METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700
TEL 510.817.5700
TDD/TTY 510.817.5769
FAX 510.817.5848
E-MAIL info@mtc.ca.gov
WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

Memorandum

TO: Commission

DATE: July 16, 2008

FR: Executive Director

W. I.

RE: Transportation 2035: Adoption of Financially Constrained Program and High-Occupancy Toll (HOT) Network Implementation Principles; MTC Resolution No. 3868

The Planning Committee has approved a financially constrained investment program and companion funding strategy and is seeking Commission adoption. The committee also seeks adoption of a set of objectives that MTC and CMA staffs have developed to guide the Regional HOT Network implementation. Additional summary information is provided in the attached PowerPoint presentation.

Background

The financially constrained investment projects is a key element of the Transportation 2035 Plan that is funded with federal, state, regional and local revenues we expect to be available to the region over the next 25 years. Of the $223 billion in revenue projected to be available to the region over the next 25 years, $191 billion is deemed committed by voter mandate, statute or Commission policy towards mostly maintaining and operating our existing transportation system. In January 2008, the Planning Committee provisionally approved "prior commitments criteria" for committed funding and committed projects. The criteria are summarized on page 6 of the PowerPoint presentation and the Planning Committee is seeking Commission adoption of the criteria as part of the overall financially constrained program. (Note: Complete Committed and Uncommitted project listings are on MTC's webpage: http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/2035_plan/index.htm)

The remaining $32 billion is uncommitted discretionary revenues. Transportation priorities vying for this $32 billion include: transit, local road, and State highway maintenance shortfalls; system operations strategies, including the Freeway Performance Initiative; programs aimed at focused growth, climate protection, and Lifeline service; and numerous capacity expansion projects throughout the region.

Recommended Financially Constrained Investment Program

The financially constrained program investment plan before you today is the culmination of several meetings and numerous hours of Planning Committee discussion. This discussion has been shaped by Commission workshop input and comments received from partner agencies, MTC advisory committees, stakeholders and the general public. The Planning Committee therefore recommends the financially constrained program shown on pages 2-3 of the PowerPoint presentation, with consideration of six key issues that were discussed at the committee's July 11, 2008 meeting:

1. Prior Project/Funding Commitments – the committee asked that staff provide additional information on committed funding and projects.
2. Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Funding Parity – the committee recommended the funding amount shown to complete the regional bicycle network, but asked staff to provide information on how much committed and other discretionary funding is available for pedestrian projects.

3. Reconcile Local and Regional Project Priorities – the committee asked that the CMAs provide written justification for excluding a limited number of high-effectiveness projects and including projects with uncertain need from STIP/SLPP priority lists. Their complete responses are included in Attachment A.
4. Recommended ITIP Program – the committee agreed to add an additional project requested by the Contra Costa Transportation Authority, but asked staff to develop a revised financially constrained program list.
5. HOT Principles – the committee recommends the Commission adopt the principles shown in Attachment B.
6. Resolution 3434 Shortfalls: Transbay Terminal/Caltrain Downtown Extension (DTX)– the committee sought clarification on the funding plan for all phases of the project

The information that the Planning Committee requested on the issues above is summarized in the attached PowerPoint presentation that will be reviewed by staff at your meeting. With regard to the Transbay Terminal: the bus terminal component is fully funded; the DTX is funded through design, has a $700 million construction reserve, but still carries a $2 billion construction shortfall and therefore is not part of the financially constrained investment program.

Next Steps

Commission approval of the financially constrained investment program closes one phase of the Transportation 2035 Plan development process and begins several others. Over the next few months, leading to plan adoption in March 2009, staff will be working on a number of issues that will be brought back to the Planning Committee and Commission for review and discussion before and after Transportation 2035 Plan adoption. These include:

- Further Policy Discussions – The financially constrained element is a first step toward achieving performance targets and implementing broader Vision Policy Strategies previously approved by the Commission. The strategies define a continuum of efforts and innovations categorized as short, medium and long-term strategies based on available resources, the state of various technologies, and the time needed to realize the full impact of improvements – a "change in motion" if you will. Staff intends to revisit these policy strategies with the Commission as we begin writing the plan.
- Further RTP Analyses – As required by state law, staff will be conducting a programmatic Environmental Impact Report to assess environmental impacts of the Transportation 2035 Plan and reasonable range of alternatives to the Project (see next agenda item). In addition, staff will loop back and assess how the Transportation 2035 Plan addresses the performance targets approved by the Commission and discussed at the October 2007 ABAG/MTC Fall Forum.
- New Funding Advocacy – There is insufficient known funding (e.g. STP/CMAQ, STIP) to fulfill the recommended program of projects. We expect that "anticipated/unspecified" revenues will likely become available over the RTP period to fund the remainder of the constrained plan. Working with the Commission and our partner agencies, we will need to develop policies on where this new funding should be spent. The single largest share of the anticipated/unspecified revenue is reserved for maintenance shortfalls, which would suggest that investment category should be given priority for any new legislative funding advocacy.

- Program Frameworks - The Commission has routinely adopted follow-on initiatives to implement policies and programs included in the regional transportation plan. One example is its Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Policy adopted for the Resolution 3434 Transit Expansion Program that helped implement MTC's Land Use Platform from Transportation 2030. The Transportation 2035 Plan includes new and expanded regional grant programs. Staff anticipates that the Commission will not only want to ensure that program investments are consistent with existing policies, but that new policies reflect emerging Commission priorities such as climate change and FOCUS. Staff intends to develop new fund programming policies with our partners and the Commission over the next several months.
- HOT Network Implementation – The Commission's adoption of HOT Network Implementation Principles represents a fundamental first step toward developing a regional HOT Network. As Commissioner Yeager cautioned at the Planning Committee, which is reflected in the principles before you, many issues still need to be vetted prior to implementation, most notably: development of HOT revenue distribution policies, development of corridor investment plans and agreement on how the system will be managed. To address these issues the Committee has directed staff to continue its ongoing HOT Network implementation discussions with the CMAs, Caltrans, and the California Highway Patrol over the coming months, with a target of reaching agreement by the end of the year so enabling legislation can be pursued in the 2009 session in Sacramento.

Recommendations

The Planning Committee recommends approval of MTC Resolution No. 3868 and is bringing before the Commission the following recommendations:

1. Approval of the Transportation 2035 Financially Constrained Program.
2. Approval of HOT Network Implementation Principles.

We look forward to further discussion at your meeting.

Steve Heminger

Atttachments

SH:DK
J:\COMMITTE\Commission\2008\g_July 2008\RTP Stuff\T2035 FC program of projects_Commission.doc

Attachment A

Written CMA Responses
for High-Effectiveness Projects Excluded
and Uncertain Need Projects Included in
STIP/SLPP Priority Lists

ACCMA

Justification for excluding two RTP's High Priority Projects from the ACCMA's Countywide Transportation Plan Priority List

MTC requested justification for excluding the following RTP High Priority Cost-Effective Projects from our CWTP Priority list:

1. RTP # 230111- Implement AC Transit's Transit Priority Measures Element 2, which is a Countywide Plan Vision Project.
2. RTP # 22657 - I-580 WB Truck Climbing Lanes between Grant Line Road and North Flynn, which is not included in the Countywide Transportation Plan

Regarding the AC Transit's Project, the ACCMA is committed to AC Transit's Transit Priority Measures as demonstrated by the inclusion of RTP # 21992, which is Element 1 of the same project, in the County STIP share of our Countywide Transportation Plan. The CMA Board carefully reviewed the County's needs against limited funding and decided to commit a portion of the funds ($14.8M) to Transit Priority Measures and put the rest in the Vision portion of the plan, so that it could be addressed in the future updates to both RTP and CWTP. We request that MTC honor the CMA Board's action, which AC Transit supports.

Regarding the I-580 Westbound Truck Climbing Lane, this project goes against the CMA's long standing gateway policy on the Altamont Pass. Also, it is opposed by the local jurisdictions in the Tri-Valley area as it would worsen the existing congestion in this area during the morning commute by moving in additional congestion by trucks.

The ACCMA agrees for inclusion of these two projects in the financially constrained plan of the RTP as long as they are included as being funded from the "anticipated/ unidentified" funding category rather than the STIP.

Also, it is requested that any new projects for Alameda County submitted directly to MTC and not through the CMA be included only in the Vision, and not in the Financially Constrained portion of the Regional Transportation Plan.

CONTRA COSTA
transportation
authority

COMMISSIONERS:

Dave Hudson, Chair

Maria Viramontes, Vice Chair

Janet Abelson

Susan Bonilla

David Durant

Donald P. Freitas

Federal Glover

Brad Nix

Julie Pierce

Karen Stepper

Don Tatzin

Robert K. McCleary
Executive Director

3478 Buskirk Ave.
Suite 100

Pleasant Hill
CA 94523

PHONE:
925/ 256-4700

FAX:
925/ 256-4701

http://www.ccta.net

15 July 2008

Doug Kimsey, Director
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700

RE: Inclusion of the Routes 4 (Bypass)/160 Interchange Connectors in the 2009 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

Dear Mr. Kimsey: Doug

At its meeting of July 11, 2008, MTC's Planning Committee asked for more information regarding the effectiveness of the subject project, prior to Commission action on July 23rd. As background, the project is part of the Authority's voter-approved Measure J local transportation sales tax expenditure plan. The proposed RTP funding would be derived from Contra Costa's "county share" funds, and is needed to fully fund this project.

Regional Model Not Adequate for This Analysis

As our staff advised MTC staff in January 2008 and on subsequent occasions, our experience with computerized transportation models and our professional judgment lead us to conclude that the cost-effectiveness of an interchange project such as the Routes 4 (Bypass)/160 interchange is difficult to measure using the regional travel model. We believe use of our countywide, more-fined grained model would be more effective, and that impacts on local streets from not constructing these ramp connectors also are more readily forecast and evaluated with our model and more fine-grained tools.

Benefits of the Routes 4/160 Connectors

The primary benefits of the Routes 4 (Bypass)/160 connectors can be summarized as follows:

- Partial funding for the WB Route 4 to NB Route 160 connector is included in the recently-adopted first Measure J Transportation Sales Tax Strategic Plan covering the period through 2015.
- The project is included in the East Contra Costa Regional Fee and Financing Authority's (ECCRFFA) Strategic Financial Plan for partial funding from local development fees.
- The project would provide missing connector links at the Route 4/160 Interchange. *Currently southbound SR160 traffic wishing to travel on the Bypass to SR4 east, and westbound SR4 (Bypass) traffic heading to SR160 north, travel through Oakley local streets to get to the Laurel Road Interchange on-ramp or Main Street on ramp.*
- The project would remove truck traffic from Oakley local streets, improving safety and reducing congestion in area. *Specifically, two percent of daily traffic on SR4 is truck traffic – approximately 220 trucks per day – that will be removed from local streets.*

CONTRA COSTA
transportation
authority

COMMISSIONERS:

Dave Hudson, Chair

Maria Viramontes, Vice Chair

Janet Abelson

Susan Bonilla

David Durant

Donald P. Freitas

Federal Glover

Brad Nix

Julie Pierce

Karen Stepper

Don Tatzin

Robert K. McCleary
Executive Director

3478 Buskirk Ave.
Suite 100

Pleasant Hill
CA 94523

PHONE:
925/ 256-4700

FAX:
925/ 256-4701

http://www.ccta.net

15 July 2008

Doug Kimsey, Director
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700

RE: Inclusion of I-680/Norris Canyon Direct HOV Ramps in the 2009 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

Doug

Dear Mr. Kimsey:

At its meeting of July 11, 2008, MTC's Planning Committee asked for more information regarding the effectiveness of the subject project, prior to Commission action on July 23rd. As background, the project is part of the Authority's voter-approved Measure J local transportation sales tax expenditure plan. The proposed RTP funding would be derived from Contra Costa's "county share" funds, and are needed to fully fund this project.

Regional Model Not Adequate for This Analysis

As our staff advised MTC staff in January 2008 and on subsequent occasions, our experience with the computerized transportation models and our professional judgment lead us to conclude that the cost-effectiveness of a localized interchange project such as the I-680/Norris Direct HOV Ramps cannot be reasonably determined through application of the regional travel model. That model is best used at a very aggregated scale to compare the relative effectiveness of extended widening projects, gap closures, transit expansions or similar dramatic investments. In addition, as reflected in MTC's analysis of its own proposed regional programs, there are many simplifying assumptions that go into calculating cost-effectiveness of future investments. As MTC staff has done for the proposed regional programs, the Commission should consider all factors in determining the value of a project, and not just a numeric value that is simplistically derived. While there are finer-grained modeling approaches that could be applied using FREQ or a similar traffic flow analysis, such detail is realistically beyond the scope of the RTP.

Benefits of the I-680/Norris Canyon Direct HOV Ramps

However, when examined from the regional level, we believe it is more important to note:

- The proposed ramps are intended to provide significantly enhanced bus transit and HOV access to San Ramon's Bishop Ranch office park, one of the East Bay's major employment centers with approximately 32,000 workers.
- Express Bus service – supported with funding from Bishop Ranch Transportation Association – links the office park with both Walnut Creek BART and Dublin/Pleasanton BART stations.
- The ramps are expected to save approximately 5 to 10 minutes per trip for the current 45 buses and 1,120 transit trips per day. Improved access would provide

BYPASS AUTHORITY

Joint Exercise of Powers Agency

City of Antioch City of Brentwood City of Oakley County of Contra Costa

July 14, 2008

Doug Kimsey, Director of Planning
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, California 94607

RE: SR4 Bypass/SR160 Freeway Connectors included in 2009 RTP

Dear Mr. Kimsey:

The SR4 Bypass/SR160 Freeway Connectors (Segment 1, Phase 2 of the SR4 Bypass) are a very high priority for Eastern Contra Costa County. Segment 1, Phase 1 of the SR4 Bypass, which includes the SR4Bypass/SR160 freeway-to-freeway interchange, was opened to traffic in February 2009. However, **Segment 1, Phase 1** only includes two freeway connectors at the new SR4/SR160 Interchange. There are two remaining connectors to be constructed as part of **Segment 1, Phase 2**, the WB SR4 to NB SR160 connector and the SB 160 to EB SR4 connector. These remaining two freeway connectors are included in the CCTA Measure J Strategic Plan and the ECCRFFA Strategic Financial Plan. In addition, these remaining freeway connectors are environmentally cleared and design is scheduled to start in spring 2009.

Without the remaining two freeway connectors, SB SR160 and WB SR4 traffic wishing to travel on SR4 east or SR160 north has to either exit at the Main Street off-ramp or Laurel Road off-ramp and travel through Oakley streets to get to the Laurel Road interchange on-ramp, or Main Street on ramp, depending on which direction you are traveling. The lack of freeway connectors is impacting existing facilities in Oakley and generally contributes to cut-through traffic and traffic congestion in the Oakley area. In addition, SR4 is a major truck route from the Central Valley and trucks traveling from SR160 to SR4 Bypass (and vice versa) without freeway connectors have to travel on Oakley streets, thereby impacting residents, a school and businesses adjacent to the local roadways.

The completion of the missing freeway connectors would greatly improve safety by removing trucks and vehicles traveling through Oakley with all its points of conflict, including the above-mentioned school. The total number of accidents would be greatly reduced once the ramps are constructed and additional cars removed from the parallel route. Traffic modeling indicates that Neroly Road in Oakley is the north-south facility that is most likely to carry the bulk of this traffic with the LOS on the roadway suffering

Board of Directors:
Robert Taylor, Chair
Brad Nix, Vice Chair
Mary N. Piepho
Donald P. Freitas

Authority Staff Office:
Contra Costa County
255 Glacier Drive
Martinez, CA 94553
(925) 686-0619

SM C/CAG

To: Doug Kimsey
Fr: San Mateo C/CAG Staff
Re: Justification for SM 92 (I-280 to US 101) passing Lanes

This project will provide both operational and safety improvement to the Route 92 corridor, a key east-west corridor in San Mateo County. It will provide the needed improvements to regional traffic between the San Mateo/Hayward Bridge and the far west end of the Bay Area as well as improve local traffic operation. It has strong local support including from C/CAG, SMCTA, and City of San Mateo. It has been included in the current and new San Mateo County Measure A programs. A Project Study Report has been prepared. During the project development stage, sponsor(s) will continue to refine the project alternatives to maximize the corridor efficiency and benefit.

STA

From: "Robert Macaulay" <rmacaulay@sta-snci.com>
To: "'Doug Kimsey'" <DKimsey@mtc.ca.gov>
Date: 7/15/2008 9:01:36 AM
Subject: RE: Write-ups

Doug - the SR 12 safety and operations improvements are not included in our funding list because the project is not fully defined, and because we are seeking a local funding source such as a regional impact fee to carry a portion of the financial burden.
The North Connector is being added to the requested project list - se a separate e-mail on that list.

Robert Macaulay
Director of Planning
Solano Transportation Authority
rmacaulay@sta-snci.com
707 424-6006 direct
707 580-0458 cell

-----Original Message-----
From: Doug Kimsey [mailto:DKimsey@mtc.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, July 14, 2008 6:59 AM
To: rmacaulay@sta-snci.com
Subject: Fwd: Write-ups

Second send attempt.

Attachment B

2009 RTP
BAY AREA EXPRESS (HOT) LANES NETWORK
July 11, 2008

2009 RTP OBJECTIVES

Development and Implementation of a Bay Area Express /High Occupancy Toll (HOT) Lanes Network has four primary objectives:

- More effectively manage the region's freeways in order to provide higher vehicle and passenger throughput and reduce delays for those traveling within each travel corridor;
- Provide an efficient, effective, consistent, and seamless system for users of the network;
- Provide benefits to travelers within each corridor commensurate with the revenues collected in that corridor, including expanded travel options and funding to support non-highway options that enhance effectiveness and throughput;
- Implement the Express/HOT Lane Network in the Bay Area, as shown in exhibit 1 and as amended from time to time, using a rapid delivery approach that takes advantage of the existing highway right of way to deliver the network in an expedited time frame; and
- Toll Revenue collected from the HOT network will be used to operate the HOT network; to maintain HOT system equipment and software; to provide transit services and improvements in the corridors; to finance and construct the HOT network; and to provide other corridor improvements.

IMPLEMENTATION

1. Collaboration and Cooperation. To accomplish the objectives requires collaboration and cooperation by numerous agencies at several levels of government, including the Congestion Management Agencies (CMA), Caltrans, California Highway Patrol (CHP) and the Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA). This collaborative process shall establish policies for implementation of the HOT network including, but not limited to, (a) phasing of HOV conversion and HOT construction, (b) phasing of corridor investment plan elements, and (c) occupancy and pricing policies for HOT network operations.
2. Corridor-Based Focus & Implementation. Utilize a corridor-based structure that recognizes commute-sheds and geographic communities of interest as the most effective and user-responsive models for Bay Area Express/HOT Lane facilities implementation.
3. Reinvestment within the Corridor. Recognize that popular, political and legislative support will rest on demonstrating that the revenues collected in a corridor benefit travelers – including the toll payers – in the corridor through a variety of mechanisms, including additional capital improvements on the freeway and parallel arterials, providing support for transit capital and operations that increase throughput capacity in the corridor, and providing funds for enhanced operations and management of the corridor.
4. Corridor Investment Plans. Corridor Investment Plans, developed by stakeholder agencies within the corridor, will direct reinvestment of revenues to capital and operating programs serving the corridor, commensurate with the revenue generated by each corridor.
5. Simple System. Users deserve a simple, consistent and efficient system that is easy to use and includes the following elements: (a) consistent geometric design; (b) consistent signage; (c) safe