economic climate amid a global pandemic, Oakland and Alameda County are continuing to grapple with a substantial decline in tax revenue. In May, Alameda County Administrator Susan Muranishi warned that the Board of Supervisors would need to deal with the abrupt economic downturn faster than previously expected. The county's [baseline budget shortfall](#) is close to \$140 million – and possibly much larger. Even though these projects sit in the long-term portion of the CTP, it is more imperative than ever that the allocation of taxpayer dollars needs to be focused on helping those who have been impacted by the devastation of the pandemic, not fund new transportation infrastructure for a

luxury ballpark, housing, and retail development at Howard Terminal which is entirely duplicative of the transportation infrastructure which already supports the Coliseum location.

If the team's waterfront project is ultimately approved, the Oakland A's – not taxpayers – should be responsible for financing and building the necessary transportation infrastructure, and not wait decades for the long-range planning process associated with the CTP. If the A's intend to build at Howard Terminal, basic safety projects, such as grade separations and fan access such as contemplated in the CTP, need to be built immediately along with initial stadium development. These projects are not currently in the CTP, should not be in the CTP, and should be the responsibility of the A's – not County taxpayers.

It is the team that is proposing to build on an exceptionally problematic industrial site for its new stadium. And, in the process, the A's would leave their current home at the Oakland-Alameda County Coliseum which already has the existing taxpayer-subsidized infrastructure, including a dedicated BART station, multiple freeway on-ramps and off-ramps, a direct link to Amtrak, the Oakland Airport connector, and acres of space for adequate parking. County taxpayers should not be asked to fund another \$1 billion-plus in subsidies for a "privately financed" stadium when the Coliseum already has all of the infrastructure necessary to be successfully redeveloped with minimal additional public dollars.

Moreover, as it stands now, while the City is in its initial review stages of planning at the request of the A's, their project has little chance of being developed. The A's are proposing uses and construction which is not lawful under the BCDC Seaport Plan. The A's are proposing uses which are inconsistent with the state tidelands trust on state property managed for those purposes and have very high hurdles to meet at the State Lands Commission. And, the location selected for public open spaces and housing, along with the stadium and office space is under a restrictive covenant between the Port and the state Department of Toxic Substances Control that prohibits housing and public open space.

With little information on development plans or funding mechanisms for the ballpark at Howard Terminal, there continues to be real concerns about the project that have yet to be addressed. The City and County must employ a transparent process in evaluating the Howard Terminal project and its affiliated planning components to ensure Alameda County taxpayers are protected. In the meantime, these projects should be removed from the Draft CTP.

Sincerely,

East Oakland Stadium Alliance

CC: Alameda County Transportation Commissioners
Carolyn Clevenger



September 30, 2020

Carolyn Clevenger
Deputy Executive Director of Planning and Policy
Alameda County Transportation Commission
1111 Broadway, 8th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607

Delivered via email to: clevenger@AlamedaCTC.org

Re: Comments on Draft 2020 Countywide Transportation Plan

Dear Ms. Clevenger,

On behalf of the members of the Pacific Merchant Shipping Association (PMSA), I am pleased to submit these comments on ACTC's Draft 2020 Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP). As you are aware, PMSA represents marine terminal operators, ocean carriers, and other maritime-focused transportation providers in the international, intermodal supply chain. Every container handled at the Port of Oakland which is moved through this vital Northern California seaport and international gateway is processed and handled by at least one member of PMSA and often by multiple PMSA members.

PMSA members are primary and principal stakeholders in the success of the Port of Oakland, an enterprise agency. Without the long-term commitments of billions of dollars in future lease revenues of marine terminal operators and the decisions by ocean carriers to call on the Port of Oakland at these terminals, the Port would simply cease to be able to reinvest in its operations and infrastructure, including the cutting edge technology and environmental investments which are made and operated collaboratively between the Port and our members.

In short, aside from the Port itself, no group of stakeholders has a more direct and primary interest in seeing the Port of Oakland grow, thrive, invest, and continue to innovate than PMSA's members.

PMSA was also pleased to participate in the development of, and to support the adoption of, the ACTC 2016 Goods Movement Plan. PMSA offers its comments today in support of the long-term success of the Port of Oakland to attract cargo and achieve its vision of improved sustainability as well as in support of ACTC meeting its Goods Movement Plan objectives.

Draft Includes Framework of Potential Strategies and Critical Gateway Investments to Support Sustained Win-Win Economic Growth and Environmental Improvements at the Port of Oakland

PMSA supports the Draft CTP's focus on improving goods movement mobility and seaport sustainability both with respect to economic and environmental impacts. In particular, PMSA endorses the ACTC Staff's identification of "Potential Strategies" for improving Countywide Goods Movement and to set important policy benchmarks for projects (see Table 4, "Potential Strategies to Consider Including in CTP

for Goods Movement” (2020 CTP Needs Assessment Pt. 2, March 2, 2020). These important Potential Strategies include all of the following:

- “Targeted Infrastructure Investments” to include projects “to address identified truck delays” and as “multi-modal projects improving access and efficiency at the Port of Oakland.”
- “Freight Guidelines for Complete Streets” to develop “guidelines, and best practices” which will “reduce conflicts between goods movement and transit, bicycles, and pedestrians...”
- “Near-Zero and Zero-Emission Technology” to “[t]arget freight corridors and facilities in communities with greatest adverse impacts from freight emissions.”
- “Land use guidelines and incentive programs” to focus planning improvements that result in “setting up buffer zones, incentives, to preserve buffers ... and reduction of negative impacts on communities from freight operations.”
- “Truck Access Management” to include a priority to “[e]valuate direct truck access between the Port and I-880.”
- “At-Grade Crossing Safety and Grade Separation Policy and Program” to develop and implement “at-grade crossing safety and grade separation policy.”
- “Resilient Airport and Seaport” with a focus to “[p]rotect existing critical infrastructure by investing in ... seaport infrastructure that is resilient to the forecasted effects of climate change.”

We would request that the final CTP reflect an adoption of each of these Strategies.

In furtherance of these Strategies, and in support of the adopted 2016 Goods Movement Plan, PMSA strongly supports the inclusion of each of these items:

“Draft Final 10-Year Priority Projects and Programs for the 2020 CTP”

ID 10:	7th Street Grade Separation West	Port of Oakland	\$312m
ID 45:	Near and Mid-Term Port Operations and Emission Reductions - Project Bundle		
45A	Roundhouse EV Charging Facility	Port of Oakland	\$12m
45B	Seaport Near Dock Rail Enhancements	Port of Oakland	\$8m
45C	Port Operational Efficiency Enhancements	Port of Oakland	\$25m
45D	Port Wide Electrification	Port of Oakland	TBD*

“Draft Final 30-Year Project List for the 2020 CTP”

ID 185:	Inner Harbor Turning Basin	Port of Oakland	\$350m
ID 186:	Outer Harbor Turning Basin Expansion	Port of Oakland	\$80m
ID 263:	Seaport Pavement Mgmt/Paving Program	Port of Oakland	\$150m
ID 310:	Marine Terminal Modernization	Port of Oakland	\$74m
ID 311:	Port Wide Electrification	Port of Oakland	\$218m
ID 312:	Seaport Emergency Power System	Port of Oakland	\$20m

* To clarify with respect to Port Wide Electrification, we support ACTC efforts to contribute to efforts to build the enhanced infrastructure necessary to accommodate broader efforts for enhancing electrification of port activities, including shorepower, for instance, as the Port of Oakland plugs in more vessels than any other Port in the world.

Each of these critical projects step beyond the traditional revenue-bonding infrastructure development model of the Port and are capital improvement projects that deliver multiple benefits across several of the proposed CTP Strategies and they will improve efficiency, capacity, and the environment.

ACTC Should Not Include “Howard Terminal”-Related Projects Requested by the City of Oakland in the 30-Year Project List of the 2020 CTP

PMSA is both surprised and disappointed to see a number of proposed projects in the proposed “Draft Final 30-Year Project List for the 2020 CTP” submitted by the City of Oakland in relation to the “Howard Terminal.”

The Howard Terminal at the Port of Oakland is currently an operating multi-modal truck and equipment staging facility which processes over 325,000 gate transactions a year, taking trucks out of the community of West Oakland, reducing congestion by accommodating non-peak hour truck moves, and reducing VMT and emissions by having on-Port near-dock access to intermodal equipment storage and parking. Howard Terminal also serves as a lay berth for vessels. The Howard Terminal is managed under trust for the State of California by the Port as a trustee/grantee and is obligated under the tidelands trust to facilitate waterfront-dependent uses and any change to this status requires affirmative review and findings by the State Lands Commission. Under the BCDC Seaport Plan the Howard Terminal is designated as a Seaport Priority Use area and consistent with all of the above the property is zoned as Port Industrial under the City’s general plan and zoning ordinances. Howard Terminal is also subject to a settlement agreement between the Port and the state Department of Toxic Substances Control which imposed a legal restriction on the property which bans all non-industrial uses, including for public open space, recreational, or housing uses.

We are surprised to see the Howard Terminal on this project list because while the Oakland A’s currently have a proposal submitted to the City of Oakland for environmental review and an Exclusive Negotiating Agreement with the Port of Oakland to potentially negotiate tentative rights to this property for a Housing/Office/Stadium entertainment complex, no such project actually exists at this time. Moreover, not only has this project not yet moved beyond the initial review and concept phases, indeed the Oakland City Council has not even seen a project proposal, but the development of this project as conceived by the Oakland A’s remains patently unlawful under application of current state law, local restrictions, and by land use covenant.

We are disappointed to see the proposed Howard Terminal development on this project list because the inclusion of these projects run counter to ACTC’s goals and policies, the stadium project is an ill-conceived transportation nightmare, and the attempt by the Oakland A’s to force over a billion dollars of project costs onto the taxpayers of Alameda County is reprehensible given current public investment in the Coliseum location. First, the Howard Terminal project as proposed by the Oakland A’s results in numerous outcomes which run counter to the goals of ACTC: it increases congestion, it increases emissions, it is anti-transit, it will impede freight efficiency, it increases truck idling, it increases truck VMT, it increases truck congestion, it decreases Port access, it increases pedestrian-truck and bicycle-truck risk of death and injury, and is in conflict with and poses safety issues with freight and passenger rail services, it threatens completion of the turning basin expansion, threatens to undermine the financing for port electrification projects, and walks away from TOD planning principles in the process.

The Oakland A's can avoid all of these outcomes by simply staying at and redeveloping the current Oakland Coliseum complex, where the people of Alameda County have already invested hundreds of millions of dollars of public money into the creation of a fully-accessible stadium complex with BART, freeway, regional Amtrak, and even direct airport access with numerous acres for parking.

Given that the Oakland A's have pledged that their stadium project will be "privately financed" and targeted 2023 for the year that they intended to have their first game a new stadium. If approved by the City, they will doubtlessly be responsible as the private project sponsor to achieve the levels of transportation infrastructure, rail and grade separation safety, and pedestrian access projects in order to facilitate not only the access of fans to the stadium, but residents of over 3,000 housing units, and workers at 1.5 million square feet of new office space and a hotel, an entertainment venue, restaurants, and the stadium. These uses will have *immediate* safety issues with the at-grade railroad crossing, lack of transit access to the site, and hundreds of thousands of truck moves which occur in the immediately proximate heavy-weight trucking corridors.

Given the timeline of the Howard Terminal project, as we understand the proposal, the inclusion of transportation elements on the "30-Year Project List" for Howard Terminal is bizarre. If the aspects of the Oakland A's proposal, including grade separations and safe fan access, are essential to the safety of fans, residents, workers, and visitors on the site, then it is most reasonable to presume that the Oakland A's will be required to fund and construct these elements of its project up front and as part of initial project development. Thus, all of these elements will be constructed and in-use well before ACTC begins to review which of the projects on its "30-Year List" to begin to evaluate. Otherwise, one must conclude that the City of Oakland does not intend to require that these access elements be part of the construction of the Howard Terminal project (or required as part of an approved EIR). But this would not only externalize the actual project costs onto the taxpayers of Alameda County, contrary to the "privately financed" promises of the A's, but also purposefully expose fans and residents to unnecessary grade-crossing risks for decades in the process. These are unacceptable outcomes.

The A's should fully carry the costs of their project up-front and should be responsible for mitigating and remediating all of their own project impacts and, furthermore, the City of Oakland should not foist the costs of its sports franchises on the whole of Alameda County to the tune of an additional \$1.2 billion.

Therefore, PMSA is strongly opposed to the inclusion of each of these items in the "Draft Final 30-Year Project List for the 2020 CTP":

ID 173: Gondola Project Phase 1 Washington Street	Oakland	\$350m
ID 174: Gondola Project Phase 2 Alameda Connection	Oakland	\$569m
ID 175: Howard Terminal Railroad Grade Separation Project for Vehicles and for Pedestrians/Bikes	Oakland	\$298m

PMSA is also opposed to the reduction of interstate highway mileage and capacity at the foot of our seaport operations, which will also likely result in increased congestion, emissions, idling, and lost productivity for trucks entering and exiting the Seaport. We would ask that ACTC remove the Oakland the "I-980 Multimodal Boulevard Study" (ID 283, \$2m) from the 30-year project list.

Thank you for considering our comments on the Draft 2020 CTP. If you have any questions or would like to further discuss any of these comments, please do not hesitate to call or email me at your earliest convenience.

Best,



Mike Jacob
Vice President & General Counsel

cc: Tess Lengyel, Executive Director
Kristen Villanueva, Sr. Transportation Planner

This page intentionally left blank

10-Year Priority Projects and Programs for the 2020 CTP

ID ¹	Project	Sponsor Agency	Location	Total Cost (\$ Millions) ^{2,3}
1	Alameda Point Transit Network Improvements	AC Transit	Alameda	\$150
2	Division 4 Replacement (Phase 1)	AC Transit	N/A	\$30
3	Fruitvale Ave. Corridor Short Term Improvements	AC Transit	Oakland	\$61
4	Shattuck Ave./Martin Luther King Jr. Way Corridor	AC Transit	Berkeley Oakland	\$57
5	West Grand Ave. Corridor ⁴	AC Transit Oakland	Oakland	\$93
	A - Grand Avenue Corridor Bus Lanes	AC Transit	Oakland	\$83
	B - West Grand Ave. Road Diet	Oakland	Oakland	\$10
6	East Lewelling Boulevard Complete Streets (Phase 2)	ACPWA	Uninc. Central County	\$10
7	Hesperian Boulevard (Phase 2)	ACPWA	Uninc. Central County	\$15
8	Niles Canyon Trail (Phase 1)	ACPWA	Fremont	\$30
9	Tesla Rd. Safety Improvements (Phase 1)	ACPWA	Uninc. East County	\$15
10	Lincoln Avenue/Marshall Way Safety Improvements	Alameda	Alameda	\$5
11	Shoreline Overtopping Near Webster and Posey Tubes	Alameda	Alameda	\$30
12	Willie Stargell Bus Priority and Multimodal Safety Corridor	Alameda	Alameda	\$6
13	7th Street Grade Separation West	Alameda CTC	Port of Oakland	\$312
14	East 14th/Mission and Fremont Blvd Corridor ⁴	Alameda CTC	Central and South County	\$280
	A - Fremont Boulevard Complete Street in Downtown and Irvington PDAs	Fremont	Fremont	\$24
	B - Mission Blvd. / East 14th Phase III	ACPWA	Uninc. Central County	\$45
	C - Mission Blvd Phase 3 Improvements	Hayward	Hayward	\$18
	D - Mission Blvd (SR 238) "Complete Street" Project	Union City	Union City	\$20
	E - Walnut Avenue Protected Bikeway (Phase 2) in Downtown PDA: Paseo Padre to Argonaut	Fremont	Fremont	\$3
15	East Bay Greenway (Phase 1) ^{4,5}	Alameda CTC	Multiple	\$288
	A - East Bay Greenway	Alameda CTC	North and Central County	\$224
	B - East Bay Greenway (Reach 6): Innovation District to Bay Trail	Fremont	Fremont	\$62
	C - East Bay Greenway: Irvington BART Station Area	Fremont	Fremont	\$2
16	I-680 Express Lanes: SR-84 to Alcosta (Phase 1 - Southbound)	Alameda CTC	Dublin Pleasanton	\$260
17	I-680/SR-84 Interchange and SR-84 Expressway	Alameda CTC	Uninc. East County	\$244
18	I-580/I-680 Interchange (Phase 1)	Alameda CTC	Dublin Pleasanton	\$300
19	I-80/Ashby Avenue Interchange Modernization	Alameda CTC	Berkeley Emeryville	\$100
20	I-80/Gilman Street Interchange Modernization	Alameda CTC	Berkeley	\$62

10-Year Priority Projects and Programs for the 2020 CTP

ID ¹	Project	Sponsor Agency	Location	Total Cost (\$ Millions) ^{2,3}
21	I-880/Winton Avenue/A Street Interchange Modernization	Alameda CTC	Hayward	\$114
22	I-880/Whipple Rd./Industrial Pkwy SW Interchange Modernizations	Alameda CTC	Hayward Union City	\$220
23	Oakland/Alameda Access Project	Alameda CTC	Alameda Oakland	\$114
24	Rail Safety and Connectivity ⁴	Alameda CTC	Multiple	\$155
	<i>A - Railroad Quiet Zone Multimodal Safety Project</i>	Berkeley	Berkeley	\$11
	<i>B - Railroad At-Grade Corridor Safety Project through Jack London District</i>	Oakland	Oakland	\$18
	<i>C - Railroad Crossing Upgrades - Near Term Safety Enhancements</i>	San Leandro	San Leandro	\$3
	<i>D - UPRR Quiet Zones: Centerville Area, Tier 1 Priorities</i>	Fremont	Fremont	\$4
25	San Pablo Avenue Corridor ⁴	Alameda CTC	North County	\$312
	<i>A - San Pablo Avenue Complete Streets Corridor</i>	Berkeley	Berkeley	\$7
	<i>B - San Pablo Complete Streets</i>	Albany	Albany	\$5
26	SR-262 Mission Boulevard Cross Connector Improvements (Phase 1 – Warm Springs Grade Separation and Local Road Safety)	Alameda CTC	Fremont	\$350
27	Solano Avenue Complete Streets	Albany	Albany	\$12
28	19th Street Bike Station Plaza	BART	Oakland	\$6
29	19th Street/Oakland BART Station Street Elevator	BART	Oakland	\$12
30	Bay Fair Connection	BART	N/A	\$234
31	BART Core Capacity	BART	N/A	\$1,587
32	BART Next Generation Fare Gates ⁶	BART	Multiple	\$35
33	Dublin/Pleasanton BART Station Active Access Improvements	BART	Dublin/Pleasanton	\$16
34	Hayward Maintenance Complex (Phase 1) ⁶	BART	N/A	\$209
35	Irvington BART Station	BART Fremont	Fremont	\$230
36	Lake Merritt BART Station Area Improvements	BART Oakland	Oakland	\$60
37	North Berkeley BART Station Active Access Improvements	BART	Berkeley	\$13
38	Transit Operations Facility (TOF) ⁶	BART	N/A	\$60
39	West Oakland TOD	BART	Oakland	\$30
40	Adeline Street Corridor Transportation Improvements	Berkeley	Berkeley	\$11
41	Martin Luther King Jr Way Complete Streets Corridor	Berkeley	Berkeley	\$10
42	Telegraph Avenue Multimodal Corridor	Berkeley	Berkeley	\$9
43	South Bay Connect	CCJPA	Multiple	\$264
44	Dublin Blvd. - North Canyons Pkwy Extension	Dublin	Dublin	\$164

10-Year Priority Projects and Programs for the 2020 CTP

ID ¹	Project	Sponsor Agency	Location	Total Cost (\$ Millions) ^{2,3}
45	I-580/Fallon/El Charro Interchange Modernization (Phase 2)	Dublin	Dublin Pleasanton	\$32
46	40th Street Transit-Only Lanes and Multimodal Enhancements	Emeryville	Emeryville	\$16
47	Greenway and Mandela Connector	Emeryville	Emeryville	\$3
48	Quiet Zone Safety Engineering Measures	Emeryville	Emeryville	\$9
49	Dumbarton to Quarry Lakes Trail	Fremont	Fremont	\$25
50	I-680 Interchange Modernizations at Washington and Mission ⁴	Fremont	Fremont	\$20
	<i>A - I-680/Mission Boulevard (North) Interchange Modernization</i>	<i>Fremont</i>	<i>Fremont</i>	<i>\$10</i>
	<i>B - I-680/Washington Boulevard Interchange Modernization</i>	<i>Fremont</i>	<i>Fremont</i>	<i>\$10</i>
51	Sabercat Trail: Irvington BART to Ohlone College	Fremont	Fremont	\$56
52	Downtown Hayward PDA Multimodal Complete Streets	Hayward	Hayward	\$35
53	Main Street Complete Street	Hayward	Hayward	\$5
54	Rt 92/Clawiter/Whitesell Interchange Modernization	Hayward	Hayward	\$40
55	Tennyson Rd. Corridor PDA Complete Streets	Hayward	Hayward	\$5
56	Atlantis O&M Facility	LAVTA	East County	\$33
57	I-580/First Street Interchange Modernization	Livermore	Livermore	\$62
58	I-580/Vasco Road Interchange Modernization	Livermore	Livermore	\$81
59	Bay Bridge Forward ⁴	MTC/ABAG Alameda CTC	Oakland Emeryville	\$136
	<i>A - The Link: Improved Bike/Ped Access to East Span of San Francisco – Oakland Bay Bridge</i>	<i>MTC/ABAG</i>	<i>Oakland</i>	<i>\$63</i>
60	San Francisco Bay Trail and Bay Trail Connectors (Phase 1)	MTC/ABAG	Multiple	N/A
61	I-580 Design Alternatives Assessments (DAAs) Implementation (Phase 1)	MTC/ABAG Alameda CTC	Central and South County	\$128
62	Decoto Road Complete Streets/Dumbarton Corridor ⁴	Multiple	Fremont Union City	\$62
	<i>A - Decoto Road Complete Street: I-880 to Paseo Padre Parkway</i>	<i>Fremont</i>	<i>Fremont</i>	<i>\$20</i>
	<i>B - I-880/Decoto Road Interchange Modernization</i>	<i>Fremont</i>	<i>Fremont</i>	<i>\$10</i>
	<i>C - Bayside TOD PDA Transit Station and Pedestrian Overcrossing</i>	<i>Newark</i>	<i>Newark</i>	<i>\$12</i>
	<i>D - Decoto Road Complete Streets Project</i>	<i>Union City</i>	<i>Union City</i>	<i>\$20</i>
63	Iron Horse Trail ⁴	Multiple	East County	\$48
	<i>A - Iron Horse Trail Crossing (old SPRR ROW) at Dublin Boulevard</i>	<i>Dublin</i>	<i>Dublin</i>	<i>\$10</i>
	<i>B - Livermore Iron Horse Trail</i>	<i>Livermore</i>	<i>Livermore</i>	<i>\$20</i>
	<i>C - Iron Horse Trail Improvements</i>	<i>Pleasanton</i>	<i>Pleasanton</i>	<i>\$18</i>

10-Year Priority Projects and Programs for the 2020 CTP

ID ¹	Project	Sponsor Agency	Location	Total Cost (\$ Millions) ^{2,3}
64	Central Avenue Overpass	Newark	Newark	\$35
65	Thornton Avenue Complete Streets Corridor	Newark	Newark	\$26
66	42nd Ave. & High St. I-880 Access Improvements	Oakland	Oakland	\$18
67	Bancroft Avenue Greenway	Oakland	Oakland	\$18
68	Broadway Transit Corridor	Oakland	Oakland	\$22
69	Downtown Oakland East-West Safe Streets ⁴	Oakland	Oakland	\$20
	A - 14th Street Safe Routes in the City	Oakland	Oakland	\$14
	B - 19th Street BART to Lake Merritt Urban Greenway	Oakland	Oakland	\$6
70	East Bay BRT Corridor Safety Improvements ⁴	Oakland	Oakland	\$34
	A - East Bay BRT Corridor Pedestrian Safety Improvements	Oakland	Oakland	\$20
	B - East 12th St. Bikeway	Oakland	Oakland	\$14
71	East Oakland Neighborhood Bikeways	Oakland	Oakland	\$28
72	Oakland Army Base Infrastructure Improvements	Oakland	Oakland/Port of Oakland	\$34
73	Telegraph Avenue Complete Streets	Oakland	Oakland	\$11
74	MacArthur Smart City Corridor	Oakland	Oakland	\$13
75	West Oakland Industrial Streets ⁴	Oakland	Oakland	\$31
	A - West Oakland Industrial Streets	Oakland	Oakland	\$10
	B - 7th Street Connection Project	Oakland	Oakland	\$21
76	I-680 Sunol Interchange Modernization	Pleasanton	Pleasanton	\$45
77	West Las Positas Bike Corridor Improvements	Pleasanton	Pleasanton	\$13
78	Doolittle Drive Resiliency	Port of Oakland	Port of Oakland Alameda	\$50
79	Near and Mid-Term Port Operations and Emission Reductions ⁴	Port of Oakland	Port of Oakland	\$120
	A - Roundhouse EV Charging Facility	Port of Oakland	Port of Oakland	\$12
	B - Seaport Near Dock Rail Enhancements	Port of Oakland	Port of Oakland	\$8
	C - Port Operational Efficiency Enhancements	Port of Oakland	Port of Oakland	\$25
	D - Port Wide Electrification	Port of Oakland	Port of Oakland	\$75
80	Oakland International Airport Perimeter Dike	Port of Oakland	Port of Oakland Alameda	\$53
81	ACE Medium-Term Service Increases	SJRRC	East and South County	\$166
82	Downtown San Leandro Streetscapes	San Leandro	San Leandro	\$6
83	San Leandro BART Station Area Safety Improvements	San Leandro	San Leandro	\$5
84	San Leandro Creek Trail	San Leandro	San Leandro	\$33
85	Valley Link ⁴	TVSJVRRRA	East County	\$2,142
	A - Valley Link (Dublin/Pleasanton BART to Mountain House)	TVSJVRRRA	East County	\$2,040
	B - Greenville /Valley Link Multimodal Improvements	Livermore	Livermore	\$40
	C - Isabel/Valley Link Multimodal Improvements	Livermore	Livermore	\$23

10-Year Priority Projects and Programs for the 2020 CTP

ID ¹	Project	Sponsor Agency	Location	Total Cost (\$ Millions) ^{2,3}
	<i>D - S. Front/Valley Link Multimodal Improvements</i>	<i>Livermore</i>	<i>Livermore</i>	<i>\$39</i>
86	Union Landing Transit Center Modifications	UC Transit	Union City	\$5
87	Quarry Lakes Parkway (Segments 1-4)	Union City	Union City	\$208
88	Berkeley-San Francisco Ferry	WETA	Berkeley	\$60
89	Redwood City-San Francisco-Oakland Ferry	WETA	Alameda Oakland	\$60
90	Seaplane Lagoon-San Francisco Ferry	WETA	Alameda	\$42
91	Mobility for Seniors and People with Disabilities – Paratransit ⁷	Alameda CTC	Multiple	N/A
92	Safe Routes to School ⁷	Alameda CTC	Multiple	N/A
93	Student Transit Pass Program ⁷	Alameda CTC	N/A	N/A
94	State of Good Repair (Local Streets and Roads) ⁷	Multiple	Multiple	N/A
95	Transit Operations ⁷	Multiple	N/A	N/A

Notes:

1. Projects are sorted in alphabetical order by sponsor.
2. Costs shown are for capital costs only. They represent planning-level estimates and are subject to change as projects move through development stages.
3. Total cost reflects information provided by sponsors in CTP project submittals unless indicated as a "Phase" in the project name. These phased costs reflect an estimate of expenditure that could occur within 10-year window.
4. This priority project represents a project bundle of constituent projects, some or all of which are shown below indicated by ordered letters.
5. ROW costs are not included.
6. Represents an approximation of an Alameda County share of the regional BART project.
7. Represents an on-going programmatic commitment of Alameda CTC.

Fully Funded Project List for the 2020 CTP

ID	Project	Sponsor Agency	Total Cost (\$ millions)
96	Meekland Avenue Corridor Improvements	ACPWA	\$9
97	Central Avenue Safety Improvements	Alameda	\$15
98	New Alameda Point Ferry Terminal	Alameda	\$22
99	Ralph Appezzato Memorial Parkway Dedicated Bus Lanes or Bus Queue Jump Lanes	Alameda	\$9
100	7th Street Grade Separation East	Alameda CTC	\$317
101	I-680 Express Lanes (NB): SR-84 to Automall Pkwy Phase 1	Alameda CTC	\$236
102	19th Street/Oakland BART Station Modernization	BART	\$50
103	Milvia Bikeway Project	Berkeley	\$3
104	Shattuck Complete Streets and De-Couplet	Berkeley	\$10
105	Southside Complete Streets & Transit Improvement	Berkeley	\$9
106	Dougherty Road Widening	Dublin	\$23
107	Dublin Boulevard widening	Dublin	\$7
108	Fremont Boulevard & Thornton Avenue Complete Streets in Centerville PDA, (Part of former SR 84)	Fremont	\$9
109	Fremont Boulevard Safe and Smart Corridor	Fremont	\$11
110	Relinquished State Route 84: State of Good Repair Improvements <i>Funded through Local Area Transportation Improvement Plan subject to sale of surplus State ROW</i>	Fremont	\$18
111	Warm Springs BART West Access Bridge and Plaza	Fremont	\$41
112	Mission Blvd Phase 2 Improvements	Hayward	\$33
113	Fruitvale Alive Gap Closure Streetscape Project	Oakland	\$9
114	14th Avenue Streetscape Project	Oakland	\$7
115	Union City Intermodal Station, Phase 3	Union City	\$75

Notes: Fully funded projects are included for informational and funding close-out purposes. Some of these may be open by the time the 2020 CTP is adopted.

30-Year Project List for the 2020 CTP

ID ¹	Project	Sponsor Agency	Total Cost (\$ millions) ²
116	Foothill Blvd Corridor Short Term Improvements	AC Transit	\$50
117	Castro Valley Boulevard Streetscape Improvement Phase II	ACPWA	\$25
118	Crow Canyon Road Safety Improvements	ACPWA	\$10
119	East 14th Phase I (Retrofit to add Class IV)	ACPWA	\$20
120	Estuary Bridges Maintenance and Repairs	ACPWA	\$15
121	Fruitvale Avenue (Miller Sweeney) Lifeline Bridge Project	ACPWA	\$63
122	Niles Canyon Trail (Phase 2)	ACPWA	\$120
123	Patterson Pass Road Safety Improvements	ACPWA	\$15
124	San Lorenzo Creek Trail Project	ACPWA	\$34
125	Strobridge Avenue IC Modifications / Ramp Improvements	ACPWA	\$20
126	Tesla Road Safety Improvements Phase II	ACPWA	\$11
127	Vasco Road Safety Improvement Phase II	ACPWA	\$22
128	Clement Ave. and Tilden Way Complete Streets	Alameda	\$15
129	West End Bike/Ped Crossing	Alameda	\$150
130	East Bay Greenway (Phase 2)	Alameda CTC	\$350
131	I-580/I-680 Interchange (Phase 2)	Alameda CTC	\$1,200
132	I-680 Express Lanes (NB): Automall Pkwy to SC County Line Phase 2	Alameda CTC	\$130
133	I-680 Express Lanes: SR-84 to Alcosta Phase 2 (northbound)	Alameda CTC	\$228
134	I-680 Express Bus to Silicon Valley	Alameda CTC	\$75
135	SR-262 Mission Boulevard Cross Connector Improvements (Phase 2)	Alameda CTC	\$562
136	Ashby Avenue Complete Streets Corridor	Berkeley	\$3
137	Berkeley Marina Bay Trail Extension and University Avenue Reconstruction	Berkeley	\$88
138	Center Street Plaza Project	Berkeley	\$3
139	College Avenue Complete Streets Corridor	Berkeley	\$3
140	Dwight & Channing Complete Streets Corridor	Berkeley	\$4
141	Gilman Street Complete Streets Corridor	Berkeley	\$8
142	Ohlone Greenway and Intersection Improvement Project	Berkeley	\$7
143	Sacramento Complete Streets Corridor	Berkeley	\$3
144	Shattuck Avenue Complete Streets Corridor	Berkeley	\$15
145	University Avenue Complete Streets Corridor	Berkeley	\$4
146	I-580 Interchange Improvements at Hacienda	Dublin	\$36
147	Tassajara Road Widening from N. Dublin Ranch Drive to City Limit	Dublin	\$23
148	Powell Street Bridge Widening	Emeryville	\$9
149	Auto Mall Parkway Improvements Near I-680	Fremont	\$50
150	Fremont Boulevard Complete Streets in Warm Springs PDA	Fremont	\$5
151	Grimmer Greenway Trail: Central Park to Fremont Boulevard	Fremont	\$6
152	Grimmer to Pacific Commons Trail w/ new I-880 Bridge	Fremont	\$51
153	Kato Road Complete Street	Fremont	\$7

30-Year Project List for the 2020 CTP

ID ¹	Project	Sponsor Agency	Total Cost (\$ millions) ²
154	Mission Creek Trail Gap Closure: Palm Avenue to Mission Boulevard	Fremont	\$4
155	Mowry Ave. Complete Streets w/ new Bike/Ped Tunnel at UPRR Undercrossing (Part of former SR 84)	Fremont	\$10
156	Peralta Ave. Complete Streets (Part of former SR 84)	Fremont	\$14
157	Shinn Trail Connection to Niles w/ new Alameda Creek Bridge	Fremont	\$10
158	UPRR Quiet Zones: Other Fremont Locations	Fremont	\$4
159	Vargas Road Safety Improvements	Fremont	\$5
160	Fremont BART Station Modernization	Fremont BART	\$5
161	Hayward Blvd Multi-modal Project	Hayward	\$3
162	Mission Blvd. Linear Park	Hayward	\$5
163	First Street Bike Improvements	Livermore	\$3
164	I-580 Greenville Road Interchange Improvements	Livermore	\$68
165	I-580 SR-84/Isabel Interchange Improvements Phase 2	Livermore	\$43
166	San Francisco Bay Trail and Bay Trail Connectors (Phase 2)	MTC/ABAG	N/A
167	I-580 Design Alternatives Assessments (DAAs) Implementation (Phase 2)	MTC/ABAG Alameda CTC	\$272
168	27th Street Complete Streets Corridor	Oakland	\$4
169	Coliseum City Transit Hub/Coliseum City infrastructure	Oakland	\$200
170	East Oakland Industrial Streets (Central Estuary Plan)	Oakland	\$65
171	Lakeside Family Streets	Oakland	\$5
172	Park Boulevard Path	Oakland	\$5
173	West Oakland Industrial Streets (Phase 2)	Oakland	\$50
174	Downtown Parking Garage	Pleasanton	\$68
175	Extension of El Charro Road from Stoneridge Drive to Stanley Blvd	Pleasanton	\$137
176	Foothill Road Complete Streets	Pleasanton	<\$1
177	I-680 Overcrossing Widening and Improvements (at Stoneridge Drive)	Pleasanton	\$44
178	Santa Rita Road I-580 Overcrossing Widening	Pleasanton	\$49
179	Airport Drive Rehabilitation	Port of Oakland	\$9
180	Inner Harbor Turning Basin	Port of Oakland	\$350
181	Outer Harbor Turning Basin Expansion	Port of Oakland	\$80
182	Dumbarton Rail/Group Rapid Transit	SAMTRANS	\$3,255
183	Cross Town Class IV Corridors and Williams St. Pedestrian Improvements	San Leandro	\$4
184	Doolittle Drive Streetscape	San Leandro	\$12
185	MacArthur Blvd Roundabout, Streetscape, and Park & Ride	San Leandro	\$4
186	Marina Boulevard Streetscape	San Leandro	\$10
187	Altamont Corridor Vision (ACE)	SJRRRC	\$917
188	I-880/Alvarado-Niles Interchange "Complete Streets" Modifications	Union City	\$20

30-Year Project List for the 2020 CTP

ID ¹	Project	Sponsor Agency	Total Cost (\$ millions) ²
189	Quarry Lakes Parkway (Segment 5)	Union City	\$60
190	Station District Pedestrian Bridge	Union City	\$15
191	Union City Boulevard Widening (Whipple to City Limit)	Union City	\$17
192	Whipple Road Widening Project	Union City	\$25

Notes:

1. Projects are sorted in alphabetical order by sponsor.
2. Costs shown are for capital costs only. They represent planning-level estimates and are subject to change as projects move through development stages.

Programmatic Projects for the 2020 CTP

ID ¹	Project	Sponsor Agency	Total Cost (\$ millions)
<i>Bike/Ped Plan Implementation</i>			
194	Bicycle Master Plan Build-out	Alameda	\$41
195	Pedestrian Master Plan Build-out	Alameda	\$40
196	Vision Zero Action Plan and Safe Routes to School Build-out	Alameda	\$25
197	Active Transportation Program	Albany	\$21
198	Citywide Bicycle Parking	Berkeley	\$4
199	Citywide Bike Boulevard/Major Street Intersections Project	Berkeley	\$8
200	Complete Streets & Transit Corridor Studies and Implementation	Berkeley	\$20
201	West Berkeley Areawide Pedestrian & Bicycle Improvements	Berkeley	\$10
202	SR2S Improvements	Dublin	\$7
203	Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Implementation	Emeryville	\$59
204	Village Greens and Greenways	Emeryville	\$5
205	Citywide ADA Sidewalk and Intersection Improvements	Fremont	\$95
206	Citywide Bike Master Plan Implementation	Fremont	\$164
207	Citywide Pedestrian Master Plan Implementation	Fremont	\$80
208	Citywide Safe Routes to Schools Improvements	Fremont	\$25
209	Citywide Trails Plan Implementation	Fremont	\$50
210	Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan	Hayward	\$25
211	Safe Routes to Schools	Hayward	\$2
212	Livermore Bicycle, Pedestrian & Active Transportation Plan	Livermore	\$183
213	Community Based Transportation Plans: Implementation and Planning	Multiple	\$100
214	Citywide Bicycle Master Plan Implementation	Newark	\$28
215	Citywide Pedestrian Master Plan implementation	Newark	\$47
216	ADA 30-Year Curb Ramp Transition Plan	Oakland	\$66
217	Bike Plan Short-Term Priority Corridors	Oakland	\$17
218	City-Wide Bay Trail Network	Oakland	\$8
219	City-Wide Bike Plan Implementation Program	Oakland	\$76
220	Citywide Sidewalk Repairs	Oakland	\$30
221	Downtown Oakland Specific Plan (DOSPP) Mobility Implementation Projects	Oakland	\$60
222	Implementation Program for Citywide Safe Routes to Schools	Oakland	\$23
223	Oakland Complete Streets Program	Oakland	\$199
224	Pedestrian Plan Implementation Program	Oakland	\$109
225	Piedmont Pedestrian and Bike Master Plan	Piedmont	\$9
226	City of Pleasanton Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan	Pleasanton	\$38
227	City of Pleasanton Trails Master Plan	Pleasanton	\$64
228	Citywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan & Sidewalk Program Implementation	San Leandro	\$14
<i>Roadway Improvements, Technology, and Safety</i>			
229	Roadway Multimodal Safety Improvements in Unincorporated Alameda County	ACPWA	\$19

Programmatic Projects for the 2020 CTP

ID ¹	Project	Sponsor Agency	Total Cost (\$ millions)
230	Sidewalk Improvements in Unincorporated Alameda County	ACPWA	\$210
231	Citywide Smart Signal Program	Alameda	\$5
232	New Technologies and Innovations	Alameda	\$10
233	Webster/Posey Tubes Lifeline Replacement or New Transit/Bike/Pedestrian Lifeline Tube	Alameda	\$10
234	I-580 Integrated Corridor Mobility (ICM)	Alameda CTC	\$146
235	Implementation of the New Mobility Roadmap	Alameda CTC	\$200
236	West Berkeley Area Intersection Project	Berkeley	\$4
237	Multimodal Corridor Signal Interconnect & Transit Signal Priority Wayside Upgrade	Berkeley	\$12
238	Vision Zero Action Plan Implementation	Berkeley	\$8
239	Downtown Dublin Streetscape Plan Implementation	Dublin	\$40
240	Technology Enhancements to connect arterials with freeways for Connected and autonomous vehicles	Dublin	\$20
241	Powell Street Traffic Safety Improvements	Emeryville	\$10
242	Traffic Signal Modernization Program	Emeryville	\$5
243	Citywide Pavement Rehabilitation	Fremont	\$90
244	Citywide Traffic Signal Modernization	Fremont	\$20
245	Citywide Vision Zero Traffic Safety Improvements	Fremont	\$10
246	Freeway Interchange Safety Improvements and Modernization Identified in Caltrans D4 Bike Plan	Fremont	\$10
247	Fremont Citywide Transit Signal Priority	Fremont	\$5
248	Annual Pavement Maintenance	Livermore	\$103
249	Railroad Grade Separations across Alameda County (includes submissions for Gilman Street in Berkeley, Oakland waterfront, and San Leandro and could include other grade separations projects)	Multiple <i>Berkeley</i> <i>San Leandro</i> <i>Oakland</i>	\$150
250	Citywide Bridge Preventive Maintenance Program	Oakland	\$21
251	City-Wide Intelligent Transportation System Program	Oakland	\$240
252	City-Wide Parking Management & Mobility Program	Oakland	\$21
253	City-Wide Paving Program	Oakland	\$1,410
254	City-Wide Traffic Signal System Management	Oakland	\$60
255	Intersection Safety Improvements Program	Oakland	\$20
256	Underpass Improvement Program	Oakland	\$20
257	West Oakland, Jack London District, and Downtown Oakland Connectivity Project	Oakland	\$75
258	City of Pleasanton Automated Traffic Signal Performance Expansion	Pleasanton	<\$1
259	Seaport Pavement Management/Paving Program	Port of Oakland	\$150
260	2035 General Plan Traffic Circulation Improvements	San Leandro	\$24
261	Local Street Rehabilitation and Complete Streets Implementation	San Leandro	\$165
262	San Leandro Street Circulation and Capacity Improvements	San Leandro	\$17
263	Traffic Signal Modernization	San Leandro	\$4

Programmatic Projects for the 2020 CTP

ID ¹	Project	Sponsor Agency	Total Cost (\$ millions)
Transit Fare Programs			
264	Means-Based Fare Discount Program ²	BART	\$55
265	LAVTA Integrated Mobility App Development and Implementation	LAVTA	\$2
Transit Planning and Operations			
266	All Door Boarding Pilot Program	AC Transit	\$1
267	Delay Hotspot Correction Program	AC Transit	\$10
268	Fremont and Newark Service Improvements	AC Transit	\$10
269	Infrastructure Analysis and Upgrade Planning	AC Transit	\$1
270	Intra East Bay Express Bus Service	AC Transit	\$6
271	Alameda Shuttle (assumes that the Alameda Shuttle #1, Crosstown Bus #22 and Regional Transit Hub #28 are combined)	Alameda	\$6
272	Bus Service (AC Transit) - Increased Frequencies: Alameda Point Bus Rapid Transit Service (TCP #19), Local Bus Routes (TCP #24), Transbay Bus Routes (TCP #25), Faster Line 51A Bus Service (TCP #33)	Alameda	\$16
273	Water Shuttle Operations	Alameda	\$40
274	LAVTA Individualized Marketing Programs	LAVTA	\$1
275	LAVTA On-Demand First-Mile/Last-Mile Microtransit Program	LAVTA	\$16
276	LAVTA Shared Autonomous Vehicle Demonstration and Deployment	LAVTA	\$50
277	LAVTA Short Range Transit Planning	LAVTA	<\$1
278	Para-Taxi Operations	LAVTA	\$2
279	2nd Transbay Crossing-I-980 Multimodal Boulevard Study	Oakland	\$2
280	Broadway Shuttle Operations and Improvements	Oakland	\$68
281	BART Metro Infill Station Study	Oakland BART	\$1
282	New San Francisco-Oakland Transbay Rail Crossing (advanced planning)	Regional	\$15
283	Alameda/Oakland Ferry Frequency Increase	WETA	\$44
284	Harbor Bay Ferry Frequency Increase	WETA	\$83
285	South San Francisco Frequency Increase	WETA	\$130
Transit Capital Programs			
286	Service Critical Infrastructure Program	AC Transit	\$78
287	Bus Infrastructure: Bus Stop Improvements (TCP #3), Transit Signal Priority (TCP #10), Westline Drive Bus Lane (TCP #17), Alameda Point Bus Rapid Transit (TCP #19) and Bikes in Buses through Posey Tube (TCP #31)	Alameda	\$18
288	BART Station Modernization Program ²	BART	\$2,273
289	Secure Bike Parking Program ²	BART	\$6
290	Security Program ²	BART	\$112
291	Station Access Program ²	BART	\$234
292	System Reinvestment and Capacity Improvement Program ²	BART	\$5,237
293	System Support Program ²	BART	\$78

Programmatic Projects for the 2020 CTP

ID ¹	Project	Sponsor Agency	Total Cost (\$ millions)
294	Downtown Berkeley Transit Center & Transit Corridor Improvements	Berkeley	\$6
295	Citywide Bus Shelter Improvements	Fremont	\$10
296	AVL System Upgrade	LAVTA	\$1
297	LAVTA Systemwide Passenger Facilities Rehabilitation and Enhancement	LAVTA	\$3
298	Transit Capital Program (with AC)	Oakland	\$100
299	Replacement Fleet Program	UC Transit	\$18
Adaptation and Resilience Programs			
300	Sea Level Rise Resiliency - Doolittle Drive (State Route 61) and Webster/Posey Tubes area (State Route 260) and Critical High Use Roads (City lead)	Alameda	\$20
301	Climate Adaptation/Resiliency and Sustainability Program ²	BART	\$162
302	Seismic Retrofit Program ²	BART	\$820
303	Climate Action Plan Implementation	Emeryville	\$25
304	Green Infrastructure Projects Program	Emeryville	\$10
305	Lindsay Tract Green Infrastructure and Storm Drain Improvements	Newark	\$4
306	Green Stormwater Infrastructure in Transportation Program	Oakland	\$45
307	"Big Ship Ready" Marine Terminal Modernization	Port of Oakland	\$74
308	Port Wide Electrification (Phase 2)	Port of Oakland	\$218
309	Seaport Infrastructure Resiliency- Emergency Power System	Port of Oakland	\$20
Transportation Demand Management Programs			
310	Carpool Projects: Casual Carpool Pick-up Spots (TCP #14) and Constitution Way Carpool Lane (TCP #15)	Alameda	\$4
311	Comprehensive Congestion Pricing	Alameda	\$2
312	Transportation Awareness Campaign	Alameda	<\$1
313	Transportation Demand Management: EasyPass Expansion (TCP #4), Public/Private Partnerships (TCP #12), TDM Ordinance (TCP #29) and Citywide TMA (TCP #32)	Alameda	\$6
314	Alameda CTC Transportation Demand Management Program	Alameda CTC	\$20

Notes:

1. Projects are sorted in alphabetical order by sponsor.
2. Represents an approximation of Alameda County share of a regional BART program.

This page intentionally left blank