



## **Alameda County Transportation Commission (Commission) Meeting Agenda Thursday, July 24, 2025, 2:00 PM**

The Commission and its Standing Committees will meet in the Mary V. King Conference Room at Alameda CTC's offices at 1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607. The live stream of each Alameda CTC Commission and Standing Committee meeting is available for public viewing at [www.alamedactc.org/all-meetings](http://www.alamedactc.org/all-meetings) by clicking on **View Event** next to the meeting in the list of Upcoming Events.

Members of the public may submit public comments that are addressed to the Commission or Committee members on topics germane to the jurisdiction of the Alameda CTC in person by attending the meeting in Alameda CTC's offices. Alameda CTC conducts orderly meetings to fulfill its mandate. Discriminatory statements or conduct that would potentially violate the federal Civil Rights Act of 1964 and/or the California Fair Employment and Housing Act, California Penal Code sections 403 or 415 is per se disruptive to a meeting and will not be tolerated. Please see [Alameda CTC's Meeting Code of Conduct](#) for more information.

Additionally, comments may be submitted by email sent to the Clerk of the Commission at [clerk@alamedactc.org](mailto:clerk@alamedactc.org), including the words "Public Comment" and the meeting to which it pertains in the email's subject line. Public comments received by 5:00 p.m. the day before the scheduled meeting will be distributed to Commissioners or Committee members before the meeting and posted on the Alameda CTC website; comments submitted after that time will be distributed to Commissioners or Committee members and posted as soon as possible.

As a convenience, members of the public may also make comments remotely during the meeting by accessing the Zoom link listed below, using the "Raise Hand" feature on their phone, tablet or other device during the relevant agenda item, and waiting to be recognized by the Chair. If calling into the meeting from a telephone, you can press the star key (\*) and then the number 9 (\*9) to raise/lower your hand. Comments made in person or via Zoom will generally be limited to three minutes in length, or as specified by the Chair. Alameda CTC cannot guarantee that the public's access to Zoom via phone or other device will be uninterrupted, and technical difficulties may occur from time to time. Unless required by the Brown Act, the meeting will continue despite technical difficulties for participants using the Zoom option.

Chair: David Haubert  
Vice Chair: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft

Executive Director: Tony Tavares  
Acting Clerk of the Commission: Elizabeth (Liz) Lake

## **Location Information:**

Alameda County Transportation Commission  
Mary V. King Conference Room  
1111 Broadway, Suite 800  
Oakland, CA 94607

Alameda County Fairgrounds  
Heritage House  
4501 Pleasanton Drive  
Pleasanton, CA 94566

Dublin City Hall  
City Manager's Conference Room  
100 Civic Plaza  
Dublin, CA 94568

Fremont City Hall  
3300 Capitol Avenue  
Fremont, CA 94538

Ritz Carlton  
Business Center  
181 Peachtree Street NE  
Atlanta, GA 30303

Zoom Link:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/81823881400?pwd=VoRnUUNTlNTQWo2cog3aHVHeWRlZzo9>

Dial-in Information: 1 (669) 900 6833  
Webinar ID: 818 2388 1400  
Passcode: 758993

## **Meeting Agenda**

### **1. Call to Order**

### **2. Roll Call**

### **3. Public Comment**

#### 3.1 Public Comment

##### **Information**

[3.1\\_COMM\\_Public\\_Comment\\_20250724.pdf](#)

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

### **5. Executive Director's Report**

#### 5.1 Executive Director's Report - July

##### **Information**

### **6. Consent Calendar**

#### 6.1 Approve the June 26, 2025 Commission Meeting Minutes

##### **Action**

[6.1\\_COMM\\_Minutes\\_20250626.pdf](#)

#### 6.2 Approve concurrence action in support of AC Transit's Regional Measure 3 Allocation Request

##### **Action**

[6.2\\_COMM\\_RM3#11\\_ACTransit\\_Allocation\\_Concurrence\\_20250724.pdf](#)

#### 6.3 Rail Safety Enhancement Program – Phase A Project (PN 1392.104): Award Contract Agreement No. A26-0001

##### **Action**

[6.3\\_COMM\\_RSEP-A\\_Award\\_CMGC\\_20250724.pdf](#)

#### 6.4 SR 262 Cross Connector Project (PN 1472.000): Approve Amendment No. 2 to Agreement No. A21-0042

##### **Action**

[6.4\\_COMM\\_SR\\_262\\_KHA\\_20250724.pdf](#)

#### 6.5 Oakland Alameda Access Project (PN 1196.000): Approve use of Risk Contingency

##### **Action**

[6.5\\_COMM\\_OAAP\\_20250724.pdf](#)

#### 6.6 Approve the 2026 State Transportation Improvement Program Programming Principles and Schedule

##### **Action**

[6.6\\_COMM\\_2026-STIP-Principles\\_20250724.pdf](#)

#### 6.7 I-580 Express Lanes Expenditure Plan – Financial Projections and Net Revenue Principles Update

##### **Information**

[6.7\\_COMM\\_I-580\\_Financial\\_Projections\\_20250724.pdf](#)

- 6.8 Congestion Management Program (CMP): Summary of the Alameda County Transportation Commission's (Alameda CTC) Review and Comments on Environmental Documents and General Plan Amendments

**Information**

[6.8\\_COMM\\_Environmental\\_Docs\\_20250724.pdf](#)

## 7. Committee Reports

- 7.1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

**Information**

- 7.2 Independent Watchdog Committee (IWC)

**Information**

- 7.3 Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee (PAPCO)

**Information**

[7.3\\_COMM\\_PAPCO\\_20250724.pdf](#)

## 8. Regular Matters

- 8.1 Federal, state, regional, and local legislative activities update

**Information / Action**

[8.1\\_COMM\\_July\\_Legislative\\_Update\\_20250724.pdf](#)

- 8.2 2026 Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) Update

**Information**

[8.2\\_COMM\\_CTP\\_Update\\_2025724.pdf](#)

[8.2\\_COMM\\_CTP\\_Update\\_Presentation\\_20250724.pdf](#)

- 8.3 Capital Programs Update

**Information**

[8.3\\_COMM\\_Capital\\_Programs\\_Update\\_2025724.pdf](#)

[8.3\\_COMM\\_Capital\\_Programs\\_Update\\_Presentation\\_20250724.pdf](#)

## 9. Adjournment

### Next Meeting:

September 25, 2025

### Notes:

- All items on the agenda are subject to action and/or change by the Commission/Committee.
- To comment on an item not on the agenda, submit a speaker card to the Clerk or follow remote instructions listed in the agenda preamble.
- Meeting agendas and staff reports are available on the [website calendar](#).
- Alameda CTC is located near 12th St. Oakland City Center BART station and AC Transit bus lines. [Directions and parking information](#) are available online.
- For language assistance, please call (510) 208-7475. We request at least five working days' notice to accommodate your request.



- Para obtener asistencia de idioma, comuníquese al (510) 208-7475. Para hacer lugar a su pedido, solicitamos que nos avise con una anticipación mínima de cinco días hábiles.
- 如需语言协助, 请致电 (510) 208-7475. 请至少提前五个工作日通知, 以便满足您的要求。
- Para sa tulong sa wika, tumawag sa (510) 208-7475. Mag-abiso nang limang araw na may pasok o mas maaga para mapagbigyan ang inyong kahilingan.
- Để được hỗ trợ ngôn ngữ, vui lòng gọi (510) 208-7475. Chúng tôi yêu cầu quý vị thông báo ít nhất năm ngày làm việc để có thể đáp ứng được yêu cầu của quý vị.
- Call (510) 208-7450 (Voice) or 1(800) 855-7100 (TTY) five days in advance of the meeting to request a sign-language interpreter.
- Call (510) 208-7400 48 hours in advance to request other accommodations or assistance at this meeting.



# Memorandum

3.1

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• 510.208.7400

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

<b>DATE:</b>	July 17, 2025
<b>TO:</b>	Alameda County Transportation Commission
<b>FROM:</b>	Tony Tavares, Executive Director Elizabeth (Liz) Lake, Acting Clerk of the Commission
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Public Comment Submissions regarding Agenda Item 3.1: Public Comment

Please find the written public comment received for the July 24, 2025 Commission Meeting Agenda Item 3.1: Public Comment:

- Mitchell Ball

---

**PUBLIC COMMENT | "Proposal for new Bus Lane on 7th Street to reduce congestion caused by the Oakland Alameda Access Project"**

---

From Mitchell Ball

Date Mon 7/14/2025 3:32 PM

To Alameda CTC

Name

Mitchell Ball

Email Address

[REDACTED]

Meeting Date

2025-07-24

Please specify which meeting this public comment is for:  
Alameda County Transportation Commission (Commission)

I wish to comment about

Proposal for new Bus Lane on 7th Street to reduce congestion caused by the Oakland Alameda Access Project

My comments

Hello, thank you for taking my comment. I would comment in person if I was available at this time. As you are all likely well aware, disruptive but necessary construction will occur in the Webster and Posey tubes within the next few years as part of the Oakland Alameda Access Project. This will mean single lane closures within each tube for multiple months. This will create a bottleneck and a very likely result of these lane closures will be increased congestion. This congestion will somewhat paradoxically not occur within the tubes (the bottlenecks) themselves, but the entrances to the tubes where multiple lanes file into one. One of the best ways to reduce congestion is to encourage people to take more space efficient modes of transportation such as buses, but if the buses get caught up in the same traffic as cars, there is not much incentive to take them. Bus lanes solve this problem.

A bus lane currently exists at the Webster St entrance to the Posey tube between Ralph Azzetto Memorial Parkway and Willie Stargell Avenue and is appreciated for keeping buses on time. However, a bus lane does not yet exist for the entrance to the Webster Tube. Most buses entering the tube travel along 7th St from Broadway Ave and stick the far right lane to access the bus stop at 7th and Franklin St. Cars do not typically use the far right lane from Broadway Ave to Franklin St as they are only allowed to turn right to the bottom of Franklin St which has no outlet. However, they often use the far right lane of 7th St from Franklin St to the Webster Tube to turn right into the Webster Tube (the center right lane also allows cars to make this right turn). I expect that during the single lane closures of the Webster Tube, traffic will pile up in this lane preventing buses from making their stops on time. I propose that the far right lane of 7th St from Franklin St to the Webster Tube be made a temporary (or permanent bus lane) to assist in bus travel both into the Webster St Tub and past it to

continue on 7th St. This will keep travel times low for buses while causing minimal disruption to car drivers who can continue to stay on the center right lane to enter the Webster Tube. Ultimately, this will encourage people to use public transit during this period of construction and reduce the resulting congestion.

Optionally, AC Transit may also consider giving the O, the only bus that does not currently take 7th St into the Webster tube, a short detour onto 7th St to make use of this bus lane.

Perhaps this is something AlamedaCTC has already considered and is planning for and if so, I would love to briefly hear back via email from any one of you.

Thank you for taking my comment.



# Alameda County Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes Thursday, June 26, 2025, 2:00 p.m.

6.1

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

PH: (510) 208-7400

www.AlamedaCTC.org

## 1. Call to Order

## 2. Roll Call

A roll call was conducted. All members were present with the exception of Commissioners Brown, Fortunato Bas, González, Hernandez, Miley and Solomon.

Commissioner Bowen attended as an alternate for Commissioner Tam.

### Subsequent to the roll call:

Commissioners Fortunato Bas, Miley and Solomon arrived during item 4.

Commissioner Hernandez arrived during item 8.1.

## 3. Public Comment

There were no public comments.

## 4. Chair and Vice Chair Report

Chair Haubert thanked Commission Vice Chair Ezzy Ashcraft, Commissioners Hernandez and Salinas, and Alameda CTC staff who went on the Washington, D.C. legislative trip for their participation. Chair Haubert also welcomed Executive Director Tony Tavares to his first Commission meeting and emphasized several key items on the agenda including the Student Transit Pass Program update and the Fiscal Year (FY) 2023-24 Direct Local Distribution (DLD) Program Compliance Report.

Vice Chair Ezzy Ashcraft reminded meeting attendees of Alameda CTC's meeting Code of Conduct, including administering public comments during the meeting, and provided instructions regarding technology procedures.

## 5. Executive Director's Report

Executive Director Tony Tavares provided the Commission with a brief report, which included a highlight of the Washington, D.C. trip and the newly released Alameda CTC Annual Report.

## 6. Consent Calendar

### 6.1 Approve the May 22, 2025 Commission Meeting Minutes

### 6.2 Approve the Administrative Amendments to Various Agreements to Extend Agreement Expiration Dates

### 6.3 I-580 and I-680 Express Lanes Quarterly Operations Update

### 6.4 Approve Amendment No. 2 to Cooperative Agreement with the Bay Area Infrastructure Financing Authority (BAIFA) for Express Lanes Operations Services

### 6.5 Approve Actions Necessary to Initiate Procurement of Express Lanes Maintenance Services

- 6.6 Rail Safety Enhancement Program - Phase A (Project Number 1392.104): Award Contract A25-0024 to WSP USA Incorporated**
- 6.7 Congestion Management Program (CMP): Summary of the Alameda County Transportation Commission's (Alameda CTC) Review and Comments on Environmental Documents and General Plan Amendments**
- 6.8 Federal, state, regional, and local legislative activities update**
- 6.9 Approve the Community Advisory Committee Appointments**

*Commissioner Jordan made a motion to approve the Consent Calendar.  
Commissioner Salinas seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following roll call vote:*

*Yes: Balch, Bowen, Ezzy Ashcraft, Fife, Fortunato Bas, Hannon, Haubert, Hu, Jordan, Marchand, Márquez, McCarthy, Miley, Salinas, Salwan, Singh, Solomon, Taplin, Young*  
*No: None*  
*Abstain: None*  
*Absent: Brown, González, Hernandez*

## **7. Committee Member Reports**

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

There was no report from the BPAC Chair or Vice Chair.

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

There was no report from the IWC Chair.

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

PAPCO Chair Sandra Johnson provided a report from the June 23, 2025 PAPCO meeting.

## **8. Regular Matters**

### **8.1 Alameda CTC Student Transit Pass Program Update**

Michael Consunji provided the Commission with an update on the Alameda County Transportation Commission Student Transit Pass Program.

This item received one verbal public comment.

### **8.2 FY 2023-24 Direct Local Distribution Program Compliance Summary Report Update**

John Nguyen provided the Commission with an update on the Measure B, Measure BB, and Vehicle Registration Fee DLD Compliance for the FY 2023-24 reporting period.

## **9. Adjournment**

The next Commission meeting is Thursday, July 24, 2025, at 2:00 p.m. and will be conducted at the Alameda CTC offices at 1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607.



# Memorandum

6.2

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• PH: (510) 208-7400

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

**DATE:** July 17, 2025

**TO:** Alameda County Transportation Commission

**FROM:** Vivek Bhat, Senior Director of Programming and Projects  
Jacki Taylor, Assistant Director of Programming and Allocations

**SUBJECT:** Approve concurrence action in support of AC Transit's Regional Measure 3 Allocation Request

## Recommendation

It is recommended that the Commission approve a concurrence action in support of an Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit) allocation request to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for \$13.1 million of Regional Measure 3 (RM3) funds for core capacity transit improvements: Training and Education Center Modernization and Hayward Facility Hydrogen Charging Infrastructure Projects.

## Summary

MTC, Alameda CTC and AC Transit are the project sponsors of Core Capacity Transit Improvements, a \$140 million programmatic category within RM3 (RM3 Project #11). This RM3 program category is intended to implement recommendations from the Core Capacity Transit Study and other strategies to maximize person throughput in the transbay corridor.

On June 11, 2025, the AC Transit Board approved submitting an RM3 allocation request for a total of \$13.1 million to be used towards core capacity transit improvements: \$9 million for the Training and Education Center (TEC) Modernization Project and \$4.1 million for the Hayward Facility/Division 6 Hydrogen Charging Infrastructure Project. The requested RM3 amounts will fully fund these projects.

Per the RM3 guidelines, all listed co-sponsors are required to provide concurrence in support of fund allocation requests in addition to MTC's approval. Staff has coordinated with AC Transit and MTC on the development of this allocation request and recommends the Commission provide its concurrence so that MTC may consider approving the allocation.

## **Background**

RM3 was approved by voters in the nine county San Francisco Bay Area in June 2018. The measure provides \$4.45 billion in transportation funding, with an estimated \$1 billion eligible for Alameda County projects. The measure includes a plan to build projects that support better goods movement and economic development, highway and express lane improvements, major transit investments in operations and capital projects, and active transportation, funded by an increase in bridge tolls on all Bay Area toll bridges except the Golden Gate Bridge.

MTC, Alameda CTC and AC Transit are the project sponsors of RM3 Project #11, a programmatic category for Core Capacity Transit Improvements, which includes \$140 million in RM3 toll funds. This RM3 category is intended to implement recommendations from the Core Capacity Transit Study and other strategies to maximize person throughput in the transbay corridor. Eligible projects include, but are not limited to, transbay bus improvements and high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane access improvements.

Per RM3 guidance, MTC requires Alameda CTC, as a co-sponsor, to also provide its concurrence with AC Transit allocation requests prior to MTC's approval. Over the past few months, AC Transit staff have been coordinating with Alameda CTC and MTC staff regarding the use of these RM3 funds on projects ready to implement. MTC staff confirmed that the projects included in the allocation request by AC Transit are eligible for RM3 Project #11.

At its June 11, 2025 meeting, the AC Transit Board approved a \$13.1 million RM3 allocation request for the TEC Modernization and Hayward Facility/Division 6 Hydrogen Charging Infrastructure Projects (Attachment A). This allocation request was subsequently forwarded to Alameda CTC for its concurrence and to MTC for its consideration and approval. MTC is scheduled to approve the allocation request at its July 23, 2025 Commission meeting, on the condition that Alameda CTC Commission approves its concurrence action on July 24, 2025 (one day following MTC's action). Following MTC's approval, AC Transit would work directly with MTC to access the allocated funds.

Staff recommend Commission approval of the concurrence action for AC Transit's RM3 allocation request and will continue to work with AC Transit and MTC staff to develop a strategic plan for the future programming and allocation of the remaining \$126.9 million RM3 funds within this category, which will be brought to the Commission, AC Transit Board and MTC for approval at a future meeting.

**Fiscal Impact:** There are no fiscal impacts associated with the requested actions.

## **Attachment:**

- A. AC Transit June 11, 2025 Board staff report, adopted resolution and RM3 allocation request package



## ALAMEDA-CONTRA COSTA TRANSIT DISTRICT



## STAFF REPORT

MEETING DATE: 6/11/2025

Staff Report No. 25-324

TO: AC Transit Board of Directors  
 FROM: Salvador Llamas, General Manager/Chief Executive Officer  
 SUBJECT: Regional Measure 3 Capital Allocation

## ACTION ITEM

**AGENDA PLANNING REQUEST:** ☐**RECOMMENDED ACTION(S):**

Consider adoption of Resolution No. 25-024 authorizing the General Manager or their designee to file and execute allocation requests from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) of Regional Measure 3 (RM3) funds for core capacity transit improvements: Training and Education Center Modernization and Hayward Facility Hydrogen Charging Infrastructure Projects.

Staff Contact:  
 Chris Andrichak, Chief Financial Officer

**STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE:**

Goal - Financial Stability and Resiliency  
 Initiative - Zero Emission Programs

The adoption of this resolution would enable the allocation of RM-3 funds to the Training and Education Center (TEC) Modernization and Division 6 (D6) Hydrogen Station Development Projects. This allocation of funds will fully fund both projects. These projects are consistent with the District's goals of service reliability, workforce development, and transition to zero emission bus service.

**BUDGETARY/FISCAL IMPACT:**

The resolution and allocation requests are for \$483,000 for Design and \$3,617,000 for Construction of the D6 Hydrogen Station Development Project, and for \$9,000,000 for Construction of the TEC Modernization Project. Securing these funds from MTC should complete the full funding plan for each project. This funding source does not require matching funds and can serve as the local match for other state and federal funding sources. These allocation requests reduce potential future need of these projects for District funds.

**BACKGROUND/RATIONALE:**

Voter-approved Regional Measure 3 (RM-3) raised tolls on the region's seven state-owned toll bridges by \$1 beginning January 1, 2019. RM-3 will allocate \$4.45 billion worth of highway and transit improvements in toll-bridge corridors and along their approach routes.

Tolls were increased by another \$1 in January 2022 and another \$1 increase in January 2025. The 2019 increase marked the first toll hike on the seven state-owned bridges since 2010. Since then, funds were placed in escrow pending resolution of lawsuits challenging Senate Bill 595 and RM-3. These challenges were dismissed by the California Supreme Court in January 2023 and funds are now released from escrow. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) began making RM-3 allocations in June 2023. Prior AC Transit RM-3 allocations were made for the Quick-Build Durant, MacArthur and International Projects and the Telegraph Rapid Corridors Project in December 2023.

There are \$140 million in total RM-3 funds targeted for improvements in RM-3's Core Capacity Transit Improvements program of projects. These allocation requests are for a total of \$13.1 million. Staff recommend \$4.1 million for the D6 Hydrogen Station Development Project and \$9 million for the TEC Modernization Project be submitted to MTC for funding allocations under RM-3's Core Capacity Transit Improvements program of projects in this Regional Measure.

Following AC Transit Board approval these allocations must also be approved by the Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC) and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). If approved, these funds will be available for the District to draw down starting in August 2025. Once the allocation is approved, the District has six months to begin spending these funds. These projects are prepared to meet that timeline.

Staff would need to return to the Board to approve future RM-3 allocations and plan to do so when RM-3 eligible projects in the District's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) are ready to proceed into their design or construction phases. RM-3 funds are regional funds. They can be used as a local match for state and federal funding that requires matching funds.

#### **ADVANTAGES/DISADVANTAGES:**

This RM-3 funding allocation would allow for full funding and therefore construction and completion of two capital projects supporting workforce development, training on maintenance of zero emission buses, and the fueling of hydrogen fuel cell buses. It will provide a state-of-the-art facility for training front line maintenance staff and enable the deployment of zero emission buses in South Alameda County.

The primary disadvantage is the need for staff resources to complete the construction of these projects.

#### **ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS:**

The alternative to requesting this funding allocation would be to not submit a request and attempt to find another way to fully fund these projects, to submit a request later or modify this request. The allocation request as drafted supplies needed funding for these projects and maximizes the use of this funding source in line with the objectives of the RM-3 program. Staff recommend proceeding with this allocation request. Delaying this allocation request would delay the start of Design and/or Construction of these projects.

#### **PRIOR RELEVANT BOARD ACTION/POLICIES:**

SR 23-384 Regional Measure 3 Capital Allocation

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Resolution 25-024

**Prepared by:**

Jesse Rosemoore, Senior Capital Planning Specialist

**In Collaboration with:**

Emily Heard, Capital Planning and Grants Manager

Joe Callaway, Director of Capital Projects

**Approved/Reviewed by:**

Richard Oslund, Director of Management & Budget

Chris Andrichak, Chief Financial Officer

Aimee L. Steele, General Counsel/Chief Legal Officer

**ALAMEDA-CONTRA COSTA TRANSIT DISTRICT  
RESOLUTION NO. 25-024**

**A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE GENERAL MANAGER OR THEIR DESIGNEE TO FILE AND  
EXECUTE ALLOCATION REQUESTS FROM THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION (MTC) OF REGIONAL MEASURE 3 (RM3) FUNDS FOR CORE CAPACITY TRANSIT  
IMPROVEMENTS: TRAINING AND EDUCATION CENTER MODERNIZATION AND HAYWARD  
FACILITY HYDROGEN CHARGING INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS**

---

**WHEREAS**, SB 595 (Chapter 650, Statutes 2017), commonly referred as Regional Measure 3, identified projects eligible to receive funding under the Regional Measure 3 Expenditure Plan; and

**WHEREAS**, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is responsible for funding projects eligible for Regional Measure 3 funds, pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 30914.7(a) and (c); and

**WHEREAS**, MTC has established a process whereby eligible transportation project sponsors may submit allocation requests for Regional Measure 3 funding; and

**WHEREAS**, allocation requests to MTC must be submitted consistent with procedures and conditions as outlined in Regional Measure 3 Policies and Procedures (MTC Resolution No. 4404; and

**WHEREAS**, AC Transit is an eligible sponsor of transportation project(s) in the Regional Measure 3 Expenditure Plan; and

**WHEREAS**, the Hayward Facility Hydrogen Charging Infrastructure Project and the Training and Education Center Modernization Project, subprojects of RM3-11: Core Capacity Transit Improvements are eligible for consideration in the Regional Measure 3 Expenditure Plan, as identified in California Streets and Highways Code Section 30914.7(a); and

**WHEREAS**, the Regional Measure 3 updated Initial Project Reports (IPR) and allocation requests, attached hereto and incorporated herein as though set forth at length, lists the project, purpose, schedule, budget, expenditure and cash flow plan for which AC Transit is requesting that MTC allocate Regional Measure 3 funds.

**NOW THEREFORE**, the Board of Directors of the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District does resolve as follows:

**Section 1.** AC Transit, and its agents shall comply with the provisions of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Regional Measure 3 Policies and Procedures).

**Section 2.** AC Transit certifies that Core Capacity Transit Improvements is consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

**Section 3.** the year of funding for any design, right-of-way and/or construction phases has taken into consideration the time necessary to obtain environmental clearance and permitting approval for the project.

**Section 4.** the Regional Measure 3 phase or segment is fully funded, and results in an operable and useable segment.

**Section 5.** AC Transit approves the allocation requests and updated IPRs, attached to this resolution.

**Section 6.** AC Transit approves the cash flow plans, attached to this resolution.

**Section 7.** AC Transit has reviewed the project needs and has adequate staffing resources to deliver and complete the project within the schedule set forth in the allocation requests and updated IPRs, attached to this resolution.

**Section 8.** AC Transit is authorized to submit an allocation request for Regional Measure 3 funds for Core Capacity Transit Improvements in accordance with California Streets and Highways Code 30914.7(a).

**Section 9.** AC Transit certifies that the projects and purposes for which RM3 funds are being requested is in compliance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.), and with the State Environmental Impact Report Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.) and if relevant the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42 USC Section 4-1 et. seq. and the applicable regulations thereunder.

**Section 10.** there is no legal impediment to AC Transit making allocation requests for Regional Measure 3 funds.

**Section 11.** there is no pending or threatened litigation which might in any way adversely affect the proposed project, or the ability of AC Transit to deliver such project.

**Section 12.** AC Transit agrees to comply with the requirements of MTC's Transit Coordination Implementation Plan as set forth in MTC Resolution 3866.

**Section 13.** AC Transit indemnifies and holds harmless MTC, BATA, and their Commissioners, representatives, agents, and employees from and against all claims, injury, suits, demands, liability, losses, damages, and expenses, whether direct or indirect (including any and all costs and expenses in connection therewith), incurred by reason of any act or failure to act of AC Transit, its officers, employees or agents, or subcontractors or any of them in connection with its performance of services under this allocation of RM3 funds. AC Transit agrees at its own cost, expense, and risk, to defend any and all claims, actions, suits, or other legal proceedings brought or instituted against MTC, BATA, and their Commissioners, officers, agents, and employees, or any of them, arising out of such act or omission, and to pay and satisfy any resulting judgments. In addition to any other remedy authorized by law, so much of the funding due under this

allocation of RM3 funds as shall reasonably be considered necessary by MTC may be retained until disposition has been made of any claim for damages.

**Section 14.** AC Transit shall, if any revenues or profits from any non-governmental use of property (or project) that those revenues or profits shall be used exclusively for the public transportation services for which the project was initially approved, either for capital improvements or maintenance and operational costs, otherwise the Metropolitan Transportation Commission is entitled to a proportionate share equal to MTC's percentage participation in the projects(s).

**Section 15.** assets purchased with RM3 funds including facilities and equipment shall be used for the public transportation uses intended, and should said facilities and equipment cease to be operated or maintained for their intended public transportation purposes for its useful life, that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) shall be entitled to a present day value refund or credit (at MTC's option) based on MTC's share of the Fair Market Value of the said facilities and equipment at the time the public transportation uses ceased, which shall be paid back to MTC in the same proportion that Regional Measure 3 funds were originally used.

**Section 16.** AC Transit shall post on both ends of the construction site(s) at least two signs visible to the public stating that the Project is funded with Regional Measure 3 Toll Revenues.

**Section 17.** AC Transit authorizes its General Manager, or their designee to execute and submit allocation requests for the design phase with MTC for Regional Measure 3 funds in the amount of \$483,000; for the construction phase with MTC for Regional Measure 3 funds in the amount of \$12,617,000, for the project, purposes and amounts included in the allocation requests attached to this resolution.

**Section 18.** the General Manager, or their designee is hereby delegated the authority to make non-substantive changes or minor amendments to the allocation requests or IPRs as he/she deems appropriate.

**Section 19.** a copy of this resolution shall be transmitted to MTC in conjunction with the filing of the AC Transit allocation requests referenced herein.

**Section 20.** This resolution shall become effective immediately upon its passage by four affirmative votes of the Board of Directors.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 11th day of June 2025.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Diane Shaw  
President

Attest:



Linda A. Nemeroff

Board Administrative Officer/District Secretary

I, Linda A. Nemeroff, District Secretary for the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was passed and adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Directors held on the 11th day of June, 2025, by the following roll call vote:

AYES: DIRECTORS YOUNG, PEEPLES, WALSH, SYED, SILVA, VICE PRESIDENT MCCALLEY,  
AND PRESIDENT SHAW

NOES: NONE

ABSENT: NONE

ABSTAIN: NONE



Linda A. Nemeroff

Board Administrative Officer/District Secretary

Approved as to Form and Content:



Aimee L. Steele

General Counsel/Chief Legal Officer

DRAFT



# Regional Measure 3

## Initial Project Report

### *Project/Subproject Details*

#### Basic Project Information

Project Number	11
Project Title	Core Capacity Transit Improvements
RM3 Funding Amount	\$140,000,000

#### Subproject Information

Subproject Number	
Subproject Title	Training and Education Center Modernization
RM3 Funding Amount	\$9,000,000

### I. Overall Subproject Information

#### a. Project Sponsor / Co-sponsor(s) / Implementing Agency

Project Sponsor: Alameda – Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit)

Co-sponsors: Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Federal Transportation Agency, California  
Transportation Commission

Implementing Agency: AC Transit

#### b. Detailed Project Description *(include definition of deliverable segment if different from overall project/subproject)*

This project transforms and retrofits the current Training and Education Center to enable it to become both a bus maintenance and a classroom/laboratory facility concurrently. The retrofit also creates a zero-emission bus compliant facility to allow staff to safely work and learn zero emission bus (ZEB) technologies indoors as well as more learning space and programs to meet the training and maintenance needs of AC Transit's expanding ZEB fleet.

The modernization of the Training and Education Center allows AC Transit to increase and improve operations and maintenance training in ZEB-related technologies. By bringing its training facilities up to date, AC Transit will train staff in ZEB-related tasks and have staff at its maintenance yards prepared for





## Regional Measure 3 Initial Project Report

effective support of AC Transit's operations and fleet. This project will make the training facility zero-emission compliant with the latest safety equipment and infrastructure.

The Project will include the addition of classrooms, offices and conference rooms within the existing footprint of the building, with renovations of the existing lobby and auditorium. These renovations will include upgrades to the varying audio and visual systems with Augmented Reality technologies. The project will convert the existing maintenance training bays into a working instruction facility that will be used to train apprentices and journey level mechanics. When fully constructed, the existing Training & Education Center will be an advanced learning lab featuring multi-purpose maintenance bays where trainees can merge in-class learning with Augmented Reality and hands-on practical application training in ZEB propulsion systems and core ZEB components such as heating, ventilation and energy storage. This is critical to train mechanics and operators to maintain and operate ZEBs which are different from diesel buses.

Published in 2017, the Core Capacity Transit Study listed four priority projects under this program for AC Transit. Those projects included:

### Tier 1:

- AC Transit Bus Ramp to Transbay Terminal (*complete*),
- AC Transit Richmond Facility Reopening / Reopening of the Richmond bus facility to support current operations (*complete*)

### Tier 2:

- AC Transit Fleet Expansion / Expands fleet by 40 high-capacity buses (on hold),
- AC Transit West County Bus Facility / Relocation and expansion of Division 3 Bus facility and redevelopment of the current site as a transit-oriented development (on hold)

Before the start of the COVID-19 pandemic in early 2020, AC Transit transbay service eased capacity issues on BART trains that were at or beyond capacity at rush hour. At that time, AC Transit planned to expand transbay service to assist with this issue. Since the COVID-19 pandemic, BART ridership is down and has remained down and has not had these capacity issues. AC Transit service transitioned from the goal of expanding transbay service to enhancing feeder service to and from BART to provide critical first-last mile service for regional transbay trips. AC Transit service supports BART in providing these transit connections for trips that start or end in downtown San Francisco.

In addition, AC Transit has been working to comply with the Innovative Clean Transit (ICT) ruling of 2018 requiring AC Transit to purchase zero emission buses and their corresponding fueling and charging infrastructure when replacing its revenue fleet. One-time COVID relief funding has been exhausted and like many agencies and municipalities in the region, AC Transit is facing ongoing operating and capital budget deficits.

AC Transit is currently at 85% of its pre-pandemic service levels due to driver recruitment and operating revenue challenges. The Tier 2 expansion projects listed in the Core Capacity Transit Study are on hold because AC Transit has been forced to shift from expansion to rebuilding service back to pre-pandemic



## Regional Measure 3 Initial Project Report

levels. AC Transit would like to revisit these projects when it is back to 100% of its pre-pandemic service levels and is in a place to expand.

This project supports Core Capacity transit under circumstances that were not foreseen when the Core Capacity Transit Study was published in 2017. Currently AC Transit's priority for regional service of is feeder service to BART, enabling regional trips to and from downtown San Francisco to be served end to end on transit. This Project is in service of that goal, providing infrastructure required for bus replacements under the ICT ruling and enabling AC Transit to provide this critical first-last mile service for regional transbay trips.

### c. Impediments to Project Completion

Procurement timelines and escalating costs are challenges for the project. The construction estimate for the project has been increasing as the project has been going through the design phase. The current impacts of skilled labor shortages and supply chain disruptions may have an impact on both schedule and cost of the project.

### d. Risk Management *(describe risk management process for project budget and schedule, levels of contingency and how they were determined, and risk assessment tools used)*

AC Transit uses standard levels of contingency budgeting in project development but may increase those amounts where conditions are less well defined or there is specific project risks identified. The project team maintains an active risk register that is reviewed at progress meetings, to determine future risks and mitigation.


### e. Operability *(describe entities responsible for operating and maintaining project once completed/implemented)*

The facility that this project renovates will be operated and maintained by AC Transit. This facility is of regional importance as staff from other transit agencies in the Bay Area region may utilize the facility for training as it pertains to their agency's zero emission buses.

### f. Project Graphic(s) *(include below or attach)*



## Regional Measure 3 Initial Project Report



## II. Project Phase Description and Status

### a. Environmental/Planning

Does NEPA apply? Yes ☐ No ☒



## Regional Measure 3 Initial Project Report

This project occurs entirely within AC Transit property and right of way and will receive a CatEx. AC Transit has a Notice of Exemption for this project for NEPA clearance.

### b. Design

Design for the project is underway and currently at 60% completion. Bid ready documents are scheduled by 1/2/2026.

### c. Right-of-Way Activities / Acquisition

Not applicable, this entire project takes place on AC Transit property on AC Transit right of way.

### d. Construction / Vehicle Acquisition / Operating

AC Transit will be ready to release the Invitation for Bid for the project upon final completion of design for the project. In addition, AC Transit expects the designer to remain on contract and provide support during the construction phase.

## III. Project Schedule

Phase-Milestone	Planned	
	Start Date	Completion Date
Environmental Studies, Preliminary Eng. (ENV / PE / PA&ED)	4/2025	5/2025
Final Design - Plans, Specs. & Estimates (PS&E)	5/2024	12/2025
Right-of-Way Activities /Acquisition (R/W)		
Construction (Begin – Open for Use) / Acquisition (CON)	1/2026	9/2027

## IV. Project Budget

### Capital

Project Budget	Total Amount - Escalated to Year of Expenditure (YOE)-
----------------	--



### Regional Measure 3 Initial Project Report

	(Thousands)
Environmental Studies & Preliminary Eng (ENV / PE / PA&ED)	
Design - Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E)	2,170
Right-of-Way Activities /Acquisition (R/W)	
Construction / Rolling Stock Acquisition (CON)	24,250
Total Project Budget (in thousands)	26,420

Deliverable Segment Budget (if different from Project budget)	Total Amount - Escalated to Year of Expenditure (YOE)- (Thousands)
Environmental Studies & Preliminary Eng (ENV / PE / PA&ED)	
Design - Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E)	
Right-of-Way Activities /Acquisition (R/W)	
Construction / Rolling Stock Acquisition (CON)	
Total Project Budget (in thousands)	

Operating	Total Amount - Escalated to Year of Expenditure (YOE)- (Thousands)
Annual Operating Budget	

## V. Project Funding

*Please provide a detailed funding plan in the Excel portion of the IPR. Use this section for additional detail or narrative as needed and to describe plans for any "To Be Determined" funding sources, including phase and year needed.*



## Regional Measure 3 Initial Project Report

### VI. Contact/Preparation Information

#### **Contact for Project Sponsor**

Name: Emily Heard

Title: Capital Planning and Grants Manager

Phone: 510-891-5405

Email: [ehheard@actransit.org](mailto:ehheard@actransit.org)

Mailing Address: 1600 Franklin St. 5<sup>th</sup> Floor / Oakland, CA 94602

#### **Person Preparing Initial Project Report** (if different from above)

Name: Jesse Rosemoore

Title: Senior Capital Planning Specialist

Phone: 510-220-0178

Email: [jrosemoore@actransit.org](mailto:jrosemoore@actransit.org)

Mailing Address: 1600 Franklin St. 5<sup>th</sup> Floor / Oakland, CA 94602



**Regional Measure 3**  
**Initial Project Report - Subproject Report**  
**Funding Plan**

Project Title: Core Capacity Transit Improvements  
 Subproject Title: Training and Education Center Modernization  
 Project/Subproject Number: 11  
 Total RM3 Funding: \$ 140,000,000

(add rows as necessary)

**CAPITAL FUNDING**

Funding Source	Committed? (Yes/No)	Total Amount (\$ thousands)	Amount Expended (\$ thousands)	Amount Remaining (\$ thousands)
<b>ENV</b>				
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -
ENV Subtotal		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>PSE</b>				
FTA 5339 Low No Funds	Yes	\$ 1,575	\$ 544	\$ 1,031
Prop 1B PTMISEA Revenue	Yes	\$ 239	\$ 238	\$ 1
AC Transit District Funds	Yes	\$ 356	\$ 60	\$ 296
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -
PSE Subtotal		\$ 2,170	\$ 842	\$ 1,328
<b>ROW</b>				
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -
ROW Subtotal		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>CON</b>				
RM-3	No	\$ 9,000		\$ 9,000
FTA 5339 Low No Funds	Yes	\$ 14,400		\$ 14,400
FTA Community Funding	No	\$ 850		\$ 850
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -
CON Subtotal		\$ 24,250	\$ -	\$ 24,250
<b>Capital Funding Total</b>		\$ 26,420	\$ 842	\$ 25,578

**OPERATING FUNDING (Annual)**

Funding Source	Phase	Committed? (Yes/No)	Total Amount (\$ thousands)
	Operating		
<b>Operating Funding Total</b>			\$ -

**Funding Plan - Deliverable Segment - Fully funded phase or segment of total project**

RM3 Deliverable Segment Funding Plan - Funding by planned year of allocation



**Regional Measure 3  
Initial Project Report - Subproject Report  
Cash Flow Plan**

Project Title:	Core Capacity Transit Improvements
Subproject Title:	Training and Education Center Modernization
Project/Subproject Number:	11
Total RM3 Funding:	\$ 140,000,000

(please include all planned funding, add rows as necessary)

RM3 Cash Flow Plan for Deliverable Segment - Funding by planned year of expenditure

Funding Source	Prior	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	Future committed	Total Amount (\$ thousands)
ENV										
RM 3										
ENV Subtotal	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
PSE										
RM 3										
FTA 5339 Low No Funds	\$	1,181	394							\$ 1,575
Prop 1B PTMISEA Revenue	\$	179	60							\$ 239
AC Transit District Funds	\$	267	89							\$ 356
PSE Subtotal	\$	\$ 1,628	\$ 543	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 2,170
ROW										
RM 3										
ROW Subtotal	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
CON										
RM 3										
FTA 5339 Low No Funds	\$	3,600	3,600	3,600	1,800					\$ 9,000
FTA Community Funding	\$	5,760	5,760	5,760	2,880					\$ 14,400
	\$	340	340	340	170					\$ 850
CON Subtotal	\$	\$	\$ 9,700	\$ 9,700	\$ 4,850	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 24,250
RM 3 Funding Subtotal	\$	\$	\$ 3,600	\$ 3,600	\$ 1,800	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 9,000
Capital Funding Total	\$	\$ 1,628	\$ 10,243	\$ 9,700	\$ 4,850	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 26,420



## Regional Measure 3 Allocation Request

### RM3 Project Information

Project Number	11
Project Title	Core Capacity Transit Improvements
Project Funding Amount	\$140,000,000

### Subproject Information (if different from overall RM3 project)

Subproject Number	
Subproject Title	Training and Education Center Modernization
Subproject Funding Amount	\$9,000,000

### RM3 Allocation History (Add lines as necessary)

	MTC Approval Date	Amount	Phase
#1:			
#2			
#3			

**Total:** \$

### Current Allocation Request:

Request submittal date	Amount	Phase
May 9 <sup>th</sup> , 2025	\$9,000,000	Construction

### I. RM3 Allocation Request Information

- a. Describe the current status of the project, including any progress since the last allocation request or IPR update, if applicable.

This is the first allocation request for this subproject. AC Transit is submitting an updated IPR for this subproject concurrently. AC Transit is currently in the design phase of this project at the milestone of 60% completion and is expecting to complete the design phase at the end of December 2025. The project has gone through initial planning phases. The project has filed a categorical exclusion with the FTA for NEPA clearance for this project. The project is fully within AC Transit property right of way.

- b. Describe the scope of the allocation request. Provide background and other details as necessary. The scope must be consistent with the RM3 statute. If the scope differs from the most recent IPR for this project, please describe the reason for any changes here; a revised IPR may be necessary.**

This allocation request is for the construction phase of the project as described in the concurrently submitted updated IPR. The scope is consistent with the RM3 statute and aligns with RM3 Project Number 11. The scope of the project has not changed since the last IPR was submitted, the cost estimates for the project however are now more accurate as the project has proceeded and information was gained since this prior submission.

Published in 2017, the Core Capacity Transit Study listed four priority projects under this program for AC Transit. Those projects included:

Tier 1:

- AC Transit Bus Ramp to Transbay Terminal (*complete*),
- AC Transit Richmond Facility Reopening / Reopening of the Richmond bus facility to support current operations (*complete*)

Tier 2:

- AC Transit Fleet Expansion / Expands fleet by 40 high-capacity buses (on hold),
- AC Transit West County Bus Facility / Relocation and expansion of Division 3 Bus facility and redevelopment of the current site as a transit-oriented development (on hold)

Before the start of the COVID-19 pandemic in early 2020, AC Transit transbay service eased capacity issues on BART trains that were at or beyond capacity at rush hour. At that time, AC Transit planned to expand transbay service to assist with this issue. Since the COVID-19 pandemic, BART ridership is down and has remained down and has not had these capacity issues. AC Transit service transitioned from the goal of expanding transbay service to enhancing feeder service to and from BART to provide critical first-last mile service for regional transbay trips. AC Transit service supports BART in providing these transit connections for trips that start or end in downtown San Francisco.

In addition, AC Transit has been working to comply with the Innovative Clean Transit (ICT) ruling of 2018 requiring AC Transit to purchase zero emission buses and their corresponding fueling and charging infrastructure when replacing its revenue fleet. One-time COVID relief funding has been exhausted and like many agencies and municipalities in the region, AC Transit is facing ongoing operating and capital budget deficits.

AC Transit is currently at 85% of its pre-pandemic service levels due to driver recruitment and operating revenue challenges. The Tier 2 expansion projects listed in the Core Capacity Transit Study are on hold because AC Transit has been forced to shift from expansion to rebuilding service back to pre-pandemic levels. AC Transit would like to revisit these projects when it is back to 100% of its pre-pandemic service levels and is in a place to expand.

This project supports Core Capacity transit under circumstances that were not foreseen when the Core Capacity Transit Study was published in 2017. Currently AC Transit's priority for regional service of is feeder service to BART, enabling regional trips to and from downtown San Francisco to be served end to end on transit. This Project is in service of that goal, providing infrastructure required for bus replacements under the ICT ruling and enabling AC Transit to provide this critical first-last mile service for regional transbay trips.

- c. Deliverable segment budget – please fill out attached Excel file. If the budget differs from the most recent IPR for this project, please describe the reason for any changes here; a revised IPR may be necessary.**

This allocation request will fulfill the full funding plan of this project, augmenting federal funds including a grant award from the 2023 Low and No Emissions Program.

- d. Schedule – what is the expected completion date of the phase for this allocation? Describe any significant milestones.**

The project intends to post the bid in March 2026 and issue a notice to proceed in June 2026. AC Transit intends to complete the project in September 2027.

- e. If the project received an RM3 Letter of No Prejudice, how much has been spent against the approved RM3 LONP amount? (Note: the scope and RM3 amount for this allocation request should match the approved LONP)**

Not Applicable

**f. Request Details**

Amount being requested	\$9,000,000
Project phase being requested	Construction
Are there other fund sources involved in this phase?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Date of anticipated Implementing Agency Board approval of RM3 Allocation Request resolution for the allocation being requested	June 2025

Month/year being requested for MTC commission approval of allocation	July 2025
--	-----------

Note: Allocation requests are recommended to be submitted to MTC staff for review sixty (60) days prior to action by the Implementing Agency Board

**g. List any other planned bridge toll allocation requests in the next 12 months**

AC Transit has submitted its list of planned allocation requests of RM3 funds over the next three fiscal years per request by MTC. This includes Hayward Facility Hydrogen Charging Infrastructure, Zero Emission Bus Maintenance Bays, Division 4 Battery Electric Charging and Self – Generation of Power, and Division 2 Battery Electric Storage System in FY 2026 within Project 11. In Project 12, MTC plans to submit an allocation request for improvements on Grand Avenue.

Regional Measure 3  
Allocation Request  
Funding Plan - Deliverable Segment - Fully funded phase or segment of total project

Project Title:	Core Capacity Transit Improvements
Subproject Title:	Training and Education Center Modernization
Project/Subproject Number:	11
Total RM3 Funding:	\$ 140,000,000

(add rows as necessary)

RM3 Deliverable Segment Funding Plan - Funding by planned year of allocation

Funding Source	Phase	Prior	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	Future committed	Total Amount (\$ thousands)	Amount Expended (\$ thousands)	Amount Remaining (\$ thousands)
RM3	ENV										\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	ENV										\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
											\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
											\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
ENV Subtotal											\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
RM 3	PSE										\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
FTA 5339 Low No Funds	PSE		\$ 1,575								\$ 1,575	\$ -	\$ 1,575
Prop 1B PTMSEA Revenue	PSE		\$ 239								\$ 239	\$ -	\$ 239
JAC Transit District Funds	PSE		\$ 356								\$ 356	\$ -	\$ 356
											\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
PSE Subtotal			\$ 2,170								\$ 2,170	\$ -	\$ 2,170
RM 3	ROW										\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	ROW										\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
											\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
											\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
ROW Subtotal											\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
RM 3	CON			\$ 9,000							\$ 9,000	\$ -	\$ 9,000
FTA 5339 Low No Funds	CON		\$ 14,400								\$ 14,400	\$ -	\$ 14,400
FTA Community Funding	CON		\$ 850								\$ 850	\$ -	\$ 850
											\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
											\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
											\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
											\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
											\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
											\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CON Subtotal			\$ 24,250	\$ 9,000							\$ 33,250	\$ -	\$ 33,250
RM 3 Funding Subtotal			\$ 2,170	\$ 24,250							\$ 26,420	\$ -	\$ 26,420
Capital Funding Total											\$ -	\$ -	\$ -



	Net Capital Gains Tax	\$ 0.00
	Total Capital Gains Tax	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Federal Income Tax	\$ 0.00
	Estimated State Income Tax	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Local Income Tax	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Social Security Tax	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Medicare Tax	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Unemployment Tax	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Property Tax	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Sales Tax	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Other Taxes	\$ 0.00
	Total Estimated Taxes	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Tax	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Net Tax	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Refund	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Balance Due	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Overpayment	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Credit	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Credit	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Payment	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Liability	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Asset	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Equity	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Debt	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Net Worth	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Cash Flow	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Income	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Expense	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Profit	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Loss	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Gain	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Reduction	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Increase	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Change	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Variation	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Deviation	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Fluctuation	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Oscillation	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Undulation	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Perturbation	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Disturbance	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Interference	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Obstruction	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Impediment	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Hinderance	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Retardation	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Delayance	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Protraction	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Prolongation	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Extension	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Augmentation	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Amplification	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Enlargement	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Expansion	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Growth	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Development	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Advancement	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Progression	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Advancement	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Improvement	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Enhancement	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Upgrade	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Upkeep	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Maintenance	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Support	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Assistance	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Help	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Aid	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Relief	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Alleviation	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Mitigation	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Diminution	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Reduction	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Decrease	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Drop	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Fall	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Decline	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Deterioration	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Degradation	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Downfall	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Collapse	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Ruin	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Destruction	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Annihilation	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Eradication	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Extirpation	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Obliteration	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Wipeout	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Elimination	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Deletion	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Removal	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Disposal	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Abandonment	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Surrender	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Relinquishment	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Concession	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Yielding	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Submission	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Compliance	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Accordance	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Conformity	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Adherence	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Obedience	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Submissiveness	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Placidity	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Tranquility	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Calmness	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Serenity	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Peacefulness	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Quietude	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Stillness	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Immobility	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Inactivity	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Idleness	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Inertia	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Stagnation	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Standstill	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Halt	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Stoppage	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Interruption	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Suspension	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Cessation	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Termination	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Conclusion	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total End	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Completion	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Fulfillment	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Satisfaction	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Contentment	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Well-being	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Happiness	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Joy	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Pleasure	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Delight	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Enjoyment	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Gratification	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Satisfaction	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Approval	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Praise	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Commendation	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Acclaim	\$ 0.00
	Estimated Total Applause	\$ 0.00

*Please include all journal headings and notes in writing!*  
*Please specify the relevant journal field in your submission. The first 10 months of each year are included by default, but you can request a different period of time.*

2011 Cash Flow Plan for Dallas/Fort Worth Segment - Funding by requested expenditure period

[illegible]

Capital Funding Total	\$	1,170	\$	2,425	\$	2,425	\$
<p>As of 12/31/2014, the total amount of the Capital Funding Total is \$1,170,000. The amount of the Capital Funding Total is \$2,425,000. The amount of the Capital Funding Total is \$2,425,000. The amount of the Capital Funding Total is \$2,425,000.</p>							



# Regional Measure 3

## Initial Project Report

### *Project/Subproject Details*

#### Basic Project Information

Project Number	11
Project Title	Core Capacity Transit Improvements
RM3 Funding Amount	\$140,000,000

#### Subproject Information

Subproject Number	
Subproject Title	Hayward Facility Hydrogen Charging Infrastructure
RM3 Funding Amount	\$4,100,000

#### I. Overall Subproject Information

##### a. Project Sponsor / Co-sponsor(s) / Implementing Agency

Project Sponsor: Alameda – Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit)

Co-sponsors: Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Federal Transportation Agency

Implementing Agency: AC Transit

##### b. Detailed Project Description *(include definition of deliverable segment if different from overall project/subproject)*

This project will demolish a red-tagged parking garage at AC Transit's Hayward Facility (Division 6) and clear the site of the garage. The demolition of the parking structure will provide space for the new hydrogen equipment with the balance of the area repurposed as surface level parking. This project will install a new hydrogen station at Division 6 with hydrogen equipment utilizing cryogenic pump technology, a 25,000-gallon liquid hydrogen storage, two pressure build vaporizers, 18 - high pressure storage tubes, and four hydrogen dispensers located at the fuel island. The project would allow Division 6 to fuel 100+ buses in a fueling window of 12 hours. The project will be built in two phases. The demolition of the parking structure will be phase 1 followed by the installation of the hydrogen station as phase 2. This project is vital to meeting AC Transit's goals of fully transitioning to Zero Emission Bus





## Regional Measure 3 Initial Project Report

service by 2040, providing zero emission bus service in South Alameda County, and maintaining AC Transit facilities in a state of good repair.

Published in 2017, the Core Capacity Transit Study listed four priority projects under this program for AC Transit. Those projects included:

### Tier 1:

- AC Transit Bus Ramp to Transbay Terminal (*complete*),
- AC Transit Richmond Facility Reopening / Reopening of the Richmond bus facility to support current operations (*complete*)

### Tier 2:

- AC Transit Fleet Expansion / Expands fleet by 40 high-capacity buses (on hold),
- AC Transit West County Bus Facility / Relocation and expansion of Division 3 Bus facility and redevelopment of the current site as a transit-oriented development (on hold)

Before the start of the COVID-19 pandemic in early 2020, AC Transit transbay service eased capacity issues on BART trains that were at or beyond capacity at rush hour. At that time, AC Transit planned to expand transbay service to assist with this issue. Since the COVID-19 pandemic, BART ridership is down and has remained down and has not had these capacity issues. AC Transit service transitioned from the goal of expanding transbay service to enhancing feeder service to and from BART to provide critical first-last mile service for regional transbay trips. AC Transit service supports BART in providing these transit connections for trips that start or end in downtown San Francisco.

In addition, AC Transit has been working to comply with the Innovative Clean Transit (ICT) ruling of 2018 requiring AC Transit to purchase zero emission buses and their corresponding fueling and charging infrastructure when replacing its revenue fleet. One-time COVID relief funding has been exhausted and like many agencies and municipalities in the region, AC Transit is facing ongoing operating and capital budget deficits.

AC Transit is currently at 85% of its pre-pandemic service levels due to driver recruitment and operating revenue challenges. The Tier 2 expansion projects listed in the Core Capacity Transit Study are on hold because AC Transit has been forced to shift from expansion to rebuilding service back to pre-pandemic levels. AC Transit would like to revisit these projects when it is back to 100% of its pre-pandemic service levels and is in a place to expand.

This project supports Core Capacity transit under circumstances that were not foreseen when the Core Capacity Transit Study was published in 2017. Currently AC Transit's priority for regional service of is feeder service to BART, enabling regional trips to and from downtown San Francisco to be served end to end on transit. This Project is in service of that goal, providing infrastructure required for bus replacements under the ICT ruling and enabling AC Transit to provide this critical first-last mile service for regional transbay trips.

### c. Impediments to Project Completion



## Regional Measure 3 Initial Project Report

Procurement timelines and long lead equipment timelines and unknowns related to the Hydrogen fuel market and supply in the state of California.


**d. Risk Management** *(describe risk management process for project budget and schedule, levels of contingency and how they were determined, and risk assessment tools used)*

AC Transit uses standard levels of contingency budgeting in project development but may increase those amounts where conditions are less well defined or there are specific project risks identified. Project team has a living risk register that is reviewed weekly to determine future risks and mitigation steps if necessary.

**e. Operability** *(describe entities responsible for operating and maintaining project once completed/implemented)*

New hydrogen infrastructure at Division 6 will be operated and maintained by AC Transit as are existing facilities at AC Transit's Emeryville Facility (Division 2) and East Oakland Facility (Division 4). These elements are part of normal day-to-day activities for AC Transit, though there could be additional O&M costs for new infrastructure.

**f. Project Graphic(s)** *(include below or attach)*







## Regional Measure 3 Initial Project Report

AC Transit will be ready to release the Invitation for Bid for each phase of the project upon final completion of design for each phase of the project. In addition, AC Transit expects the designer to remain on contract and provide support during the construction phase.

### III. Project Schedule

Phase-Milestone	Planned	
	Start Date	Completion Date
Environmental Studies, Preliminary Eng. (ENV / PE / PA&ED)	N/A	N/A
Final Design - Plans, Specs. & Estimates (PS&E)	9/2025	7/2026
Right-of-Way Activities /Acquisition (R/W)	N/A	N/A
Construction (Begin – Open for Use) / Acquisition (CON)	8/2026	12/2027

### IV. Project Budget

#### Capital

Project Budget	Total Amount - Escalated to Year of Expenditure (YOE)- (Thousands)
Environmental Studies & Preliminary Eng (ENV / PE / PA&ED)	
Design - Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E)	2,416
Right-of-Way Activities /Acquisition (R/W)	
Construction / Rolling Stock Acquisition (CON)	17,853
Total Project Budget (in thousands)	20,269

Deliverable Segment Budget (if different from Project budget)	Total Amount - Escalated to Year of Expenditure (YOE)- (Thousands)
Environmental Studies & Preliminary Eng (ENV / PE / PA&ED)	
Design - Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E)	



## Regional Measure 3 Initial Project Report

Right-of-Way Activities /Acquisition (R/W)	
Construction / Rolling Stock Acquisition (CON)	
Total Project Budget (in thousands)	

Operating	<b>Total Amount - Escalated to Year of Expenditure (YOE)- (Thousands)</b>
Annual Operating Budget	

### V. Project Funding

*Please provide a detailed funding plan in the Excel portion of the IPR. Use this section for additional detail or narrative as needed and to describe plans for any "To Be Determined" funding sources, including phase and year needed.*

### VI. Contact/Preparation Information

#### Contact for Project Sponsor

Name: Emily Heard

Title: Capital Planning and Grants Manager

Phone: 510-891-5405

Email: eheard@actransit.org

Mailing Address: 1600 Franklin St. 5<sup>th</sup> Floor / Oakland, CA 94602

#### Person Preparing Initial Project Report (if different from above)

Name: Jesse Rosemoore

Title: Senior Capital Planning Specialist

Phone: 510-220-0178

Email: jrosemoore@actransit.org

Mailing Address: 1600 Franklin St. 5<sup>th</sup> Floor / Oakland, CA 94602

**Regional Measure 3**  
**Initial Project Report - Subproject Report**  
**Funding Plan**

Project Title: Core Capacity Transit Improvements  
 Subproject Title: Hayward Facility Hydrogen Charging Infrastructure  
 Project/Subproject Number: 11  
 Total RM3 Funding: \$ 140,000,000

(add rows as necessary)

**CAPITAL FUNDING**

Funding Source	Committed? (Yes/No)	Total Amount (\$ thousands)	Amount Expended (\$ thousands)	Amount Remaining (\$ thousands)
<b>ENV</b>				
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -
ENV Subtotal		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>PSE</b>				
FTA Formula Section 5307	No	\$ 1,550		\$ 1,550
Low No FTA 5339	Yes	\$ 383		\$ 383
Regional Measure 3	Yes	\$ 483		\$ 483
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -
PSE Subtotal		\$ 2,416	\$ -	\$ 2,416
<b>ROW</b>				
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -
ROW Subtotal		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>CON</b>				
FTA Formula Section 5307	No	\$ 4,008		\$ 4,008
Low No FTA 5339	Yes	\$ 10,228		\$ 10,228
Regional Measure 3	No	\$ 3,617		\$ 3,617
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -
CON Subtotal		\$ 17,853	\$ -	\$ 17,853
<b>Capital Funding Total</b>		\$ 20,269	\$ -	\$ 20,269

**OPERATING FUNDING (Annual)**

Funding Source	Phase	Committed? (Yes/No)	Total Amount (\$ thousands)
	Operating		
<b>Operating Funding Total</b>			\$ -



### Regional Measure 3

Project Title:	Core Capacity Transit Improvements
Subproject Title	Hayward Facility Hydrogen Charging Infrastructure

Project/Subproject Number:

**Total RM3 Funding:**

(add rows as necessary)

RM3 Deliverable Segment Funding Plan - Funding by planned year of allocation

Funding Source	Prior	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	Future committed	Total Amount (\$ thousands)	Amount Expended (\$ thousands)	Amount Remaining (\$ thousands)
ENV												
RM-3										\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
										\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
										\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
										\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
										\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
ENV Subtotal	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
PSE												
RM-3			\$ 483							\$ 483	\$ 483	\$ -
FTA 5307		\$ 1,550	\$ 1,550							\$ 1,550	\$ 1,550	\$ -
FTA 5339		\$ 383	\$ 383							\$ 383	\$ 383	\$ -
										\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
										\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
PSE Subtotal	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,416	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,416	\$ -	\$ 2,416
ROW												
RM-3										\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
										\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
										\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
										\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
										\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
ROW Subtotal	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CON												
RM-3		\$ 3,617	\$ 3,617							\$ 3,617	\$ -	\$ 3,617
FTA 5307		\$ 4,008	\$ 4,008							\$ 4,008	\$ -	\$ 4,008
FTA 5339		\$ 10,228	\$ 10,228							\$ 10,228	\$ -	\$ 10,228
										\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
										\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
										\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
										\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
										\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CON Subtotal	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17,853	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17,853	\$ -	\$ 17,853
RM-3 Funding Subtotal	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,100	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,100	\$ -	\$ 4,100
Capital Funding Total	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,269	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,269	\$ -	\$ 20,269



## Regional Measure 3 Allocation Request

### RM3 Project Information

Project Number	11
Project Title	Core Capacity Transit Improvements
Project Funding Amount	\$140,000,000

### Subproject Information (if different from overall RM3 project)

Subproject Number	
Subproject Title	Hayward Facility Hydrogen Charging Infrastructure
Subproject Funding Amount	\$4,100,000

### RM3 Allocation History (Add lines as necessary)

No previous RM3 Allocation for this Subproject.

	MTC Approval Date	Amount	Phase
#1:			
#2			
#3			

**Total:** \$

### Current Allocation Request:

Request submittal date	Amount	Phase
May 9, 2025	\$4,100,000	Design and Construction



Regional Measure 3  
Initial Project Report - Subproject Report  
Cash Flow Plan

Project Title:	Core Capacity Transit Improvements
Subproject Title:	Hayward Facility Hydrogen Charging Infrastructure
Project/Subproject Number:	11
Total RM3 Funding:	\$ 140,000,000

(please include all planned funding, add rows as necessary)

RM3 Cash Flow Plan for Deliverable Segment - Funding by planned year of expenditure

Funding Source	Prior	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	Future committed	Total Amount (\$ thousands)
ENV										
RM 3										
ENV Subtotal	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
PSE										
RM 3										
FTA 5307			\$ 386	\$ 97						\$ 483
FTA 5339			\$ 1,240	\$ 310						\$ 1,550
			\$ 306	\$ 77						\$ 383
PSE Subtotal	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,933	\$ 483	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,416
ROW										
RM 3										
ROW Subtotal	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CON										
RM 3										
FTA 5307			\$ 2,604	\$ 1,013						\$ 3,617
FTA 5339			\$ 2,886	\$ 1,122						\$ 4,008
			\$ 7,364	\$ 2,864						\$ 10,228
CON Subtotal	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,854	\$ 4,999	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17,853
RM 3 Funding Subtotal	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 386	\$ 2,701	\$ 1,013	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,100
Capital Funding Total	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,933	\$ 19,337	\$ 4,999	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,269

## I. RM3 Allocation Request Information

- a. **Describe the current status of the project, including any progress since the last allocation request or IPR update, if applicable.**

This is the first allocation request for this subproject. AC Transit is submitting an IPR for this subproject concurrently. The project has gone through initial planning phases. The project has submitted NEPA to the FTA and has received no comments. FTA funds have been executed and are now active.

- b. **Describe the scope of the allocation request. Provide background and other details as necessary. The scope must be consistent with the RM3 statute. If the scope differs from the most recent IPR for this project, please describe the reason for any changes here; a revised IPR may be necessary.**

This allocation request is for the design and construction phases of the project as described in the concurrently submitted IPR. \$483,000 will be allocated to the Design Phase and \$3,617,000 will be allocated to the construction phase. The scope is consistent with the RM3 statute and aligns with RM3 Project Number 11.

AC Transit is requesting a multi-phase allocation to allow the procurement of long lead equipment to occur concurrent to detailed design phase work.

Published in 2017, the Core Capacity Transit Study listed four priority projects under this program for AC Transit. Those projects included:

### Tier 1:

- AC Transit Bus Ramp to Transbay Terminal (*complete*),
- AC Transit Richmond Facility Reopening / Reopening of the Richmond bus facility to support current operations (*complete*)

### Tier 2:

- AC Transit Fleet Expansion / Expands fleet by 40 high-capacity buses (on hold),
- AC Transit West County Bus Facility / Relocation and expansion of Division 3 Bus facility and redevelopment of the current site as a transit-oriented development (on hold)

Before the start of the COVID-19 pandemic in early 2020, AC Transit transbay service eased capacity issues on BART trains that were at or beyond capacity at rush hour. At that time, AC Transit planned to expand transbay service to assist with this issue. Since the COVID-19 pandemic, BART ridership is down and has remained down and has not had these capacity issues. AC Transit service transitioned from the goal of expanding transbay service to enhancing feeder service to and from BART to provide critical first-last mile service for regional transbay trips. AC Transit service supports BART in providing these transit connections for trips that start or end in downtown San Francisco.

In addition, AC Transit has been working to comply with the Innovative Clean Transit (ICT) ruling of 2018 requiring AC Transit to purchase zero emission buses and their corresponding fueling and charging infrastructure when replacing its revenue fleet. One-time COVID relief funding has been exhausted and like many agencies and municipalities in the region, AC Transit is facing ongoing operating and capital budget deficits.

AC Transit is currently at 85% of its pre-pandemic service levels due to driver recruitment and operating revenue challenges. The Tier 2 expansion projects listed in the Core Capacity Transit Study are on hold because AC Transit has been forced to shift from expansion to rebuilding service back to pre-pandemic levels. AC Transit would like to revisit these projects when it is back to 100% of its pre-pandemic service levels and is in a place to expand.

This project supports Core Capacity transit under circumstances that were not foreseen when the Core Capacity Transit Study was published in 2017. Currently AC Transit's priority for regional service of is feeder service to BART, enabling regional trips to and from downtown San Francisco to be served end to end on transit. This Project is in service of that goal, providing infrastructure required for bus replacements under the ICT ruling and enabling AC Transit to provide this critical first-last mile service for regional transbay trips.

- c. Deliverable segment budget – please fill out attached Excel file. If the budget differs from the most recent IPR for this project, please describe the reason for any changes here; a revised IPR may be necessary.**

This project has multiple components. The first component includes prerequisite site clearance and demolition of a parking garage necessary for hydrogen fueling infrastructure at Division 6, AC Transit's bus facility in Hayward. Once the parking garage is demolished and the site is cleared, construction of the hydrogen fueling facility will be completed. Following completion of the hydrogen fueling component, the parking will be restored. This allocation request is for design and construction of all elements to enable AC Transit to complete staggered design and construction throughout the multi-step project. Further, this enables AC Transit to procure long lead hydrogen fueling equipment throughout design and site clearance.

- d. Schedule – what is the expected completion date of the phase for this allocation? Describe any significant milestones.**

Per the concurrently submitted IPR, the expected completion date for Design of this project is July 2026. The construction phase is expected to be completed in December 2027. These milestones cover all components of the project but each component is anticipated to utilize separate contracts that may overlap.

Other significant milestones are as follows:

Project Initiation: July 2025

Preliminary PS&E: August 2025

PS&E – Bid Set: September 2025

Bid Posting: December 2025

Bid Opening: March 2026

Contract Award: July 2026

Notice to Proceed: August 2026

Notice of Completion: December 2027

- e. If the project received an RM3 Letter of No Prejudice, how much has been spent against the approved RM3 LONP amount? (Note: the scope and RM3 amount for this allocation request should match the approved LONP)

Not Applicable.

**f. Request Details**

Amount being requested	\$4,100,000
Project phase being requested	Design and Construction
Are there other fund sources involved in this phase?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Date of anticipated Implementing Agency Board approval of RM3 Allocation Request resolution for the allocation being requested	June 2025
Month/year being requested for MTC commission approval of allocation	July 2025

Note: Allocation requests are recommended to be submitted to MTC staff for review sixty (60) days prior to action by the Implementing Agency Board

**g. List any other planned bridge toll allocation requests in the next 12 months**

AC Transit has submitted its list of planned allocation requests of RM3 funds over the next three fiscal years per request by MTC. This includes Training and Education Center Modernization, Zero Emission Bus Maintenance Bays, Division 4 Battery Electric Charging and Self – Generation of Power, and Division 2 Battery Electric Storage System in FY 2026 within Project 11. In Project 12, MTC plans to submit an allocation request for improvements on Grand Avenue.





[illegible]

early in the 1990s, but the fact that the majority of the population is still in poverty is a cause for concern. The government has a long way to go to meet its commitment to the people.

Notes: AAT funds would be drawn down proportionally progressively with other funding sources in the same phase. The allocation expenditure date will be the end of the fiscal fiscal year in which AAT funds are planned to be expended for the requested phase.

## FY 2025-26 Recommended Budget

figures in thousands

	Actual FY 2023-24	Budget FY 2024-25	% Change	Proposed Budget FY 2025-26	Recommended Budget FY 2025-26	% Change
Operations Revenues						
Farebox	34,332	36,740	7.0%	40,008	40,008	8.9%
Contract Services	10,253	8,533	-16.8%	8,789	8,789	3.0%
Other	15,744	9,511	-39.6%	9,202	9,202	-3.3%
<b>Total Operations Revenues</b>	<b>60,329</b>	<b>54,784</b>	<b>-9.2%</b>	<b>57,999</b>	<b>57,999</b>	<b>5.9%</b>
Subsidies Revenues						
Property & Parcel Tax	189,284	190,214	0.5%	199,875	199,875	5.1%
Sales Tax	243,780	240,093	-1.5%	225,418	225,418	-6.1%
Other Federal, State, & Local	88,132	68,544	-22.2%	60,450	60,450	-11.8%
<b>Total Subsidies Revenues</b>	<b>521,196</b>	<b>498,852</b>	<b>-4.3%</b>	<b>485,743</b>	<b>485,743</b>	<b>-2.6%</b>
<b>Subtotal "Regular" Revenues</b>	<b>581,525</b>	<b>553,636</b>	<b>-4.8%</b>	<b>543,742</b>	<b>543,742</b>	<b>-1.8%</b>
Federal and State Pandemic Funding	24,905	52,173	109.5%	21,000	21,000	-59.7%
Reserves	0	0		41,536	41,536	
<b>Total Operating Revenues</b>	<b>606,430</b>	<b>605,809</b>	<b>-0.1%</b>	<b>606,278</b>	<b>606,278</b>	<b>0.1%</b>
Labor						
Salaries & Wages	176,738	183,590	3.9%	191,292	191,292	4.2%
Fringe Benefits	151,882	151,400	-0.3%	159,479	159,479	5.3%
Pension Expense	61,177	70,500	15.2%	65,200	65,200	-7.5%
<b>Total Labor Expenses</b>	<b>389,797</b>	<b>405,491</b>	<b>4.0%</b>	<b>415,970</b>	<b>415,970</b>	<b>2.6%</b>
Non-Labor						
Services	42,160	56,307	33.6%	51,744	51,744	-8.1%
Fuel & Lubricants	17,656	18,123	2.6%	16,381	16,381	-9.6%
Materials & Supplies	23,235	22,242	-4.3%	21,703	21,703	-2.4%
Utilities & Taxes	8,570	9,996	16.6%	10,303	10,303	3.1%
Casualty & Liability	23,995	28,330	18.1%	30,715	30,715	8.4%
Purchased Transportation	41,962	58,630	39.7%	54,381	54,381	-7.2%
Other	4,919	6,644	35.1%	5,080	5,080	-23.5%
<b>Total Non-Labor Expenses</b>	<b>162,497</b>	<b>200,272</b>	<b>23.2%</b>	<b>190,308</b>	<b>190,308</b>	<b>-5.0%</b>
<b>Total Operating Expenses</b>	<b>552,294</b>	<b>605,763</b>	<b>9.7%</b>	<b>606,278</b>	<b>606,278</b>	<b>0.1%</b>
<b>OPERATING SURPLUS / (DEFICIT)</b>	<b>54,136</b>	<b>46</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
District Capital Contribution	3,568	12,000		11,380	11,380	
<b>Net of District Capital Contribution</b>	<b>50,568</b>	<b>(11,954)</b>		<b>(11,380)</b>	<b>(11,380)</b>	

FY 2025-26 RECOMMENDED CAPITAL BUDGET							
Project ID	Project Title	FY 2024-25 and Prior (Expended)	FY 25-26 Grants (Programmed)	FY 25-26 District (Programmed)	FY 25-26 Total (Programmed)	Future Planned Funds	Total Project Cost
<b>Corridors</b>							
2143	MacDonald Avenue and Cutting Blvd TSP	330,091	8,069,069	541,704	8,610,773	-	8,940,864
2210	Fruitvale Corridor TSP	-	4,711,830	252,170	4,964,000	-	4,964,000
2217	Foothill Corridor Planning Study	19,144	1,950,000	275,197	2,225,197	-	2,244,341
2228	High-Priority Bus Stop Improvements/InACT	-	1,800,000	600,000	2,400,000	600,000	3,000,000
TBD	International, Phase 2	-	3,906,000	505,592	4,411,592	-	4,411,592
2240	Park St TSP	-	1,094,418	141,793	1,236,211	-	1,236,211
NEW/0699	Grand Avenue Bus Lanes Planning	-	-	150,000	150,000	-	150,000
NEW/0697	Line 51 Rapid Gap Closure	-	6,900,000	-	6,900,000	-	6,900,000
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>349,235</b>	<b>28,431,317</b>	<b>2,466,456</b>	<b>30,837,773</b>	<b>600,000</b>	<b>31,847,003</b>
<b>Safety and Environment</b>							
2220	CMF - Entrance Gate/Fencing	-	-	450,000	450,000	-	450,000
2218	Security Enhancement CMF D2 D4	27,280	-	1,365,070	1,365,070	1,558,419	2,950,769
2219	Security Enhancement D3 and GO	-	-	-	-	2,094,800	2,094,800
2229	Climate Adaptation Planning Grant	99,043	324,542	0	324,542	-	423,585
Annual	Environmental Remediation	N/A	-	200,000	200,000	-	200,000
NEW/0688	Tempo BRT Station Ped Bollards	N/A	-	295,000	295,000	-	295,000
NEW/0630	D4 SEWER REPLACEMENTS	N/A	-	2,875,000	2,875,000	-	2,875,000
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>126,323</b>	<b>324,542</b>	<b>5,185,070</b>	<b>5,509,612</b>	<b>3,653,219</b>	<b>9,289,154</b>
<b>Facilities</b>							
2097	Bus Washers Maintenance Repair	-	613,570	-	613,570	-	613,570
2132	Ardenwood Parking Study	-	-	140,000	140,000	-	140,000
3111	GO Parking Garage Ramp	100,545	-	529,455	529,455	-	630,000
2160	D4-Transp HVAC Repair	266,986	-	398,014	398,014	-	665,000
2174	BART Restrooms	749,165	-	464,167	464,167	-	1,213,332
2184	D4 ZE Infrastructure	650,068	12,713,257	-	12,713,257	1,389,436	14,752,761
2193	D6 Hydrogen Station Development	7,840	13,856,292	1,637,868	15,494,160	-	15,502,000
2198	Rehab Maint. Bays for ZEBs	279,349	8,528,264	233,566	8,761,830	-	9,041,179
2204	TEC Modernization	842,244	19,871,400	507,920	20,379,319	-	21,221,563
2211	D4 H2 Upgrade	3,254,393	5,898,413	1,668,424	7,566,837	-	10,821,230
2231	D6 Parking Garage Demolition	-	3,827,200	956,800	4,784,000	-	4,784,000
2232	D2 Electrical Vault Repairs	-	245,000	-	245,000	-	245,000
2233	D6 Maintenance Re-Roof	-	500,000	-	500,000	4,906,083	5,406,083
Annual	Emergency Facility Repair	N/A	-	200,000	200,000	-	200,000
Annual	Stations/shelters Capital Maintenance	N/A	-	300,000	300,000	-	300,000
Annual	Facilities Maintenance	N/A	-	250,000	250,000	-	250,000
NEW/0714	Bus Operator Restrooms Feasibility Study	N/A	-	100,000	100,000	-	100,000
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>6,150,590</b>	<b>66,053,396</b>	<b>7,386,214</b>	<b>73,439,610</b>	<b>6,295,519</b>	<b>85,885,718</b>



Project ID	Project Title	FY 2024-25 and Prior (Expanded)	FY 25-26 Grants (Programmed)	FY 25-26 District (Programmed)	FY 25-26 Total (Programmed)	Future Planned Funds	Total Project Cost
<b>IT</b>							
1861	CAD/AVL Real Time Bus Comm	28,420,440	63,200	378,667	441,868	-	28,862,307
2199	GO 10thFlr Conf Rm	47,175	267,108	111,777	378,885	-	426,060
3065	Expansion and Upgrade of APC	764,002	-	328,998	328,998	-	1,093,000
2208	Hastus Upgrade Latest	1,112,413	857,354	936,831	1,794,185	-	2,906,598
2209	Data Integration Managed Environment (DIME)	302,393	-	452,607	452,607	-	755,000
2221	Customer Relationship Mgmt Sys	689,487	-	769,830	769,830	-	1,459,317
2226	Clever - Radio Communication Backup	54,574	-	301,426	301,426	-	356,000
2227	Employee Engagement Software	-	-	120,000	120,000	-	120,000
2237	Enterprise Document Management	-	-	250,000	250,000	2,050,000	2,300,000
2192	EBP Software Purchase	-	-	3,000,000	3,000,000	-	3,000,000
Annual	IT Equipment Replacement	N/A	-	130,000	130,000	-	130,000
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>31,390,484</b>	<b>1,187,663</b>	<b>6,780,136</b>	<b>7,967,798</b>	<b>2,050,000</b>	<b>41,408,282</b>

<b>Vehicles</b>							
2234	47 40ft NF Fuel Cell Buses	-	72,960,831	681,893	73,642,724	-	73,642,724
2235	9 60ft Artic NF Fuel Cell Bus	-	19,127,784	1,222,189	20,349,973	-	20,349,973
2236	18 40ft Diesel Buses	-	11,085,407	-	11,085,407	4,152,075	15,237,482
3106	BRT Maintenance Trucks	175,915	-	24,085	24,085	-	200,000
2181	Bus Maintenance Training	167,495	278,651	260,596	539,248	-	706,742
Annual	Non-revenue Fleet Replacement	N/A	-	300,000	300,000	-	300,000
NEW/0692	Purchase 10 35ft Battery Electric Buses	N/A	14,999,075	-	14,999,075	-	14,999,075
NEW/0720	Purchase 48 40ft Fuel Cell Buses	N/A	86,579,663	-	86,579,663	-	86,579,663
NEW/0721	Purchase 23 60ft Artic Fuel Cell Buses	N/A	54,569,118	-	54,569,118	-	54,569,118
NEW/0738	Purchase 19 40ft Diesel Buses	N/A	10,548,000	-	10,548,000	5,558,138	16,106,138
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>343,410</b>	<b>270,148,529</b>	<b>2,488,763</b>	<b>272,637,292</b>	<b>9,710,213</b>	<b>282,690,915</b>

<b>Other</b>							
2238	LowNo - Workforce Development	23,075	2,007,214	501,816	2,509,030	-	2,532,105
Annual	STC Capital Contribution	N/A	-	500,000	500,000	-	500,000
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>23,075</b>	<b>2,007,214</b>	<b>1,001,816</b>	<b>3,009,030</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,032,105</b>

Project ID	Project Title	FY 2024-25 and Prior (Expended)	FY 25-26 Grants (Programmed)	FY 25-26 District (Programmed)	FY 25-26 Total (Programmed)	Future Planned Funds	Total Project Cost
------------	---------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------

Likely Closeout* Projects (*may rollover to allow for final closeout and billing)							
Project ID	Project Title	FY 2024-25 and Prior	Total FY 25-26 Grants	Total FY 25-26 District	FY 25-26 (Programmed)	Future Funds	Total Project Cost
2070	South County Corridor Line 97	6,686,355	23,126	2,996	26,122	-	6,712,477
2100	Bus TSP Equipment	905,362	-	80,471	80,471	-	985,833
2119	Mission Boulevard Corridor TSP	1,173,047	862,729	8,692	871,421	-	2,044,468
2164	Rapid Corridor Improvements	7,985,464	7,315,496	-	7,315,496	-	15,300,960
2165	Southside Transit Lanes	338,868	-	0	0	-	338,868
2205	Durant Ave and MacArthur	2,211,399	912,159	27,531	939,691	-	3,151,089
2206	Tempo BRT Lane Delineation	1,760,174	1,142,600	68,645	1,211,245	-	2,971,419
3038	CMF-Remove 2 Single-Wall USTs	916,212	965,871	-	965,871	-	1,882,083
2054	San Leandro BART Terminal	7,704,473	-	132,920	132,920	-	7,837,393
2064	Richmond Parkway TC Rehab	1,712,242	1,307,046	-	1,307,046	-	3,019,287
2183	D2 ZE Infrastructure	5,157,194	975,587	-	975,587	-	6,132,781
2222	50 40ft Diesel Buses (2nd buy)	33,962,148	149,250	108,078	257,328	-	34,219,475
3014	SGR Non-Revenue Vehicles	970,121	29,879	-	29,879	-	1,000,000
Subtotal		71,483,056	13,683,742	429,334	14,113,076	-	85,596,132

Grand Total (Excluding Likely Closeout)	38,383,117	368,152,660	25,308,455	393,461,115	22,308,951	454,153,182
Grand Total (Including Likely Closeout)	109,866,173	381,836,402	25,737,789	407,574,191	22,308,951	539,749,315



# Memorandum

6.3

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• 510.208.7400

• www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** July 17, 2025

**TO:** Alameda County Transportation Commission

**FROM:** Jhay Delos Reyes, Director of Project Delivery and Construction  
Angelina Leong, Principal Program Analyst

**SUBJECT:** Rail Safety Enhancement Program – Phase A Project (PN 1392.104):  
Award Contract Agreement No. A26-0001

## Recommendation

It is recommended that the Commission authorize the Executive Director or designee to execute Agreement A26-0001 with Clark Construction Group (Clark) for a total-not-to-exceed amount of \$1,300,000 for Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC) services during the pre-construction phase for the Rail Safety Enhancement Program – Phase A (RSEP-A) Project for a duration of 36 months.

## Summary

The Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) is the Project Sponsor and Implementing Agency for the RSEP-A Project (Project). The Rail Safety Enhancement Program (RSEP) was developed from the Countywide Goods Movement Plan, and the prioritization framework to select the at-grade crossings identified in the Rail Strategy Study, approved by the Commission in 2016 and 2018, respectively. The first phase of the program, RSEP-A, is underway and will implement pedestrian and roadway safety improvements at 26 at-grade rail crossings and two trespass areas across six jurisdictions (Cities of Berkeley, Oakland, San Leandro, Hayward and Livermore and unincorporated Alameda County) along Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) corridors within Alameda County.

Alameda CTC intends to deliver the Project in multiple-phased construction packages to allow construction to begin for the much-needed safety improvements as soon as possible. The Project has obtained 100% UPRR plan approval on the Livermore and Hayward crossings and is currently progressing towards the 100% PS&E design stage for the remaining jurisdictions. Construction of the first package is anticipated to begin in 2026.

In December 2024, Alameda CTC evaluated different delivery methods and the Commission approved the use of the CM/GC alternative delivery method to deliver the Project. The CM/GC alternative delivery method requires Independent Cost Estimator

services and allows for early contractor engagement to get to a negotiated and agreed to price for construction. In June 2025, the Commission approved the award of the Construction Management and Independent Cost Estimator services contract with WSP USA Inc.

Alameda CTC's competitive selection process to procure CM/GC services for this Project began in December 2024 with the Commission's approval to release the Request for Qualifications (RFQ). RFQ R25-0005 was released in February 2025 with statements of qualifications (SOQ) due in March 2025. Staff recommends the award of A26-0001 to Clark as the top-ranked firm.

## **Background**

The major freight and passenger rail corridors (UPRR's Coast, Martinez, Niles and Oakland Subdivisions) in the Bay Area traverse multiple communities in Alameda County, including many regionally defined Equity Priority Communities. The rail system connects the region and the Port of Oakland to the larger Northern California megaregion and national markets. Local communities are heavily impacted by passenger and freight rail traffic and will see increased impacts as projected growth is anticipated to result in increased freight travel and passenger rail service. There are 133 at-grade crossings throughout the County, and addressing safety at these crossings was identified as a key agency priority in the Rail Strategy Study. In 2018, the Rail Strategy Study used a prioritization framework focusing on collision history/social costs, proximity to equity priority communities, and anticipated growth to prioritize at-grade locations needing safety improvements. The Rail Safety Enhancement Program was established to develop and implement safety improvements at these locations.

### **RSEP-A**

Alameda CTC is currently advancing delivery of RSEP-A. RSEP-A includes pedestrian and roadway safety improvements at 26 at-grade crossings and two trespass locations across six jurisdictions throughout the county: Cities of Berkeley, Oakland, San Leandro, Hayward and Livermore, and unincorporated Alameda County. The Project will be delivered via multiple construction packages grouped by jurisdiction to allow for construction to begin on each package in a phased manner to ensure the safety improvements are delivered as quickly as possible. Currently, two jurisdictions are nearing construction, which we expect to begin in 2026: the Livermore package of improvements is in the Construction and Maintenance Agreement process, and the Hayward package of improvements received signal, surface and maintenance estimates from UPRR. The remaining jurisdictions are progressing towards the 100% PS&E milestone.

RSEP-A will implement elements from two categories of safety enhancements. The first category is "Full Pedestrian Treatments," which include sidewalks, active pedestrian gates, manual emergency swing gates, channelizing railings, tactile warning strips and fencing to address trespassing incidents. The second category is "Roadway Treatments," which includes signing, striping, lighting, queue cutters, median islands and bulb-outs.

Diagnostic field visits were conducted at each crossing and trespass area and the diagnostic team (Alameda CTC, UPRR, California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and the local jurisdiction) recommended safety elements for each location.

### CM/GC Approach

Alameda CTC evaluated different delivery methods and determined that the CM/GC alternative delivery method was most suitable for this Project. The Commission approved this project delivery approach at its December 2024 meeting. The CM/GC alternative delivery method allows for early contractor involvement during the pre-construction phase and will enhance Alameda CTC's ability to deliver this project efficiently in phased packages, identify and manage risks early, and help control costs across the six jurisdictions involved. CM/GC requires bringing on an Independent Cost Estimator and CM/GC contractor during the pre-construction phase to get to a negotiated and agreed to price for construction. In June 2025, the Commission approved the award of the Construction Management and Independent Cost Estimator services contract with WSP USA Inc. Staff is now recommending approval to award the CM/GC contract with Clark.

The CM/GC contract will contain two phases of work: phase one for pre-construction services, with phase two as the option to extend to construction services. If agreed to with the CM/GC contractor, the construction contract will be brought to the Commission for approval and award at a later date. If Alameda CTC staff evaluates the procurement time and it doesn't create any unnecessary delays and Alameda CTC and the CM/GC contractor cannot agree to a construction cost, the Project would be publicly advertised using the traditional Design-Bid-Build method. The CM/GC contractor would be excluded from submitting or participating in any bid for the Project.

Alameda CTC's selection process to procure CM/GC services for the Project began in December 2024 with the Commission's approval to release the RFQ. RFQ R25-0005 was released in February 2025.

A mandatory pre-proposal meeting was held on February 24, 2025. A total of 39 attendees representing ten (10) prime consultants and three (3) subconsultant firms attended the meeting. SOQs were received from five (5) firms by the due date of March 25, 2025, which were (in alphabetical order): Clark, Herzog/Bay Cities Joint Venture (JV), Myers & Sons/Railworks JV, Stacey and Witbeck, Inc./McGuire and Hester JV, and Tru's Construction and Traffic Control LLC.

Alameda CTC conducted an initial review of the SOQs for minimum qualifications, and one (1) firm was determined to be nonresponsive. A selection panel composed of representatives from Alameda CTC and the City of San Leandro reviewed the submitted and responsive SOQs and proceeded to interview the four (4) firms on May 16, 2025 which were (in alphabetical order): Clark, Herzog/Bay Cities JV, Myers & Sons/Railworks JV, and Stacey and Witbeck, Inc./McGuire and Hester JV. The shortlisted firms were evaluated on the following criteria, as identified in the RFP: Understanding the Objectives and Work Requirements, Firm Qualifications, Experience, and Expertise, Management Approach, Key Personnel Qualifications, Experience, and Expertise and Effectiveness of

Interview. The Clark team was the top-ranked firm based on their ability to clearly describe and effectively communicate the scope of work and requirements, expertise in delivering similar projects with UPRR, experience as a contractor under CM/GC and effectiveness of their interview.

Staff negotiated the contract for CM/GC pre-construction services with Clark for a total not-to-exceed amount of \$1,300,000. The work under this contract will include the evaluation of construction staging and providing input related to risks, design innovation, construction phasing, constructability and risk management, utility verification and preparation of detailed cost estimates which will be evaluated against the independent cost estimate prepared by the Independent Cost Estimator under the separate Construction Management/ Independent Cost Estimator contract and the Engineer's Estimate prepared by Engineer of Record, Kimley-Horn and Associates. The initial estimated duration for these phase-one-services is approximately 36 months.

Early local Measure BB investments have successfully leveraged \$80 million of external funding from federal, state and regional sources for the Project. The Project funding comprises of \$25 million of Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety Improvements funds from the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), \$25 million of Regional Measure 3 funds from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and \$30 million of State Senate Bill 1 Trade Corridor Enhancement Program funds from the California Transportation Commission for the construction phase. The Project funding plan will be brought to the Commission for approval at a future date ahead of construction. Since the federal funds are derived from the FRA rather than Federal Highway Administration, the Project is not subject to the Disadvantaged Business Program or the Alameda CTC Local Business Contract Equity Program. However, Clark's team includes one firm certified as a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise, two firms are Alameda CTC certified Local Business Enterprises and Small Local Business Enterprises and one firm is a Very Small Local Business Enterprise.


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

**Fiscal Impact:** Award of Agreement A26-0001 to Clark will encumber \$1,300,000 to the Project. Work performed in FY 25-26 is included in the FY 25-26 Capital Project Budget.

**Attachments:**

- A. RSEP-A Project Location Map
- B. RSEP-A Fact Sheet





**BERKELEY**

- 1 Cedar Street
- 2 Virginia Street
- 3 Hearst Avenue
- 4 Addison Street
- 5 Bancroft Way

**OAKLAND**

- 6 29th Avenue
- 7 Fruitvale Avenue
- 8 50th Avenue

**SAN LEANDRO**

- 9 Davis Street
- 10 Alvarado Street
- 11 Williams Street
- 12 Castro Street
- 13 Marina Boulevard
- 14 Washington Avenue
- 15 Halcyon Drive
- 16 Hesperian Boulevard
- 17 Williams Street (Coast)
- 18 Marina Boulevard (Coast)

**ALAMEDA COUNTY**

- 19 Lewelling Boulevard
- 20 Paseo Grande - Trespass
- 21 Paseo Grande Avenue
- 22 Blossom Way

**HAYWARD**

- 23 Tennyson HS Pedestrian Crossing
- 24 Leidig Court - Trespass
- 25 Industrial Parkway
- 26 Industrial Parkway Trail

**LIVERMORE**

- 27 L Street
- 28 Junction Avenue

**LEGEND**

- # At-Grade Crossing/Trespass Location
- +++ Railway
- UPRR Martinez Subdivision
- UPRR Niles Subdivision
- UPRR Oakland Subdivision
- UPRR Coast Subdivision
- UPRR Warm Springs Subdivision
- - - County Line
- Primary/Secondary Schools Within Close Proximity to Rail Corridor



MAP NOT TO SCALE




## PROJECT OVERVIEW

In response to the Alameda County Goods Movement Plan approved in 2016, individual rail crossings throughout the County were examined to identify crossings and corridors most impacted by rail traffic and to identify where rail crossings safety can be enhanced. The crossings analysis considered the following primary factors:

- Current and potential future rail volumes and routing, annual average daily automobile traffic, accident history, and areas prioritized for future development
- Safety, delay, noise and air quality

Once the crossing analysis identified needed at-grade rail crossing safety enhancements, those most impacted and in need of improvements were included in the Rail Safety Enhancement Program (RSEP).

Implementation of the program is a three-phased approach: RSEP-A, RSEP-B, and RSEP-C. RSEP-A, is comprised of crossings that are within six local jurisdictions, with recommended safety enhancements centered around pedestrian treatments, such as sidewalks, automatic pedestrian gates, channelization, lighting, warning strips, fencing and gates, and signing and striping. These near-term upgrades will have significant and immediate positive safety impacts for our local communities.



## PROJECT NEED

- Alameda County has a high volume of rail activity combined with densely populated residential areas.
- Pedestrian oriented safety devices are lacking in most of these areas.

## PROJECT BENEFITS

- Improves rail and roadway safety
- Reduces conflicts between roadway users at rail crossings, particularly in communities near schools
- Promotes economic vitality by supporting rail connectivity to the Port of Oakland
- Modernizes infrastructure to increase freight service reliability and efficient goods movement
- Improves transportation viability for passenger rail service and roadway networks
- Reduces noise pollution and idling in densely populated residential areas with families and children
- Supports housing and commercial redevelopment
- Advances cost-effective, multi-benefit infrastructure improvements





Tennyson High School Pedestrian (train track) Crossing in the City of Hayward.



Rail crossing on L Street in the City of Livermore.

STATUS

Implementing Agency: Alameda CTC

Current Phase: Environmental/Final Design

- California Environmental Quality Act clearance through Categorical Exemptions and Initial Studies/Mitigated Negative Declarations were completed in September 2023.
- National Environmental Policy Act clearance through a Categorical Exclusion was completed in September 2024 for 26 of the 28 locations.
- The project has completed the 95% design milestone for all crossings.

Note: Project schedule subsequent to the preliminary engineering/ environmental phase is contingent on funding availability for future phases.

COST ESTIMATE BY PHASE (\$ X 1,000)

Environmental	\$2,284
Design	\$12,734
Right-of-Way	\$5,312
Construction <sup>1</sup>	\$91,500
Total Expenditures	\$111,830

<sup>1</sup>Inclusive of Union Pacific signal and track costs.

FUNDING SOURCES (\$ X 1,000)

Measure BB	\$16,693
Federal <sup>2</sup>	\$25,000
Regional <sup>3</sup>	\$25,000
State – SB 1 TCEP <sup>4</sup>	\$30,000
TBD	\$15,137
Total Revenues	\$111,830

<sup>2</sup>\$25 million of Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety

Improvements Program (CRISI).

<sup>3</sup>Regional Measure 3 (RM 3).

<sup>4</sup>Senate Bill 1 Trade Corridor Enhancement Program (TCEP).

SCHEDULE BY PHASE

	Begin	End
Preliminary Engineering/ Environmental	Fall 2020	Fall 2024
Final Design <sup>5</sup>	Summer 2023	Summer 2026
Right-of-Way <sup>5</sup>	Summer 2023	Summer 2026
Construction <sup>5</sup>	Fall 2026	Fall 2029

<sup>5</sup>Reflects the first construction package.

PARTNERS AND STAKEHOLDERS

Alameda CTC, Alameda County and the cities of Berkeley, Hayward, Livermore, Oakland, and San Leandro, the Federal Railroad Administration, California Public Utilities Commission, Union Pacific Railroad, Caltrans, Hayward Unified School District, and Capital Corridor

Note: Information on this fact sheet is subject to periodic updates.



# Memorandum

6.4

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• 510.208.7400

• www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** July 17, 2025

**TO:** Alameda County Transportation Commission

**FROM:** Jhay Delos Reyes, Director of Project Delivery and Construction

**SUBJECT:** SR 262 Cross Connector Project (PN 1472.000): Approve Amendment No. 2 to Agreement No. A21-0042

## Recommendation

It is recommended that the Commission authorize the Executive Director or designee to execute Amendment No. 2 to Agreement A21-0042 with Kimley Horn Associates, Inc. (KHA) for Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA&ED) phase services to align the with scope of Plan Bay Area 2050+ (PBA 2050+) with no change in budget and authorize a 20-month extension to December 31, 2027 for the State Route 262 (SR 262, Mission Boulevard) Cross Connector Project (Project, Project Number 1472.000).

## Summary

The Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) is the project sponsor and implementing agency for the Project that has been developed in partnership with Caltrans and the City of Fremont (City). The Project, as initially proposed, would have implemented infrastructure improvements to separate the regional and local traffic within the SR 262 corridor and provided multimodal travel options to the road users by improving bicycle and pedestrian facilities within the SR 262 Corridor.

While updating the statutorily required Regional Transportation Planning, referred to as PBA 2050+, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC, and agency responsible for document) communicated to Alameda CTC that the Project scope could as described in PBA 2050 could not be maintained in PBA 2050+. Staff, in consultation with the City of Fremont, worked closely with MTC staff to reduce the Project scope to keep the project in PBA 2050+ with interchange improvements at Interstate 680 (I-680) and SR 262 and advance the bicycle-pedestrian improvements as previously approved in the Project Initiation Documents.

Approval of this item would align the KHA scope with the Project to be updated with PBA 2050+ with no change budget, and extend the term of to end on December 31, 2027, capturing more streamlined Environmental Clearance activities due to the revised scope.

Alameda CTC through a competitive selection process awarded A21-0042 to KHA on October 1, 2021. Actions related to contract A21-0042 are summarized in Table A.

## **Background**

Alameda CTC began work for the Environmental Phase in Fall 2021 following the completion of the Project Study Report – Project Development Support (PSR-PDS) document. The PSR-PDS developed a Project that initially proposed to reduce congestion and improve east-west regional connectivity between I-880 and I-680 within the SR-262/Mission Boulevard Corridor by grade separating through-traffic at the Warm Springs Boulevard and Mohave Drive intersections, associated widening of the freeways, and reconfiguring the I-680/SR-262 interchange ramps to accommodate current and future traffic patterns and to address existing deficiencies, such as lack of ADA compliant path of travel or pedestrian connections, and lack of bike facilities through this interchange.

However, while coordinating updates to PBA 2050+ in Spring 2024, MTC communicated to Alameda CTC that it could not include the Project in PBA 2050+, as described in PBA 2050 due to concerns related to performance measure and benefit/cost. As the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization for the region, MTC is required to ensure that the region meets its carbon reduction goals in part through the Transportation Element identified PBA 2050+. The Transportation Element of PBA 2050+ holds a unique role in the federally- and state-mandated transportation planning processes that includes meeting fiscal and climate realities such as air quality conformity to allow transportation projects to be constructed and be eligible for state and federal funding. To curtail the greenhouse gas emissions (i.e. to meet region's carbon reduction goals), MTC affirmed that it could not include infrastructure improvements, such as the Project's proposed improvement of constructing a viaduct or trench to separate the regional traffic from local traffic, in PBA 2050+. Staff worked closely with MTC staff to reduce the Project scope to advance the Project's goals, such as encouraging mode shift by implementing a bicycle and pedestrian improvement project and improving the traffic operations at the I-680/SR 262 Interchange by reconfiguring on- and off-ramps to facilitate safe pedestrian and bicycle movements through this interchange. Signal operations at the Warm Springs, Mohave Drive and I680 Ramp Termini intersections with SR 262 will be improved to facilitate safe pedestrian and bicycle crossings.

The reduced scope of the Project has been included in the draft PBA 2050+ as a named project, enabling to remain eligible to secure state and federal fundings for future phases of work. This reduced scope project proposes to implement the following improvements:

- Modify the I680/SR 262 Interchange to facilitate safe bicycle and pedestrian movement through the interchange
- Construct a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility from Warm Springs Boulevard to east of I-680/SR 262 Interchange

### Local Collaboration:

Staff has continued to work in collaboration with City since 2021 to refine the project scope which evaluated a project that would not preclude the inclusion of express lane direct connectors between Interstate 680 and 880 in the future but scaled down the improvements along SR 262 that required less right of way acquisition. These options were presented as part of the Environmental Scoping meeting held in May 2023 consistent with the requirements for an Environmental Impact Report for the California Environmental Quality Act. Property

owners adjacent to the Project were engaged in collaboration with City Public Works and Economic Development staff to further understand how the proposed project improvements would impact the commercial properties abutting SR 262 both during and after construction. Simultaneously the project team continued to advance critical-path technical deliverables related to the environmental phase for the Caltrans process.

In September 2024, staff reached out and shared its resulting PBA 2050+ coordination efforts with the City staff. Both agencies' staff jointly reviewed near-term bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements that can be implemented within the project corridor, consistent with the community feedback received on draft ATP. The City then expressed its support to Alameda CTC for its efforts to advance bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements within the SR 262 Corridor, including support of the use of RM3 funds for its efforts.

In May 2025, the City Council adopted an Active Transportation Plan (ATP) and includes a long-term goal for improving bicycle and pedestrian safety along the SR 262 Corridor by upgrading the existing Class II bike lanes along SR 262 (Mission Boulevard) to Class IV protected bikeways, as well as implementing intersection and ramp improvements/reconfigurations at the I-680/SR-262 interchange to improve bicyclist and pedestrian safety.

Consultant Contract:

Alameda CTC selected KHA through a competitive bid process to provide PA&ED phase services for the project. On October 1, 2021, Alameda CTC entered into a Professional Services Agreement with KHA. Pending to Commission's approval, Amendment No. 2 to Agreement No. A21-0042 will redefine the scope of services required to deliver a reduced scope for the Project and revise the project deliverables and extend the term of the agreement to December 31, 2027. Services under this consulting contract has been funded by MTC's Regional Measure 3 (RM3) funds, therefore, this contract is exempt from the Local Business Contract Equity (LBCE) goals.

Summary of amendment is provided below, in Table A:

<b><u>Table A: Summary of Agreement No. A21-0042</u></b>			
<b>Contract Status</b>	<b>Work Description</b>	<b>Amendment Value</b>	<b>Total Contract Not-to-Exceed Value</b>
Original Professional Services Agreement with KHA (A21-0042) <i>Approved September 2021</i>	Provide preliminary engineering, environmental studies for environmental clearance and project approval.	\$8,300,000	\$8,300,000
Amendment No. 1 <i>Commission action was not required</i>	Extend the term of the year by 12 months	\$0	\$8,300,000
<b><i>Amendment No. 2 (Proposed)</i></b>	<b>Redefine the PA&amp;ED phase scope, and extend the term of Agreement from April 2026 to December 2027</b>	<b><i>\$0 (Proposed)</i></b>	<b><i>\$8,300,000 (Proposed)</i></b>

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

**Fiscal Impact:** There is no fiscal impact as the agreement does not change the current contract not-to-exceed amount. No allocation for this item is necessary as funding is already allocated to the project funding plan. This is included in the FY2025-26 Capital Program Budget.

**Attachments:**

- A. Project Fact Sheet
- B. Plan Bay Area 2050+, Project List
- C. Project Improvement Exhibit



## ATTACHMENT A - PROJECT LOCATION MAP



SR 262 (MISSION BOULEVARD) CROSS CONNECTOR PROJECT (1472.000)

# ATTACHMENT B - PLAN BAY AREA 2050+, PROJECT LIST

6.4B

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS




Strategy	Route/ Facility	RTPID	Title	Scope	Location	Opening Period	Capital Cost (YOE, \$millions)	Operating Cost (YOE, \$millions)	Total Cost (YOE, \$millions)
<b>I-680</b>									
	25-T06-036	Interchange Improvements   SR-262 ("Mission Blvd")	I-680	This program includes funding to implement interchange improvements on I-680 at SR-262. Improvements include intersection modifications, and new bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, including new separated Class IV Bicycle Lane and Pedestrian facilities between Warm Springs Boulevard and east of the I-680/SR 262 Interchange.	Alameda	2025 – 2035	\$76	\$0	<b>\$76</b>
	25-T06-037	Interchange Improvements   Sunol Blvd	I-680	This program includes funding to implement interchange improvements on I-680 at Sunol Blvd. Improvements include new on-ramp lanes; widening the Sunol Blvd overcrossing; and new bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities.	Alameda	2025 – 2035	\$33	\$0	<b>\$33</b>
	25-T06-038	Interchange Improvements   Mission Blvd	I-680	This program includes funding to implement interchange improvements on I-680 at Mission Blvd. Improvements include a reconstruction of the southbound off-ramp, and new bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities.	Alameda	2036 – 2050	\$54	\$0	<b>\$54</b>
	25-T06-039	Interchange Improvements   Stoneridge Dr	I-680	This program includes funding to implement interchange improvements on I-680 at Stoneridge Dr. Improvements include widening Stoneridge Dr, the bridge overcrossing and the northbound on-ramp; and bicycle and/or pedestrian enhancements.	Alameda	2036 – 2050	\$26	\$0	<b>\$26</b>
	25-T06-040	Interchange Improvements   SR-4, Phases 1, 2a, 4	I-680	This program includes funding to implement interchange improvements on I-680 at SR-4. Improvements include a two-lane flyover direct connector between northbound I-680 and westbound SR-4; a direct connector between southbound I-680 and eastbound SR-4; a new slip ramp; and ramp metering facilities.	Contra Costa	Various	\$594	\$0	<b>\$594</b>
	25-T06-041	Interchange Improvements   Montague Expwy	I-680	This program includes funding to implement interchange improvements on I-680 at Montague Expwy. Improvements include interchange modifications and widening Montague Expwy from four to six lanes between Dempsey Rd and Pecten Ct.	Santa Clara	2025 – 2035	\$43	\$0	<b>\$43</b>
<b>I-880</b>									
	25-T06-042	Interchange Improvements   Decoto Rd	I-880	This program includes funding to implement interchange improvements on I-880 at Decoto Rd. Improvements include an interchange reconstruction; new transit priority lanes between Decoto Rd/Cabrillo Ct and the southbound I-880 off-ramp; and bicycle and/or pedestrian enhancements.	Alameda	2025 – 2035	\$30	\$0	<b>\$30</b>
	25-T06-043	Interchange Improvements   Industrial Pkwy West	I-880	This program includes funding to implement interchange improvements on I-880 at Industrial Parkway West. Improvements include a new southbound on-ramp and new northbound off-ramp; realigning the northbound and southbound on- and off-ramps; a new northbound auxiliary lane; and bicycle and/or pedestrian enhancements.	Alameda	2025 – 2035	\$140	\$0	<b>\$140</b>
	25-T06-044	Interchange Improvements   Posey and Webster Tubes ("Oakland-Alameda Access Project")	I-880	This program includes funding to implement interchange improvements on I-880 at Posey and Webster Tubes. Improvements include interchange and intersection reconfigurations between I-880, Posey and Webster tubes, and downtown Oakland; ramp removal, reconstruction, and reconfiguration at the I-880 and I-980 interchanges, such as a new horseshoe connector between Posey Tube and I-880; local street modifications; and new bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities.	Alameda	2025 – 2035	\$166	\$0	<b>\$166</b>
	25-T06-045	Interchange Improvements   Whipple Rd	I-880	This program includes funding to implement interchange improvements on I-880 at Whipple Rd. Improvements include reconfiguration of the northbound on- and off-ramps; a new auxiliary lane; and bicycle and/or pedestrian enhancements.	Alameda	2025 – 2035	\$80	\$0	<b>\$80</b>



# SR-262 (MISSION BLVD) CROSS CONNECTOR PROJECT 6.4C

## PROJECT EXHIBIT







# Memorandum

6.5

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• 510.208.7400

• www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** July 17, 2025

**TO:** Alameda County Transportation Commission

**FROM:** Jhay Delos Reyes, Director of Project Delivery and Construction

**SUBJECT:** Oakland Alameda Access Project (PN 1196.000): Approve use of Risk Contingency

## Recommendation

It is recommended that the Commission approve the use of \$8,090,000 of previously programmed Risk Contingency, the for the Oakland Alameda Access Project (Project, Project Number 1196.000)

## Summary

The Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) is the project sponsor and the implementing agency for the Plans, Specifications and Estimate (PS&E) and right-of-way (R/W) phases for the Project located on the State Highway System and in the Cities of Alameda and Oakland. Caltrans is the implementing agency for the Construction phase of the project.

The Project completed the Ready-to-List (RTL) milestone on October 14, 2024. The Project received the final allocation of Construction phase funding from the California Transportation Commission (CTC) on December 6, 2024. Caltrans advertised the Project on April 21, 2025, and bids were opened on June 17, 2025. Caltrans received two bids, and both exceeded the advertised Engineer's Estimate of \$87,000,000. In order to award to the lowest bidder, Caltrans requires complete funding within cooperative agreement with Alameda CTC. The overage based on the amount from the apparent low bidder exceeds the available construction capital budget by approximately \$9.8 Million. Both Caltrans and Alameda CTC are participating in the cost increase consistent with the various fund sources within the Cooperative Agreement for the construction phase and the resulting amount provided by Caltrans is approximately \$1.7 Million and from Alameda CTC is approximately \$8.1 Million.

The Commission in September 2024, approved a programming action to include a risk contingency of \$8.5 Million to address increased construction phase costs, but requires

Commission approval to utilize the funds. Approval of this action provides staff the resources needed to update the Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans to award the construction contract to the lowest bidder.

## **Background**

The Project, previously known as the I-880 Broadway Jackson Project, has been in the planning stages for nearly 30 years. This project responds to a deficiency plan that was established in the late 1990s, pursuant to state law, in the Congestion Management Program (CMP). The Cities of Oakland, Alameda and Berkeley are listed as responsible jurisdictions to implement the project as part of the deficiency plan.

Caltrans is the lead agency for the environmental document who approved the final environmental document in August 2021, which was an Environmental Impact Report in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and an Environmental Assessment in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act. The related Project Report was approved by Caltrans in January 2022, marking the completion of the Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA&ED) phase. The PS&E and R/W phase work began in 2022 and was completed in October 2024.

The Construction phase of the Project is funded through a combination of Measure BB, Regional and State funds which are the State Transportation Improvement Program and Senate Bill 1 Local Partnership Programs. The CTC allocated the state funding for the construction phase of the Project on December 6, 2024 after the project achieved RTL in October 2024.

### Caltrans Advertisement and Bid Analysis

Caltrans advertised the Project on April 21, 2025 and opened bids on June 17, 2025 which included the addendum to remove and replace the Caltrans maintenance path to allow for two lanes coming out of the Posey Tube once a new structural column was constructed. Caltrans and the Alameda CTC Project team required a mandatory pre-bid meeting held on May 5, 2025 with 4 prospective prime contractors attending. Caltrans received two bids, with the apparent low bidder amount of \$95,759,696.58 from Bay Cities Paving and Grading (Bay Cities) and the second bid of \$144,444,444.00 from DeSilva Gates Construction. The Public Contracting Code followed by Caltrans awards the construction contract to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder. As per the bidding documents, the bids are only valid for 30 days but Bay Cities has agreed to extend their bid offer beyond the initial expiration. Caltrans would like to award the contract to the lowest bidder before the bid expires on August 24, 2025.

Caltrans with the Alameda CTC Project team have already completed a thorough analysis of the bids and conducted interviews with both the bidders and it was concluded that Bay Cities has the lowest responsive and responsible bid. Both the bidders attributed their higher unit costs based on the complexity of construction, limited construction time windows due to various street and tube closure restrictions, constrained space to facilitate construction activities, limited access to the construction area for heavy equipment and

materials, multiple construction stagings, significant potential of encountering differing site conditions and underground unknown utilities and challenging traffic management.

#### Next Steps for Award

In order to award the construction contract, the Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans must be fully funded to include the anticipated award amount to Bay Cities. The Cooperative Agreement must also include resources to allow Caltrans to execute contract change orders which included as contingency for a project (not included in the contractor bid), supplemental work items which addresses work in the construction contract that does not have a formal specification and state furnished materials which is construction efforts related work directly charged to Caltrans and not through the contractor. The total amount to be considered for the Construction Capital needed is shown in Table 1 below, which is an increase of approximately \$9.8 Million.

**Table 1: Construction Capital Costs with the Lowest Bid**

Category	Revised Amount
General Contractor	\$95,207,833.25
Supplemental Work	\$3,375,900
State Furnished Work	\$2,106,900
Contingency	\$10,075,106.65
Total to Award	\$110,765,739.90

The current funding allocations to construction capital is \$101,000,000, which includes \$17,344,000 from State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), \$25,000,000 from Local Partnership Program (LPP) Competitive, \$7,281,000 from LPP Formulaic, \$48,564,000 from Measure BB, \$2,500,000 from CMA TIP and \$311,000 from Bay Area Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) funding. Per CTC policy, an increase in any phase of the project needs to be funded proportionate to the original funding shares of various funding sources in that phase except for LPP funding. According to LPP guidelines, project sponsors are responsible for funding any cost increases and no cost increases can be funded from LPP funding. As such, Alameda CTC is responsible for funding cost increases proportional to the funding sources except for STIP. Table 2 below shows the current and revised funding contributions for construction award for the lowest bid.

**Table 2: Current and Proposed Funding for Award to the Lowest Bidder**

Fund Source	Current Funding Amount	Revised Funding Amount	<i>Increase in Funding</i>
STIP-RIP	\$17,344,000	\$17,344,000	
Caltrans G-12		\$1,675,739.90	<i>\$1,675,739.90</i>
LPP Competitive	\$25,000,000	\$25,000,000	
LPP Formulaic	\$7,281,000	\$7,281,000	
Measure BB	\$48,564,000	\$56,654,000	<i>\$8,090,000.00</i>
CMA TIP	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	
TFCA	\$311,000	\$311,000	
Total	\$101,000,000	\$110,765,739.90	<i>\$9,765,739.90</i>

Caltrans has agreed to utilize the delegated authority (also known as G-12) provided by CTC to fund a portion of the cost increase for Construction Capital. The amount shown for STIP in Table 2 reflects the maximum limit of the authority given to Caltrans. Alameda CTC, as previously noted, must provide a proportional share; and by maximizing Caltrans' construction reduces Alameda CTC's proportional share need. The resulting Alameda CTC contribution through Measure BB, shown in Table 2 is within the Risk Contingency previously programmed by the Commission for matters such as this.

If approved, staff will work with Caltrans to encumber the funds into the Construction Phase Cooperative Agreement. Staff may return to the Commission in the future to request replenishment of the risk contingency based on an updated Risk Register when the Project is well into construction, such request is not being made with this item.

**Fiscal Impact:** Approval of this action would encumber \$8,090,000, of previously programmed funds, for use on the construction phase of the Project. This increase will be included as part of the Mid-Year 2025-2026 Budget Update.



# Memorandum

6.6

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• 510.208.7400

• www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** July 17, 2025

**TO:** Alameda County Transportation Commission

**FROM:** Vivek Bhat, Senior Director of Programming and Projects  
Jacki Taylor, Assistant Director of Programming and Allocations  
Seon Joo Kim, Senior Program Analyst

**SUBJECT:** Approve the 2026 State Transportation Improvement Program  
Programming Principles and Schedule

## Recommendation

Approve the programming principles and schedule for the development of the Alameda County 2026 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) project list.

## Summary

The STIP is a multi-year capital improvement program of transportation projects on and off the State Highway System, funded with revenues from the State Highway Account and other State and federal funding sources administered by the California Transportation Commission (CTC), including Senate Bill 1 (SB 1). The 2026 STIP will cover Fiscal Years (FYs) 2026-27 through 2030-31. Based on the State's draft 2026 STIP Fund Estimate (FE) released in June, approximately \$14 million of new programming capacity is anticipated for Alameda County. A final FE is scheduled for adoption by the CTC in mid-August.

As part of the overall STIP programming process, the County Transportation Agencies for the 9-county Bay Area, including Alameda CTC for Alameda County, are to adopt and forward a program of STIP projects to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for inclusion in MTC's 2026 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). As the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the nine-county Bay Area, MTC is responsible for developing and approving the regional priorities for the RTIP and submitting it to the CTC for inclusion in the STIP. Staff is recommending Commission approval of the proposed programming principles (Attachment A) and schedule (Attachment B) for the development of the Alameda County 2026 STIP project list. In August, Alameda CTC will request project nominations/information for STIP eligible projects, due by early September.

## **Background**

The STIP is composed of two sub-elements with 75% of the STIP funds reserved for the RTIP and 25% for the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP). Each STIP cycle, the Bay Area County Transportation Agencies (CTAs) adopt and forward their respective county's program of STIP projects to MTC. MTC approves the region's RTIP, which incorporates the county project lists, and submits it to the CTC for inclusion in the STIP. Caltrans is responsible for developing the ITIP.

## **Development of the 2026 STIP**

### ***2026 STIP Fund Estimate***

Each biennial STIP programming process (STIP cycle) begins with the development of the STIP FE, approved by the CTC. The STIP FE serves as the basis for determining the county shares and the amounts available for programming each fiscal year during the five-year STIP period. Typically, the county shares represent the amount of new STIP funding available for programming in the last two years of the new STIP period.

Although the passage of SB 1 has added some stability to the STIP revenue, historically, the amount of funding available to Alameda County in a given STIP cycle has varied anywhere from \$0 to \$200 million. The Draft 2026 STIP FE presented at the June 2025 CTC meeting indicates approximately \$14 million of new programming capacity is expected to be available for Alameda County in FYs 2029-30 and/or 2030-31.

The CTC is scheduled to adopt the Final 2026 STIP FE and Guidelines in mid-August. MTC's 2026 RTIP Policies and FE are anticipated to be released and adopted in September 2025 and could potentially include adjustments to the available funding.

### ***Alameda County 2026 STIP Principles***

In preparation for the development of the Alameda County 2026 STIP project list, the Commission is requested to approve a set of principles by which the Alameda County share of the 2026 STIP will be programmed (Attachment A). The proposed principles for the development of the 2026 STIP are consistent with prior cycles' STIP Guidelines and the goals and objectives of Alameda CTC's strategic planning and programming documents, the Countywide Transportation Plan and the Comprehensive Investment Plan. Key project prioritization principles include:

- Ability of a project to demonstrate readiness to meet applicable STIP eligibility, programming, allocation and delivery requirements, including obtaining federal National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
- Potential to leverage external funding such as federal discretionary, state Senate Bill 1 (SB1) and Regional Measure 3 funding programs
- A complete funding plan for the phase for which STIP funding is requested
- Existing STIP commitments, including projects currently programmed in the 2024 STIP that have remaining funding needs eligible for 2026 STIP

funds, will be prioritized first to maximize the ability to advance projects given the limited funding available

### **Next Steps**

MTC is scheduled to release its 2026 RTIP Guidelines in early September and adopt them in late September. Due to the CTC's condensed programming schedule for the 2026 STIP, it's anticipated that the Alameda County STIP project list will need to be adopted by the Commission and submitted to MTC in October 2025 and MTC will need to approve and submit to the CTC a regional list of projects (2026 RTIP) in December 2025. Based on this compressed schedule, in August Alameda CTC will request project nominations/ information for STIP eligible projects, due by early September. Based on the 2026 STIP Principles (Attachment A), staff will assess the eligibility and readiness of project nominations and present a draft project list to the Commission in October 2025. The proposed 2026 STIP development schedule (Attachment B) is included for informational purposes and is subject to change, if needed, due to MTC and CTC updates this summer.

For projects selected for the 2026 STIP, supporting documentation required by MTC is expected to include: MTC Complete Streets Checklist, STIP Electronic Project Programming Request (ePPR) form, project performance measures analysis, Final Project Study Report (PSR) or PSR Equivalent, governing-body approved Resolution of Local Support, and STIP Certification of Assurances. MTC's deadline to submit final application packages with all supporting documentation for projects recommended for the 2026 RTIP is expected to be no later than November 1, 2025.

The final 2026 STIP is scheduled to be adopted by the CTC in March 2026.

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

### **Attachments:**

- A. Draft Principles for the Development of the Alameda County 2026 STIP Project List
- B. 2026 STIP Development Schedule



**Draft Principles for the Development of the Alameda County  
2026 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Project List**

- It is anticipated that any new funding programmed in the 2026 STIP will be made available in Fiscal Years (FYs) 2029-30 and/or 2030-31.
- Previously-approved county and/or regional commitments for STIP programming will be considered during the development of the 2026 STIP project list.
- Sponsors of currently programmed STIP projects will be required to provide updated project scope, status, schedule, cost and funding information.
- Any project considered for funding must be consistent with the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) and satisfy all STIP programming requirements.
- Projects recommended for STIP funding must demonstrate readiness to meet applicable STIP programming, allocation and delivery requirements and deadlines, including federal requirements.
- Consideration of the following are proposed for the required project prioritization for the development of the 2026 STIP project list:
  - The principles and objectives set forth in the Alameda CTC Comprehensive Investment Plan;
  - Projects that can leverage funds from other federal, Senate Bill 1 (SB1) and Regional programs;
  - Previous commitments for STIP programming approved by Alameda CTC, which may include existing STIP projects with remaining funding needs eligible for additional STIP funding;
  - The degree to which a proposed project, or other activity intended to be funded by transportation funding programmed by Alameda CTC, achieves or advances the goals and objectives included in the CTP; and
  - The degree to which a proposed project has viable project implementation strategies that are based on current project-specific project delivery information provided by applicants, including:
    - Readiness for the current/requested project delivery phase;
    - The status of environmental clearance, including federal National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).
    - The project cost/funding plan by phase, including demonstration of a complete funding plan for the phase for which STIP funding is requested;
    - The potential for phasing of initial segment(s) that are fully funded and provide independent benefit; and
    - Potential impediments and risks to successful project implementation in accordance with the proposed project delivery schedule.

**Draft 2026 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Development Schedule**  
*(subject to change per CTC's Final Guidelines and MTC's Regional Guidelines)*

<b>Alameda CTC Activity</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>MTC/ CTC Activity</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request updates for existing STIP projects</li> </ul>	June 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CTC releases Draft 2026 STIP Fund Estimate and Guidelines</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approve 2026 STIP Principles</li> </ul>	July 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CTC holds Fund Estimate and Guidelines Workshop</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request project nominations / information</li> </ul>	August 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CTC adopts Final Fund Estimate and Guidelines</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop Draft 2026 STIP program recommendation</li> </ul>	September 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MTC releases and approves Draft Regional STIP (RTIP) Policies and Procedures</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submit Draft 2026 STIP Project List &amp; Complete Streets Checklists to MTC by early October</li> <li>Draft 2026 STIP recommendation to Committees and Commission</li> </ul>	October 2025	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submit Final, Commission-adopted Project List and required supporting documentation, including resolutions of local support, to MTC by November 1<sup>st</sup></li> </ul>	November 2025	
	December 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MTC releases Draft 2026 RTIP</li> <li>MTC approves and submits 2026 RTIP to CTC</li> </ul>
	March 2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CTC adopts 2026 STIP</li> </ul>



# Memorandum

6.7

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• 510.208.7400

• www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** July 17, 2025

**TO:** Alameda County Transportation Commission

**FROM:** John Lowery, Director of Express Lane Operations

**SUBJECT:** I-580 Express Lanes Expenditure Plan – Financial Projections and Net Revenue Principles Update

## Recommendation

This is an information item to provide the Commission with an update on the development of the I-580 Express Lanes Expenditure Plan, including an overview of 20-year financial projections and net revenue principles.

## Summary

California Streets and Highways Code (SHC) Section 149.5 authorizes Alameda CTC to administer and operate express lanes on the I-580 and I-680 corridors in Alameda County and defines eligible uses of toll revenues. Per the SHC, each corridor is defined as a Program and toll revenues are to be made available first for Direct Expenses, defined as expenses related to the operation, maintenance, construction and administration of the Program. Toll revenue that remains after payment of Direct Expenses is defined as Net Revenue and is to be allocated for transportation purposes within the specific Program area per an adopted Expenditure Plan.

The Commission adopted the I-580 Express Lanes Expenditure Plan in 2018 (2018 Plan) and the I-680 Express Lanes Expenditure Plan in 2024. This year, staff is advancing a two-part process to update the I-580 Expenditure Plan to allow the Commission to provide early policy guidance on the process by which Net Revenue will be allocated for transportation purposes within the I-580 corridor. The first part is an update to the financial projections to show estimated toll revenues and expenditures over a 20-year horizon. Since the 2018 Plan was adopted, the capital loans used for construction of the I-580 Express Lanes have been repaid and an Operational Risk Reserve has been established. As a result, the updated financial projections show Net Revenue available to program for other transportation purposes within the I-580 corridor.

This staff report provides financial projections demonstrating that toll revenues are projected to be sufficient to cover all Direct Expenses and generate Net Revenue that can be used per the authorizing legislation. Staff will also seek Commission feedback on proposed principles to guide staff in developing recommendations for the allocation of Net Revenue. Staff will return to the Commission later this year after conferring with stakeholders in the I-580 corridor, including the cities, transit agencies, and Caltrans, to seek adoption of the I-580 Express Lanes Expenditure Plan.

## **Background**

Section 149.5 of the California SHC authorizes Alameda CTC to administer and operate express lanes on the I-580 and I-680 corridors in Alameda County. The I-580 Express Lanes, located in the Tri-Valley corridor through the Cities of Dublin, Pleasanton, and Livermore, opened to traffic in 2016. On I-680, Alameda CTC operates the I-680 Sunol Express Lanes through Sunol and Fremont and is the project sponsor for the I-680 Southbound Gap Project that will extend the southbound express lane to close the gap with the existing express lanes in Contra Costa County.

The SHC defines eligible uses of toll revenue for Alameda CTC's express lanes on the I-580 and I-680 corridors. Toll revenues are first to be made available for the payment of Direct Expenses, which are defined to include expenses related to the operation (including collection and enforcement), maintenance, construction and administration of the express lanes program. Net Revenue is defined as toll revenue that remains after payment of Direct Expenses and is to be allocated for transportation purposes within the Program area per an adopted Expenditure Plan. Because each of Alameda CTC's express lane corridors is defined as a Program in SHC Section 149.5, each corridor has its own Expenditure Plan. The I-580 Expenditure Plan was adopted in April of 2018, and the I-680 Expenditure Plan was adopted in April of 2024.

Staff is advancing a two-step process to update the I-580 Expenditure Plan to reflect changes since the 2018 Plan was adopted. The I-580 Expenditure Plan is proposed to be comprised of two major items: (1) financial projections and (2) a Net Revenue Policy. This staff report provides a summary of the first part, which consists of an update to the financial projections that provide a forecast of toll revenue, Direct Expenses, and Net Revenue over a 20-year horizon. The updated financial projections demonstrate that the I-580 Express Lanes are projected to generate Net Revenue that can be made available for transportation purposes within the I-580 corridor. As such, staff is seeking Commission feedback on proposed principles to inform the second part of the I-580 Expenditure Plan development, which will establish a Net Revenue Policy. Staff intends to return to the Commission later this year to adopt the updated I-580 Expenditure Plan, inclusive of the financial projections and Net Revenue Policy, after staff meets with stakeholders, including cities, transit agencies, and Caltrans, to assess needs within the I-580 corridor.

## Updated Financial Projections

The 2018 Plan included projections indicating that toll revenue would be sufficient to pay for annual operations and maintenance costs, establish an Operational Risk Reserve, repay Measure B funds that were loaned for construction of the I-580 Express Lanes, and provide funding to perform a lifecycle replacement of the express lanes toll equipment within the first 10 years of the Plan. Despite the effects that the COVID-19 pandemic had on express lanes traffic and revenue, the revenue generated on I-580 proved to be sufficient to achieve all of these milestones. Now that toll revenues have stabilized and initial financial obligations have been met, staff prepared updated financial projections to plan for future I-580 Express Lane expenses and forecast the availability of Net Revenue.

Financial projections over a 20-year horizon are inherently uncertain, particularly for express lane facilities that rely on drivers making a choice to pay a toll to avoid congestion. Express lane financials are subject to a range of variables, including economic conditions, travel behavior, policy changes, and technological developments. As such, these forecasts should be interpreted as estimates based on current assumptions rather than precise predictions. Staff plans to update the projections every two years.

Attachment A provides updated 20-year financial projections including estimated toll revenues, Operations and Maintenance (O&M) costs, contributions to reserves, capital project costs, and estimated Net Revenue. The updated projections demonstrate that over the coming 20-year timeframe, I-580 toll revenues are anticipated to be sufficient to cover express lane operating costs, fund a maintenance reserve to keep the express lanes infrastructure in a state of good repair, and generate Net Revenue. A summary of the 20-year financial projections is provided in Table 1 below.

**Table 1. I-580 Financial Projections Summary**

	<b>Amount in millions</b>
<b>FY25-26 Beginning Fund Balance</b>	\$17
<b>20-Year Projections (FY25-26 through FY44-45)</b>	
<b>Gross Toll Revenues</b>	\$354
<b>Operations &amp; Maintenance (O&amp;M) Expenditures</b>	(\$185)
<b>Maintenance Reserve Contributions</b>	(\$124)
<b>I-580 Capital Project Allocations</b>	(\$5)
<b>Minimum Fund Balance</b>	(\$4)
<b>Net Revenue</b>	\$53

Table 2 below describes each section of the financial projections included in Attachment A and the assumptions used to develop the 20-year projections. It is important to note that the financial projections do not consider impacts associated with the Valley Link Project, which proposes to construct a new rail service along and within the I-580 corridor. Alameda CTC staff are working with Valley Link staff to identify potential impacts that could affect assumptions used in the financial projections, such as impacts to toll revenue during construction or changes in the timing of equipment lifecycle replacement needs.

**Table 2. Financial Projection Cost Components and Key Assumptions**

<b>20-Year Financial Projection Component</b>	<b>Assumptions</b>
<b>(A) Gross Revenues:</b> Includes revenue collected from the payment of tolls and toll violation penalties as well as investment income.	
I-580 Express Lanes Gross Revenues	The 2018 Plan assumed a 2.5% annual growth rate for toll revenues, which was not realized due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. To be more conservative and to reflect the high levels of uncertainty, the projected annual growth rate for toll revenues was lowered to 2% in the updated projections.
<b>(B) Operations and Maintenance (O&amp;M) Expenditures:</b> Includes costs required for day-to-day operations and maintenance of the express lanes.. Costs are assumed to escalate by 3.5% per year, which is the same assumption used in the 2018 Plan.	
Toll System Operations & Maintenance	Includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Toll System Integrator (TSI) costs to operate and maintain express lane toll equipment, including monitoring and replacement of roadside equipment, software licensing and upgrades, and review of license plate images;</li> <li>• Costs paid to Caltrans for roadway maintenance such as sweeping and litter removal; and</li> <li>• Utility costs, including power and telecommunications.</li> </ul>
Monitoring & Enforcement	Includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff and consultant costs to oversee express lane operations;</li> <li>• California Highway Patrol (CHP) costs to enforce express lane occupancy requirements; and</li> <li>• Monitoring of express lane operations in real time by operators staffed at MTC's Regional Operations Center.</li> </ul>



<b>20-Year Financial Projection Component</b>	<b>Assumptions</b>
Revenue Collection	Includes costs paid to the Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA) for Alameda CTC's share of costs to operate the FasTrak® Regional Customer Service Center (RCSC). The RCSC applies Alameda CTC toll transactions to FasTrak customer accounts and serves as the point of contact for all customer inquiries.
Administration & Other	Includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff costs for express lane administration;</li> <li>• Insurance costs;</li> <li>• Legal fees;</li> <li>• Public outreach and education about express lane operations; and</li> <li>• Other miscellaneous costs.</li> </ul>
Contingency	Includes 10% of the Operations & Maintenance costs above as contingency.
<b>(C) Operational Risk Reserve Contribution:</b>	The I-580 Operational Risk Reserve has reached the target balance of \$20 million that was established by the Commission in the 2018 Plan. Therefore, no additional contributions are shown during the 20-year horizon. The Operational Risk Reserve is intended to serve as a contingency fund to address unanticipated adverse events and to provide a safeguard to help ensure the long-term financial stability and resilience of the I-580 Express Lanes. Should this reserve need to be utilized, the Expenditure Plan would need to be updated to show it being replenished to the target balance.
<b>(D) Maintenance Reserve Contributions:</b> Includes contributions to a Maintenance Reserve to fund the costs to repair, replace, maintain and rehabilitate express lane toll system and infrastructure elements as described below. The updated financial projections include the same categories of maintenance expenditures as the 2018 Plan, but the timing and cost for replacements and rehabilitations have been updated to reflect current timing expectations and estimated costs.	

<b>20-Year Financial Projection Component</b>	<b>Assumptions</b>
Technology Replacement/ Upgrade	Include costs to replace express lane toll system technology every 10 years with costs for periodic equipment and software upgrades/refreshes between replacements. Given that work is currently underway to replace I-580 toll system equipment, the next scheduled replacement would take place in FY35-36.
Civil Infrastructure Replacement	Include cost to replace express lane civil infrastructure, including signage, toll gantries, toll cabinets and fiber optic cable assuming a useful life of 25 years for these elements.
Pavement Maintenance	Include annual preventative pavement maintenance costs estimated at \$5,000 per lane-mile of express lanes (2025\$) escalated at 5% per year.
Pavement Rehabilitation	Include estimated express lanes share of pavement preservation costs estimated by Caltrans.
<b>Maintenance Reserve Balance</b>	Calculated as the cumulative sum of maintenance reserve contributions minus the cumulative sum of costs for the maintenance items listed above.
<b>(E) I-580 Corridor Capital Projects</b>	Includes funding allocated for I-580 Express Lanes capital projects, including funding for the I-580 Upgrade Project to replace aging toll system equipment that began this year.
<b>Unrestricted Fund Balance</b>	Cumulative fund balance after accounting for all toll revenues and expenditures. Calculated as cumulative sum of (A) Gross Toll Revenue minus (B) Operations and Maintenance Expenditures, minus (C) Operational Risk Reserve contribution, minus (D) Maintenance Reserve contribution, minus (E) I-580 Express Lanes Capital Projects.
<b>Minimum Fund Balance Requirement</b>	Represents the minimum fund balance to be maintained each year to ensure financial stability, calculated as 30% of the O&M Expenditures for the given year.

<b>20-Year Financial Projection Component</b>	<b>Assumptions</b>
<b>(F) Net Revenue</b>	Represents toll revenue that is projected to be available after covering all other express lane obligations as defined in Section 149.5 of the California SHC. Calculated as Unrestricted Fund Balance minus Minimum Fund Balance Requirement.

## Net Revenue Principles

The second part of the I-580 Expenditure Plan will consist of a Net Revenue Policy to define the process by which Net Revenue will be allocated. Staff will meet with the stakeholders within the I-580 corridor to identify needs and develop a recommendation for Commission approval. As a starting point for the development of a Net Revenue Policy, staff is seeking Commission feedback on the following proposed principles. These principles would serve as a basis for a prioritization framework to be defined in the Net Revenue Policy. The principles reflect goals adopted in Alameda CTC's Policy Blueprint for the Countywide Transportation Plan and are also intended to ensure that Net Revenue can have a meaningful impact in the I-580 corridor.

1. **Definition of I-580 Corridor** – SHC 149.5 requires that Net Revenue be allocated for transportation purposes within the I-580 Express Lanes program area with the intent that Net Revenue be used to benefit the express lanes corridor. It is recommended for the purposes of Net Revenue eligibility that the corridor be defined to include the jurisdictions and transit agencies within the limits of the I-580 Express Lanes. These include the Tri-Valley cities of Dublin, Pleasanton and Livermore; Caltrans; and transit agencies with current and planned service along the corridor including BART, LAVTA, ACE and Valley Link.
2. **Transit** – Providing funding for transit was an early priority of the Commission when the Express Lanes Program was initially developed. Given the “fiscal cliff” that transit providers are facing due to disruptions in transit ridership following the COVID-19 pandemic, transit operators have an urgent need for funding. Streets and Highways Code Section 149.5, which authorizes Alameda CTC's Express Lanes Program, directly references the eligibility of Net Revenue for transit capital and operations in the corridor.
3. **Safety** – Reducing fatalities and severe injuries is one of the core goals adopted by the Commission for the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP). Last year, the Commission allocated funding to advance near-term safety improvements for the I-580/I-680 interchange area, and the scoping work with partner agencies is currently underway. In addition, the I-580 Transit and Multimodal Corridor Strategy (TAMS) that was completed earlier this year recommended the

advancement of safety projects in the corridor. Net Revenue from the I-580 Express Lanes could be used towards programs and projects that continue to advance these safety priorities.

4. **Equity** – Creating equitable opportunities and access for marginalized communities is another goal that was adopted for the CTP, and an important consideration for express lanes, where users must pay to access benefits. There are two initiatives underway in the Bay Area to promote equity by expanding access to express lane benefits. These include a pilot program by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to provide express lane toll discounts to low-income drivers, and a program in San Mateo County that uses express lanes toll revenue to provide toll and transit credits for county residents. Staff is working with our regional express lane partners to evaluate the existing programs and assess potential for expansion. Net Revenue could be prioritized for programs and projects that meaningfully address equity, either through direct low-income programs or investments that benefit low-income residents.
5. **Climate and Sustainability** – The Climate and Sustainability goal established for the CTP aligns with goals established for the express lanes program, which include incentivizing high-occupancy travel modes, expanding access to multimodal travel, and minimizing impacts of greenhouse gas emissions. With these goals in mind, Net Revenue could be used to advance multimodal projects within the I-580 corridor.
6. **Leveraging** – In the same way that Alameda CTC leverages local funds to attract regional, state and federal fund sources, I-580 Net Revenue can be used to leverage external funding sources to maximize impact. This can be accomplished by prioritizing Net Revenue to projects and programs that bring additional funding sources or are most likely to attract additional funding sources.
7. **Pay As You Go** – Given the uncertainty inherent in a 20-year forecast, it is important to ensure that the recommended I-580 Net Revenue Policy promotes financial security. The pandemic was an example of an unanticipated event that had significant impacts on traffic and the amount of express lane revenue collected. Therefore, a pay as you go strategy is recommended whereby Net Revenue would only be allocated when funds are available rather than allocating funds based on future projections.

**Fiscal Impact:** This is an informational item. There is no fiscal impact.

**Attachment:**

- A. I-580 Express Lanes 20-Year Financial Projections

I-580 Express Lanes  
Twenty-Year Financial Projections

Fiscal Year		Notes	Year 0	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	Year 11	Year 12	Year 13	Year 14	Year 15	Year 16	Year 17	Year 18	Year 19	Year 20
			FY 24-25 Adopted Budget	FY 25-26 Adopted Budget	FY 26-27 Projected	FY 27-28 Projected	FY 28-29 Projected	FY 29-30 Projected	FY 30-31 Projected	FY 31-32 Projected	FY 32-33 Projected	FY 33-34 Projected	FY 34-35 Projected	FY 35-36 Projected	FY 36-37 Projected	FY 37-38 Projected	FY 38-39 Projected	FY 39-40 Projected	FY 40-41 Projected	FY 41-42 Projected	FY 42-43 Projected	FY 43-44 Projected	FY 44-45 Projected
(A)	Gross Revenues	1	\$13,900	\$14,600	\$14,900	\$15,200	\$15,500	\$15,800	\$16,100	\$16,400	\$16,700	\$17,000	\$17,300	\$17,600	\$18,000	\$18,400	\$18,800	\$19,200	\$19,600	\$20,000	\$20,400	\$20,800	\$21,200
(B)	Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Expenditures	2	(\$6,038)	(\$6,450)	(\$6,774)	(\$7,011)	(\$7,257)	(\$7,510)	(\$7,773)	(\$8,045)	(\$8,327)	(\$8,618)	(\$8,920)	(\$9,232)	(\$9,555)	(\$9,890)	(\$10,236)	(\$10,594)	(\$10,965)	(\$11,349)	(\$11,746)	(\$12,157)	(\$12,583)
	Toll System Operations & Maintenance		(\$2,765)	(\$2,850)	(\$2,950)	(\$3,053)	(\$3,160)	(\$3,270)	(\$3,385)	(\$3,503)	(\$3,626)	(\$3,753)	(\$3,884)	(\$4,020)	(\$4,161)	(\$4,307)	(\$4,457)	(\$4,613)	(\$4,775)	(\$4,942)	(\$5,115)	(\$5,294)	(\$5,479)
	Monitoring & Enforcement		(\$779)	(\$873)	(\$904)	(\$935)	(\$968)	(\$1,002)	(\$1,037)	(\$1,073)	(\$1,111)	(\$1,150)	(\$1,190)	(\$1,231)	(\$1,275)	(\$1,319)	(\$1,365)	(\$1,413)	(\$1,463)	(\$1,514)	(\$1,567)	(\$1,622)	(\$1,678)
	Revenue Collection		(\$1,600)	(\$1,760)	(\$1,822)	(\$1,885)	(\$1,951)	(\$2,020)	(\$2,090)	(\$2,163)	(\$2,239)	(\$2,318)	(\$2,399)	(\$2,483)	(\$2,570)	(\$2,659)	(\$2,753)	(\$2,849)	(\$2,949)	(\$3,052)	(\$3,159)	(\$3,269)	(\$3,384)
	Administration & Other		(\$394)	(\$467)	(\$483)	(\$500)	(\$518)	(\$536)	(\$555)	(\$574)	(\$594)	(\$615)	(\$636)	(\$659)	(\$682)	(\$706)	(\$730)	(\$756)	(\$782)	(\$810)	(\$838)	(\$867)	(\$898)
	Contingency		(\$500)	(\$500)	(\$616)	(\$637)	(\$660)	(\$683)	(\$707)	(\$731)	(\$757)	(\$783)	(\$811)	(\$839)	(\$869)	(\$899)	(\$931)	(\$963)	(\$997)	(\$1,032)	(\$1,068)	(\$1,105)	(\$1,144)
(C)	Operational Risk Reserve Contribution	3	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Operational Risk Reserve Balance		\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
(D)	Maintenance Reserve Contribution	4	\$0	(\$5,000)	(\$6,000)	(\$6,100)	(\$6,100)	(\$6,100)	(\$6,250)	(\$6,250)	(\$6,250)	(\$6,250)	(\$6,250)	(\$6,250)	(\$6,350)	(\$6,350)	(\$6,450)	(\$6,500)	(\$6,250)	(\$6,250)	(\$6,250)	(\$6,250)	(\$6,250)
	Repair & Replacement Costs		\$0	\$0	(\$758)	(\$765)	(\$774)	(\$782)	(\$791)	(\$801)	(\$811)	(\$822)	(\$25,833)	(\$15,244)	(\$15,257)	(\$1,179)	(\$1,193)	(\$32,207)	(\$1,222)	(\$1,237)	(\$1,254)	(\$1,271)	(\$1,289)
	Technology Replacement/Upgrade	5	\$0	\$0	(\$600)	(\$600)	(\$600)	(\$600)	(\$600)	(\$600)	(\$600)	(\$600)	(\$600)	(\$15,000)	(\$15,000)	(\$910)	(\$910)	(\$910)	(\$910)	(\$910)	(\$910)	(\$910)	(\$910)
	Civil Infrastructure Replacement	6	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$31,000)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Pavement Maintenance	7	\$0	\$0	(\$158)	(\$165)	(\$174)	(\$182)	(\$191)	(\$201)	(\$211)	(\$222)	(\$233)	(\$244)	(\$257)	(\$269)	(\$283)	(\$297)	(\$312)	(\$327)	(\$344)	(\$361)	(\$379)
	Pavement Rehabilitation	8	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$25,000)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Maintenance Reserve Balance	9	\$5,000	\$10,000	\$15,243	\$20,577	\$25,903	\$31,221	\$36,680	\$42,129	\$47,568	\$52,996	\$33,413	\$24,419	\$15,512	\$20,683	\$25,940	\$233	\$5,261	\$10,274	\$15,270	\$20,249	\$25,210
(E)	I-580 Express Lanes Capital Projects	10	(\$7,979)	(\$4,653)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Change in Unrestricted Fund Balance	11	(\$116)	\$2,577	\$2,126	\$2,089	\$2,143	\$2,190	\$2,077	\$2,105	\$2,123	\$2,132	\$2,130	\$2,118	\$2,095	\$2,160	\$2,114	\$2,106	\$2,385	\$2,401	\$2,404	\$2,393	\$2,367
	Unrestricted Fund Balance		\$12,940	\$15,517	\$17,643	\$19,732	\$21,875	\$24,065	\$26,141	\$28,246	\$30,369	\$32,501	\$34,631	\$36,748	\$38,843	\$41,003	\$43,117	\$45,223	\$47,608	\$50,009	\$52,413	\$54,805	\$57,173
	Minimum Fund Balance Requirement	12	\$1,811	\$1,935	\$2,032	\$2,103	\$2,177	\$2,253	\$2,332	\$2,414	\$2,498	\$2,586	\$2,676	\$2,770	\$2,867	\$2,967	\$3,071	\$3,178	\$3,290	\$3,405	\$3,524	\$3,647	\$3,775
(F)	Net Revenue (Cumulative)	13	\$11,129	\$13,582	\$15,611	\$17,628	\$19,698	\$21,812	\$23,809	\$25,832	\$27,871	\$29,915	\$31,954	\$33,979	\$35,976	\$38,036	\$40,046	\$42,044	\$44,318	\$46,604	\$48,889	\$51,158	\$53,398

Notes	
1.	Gross Revenue includes revenue collected from the payment of tolls, toll violation penalties, and interest.
2.	Operations & Maintenance Expenditures are projected using a 3.5% annual escalation rate.
3.	The Operational Risk Reserve has reached the target of \$20 million, which is to be used if unanticipated events impact the ability to collect revenue. Examples include catastrophic failure of the toll system, natural disasters, or the relocation or removal of facilities in the event of termination as required per the Operations and Maintenance Agreement with Caltrans.
4.	The Maintenance Reserve is established to ensure funds are available to pay for Repair and Replacement Costs.
5.	Technology Replacement/Upgrade costs assume a full technology replacement every 10 years with incremental equipment and software upgrades/refreshes between replacements. 10-year replacement costs are estimated assuming a 5% annual escalation over FY24/25 replacement costs.
6.	Civil Infrastructure Replacement costs include replacement every 25 years of sign structures, toll gantries, median lighting, fiber optic lines, toll system cabinets, and other non-technological and non-paving infrastructure. Replacement costs are stimated assuming a 5% annual escalation over the original infrastructure costs.
7.	Pavement Maintenance costs assumes annual pavement maintenance cost of \$5,000/lane-mile in 2025\$ escalated at 5% per year (unit cost from 2013 Caltrans Life Cycle Cost Analysis Procedures Manual)
8.	Pavement Rehabilitation costs assume a 20-year replacement cycle at cost of \$500,000/lane-mile in 2025\$ escalated at 5% per year (unit cost from 2020 Caltrans State of the Pavement Report)
9.	The Maintenance Reserve Balance is calculated as the sum of Maintenance Reserve Contributions minus the sum of Repair and Replacement Costs.
10.	Capital costs shown for FY24-25 and FY25-26 are for express lane related capital projects, including the cost for the I-580 Upgrade Project that will replace toll system equipment and software in FY25-26.
11.	The Change in Unrestricted Fund Balance for FY25-26 includes \$4.08 million of funds received from the settlement of a legal matter with a previous toll system contractor.
12.	The Minimum Fund Balance Requirement assumes that the unrestricted fund balance must be maintained at or above 30% of the estimated Operations & Maintenance expenditures for the year.
13.	Net Revenue is calculated as the difference between the Minimum Fund Balance Requirement and the Unrestricted Fund Balance.



# Memorandum

6.8

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• PH: (510) 208-7400

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

**DATE:** July 17, 2025

**TO:** Alameda County Transportation Commission

**FROM:** Colin Dentel-Post, Principal Transportation Planner  
Aleida Andrino-Chavez, Associate Transportation Planner

**SUBJECT:** Congestion Management Program (CMP): Summary of the Alameda County Transportation Commission's (Alameda CTC) Review and Comments on Environmental Documents and General Plan Amendments

## Recommendation

This item is to provide the Commission with a summary of Alameda CTC's review and comments on Environmental Documents and General Plan Amendments. This item is for information only.

## Summary

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

Between May 16 and June 15, 2025, Alameda CTC has not submitted comments on any Notices of Preparation (NOPs) or Draft Environmental Impact Reports (DEIRs).

**Fiscal Impact:** There is no fiscal impact. This is an information item only.



**Alameda County Transportation Commission  
Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee  
Member Roster - Fiscal Year 2025-2026**

7.3

	<b>Title</b>	<b>Last</b>	<b>First</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Appointed By</b>	<b>Term Began</b>	<b>Re apptmt.</b>	<b>Term Expires</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Ms.</b>	<b>Johnson, Chair</b>	<b>Sandra J.</b>	<b>Oakland</b>	<b>Alameda County Board of Supervisors, District 4</b>	<b>Sep-10</b>	<b>Sep-23</b>	<b>Sep-25</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Mr.</b>	<b>Suter, Vice Chair</b>	<b>John</b>	<b>Emeryville</b>	<b>City of Emeryville</b>	<b>May-21</b>	<b>Sep-23</b>	<b>Sep-25</b>
3	Mr.	Costello	Shawn	Dublin	City of Dublin	Sep-08	Jun-16	<b>Jun-18</b>
4	Mr.	Hastings	Herb	Dublin	Alameda County Board of Supervisors, District 1	Mar-07	Oct-18	<b>Oct-20</b>
5	Mr.	Lewis	Anthony	Alameda	City of Alameda	Jul-18		<b>Jul-20</b>
6	Mr.	Marshall	Roger	Fremont	City of Fremont	Jan-24		<b>Jan-26</b>
7	Mr.	Mital	Arun	Fremont	AC Transit	Jan-24		<b>Jan-26</b>
8	Ms.	Pansino	Jeanne "Dede"	Albany	City of Albany	Mar-25		<b>Mar-27</b>
9	Ms.	Rivera-Hendrickson	Carmen	Pleasanton	City of Pleasanton	Sep-09	Apr-19	<b>Apr-21</b>
10	Ms.	Rousey	Michelle	Oakland	BART	May-10	Jan-16	<b>Jan-18</b>
11	Ms.	Stadmire	Sylvia	Oakland	Alameda County Board of Supervisors, District 3	Sep-07	Jul-19	<b>Jul-21</b>
12	Ms.	Van Slyke	Helen	Hayward	Alameda County Board of Supervisors, District 2	Apr-24		<b>Apr-26</b>
13	Ms.	Waltz	Esther Ann	Livermore	LAVTA	Feb-11	Sep-23	<b>Sep-25</b>

	<b>Title</b>	<b>Last</b>	<b>First</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Appointed By</b>	<b>Term Began</b>	<b>Re apptmt.</b>	<b>Term Expires</b>
14		<b>Vacancy</b>			<b>Alameda County Board of Supervisors, District 5</b>			
15		<b>Vacancy</b>			<b>City of Berkeley</b>			
16		<b>Vacancy</b>			<b>City of Hayward</b>			
17		<b>Vacancy</b>			<b>City of Livermore</b>			
18		<b>Vacancy</b>			<b>City of Newark</b>			
19		<b>Vacancy</b>			<b>City of Oakland</b>			
20		<b>Vacancy</b>			<b>City of Piedmont</b>			
21		<b>Vacancy</b>			<b>City of San Leandro</b>			
22		<b>Vacancy</b>			<b>City of Union City</b>			
23		<b>Vacancy</b>			<b>Union City Transit</b>			



Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
Monday, March 24, 2025, 1:30 p.m.

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• 510.208.7400

• www.AlamedaCTC.org

**1. Call to Order**

PAPCO Chair Sylvia Stadmire called the meeting to order.

**2. Roll Call**

A roll call was conducted, and all members were present with the exception of Roger Marshall, John Suter, and Helen Van Slyke.

**3. Public Comment**

There were no public comments.

**4. Consent Calendar**

**4.1 Approve the January 27, 2025, PAPCO Meeting Minutes**

**4.2 Fiscal Year (FY) 2024-25 PAPCO Meeting Calendar**

**4.3 PAPCO Roster Update**

*Herb Hastings moved to approve the Consent Calendar. Carmen Rivera-Hendrickson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following vote:*

*Yes: Costella, Hastings, Johnson, Lewis, Mital, Rivera-Hendrickson, Rousey, Stadmire, Waltz*

*No: None*

*Abstain: None*

*Absent: Marshall, Suter, Van Slyke*

**5. Regular Matters**

**5.1 Alameda County Mobility Needs Assessment for Older Adults and People with Disabilities Update**

Krystle Pasco stated that PAPCO members will receive an update on the Alameda County Mobility Needs Assessment for Older Adults and People with Disabilities that the agency is initiating. PAPCO members had the opportunity to provide input and engage in a discussion with the Nelson\Nygaard team, who is leading the effort.

*This item was for information only.*

## **5.2 Equity Initiatives Update**

Krystle Pasco provided an update on Alameda CTC equity initiatives.

*This item was for information only.*

## **5.3 Mobility Management Update**

Naomi Armenta provided an update on mobility management.

*This item was for information only.*

## **6. Committee Member Reports**

### **6.1 Alameda CTC Independent Watchdog Committee (IWC) Update**

There were no updates.

### **6.2 East Bay Paratransit Access Committee (EBPAC) formerly East Bay Paratransit's Service Review Advisory Committee (SRAC) Meeting Agenda Update**

Tony Lewis mentioned that the EBPAC discussed and viewed the new East Bay Paratransit bus. Naomi Armenta noted that the new bus has a wheelchair area closer to the front of the bus. Members requested that staff host a similar viewing of the new bus at a future PAPCO meeting.

### **6.3 Other ADA and Transit Advisory Committee Updates**

Herb Hastings discussed the new bus stops located at the Alameda County Fairgrounds. Carmen Rivera-Hendrickson mentioned that she requested that the Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority (LAVTA) to print tickets for the Alameda County Fair, along with the ability to purchase tickets remotely.

## **7. Staff Reports**

Krystle Pasco mentioned that the Program Plan Review is scheduled for April 28-29 from 1:00 to 4:00 p.m. She informed the Committee that she will notify the members of their appointments the week of March 24, 2025.

## **8. Adjournment**

The Paratransit Program Plan Review Subcommittee meetings are scheduled for April 28-29, 2025, at 1:00 p.m.

The next PAPCO meeting is scheduled for June 23, 2025, at 1:30 p.m. and will be held in person at the Alameda CTC offices, located at 1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607.



# Memorandum

8.1

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• 510.208.7400

• www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** July 17, 2025

**TO:** Alameda County Transportation Commission

**FROM:** Carolyn Clevenger, Deputy Executive Director of Planning and Policy  
Remy Goldsmith, Assistant Director of Policy and Government Affairs

**SUBJECT:** Federal, state, regional, and local legislative activities update

## Recommendation

This item will provide the Commission with an update on federal, state, regional, and local legislative activities. Staff recommend a Support in Concept position on Senate Bill 63 (Wiener/Arreguín), enabling legislation for a transportation revenue measure to support transit, and provide input and direction to staff regarding key principles. Given the rapidly evolving state of the bill, significant updates are expected following finalization of this staff report; staff will provide updates to the Commission as available.

## Background

The Commission approved the 2025 Legislative Program in December 2024. The purpose of the legislative program is to establish funding, regulatory, and administrative principles to guide Alameda CTC's legislative advocacy.

Each month, staff brings updates to the Commission on legislative issues related to the adopted legislative program, including recommended positions on bills as well as legislative and policy updates. Attachment A is the Alameda CTC 2025 adopted Legislative Program.

## Federal Update

On July 4<sup>th</sup> the President signed into law the "One Big Beautiful Bill Act" budget reconciliation bill. With its deep funding cuts, this year's federal budget is expected to have wide-reaching implications for states, including California. Reductions in federal spending are anticipated to be passed on to states, leaving gaps in many programs such as California's Medi-Cal program, and these anticipated impacts can be seen in the state's budget challenges.

## State Updates

### State Budget

On June 24, the legislature and Governor announced an agreement on next year's state budget. Thanks to advocacy from legislative leadership, the agreement includes a commitment to restore \$1.1 billion in funds for transit projects. The agreement also provides up to \$750 million in loans for specified Bay Area transit operators, including BART and AC Transit. The legislation outlines two key conditions for the funding to be made available. First, a trailer bill must be enacted to establish loan terms and structure. Second, legislation authorizing a regional measure to support the long-term financial stability of the transit agencies must also be approved.

The Governor signed the state budget at the end of June. Bills are expected to follow including "Budget Jr. Bills" which amend the budget, often with more details, and trailer bills which make budget implementation possible by enacting any corresponding changes to state law. Details for the Cap-and-Invest Program are anticipated to be determined during this period. Lawmakers anticipate additional budget revisions will be needed once federal program cuts are known.

### State Legislation

July 18 is the last day for lawmakers' policy committees to meet and report bills, after which the state legislature is adjourned for one month. Lawmakers will reconvene in August and the last day for the chambers to pass bills is in mid-September. Staff continue to monitor legislative developments and evaluate bills related to the Alameda CTC Legislative Program, continuing to bring updates to the Commission throughout the legislative cycle.

Table 1. below details legislation for which the Commission has existing positions and includes status updates. Staff recommend an update to the Commission's position on SB 63, from a Watch position to a Support in Concept.

#### *SB 63 (Wiener/ Arreguín)*

Transit agencies throughout the region are facing major fiscal challenges, as early as next fiscal year. As shared by AC Transit, BART and LAVTA staff at the Commission's April meeting, transit agencies are actively working to cut costs and attract riders back to their systems. However, additional funding will be needed to support sustainable transit operations.

Senate Bill 63 (Wiener/Arreguín) would enable a transportation revenue measure for transit to be placed on the 2026 ballot. The bill currently (as of July 15, 2025) includes Alameda, Contra Costa and San Francisco counties, with the option for San Mateo and Santa Clara counties to opt in by mid-August. The bill would authorize a



½ percent sales tax measure in Alameda and Contra Costa counties, and up to a 1 percent sales tax measure in San Francisco County, with funds dedicated to supporting transit in the participating counties.

BART, AC Transit, Muni, Caltrain, SF Bay Ferry, LAVTA, Union City Transit, County Connection, Tri-Delta Transit and WestCAT are specifically identified in the bill as the agencies to receive funding. The sales tax would be in place for a 10-to-15-year period. As drafted, MTC would be the administering agency, and receive funding for administration as well as an implementing agency, implementing transit enhancement projects and programs.

The Commission took a Watch position on SB 63 earlier this year, given the ongoing discussions and additional pending details. It is anticipated that significant amendments will be introduced to the bill in July, with negotiations likely continuing through August following the legislature's recess. Major outstanding items still to be determined include: the expenditure plan, final definition of counties included in the bill, governance, and funding levels for regional transit enhancements.

Given the timing of the negotiations in the legislature, staff recommend a Support in Concept position and provide input and direction to staff regarding key principles to communicate to the legislature. Should more details be available prior to the Commission meeting, staff will consider updating the recommendation at the Commission meeting. It is anticipated that the authors will release a draft expenditure plan in early July, with significant amendments anticipated throughout the month of July and into early August.

A Support in Concept position can demonstrate the Commission's ongoing support for transit, consistent with the Commission's adopted 2025 Legislative Program, which includes "advocate for sustainable funding to support transit agencies in their continued recovery", and principles can articulate priorities of the Commission. BART, AC Transit, LAVTA, WETA, MTC and the cities of Alameda and Emeryville currently have either Support or Support and Seek Amendment positions on the bill. Letters communicating the positions of AC Transit, BART, LAVTA, WETA and the cities of Alameda and Emeryville are included as Attachment B.

Staff recommend for the Commission's consideration the following key principles:

- Return to Source: Alameda CTC is a strong supporter of transit, and residents and visitors throughout the county rely on a variety of transit modes and agencies to travel across the county and region. Measure BB provides significant operating and capital funding to all operators in the county, as well as paratransit providers, and Alameda County voters provide additional funding for AC Transit and BART through a variety of other local and regional measures. Any new sales tax measure must ensure that the operating needs of

agencies operating in Alameda County are the first priority for funds generated in Alameda County, including both the large (AC Transit and BART) and small (LAVTA and Union City Transit) operators. While residents use transit throughout the region, the vast majority of funds generated in Alameda County should go towards transit operations in the county. As the projected revenues from the measure are not expected to fully meet the fiscal needs of the transit agencies, it is imperative that service cuts be minimized to the maximum extent possible.

- The Measure Must Be Capable of Passing: Transit agencies are facing imminent fiscal cliffs, and revenues are urgently needed to avoid devastating cuts in service. Alameda County, as the second largest county in the region and the largest of the three currently included in the measure, will be critical to passage of the measure. The majority of Alameda County jurisdictions have existing sales tax rates of 10.25-10.75%, many of the highest in the state. It is important that voters in Alameda County can see clear and direct benefits of the measure. This is particularly important for parts of the county with less robust transit service. It is also important that the measure and expenditure plan is simple and transparent and can clearly articulate the importance and benefits of the investments.
- Support for Fare Programs and Accessibility Services that Benefit Riders: The current bill stipulates that 5 percent of revenues go to MTC to implement transit enhancements. MTC has identified transit fare programs, wayfinding/mapping, accessibility and transit priority projects as priorities for transit enhancements. While all of the categories of transit enhancements are important, given the limited funding and importance of prioritizing maintaining transit service, staff recommend supporting an emphasis on fare programs that reduce the costs of transfers between systems, expansion of the Clipper START program, which provides transit discounts to low-income residents, and accessibility services for older adults and people with disabilities. These elements provide direct benefits to riders and seek to support low-income residents, who are disproportionately impacted by sales tax increases.
- Efficient Administration and Accountability: Establishing efficient mechanisms to administer the funds will ensure that the maximum amount of money can go towards transit operations. Numerous polls conducted by MTC and transit agencies over the past few years have identified accountability as a key issue for support of any new measure. Striking a reasonable balance between oversight and accountability and efficient administration that does not add numerous new processes and reporting requirements will be important.

**Table 1. Summary of Existing Bill Positions**

Bill	Summary	Analysis	Recommended Position
<b>Existing Positions with Changes Recommended</b>			
<a href="#">SB 63</a> (Wiener, Arreguín)	SB 63 authorizes a 10- to 15-year regional public transportation operations sales tax measure on the November 2026 ballot in specified Bay Area counties to provide critical funding for transit agencies with major operations shortfalls. Specifically, SB 63 authorizes a ½-cent sales tax measure in Alameda, Contra Costa, and San Francisco Counties – with up to 1 cent in San Francisco to provide greater Muni funding.	<p>Alameda CTC’s Legislative Program specifically includes to “advocate for sustainable funding to support transit agencies in their continued recovery”. Given the ongoing discussions regarding SB 63, staff will provide a verbal update at your meeting.</p> <p>The bill was approved by the Senate and it now in the Assembly.</p> <p>Status as of 7/15/2025: Approved in Assm. Revenue and Tax Committee; referred for hearing to Assm Appropriations Committee.</p>	Support in Concept with Key Principles
<b>Existing Positions with No Changes Recommended</b>			
<a href="#">SB 707</a> ( <a href="#">Durazo</a> D) Open meetings: meeting and teleconference requirements.	Would reform the Ralph M. Brown Act, the existing law guiding public meeting requirements to include certain	Extends teleconferencing participation to most subsidiary bodies; late bill amendments require significant	Watch

Bill	Summary	Analysis	Recommended Position
	<p>teleconferencing provisions and would require a city council or a county board of supervisors to comply with additional meeting requirements, including that all open and public meetings include an opportunity for members of the public to attend via a two-way telephonic option or a two-way audiovisual platform that a system is in place for requesting and receiving interpretation services for public meetings, as specified, and that good faith efforts are made to encourage residents to participate in public meetings.</p>	<p>review and analysis from staff.</p> <p>With recent amendments, Alameda CTC's community committee members who participate remotely would be able to receive their per diem. Numerous additional recent amendments are currently under review.</p> <p>Status as of 7/15/2025: Amended and re-referred to Committee on Local Government.</p>	
<p><a href="#"><u>Senate Bill 71</u></a> (Wiener)</p> <p>Environmental Streamlining for Sustainable Transportation</p>	<p>Removes the statutory sunset in current law that exempts certain transit, bicycle and pedestrian projects from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements and makes other minor updates.</p>	<p>Alameda CTC's Legislative Program supports multimodal improvements and safety, as well as efficient project delivery. Alameda CTC supported SB 288, the bill that allowed streamlining for a limited duration: this bill would remove the</p>	<p>Support</p>

Bill	Summary	Analysis	Recommended Position
		<p>sunset date for the exemption.</p> <p>The California Transit Association is sponsoring the bill and SPUR and the Bay Area Council are co-sponsors. MTC has taken a support position on the bill.</p> <p>Status as of 7/15/2025: Referred to Assembly Natural Resources Committee</p>	
<p><a href="#">Senate Bill 239</a> (Arreguín)</p> <p>Ralph M. Brown Act Teleconferencing Reform</p>	<p>Expands remote meeting options for non-decision-making local legislative bodies - including advisory boards - that do not take final action.</p>	<p>Alameda CTC's Legislative Program supports legislation that provides flexibility for remote meetings for advisory bodies.</p> <p>Previously, the Commission supported AB 817, which would have provided similar options for remote meetings.</p> <p>MTC and the California State Association of Counties have co-sponsored the bill.</p> <p>Status as of 7/15/2025: Referred</p>	<p>Support</p>

Bill	Summary	Analysis	Recommended Position
		to Senate Inactive File	

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

**Attachments:**

- A. Alameda CTC 2025 Legislative Program
- B. AC Transit, BART, LAVTA, WETA and the cities of Alameda and Emeryville Positions on SB 63



## 2025 Legislative Program

The Alameda County Transportation Commission’s legislative program identifies core legislative priorities to support and advance the vision and goals adopted in the Policy Blueprint for the 2026 Countywide Transportation Plan. Alameda CTC will develop strategic partnerships and support efforts to increase transportation funding and support policies that advance this legislative program.

*“Alameda County residents, businesses, and visitors will be served by a premier transportation system that supports a vibrant and livable Alameda County through a connected and integrated multimodal transportation system promoting safety, equity, sustainability, access, transit operations, public health, and economic opportunities.”*

- Policy Blueprint Vision

Core Legislative Priorities
<p><b>Transportation Funding:</b> Advocate for increased transportation funding and protection of existing funding to support projects, programs, and operations and seek to leverage local funds to the maximum extent possible to implement transportation improvements and services through grants and partnerships with regional, state and federal agencies. Advocate for sustainable funding to support transit agencies in their continued recovery. Advocate for efforts to reauthorize California’s Cap-and-Trade Program that benefit transit and sustainable transportation.</p>
<p><b>Equity:</b> Advocate for resources, legislation, and initiatives that provide accessible, affordable and equitable transportation opportunities and elevate the needs of equity priority communities. Prioritize and advance racial and socio-economic equity and environmental justice throughout the legislative program.</p>
<p><b>Safety:</b> Advocate for resources and legislation that enable Alameda CTC to deliver safe, multimodal infrastructure, prioritizes the safety of all users, and advances policies and strategies to further Vision Zero, a transportation safety initiative aimed at eliminating all traffic fatalities and serious injuries. Support opportunities for local jurisdictions to advance initiatives to increase safety in their communities.</p>
<p><b>Sustainability:</b> Support legislation, strategies and investments that reduce greenhouse gas emissions to create sustainable and healthy communities and increase the resiliency of our transportation system and communities, especially for equity communities; support investments and funding for alternative fuels, vehicles and supportive infrastructure to reduce emissions.</p>
<p><b>Effective Project Delivery and Operations:</b> Support policies that facilitate efficient and expedited project development and delivery processes, effective operations of the transportation system including Express Lane and HOV operations and governance, and support innovative project delivery.</p>

## Core Legislative Priorities in Depth

**Transportation Funding:** Advocate for increased transportation funding and protection of existing funding to support projects, programs, and operations and seek to leverage local funds to the maximum extent possible to implement transportation improvements and services through grants and partnerships with regional, state and federal agencies. Advocate for sustainable funding to support transit agencies in their continued recovery. Advocate for efforts to reauthorize California's Cap-and-Trade Program that continue to benefit transit and sustainable transportation.

- Seek, acquire, accept and implement grants to advance project and program delivery.
- Support efforts to increase transportation funding and advance priority projects and programs in Alameda County, including as part of any regional transportation measure.
- Support transit agencies as they seek to recover from the lingering impacts of the pandemic on fiscal solvency and ridership, including regional efforts to secure sustainable multi-year funding and improve service for the public.
- Support efforts that protect against transportation funding diversions.
- Ensure fair share of sales tax allocations from new laws and regulations.
- Protect and enhance voter-approved funding. Support efforts to lower the two-thirds voter threshold for voter-approved transportation measures including funding for delivery of programs and operations.
- Support rewarding Self-Help Counties and states that provide significant transportation funding.
- Support efforts to increase funding and advance policies that support transit, paratransit, and multimodal transportation incorporating multiple modes of transportation.
- Support efforts to increase funding to advance safety and active transportation.
- Support policies and funding that enhance Bay Area goods movement and passenger rail funding, delivery and advocacy that enhance the economy, local communities, and the environment.
- Support policies and programs that improve transportation services and infrastructure and do not create unfunded mandates.

**Equity:** Advocate for resources, legislation, and initiatives that provide accessible, affordable and equitable transportation opportunities and elevate the needs of equity priority communities. Prioritize and advance racial and socio-economic equity and environmental justice throughout the legislative program.

- Support accessible, affordable and equitable transportation resources throughout each policy area of this legislative program.
- Support investments in transportation for transit-dependent communities that provide enhanced access to goods, services, jobs and education.
- Support means-based fare programs while being fiscally responsible.

- Support policies and funding to develop and implement equitable mobility improvements.
- Support projects and programs that reduce emissions with a particular emphasis on communities historically disproportionately burdened by pollution from the transportation sector.
- Support expanding economic opportunities for small and local businesses by leveraging our procurement, contracting and hiring processes and supporting those historically disenfranchised such as women and minority owned businesses.

**Safety:** Advocate for resources and legislation that enable Alameda CTC to deliver safe, multimodal infrastructure that prioritizes the safety of all users and advances Vision Zero policies and strategies. Support opportunities for local jurisdictions to advance initiatives to increase safety in their communities.

- Expand multimodal options, shared mobility and innovative technology.
- Support investments in active transportation, including for improved safety and advance Vision Zero strategies to reduce speeds and protect communities.
- Support allowing cities the discretion to use more effective methods of speed enforcement within their jurisdictions.
- Support policies that advance safety for all users of the transportation system.
- Support advocacy of cooperation and partnership with railroads to advance projects, with a particular interest in rail safety projects.

**Sustainability:** Support legislation, strategies and investments that reduce greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) to create sustainable and healthy communities and increase the resiliency of our transportation system and communities, especially for equity communities which are or have historically been underserved; support investments and funding for alternative fuels, vehicles and supportive infrastructure to reduce emissions.

- Support funding for infrastructure, operations, and programs to relieve congestion, improve air quality, reduce emissions, expand resiliency and support economic development, including to support transitioning to a zero-emission transportation system.
- Support emerging technologies such as alternative fuels and technology to reduce GHG emissions and prioritize continued access to the electric grid for charging to support reliable operations.
- Support legislation to modernize the Congestion Management Program, supporting the linkage between transportation, housing, and multi-modal performance monitoring.
- Support efforts to increase transit priority throughout the transportation system, such as on freeway corridors and bridges.
- Support efforts to address sea level rise adaptation including planning, funding and implementation support.

- Support legislation and policies to facilitate deployment of connected and autonomous vehicles in Alameda County to enhance last mile connectivity to transit, including data sharing that will enable long-term planning and analysis of benefits and impacts.
- Support legislation that increases flexibility and reduces barriers for infrastructure improvements that support the linkage between transportation, housing and jobs and leverage opportunities for implementing Transportation-oriented Development (TOD) and Priority Development Areas (PDA), the latter which are places near public transit that are planned for new homes, jobs and community amenities. This includes transportation corridor investments that link PDAs.

**Effective Project Delivery and Operations:** Support policies that facilitate efficient and expedited project development and delivery processes, effective operations of the transportation system including Express Lane and HOV operations and governance, and support innovative project delivery.

- Advance innovative and cost-effective project delivery.
- Advance efficient and effective operations and governance of the Express Lane and HOV systems.
- Support environmental streamlining, efforts that reduce project and program implementation costs, and expedited project delivery, including contracting flexibility and innovative project delivery methods.
- Support funding and policies to implement transportation projects that create jobs and economic growth, including for apprenticeships and workforce training programs.
- Support HOV/managed lane policies and efforts that promote effective and efficient lane implementation and operations, protect toll operators' management of lane operations and performance, toll rate setting and toll revenue reinvestments, deployment of new technologies and improved enforcement.
- Oppose legislation that degrades HOV lanes that could lead to congestion and decreased efficiency.



Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District

Salvador Llamas, General Manager

May 30, 2025

The Honorable Scott Wiener  
California State Senate  
1021 O Street, Suite 8620  
Sacramento, CA 95814

The Honorable Jesse Arreguin  
California State Senate  
1021 O Street, Suite 6710  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**Re: SB 63 (Wiener & Arreguin): San Francisco Bay Area; Transportation Funding Support & Seek Amendments**

Dear Senator Wiener & Senator Arreguin:

On behalf of the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit), I am writing to extend AC Transit's support for SB 63, and encourage your favorable consideration of amendments that AC Transit feels are critical to providing an equitable allocation of funds, clear governance of the Transportation Revenue Measure District, promote a partnership with transit and prevent harmful impacts to existing service levels.

AC Transit is the largest bus-only public transit system in California, serving an average of 135,000 weekday riders from Richmond to Fremont. We have recovered 75 percent of our overall pre-pandemic ridership, 89 percent locally. AC Transit primarily serves low-income and transit-dependent riders and provides critical regional connections to BART, Amtrak, SFMTA, and other local transit agencies.

Similar to other Bay Area transit agencies, AC Transit continues to face significant operational budget challenges stemming from the COVID-19 pandemic, slow ridership recovery, inflation, labor costs, and the expiration of state and federal emergency relief funds. To maintain existing service levels of 85 percent of pre-pandemic service, our financial need over the next four years is projected at \$234 million. Beginning in FY 2026, we anticipate a shortfall of \$42 million, followed by \$74 million in FY 2027, \$60 million in FY 2028 and \$58 million in FY 2029.

Without stable, long-term operational funding sources such as those contemplated in SB 63, AC Transit may be forced to implement severe service reductions. These could include decreased frequency on core routes, elimination of low-ridership routes, and cuts to Transbay, late-night, and weekend service, significantly impacting transit-dependent riders and regional mobility. Without clear assurances that regional revenues will address our operational deficit, we must begin preparing our Board for financial contingency plans, including, but not limited to, potential service cuts.

Since 2019, AC Transit has taken bold action to reduce costs and overhead and our Board recently approved \$9 million in cuts for purchased transportation and professional services. While we remain committed to pursuing operational efficiencies, immediate investment in transit operations is essential to sustain our current service levels, which remain at approximately 85

percent of pre-pandemic levels. Any further service reductions will likely result in lower ridership – that may not return – and increased roadway congestion.

Given the significant impact AC Transit’s fiscal outlook will have on service levels, the AC Transit Board of Directors has adopted a **support and seek amendments position** on SB 63. If enacted, the implementation and oversight of SB 63 must be done in partnership with the transit operators, and there are critical areas of concern that must be addressed in the legislation. We look forward to working with you on the following issues:

*Equitable Allocation of Funds:* SB 63 currently does not specify funding amounts for the transit operators in the three named counties, Alameda, Contra Costa and San Francisco, or for any future counties who decide to opt-in. While we support the work currently underway by the county transportation authorities to identify funding allocations to each operator, if funding amounts or percentages are not identified in the bill, language should be added providing direction that the allocation of revenue should at a minimum proportionally address the operating deficit of each specified operator.

*Special District Governance:* SB 63 would create a new special district comprised of three counties. The legislation specifies that the governing body for this special district would include all 21 members of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) governing board. This includes 18 voting members and 3 nonvoting members. The new special district would be governed by a board whereby a majority, consisting of 10 voting members, that do not represent the residents of the special district, raising serious concerns about local accountability and governance.

SB 63 should be amended to create a distinct governing body that includes those MTC governing board members that represent the counties covered by the special district and include representation from transit operators and the county transportation authorities. A distinct governing body would help clarify other provisions in the bill regarding the adoption of the “financial efficiency report,” adopting or rejecting any exemptions requested by operators, and maintenance of effort requirements.

*Mitigating Title VI Reviews:* SB 63 specifies that the transit operators are responsible for completing any requirements under Title VI of the federal Civil Rights Act of 1964. However, SB 63 does not address how to mitigate the impacts identified in a Title VI review that result from fulfilling the 2021 Bay Area Transit Transformation Action. Paragraph (b) of Section 67772 should be amended to include a subparagraph 5 that prohibits the commission from requiring a transit operator to implement any policy or programs that result in impacts identified pursuant to Title VI of the federal Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Public Law 88 352) regarding service and fare changes, unless MTC provides sufficient funding to fully mitigate those impacts.

*Building a Partnership:* The implementation and oversight of SB 63 must be done in partnership with the transit operators within the Transportation Revenue Measure District. SB 63 references that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) should continue acting as the Regional Network Manager. Bay Area transit operators should not merely serve an advisory role. To promote regional collaboration on transit funding and the implementation of regional coordination efforts, SB 63 needs to formalize a partnership between transit operators and MTC by codifying the Regional Network Management Council. This would leverage the expertise of



these transit general managers in the decision-making process. Amendments should also be considered to place a representative of the Council on MTC's governing board. This voice is critical as MTC increases its oversight on regional transit improvements, and the administration of existing and future transit funding.

Accountability:

- Section 67768 states that to be eligible for funding each transit operator shall meet specified maintenance of effort requirements based on prior year operating budgets. This section also allows transit operators to request an exception to these requirements. The exception process should be amended to require MTC to provide written findings on why a request is denied and provide a grace period until issues are corrected.
- Section 67752 merely states it is the intent of the legislature that MTC does not supplant funds that would otherwise be directed to projects in the special district counties. Section 67752 should be amended to clearly prohibit MTC from supplanting funds that would otherwise benefit counties within the special district.
- Section 67772 authorizes a transit operator to adopt findings that a requirement to implement a policy, or expenditure would be unacceptable with respect to its impact on transit service, staffing, maintenance, or other specified operational or state of good repair considerations. However, SB 63 requires the transit operator to develop these findings in consultation with MTC staff, and the transit operator must present these findings to the MTC governing board before the transit operator's governing board is allowed to adopt these findings. The transit operators covered by SB 63 are independent special districts, and BART and AC Transit have independent publicly elected governing boards. Prohibiting AC Transit's Board of Directors from adopting findings that outline the impacts of a requirement proposed by MTC without first consulting and presenting the findings to MTC infringes on AC Transit independent governing authority.

I appreciate your leadership in addressing the Bay Area's public transit funding crisis and look forward to working closely with you to refine SB 63. Our shared goal is to advance a version of the bill that truly reflects regional partnership, equity, and accountability—principles essential to building a sustainable and reliable transit future for all Bay Area residents. Should you have any questions, I can be reached at [sllamas@actransit.org](mailto:sllamas@actransit.org) or 510-891-4753 or you may contact Claudia Burgos, Interim Executive Director of External Affairs, Marketing and Communications, at [cburgos@actransit.org](mailto:cburgos@actransit.org) or 510-701-2935.

Sincerely,



Salvador Llamas  
General Manager

cc: AC Transit Board of Directors  
AC Transit Legislative Delegation  
Steven Wallauch, Platinum Advisors



**SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT**

2150 Webster Street, P.O. Box 12688  
Oakland, CA 94604-2688  
(510) 464-6000

2025

April 15, 2025

Mark Foley  
PRESIDENT

Melissa Hernandez  
VICE PRESIDENT

Robert Powers  
GENERAL MANAGER

The Honorable Scott Wiener  
California State Senate  
1021 O Street, Suite 8620  
Sacramento, CA 95814

The Honorable Jesse Arreguin  
California State Senate  
1021 O Street, Suite 6710  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: SUPPORT for SB 63 – San Francisco Bay Area: local revenue measure: transportation funding**

**DIRECTORS**

Matthew Rinn  
1ST DISTRICT

Mark Foley  
2ND DISTRICT

Bamali Ghosh  
3RD DISTRICT

Robert Raburn, Ph.D.  
4TH DISTRICT

Melissa Hernandez  
5TH DISTRICT

Elizabeth Ames  
6TH DISTRICT

Victor Flores  
7TH DISTRICT

Janice Li  
8TH DISTRICT

Edward Wright  
9TH DISTRICT

Dear Senators Wiener and Arreguin:

The San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) Board of Directors is proud to support your Senate Bill (SB) 63. This bill would authorize a regional transportation funding measure that would enact a sales tax in the counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, and San Francisco, with an option for the counties of San Mateo and Santa Clara to opt in. The revenue generated would allow transit operators to avoid major service cuts, address near-term budget deficits, while funding rider-focused improvements.

The limited-duration sales tax authorized by SB 63 shares similarities with Scenario 1A, which was developed during the Revenue Measure Select Committee process led last year by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). During that process, BART supported Scenario 1A as a simple, politically viable option, that raises enough revenue to significantly address the collective deficits of the region's largest operators. BART also appreciates the collaborative process prescribed in the bill for the development of the Transit Operations Financial Responsibility and Implementation Plan (T-FRIP) and looks forward to engaging with relevant stakeholders.

Additionally, BART supports the financial transparency and accountability provisions included in SB 63. The District has consistently welcomed outside review of our agency's finances. We appreciate how this bill provides for a third-party financial efficiency review of all agencies receiving funding and includes work administered by MTC. Having transit operator representation on the proposed select committee responsible for working with the independent third-party reviewer will also ensure efforts are successful in identifying potential cost efficiencies.

For the reasons stated above, BART supports SB 63. If you have any questions about our support or requests for information, please contact Alex Walker, Manager of Government Relations and Legislative Affairs, at [alex.walker@bart.gov](mailto:alex.walker@bart.gov) or 510-299-6514.

Sincerely,

Mark Foley  
President

cc: BART Board of Directors  
BART General Manager

Livermore Amador Valley  
TRANSIT AUTHORITY



April 10, 2025

The Honorable Scott Wiener  
California State Senate  
1021 O Street, Suite 8620  
Sacramento, CA 95814

The Honorable Jesse Arreguín  
California State Senate  
1021 O Street, Suite 6710  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**Re: Senate Bill 63 (Wiener) San Francisco Bay area: local revenue measure:  
transportation funding**

**Position letter from the Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority (LAVTA)**

Dear Senator Wiener and Senator Arreguín:

On behalf of the Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority (LAVTA) Board of Directors, I write to share our **Support if Amended** position on SB 63 (Wiener), the Bay Area Regional Transportation Measure authorization legislation.

LATVA is the public transit agency serving the nearly 250,000 residents of the Tri-Valley cities of Dublin, Pleasanton, and Livermore. We provide over 1.3 million trips per year via the Wheels fixed-route bus and complementary paratransit service. Of importance is our timed integration with BART, ACE Rail, and other regional transit systems, providing a critical link in the Bay Area's regional transportation network, within which we coordinate closely with our regional transit partners. Transportation-related funding is critical to our operations, and we want to be engaged throughout the legislative process relating to the Bay Area Transportation Revenue Measure.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback on the Transit Operations Financial Responsibility and Implementation Plan (T-FRIP) and proposed framework for the expenditure of new revenue measure funding in the Transportation Revenue Measure District (TRMD). We acknowledge that the current framework as drafted identifies certain local operators in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties as eligible for any leftover funds after the four larger operators and MTC's transit transformation initiatives have been funded through TRMD revenues. Given the extreme deficits facing the four large operators, it is unlikely that any funding will remain to fund the forecasted operating deficits of the local operators during the time horizon of the proposed Regional Transportation Measure, notably where spatial gaps in access to the regional



network exist in participating TRMD counties that are currently covered by integrated feeder bus service.

As it relates to SB 63, our main comments are listed below; we look forward to working with your respective offices to address our concerns so that we can move to a support position on this legislation. With our service area having 15% of Alameda County's population and Alameda being by far the largest of the three counties initially being considered for inclusion in a potential voter measure yet having the highest current sales tax rate of 10.25%, we feel it is important to understand the potential impacts in and of our communities on the eventual success or failure of any future measure. We therefore want to express support for various aspects and highlight our local needs.

1. We strongly agree there needs to be supplemental funding for all transit agencies to meet their operating deficits. While LAVTA is not currently facing near-term "fiscal cliff" operating deficits or service cuts to the same degree and urgency as other agencies, we do project a financial shortfall as soon as FY27. Since 1997, LAVTA and other local bus operators in neighboring Contra Costa County have been providing feeder bus service to BART from areas within the counties that do not have a BART station. BART and MTC have signaled to all the local operators that after FY26, our BART feeder bus funding will be eliminated. This is a reversal of longstanding policies acknowledging that (a) not all areas within the original three BART sales-tax counties were being served by BART, and (b) a portion of the permanent BART sales tax revenues are allocated statutorily to SFMTA and AC Transit, including those revenues generated in Eastern Alameda and Contra Costa Counties.

Therefore our top priority in the current fiscal climate, which includes long-term structural funding challenges for all California transit agencies, is protecting our existing sources of operating revenues. As LAVTA lacks its own dedicated source of operating revenue, these existing sources enable our 1.3 million passengers per year, 68% of whom earn less than \$50,000 per year, to get to work and school every day. Our current funding levels also maintain good jobs for roughly 120 front-line workers including our drivers, mechanics, and support staff.

2. We strongly urge consideration of a return to source formula to ensure we capture local and regional revenue, in order to provide meaningful transit funding to growing communities, notably those in participating TRMD jurisdictions that lack direct access to the regional transit network. For the past three decades, the Tri-Valley has strongly supported California's and the Bay Area region's climate, economic, and housing goals. Since 1990, the Tri-Valley has built housing for 36,000 new households, increasing the local supply of housing 80% as new job centers were created at the same time. By

comparison, the Tri-Valley's rate of housing production since 1990 is more than four times that of San Francisco County and more than eight times that of San Mateo County, despite the large gains in employment which other jurisdictions did not add sufficient new housing to accommodate. Communities such as ours that are supplying the region with much-needed housing in support of our state's and region's economic and climate goals should see commensurate and timely returns on those substantive efforts and their results. With a return-to-source funding formula, operating funds should be allocated to local operators to support feeder bus service with timed connections to regional transit in communities that lack direct access to the regional network, for as long as TRMD revenues are being collected from those communities.

3. Because areas accommodating rapid and substantial growth in the region face multiple challenges and unmet needs in terms of local infrastructure, we also support a degree of local flexibility and delegated authority to identify local priorities by engagement with the public and the formation of localized expenditure plans.

Finally, while the issues we have identified above are focused on our service area and local priorities, we acknowledge that the effort to authorize a future voter measure is a regional one, and we wish to underscore any comments offered by other key regional stakeholders that the T-FRIP must meaningfully detail for a clear path forward for potential three-, four-, and five-county options, which includes participation in the T-FRIP for affected regional operators regardless of individual counties' decision to opt in to the TRMD.

We look forward to working with you to address our concerns and draft language relating to smaller operators so we can support this important legislation.

Sincerely,

  
Evan Branning (Apr 10, 2025 15:58 PDT)

Evan Branning, Chair  
Livermore City Councilmember

CC    Senator Tim Grayson  
      Senator Jerry McNerney  
      Assemblymember Rebecca Bauer-Kahan  
      Assemblymember Liz Ortega

May 13, 2025

The Honorable Scott Wiener  
California State Senate  
1021 O Street, Suite 8620  
Sacramento, CA 95814

The Honorable Jesse Arreguín  
California State Senate  
1021 O Street, Suite 6710  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: SB 63 – San Francisco Bay Area: local revenue measure: transportation funding – SUPPORT IF AMENDED**

Dear Senators Wiener and Arreguín:

The San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA) supports Senate Bill (SB) 63 – the Connect Bay Area Act – and requests amendments to include San Francisco Bay Ferry (SF Bay Ferry) as an eligible operator to receive funding. This inclusion would help address SF Bay Ferry's operating shortfall in the same way the legislation addresses shortfalls for other named transit operators.

SF Bay Ferry service is operated by WETA and carries over three million passengers annually utilizing a fleet of 19 high-speed, passenger-only ferry vessels. SF Bay Ferry currently provides service to Alameda, Contra Costa, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Solano County. Prior to the pandemic, SF Bay Ferry was the fastest-growing transit service in the region, and it has been the fastest regional operator to recover ridership during pandemic recovery. The service holds the highest customer satisfaction rating of any transit operator in the nation and is the sixth most cost-effective transit service in the Bay Area.

Unlike other regional transit services that rely on sales tax revenue, SF Bay Ferry's operations are funded largely through a share of bridge toll revenue—funding that is capped, does not adjust with inflation, and has lost significant purchasing power over time. While these funds are sufficient to maintain service through FY 2033, service cuts will be required in FY 2034 unless new revenue is secured.

Revenue from a regional measure authorized under SB 63 would help avoid major service cuts, address near-term budget deficits, and support rider-focused improvements across participating counties, including SF Bay Ferry.

An investment of approximately \$92 million over the life of a 10-year measure would maintain SF Bay Ferry service for the communities in Alameda, Contra Costa, and San Francisco that depend on it. Residents in the SF Bay Ferry service area have expressed strong support for the creation and allocation of new, regionally generated funding to preserve and expand ferry service. The system is also poised to connect regional travelers to the Bay Area's fastest-growing neighborhoods—such as Treasure Island and Mission Bay—which currently lack adequate public transit options and cannot thrive without the addition of reliable, water-based public transportation.

WETA welcomes the robust accountability measures in SB 63, including an independent third-party financial efficiency review and oversight mechanisms that include representation from transit operators.

Thank you for considering our support for this important legislation. Please contact Lauren Gulate at [lauren.gulate@sfbayferry.com](mailto:lauren.gulate@sfbayferry.com) or (415) 364-3188 with any questions or for additional information.

Sincerely,



[Seamus Murphy \(May 14, 2025 10:58 PDT\)](#)

Seamus Murphy  
Executive Director





June 17, 2025

The Honorable Lori Wilson  
Chair, Assembly Transportation Committee  
1020 N Street, Room 112  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: SB 63 (Wiener) – SUPPORT**

Dear Chair Wilson:

The City of Alameda supports SB 63 (Wiener) which will authorize a regional transportation revenue measure to invest in and sustain public transit services in the San Francisco Bay Area.

AC Transit, BART, Caltrain, and San Francisco Muni collectively carry about 80% of the region's transit trips and all face significant annual operating deficits. SB 63 is critical to the Bay Area region's transit services by providing a sustainable funding solution to avert major service cuts and maintain essential transit operations.

Specifically, SB 63 proposes the creation of the Transportation Revenue Measure District, encompassing the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, and the City and County of San Francisco, with provisions allowing San Mateo and Santa Clara counties to opt in. This district would have the authority to place a retail transaction and use tax measure—ranging from 0.5% to 1%—on the November 2026 ballot, subject to approval by two-thirds of the voters. The revenue generated would be dedicated to supporting and enhancing public transportation services across the region.

The City of Alameda supports funding for stable and reliable revenue streams for transportation and transportation efforts to minimize traffic congestion and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. For these reasons, we are pleased to support SB 63 and respectfully ask for your “AYE” vote when this measure comes before you. Thank you.

Best Regards,

Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft  
Mayor of Alameda

cc: The Honorable Scott Wiener  
Honorable Members, Assembly Transportation Committee

City of Alameda  
Mayor's Office

2263 Santa Clara Avenue, Room 320  
Alameda, California 94501  
510.747.4700



# City of Emeryville

INCORPORATED 1896

## OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

1333 Park Avenue. Emeryville, CA 94608-3517  
t (510) 596-4300 | f (510) 596-4389

June 10, 2025

The Honorable Scott Wiener  
California State Senate  
1021 O Street, Suite 8620  
Sacramento, CA 95814

The Honorable Jesse Arreguin  
California State Senate  
1021 O Street, Suite 6710  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: Senate Bill 63 (Wiener and Arreguin) – Bay Area Transportation Revenue Measure  
Transbay Joint Powers Authority  
City of Emeryville – Notice of Support**

Dear Senators Wiener and Arreguin,

The City of Emeryville writes in strong support of Senate Bill 63, which authorizes a 10- to 15-year regional public transportation operations sales tax measure on the November 2026 ballot in specified Bay Area counties to provide critically needed operations funding.

In April of this year, the City of Emeryville officially proposed to the MTC and Link21's Equity Advisory Council, the addition of an Emeryville BART station as part of the region's Transit 2050+ plan. Emeryville is rapidly growing, with its population expected to double in the next twenty years. This station is crucial, not only to support our population growth, and workers, but to meet the state's climate goals. An Emeryville BART station will remove 10,000 vehicles from our city's roadways daily, which will, in turn, remove 30,000 pounds of carbon emissions per day.

While public transportation continues to be an essential service for Bay Area residents, shifting travel patterns due to and after the pandemic have led to significant reductions in transit trips taken though BART has seen ridership increase compared to the pandemic lows, with a 5.3% growth in passenger trips in Calendar Year 2024 and an almost 6.5% increase in the first three months of 2025 compared to the same period in 2024. However, this growth has not brought ridership back to the levels seen before the pandemic, which relied heavily on fare revenue.

Prior to the pandemic, passenger fares covered nearly 70% of BART's operating expenses. Now, with depressed ridership, only about 25% of operating costs are covered by fares. This has created a structural deficit. BART has relied on almost \$2 billion in federal, state, and regional emergency assistance to cover the gap since 2020. However, this funding is projected to run out in FY26. Beginning in FY27, BART faces ongoing structural deficits estimated to range from \$350 million to over \$400 million per year. New funding is critical for transit operators to maintain service in the Bay Area and help the region continue its economic recovery.

Moreover, SB 63 includes regional network management and financial efficiency provisions that will identify cost-saving measures to help transit operators provide improved safe, clean, reliable, and more seamlessly integrated service.

For these reasons, the City of Emeryville strongly supports SB 63 and thanks Senators Wiener and Arreguin for their leadership on this issue.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "D. Mourra", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

David Mourra, Mayor  
City of Emeryville

Cc: Members of the City Council  
LaTanya Bellow, City Manager



# Memorandum

8.2

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• 510.208.7400

• www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** July 17, 2025

**TO:** Alameda County Transportation Commission

**FROM:** Kristen Villanueva, Director of Planning  
Chris G. Marks, Senior Transportation Planner  
Grasielita Diaz, Associate Transportation Planner

**SUBJECT:** 2026 Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) Update

## Recommendation

It is recommended that the Commission receive an update on the 2026 CTP including upcoming project milestones and public and stakeholder engagement.

## Background

The CTP creates a vision for the future of transportation in Alameda County, sets priorities, and guides decision-making at the Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) as it plans, funds, and delivers transportation improvements. Alameda CTC updates this transportation plan approximately every four years to respond to changing conditions and evaluate new opportunities and demands placed on the transportation system. The CTP also articulates Alameda CTC's needs within the region, and in turn reflects regional, state, and federal policies and planning assumptions. This makes it an important input to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC's) updates to Plan Bay Area, the region's long-range transportation and land use plan, and is an important pathway for funding for many types of projects.


The current update to the CTP is referred to as the 2026 CTP. In November 2023, Alameda CTC kicked off the update as a two-phased process, with an approval of the policy element in the first year. In October 2024, the Commission adopted the [Policy Blueprint](#), which sets the plan's vision, goals, and policy objectives and completed the first phase of work. The Blueprint informs all aspects of CTP development and is organized around four goals: safety, equity, climate, and economic vitality, with policy objectives that detail how the plan will advance each goal. The Blueprint additionally described the community engagement approach for the CTP phase, including the establishment of a working group of leaders from community-based organizations (CBOs) to collaborate with and conduct public engagement.

During the first half of 2025, Alameda CTC staff worked with jurisdiction staff, agency partners, and CBOs to advance the technical phases of the CTP. At the July PPLC meeting, staff will provide an update on upcoming CTP milestones, plans for public engagement, and a summary of key feedback from discussions with local jurisdictions and agencies. In the coming months, staff will continue to provide updates at each major milestone in the CTP development process ahead of anticipated plan completion in 2026.

## CTP Development and Milestones

Building on the Policy Blueprint adopted in October 2024, the technical phases of the CTP generate core recommendations that influence how Alameda CTC plans, funds, and delivers projects. The work program to develop the CTP includes four key elements: a countywide needs assessment, development of project and program recommendations from existing project pipelines, identification of additional gaps and opportunities, strategies and near-term actions, and a performance evaluation of the full plan. Together, these elements will provide direction for future transportation investments and policy decisions that collectively fulfill the Policy Blueprint's vision and advance safety, equity, climate, and economic vitality goals. Staff expect to release Draft & Final Plans in 2026 for the Commission to consider approving through the process detailed in Figure 1.

**Figure 1. CTP Core Recommendations Timeline**



## CTP Core Recommendations

The core recommendations of the 2026 CTP will guide Alameda CTC decision-making and help achieve the ambitious transportation vision and goals adopted by the Commission in the Policy Blueprint through three components:

- **Project and Program Recommendations:** Staff will update the 2020 CTP Project List, collect new local priority projects, and assess how well each project advances CTP goals. Staff will confirm project information with local jurisdictions and agencies before developing draft recommendations later this year.

- **Gaps and Opportunities Assessment:** Building off the needs assessment, staff will identify specific locational and thematic gaps not fully addressed by the project and program recommendations. This analysis will help shape the CTP's non-infrastructure recommendations.
- **Strategies and Near-term Actions:** Staff will develop strategies and actions that complement project recommendations and inform the agency's future work plan including planning, funding, and advocacy.

**Performance Evaluation:** As required by MTC in their most recent CTP guidelines, the plan's performance evaluation will assess how well the 2026 CTP performs in alignment with the goals and policy objectives. This assessment will inform priority project list and strategy refinement. Evaluation metrics will include quantitative metrics for at least vehicle-miles traveled (VMT) and equity, as required by MTC, as well as transit priority performance targets to address transit speed and reliability on major streets.

### **CTP Working Group and Upcoming Community Engagement**

The first year of the Policy Blueprint development focused on cultivating relationships with CBOs. After reaching out to over 500 organizations, staff met with approximately 40 CBOs throughout the Policy Blueprint phase and collected feedback on the goals and objectives. To deepen relationships built in the previous phase and expand participation, the Policy Blueprint recommended creating a CTP Working Group comprised of CBOs to advise engagement and provide input to the CTP.

Based on engagement in the Policy Blueprint, availability and interest, the CTP team solicited participation for the CTP Working Group. The Working Group includes 10 organizations from all planning areas as shown in **Attachment A**. The group is compensated for its time and has met twice so far to review the CTP engagement plan and specific tactics. During the first two meetings, the CTP Working Group reviewed the proposed engagement approach and provided recommendations on language and strategies to reach specific audiences. They also provided input on the summer community survey and specific events and partnered events.

Significant community engagement for the CTP will happen in summer and fall 2025.

**Attachment B** describes the engagement activities planned for this phase, including a list of community events. The CTP team will coordinate the engagement with planned updates to the Countywide Active Transportation Plan, Paratransit Needs Assessment, and with the agency's communications team, which regularly attends large events throughout the year. All CTP engagement resources will be translated into English, Spanish, and Simplified Chinese with additional translation and interpretation available upon request.

### **Listening Sessions with Local Jurisdictions and Agencies**

Alameda CTC staff held individual listening sessions with 23 jurisdictions and agencies throughout Alameda County between March 27th and May 22nd, 2025. Each conversation covered the CTP development approach, engagement details, and project evaluation methodology. Jurisdictions and agencies then shared local investment priorities, thematic



implementation opportunities, and challenges they face in advancing transportation goals. Alameda CTC met with the following:

- Local Jurisdictions and Agencies: Alameda County Public Works Agency, Alameda, Albany, Berkeley, Dublin, Emeryville, Fremont, Hayward, Livermore, Oakland, Piedmont, Pleasanton, San Leandro, Union City
- Other Agencies: Port of Oakland, East Bay Regional Parks District (EBRPD)
- Transit Agencies: Alameda-Contra Costa Transit Agency (AC Transit), Altamont Corridor Express (ACE), Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART), Capitol Corridor, Livermore-Amador Valley Transit Authority (LAVTA/Wheels), Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA/SF Bay Ferry), Union City Transit, Valley Link

Across the meetings, agency staff reconfirmed the ambitious goals and objectives of the Commission's Policy Blueprint. Staff focused on delivery challenges in meeting these objectives in the current funding and inflationary environment and provided context for refining CTP recommendations, particular Strategies and Near-Term Actions, that can support advancing the CTP's policy objectives over the long-term. Key themes from these conversations include:

- Renewed priority on maintaining and modernizing infrastructure: Local jurisdictions and agencies consistently emphasized issues caused by aging infrastructure, especially older traffic signal systems with limited functionality and pavement. Costs for repairs have increased significantly and existing maintenance budgets do not reach as far as previous cycles.
- Funding uncertainty has narrowed priorities: Many jurisdictions have adopted more strategic and incremental project delivery approaches in response to budget constraints. Many jurisdictions are phasing complete streets projects into smaller, less complex components that are easier to fund and deliver. Most jurisdictions now prioritize fixing existing infrastructure first, while transit operators have shifted funding to operations, with system maintenance and safety remaining top priorities.
- Project and operational costs rising: Individually valuable design requirements like stormwater permits, ADA and PROWAG<sup>1</sup> compliance, and other requirements have increased the cost and complexity of many projects. At the same time, most jurisdictions have seen the cost of project elements and operational costs exceed inflation. Together, these rising costs have created significant issues for project delivery and many transit operators face a fiscal cliff in the next 2 years, with all facing major challenges by 2030.
- Zero-Emission Vehicle (ZEV) transition is hitting obstacles: The State of California's mandated transition to ZEV presents new procurement challenges for most transit operators. Tariffs and changes to the regulatory environment have caused

---

<sup>1</sup> The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Public Right-of-Way Accessibility Guidance (PROWAG)

manufacturers to pull back, especially for hydrogen vehicles, reducing competition, increasing delivery timelines, and increasing costs. Even with vehicle procurement, facilities lack grid capacity to recharge ZEV fleets, requiring improvements to maintenance and operations capacity alongside rolling stock acquisition.

- Most projects require significant trade-offs: Jurisdictions consistently described the complex challenge of balancing competing community needs within limited space and resources. Many cities continue to prioritize multimodal interchange projects, recognizing that the freeway system remains a significant barrier to safe active transportation. Cities are increasingly focusing on pedestrian safety infrastructure projects that address critical safety needs.

In addition, Alameda CTC is currently leading two planning efforts, the Countywide Active Transportation Plan and Paratransit Needs Assessment. The recommendations from these studies will also inform the CTP recommendations.

### **CTP Milestones and Next Steps**

In the coming months, staff will continue working on key tasks to develop the Draft 2026 CTP. Throughout the summer, staff will gather public feedback on transportation priorities through community events and the survey, working closely with the CTP Working Group to incorporate that feedback into the core recommendations. Staff will review the projects and programs submitted by local jurisdictions and agencies and meet with them again this fall to finalize a draft project list. By the end of this year, staff will bring an update on needs, gaps and opportunities as well as an update on draft recommendations to the Commission for review and guidance before finalizing the plan in 2026.

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

### **Attachments:**

- A. CTP Working Group Organizations
- B. 2026 CTP Public Engagement Approach and Draft Events List

**Attachment A****CTP Working Group Organizations**

- El Timpano
- Girls Inc. of Alameda County
- Center for Independent Living
- Roots Community Health
- Cherryland Community Association
- San Leandro 2050
- Afghan Coalition
- Deaf Plus Adult Community
- CityServe of the Tri-Valley
- Three Valleys Community Foundation

## Attachment B

### 2026 CTP Public Engagement Approach and Draft Events List

With guidance from the CTP Working Group, the CTP team will conduct the following engagement tactics to support the CTP's core recommendations over summer and fall 2025:

- Community Survey - Gather feedback from a broad range of residents across the county, especially those from underserved communities, on transportation needs.
- Share Your Experience - Provide an open-ended form where community members can share detailed personal experiences about transportation challenges, barriers, or needs in their own words. This alternative to the structured survey allows for more nuanced feedback and helps capture issues that may not be addressed in standard survey questions.
- Community Leader Interviews - Deepen understanding of specific community needs and priorities by meeting with CBOs and service organizations not participating in the CTP Working Group.
- Pop-ups and Event Tabling - Engage diverse community members by connecting with them at existing community events to raise awareness of the CTP, gather direct input, and promote survey participation.
- Pop-ins and Presentations at Standing Meetings - Present CTP updates and gather input at community or organizational meetings, including presentations to Alameda CTC's standing public committees.
- Multilingual Text, SMS, or WhatsApp Promotion Campaign - Invite survey participation through multilingual messaging to reach diverse communities through their preferred communication channels.
- Press Releases and Email Outreach - Distribute CTP updates and engagement opportunities through traditional channels managed by Public Information Officers, Chambers of Commerce and other organizational email networks.
- Targeted Social Media Campaign - Amplify engagement opportunities and share CTP updates through targeted social media content to reach unique audiences missed by other outreach.

## Draft Pop-Up and Pop-In Event List

The following tables provide proposed engagement events for the CTP for Summer and Fall 2025 as of June 30, 2025. Additional partner events are being discussed with members of the CTPWG in all planning areas.

### North County

Date	Event Name	Event Type	CTPWG Org	Location
8/9/2025	<a href="#">Laurel Street Fair World Music Festival</a>	Pop-up	N/A	Oakland
8/23-24/25	<a href="#">Oakland Chinatown 36th Streetfest</a>	Pop-Up	N/A	Oakland
10/5/25	Emeryville Harvest Festival	Pop-up	N/A	Emeryville

### Central County

Date	Event Name	Event Type	CTPWG Org	Location
8/23/25	<a href="#">FamFest</a>	Pop-up	Cherryland Community Association	Ashland
Aug/Sept 2025	<a href="#">San Leandro Food Pantry</a>	Pop-in / 1:1 outreach	San Leandro 2050	San Leandro
9/1/25	Hayward Mariachi Festival	Pop-up	N/A	Hayward


### South County


Date	Event Name	Event Type	CTPWG Org	Location
7/17/25	Fremont Summer Concerts in the Park	Pop-Up	N/A	Fremont
8/2-8/3/25	Fremont Festival of the Arts	Pop-Up	N/A	Fremont
8/5/2025	<a href="#">Newark National Night Out</a>	Pop-In	N/A	Newark
8/5/2025	<a href="#">Union City Night Out</a>	Pop-Up	N/A	Union City

### East County

Date	Event Name	Event Type	CTPWG Org	Location
8/29/25	<a href="#">Pleasanton Concerts in the Park</a>	Pop-up	N/A	Pleasanton
Aug 2025	Innovation Tri-Valley Lunch and Learn	Pop-in	N/A	TBD
9/13/25	<a href="#">Splatter</a> (In Dublin)	Pop-Up	N/A	Dublin
Sept 2025	Survey Work Session	Partner event	CityServe	TBD
Sept or Oct 2025	Commuter Choice Transportation Fair	Pop-up	CityServe	TBD

# 2026 Countywide Transportation Plan





**ALAMEDA**  
County Transportation  
Commission

**Alameda County Transportation Commission**

July 24, 2025

## Agenda

- CTP background and work plan update
- Community engagement overview
- Partner agency listening sessions
- Next steps





## What does the CTP do?

The CTP...

- Establishes a countywide **transportation vision and goals**
- Articulates needs and priorities for the Regional Transportation Plan: **Plan Bay Area 2060**
- Enables **funding eligibility** (ex. OBAG cycles) for many projects and informs **funding criteria**
- Informs agency **policy priorities, planning initiatives, and advocacy platform**



2024 Alameda Countywide Transportation Plan  
POLICY BLUEPRINT

PREPARED BY  
FERRIS PEERS



3

## State and Regional CTP Requirements

The CTP is required to...


- Incorporate **strategies from PBA 2050**:
  - Land Use strategies and growth assumptions
  - Support Transit-Oriented Communities
- Conduct **engagement** consistent with the Public Participation Plan
- Produce a quantitative **performance evaluation**
  - Estimate VMT and GHG emissions
  - Equity impacts



4

## What is the Policy Blueprint?

- **Adopted** by the Commission in October 2024 and a major part of the February **Commission Retreat**
- Includes a **vision and four goals**:
  - Equity
  - Safety
  - Climate
  - Economic Vitality
- **Policy Objectives** for each goal



5

## Safety Goal and Policy Objectives

### Goal

Reduce fatalities and severe injuries of all users towards zero by deterring unsafe speeds, prioritizing vulnerable users, and implementing the Safe System Approach.

### Policy Objectives

- Eliminate Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes
- Design for Safe Target Speeds
- Utilize the High-Injury Network and Proactive Safety Network
- Prioritize Vulnerable Users
- Separate Users
- Advance the Safe System Approach



Note: complete list of policy objectives for each goal in Policy Blueprint

6







## Equity Goal and Policy Objectives

### Goal

Advance deliberate policies, systems and actions to deliver a transportation system that removes barriers and transportation-related inequities and results in more equitable opportunities, access and positive outcomes for marginalized communities.



### Policy Objectives

-  Prioritize Community-Based Projects
-  Foster Partnerships
-  Improve Infrastructure
-  Increase Access to Destinations
-  Reduce Climate Impacts
-  Reduce the Transportation Cost Burden

Note: complete list of policy objectives for each goal in Policy Blueprint

7


## Climate Goal and Policy Objectives

### Goal

Create safe multimodal facilities to walk, bike and access public transportation to promote healthy outcomes and support strategies that reduce reliance on single-occupant vehicles and minimize impacts of pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions.



### Policy Objectives

-  Support Multimodal Corridors
-  Improve Access to Transit
-  Advance Clean Transportation Options
-  Integrate Sustainable and Resilient Infrastructure
-  Implement a Safe Active Transportation Network

Note: complete list of policy objectives for each goal in Policy Blueprint

8

# Economic Vitality Goal and Policy Objectives

## Goal

Support a resilient Alameda County economy and vibrant local communities through a transportation system that is affordable, clean, reliable, well-maintained and integrated with land uses that support sustainable travel.

## Policy Objectives

-  Modernize Freight Transportation
-  Support Zero-Emission Commercial Activity
-  Support Compact Multimodal Development Areas
-  Connect Planned Developments and Commercial Districts
-  Support Priority Production Areas
-  Improve Equitable Access to Economic Opportunities



*Note: complete list of policy objectives for each goal in Policy Blueprint*

9

# CTP Core Recommendations

## CTP Core Recommendations

- 1 Comprehensive Needs Assessment and Gaps and Opportunities Analysis**  
Informs agency work plan and future planning initiatives
- 2 Project and Program Recommendations**  
Path for funding eligibility for projects
- 3 Strategies and Near-Term Actions**  
Informs agency work plan and future priorities and planning initiatives




Countywide Active Transportation Plan Update (2026)

Paratransit Needs Assessment Update (2025/2026)



10

## Core Recommendations Timeline



11

## Who will provide input on the CTP?



### Community Engagement

Community engagement will emphasize **historically marginalized populations** through:

- **Community-Based Organizations** with the CTP Working Group (CTPWG)
- General **public engagement**, including with business organizations



### Agency Partners

Traditional channels will include:

- **Local Jurisdiction and Agency** staff through individual discussions and workshops
- **Public Committees** through regular presentations



### Commission

Input on **major milestones** and provides **final approval**



12

## The CTPWG includes CBOs from across the County

The CTP Working Group...

- Consists of a **group of CBOs** that represents the needs of their constituent communities
- Provides **guidance on engagement strategies** to expand and deepen engagement
- Met in **February and May**, will meet next in the fall and up to five times throughout the duration of the CTP



### Countywide:

- El Timpano
- Girls Inc. of Alameda County

### North Planning Area:

- Center for Independent Living
- Roots Community Health

### Central Planning Area:

- Cherryland Community Association
- San Leandro 2050

### South Planning Area:

- Afghan Coalition
- Deaf Plus Adult Community

### East Planning Area:

- CityServe of the Tri-Valley
- Three Valleys Community Foundation

13

## CTP WG: What We Heard



### Leverage partnerships and build trust

- Leverage CBO connections
- Use a variety of methods to engage audiences



### Use accessible and inclusive engagement materials

- Using plain language and simple graphics
- Use sensitive and inclusive terms



### Partnership opportunities and event recommendations

- Attending existing meetings



14

## Varied formats will engage a broad set of audiences

Throughout the Project

### CBO Engagement

- CTP Working Group
- Community Leader Interviews

Summer/Fall 2025

### Prioritizing Objectives & Recommendations

- Community Survey and "Share your Experience" option
- Pop-Ups and tabling events
- Pop-Ins and presentations
- Multilingual promotional campaign
- Press Releases and email outreach
- Targeted social media campaign

Winter 2025/26

### Draft Plan

- Pop-Ins and presentation events
- Multilingual promotional campaign
- Press Releases and email outreach



15

## Agency Listening Sessions



**23**

Local jurisdictions and agencies



**22**

90-minute meetings



**224**

Projects submitted

*85 new projects and 139 projects carried over from the 2020 CTP*



**130**

Programs submitted



16



## Agency Listening Sessions: What we Heard



### **Infrastructure maintenance and modernization**

- Renewed priority on signal system upgrades for safety and reliability
- Deferred pavement maintenance costs rising



### **Funding Uncertainty**

- State and federal changes squeezing local budgets
- Jurisdictions simplifying projects and adopting phased approach
- Larger interchange and complete streets projects caught in funding gap



17

## Agency Listening Sessions: What we Heard



### **Rising project and operational costs**

- Project requirements increasing scope and complexity
- Construction bids consistently above older estimates
- Transit operational costs rising and fiscal cliff



### **Zero-Emission Vehicle transition hitting obstacles**



### **Project trade-offs**

- Multimodal interchanges remain a priority
- Balancing needs in limited right-of-way
- Focus shifting to pedestrian safety projects



18


## How we will use this information

- The 2026 CTP project and program recommendations reflect needs that **advance the CTP's four goals**
- Alameda CTC is working with agencies to identify projects that are **aligned with the Policy Blueprint objectives**
- Community and agency engagement informs **priority objectives and actions** for the CTP
- Priority objectives and actions not covered by projects will be discussed as **Gaps and Opportunities**



19

## Public and Stakeholder Engagement: CTP Development Process



20

## Commission Milestones

- **November 2023:** CTP kickoff
- **February, April, July 2024:** Policy Blueprint updates and input
- **October 2024:** Policy Blueprint approval and HIN/PSN Report
- **July 2025:** Midyear work plan update, summer engagement, listening session report
- **Fall/Winter 2025:** Needs/Gaps/Opportunities, public engagement summary, Core Recommendations
- **Spring/Summer 2026**
  - Review Draft Plan
  - Final CTP approval



21

## CTP Next Steps – Summer and Fall 2025

- Review project submissions and meet with local jurisdiction and agency partners again
- Partner with CTP Working Group and conduct community engagement
- Present update to PPLC at November meeting



22





# Memorandum

8.3

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

PH: (510) 208-7400

www.AlamedaCTC.org

**DATE:** July 17, 2025

**TO:** Alameda County Transportation Commission

**FROM:** Jhay Delos Reyes, Director of Project Delivery and Construction  
Matthew Bomberg, Principal Transportation Engineer  
Angelina Leong, Principal Transportation Analyst

**SUBJECT:** Capital Program Update

## Recommendation

This item is to provide the Commission with an update on Alameda County Transportation Commission's (CTC) Capital Program. This item is for information only.

## Summary

Alameda CTC's mission is to plan, fund, and deliver transportation programs and projects that expand access and improve mobility to foster a vibrant and livable Alameda County. Through the Commission, Alameda CTC directly manages plans, funds, and delivers a Capital Program that expands access and improves mobility to foster a vibrant and livable Alameda County. These multi-modal projects include port/rail projects, multi-modal corridor improvement projects, interchange modernization projects, express lane projects, and landscaping or plant establishment period projects. These projects will enhance safety, facilitate goods movement, implement bicycle/pedestrian, transit, and technology improvements and reduce congestion with the goal of providing an effective, efficient, and safe transportation network throughout Alameda County. Many of these projects are in the 2000 and 2014 Transportation Expenditure Plans (TEPs).

There are 26 active Capital Projects which are regionally significant capital projects valued at approximately \$2.5 billion and are in various phases of delivery from scoping through construction. This update includes an overview (scope schedule, cost, and status) of the Alameda CTC managed capital projects.

## Background

Alameda CTC is directly managing 26 active capital projects that span various stages of delivery, including: Scoping, Preliminary Engineering/ Environmental, Final Design, Right of Way, Construction and Landscaping/Plant Establishment. These projects are

valued at approximately \$2.5 billion and are fully detailed in Attachment A. The Commission approved the use of Measure B and BB funds for Alameda CTC serves as the Implementing Agency of these projects. For 22 of the projects, Alameda CTC also serves as the Project Sponsor responsible for development of a project's scope, cost and schedule. Many of these projects originate from the 2000 and the 2014 TEP.

Alameda CTC performs direct Project Management and delivery for these projects, which require multi-jurisdictional coordination and/or have significant regional impact. Multi-jurisdictional coordination includes working with various regional, state or federal agencies for project development such as park districts, utility companies, the Bay Conservation and Development Commission, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the State Historic Preservation Office, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the United States Army Corps of Engineers. Regional impact considerations include investment of transportation improvements in Equity Priority Communities, (Historically) Disadvantaged Communities, improvements on Alameda CTC's Countywide High Injury Network, or projects that advance the goals in Alameda CTC's Countywide Transportation Plan and/or Countywide Goods Movement Plan.

These multi-modal projects include port/rail projects, multi-modal corridor improvement projects, arterials and interchange modernization projects that improve operations, addition of express lane infrastructure, and follow-up landscaping projects. These projects will enhance safety, facilitate goods movement, implement bicycle/pedestrian, transit, and technology improvements and reduce congestion with the goal of providing an effective, efficient, and safe transportation network throughout Alameda County. An overview update of each project is provided in Attachment B and summary of all project costs are provided in Attachment B.

#### Highlights of Projects Sponsored by Alameda CTC

Alameda CTC's active Capital Program currently has 8 projects worth approximately \$1.2 Billion where all funding has been secured, including approximately \$778 million of other local, regional, state and federal grants. Generally, these projects are proceeding to construction, well into the construction phase or a form of closeout of recently completed construction work. These projects include the Oakland Alameda Access Project, Route 84 Express – South Segment Landscape, I-880 Southbound High Occupancy Vehicle – Landscape, I-80 Gilman Interchange Improvements, the SR 84 Widening and SR 84/I-680 Interchange Improvements, Freight Intelligent Transportation System, 7<sup>th</sup> Street Grade Separation East and the I-680 Southbound Express Lane from SR 84 to Alcosta Blvd Projects. Three of the projects in this list are directly from the 2014 TEP and the 7<sup>th</sup> Street Grade Separate East project represents the first transportation infrastructure construction project administered by Alameda in over a decade.

Alameda CTC has been diligent in the near-term delivery of several projects which address safety, encourages mode shift to biking, walking or taking transit or provides operational improvements on high volume facilities such as highways. There are 7 projects where Alameda CTC has a conceptual full funding plan for the projects and is

working to complete the delivery milestones needed to receive the construction allocations. These projects include the Rail Safety Enhancement Program – Phases A and B, the I-80 Ashby Bicycle and Pedestrian Overcrossing, San Pablo Avenue Multimodal Corridor Safety Enhancements and Bus Bulbs, Parallel Bike and Jackson Street Parallel Bike, East Bay Greenway Multimodal – North Segment Projects. Combined value of these projects are approximately \$415 million with over \$227 million in similar grant funds. All of these projects are currently in the Plans, Specification and Estimate phase. Six of these projects began project development after 2020 and one of these projects fulfills another project in the 2014 TEP.

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

**Attachments:**

- A. Alameda CTC Capital Projects Cost Summary Table
- B. Alameda CTC Capital Project Update Overview



Ala CTC Project No.	Project Name	Project Sponsor	Implementing Agency	Current Phase	Begin	End	Funding (Millions)							Project Cost (All Sources) (Millions)
							Sales Tax		Leveraged Funds				Unsecured Funds	
							2000 MB	2014 MBB	Federal	State	Regional	Other/ Local		
Active Projects														
1196000	Oakland/Alameda Access (I-880 Broadway-Jackson)	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC	PS&E (Design)	Early 2022	Fall 2024	8.1	94.9	0.0	70.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	173.3
1210002	Route 84 Expressway - South Segment Landscape	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC	Plant Establishment	Early 2022	Summer 2026	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0
1369001	Interstate 680 Northbound Express Lanes - Landscape	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC	PS&E (Design)	Fall 2024	Early 2027	0.0	1.7	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	6.4	9.1
1376001	I-880 Southbound High Occupancy Vehicle - Landscape	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC	Plant Establishment	Begin 2021	End 2025	0.1	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	2.7
1381000	I-80 Gilman Interchange Improvements	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC	Closeout	Summer 2022	Summer 2025	0.0	36.4	7.2	53.8	0.0	4.9	0.0	102.3
1386000	SR 84 Widening and SR 84 / I-680 Interchange Improvements	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC	Construction	Spring 2021	Summer 2025	1.0	122.0	0.0	19.7	85.0	16.2	0.0	243.9
1386001	SR 84 Widening and SR 84 / I-680 Interchange Improvements - Landscape	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC	PS&E (Design)	Fall 2024	Early 2027	6.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.1	12.5
1392104	Rail Safety Enhancement Program - Phase A	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC	PS&E (Design)	Fall 2023	Summer 2026	0.0	16.6	25.0	30.0	25.0	0.0	15.2	111.8
1442000	Freight Intelligent Transportation System (FITS)	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC	Closeout	End 2023	Spring 2027	0.0	29.3	9.7	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	51.5
1442001	7th Street Grade Separation (East)	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC	Construction	End 2023	Summer 2028	0.0	111.3	0.0	191.7	55.0	20.0	0.0	378.0
1445001	I-80 Ashby - Bicycle and Pedestrian Overcrossing	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC	PS&E (Design)	Spring 2024	Fall 2027	0.0	7.9	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	42.0	50.0
1453000	I-880 Interchanges (Whipple Road/Industrial Parkway Southwest & Ind. Parkway West) Improvements*	Hayward	Alameda CTC	PS&E (Design)	Summer 2022	TBD	0.0	104.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	115.9	220.0
1471000	I-880 Interchanges (Winton Ave and A Street)*	Hayward	Alameda CTC	Environmental	Fall 2019	End 2025	0.0	6.8	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	80.9	87.8
1472000	State Route 262 (Mission Boulevard) Connector	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC	Environmental	Fall 2021	Summer 2027	0.0	9.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	57.0	76.0
1475001	San Pablo (SR-123) Multi-modal Corridor Bus and Bike Improvements	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC	Scoping	Spring 2023	Summer 2025	0.0	8.0	10.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	232.6	250.8
1475002	San Pablo (SR-123) Multi-modal Corridor Safety Improvements and Bus Bulbs	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC	PS&E (Design)	Begin 2022	Summer 2026	0.0	4.3	15.0	14.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	33.4
1475003	San Pablo (SR-123) Multi-modal Corridor Parallel Bicycle Facility	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC	PS&E (Design)	Spring 2022	Winter 2025	3.4	2.3	13.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.8
1475004	San Pablo (SR 123) Jackson Street Parallel Bike	Alameda CTC	Albany	Environmental	Begin 2024	End 2026	0.0	1.1	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1
1483000	Dublin Boulevard - North Canyons Parkway Extension*	Dublin	Alameda CTC	PS&E (Design)	Spring 2021	Summer 2026	0.0	7.7	0.5	0.0	0.0	99.9	51.8	159.9
1490001	I-680 SB Express Lane from SR84 to Alcosta Blvd	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC	Construction	Begin 2023	End 2025	13.4	47.7	0.0	134.1	80.0	0.0	0.0	275.2
1490002	I-680 SB Express Lane from SR84 to Alcosta Blvd - Landscape	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC	PS&E (Design)	Summer 2024	Early 2027	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.0	0.0	13.0
1587001	East Bay Greenway (Phase 1) - Lake Merritt to Bayfair (North Segment)	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC	PS&E (Design)	Early 2023	Summer 2026	0.0	17.8	30.0	58.9	25.0	0.0	65.0	196.7
1587002	East Bay Greenway (Phase 1) - Bayfair to 162nd Ave (County Segment)	Alameda County	Alameda County	PS&E (Design)	Fall 2025	Fall 2027	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.3	14.4
1587003	East Bay Greenway (Phase 1) - Downtown Hayward to South Hayward (Hayward Segment)**	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC	Scoping	Late 2023	Fall 2025	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2
1618000	Rail Safety Enhancement Program, Phase B	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC	Environmental	Mid 2025	Summer 2026	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	3.2
1630000	I-580/I-680 Interchange Safety Improvements Project**	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC	Scoping	Begin 2025	Summer 2026	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
Active Projects Total:							33.7	636.9	112.8	586.6	280.2	156.2	686.2	2492.6
Project Initiation Only														
1475000	San Pablo (SR 123) Multi-modal Corridor - Project Initiation Only	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC	N/A	Summer 2017	Late 2022	0.0	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	5.4
1587000	East Bay Greenway Multi-modal (Phase 1) - Lake Merritt BART to S. Hayward BART - Project Initiation Only	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC	N/A	Late 2021	Late 2023	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8
Project Initiation Only Total:							0.0	7.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	8.2
Project Development On-Hold														
1442002	7th Street Grade Separation (West)	Alameda CTC	TBD	PS&E Paused	TBD	TBD	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	308.5	311.0
1445000	I-80 Ashby Interchange Improvements	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC	PS&E Paused	Late 2017	Late 2023	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	133.7	143.8
1457001	East Bay Greenway Urban Trail (Phase 2)	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC	PS&E Paused	TBD	TBD	0.3	3.5	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	432.4	438.8
1476000	East 14th Street/Mission and Fremont Boulevard Multi-modal Corridor	Alameda CTC	TBD	Env Paused	TBD	TBD	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6
1490000	I-680 Northbound Express Lane from SR84 to Alcosta Blvd	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC	PS&E Paused	Fall 2018	Fall 2020	0.0	6.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.5
Project Development On-Hold Total:							0.3	25.1	2.6	0.1	0.0	0.0	874.6	902.7
Completed Construction Projects														
1174000	I-880 / SR-262 Interchange Improvements	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC		Begin 2001	Spring 2015	10.9	0.1	3.8	66.6	0.0	84.1	0.0	165.4
1210001	Route 84 Expressway - North Segment	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC		Spring 2005	Summer 2014	20.5	0.0	0.0	16.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	36.5
1210002	Route 84 Expressway - South Segment (Highway Improvements)	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC		Spring 2005	Late 2019	23.3	10.0	0.0	47.0	0.0	13.1	0.0	93.4
1367000	I-880 North Safety and Operational Improvements at 23rd and 29th	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC		Summer 2013	Summer 2023	4.0	12.9	77.6	4.1	12.3	0.0	0.0	110.9
1369000	I-680 Sunol Express Lanes - (Phase 1)	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC		Spring 2023	End 2024	122.4	5.7	0.0	58.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	186.7
1376001	I-880 Southbound High Occupancy Vehicle (Highway Improvements)	Alameda CTC	Alameda CTC		Begin 2007	Summer 2016	0.9	0.0	5.0	52.8	0.0	11.0	0.0	69.7
Completed Construction Total:							182.0	28.7	86.4	245.1	12.3	108.2	0.0	662.6
Total:							216.0	698.2	201.8	831.7	292.5	265.1	1560.8	4066.1
Notes:														
* Unsecured funds determined by Project Sponsor														
** Project Costs to be determined after Scoping work has been completed.														

## Attachment B – Capital Project Update Overview

### Port & Rail Projects

1. *Global Opportunities at the Port of Oakland (GoPort) – Freight Intelligent Transportation System:* The project is located in the Port of Oakland (Port), one of the ten busiest container ports in the nation. Project benefits include improving truck and rail access to the Port, safety enhancement, reduction of emissions, and overall efficiency of operations and traffic through both engineering and use of technology. Project improvements include a suite of demonstration information technology projects along streets in the Port that are intended to improve truck traffic flows, increase the efficiency of goods movement operations, and enhance the safety and incident response capabilities throughout the seaport. The project is currently in closeout.
2. *GoPort – 7th Street Grade Separation East:* The project is located at the Port of Oakland. Project benefits include improved safety and efficiency of truck and rail access to the Port, state of good repair, and a Bay Trail gap closure. The project will realign and reconstruct the existing railroad underpass and multi-use path along 7th Street between west of I-880 and Maritime Street meet current roadway standards and improve the shared pedestrian/bicycle pathway. The project is currently in construction which is anticipated to be completed by Spring 2028.
3. *Rail Safety Enhancement Program (RSEP) – Phase A:* The project within the cities of Livermore, Hayward, San Leandro, Berkeley and Oakland and unincorporated Alameda County. Project benefits include improved pedestrian, bicycle and vehicle safety at grade crossings, improved efficiency and reliability of freight and rail operations and reduced greenhouse gas emissions. The project traverses numerous Equity Priority. Project improvements include pedestrian and roadway treatments such as sidewalks, upgraded automated vehicle gates, new automated pedestrian gates with an emergency swing gate, channelizing railings, anti-trespassing fencing, median islands, advanced pavement markings and signage. The project is in the final design phase which is anticipated to be completed in 2026.
4. *RSEP Phase B:* the project is located in the North and South planning areas. The project will implement improvements at two crossings: at High Street on the Niles Subdivision in Oakland and H Street on the Niles Subdivision in Union City, with recommended safety enhancements centered around pedestrian treatments, such as sidewalks, automatic pedestrian gates, channelization, lighting, warning strips, fencing and gates, and signing and striping. The project is currently in environmental phase with anticipated completion in summer 2026.

## Multimodal Corridor and Arterial Projects

5. *San Pablo Multimodal Corridor – Safety Enhancements:* The project is located in the cities of Berkeley and Albany. Project benefits include improved safety, transit speed, and improved access to destinations such as schools, commercial districts, parks, and community centers. The entire project length is within designated Equity Priority Communities. Project improvements include bus bulbs, new signals and flashing beacons, median refuges, lighting improvements, bus stop relocations, and accessible curb ramp improvements. The project is in the final design phase which is anticipated to be completed in 2026.
6. *San Pablo Multimodal Corridor – Parallel Bike Improvements:* The project is located in the cities of Oakland, Berkeley and Albany. Project benefits include improved safety, multimodal gap closures, and improved access to destinations such as schools, commercial districts, parks, and community centers. The entire project length is within designated Equity Priority Communities. Project improvements include new bike boulevard improvements along streets parallel and connecting to San Pablo Avenue including traffic calming (traffic circles, diverters, and speed humps), crossing treatments, wayfinding, paving, and signing and striping. The project is in the final design phase which is anticipated to be completed in late 2025.
7. *San Pablo Multimodal Corridor – Bus and Bike Lanes:* The project is located in area in the cities of Oakland, Emeryville, and Berkeley. Project benefits include improved safety, transit speed, and improved access to destinations such as schools, commercial districts, parks, and community centers. The entire project length is within designated Equity Priority Communities. Project improvements include new dedicated bus lanes, separated bike lanes, pedestrian crossing treatments, bus loading islands, lighting, and paving. The project is in the scoping phase which is anticipated to be completed in summer 2025.
8. *San Pablo Multimodal Corridor – Jackson Street Parallel Bike:* The project in the City of Albany. The City of Albany is the implementing agency for this project. Project benefits include improved safety along a high injury network corridor, a gap closure in the Countywide Bike Network, and improved connection to destinations such as student housing and schools. The project will construct a new shared use path along the east side Jackson Street from 8<sup>th</sup> Street to Buchanan Street. The project is in the environmental phase.
9. *East Bay Greenway (Phase 1) – Lake Merritt BART to Bayfair (North Segment):* The project is located in the cities of Oakland and San Leandro. Project benefits include improved safety along high injury corridor streets, multimodal gap closures, and improved access to destinations such as regional transit, schools, and affordable housing. The project traverses numerous Equity Priority Communities. Project improvements include new shared use paths, separated bikeways, crossing improvements, bus stop

improvements, and urban greening. The project is in the final design phase which is anticipated to be completed in 2026.

10. *East Bay Greenway (Phase 1) – Bayfair to 162<sup>nd</sup> Avenue (County Segment):* The project is in the unincorporated community of Ashland. Alameda County is the project sponsor. Project benefits include improved safety along high injury corridor streets, multimodal gap closures, and improved access to regional transit, schools, affordable housing, and community parks. Project improvements include separated bikeways, intersection safety improvements, bus stop improvements, and urban greening. The County will be implementing the final design phase which is anticipated to be completed in 2027.
11. *East Bay Greenway (Phase 1) – Downtown Hayward to South Hayward (Hayward Segment):* The project is located in the City of Hayward. The project aims to develop alternative concepts which will construct an active transportation facility on the west side of the BART and Union Pacific Railroad corridors to connect the Hayward and South Hayward BART stations through Downtown Hayward. Project improvements will include Class I pathways, Class IV separated bikeways, where feasible, pedestrian crossing enhancements, bus stop upgrades, raised medians, protected intersections, new and upgraded traffic signals, safety lighting, curb ramp upgrades, and opportunities for improving stormwater treatment, street trees, etc. The project is currently in scoping phase which is anticipated to be completed by
12. *Dublin Boulevard – North Canyons Parkway Extension:* The project is located in the cities of Dublin and Livermore and unincorporated Alameda County. Project benefits include improved safety, enhanced multimodal connectivity, reduced congestion, and improved regional and interregional connectivity. Project improvements include a new 4-6 lane roadway extension, bike lanes and bike path, sidewalks, and traffic signals. The project is in the final design phase which is anticipated to be completed in 2026.

#### Multimodal Interchange Modernization and Operational Improvement Projects

13. *I-80 Gilman Interchange Improvements:* The project is located in the cities of Berkeley and Albany. Project benefits are designed to reduce congestion, shorten vehicle queues, and minimize merging and turning conflicts. A comprehensive set of improvements, including a modernized at-grade rail crossing, upgraded multimodal corridors, interchange enhancements, and new landscaping. Construction is in two phases, and Phase 1 of the project has been completed, while Phase 2 is under construction and near completion. Following completion, a three-year Plant Establishment Period will begin and expected to end in 2028.
14. *I-80 Ashby Interchange Improvements (Bicycle and Pedestrian Overcrossing):* The project is in the City of Emeryville near the I-80/Ashby

Avenue interchange, proposes to construct a Bicycle and Pedestrian Overcrossing (BPOC) structure across I-80 to advance the bicycle and pedestrian facility improvements as Phase 1 of the I-80/Ashby Avenue (SR-13) Interchange Improvements project. The proposed Phase 1 - BPOC Project improvements will provide multi-modal transport options, by providing an east-west connection across I-80, including connectivity to the existing Bay Trail and Point Emery.

15. *I-880 Interchanges (Whipple Road/Industrial Parkway Southwest and Industrial Parkway West) Improvements:* The project is located in within the cities of Hayward and Union City. The Project sponsor is the City of Hayward and Alameda CTC is the implementing agency. This project will improve safety, relieve freeway and interchange congestion, improve pedestrian and bicycle access across I-880 and enhance goods movement along the I-880 Corridor and to major industrial and warehouse areas. Proposed improvements include construction of a new I-880 northbound off-ramp and replacement of bridge structures at the Industrial Interchange, ramp realignments and reconfigurations, local street widening, intersection and signal improvements, dedicated lanes for pedestrians and bicyclists on local streets and over the new structures across I-880, and auxiliary lanes along I-880. Currently, the project is in the final design phase.
16. *I-880 Interchanges (Winton Avenue and A Street) Improvements:* The project is within the City of Hayward. This project will improve safety, relieve freeway and interchange congestion, improve pedestrian & bicycle accessibility and improve truck turning movements at intersections. Proposed improvements include ramp configurations, local road and intersection improvements and auxiliary lanes along I-880. Currently, the project is in the environmental phase.
17. *SR 84/I-680 Interchange Improvements and SR 84 Widening:* The project is located near the unincorporated area of Sunol and near the Cities of Livermore and Pleasanton. A key objective of the project is to address weaving and merging conflicts between SR-84 and I-680, which will enhance overall safety and reduce congestion in the area. This project involves a range of multimodal corridor upgrades, interchange modernization efforts, and environmental enhancements. It includes widening State Route 84 by adding one lane in each direction. Currently in the construction phase, the project is scheduled for completion in summer 2025.
18. *State Route 262 (Mission Boulevard) Connector:* This project is located in the City of Fremont along SR 262 from the Warm Springs Boulevard to east of the I-680/SR 262 Interchange. The project proposes to implement a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility, where feasible, including modifications at the I-680/SR 262 interchange to improve the safety of bicycles and pedestrians, thus will provide multimodal travel options. The project is currently in environmental phase with anticipated phase completion in summer 2027.

19. *Oakland/Alameda Access Project (OAAP) (formerly I-880 Broadway-Jackson)*: The project is located within the cities of Oakland and Alameda. OAAP will improve safety and reduce congestion by separating regional and local vehicular traffic, improve accessibility and connectivity for bicyclists and pedestrians and reduce emissions in Equity Priority Communities. Proposed improvements include a new ramp connector from the Posey Tube direct to northbound I-880, modifications of several ramps, new bicycle facilities, new pedestrian facilities, added lighting and new. Currently the OAAP is in the bidding process with construction starting in fall 2025.
20. *I-580/I-680 Interchange Safety Improvements Project*: This project is located near the Cities of Dublin and Pleasanton. The goal of the project is to identify near-term safety improvements in and around the interchange within the cities of Dublin and Pleasanton. Currently the project is in the planning/scoping phase which is expected to be completed in summer 2026.

#### Express Lane Projects

21. *I-680 Southbound Express Lanes from SR84 to Alcosta Blvd*: The project is located within the cities of Dublin and Pleasanton. This closes a nine-mile gap in the southbound I-680 Express Lane network between State Route 84 and Alcosta Boulevard. The project is currently under construction and is anticipated to be completed in late 2025.

#### Landscaping and Plant Establishment Projects

22. *I-680 Northbound Express Lanes - Landscape*: The project is a follow up to the I-680 Northbound Express Lanes highway construction project, which was completed in 2023. The approved environmental document requires a follow up landscape/mitigation project and will plant close to 700 trees & install an irrigation system to restore vegetation removed from the construction of highway improvements. Currently this project is in the final design phase which is expected to be completed in summer 2026.
23. *I-680 Southbound Express Lanes - Landscape*: The project is a follow up to the I-680 Southbound Express Lanes highway construction project, currently in construction. The approved environmental document requires a follow up landscape/mitigation project and will plant close to 1,000 trees & install an irrigation system to restore vegetation removed from the construction of highway improvements. Currently this project is in the final design phase which is expected to be completed in summer 2026.
24. *SR 84/I-680 Interchange Improvements - Landscape*: The project is a follow up to the SR84/I-680 Interchange and SR 84 Widening construction project, currently in construction. The approved environmental document requires a follow up landscape/mitigation project and will plant close to 1,300 trees &

install an irrigation system to restore vegetation removed from the construction of highway improvements. Currently this project is in the final design phase which is expected to be completed in summer 2026.

25. *I-880 Marina/Davis - Landscape*: The project is a follow up to the I-880 Marina/Davis Interchange Project, which was completed in 2015. The follow up landscaping project includes construction of the landscaping and irrigation systems as well as a four-year plant establishment period which meets the commitment of replacing highway planting identified during the project environmental approval process. Currently, this project is in the plant establishment period which is expected to be completed in December 2025.
26. *Route 84 South Segment – Landscape*: The project is a follow up to the Route 84 North and South Segment construction packages, which were completed in 2019. The follow up landscaping project enhances the existing plantings on State Route 84 to ensure survival for a three-year plant establishment period, a requirement identified during the project environmental approval process. The project will complete the plant establishment period in January 2026.






## ALAMEDA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION Capital Project Update



Alameda County Transportation Commission  
Jhay Delos Reyes, Director of Project Delivery and Construction  
July 24, 2025

## Alameda CTC Active Capital Projects Overview



# Alameda CTC Active Capital Projects Overview

Scoping (PID)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Sponsor Activity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish Project Purpose and Need (P&amp;N) and Concepts</li> <li><u>Establish needed efforts to advance the Project</u></li> <li><u>Obtain Resources for identified efforts</u></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementing Agency Activity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gather, Analyze and Synthesize data to support development of Project P&amp;N</li> <li>High-level technical work to support the establishment of concepts</li> <li><u>Identify efforts needed</u></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Env (PA/ED)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Determine Environmental Lead Agency</li> <li>Determine Mitigation Measures as appropriate</li> <li>Determine Project</li> <li>Obtain Lead Agency's acceptance of the ED</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gather, Analyze and Synthesize data to inform and obtain the needed Environmental Technical Approvals</li> <li>Produce the Environmental Document</li> </ul>
PS&E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Obtain all land rights to construct Project</li> <li>Obtain all permits and agreements</li> <li>Fulfill Environmental requirements as assigned</li> <li>Fulfill all other requirements prior to Con</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop PS&amp;E package for Construction</li> <li>Develop all supporting Permits, Licenses, Agreements and Certifications</li> <li>Support Project Sponsor by developing all needed work product to full requirements</li> </ul>




ALAMEDA CTC CAPITAL PROJECT UPDATE

3

# Alameda CTC Capital Projects Overview

## Project Delivery Phases



## Project Types:


- Rail
- Arterial/Operational Improvements
- Bicycle
- Pedestrian
- Transit
- Follow-Up Landscaping

## Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) Goals:

- Safety
- Equity
- Climate
- Economic Vitality

## Project Locations

4 Planning Areas – North (Blue), Central (Red), South (Yellow) and East (Green)




ALAMEDA CTC CAPITAL PROJECT UPDATE

4

# East Bay Greenway Multimodal – North Segment

Location Within County:




Project Type:  

Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) Goals:



- 10.6-mile active transportation facility with Class I and IV bike facilities and pedestrian crossing improvements connecting 5 BART stations and other major activity centers
- Includes transit stop improvement and stormwater treatment and urban greening components
- Improves equitable access and encourages mode shift



Total Project Cost:

\$196.7 M

Anticipated Next Milestone:

95% PS&E

Fund Sources:

MBB, Fed, State, Regional



ALAMEDA CTC CAPITAL PROJECT UPDATE

5

# Rail Safety Enhancement Program – Phase A

Location Within County:




Project Type: 

Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) Goals:



- Improves safety for all users at active grade crossings by providing pedestrian and roadway treatments focused on safety and eliminates vehicle gate go arounds such as installation of median islands or bulbouts
- Improves safety and reliability of rail operations by reducing the need for trains to stop due to incidents
- Removes barriers and encourages shift to active transportation by providing safer options for bicyclists and pedestrians such as automatic pedestrian gates, channelized railing, lighting and sidewalks



**LEGEND**  
 1. Sidewalk, typ.  
 2. Automated Pedestrian Gates, typ.  
 3. Manual Swing Gates, typ.  
 4. Channelized Railing, typ.  
 5. Tactile Warning Strips, typ.  
 6. Fencing, typ.  
 7. Maintenance Access Gate, typ.  
 8. Median Island, typ.  
 9. Upgraded Signing and Striping, typ.  
 10. Anti-Trespass Surface, typ.

Proposed Improvements (Typical)

Total Project Cost:

\$111.8 M

Anticipated Next Milestone:

100% PS&E

Fund Sources:

MBB, Fed and Regional




ALAMEDA CTC CAPITAL PROJECT UPDATE

6



# Rail Safety Enhancement Program- Phase B


Location Within  
County:



Project Type:



Countywide Transportation  
Plan (CTP) Goals:



- Improves safety for all users by eliminating the run-around the train gates or cross the train tracks opportunities for motor vehicles and pedestrians, when the railway gate arms are in operation at these at-grade rail crossings
- Improves rail service reliability & enhances economic vitality by reducing the need for the trains to reduce speeds at these at-grade crossings.
- Reduces greenhouse gas emission by improving train travel speeds

Total Project Cost:

**\$7.9M\***

Anticipated Next Milestone:

**Draft Environmental Document**

Fund Sources:

**Federal**

\*Conceptual level estimate only. Subject to revisions. Current phase is fully funded.



ALAMEDA CTC CAPITAL PROJECT UPDATE

7

# San Pablo Avenue: Safety Enhancements

Location Within  
County:




Project Type:



Countywide Transportation  
Plan (CTP) Goals:



- Pedestrian and cyclist crossing improvements along San Pablo Avenue within Berkeley and Albany
- Bus bulbs to improve bus speed and reliability
- Improves equitable access and encourages mode shift



Total Project Cost:

**\$33.3 M**

Anticipated Next Milestone:

**95% PS&E**

Fund Sources:

**MBB, State, Federal**



ALAMEDA CTC CAPITAL PROJECT UPDATE

8

# San Pablo Avenue: Parallel Bike Improvements





Project Type:

Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) Goals:

- Bicycle and pedestrian improvements to neighborhood street bicycle routes parallel and connecting to San Pablo Avenue in North Oakland, Berkeley and Albany
- Crossing upgrades at major street crossings and traffic calming
- Improves equitable access and encourages mode shift

Location Within County:



Total Project Cost: **\$18.7 M**

Anticipated Next Milestone: **100% PS&E**

Fund Sources: **MBB, Federal**



ALAMEDA CTC CAPITAL PROJECT UPDATE

9

# Oakland Alameda Access Project





Project Type:

Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) Goals:

- Improves safety and reduces congestion by separating regional and local vehicular traffic by a direct connector between Posey Tube and northbound I-880 & modifying various ramps
- Improves accessibility and connectivity for bicyclists and pedestrians (bike/ped) by constructing over 3 miles bike/ped improvements
- Reduces emissions in equity community with air pollution/ high particulate matter exposure

Location Within County:



Total Project Cost: **\$165.6 M**

Anticipated Next Milestone: **Construction start**

Fund Sources: **MB, MBB, Fed, State**



ALAMEDA CTC CAPITAL PROJECT UPDATE

10

# Received Grants

Project	Regional	State	Federal	% of Total Project Cost
• East Bay Greenway Multimodal – North Seg	\$25.0 M	\$58.9 M	\$30 M	57.9%
• Rail Safety Enhancement Program – Phase A	\$25.0 M	\$30.0 M	\$25.0 M	71.6%
• Rail Safety Enhancement Program – Phase B	\$ -	\$ -	3.2 M	100.0%
• San Pablo Avenue Safety	\$ -	\$14.0 M	\$15.0 M	86.8%
• San Palbo Avenue Parallel Bike	\$ -	\$ -	\$13.1M	69.7%
• Oakland Alameda Access Project	\$ -	\$70.3 M	\$ -	40.6%



## 7<sup>th</sup> St. Grade Separation East



Project Type:



Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) Goals:



Location Within County:



- Supports Regional Economic Development by improving flow of goods and creating job opportunities
- Increases Port of Oakland Freight Operations Efficiency and safety by reducing congestion and improving mobility
- Provides bicycle and pedestrian connectivity to Bay Trail system
- Reduces emissions and greenhouse gases by Improving truck flow and wait times to the Port

Total Project Cost:

**\$379 M**

Anticipated Completion:

**Fall 2028**

Fund Sources:

**MBB, Local, Port of Oakland, State, Regional**






# Gilman Interchange Improvements – Phases 1 & 2



**Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) Goals:**



- New pedestrian/bike bridge completed in the summer of 2023
- Roundabouts, cycle track, Bay Trail extension, and utility upgrades completed in May 2025
- Boosted traffic flow, safety, and multi-modal access
- Eased congestion on I-80 (300,000 vehicles/day)
- Enhanced safety at key regional access point & Bay Trail gateway

**Total Project Cost:**

**\$100.3M**

**Anticipated Completion:**

**Late Spring 2025**

**Fund Sources:**

**MBB, Fed, State, Local**



ALAMEDA CTC CAPITAL PROJECT UPDATE

13

# I-680 Southbound Express Lanes Project



**Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) Goals:**



- Closes a nine-mile express lane gap between SR-84 and Alcosta Blvd to reduce congestion and connect existing and planned lanes.
- Relieves heavy commute congestion
- Enhances traffic operations and efficiency



**Total Project Cost:**

**\$328.2 M**

**Anticipated Completion:**

**Winter 2025**

**Fund Sources:**

**MBB, State, Regional**



ALAMEDA CTC CAPITAL PROJECT UPDATE


14



# SR-84 / I-680 Interchange Improvements Project



- Add one lane in each direction on SR 84
- Modify ramps & extend SB I-680 express lane (~2 miles)
- Address weaving/merging conflicts
- Reduce congestion & improve safety



Total Project Cost:

**\$245.3M**

Anticipated Completion:

**Winter 2025**

Fund Sources:

**MB, MBB, Local, State, Regional**



ALAMEDA CTC CAPITAL PROJECT UPDATE

## Leveraging

Project	Alameda CTC Funds	External Funds	% Leveraged Total Project
• 7 <sup>th</sup> Street Grade Separation East	\$111.3 M	\$266.7 M	68.9%
• I-80 Gilman Interchange Phase 1 and 2	\$36.4 M	\$65.9 M	52.6%
• SR 84 Widening & SR 84/I-680 Interchange	\$123.0 M	120.9M	49.6%
• I-680 Southbound Express Lanes Project	\$61.1 M	\$214.1 M	77.8%



ALAMEDA CTC CAPITAL PROJECT UPDATE



# Thank You

For more information, visit  
[www.AlamedaCTC.org](http://www.AlamedaCTC.org)

Alameda County Transportation Commission • 1111 Broadway, Suite 800  
Oakland, CA 94607 • 510.208.7400