

Members of the Board

Jody Breckenridge, Chair
Jeffrey DelBono
Timothy Donovan
Anthony J. Intintoli, Jr
James Wunderman, Vice Chair

ALAMEDA SITE VISITS

Thursday, April 7, 2016 at 3:30 p.m.
City Hall – Parking Lot
2263 Santa Clara Avenue; Alameda

BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING

Thursday, April 7, 2016 at 7:00 p.m.
San Francisco Bay Area
Water Emergency Transportation Authority
City Hall – Council Chambers
2263 Santa Clara Avenue; Alameda

The full agenda packet is available for download at sanfranciscobayferry.com/weta.

AGENDA

The Board will conduct site visits throughout Alameda followed by the regularly scheduled Board of Directors' meeting. Members of the public who plan to attend the site visits need to make their own travel arrangements. Because certain areas of the site may be within an active construction site, public access may be limited. Please note that the regular Board meeting will commence at Alameda City Hall after the site visit. Please see location and schedule above.

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1. <u>ALAMEDA SITE VISITS</u> | <i>Information</i> |
| 2. <u>CALL TO ORDER – BOARD CHAIR</u> | |
| 3. <u>PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE/ROLL CALL</u> | |
| 4. <u>REPORT OF BOARD CHAIR</u> | <i>Information</i> |
| 5. <u>REPORTS OF DIRECTORS</u> | <i>Information</i> |
| 6. <u>REPORTS OF STAFF</u> | <i>Information</i> |
| a. Executive Director's Report | |
| b. Monthly Review of Financial Statements | |
| c. Legislative Update | |
| 7. <u>CONSENT CALENDAR</u> | <i>Action</i> |
| a. Board Meeting Minutes – March 3, 2016 | |
| b. Authorize Actions Relative to the Resolution of Local Support for the Transit Performance Initiative Incentive Program | |
| c. Approve Proposition 1B Program of Projects and Authorize Agency Officials to Execute Program Requirements | |
| d. Authorize Release of a Request for Proposals for Construction Management Services for the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project | |
| e. Authorize Release of a Request for Proposals for Professional Engineering/Consulting Services to Support Ongoing System Capital, Planning and Operational Projects | |
| 8. <u>AWARD CONTRACT TO OVERAA/POWER, A JOINT VENTURE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE CENTRAL BAY OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE FACILITY</u> | <i>Action</i> |

Water Emergency Transportation Authority
April 7, 2016 Meeting of the Board of Directors

9. APPROVE A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH THE CITY OF ALAMEDA FOR FUTURE SEAPLANE LAGOON FERRY SERVICE PROJECT **Action**
10. CURRENT STATE OF ALAMEDA FERRY SERVICE **Information/Action**
11. LANDSIDE ACCESS STATUS REPORT FOR MAIN STREET AND HARBOR BAY TERMINALS **Information/Action**
12. UPDATE OF HARBOR SEAL HAUL-OUT AND CALIFORNIA LEAST TERN HABITAT RESTORATION AS PART OF THE CENTRAL BAY OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE FACILITY PROJECT **Information/Action**
13. CLOSED SESSION **Action**
There are no planned agenda items for a Closed Session for the current meeting. **To Be Determined**
- In the event of any urgent matter requiring immediate action which has come to the attention of the WETA after the agenda has been issued and which is an item appropriately addressed in Closed Session, the WETA may discuss and vote whether to conduct a Closed Session under Brown Act (California Government Code Sections 54954.2(b)(2) and 54954.5).
- If the WETA enters into Closed Session under such circumstances, the WETA will determine whether to disclose action taken or discussions held in Closed Session under the Brown Act (California Government Code Section 54957.1).
14. OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS

ADJOURNMENT

This information will be made available in alternative formats upon request. To request an agenda in an alternative format, please contact the Board Secretary at least five (5) working days prior to the meeting to ensure availability.

PUBLIC COMMENTS The Water Emergency Transportation Authority welcomes comments from the public. Speakers' cards and a sign-up sheet are available. Please forward completed speaker cards and any reports/handouts to the Board Secretary.

Non-Agenda Items: A 15 minute period of public comment for non-agenda items will be held at the end of the meeting. Please indicate on your speaker card that you wish to speak on a non-agenda item. No action can be taken on any matter raised during the public comment period. Speakers will be allotted no more than three (3) minutes to speak and will be heard in the order of sign-up.

Agenda Items: Speakers on individual agenda items will be called in order of sign-up after the discussion of each agenda item and will be allotted no more than three (3) minutes to speak. You are encouraged to submit public comments in writing to be distributed to all Directors.

Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA) meetings are wheelchair accessible. Upon request WETA will provide written agenda materials in appropriate alternative formats to individuals with disabilities. Please send a written request to contactus@watertransit.org or call (415) 291-3377 at least five (5) days before the meeting.

Participation in a meeting may be available at one or more locations remote from the primary location of the meeting. See the header of this Agenda for possible teleconference locations. In such event, the teleconference location or locations will be fully accessible to members of the public. Members of the public who attend the meeting at a teleconference location will be able to hear the meeting and testify in accordance with applicable law and WETA policies.

Water Emergency Transportation Authority
April 7, 2016 Meeting of the Board of Directors

Under California Government Code Section 84308, Directors are reminded that they must disclose on the record of the proceeding any contributions received from any party or participant in the proceeding in the amount of more than \$250 within the preceding 12 months. Further, no Director shall make, participate in making, or in any way attempt to influence the decision in the proceeding if the Director has willfully or knowingly received a contribution in an amount of more than \$250 within the preceding 12 months from a party or such party's agent, or from any participant or his or her agent, provided, however, that the Director knows or has reason to know that the participant has a financial interest in the decision. For further information, Directors are referred to Government Code Section 84308 and to applicable regulations.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board Members

FROM: Nina Rannells, Executive Director
Kevin Connolly, Manager, Planning & Development

SUBJECT: Alameda Site Visits

Recommendation

There is no recommendation associated with this informational item.

Background/Discussion

The April 7, 2016 WETA Board meeting is scheduled to be held at 7:00 p.m. in the City of Alameda Council Chambers at City Hall. Staff has arranged for a tour of the various Alameda terminals and project sites prior to the Board meeting. This tour will provide the Board members the opportunity to become better acquainted with the ferry terminals and future facility sites utilized by WETA and its customers within the City of Alameda. This tour will leave the Alameda City Hall parking lot at 3:30 sharp (2263 Santa Clara Avenue, Alameda). The approximate schedule is identified below but could vary along the route.

No.	Site	Approximate Timeline
1	Meet at Alameda City Hall	3:30
2	Drive to Harbor Bay Terminal	3:30-3:45
3	View Harbor Bay Terminal & surrounding, <i>Guest speaker: Andrew Thomas, City of Alameda</i>	3:45-4:05
4	Drive to Central Bay Site	4:05-4:20
5	Central Bay Site, Seal haul out discussion	4:20-4:35
6	Drive to Alameda Point Site A, Discussion <i>Guest speaker: Jennifer Ott, City of Alameda</i>	4:35-5:00
7	Drive to Main Street Terminal, Discussion	5:00-5:15
8	Drive to Alameda City Hall	5:15-5:30

Please arrive at the City Hall parking lot by 3:15.

END

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: WETA Board Members

FROM: Nina Rannells, Executive Director

DATE: April 7, 2016

RE: Executive Director's Report

CAPITAL PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE

Vessel Replacement – The *Encinal* and *Harbor Bay Express II* are included in the Capital Budget for replacement as they have reached the end of their useful lives (generally 25 years) and staff has secured funding commitments for replacement vessels. In December 2013, the Board of Directors approved the contract award to Aurora Marine Design (AMD) for vessel construction management services. The Request for Proposal to construct two new passenger-only vessels was released on September 26, 2014. The Board approved a contract with Kvichak Marine Industries in April 2015 for the construction of two new replacement vessels. Vessel construction began in early September 2015. Work on hull modules for boat one is well under way, tank systems are complete and will be installed before joining the modules together. Raft deck is framed and being readied for decking. Work beginning assembly for boat two is underway with engine room modules being constructed first. Main engines, gearboxes and emissions systems have been delivered. The engine and emission system was mocked up and bench tested at the Pacific Power facility in Kent, WA on January 28. Emissions testing to comply with WETA requirements is being independently certified by InfoWedge and U.C. Riverside; results for emissions testing are complete and verified to be well below requirements. Final acceptance dates are scheduled for December 2016 for the first vessel and April 2017 for the second vessel.

***Intintoli* Major Component and Waterjet Rehabilitation Project**

This refit is planned for February/March 2016. During the replacement of the major propulsion train subcomponents work, other minor upgrades to the passenger cabins and minor vessel system upgrades will be accomplished. The Board of Directors approved the contract award to Marine Group Boat Works in November 2015. The vessel was successfully delivered to the Marine Group yard in San Diego on January 27. Pre-work noise and vibration testing was completed. The vessel was drydocked without issue and the hull bottom looks to be in great shape. Waterjet removal began on February 2. The material for the new extension ring has arrived and it is being machined. All other work is going well. The vessel is expected to launch on April 4.

***Gemini* Quarterlife and Passenger Capacity Increase Project**

This project is planned for February/May 2016. This project provides for a general refurbishment of the vessel and will include the following components: Refurbish shafts, propellers, rudders and replace bearings, replace and re-upholster seating, replace carpets, renew deck coatings, touch up interior finishes, overhaul main engines, HVAC, electrical, plumbing, emission, fire and lifesaving safety systems. In addition the scope of work for this project includes increasing the passenger capacity from 149 to 225. The Board of Directors approved the contract award to Marine Group Boat Works in February 2016. The vessel was successfully delivered to the Marine Group yard in San Diego on February 17. *Gemini* is in

drydock with major work started on February 20. Work continues, with engines and machinery removed and passenger cabin being prepared for new seating.

Peralta Mid-Life Refurbishment

The refurbishment project is separated into two phases. The Phase 1 scope of work includes refurbishment of main engines, generators, and gear boxes; installation of new steering hydraulic pumps and rams; passenger cabin renewal including refurbishment of the restrooms; new carpets; vessel dry dock; interior vessel paint; and provision of spare gearbox, propellers, and shafts. Bay Ship & Yacht completed Phase 1 work in mid-2015.

Phase 2 will include replacement of all control systems and navigation electronics, snack bar renewal, and exterior cabin paint. Phase 2 implementation has been deferred until next winter (2016/17) so that the *Peralta* can be utilized this winter while core maintenance work is completed on other vessels in the fleet.

North Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility – This project will construct a new ferry maintenance facility located at Building 165 on Mare Island in Vallejo in two phases. The landside phase includes site preparation and construction of a new fuel storage and delivery system along with warehouse and maintenance space. The waterside phase will construct a system of modular floats and piers, gangways, and over-the-water utilities.

The Board of Directors awarded a design-build contract for the landside phase to West Bay Builders, now Thompson Builders, in August 2013. Landside construction is substantially complete. Remaining tasks for the landside construction phase include commissioning and testing of systems that run between the landside and waterside portions of the project.

The Board of Directors awarded a design-build contract for the waterside construction phase to Dutra Construction in July 2014. Construction of the waterside phase is underway. Pile driving activities were completed on September 2, 2015. A total of 23 piles were driven over a 4 week period. The existing service float was modified and rehabilitated at Bay Ship & Yacht and was delivered to the site in February. All of the concrete floats were delivered to the site and secured to the piles in December. The construction contractor has begun installation of the superstructure and utility systems.

Regional Passenger Float Construction – This project will construct a new regional spare float that can be utilized as a backup for the Vallejo terminal float as well as other terminal sites such as downtown San Francisco when the permanent terminal floats must undergo periodic dry dock, inspection, and repair. This spare will support ongoing daily services and will be a valuable asset to have available for use in unplanned or emergency conditions. Ghirardelli Associates Inc. was selected as the project construction manager. Procurement of the passenger float construction contract was combined with the North Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility Project construction contract. The Request for Proposals for the project was released on February 28 and the construction contract was awarded to Dutra Construction on July 10, 2014. Final design was completed in December 2014. Float fabrication was completed in Portland, Oregon. The float arrived at Dutra's Alameda yard in early October. Float ramping and utility systems are being installed. The float is substantially complete and was towed to the existing Mare Island facility for storage.

Central Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility – This project will develop an operations and maintenance facility at Alameda Point to serve as the base for WETA's existing and future central bay ferry fleet. The proposed project would provide running maintenance services such as fueling, engine oil changes, concession supply, and light repair work for WETA vessels. The new facility will also serve as WETA's Operations Control Center for day-to-day management and oversight of service, crew, and facilities. In the event of a regional emergency, the facility

would function as an Emergency Operations Center, serving passengers and sustaining water transit service for emergency response and recovery.

On January 29, WETA received Technical Proposals from three offerors in response to its Request for Proposals (RFP) issued on December 4. Price proposals were received from each offeror on March 11. This month's Board meeting includes an agenda item recommending a contract award for construction of this project.

Staff is advancing work to provide a replacement harbor seal haul-out in conjunction with this project. A conceptual design and implementation plan has been developed in coordination with a working group consisting of Alameda community members, City staff, and a marine mammal expert. Staff is working with state and federal resource agencies with jurisdiction over the work to secure permitting approval.

Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project – This project will expand berthing capacity at the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal in order to support new and existing ferry services to San Francisco. The proposed project would also include landside improvements needed to accommodate expected increases in ridership and to support emergency response capabilities.

Preliminary (30%) design and engineering has been prepared for the project and reviewed by a Peer Review Panel as required by the Port of San Francisco. The Peer Review Panel is comprised of a geotechnical engineer, structural engineer, and university professor selected by WETA and approved by the Port of San Francisco pursuant to their Building Permit Review process. Additionally, the BCDC Engineering Criteria Review Board (ECRB) held its second hearing for the project this month and voted to approve the project. The project is tentatively scheduled to go before the full BCDC for approval in June.

SERVICE DEVELOPMENT UPDATE

Richmond Ferry Service – This service will provide an alternative transportation link between Richmond and downtown San Francisco. The conceptual design includes plans for replacement of an existing facility (float and gangway) and a phased parking plan. The WETA Board adopted a Funding Agreement and Memorandum of Understanding with the Contra Costa Transportation Authority at its March 2015 meeting that funds the operation for a minimum period of 10 years.

The NEPA environmental review process was completed in October. The project was presented to the BCDC Design Review Board (DRB) in September. The BCDC DRB recommended advancing the project to the full BCDC commission. A Planning Application for the project was submitted to the City in October. Staff is coordinating with City of Richmond staff for review by the City's DRB. The project was presented to the City DRB March 23, 2016. The project received a support from the DRB and was recommended to the Planning Commission for approval. Staff is coordinating with City for approval of a conditional use permit from the Planning Commission. The project will be presented to the Planning Commission in April or May. A draft lease was prepared by WETA and submitted to the City for review. Staff is coordinating with City staff to review the draft lease.

On December 10, the Board authorized release of a RFP for construction management services. Construction management services will assist staff by providing oversight and support during the pre-construction project development, project construction, and project closeout phases. The RFP is anticipated for release in spring 2016.

Treasure Island Service – This project, which will be implemented by the Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA), the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (acting in its capacity as the Treasure Island Mobility Management Authority) and the prospective developer, will institute new ferry service to be operated by WETA between Treasure Island and downtown San Francisco in connection with the planned Treasure Island Development Project. The development agreement states that ferry operations would commence with the completion of the 50th residential unit.

WETA staff is working with City of San Francisco staff to support development of this project, including participating in regular meetings of the City's Technical Advisory Committee convened to update and further develop the Treasure Island Mobility Management Program, which will include new ferry service provided in conjunction with the development project. Staff has begun negotiation of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the City that would set forth the terms and conditions under which WETA would operate the future Treasure Island ferry service. The finalization and execution of an MOU for the Treasure Island service would be subject to consideration by the WETA Board.

Berkeley Environmental Studies – This service will provide an alternative transportation link between Berkeley and downtown San Francisco. Staff has coordinated with FTA staff to discuss the process for completion of the Final EIS/EIR. FTA has recently expressed that it will not be able to complete the NEPA process and issue a Record of Decision because a long-term operational funding source is not available for the service. Staff is assessing possible approaches to moving this project forward in 2016.

South San Francisco Service – The South San Francisco ferry service is currently in its fourth year of operation, with 483 average weekday boardings and 28 percent farebox recovery. Based on current Regional Measure 2 (RM2) performance criteria, ferry services must reach a level of 40% farebox recovery in the third year of operation. Services that do not meet that standard are asked to develop a Corrective Action Plan, identifying measures to achieve the desired performance level. The WETA Board adopted a South San Francisco Corrective Action Plan in September 2015 that identified ridership enhancement strategies along with cost reduction actions. In addition, the Corrective Action Plan proposed modifying RM2 performance requirements to be more reflective of actual experience concerning the ramp up period necessary to achieve a 40% farebox recovery rate and the need to view the ferry system as a comprehensive whole and not a collection of independent routes. At the request of Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) staff, WETA recently sent a letter requesting these two modifications be made to the RM2 ferry program. Supporters of the South San Francisco service are also being asked to send letters supporting this proposed RM2 program modification to MTC in advance of the May 2016 Commission meeting. Staff will continue to work with MTC in support of receiving a change or variance in their policy for administering RM2 operating funds for this service.

SYSTEM STUDIES

2016 Short Range Transit Plan – WETA released a draft of its FY2015/16-2024/25 Short Range Transit Plan for public review and comment at the January board meeting. The comment period closed on February 19 and the WETA Board adopted the final plan at its March 3, 2016 meeting.

WETA Strategic Plan – WETA released its draft 20-year Strategic Plan at the January board meeting for public input. Like the SRTP, the Strategic Plan was posted on the WETA website and is available for review and comment by the general public. At the March Board meeting, Chair Breckinridge created a working group consisting of staff, Vice Chair Wunderman and Board Member Donovan to review the draft plan and develop a strategy for eventual review and

adoption by the Board of Directors. The Working Group met in late March and discussed ways to expand, re-position and re-format the plan to better communicate the vision and opportunities for expanded ferry service and discussed mechanisms for seeking additional input. Staff is preparing for a follow-up meeting of this group in April.

The Draft WETA Strategic Plan, released in January 2016, is the result of a planning process that began in March 2015 with an introductory Board workshop that provided agency and service background information and identified strategic areas for discussion. A second workshop in May 2015 reviewed and validated the Board-adopted mission and vision statements and provided an opportunity to consider new WETA policies related to service performance and expansion. Taking input from the Board, WETA staff spent the summer reaching out to stakeholders, sharing draft strategic plan policies and gaining valuable input for the eventual draft plan.

Alameda Terminals Access Study – Both ferry terminals in Alameda have experienced a surge in ridership beginning with the first BART strike in July 2013. As a result, parking at both terminals typically spills on to adjacent streets and informal parking lots. WETA initiated work on an Alameda Terminals Access Study in 2014 as a means to identify immediate, medium and long-term solutions to improve customer access to these terminals. As an outgrowth of this work, the City of Alameda Transportation Commission formed an Ad Hoc Subcommittee, made up of Transportation Commission members and City of Alameda, WETA and AC Transit and local community organization staff to investigate potential City improvements for ferry terminal access during the spring of 2015.

Initial work identified through the study outreach and taken up by the Ad Hoc Subcommittee focused on parking improvements to Harbor Bay terminal area and restoring AC Transit feeder bus service to Main Street terminal. The Ad Hoc Subcommittee and City adopted an overflow parking plan for the Harbor Bay Terminal in April 2015 that is in the process of being implemented by City staff. WETA staff spent a number of months working with the Ad Hoc Subcommittee and AC Transit staff in an effort to develop a new service route in Alameda that would, amongst other things, serve to restore feeder bus service to the Main Street terminal. This effort was ultimately not supported by the City Council, which voted at their February 2 meeting to support an alternative service route serving the northern waterfront instead.

In addition, WETA staff has worked with City staff since spring 2015 to open the Officer's Club parking lot as an overflow lot for the Main Street terminal. Construction of needed improvements, to be led by City staff and funded by WETA, is scheduled to begin in March. Aside from parking, installation of 12 bicycle lockers at the Main Street terminal -- funded through a grant from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District -- occurred on February 22. Staff will shift its focus to additional improvements that can be made related to alternative modes such as buses, shuttles, bicycles, and pedestrian improvements after the parking improvements are underway. Staff anticipates bringing forward the Access Plan and a discussion of the many ongoing work efforts in support of this plan in spring 2016.

Alameda Seaplane Lagoon Study - The City of Alameda has proposed a new ferry terminal located along Seaplane Lagoon on the former Naval Air Station at Alameda Point. Consistent with terms of the 2011 Transition Agreement executed between WETA and the City of Alameda, both parties have been working together to explore the viability of a new ferry service connecting Seaplane Lagoon and San Francisco over the past year.

Staff has been working with the City of Alameda on a draft a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that would set forth the terms and conditions under which a Seaplane Lagoon Ferry Service would be implemented, including construction of new facilities and the profile of service

operations. Sea Plane Lagoon service was included in WETA's draft Strategic Plan, released in January 2016. The Alameda City Council is scheduled to consider adoption of the MOU at its April 5th meeting. The WETA Board of Directors is scheduled to consider adoption at the April 7th meeting.

Mission Bay Ferry Terminal – The NBA Champion Golden State Warriors basketball team has identified a preferred arena site at the foot of 16th Street in the Mission Bay neighborhood of San Francisco. A Mission Bay ferry terminal has been identified in both WETA and City of San Francisco planning documents as a potential future infrastructure investment but no significant planning or development work has been conducted to date and no funding exists to develop this as a terminal site. The Warriors and the City released an Environmental Impact Report for the proposed arena in early June, 2015, that does not consider a new ferry terminal or ferry service as a part of its project. The Port of San Francisco released an engineering feasibility and site selection study for a future Mission Bay ferry terminal in March 2016. WETA staff participated in the study and provided input regarding ferry operations and potential service models. Port staff are currently preparing to release a Request for Proposals for environmental clearance and preliminary design of a Mission Bay ferry terminal and have included this work in the Port of San Francisco's proposed FY 2016/17 Capital Budget. Mission Bay ferry service was included in WETA's draft Strategic Plan, released in January 2016.

Redwood City Ferry Service Investigation – A Redwood City Ferry Terminal site feasibility report was completed in draft in July 2012, in an effort to identify site opportunities, constraints and design requirements and better understand project feasibility and costs associated with the development of a terminal and service to Redwood City. This report was developed as a part of a collaborative effort with the Port of Redwood City and Redwood City staff. An update of WETA's system ridership model and projection was also completed during this same time period, working closely with City and Port staff. At the time that this work was completed the cost associated with the identified site, coupled with low ridership projections, presented challenges related to the financial viability of the project from both a capital construction and operational cost perspective. Redwood City service was included as a potential future ferry service in WETA's draft Strategic Plan, released in January 2016. In response to changing travel conditions, and renewed local interest in Redwood City services, staff has reached out to Redwood City, Port of Redwood City, San Mateo County Transportation District, and San Mateo County Economic Development Association to re-start the dialog regarding future Redwood City service and to determine how we can work together with San Mateo officials and private industry to move this effort forward.

Contra Cost County Site Feasibility Studies – Site feasibility reports have been prepared in cooperation with the cities of Hercules, Martinez and Antioch in an effort to identify site constraints and design requirements and better understand project feasibility and costs associated with development of terminals and services to these cities. The Contra Costa County Transportation Authority, as the county transportation planning and funding authority, has utilized this information to develop a Financial Feasibility of Contra Costa Ferry Service Report (completed June 2014) to assess the feasibility of implementing ferry services in the county. The report concludes that of the candidate ferry terminals in Contra Costa County, only the Richmond project is financially feasible at this time. WETA is moving forward to construct a new terminal and service in Richmond, and Hercules and Carquinez Strait services were included as potential future ferry services in WETA's draft Strategic Plan, released in January 2016.

OTHER

CPUC Applications for New Ferry Operations – Two private ferry operators, PropSF and Tideline Marine Group, have recently applied to the Public Utilities Commission of the State of

California (CPUC) for the authority to operate as scheduled vessel common carriers with flexible rates between points in various cities in the San Francisco Bay Area. WETA has commented on these applications and will continue to monitor the development of these new ferry services as they move through the CPUC and implementation process.

Emergency Response Activities Update – WETA's enabling legislation, SB 976 as amended by SB 1093, directs the agency to provide comprehensive water transportation and emergency coordination services for the Bay Area region. Staff is currently working on the following emergency response related activities:

External and Internal Emergency Plan Updates: The external WETA Emergency Response Plan (ERP) has been developed to guide the WETA's provision of emergency services in a catastrophic event (such as a major earthquake on the southern Hayward or San Andreas faults) that necessitates a Governor's Proclamation of Emergency and a Stafford Act Disaster Declaration. The WETA's internal Emergency Operations Plan is an appendix to the external plan and addresses all other transportation incidents or required changes in service levels. The WETA Board of Directors approved the ERP on March 3.

Bay Ferry IV Regional Emergency Response Exercise: On January 20, Kevin Donnelly participated in the Bay Ferry IV Regional Emergency Response Full-Scale Exercise as an evaluator. Lauren Gularte also observed the exercise. The lead agencies responsible for the exercise were the Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District and the California Maritime Academy, Vallejo. The exercise involved more than 28 agencies with over 600 participants and took place in two separate locations (Treasure Island East Docks and surrounding waters and the San Francisco Bay Ferry Jack London Square Facility). Participating organizations represented Federal, State, Regional, County, and City Emergency Services, including the FBI, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, and California National Guard. Bay Area Passenger vessel operators were also well represented with Golden Gate Ferries, Blue and Gold Fleet, Hornblower Cruises, and the SS Potomac Society providing vessels and staff for the exercise. The scope of play for the exercise required the implementation of an incident response and unified command, supporting responders in the field to perform those actions associated with a possible maritime terrorism incident. The activities for the exercise were based on the guidance contained in the San Francisco Vessel Mutual Assistance Plan (SF V-MAP) and the San Francisco Maritime Security Plan. Specific areas of concentration for the exercise included incident command and control, interoperable communications, victim rescue, hazard identification, site security and crowd control, and device recovery and dispatch. The exercise proved to be a tremendous success. On February 19 a draft of the After Action Report /Improvement Plan was reviewed for final editing to ensure that all of the important elements and findings of this complex exercise are captured.

A short video of the Bay Ferry III exercise can be viewed at:

<http://youtu.be/cx6T446q3Bw>

Transportation Response Planning (TRP) Quarterly Steering Committee Meeting: On March 3, Kevin Donnelly attended the quarterly TRP meeting to discuss and determine the key planning elements of the upcoming MTC 2016 Regional tabletop Exercise to be held in the fall.

VEOCI: Staff is currently working to implement, VEOCI, a web-based, virtual EOC information and resource management system that will allow staff to access an online workspace for emergency management activities in the EOC and if they are unable to report to WETA's EOC or if they are in the field. VEOCI is anticipated to be used for:

- Staff notification
- Internal and External Communications
- Managing tasks and resources
- Document storage
- Compiling information for reports/situational awareness
- Reimbursement documentation

This system will be compatible with the State of California's web based resource management system, CalEOC and is expected to be complete in the fall.

Coast Guard Manning Requirements - In response to a 2015 U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) initiative, staff has been working closely with the USCG Inspections unit (San Francisco Sector) in 2015 to review and verify the current manning levels required on WETA's fleet of vessels. As a result of this work, the WETA vessels current manning levels remain in place; this is noted in the vessel files and on each vessel Certificate of Inspection. Staff is working with the Coast Guard to close out this matter.

On March 9, Lauren Gularte and Kevin Donnelly attended the California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) Regional II Mutual Aid Regional Advisory Committee (MARAC) meeting. Lauren, along with our consultant from Navigation Preparedness gave a short presentation related to WETA's ERP.

On March 16, Kevin Donnelly attended a meeting at the Port of San Francisco to discuss the Tsunami Maritime Response Playbook for the City and County of San Francisco.

KEY EXTERNAL OUTREACH/BUSINESS MEETINGS

On March 8, Kevin Connolly delivered a presentation to the Land Use and Transportation Committee of the San Mateo County Economic Development Alliance (SAMCEDA).

On March 9, Nina Rannells and Kevin Connolly participated in a forum on regional transportation issues that also included AC Transit and BART hosted by the Alameda Democratic Club.

On March 9, Lauren Gularte and Kevin Donnelly attended the Mutual Aid Regional Advisory Committee meeting and provided a presentation of WETA's Emergency Response Plan to emergency response staff from 16 Operational Areas in the California Coastal Region.

On March 9, Mike Gougherty attended the Dredge Material Management Office meeting to present the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion project.

On March 10, Keith Stahnke and Kevin Donnelly attended the Harbor Safety Committee meeting.

On March 23, Chad Mason and Kevin Connolly attended the City of Richmond Design Review Board meeting to present the Richmond Ferry Terminal project.

On March 23, Kevin Connolly attended the City of Alameda Transportation Commission, which adopted staff comments already submitted to WETA regarding the Strategic Plan.

On March 25, Nina Rannells attended a meeting of MTC's Bay Area Partnership held at the Alameda County Transportation Commission offices in Oakland.

On March 28, Nina Rannells attended the monthly meeting of the Clipper Executive Board held at the BART offices in Oakland.

On March 30, Mike Gougherty attended the BCDC Engineering Criteria Review Board to present the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion project.

On April 5, Kevin Connolly will attend the Alameda City Council meeting to provide support and information regarding the proposed Memorandum of Understanding for the future Seaplane Lagoon Ferry Terminal.

OPERATIONS REPORT

Spring Service Schedules were implemented Monday February 29 and run through May 1, 2016.

Monthly Operating Statistics - The Monthly Operating Statistics Reports for February 2016 is provided as Attachment A.

Attachment A

Monthly Operating Statistics Report February 2016

		Alameda/ Oakland	Harbor Bay	South San Francisco	Vallejo*	Systemwide	
Boardings	<i>vs. last month</i>	Total Passengers February 2016	87,951	25,786	10,846	73,740	198,323
		Total Passengers January 2016	66,587	24,594	9,652	62,163	162,996
		Percent change	32.08%	4.85%	12.37%	18.62%	21.67%
	<i>vs. same month last year</i>	Total Passengers February 2016	87,951	25,786	10,846	73,740	198,323
		Total Passengers February 2015	57,198	21,439	8,479	54,755	141,871
		Percent change	53.77%	20.28%	27.92%	34.67%	39.79%
	<i>vs. prior FY to date</i>	Total Passengers Current FY To Date	757,130	199,879	80,365	625,953	1,663,327
		Total Passengers Last FY To Date	581,054	167,216	67,076	549,280	1,364,626
		Percent change	30.30%	19.53%	19.81%	13.96%	21.89%
		Avg Weekday Ridership February 2016	3,140	1,289	542	2,919	7,890
Ops Stats	Passengers Per Hour		240	198	70	166	181
	Revenue Hours		366	130	154	445	1,095
	Revenue Miles		5,893	2,873	2,458	12,070	23,294
Fuel	Fuel Used (gallons)		32,234	11,178	14,507	100,097	158,017
	Avg Cost per gallon		\$1.36	\$1.36	\$1.36	\$1.57	\$1.49

* Vallejo ridership includes ferry + Route 200 bus passengers. February bus ridership totaled 7153.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board Members

**FROM: Nina Rannells, Executive Director
Lynne Yu, Manager, Finance & Grants**

**SUBJECT: Monthly Review of FY 2015/16 Financial Statements for Eight Months
Ending February 29, 2016**

Recommendation

There is no recommendation associated with this informational item.

Summary

This report provides the attached FY 2015/16 Financial Statements for eight months ending February 29, 2016.

Operating Budget vs. Actual

	Prior Actual	Current Budget	Current Actual
Revenues - Year To Date:			
Fare Revenue	8,881,133	9,658,684	11,005,198
Local Bridge Toll Revenue	10,230,460	12,732,667	7,502,285
Other Revenue	500	378,514	141,627
Total Operating Revenues	19,112,093	22,769,865	18,649,110
Expenses - Year To Date:			
Planning & Administration	1,340,317	1,997,260	1,688,330
Ferry Services	17,771,777	20,772,605	16,960,781
Total Operatings Expenses	19,112,093	22,769,865	18,649,110
System-Wide Farebox Recovery %	50%	46%	65%

Capital Actual and % of Total Budget

	YTD Actual	% of FY 2015/16 Budget
Revenues:		
Federal Funds	6,700,468	21.33%
State Funds	11,848,188	48.05%
Bridge Toll Revenues	5,806,496	45.21%
Other Local Funds	2,213,098	62.11%
Total Capital Revenues	26,568,250	36.65%
Expenses:		
Total Capital Expenses	26,568,250	36.65%

Fiscal Impact

There is no fiscal impact associated with this informational item.

END

San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority
FY 2015/16 Statement of Revenues and Expenses
For Eight Months Ending 2/29/2016

% of Year Elapsed 66.6%

	Feb-16	Year - To - Date			Budget	
		FY2014/15 Actual	FY 2015/16 Budget	FY 2015/16 Actual	FY 2015/16 Total	% of Total
OPERATING EXPENSES						
<u>PLANNING & GENERAL ADMIN:</u>						
Wages and Fringe Benefits	106,559	831,396	1,003,956	865,895	1,508,000	57.4%
Services	71,095	471,307	990,641	792,464	1,488,000	53.3%
Materials and Supplies	338	5,216	18,641	7,763	28,000	27.7%
Utilities	1,441	7,293	15,312	12,892	23,000	56.1%
Insurance	-	18,335	15,312	-	23,000	0.0%
Miscellaneous	13,427	50,879	79,890	59,827	120,000	49.9%
Leases and Rentals	25,516	186,762	200,392	195,830	301,000	65.1%
Admin Overhead Expense Transfer	(31,794)	(230,871)	(326,885)	(246,340)	(491,000)	50.2%
Sub-Total Planning & Gen Admin	186,583	1,340,317	1,997,260	1,688,330	3,000,000	56.3%
<u>FERRY OPERATIONS:</u>						
<u>Harbor Bay FerryService</u>						
Purchased Transportation	107,312	976,150	1,216,531	1,024,011	1,827,300	56.0%
Fuel - Diesel & Urea	15,240	254,158	306,912	179,696	461,000	39.0%
Other Direct Operating Expenses	45,882	257,172	332,477	256,242	499,400	51.3%
Admin Overhead Expense Transfer	5,597	45,565	54,592	43,687	82,000	53.3%
Sub-Total Harbor Bay	174,032	1,533,044	1,910,513	1,503,637	2,869,700	52.4%
Farebox Recovery	66%	48%	41%	61%	41%	
<u>Alameda/Oakland Ferry Service</u>						
Purchased Transportation	361,896	3,538,262	3,902,880	3,685,544	5,862,350	62.9%
Fuel - Diesel & Urea	43,948	805,826	1,050,592	597,486	1,578,050	37.9%
Other Direct Operating Expenses	63,014	455,152	803,564	501,411	1,207,000	41.5%
Admin Overhead Expense Transfer	14,644	89,094	145,800	111,648	219,000	51.0%
Sub-Total Alameda/Oakland	483,502	4,888,334	5,902,836	4,896,089	8,866,400	55.2%
Farebox Recovery	77%	54%	50%	68%	50%	
<u>Vallejo FerryService</u>						
Purchased Transportation	580,574	5,765,381	6,155,270	6,146,784	9,245,570	66.5%
Fuel - Diesel & Urea	156,920	2,668,454	3,362,601	1,853,310	5,050,820	36.7%
Other Direct Operating Expenses	81,646	653,037	984,689	644,023	1,479,060	43.5%
Admin Overhead Expense Transfer	4,937	41,867	59,918	39,820	90,000	44.2%
Sub-Total Vallejo	824,077	9,128,740	10,562,478	8,683,936	15,865,450	54.7%
Farebox Recovery	83%	56%	51%	72%	51%	
<u>South San Francisco FerryService</u>						
Purchased Transportation	158,993	1,541,794	1,543,150	1,368,268	2,317,900	59.0%
Fuel - Diesel & Urea	19,779	351,458	421,089	228,636	632,500	36.1%
Other Direct Operating Expenses	31,172	274,062	365,965	229,029	549,700	41.7%
Admin Overhead Expense Transfer	6,616	54,345	66,575	51,186	100,000	51.2%
Sub-Total South San Francisco	216,560	2,221,659	2,396,779	1,877,119	3,600,100	52.1%
Farebox Recovery	35%	20%	20%	29%	20%	
Total Operating Expenses	1,884,753	19,112,093	22,769,866	18,649,110	34,201,650	54.5%
OPERATING REVENUES						
Fare Revenue	1,245,611	8,881,133	9,658,684	11,005,198	14,507,900	75.9%
Local - Bridge Toll	639,142	10,230,460	12,732,667	7,502,285	19,125,200	39.2%
Local - Alameda Tax & Assessment	-	-	378,514	-	568,550	0%
Local - Other Revenue	-	500	-	141,627	-	0%
Total Operating Revenues	1,884,753	19,112,093	22,769,866	18,649,110	34,201,650	54.5%

San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority
FY 2015/16 Statement of Revenues and Expenses
For Eight Months Ending 2/29/2016

Project Description	Current Month	Project Budget	Prior Years Actual	FY2015/16 Budget	FY2015/16 Actual	Future Year	% of Total Project Budget
CAPITAL EXPENSES							
FACILITIES:							
Maintenance and Operations Facilities							
North Bay Operations & Maintenance Facility	2,232,531	31,082,000	17,978,666	13,103,334	7,766,881	-	83%
Central Bay Operations & Maintenance Facility	43,152	45,600,000	3,182,898	14,317,102	718,447	28,100,000	9%
Float Rehabilitation/Replacement							
Regional Spare Float Replacement	159,957	3,862,000	1,457,429	2,404,571	1,862,645	-	86%
Replace Mooring Piles - Harbor Bay Float	286	450,000	-	450,000	285,584		
Terminal Improvement							
Electronic Bicycle Lockers	-	79,500	-	79,500	-	-	0%
Channel Dredging - Vallejo Ferry Terminal	-	1,900,000	57,854	1,842,146	1,519,992	-	83%
Terminal Access Improvement	-	250,000	-	250,000	60,851		24%
FERRY VESSELS:							
Major Component Rehabilitation / Replacement							
Vessel Engine Overhaul - Gemini Class Vessels	-	1,320,000	777,927	542,073	473	-	59%
Vessel Engine Overhaul - Taurus	198,492	300,000	-	300,000	295,463		98%
Selective Catalyst Reduction (SCR) System Overhaul	185	1,400,000	-	700,000	185	700,000	0%
Major Component & Waterject Rehab - Intintoli	755,689	2,860,000	-	2,860,000	1,290,748	-	45%
Major Component Rehabilitation - Solano	-	430,000		430,000			0%
Vessel Mid-Life Repower/Refurbishment							
Vessel Mid-Life Refurbishment - Peralta	-	5,260,000	3,373,932	1,886,068	50,021	-	65%
Vessel Quarter-Life Refurbishment - Gemini ¹	484,969	3,507,000	-	3,507,000	623,203		18%
Vessel Expansion/Replacement							
Purchase Replacement Vessel - Express II & Encinal	35,030	33,951,000	3,227,001	17,086,999	10,436,332	13,637,000	40%
Purchase Replacement Vessel - Vallejo	35,362	21,052,000	387	4,999,613	43,295	16,052,000	0%
CAPITAL EQUIPMENT / OTHER:							
Purchase Heavy Duty Forklift	-	120,000	-	120,000	-	-	0%
Purchase Utility Vehicles	-	35,000	-	35,000	-	-	0%
SERVICE EXPANSION:							
Environmental Studies / Conceptual Design							
Berkeley Terminal - Environ/Concept Design	-	2,335,000	2,186,799	148,201	-	-	94%
Terminal/Berthing Expansion Construction							
Downtown Ferry Terminal Expansion - South Basin	253,104	79,580,000	3,269,602	4,180,398	1,236,920	72,130,000	6%
Richmond Ferry Terminal	52,685	17,062,500	791,931	1,240,569	334,733	15,030,000	7%
Expansion Ferry Vessels							
Richmond Ferry Vessels - 2 each	35,362	42,000,000	-	2,000,000	42,476	40,000,000	0%
Total Capital Expenses	4,286,803	294,436,000	36,304,428	72,482,573	26,568,250	185,649,000	
CAPITAL REVENUES							
Federal Funds	1,331,127	66,401,356	9,114,783	31,415,089	6,700,468	25,871,485	24%
State Funds	2,499,879	166,257,383	22,272,394	24,660,205	11,848,188	119,324,784	21%
Local - Bridge Toll	411,662	55,037,321	3,467,192	12,844,248	5,806,496	38,725,881	17%
Local - Alameda Sales Tax Measure B / BB	44,077	5,139,940	1,450,059	2,323,031	2,155,979	1,366,850	70%
Local - Alameda TIF / LLAD	58	450,000	-	90,000	57,118	360,000	13%
Local - San Francisco Sales Tax Prop K	-	1,100,000	-	1,100,000	-	-	0%
Local - Transportation Funds for Clean Air	-	50,000	-	50,000	-	-	0%
Total Capital Revenues	4,286,803	294,436,000	36,304,428	72,482,573	26,568,250	185,649,000	

¹ Board approved Project Budget increase of \$1.1 million, from \$2.4 million to \$3.5 million, in February 2016.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board Members

**FROM: Peter Friedmann, WETA Federal Legislative Representative
Ray Bucheger, WETA Federal Legislative Representative**

SUBJECT: WETA Federal Legislative Board Report – March 24, 2016

This report is divided into two sections:

1. New Possibility for Unused Earmarks
2. Future Strategy for Seeking Funding for FTA Ferry Grant Program

New Possibility for Unused Earmarks

We worked with the California Congressional delegation to secure funding for WETA for the ferry service from Berkeley to downtown San Francisco in FY08 (\$642,346), FY09 (\$475,000) and FY10 (\$1,000,000). Unfortunately, this funding has not been utilized. While WETA still has high hopes for the Berkeley-San Francisco route, certain permitting and approval issues out of WETA's control have made this route an impossibility in the near term. We explored the possibility of using this funding for the downtown San Francisco ferry building expansion project (one end of the Berkeley-San Francisco route) but were rebuffed by Caltrans.

This effort came back to life when the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2016 included a provision that allows states and territories to repurpose certain funds originally earmarked for specific projects more than ten years ago (any earmark that was designated on or before September 30, 2005). FHWA subsequently issued guidance and included a list of earmarks that can be repurposed. Since WETA's earmarks are from FY08, FY09 and FY10, they are not on the list; however, we immediately engaged the Congressional delegation to either find a way to include WETA's earmarks into this year's batch, even though they missed the mark by three years, or, if that is a non-starter, work to add language to next year's appropriations bill that gives the agency the same authority to repurpose earmarks that are not yet ten plus years old, if the earmark recipient approves the re-allocation. It is too early to know if we will be successful on either option, but we are working closely with the delegation to try to get this done.

Future Strategy for Seeking Funding for FTA Ferry Grant Program

We continue to stay in touch with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) regarding the timing for the agency's ferry grant program awards. During one of our regular "check-ins" with the agency, we learned that FTA is combining FY15 and FY16 funds, even though the most recent Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) indicated that funding would be awarded only for FY15. We believe the agency is combining FY15 and FY16 funds due to internal inefficiencies. Regardless, had the agency been forthcoming with ferry operators about plans for distributing FY16 funding along with FY15 funding, we would have changed our strategy for seeking funding in FY15 and FY16 (we would have asked for more money). We have alerted the Congressional delegation to this issue and they share our concern. In fact, the delegation is willing to press the agency, at our behest, to be upfront about how it will distribute funding in FY17 and FY18. In other words, when the FY17 Notice of Funding Availability is issued later this year, we will work with the Congressional delegation to try to determine what level of funding WETA should request, based on how the agency treats funding for FY17 and FY18. Any intelligence the

Congressional delegation can wean from the agency will be very useful so that we can be prepared to increase our “ask” if it appears the FTA may change course and combine the FY17 and FY18 grant awards. Our objective remains the same: to maximize the federal funding from the FTA program to WETA.

END

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA WATER EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

(March 3, 2016)

The Board of Directors of the San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority met in regular session at the WETA offices at 9 Pier, Suite 111, San Francisco, CA.

1. CALL TO ORDER – BOARD CHAIR

Chair Jody Breckenridge called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND ROLL CALL

Chair Breckenridge led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other directors present were Vice Chair Jim Wunderman, Director Timothy Donovan and Director Anthony Intintoli.

3. REPORT OF BOARD CHAIR

Chair Breckenridge welcomed Directors, staff and guests to the meeting and asked Directors to provide their top 3 choices for future off-site Board meetings to her at the end of the meeting to help prepare for a future agenda item moving the meetings to sites other than the WETA offices in San Francisco.

4. REPORTS OF DIRECTORS

Vice Chair Wunderman said he had watched a KTVU segment on Bay Area ferries on Monday night and, having been involved in the creation of the agency, was disturbed to hear that WETA was not doing everything possible to expand service. He said private ferry services were now providing passenger service to various places in the Bay Area including Redwood City and that WETA was at a critical point of being left behind if it did not act now. He said it may be a good thing that private services were developing but Directors needed to figure out how to expand aggressively without incurring costs and risks beyond WETA's capabilities as a responsible government agency. Vice Chair Wunderman said that hearing complaints about the parking problems at the Alameda terminals and the capacity challenges that WETA's riders had been vocalizing was a good thing because capacity challenges had been expected when the agency was created. He further explained that those issues would be resolved but aggressive expansion needed to happen right now because there was demand for it.

Vice Chair Wunderman said he had not been able to hear the presentation on alternative technologies by Elliot Bay Design Group at the February Board meeting because he had to depart early but based on conversations he had with some people, he did not believe that long-term operation costs had been considered in that analysis. He said there should be long-term costs considered. Vice Chair Wunderman added that he understood concerns about vessel commonality related to new technologies but that at some point in the near future, WETA would have to adopt alternatives and in doing so, would not have a common fleet. He said that every time he saw the Governor, this was what he was focused on. He said the Governor wanted transportation and other government agencies and the private sector rethinking long-term energy use strategies and moving away from polluting and carbon-intensive solutions.

Vice Chair Wunderman then said that without Ron Cowan, WETA wouldn't exist. He explained that Mr. Cowan was an important Alameda developer and visionary who saw the opportunity for water transit to become an integral part of mass transportation and emergency response and had pushed hard to create the Water Transit Authority and then WETA.

Vice Chair Wunderman asked that an item be added to the next Board meeting agenda for Directors to consider naming a ferry vessel after Mr. Cowan. He said perhaps a Harbor Bay service vessel could be named after him since he had developed Harbor Bay in Alameda. Vice Chair Wunderman said he felt doing so would be a nice gesture to recognize someone who had provided so much leadership.

5. REPORTS OF STAFF

Executive Director Nina Rannells referred the Board to her written report and confirmed that the next Board meeting on April 7 would be held at the Alameda City Hall Council Chambers. She thanked Jennifer Ott from the City of Alameda and her staff for their assistance in securing the meeting space. She said that staff was planning an Alameda ferry facility site tour the afternoon of April 7, prior to the Board meeting in Alameda as plans are developed.

Director Intintoli said that without identification and security of new operational funding streams, the idea of expansion was problematic. He said he wanted the Board to focus on figuring out how to extend operational funding from Regional Measure 2 (RM2) and any future Regional Measure 3 (RM3) funding to support WETA in harnessing service expansion interest. He added that without doing so, it would be impossible to expand service successfully.

Ms. Rannells said staff had spoken with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) at a variety of levels to emphasize the importance of being included in the next bridge toll revenue conversation. She added that she had also reached out to MTC staff to determine if WETA could get additional RM2 money to support the expanded service it hoped to offer during the summer months or a guarantee of money if WETA spent more than their funding cap in the process of offering the much needed expanded service offerings. Ms. Rannells said she had received a positive response to that request and that she anticipated providing MTC with additional information to support the request following the Board's discussion about summer service expansion.

Ms. Rannells also explained that there were additional ongoing staff conversations with MTC about funding. She said WETA, AC Transit and BART had met with MTC in the fall regarding how the three agencies could collectively and strategically help mitigate the growing traffic congestion on Bay Area highways in the short term. She said MTC had promised a follow-up conversation which she hoped would take place within the next few months.

Vice Chair Wunderman said he agreed that RM3 was a necessity but that he had been told the measure would likely not be on the ballot until 2018. Director Intintoli said that everyone shared the vision of an expanded ferry service but that without first securing operational funding, expanding service would marginalize everything that had been put in place for current service and that would be a disaster. He said WETA had originally been created because two jurisdictions, Vallejo and Alameda, had already built successful services and there was something to take over. Director Intintoli said it was critical that the Board focus on new operational funding sources.

Chair Breckenridge said she agreed and also felt that funding required an even broader discussion because the Federal sources that WETA had relied on historically were vulnerable. She said WETA was now competing for the increasing demand in funding for roads and highways, and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) was not presently in a position to disburse the money it already had. Chair Breckenridge said the structure in place today – for operational and capital funding – was not sustainable, and the Board needed to change WETA's funding dynamics by creatively identifying new funding sources.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

Director Intintoli made a motion to approve the consent calendar which included:

- a) Board Meeting Minutes – February 11, 2016

- b) Approve Amendment to Agreement with Weston Solutions, Inc. to Provide Additional Construction Management Services for the North Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility Project
- c) Approve Amendment to Agreement with Cambridge Systematics for Ferry Ridership Forecasting Services

Vice Chair Wunderman seconded the motion and the consent calendar carried unanimously.

Yeas: Breckenridge, Donovan, Intintoli, Wunderman. Nays: None. Absent: DelBono.

7. ADOPT SHORT RANGE TRANSIT PLAN

Senior Planner Mike Gougherty presented a slideshow on this item requesting the Board to adopt the Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP). He explained that following the January Board authorization to release the draft SRTP for public comment, staff had notified riders and interested parties through WETA's email list and the BayAlerts notification system that the draft was online for review. Additionally, staff directly contacted over 30 stakeholder organizations already engaged with WETA's recent strategic planning process. As of February 26, eleven individuals and organizations had submitted 27 comments, and a summary of those and WETA's responses was provided. Mr. Gougherty explained that many of the comments received were consolidated on both the SRTP and the Strategic Plan.

Mr. Gougherty said that most of the comments WETA had received on the Draft SRTP required only clarification for the feedback providers and that based on the comments received, very little had been changed in the original draft to create the final document. Mr. Gougherty added that upon adoption of the final SRTP by the Board, it would be submitted to MTC to fulfill WETA's FTA requirement.

Mr. Gougherty said that the next iteration of the SRTP would be created in 2018 or 2019 since the Plan needed to be updated every two or three years. He said that if a new project or service was funded within the next few years, that project would appear in the next SRTP and, depending on timing, could even be added to the current SRTP after its submission to MTC. Ms. Rannells noted that WETA's SRTP included an unrequired chapter at the end which provided the FTA and MTC with overviews of potential projects that staff was working on that did not yet have funding, but for which funding sources were being explored or solicited. Chair Breckenridge clarified that the requirements for the SRTP were set by the FTA and MTC and not by WETA.

Mr. Gougherty introduced Diana Dorinson from Transportation Analytics and said she had worked on WETA's Strategic Plan and also provided staff with the technical guidance to create the SRTP.

Vice Chair Wunderman said he understood the requirements of the SRTP and asked if MTC decided to give funds to WETA with a directive that the money be used specifically for service expansion in the next two years, if WETA would be restricted from doing so if those expansion plans were not already included in the SRTP. Planning and Development Manager Kevin Connolly said no, the expansion process could move forward if funding was available and in such cases, the SRTP on file would be amended. Mr. Connolly added that in his prior position at another transit agency, the SRTP was amended just about every year to support new projects as their viability had evolved.

Vice Chair Wunderman asked if it was possible for the Board to review the current expansion policy and change it. Chair Breckenridge said the Expansion Policy was being submitted in Chapter 8 of the SRTP not as a requirement but as an informational item. Chair Breckenridge said the objective for adopting the Expansion Policy had been due diligence to create a process for responsible service expansion consideration. She said the Board could change or waive the policy or do whatever was deemed sensible based on what Directors felt was best for a project.

Vice Chair Wunderman said other Bay Area transportation agencies were looking at creative ways to speed up their processes by combining or compressing some steps and using other creative solutions to advance projects. Chair Breckenridge said that for some state level programs, permitting steps were already being sped up to cut through red tape.

Vice Chair Wunderman asked if it was possible to start the design process for a new service before securing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Director Intintoli said that had been done in the past with Berkeley, and millions of dollars had been spent on environmental studies without an MOU. Vice Chairman said he understood risk was involved and asked the Board to consider WETA's risk tolerance. He asked if it was possible to build terminals around the Bay Area to support emergency response without worrying about offering passenger service at those terminals, at least not initially. He said this had been discussed when WETA was created and asked if the SRTP would restrict WETA from doing so. Ms. Rannells said that the basic premise of the existing WETA Expansion Policy was to ensure that there was a solid partnership and plan detailing what services were going to be provided in a document solidified with agreement details and expectations that was signed by WETA and the local entity or entities who owned the terminal property.

Ms. Rannells said conversations about building a terminal solely for emergency response support in the city of Antioch had taken place several years ago. One of the questions that had repeatedly arisen in those discussions was how, and by whom, a terminal without regular transit service would be maintained. She said WETA did not have funding to build or maintain assets that were not in active service. She added that every situation was different and each MOU unique.

Mr. Gougherty said that in addition to including capital and operating plans, the SRTP contained an overview of system performance during the last three years. Mr. Gougherty said that in contrast to the prior SRTP, the new SRTP reflected record ridership levels, costs increasing slower than ridership – suggesting that the system was becoming much more productive than in its prior assessment - and a per passenger subsidy reduction of 31 percent system-wide.

PUBLIC COMMENT

City of Vallejo Community & Economic Development Director Andrea Ouse said that Vallejo was in full support of the SRTP and fully agreed with its data, especially with regard to Vallejo's projected ridership growth. She said that growth potential for both the mainland terminal in Vallejo and the new Mare Island terminal was expected to be impacted by development of the 60 acres of undeveloped land near the mainland terminal and added that the City was already working with the master developer for that land on plans to develop it. Ms. Ouse said the City was grateful to WETA for its investments thus far in the Vallejo service and said the City looked forward to furthering its partnership with WETA on investments to enhance the existing service - already at capacity - and to support much needed service expansion in Vallejo as possible.

Director Donovan asked if the City was working with Lennar as the developer on the mainland waterfront project and when the project was expected to be completed. Ms. Ouse said Lennar was the developer on Mare Island but not on the mainland and added that she expected a new plan for the mainland project to be taken to the City Council for adoption within the next few months. She said it was hoped that once begun, the project would take about three to five years to complete.

Vice Chair Wunderman made a motion to approve the item. Director Donovan seconded the motion and the item carried unanimously.

Yeas: Breckenridge, Donovan, Intintoli, Wunderman. Nays: None. Absent: DelBono.

8. IDENTIFY NEXT STEPS FOR THE DRAFT WETA STRATEGIC PLAN

Mr. Connolly presented this item requesting Board direction to identify the next steps for the Draft WETA Strategic Plan. He said that in presenting the Draft Strategic Plan in its entirety for stakeholders and other interested parties to review as a whole, a flood of feedback had been received and the process had been very valuable. Mr. Connolly said that because of this, it made sense to take more time to finalize the Plan than initially expected to support more feedback collection and review. He said the recommendation was to reopen the public comment period and appoint a subcommittee of the Board to review and evaluate the Draft Strategic Plan considering the agency's mission and vision statements with the intent that the Subcommittee would return to the full Board with a plan and schedule for further meetings and ultimately, for Plan adoption. Mr. Connolly noted that staff had also received requests for more review time which would help the Board better assure the Plan reflected what Directors wanted.

Chair Breckenridge said that the Directors and staff had read through all of the comments that had been received thus far, and she thanked everyone who had shared feedback. She said the review process had been educational and that the Board and staff appreciated the time that had been invested in the Plan review. Chair Breckenridge said she had asked staff to reengage the stakeholders from Redwood City who had spoken at the February Board meeting to identify opportunities to work with the various San Mateo agencies to develop a plan for future service.

Chair Breckenridge said that the Plan provided an accurate overview of the present and near future WETA system and its core service attributes, but its long range vision may not accurately reflect the public's demands and the strategic priorities to drive the Board to support those demands. She said that the Plan could include a more aspirational vision such as those contained in other strategic plans. Chair Breckenridge asked Vice Chair Wunderman and Director Donovan if they would participate in a Board subcommittee to review the Plan. She said that in the process, it was paramount to craft a vision and supporting strategic priorities with an objective of arriving at a final Plan for Board adoption. She reminded the Board that it was the Directors who owned the Plan and that they were responsible to stakeholders and the public to consider their interests and expectations, just as it is staff's responsibility to implement the Plan once adopted.

Vice Chair Wunderman said Chair Breckenridge's objective was well stated. He said he appreciated the work done by staff and Directors thus far on the draft Plan and said he would be happy to work with Director Donovan on the Plan. He said he agreed with Director Intintoli that the document should support how WETA would finance what it wants to do with an emphasis on expansion and added that Redwood City was a great example. He added that it was important to determine the vision along with a realistic path to achieving that vision.

Vice Chair Wunderman said he would be heading to Washington, D.C. in late May with the Bay Area Council and that if there was a better understanding of the Plan by then, it may make sense to engage congress members or agencies with funding objectives on that trip. He said the Board should identify some creative funding sources and name them because no one else was going to do that for the agency and added that this Plan was the one in which WETA should also identify and establish its green technology objectives and strategies to achieve those objectives. Vice Chair Wunderman said he was watching companies take to the Bay and because their boats were smaller and less regulated, they were able to move very quickly. He said WETA should consider finding and providing additional resources to contract with those companies, and possibly consider purchasing smaller vessels that would be less expensive, less regulated, and easier to move through the permitting process.

Vice Chair Wunderman said one of the biggest challenges with the WETA system was the "first and last mile" problem, to and from terminals, a problem it shared with other transportation systems including railroads and BART. Vice Chair Wunderman said the future of everything was here in the Bay Area and that included transportation. He said WETA should be blending in, inventing, or partnering with services

that provide that and added that if WETA could solve that problem without having to park a million cars at the terminals, it would give the agency the opportunity to expand service.

Vice Chair Wunderman said another emerging area WETA should be looking at was freight. He said WETA was really focused on passenger service, but there were many different freight needs right now and changes were happening at ports all over the Bay Area which you could see by just looking out at the Bay. He said maybe there was an opportunity for WETA to integrate its passenger services with freight services to subsidize its operations.

Vice Chair Wunderman said he welcomed the challenge to do more outreach for feedback and to work on the Plan. He said he looked forward to collaboratively identifying the right vision and strategies, and that feedback and debate would ultimately strengthen the Plan. He also emphasized that people should really feel that their feedback had been heard.

Director Donovan said he also accepted Chair Breckenridge's invitation to work on the Plan. He added that he was thrilled to have received so much feedback already. He added that staff had done a great job so far, and he looked forward to working with Vice Chair Wunderman on solidifying a final Plan that would meet the demands for WETA services. Director Donovan said funding strategies would be a key component of the process and that he looked forward to exploring those opportunities.

Chair Breckenridge asked if Directors had any other thoughts about, or objections to, the subcommittee formation to work on the Plan and they did not.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Base Reuse Director for the City of Alameda Jennifer Ott said it sounded like WETA staff had taken the City of Alameda's comments and feedback to heart in the Strategic Plan process. She said this was appreciated and that she and her colleagues in Alameda enjoyed working with staff. She said that overall, they supported the Plan and particularly the Seaplane Lagoon expansion, as well as further partnership and expansion to meet Alameda service demands. Ms. Ott said she was working concurrently on an MOU with WETA staff and on studies for Seaplane Lagoon and that \$10 million was already committed for the project by a developer. She said further funding identification was also in the works and that the Board should expect to see a Seaplane Lagoon MOU within the next few months.

Ms. Ott said she and her colleagues completely understood that it was a tricky balancing act to support current services and facilities and add expansion to meet demands. She said existing service and facilities were very important to the City of Alameda, that BART was at capacity, and that WETA was in an ideal place to help fill the resulting Bay Area transportation gaps. She added that greenhouse gases were also of concern and said she looked forward to seeing a more aggressive vision in the Plan that prioritized access to terminals, supported current services as well as expansion, and reduced emissions.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Ouse said the WETA Strategic Plan would help inform Vallejo's long range General Plan, currently in the update process for the first time in about thirty years. She said the Plan would be headed to the City Council for adoption in the fall and that ferry service was a hub for the City, perceived and well recognized as a fundamental part of a vibrant waterfront and prosperous Vallejo. Ms. Ouse said there were efforts underway for an advanced manufacturer to take the City owned 157 acres of land on Mare Island which would be a game changer for the Vallejo community. She said ferry service on the island, even if in a limited capacity, would be a huge boon for the anticipated 2,400 new employees.

Ms. Ouse said the 3 Vallejo higher education institutions – Cal Maritime Academy, Touro University and Solano Community College – were working together to build a downtown hub just a few blocks from the ferry terminal. She emphasized that the next 20 years were going to be crucial to Vallejo's economy and

that working collaboratively with WETA staff to include more ferry service in its future was paramount to assure its success. She added that she and other City staff looked forward to it.

Vice Chair Wunderman said Vallejo and Mare Island provided a perfect example of the importance of ferry service being able to connect communities, especially areas affected by military base closures that drove underperformance in jobs and the economy, with the rest of the Bay Area. He said Vallejo's plans were a great opportunity for the WETA team to make a real difference for the entire Bay Area.

Chair Breckenridge made a motion for two members from the Board to work together to elevate the Strategic Plan, with particular attention paid to creating a robust twenty year vision and the necessary strategic priorities to support that vision. Director Intintoli seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Yeas: Breckenridge, Donovan, Intintoli, Wunderman. Nays: None. Absent: DelBono.

9. APPROVE THE WETA EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

Program Manager/Analyst Lauren Gularte presented the item to approve the WETA Emergency Response Plan (ERP). She explained that once the ERP was approved by the Board, concerted outreach efforts would continue, specifically to first responder groups, Operational Areas and local jurisdictions, through training discussions and exercises to help assure that everyone was aware of WETA's emergency response role and capabilities. Ms. Gularte introduced Navigating Preparedness Founder and Managing Director Lee Rosenberg who provided a presentation on the ERP and a basic overview of the Emergency Operations Plan (EOP), an internal confidential appendix to the ERP.

Mr. Rosenberg said while the two Plans were complete and ready for approval, WETA was not able to resolve all of the issues and follow up actions identified and that more work is required to assure WETA would be ready and equipped for what was laid out in the ERP. Mr. Rosenberg said one of the biggest remaining challenges to help assure WETA preparedness was the issue of credentialing, which is a problem identified and shared by numerous other emergency response agencies and organizations throughout the state. In addition, follow-up actions such as working with law enforcement agencies to address issues like crowd management and security for WETA emergency response staff as well as continued collaboration with the California Energy Commission on provision of emergency fuel and with CalOES for the provision of resources is also required. Mr. Rosenberg said further conversations with the Port of Oakland, CalTrans, the Port of San Francisco and other agencies responsible for land that have been identified as potential locations to support temporary terminals. Finally, he said, emergency communication systems and equipment had been tested in exercises during the revision of the ERP and that refinement of the system is required to appropriately support WETA emergency response given the challenges of WETA's wide geographic range of operations.

Ms. Gularte explained if the plan is approved, staff will outreach to local law enforcement agencies informing them of WETA's emergency response capabilities and challenges including the issue of lacking a statewide credentialing system for identification of employees involved in emergency response. The objective would be to familiarize local law enforcement agencies with the types of identification held by ferry crews, including Transportation Worker Identification Cards (TWIC cards) and Blue & Gold employee identification cards. Additionally, WETA staff will be working to obtain credentials. Ms. Gularte added that WETA's contracted operator, Blue & Gold Fleet, had also prepared a draft Service Resumption Plan to mobilize their employees in the event that all normal communications systems were down and that WETA is in the process of issuing communication equipment to Blue & Gold Fleet in order to implement the Service Resumption Plan.

Director Intintoli asked if there were funds available to support emergency response other than the reserves fund WETA had set aside to support up to two months of current, regular service operations.

He said it would be difficult to provide robust emergency response if WETA had to pay for such operations and then apply for reimbursement, something that could take years to receive given the general time frame it takes to get reimbursed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Ms. Gularte explained that WETA may be able to utilize Department of Transportation (DOT) funds which could be released more expediently and were not issued on a reimbursement basis. Mr. Rosenberg said the Governor also had authority to deliver funding to WETA after proclamation of an emergency, either as direct funding to WETA or by contracting services to be used by WETA for additional staffing, fueling and for contracting with private operators for additional vessels.

Ms. Rannells said MTC may be another source to tap for emergency response funding. Chair Breckenridge agreed and added that the best strategy would be to identify all available resources and to do so early. Director Donovan agreed, and said this was especially important because the two months of operational funds WETA had in its reserves could dwindle to one month or less if WETA was called upon to provide 24/7 emergency response services.

Chair Breckenridge said that while all of WETA's Plans were vital, the ERP needed to be ready and actionable, in hand, since an emergency event could happen any day. She said there had been alignment with an enormous number of agencies around the Bay Area and throughout the state in the ERP and EOP revision process and that agencies were now much more aware and informed of WETA's capabilities and role. Chair Breckenridge said when she first joined the Board the general understanding of most agencies had been that WETA was responsible for doing all of the prioritization and coordination for emergency water transit operations. She said they now understood that WETA was not responsible for making independent decisions about emergency response but would instead be working with other agencies responsible for emergency transportation under Cal OES' direction. Ms. Gularte said that because every route in WETA's system straddled multiple Operational Areas (or counties) it is critical for the state to set regional priorities and to coordinate the emergency service plan. For example, the movement of survivors from one county to another will require consent from the receiving county to accept delivery of those people as well as coordination for survivor support services (shelters, food and water, etc.).

Chair Breckenridge said that these Plans would not only benefit WETA but the entire region. Vice Chair Wunderman said he agreed, and he commended Chair Breckenridge's leadership on the ERP revision process. He said the ERP reflected the root of why he and others had pushed for legislation to change the Water Transit Authority (WTA), an agency with no emergency response component, into the WETA of today, mandated to provide emergency response in addition to its regular ferry service operations. He said the original thinking had been that WETA would be able to replace Bay Area transportation options should they lose their abilities to serve the public. He added that the expectation had been that WETA would have a substantial flotilla amassed prior to an emergency event and that WETA's present flotilla was still very small but better than none.

Vice Chair Wunderman asked if it was possible to take control of other vessels out on the Bay in the event of emergency, specifically those of Golden Gate Ferry and private companies' vessels, and whether WETA had the authority to evacuate a group of people without any other agency's approval in the event of communications disruption. Vice Chair Wunderman said that the initial thinking behind the agency's legislative change to add the emergency component was that WETA would take control of the entire region's transportation system in the event of a disaster or emergency. He said he didn't think that was in place and that maybe it shouldn't be.

Ms. Gularte explained that WETA did have a Master Mutual Aid Agreement that could be invoked with Golden Gate Ferry but that WETA would not be able to commandeer their vessels. She said there were other private operators identified in the Plan with whom WETA could contract with to obtain additional vessels and crews. Mr. Rosenberg said that with a proclamation of an emergency, the Governor could

also direct private vessels to support WETA operations. He said WETA would not be able to do that on its own and that because some private vessels were not unionized, using those vessels could be complicated. Mr. Rosenberg said that WETA's Executive Director also had the authority to make intelligent decisions about how to best activate the ERP and could move survivors and first responders in the event of no communication with Cal OES. Chair Breckenridge said that in an emergency, the United States Coast Guard (USCG) Captain of the Port had authority over all movement on the water in San Francisco Bay and that no vessels would be allowed to move on the Bay without USCG authorization. She said there were very specific processes for inspection of infrastructure and vessels to assure safety that would also need to be considered and managed.

Operations Manager Mr. Stahnke said staff worked closely with Port of San Francisco engineers who provide facilities inspections in the event of a disaster. He said the San Francisco Ferry Building was already one of their priorities and that our contract operator employees were being trained to perform preliminary visual inspections. He said they were well-equipped to do so because they see the facilities every day during normal service operations. Mr. Stahnke further explained that WETA's current contract with Blue & Gold Fleet contained a provision that requires the use of their vessels by WETA immediately, in the event of an emergency. Chair Breckenridge said staff had extensive knowledge of the maritime resources on the entire West Coast that were available to the agency in the event of emergency and cautioned that moving survivors from one place to another when communication systems were down may be a challenge because the status of the place they were moved to would be unknown.

Vice Chair Wunderman said the ERP would always be a work in progress, but that its revised, current version was a big step forward in being able to explain and present it to the public. He suggested that a press conference held to bring the public's attention to WETA's role and responsibilities. He added that he would be happy to help with public relations and get elected officials and possibly the mayor to attend the press conference to help draw further important attention to the announcement.

Director Donovan asked if the ERP was a working document and whether it would continue to be updated as necessary. Chair Breckenridge said it was, and that the joint Federal/State Bay Area Earthquake Plan was still in draft but that as it evolved, the WETA ERP would likely be amended to ensure alignment. Ms. Rannells said that generally, after every exercise and incident, the ERP was expected to be updated based on outcomes.

Director Donovan asked how often WETA's emergency response partners met. Ms. Gularte said that staff meets regularly with a variety of different groups. Director Donovan asked if it was possible to meet more frequently to more expediently tie up the remaining loose ends of the WETA ERP. Ms. Gularte said there were numerous meetings scheduled and that all OES staff from every county was expected to attend the Mutual Aid Regional Advisory Committee (MARAC) meeting next week and that WETA's ERP was on the agenda. Chair Breckenridge said there was no single entity responsible for pulling together all of the various emergency response and supporting agencies to participate as a whole. She said WETA was now perceived as a regional asset and would be included in pertinent emergency response related discussions.

Director Donovan asked if WETA or MARAD had the equipment necessary to assure MARAD could refuel WETA vessels in the event of emergency. Mr. Stahnke said that WETA will provide the fuel hoses and camlocks and provide it to MARAD for fueling. He added that while the equipment is heavy and will be stored at WETA's maintenance facility versus being carried on vessels.

Ms. Gularte said a logistics officer from FEMA, an agency that may be responsible for providing emergency fuel to WETA, had met with staff to clarify details on what they would need from WETA to facilitate emergency fueling. Ms. Gularte said those details could now be found in the EOP. She added

that staff had also met with FEMA's state counterpart, the California Energy Commission, which requested further details that staff was in process of providing.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Veronica Sanchez of Masters, Mates & Pilots (MM&P) thanked Chair Breckenridge for her leadership on the ERP. She said there needed to be a clear solution on the credentialing challenge and suggested that the issue be included in WETA's legislative advocacy plans, in concert with other transportation agencies facing the same challenge. She said MM&P members could fulfill customer service roles and provide information and education to people when crowd management was required at terminals in the event of an emergency. Ms. Sanchez added that there needed to be better communication systems for ferry crew members and Blue and Gold in order to support communications during and emergency. She added that another emergency response asset to consider would be the 13 water taxis of Westar Marine.

Director Intintoli made a motion to approve the item. Vice Chair Wunderman seconded the motion and the item carried unanimously.

Yeas: Breckenridge, Donovan, Intintoli, Wunderman. Nays: None. Absent: DelBono.

10. AUTHORIZE RELEASE OF A REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR NORTH BAY VESSEL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. Stahnke presented this item to authorize release of a Request for Proposals (RFP) for North Bay vessel construction. He said the item was a significant milestone for WETA that would help the agency meet the increasing demands for service, provide vessels for the new Richmond ferry route, and provide much needed assets for emergency response.

Mr. Stahnke said the new Richmond route required two high-speed (34-knot) vessel additions to the current fleet to meet the 30 minute one way service schedule and provide competitive transit services with one-hour headways. He said funding for the two new vessels was included in the FY 2015/16 Capital Budget. Mr. Stahnke explained that adding these vessels to the North Bay fleet allowed for the best utilization of fleet resources to meet the demands of the Vallejo and Richmond services.

Director Intintoli asked if the *Vallejo* vessel would remain in WETA's fleet once the new vessels were put into service. Mr. Stahnke explained that it was hoped the *Vallejo* could be kept as a service back-up and for emergency response purposes because it was a valuable asset; however, he noted that the Air Resources Board required that its engines be replaced or upgraded within the next few years.

Mr. Stahnke explained that project development had included extensive outreach and a presentation on emerging technology propulsion systems to the Board by Elliott Bay Design at the February Board meeting. Mr. Stahnke said he had also just received a report from Siemens who had been working with WETA's current shipbuilder Kvichak. He said the Siemens analysis on propulsion technologies agreed with the Elliott Bay Design engineers' findings.

Chair Breckenridge said that at the February Board meeting, there had been questions about a possible trade off consideration of reduced speed North Bay vessels in exchange for possible inclusion of alternative propulsion technologies for this procurement and asked what the outcome of that had been. Mr. Stahnke said that lifecycle costs were always a consideration in new vessel procurement projects and that this project's analyses had included a variety of alternative propulsion technologies. He explained that slower transit speeds would disrupt current scheduling for Vallejo riders who already faced hour-long rides each way and would require two vessels instead of one to support each of the Vallejo and new Richmond routes during peak commute periods. Mr. Stahnke added that in the fuel consumption comparison in the alternative technology analysis for the North Bay routes, the slower,

alternatively propelled vessels would surprisingly use more fuel than the faster, higher capacity diesel engine vessels.

Mr. Stahnke said commonality was also a concern in the consideration of alternative propulsion technologies in this project and explained that commonality applied not only to captains and crews but also to infrastructure. He emphasized that WETA's current infrastructure accommodated its current fleet and that if a boat could not dock at one of WETA's terminals or maintenance facilities, there was no commonality of that aspect in that vessel. He further explained that the physical accommodation of different vessels could also require a considerably larger investment of time and capital funding.

Director Intintoli asked if it was possible to include alternative propulsion technologies on future vessels serving shorter routes like Treasure Island. Mr. Stahnke said it was and that doing so made sense for Treasure Island, especially because new infrastructure would be built for that service. He said Treasure Island service may be an ideal candidate for a zero emissions all-electric vessel. Ms. Rannells added that beginning slowly, with shorter route service, would allow more time for the technology to evolve and be tested so that hopefully it could provide good options for WETA's longer service routes as well.

Ms. Rannells said that she and Mr. Stahnke had met with Siemens for a presentation on their alternative propulsion technologies in December. She noted that Mr. Stahnke had also attended a conference in Florida on maritime propulsion emerging technologies, and staff had attended another Siemens presentation, hosted by the Bay Area Council, about their technology currently in use in other countries. Ms. Rannells further noted that staff had also engaged Elliott Bay Design to perform an alternative technologies analysis for the routes that resulted in the Board presentation at the February meeting. She said staff was most certainly interested in having the cleanest vessels possible in the WETA fleet, but that given the trade-offs in weight, passenger capacity and speed, alternative technologies did not currently make sense to include in the procurement of the new North Bay vessels.

Ms. Rannells said that the route profile for the new Richmond service had been modeled over a year ago and used as the basis in working with the City of Richmond to secure the Agreement for the service. She said staff had been very cognizant of transit times in the planning efforts for the new service. She further explained that it was important to use the faster vessels for the new service to avoid what happened on the South San Francisco route where two vessels were required to complete just three trips during peak commute periods.

Mr. Stahnke explained that the current operating funds commitments from the City of Richmond and Contra Costa County would provide a single vessel to operate on the Richmond service for about 12 years. He said if two vessels had to be used to support the service, funding would last for just 7 years.

Vice Chair Wunderman said that at some point, WETA vessels would have to begin moving away from diesel toward greener technology. He said doing so was the California way and that in the very near future, there needed to be alignment on pursuing alternative technology options. He said greener technologies would allow WETA to pursue new revenue streams and, when asking them to invest in the agency, make its case with partners that it was doing its part to reduce emissions.

Mr. Stahnke agreed and said it would be very important to remember that as WETA moved toward greener technology options it would also need to upgrade its existing facilities to support those technologies. One such example would be to add charging stations to the terminals and maintenance facilities to support electric vessels. Ms. Rannells said staff was aware of a number of funding sources available for alternative technology use and was having ongoing discussions about those possibilities in preparation for the changes ahead.

Chair Breckenridge said the time was rapidly approaching for the Board to figure out how the first alternative propulsion technology vessel would be introduced into the fleet given the existing infrastructure. She said it will be expensive and it will be difficult but that in the long run, all of the required investments will pay off with environmental benefits. She said, although not specific to propulsion technology, it was great to see that so many other green choices had been included in the North Bay vessel procurement.

Vice Chair Wunderman said a perfect example of moving ahead for the environment was when California introduced new restrictions on emissions at ports. He said everyone screamed about it but ultimately, they all complied. He said WETA would also have to make hard changes. Mr. Stahnke said WETA had already moved ahead of current EPA emissions standards.

Vice Chair Wunderman said he had spoken with a number of state legislators about WETA and water transportation generally, in trying to make a case for funding on a legislative level. He said there were about 28 legislative members that represented the Bay Area, and they represented about 25% of the entire California Legislature. Vice Chair Wunderman said that if WETA could present a case for a large infusion of funding for larger capacity vessels – and the infrastructure to support them - by inspiring with greener technologies inclusion in its plans, it may be more likely to receive the funds it so desperately required to meet increasing current service demands and future expansion efforts.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Wind + Wing Technologies Founder and President Jay Gardner provided a handout to Directors entitled WETA Alternative Propulsion Study – REVISED – March 2016. Mr. Gardner said carbon taxes were being proposed in various places in the United States and in Canada, and that Shell Oil supported the tax. Mr. Gardner said the evaluations he was providing for Directors were strictly for the Richmond service route. He added that with the addition of carbon taxes, diesel fuel would likely soon join tobacco and alcohol and be subject to a sin tax. Mr. Gardner said he was certain that existing diesel engine designers were currently thinking about what they were going to do in the future when diesel would be obsolete. He said if WETA had reduced fuel vessels, its emergency response capabilities would be extended because less fuel would be needed. He added that there were other solutions to address electric charging challenges and noted that a vessel in Norway put two battery packs on board at either end to trickle charge the engines. He said this solution provided the ability to not use a lot of energy all at once. Mr. Gardner suggested that WETA slow down and not rush to purchase new vessels without considering the alternative technology possibilities now available.

Chair Breckenridge asked Mr. Gardner why his analysis had been done only on the Richmond route when the North Bay vessel procurement included both the Richmond and Vallejo routes. Mr. Gardner said that he believed the Vallejo route needed a faster vessel and WETA should not try to use the same vessels for both North Bay routes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Wind + Wing Technologies Director of Marketing and Development Strategy Charlie Bogue said he and Mr. Gardner were very excited about the opportunity for alternative propulsion technology vessels to be included in WETA's Strategic Plan. He said he felt that the Elliott Bay Design analysis had focused on a specific hull shape for the Vallejo route and the Vallejo and Richmond routes were very different. He said that changing the hull shape of the vessel design may reduce the passenger capacity but it could also provide opportunities to use wind and other alternative propulsion technologies. He suggested that the procurement process be delayed long enough to separate the two routes to procure just one vessel specific to each route and then use taxpayer money more effectively to build a third vessel with alternative propulsion technology as an experiment that may be able to service the Richmond route.

PUBLIC COMMENT

City of Richmond Capital Projects Manager Chad Smalley said he wanted to provide the Board with clarity on Richmond's position on the matter of the vessel procurement. Mr. Smalley said there was a lot of support by the Mayor and the City generally for clean and green technologies as evidenced by the letter the City had sent to WETA recommending evaluation of those technologies. He added that it also remained the City's first and foremost objective to begin service as soon as possible, and said the Mayor was adamant about this.

Mr. Smalley further explained that service objectives were included in the operating Agreement between WETA and the Contra Costa Transportation Authority and said service had to meet or exceed those expectations to reduce the City's financial risk. He said Richmond was already heavily invested monetarily in the performance of the service and because of this, vessel speed was critical. Mr. Smalley explained that one of the contributing factors to the failure of the Richmond service in the past had been that the ferries were too slow and hence, not competitive with other transit options. He said the WETA ferry service was going to be competing with numerous other public transit options in Richmond, including Caltrain and BART and that a 30-minute voyage time was a linchpin to its success. He emphasized that consideration of slower ferries was not an option.

Mr. Smalley said Richmond understood that vessel procurement was the critical path forward to bringing the service to the City, and Richmond was not interested in the slightest delay of any sort in moving forward. He urged the Board to release the RFP for the vessels as recommended by staff.

Director Donovan said that in reviewing the current fleet's vessel retirement dates, it made sense to move forward as soon as possible with the RFP. He added that there would be more opportunities soon to consider alternative technology vessels.

Ms. Rannells said that a benefit in procuring three similar vessels through this RFP would be the ability to move them around as determined by service demands in both Richmond and Vallejo and that having the higher speed vessels would provide that flexibility. She agreed with Director Donovan that many opportunities would be coming up for new vessel procurement.

Vice Chair Wunderman said the Board had received a letter from the City of Richmond indicating that it wanted greener boats, and then heard today from Mr. Smalley that the City wanted to move forward with the RFP for reliable and proven diesel engine vessels to get service going as soon as possible. He asked Mr. Smalley if greener or sooner was the priority. Mr. Smalley replied that he wished that the City did not have to choose but that sooner was definitely the priority. Mr. Smalley said this message was from the City Manager who regrettably had not been able to attend the meeting and share the message himself.

Vice Chair Wunderman said he agreed with Ms. Rannells that it was important to have interchangeable vessels on both North Bay routes. He said staff had done a lot of analysis and evaluation of the options available for these new vessels, and there was going to be plenty of opportunity coming up to consider alternative technologies for new vessels.

Director Donovan made a motion to approve the item. Director Intintoli seconded the motion and the item carried unanimously.

Yeas: Breckenridge, Donovan, Intintoli, Wunderman. Nays: None. Absent: DelBono.

11. OVERVIEW OF UPCOMING SUMMER 2016 SERVICE PLAN

Mr. Connolly introduced the item for discussion of the summer 2016 service plan overview which would feature a number of schedule adjustments developed to respond to increasing demand for ferry service, would minimize schedule impacts to riders, and would maximize system efficiencies and utilization of

vessels and crews. He explained that WETA's peak service period was historically and consistently in August each year, and the summer schedule strategy would address the acute areas of that demand.

Mr. Stahnke explained that traditionally, the Alameda and Vallejo services had been ramped down during the winter months because demand was lower then. He said that because the South San Francisco and Harbor Bay services were primarily commute oriented, those routes' schedules remained the same year-round but that the upcoming summer schedule would add five additional weekday departures on the Alameda/Oakland route and three new weekday departures on the Vallejo route.

Mr. Connolly noted that a slower vessel was going to be used in the summer schedule to make one of the Alameda/Oakland trips. He said using the slower vessel was not an optimal solution and that it may degrade some riders' overall satisfaction, but it was the only viable option to provide an additional trip because of fleet constraints.

Mr. Stahnke said that in addition to the increase in weekday trips, additional staff would be added to support better on-time performance on the weekends. He explained that surges in ridership and the increased use of the ferries by new riders had affected on-time performance on the weekend trips and that adding more staff on the vessels and in customer service capacities was expected to increase boarding speed and on-time performance.

Ms. Rannells said that the cost for the enhanced summer demand service schedule would be spread out across two fiscal years and that she had asked MTC to consider providing funds to support the additional service.

12. OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS

No additional public comments.

Chair Breckenridge thanked everyone for their comments and attendance.

13. ADJOURNMENT

All business having been concluded, the meeting was adjourned at 4:17 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Board Secretary

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board Members

FROM: Nina Rannells, Executive Director
Lynne Yu, Manager, Finance & Grants

SUBJECT: Authorize Actions Relative to the Resolution of Local Support for the Transit Performance Initiative Incentive Program

Recommendation

Authorize the Executive Director and Finance and Grants Manager to execute for and on behalf of WETA any actions necessary, including executing and submitting related grant application and resolution of local support relative to the Transit Performance Initiative (TPI) Incentive Program administered by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC).

Background

In May 2012, MTC adopted the Transit Sustainability Project, which included the Transit Performance Initiative (TPI) Incentive Program. This program provides financial rewards to transit agencies that improve ridership and/or productivity. The TPI-Incentive program provides \$15 million per year over the four-year program (FY2012/13 through FY2015/16). This program is funded from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Surface Transportation Program (STP), and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) funding programs. 85% of the annual \$15 million is assigned to the largest seven Bay Area transit operators and 15% to the remaining (small) transit operators. Small transit operator funds are distributed per the agreed upon formula of 50 percent based on annual ridership, 25 percent based on passenger increase, and 25 percent based on passenger per hour increase.

Discussion

The TPI-Incentive program funding is to be used for projects focused on increasing ridership and/or productivity. Staff recommends submitting an application for the four-year funding program, totaling \$1,325,467, to support the construction of the Central Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility project.

Project sponsors are required to submit an application along with a Resolution of Local Support prior to receiving TPI funds. This item authorizes the actions necessary in order to secure TPI-Incentive funds.

Fiscal Impact

This item authorizes actions relative to the filing of application for the TPI-Incentive grant program to support the construction of the Central Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility.

END

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA WATER EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

RESOLUTION 2016-07

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE FILING OF AN APPLICATION FOR FUNDING ASSIGNED TO THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AND COMMITTING ANY NECESSARY MATCHING FUNDS AND STATING ASSURANCE TO COMPLETE THE PROJECT

WHEREAS, the *San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority* (herein referred to as APPLICANT) is submitting an application to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for \$1,325,467 in funding assigned to MTC for programming discretion, which includes federal funding administered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and federal or state funding administered by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) such as Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) funding, Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)/Active Transportation Program (ATP) funding, and Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) funding (herein collectively referred to as REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING) for the *Central Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility* (herein referred to as PROJECT) for the *FY2015-16 TPI-Incentive Program* (herein referred to as PROGRAM); and

WHEREAS, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (Public Law 112-141, July 6, 2012) and any extensions or successor legislation for continued funding (collectively, MAP 21) authorize various federal funding programs including, but not limited to the Surface Transportation Program (STP) (23 U.S.C. § 133), the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) (23 U.S.C. § 149) and the Transportation Alternatives Program (TA) (23 U.S.C. § 213); and

WHEREAS, state statutes, including California Streets and Highways Code §182.6, §182.7, and §2381(a)(1), and California Government Code §14527, provide various funding programs for the programming discretion of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to MAP-21, and any regulations promulgated thereunder, eligible project sponsors wishing to receive federal or state funds for a regionally-significant project shall submit an application first with the appropriate MPO, or RTPA, as applicable, for review and inclusion in the federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and

WHEREAS, MTC is the MPO and RTPA for the nine counties of the San Francisco Bay region; and

WHEREAS, MTC has adopted a Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606, revised) that sets out procedures governing the application and use of REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING; and

WHEREAS, APPLICANT is an eligible sponsor for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING; and

WHEREAS, as part of the application for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING, MTC requires a resolution adopted by the responsible implementing agency stating the following:

- the commitment of any required matching funds; and
- that the sponsor understands that the REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING is fixed at the programmed amount, and therefore any cost increase cannot be expected to be funded with additional REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING; and
- that the PROJECT will comply with the procedures, delivery milestones and funding deadlines specified in the Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606, revised); and
- the assurance of the sponsor to complete the PROJECT as described in the application, subject to environmental clearance, and if approved, as included in MTC's federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and
- that the PROJECT will have adequate staffing resources to deliver and complete the PROJECT within the schedule submitted with the project application; and
- that the PROJECT will comply with all project-specific requirements as set forth in the PROGRAM; and
- that APPLICANT has assigned, and will maintain a single point of contact for all FHWA- and CTC-funded transportation projects to coordinate within the agency and with the respective Congestion Management Agency (CMA), MTC, Caltrans, FHWA, and CTC on all communications, inquires or issues that may arise during the federal programming and delivery process for all FHWA- and CTC-funded transportation and transit projects implemented by APPLICANT; and
- in the case of a transit project, the PROJECT will comply with MTC Resolution No. 3866, revised, which sets forth the requirements of MTC's Transit Coordination Implementation Plan to more efficiently deliver transit projects in the region; and
- in the case of a highway project, the PROJECT will comply with MTC Resolution No. 4104, which sets forth MTC's Traffic Operations System (TOS) Policy to install and activate TOS elements on new major freeway projects; and
- in the case of an RTIP project, state law requires PROJECT be included in a local congestion management plan, or be consistent with the capital improvement program adopted pursuant to MTC's funding agreement with the countywide transportation agency; and

WHEREAS, that APPLICANT is authorized to submit an application for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING for the PROJECT; and

WHEREAS, there is no legal impediment to APPLICANT making applications for the funds; and

WHEREAS, there is no pending or threatened litigation that might in any way adversely affect the proposed PROJECT, or the ability of APPLICANT to deliver such PROJECT; and

WHEREAS, APPLICANT authorizes its Executive Director, General Manager, or designee to execute and file an application with MTC for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING for the PROJECT as referenced in this resolution; and

WHEREAS, MTC requires that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the MTC in conjunction with the filing of the application.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the APPLICANT is authorized to execute and file an application for funding for the PROJECT for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING under MAP-21 or continued funding; and be it further

RESOLVED that APPLICANT will provide any required matching funds; and be it further

RESOLVED that APPLICANT understands that the REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING for the project is fixed at the MTC approved programmed amount, and that any cost increases must be funded by the APPLICANT from other funds, and that APPLICANT does not expect any cost increases to be funded with additional REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING; and be it further

RESOLVED that APPLICANT understands the funding deadlines associated with these funds and will comply with the provisions and requirements of the Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606, revised) and APPLICANT has, and will retain the expertise, knowledge and resources necessary to deliver federally-funded transportation and transit projects, and has assigned, and will maintain a single point of contact for all FHWA- and CTC-funded transportation projects to coordinate within the agency and with the respective Congestion Management Agency (CMA), MTC, Caltrans, FHWA, and CTC on all communications, inquires or issues that may arise during the federal programming and delivery process for all FHWA- and CTC-funded transportation and transit projects implemented by APPLICANT; and be it further

RESOLVED that PROJECT will be implemented as described in the complete application and in this resolution, subject to environmental clearance, and, if approved, for the amount approved by MTC and programmed in the federal TIP; and be it further

RESOLVED that APPLICANT has reviewed the PROJECT and has adequate staffing resources to deliver and complete the PROJECT within the schedule submitted with the project application; and be it further

RESOLVED that PROJECT will comply with the requirements as set forth in MTC programming guidelines and project selection procedures for the PROGRAM; and be it further

RESOLVED that, in the case of a transit project, APPLICANT agrees to comply with the requirements of MTC's Transit Coordination Implementation Plan as set forth in MTC Resolution No. 3866, revised; and be it further

RESOLVED that, in the case of a highway project, APPLICANT agrees to comply with the requirements of MTC's Traffic Operations System (TOS) Policy as set forth in MTC Resolution No. 4104; and be it further

RESOLVED that, in the case of an RTIP project, PROJECT is included in a local congestion management plan, or is consistent with the capital improvement program adopted pursuant to MTC's funding agreement with the countywide transportation agency; and be it further

RESOLVED that APPLICANT is an eligible sponsor of REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING funded projects; and be it further

RESOLVED that APPLICANT is authorized to submit an application for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING for the PROJECT; and be it further

RESOLVED that there is no legal impediment to APPLICANT making applications for the funds; and be it further

RESOLVED that there is no pending or threatened litigation that might in any way adversely affect the proposed PROJECT, or the ability of APPLICANT to deliver such PROJECT; and be it further

RESOLVED that APPLICANT authorizes its Executive Director, General Manager, City Manager, or designee to execute and file an application with MTC for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING for the PROJECT as referenced in this resolution; and be it further

RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution will be transmitted to the MTC in conjunction with the filing of the application; and be it further

RESOLVED that the MTC is requested to support the application for the PROJECT described in the resolution, and if approved, to include the PROJECT in MTC's federal TIP upon submittal by the project sponsor for TIP programming.

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned, Board Secretary, does hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of a resolution duly and regularly adopted at a meeting of the San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority held on April 7, 2016.

YEA:

NAY:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

/s/ Board Secretary

2016-07

END

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board Members

**FROM: Nina Rannells, Executive Director
Lynne Yu, Manager, Finance & Grants**

**SUBJECT: Approve Proposition 1B Program of Projects and Authorize Agency
Officials to Execute Program Requirements**

Recommendation

Authorize the following actions related to the FY2015/16 Proposition 1B Waterborne grant programs:

- 1) Approve a list of FY2015/16 Proposition 1B Waterborne projects for transmittal to the California Governor's Office of Emergency Services; and
- 2) Authorize the Executive Director, Attorney and Finance and Grants Manager to execute grant program documents and to take all other actions as may be required to obtain funding.

Background

The Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality and Port Security Bond Act of 2006 was approved by voters as Proposition 1B (Prop 1B) on November 7, 2006. Prop 1B authorizes the issuance of general obligation bonds for the specified purposes, for projects that 1) provide increased protection against a security or safety threat and 2) increase the capacity of waterborne transit agencies to provide disaster response.

Prop 1B funds in the amount of \$25 million were authorized as a part of the FY2015/16 State Budget. The funds made available in FY 2015/16 represents the ninth year increment of a total of \$250 million (\$25 million per year for 10 years) authorized for the waterborne element of the Prop 1B program, California Transit Security Grant Program – Regional Public Waterborne Transit (CTSGP-RPWT). Pursuant to California Government Code Section 66540.8, as set forth in SB 976, WETA is the designated recipient of these funds which are managed through the California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES).

Discussion

Cal OES has issued program guidelines for the FY2015/16 CTSGP-RPWT funds made available to support WETA's efforts to develop a regional waterborne emergency response capability for the San Francisco Bay Area. As required in Phase I of the grant process, staff has identified the following recommended program of projects:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. Richmond Ferry Terminal	\$ 1,000,000
2. WETA Ferry Vessels	8,000,000
3. Operations and Maintenance Facility	16,000,000
Total	<u>\$25,000,000</u>

This program is consistent with WETA's 10-year capital program, and prior year Prop 1B projects which focus on building and reinforcing core infrastructure needed to support existing and expansion ferry transportation and emergency response services. The program provides funds to support: 1) the construction of the new Richmond ferry terminal in support of system expansion; 2) the procurement of new (expansion and replacement) ferry vessels; and 3) the final funding needed to construct the Central Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility. Consistent with program requirements, these projects are integral to WETA's mandate to develop and operate a regional ferry system to serve regular and emergency response transportation needs. A more detailed description of these projects is provided in **Attachment A** to this report.

Phase II of the grant process includes Cal OES's review and approval of the program of projects and WETA's submittal of the Financial Management Forms Workbook, Board Resolution and program Grant Assurances to Cal OES.

While Cal OES's program schedule provides for award of funds in the coming months, the actual availability of project funds is subject to future state bond sales which are not yet scheduled at this time.

Fiscal Impact

This item supports actions necessary to secure \$25 million FY2015/16 Proposition 1B funds to support WETA's capital program.

END

Attachment A

Proposition 1B - Program of Projects

Project	Recommended for Funding	Project Description
1. Richmond Ferry Terminal	\$1,000,000	<i>This project will provide funds to support the construction of the new ferry terminal in the City of Richmond.</i>
2. WETA Ferry Vessels	\$8,000,000	<i>This project will provide funds to construct passenger-only vessels to enhance WETA's regional ferry system and its ability to provide waterborne emergency response in the event of a regional disaster. The funds will support the construction of new expansion vessels as well as replacements for end-of-life vessels.</i>
3. Operations and Maintenance Facility	\$16,000,000	<i>This project will provide funds to support the construction of the operations and maintenance facility in the Central (Alameda) San Francisco Bay. This facility will handle all routine servicing and maintenance work for WETA's fleet of passenger-only vessels as well as support emergency response services. This facility is a critical component in WETA's core infrastructure and supports the ability to respond effectively to regional disasters.</i>
Total Recommended Program	\$25,000,000	

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA WATER EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

RESOLUTION NO. 2016-08

APPROVAL OF PROPOSITION 1B PROGRAM OF PROJECTS AND AUTHORIZE AGENCY OFFICIALS TO EXECUTE PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

WHEREAS, the Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006 authorizes the issuance of general obligation bonds for specified purposes, including but not limited to, funding made available for capital projects that provide increased protection against security and safety threats, and for capital expenditures to increase the capacity of transit operators to develop disaster response transportation systems; and

WHEREAS, the California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) administers such funds deposited in the Transit System Safety, Security, and Disaster Response Account under the California Transit Security Grant Program (CTSGP); and

WHEREAS, the San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA) is eligible to receive CTSGP funds; and

WHEREAS, WETA will apply for FY 2015/16 CTSGP funds in an amount up to \$25 million to construct the Richmond Ferry Terminal, Passenger Ferry Vessels and Operations and Maintenance Facility; and

WHEREAS, WETA recognizes that it is responsible for compliance with all Cal OES CTSGP grant assurances, and state and federal laws, including, but not limited to, laws governing the use of bond funds; and

WHEREAS, Cal OES requires WETA to complete and submit a Governing Body Resolution for the purposes of identifying agent(s) authorized to act on behalf of WETA to execute actions necessary to obtain CTSGP funds from Cal OES and ensure continued compliance with Cal OES CTSGP assurances, and state and federal laws, therefore be it

RESOLVED, by WETA Board of Directors that the Executive Director, Attorney or the Finance and Grants Manager, is hereby authorized to execute for and on behalf of the San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority, a public entity established under the laws of the State of California, any actions necessary for the purpose of obtaining financial assistance provided by the California Governor's Office of Emergency Services under the CTSGP.

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned, Board Secretary, does hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of a resolution duly and regularly adopted at a meeting of the San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority held on April 7, 2016.

YEA:

NAY:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

/s/ Board Secretary

2016-08

END

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board Members

**FROM: Nina Rannells, Executive Director
Mike Gougherty, Senior Planner**

**SUBJECT: Authorize Release of a Request for Proposals for Construction
Management Services for the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal
Expansion Project**

Recommendation

Authorize release of a Request for Proposals (RFP) for construction management services for the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion project.

Background

The Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion project will expand and improve facilities at the existing ferry terminal in Downtown San Francisco. The first phase of the project will focus on improvements in and near the South Basin of the current terminal, including construction of two new gates and creation of a new plaza area to improve pedestrian circulation, provide weather-protected waiting areas, and enhance WETA's emergency response capabilities. The new gates and amenities will support future ferry service to Richmond, Seaplane Lagoon, Treasure Island, and other locations. The second phase of the project, including improvements in the North Basin of the terminal, will be undertaken at a future date as demand warrants.

Discussion

This item requests Board authorization to release a RFP to provide construction management services in support of the project. The firm selected for this work would serve as "Owner's Representative" providing oversight and support during the pre-construction project development, project construction, and project closeout phases. Staff hopes to have construction management services secured for this project prior to the anticipated release of a RFP for project construction in fall 2016.

Pending Board approval, staff will combine the solicitation for this work with the solicitation of construction management services for the Richmond project, which was previously authorized for release by the Board. As such, a single RFP would be issued inviting firms to submit proposals for either or both projects. This approach will create a streamlined procurement process that allows staff to ensure that the most qualified firms are selected for each specific project.

Fiscal Impact

Issuance of this RFP does not commit WETA to an expenditure of funds for this work at this point. Staff expects to return to the Board with a recommendation for contract award in late summer 2016.

END

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board Members

**FROM: Nina Rannells, Executive Director
Keith Stahnke, Manager, Operations**

SUBJECT: Authorize Release of a Request for Proposals for Professional Engineering/Consulting Services to Support Ongoing System Capital, Planning and Operational Projects

Recommendation

Authorize release of a Request for Proposals (RFP) for Professional Engineering/Consulting Services to support WETA's ongoing system capital, planning and operational projects.

Background

Over the next five years WETA will be implementing a number of ongoing and new capital and preventive maintenance programs for system vessels and facilities that will require the support and oversight of a maritime professional experienced in such activities. In past years, this work has been provided by Martin Robbins, of Fast Ferry Management Inc. (FFM), for the Vallejo service and by Keith Stahnke, WETA Manager of Operations for all other services. This work has grown in size and scope as WETA's system has evolved and the fleet and facilities have grown in number. Additionally, work provided by FFM has been provided under a contract first established by the City of Vallejo in March 2007, which requires updating in order to be eligible for federal capital funding reimbursement.

Discussion

This RFP would solicit proposals for consultant services from individuals or firms with prior experience and knowledge of ferry transportation operations with particular emphasis on local knowledge of the San Francisco Bay Area and WETA ferry activities. A strong background in marine engineering and high speed propulsion systems is required. The work to be provided will include, but will not necessarily be limited to, the following:

- Planning, development and implementation of capital maintenance projects and preventative maintenance programs involving existing and new WETA-owned ferry vessels and facilities;
- Management support for planning, organization and start-up of new ferry operation and maintenance facilities
- Maritime planning and support for the development of new ferry routes and services
- Maritime planning and support for system review and optimization of ongoing ferry operations, protocols, and logistics

This RFP will solicit proposals from qualified firms to assist in this work in the coming years.

Once the best qualified proposer is identified, staff will return to the Board to propose a contract award for this work.

Fiscal Impact

There is no fiscal impact associated with the release of this RFP.

END

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board Members

FROM: Nina Rannells, Executive Director
Kevin Connolly, Manager, Planning & Development
Mike Gougherty, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Award Contract to Overaa/Power, A Joint Venture for Construction of the Central Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility

Recommendation

Approve the following related actions for the contract award for construction of the Central Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility:

1. Approve a contract award to Overaa/Power, A Joint Venture (Overaa/Power) for design-build construction in an amount not-to-exceed \$54,670,000; and
2. Authorize the Executive Director to negotiate and enter into a contract for this work and take any other related actions as may be necessary to support this work; and
3. Authorize a budget increase to the Central Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility project in the FY 2015/16 Capital Budget in the amount of \$23,900,000 to support contract award.

Background

The Central Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility will be the future home of WETA's central San Francisco Bay ferry fleet, providing a consolidated base for WETA to maintain vessels operating on its Alameda/Oakland, Alameda Harbor Bay, and South San Francisco ferry routes, as well as future Richmond, Seaplane Lagoon, and Treasure Island services under development. The facility will also include an Operations Control Center for service dispatch and Emergency Operations Center for emergency response coordination and operations activities. The project will be constructed to achieve a LEED silver certification.

On November 5, 2015 the Board of Directors authorized release of a Request for Proposals for construction of the Central Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility project, which was issued to prospective offerors on December 4, 2015. The RFP set forth a "best value" procurement process, whereby final scores and rankings would be determined based on both technical qualifications and price submittals. The Independent Cost Estimate prepared for construction of this project is in the range of \$46 million.

Discussion

On January 29, 2016 WETA received technical proposals from three offerors in response to the RFP. All three offerors were determined by the Proposal Evaluation Committee to be within the competitive range and were invited to submit price proposals. On March 11, 2016 WETA

received price proposals from each offeror, as well as supplemental information requested concerning technical proposals. The technical and price scores for each offeror are presented below:

Offeror	Technical Score (A)	Price Proposal	Price Score (B)	Total Score (A+B)
The Dutra Group	38.0	\$58,464,140	47.5	85.5
Manson Construction	43.5	\$66,180,100	40.6	84.1
Overaa/Power	47.5	\$55,709,708	50.0	97.5

Following the receipt of price proposals and finalization of technical scores, the Overaa/Power team was identified as the apparent “best value” offeror. Overaa/Power not only received the highest technical score of the three offerors, but also submitted the lowest price proposal. Pursuant to provisions of the RFP, staff initiated negotiations with Overaa/Power to identify value engineering opportunities that would result in additional project savings for WETA. As a result of these negotiations, approximately \$6,000,000 in savings was identified.

The initial price proposal received from Overaa/Power was more than 20% over the Independent Cost Estimate of \$46 million; however, after deducting value engineering savings, the Overaa/Power price exceeds the Independent Cost Estimate by less than 10%. Given the current high demand within the regional construction industry, staff and the project design consultants believe this amount represents a fair and reasonable price to construct the project.

Staff recommends that the Board approve a contract award to Overaa/Power in an amount not to exceed \$54,670,000, which includes the amount of the price proposal from Overaa/Power price proposal less the value engineering savings (\$49,700,000), plus a 10% Owner’s contingency (\$4,970,000) for potential changes due to future unforeseen project circumstances that may come up during construction. Pending Board approval of a contract award, staff will complete negotiations with Overaa/Power and work to execute a contract within 14 calendar days and issue a Notice to Proceed for Design within 30 calendar days of contract award. Pursuant to requirements of the RFP, the selected contractor is required to achieve final completion of the project by January 31, 2018.

DBE/SBE Participation:

The Authority’s overall annual Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) goal and Small Business Enterprise (SBE) goal for Federal Fiscal Year 2015/16 is 1.36 percent for all FTA-assisted contracts. Staff has reviewed the DBE/SBE materials provided by Overaa/Power and has determined that they have complied with the DBE requirements for this contract.

Fiscal Impact

The *Central Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility* project is included in the FY 2015/16 Capital Budget in the amount of \$45,600,000 based upon early preliminary design. A capital budget increase in the amount of \$23,900,000 to be funded with Proposition 1B (Prop 1B) and Transit Performance Initiative (TPI) Incentive Program funds are required to fully fund this project at the proposed full project budget of \$69,500,000. This project will be funded as follows: \$57,674,533 Prop 1B grant funds (83%), \$10,500,000 Federal Transit Administration grant funds (15%), and \$1,325,467 TPI – Incentive Program funds (2%).

END

**RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA WATER EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**

RESOLUTION NO. 2016-09

**AWARD A CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT TO OVERAA/POWER, A JOINT VENTURE FOR
THE CENTRAL BAY OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE FACILITY AND AUTHORIZE THE
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO NEGOTIATE AND EXECUTE THE AGREEMENT**

WHEREAS, the WETA Board of Directors authorized the release of a Request for Proposals for the Central Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility at its November 5, 2015 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the WETA followed the procedures specified in the Request for Proposals and in its Administrative Code regarding solicitation and evaluation of construction proposals submitted in response to the Request for Proposals for the Central Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility issued on December 4, 2015 and thereafter amended by addendum thereto; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Board of Director hereby approves entering into an agreement with Overaa/Power, A Joint Venture for construction of the Central Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility for an amount not-to-exceed \$54,670,000 including Owner's Contingency, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Board of Directors authorizes the Executive Director to negotiate and execute the agreement and take any other related actions to support this work, and be it further

RESOLVED, the Board of Directors approves a capital budget increase in the amount of \$23,900,000 to complete this project.

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned, the Board Secretary, does hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of a resolution duly and regularly adopted at a meeting of the San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority held on April 7, 2016.

YEA:

NAY:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

/s/ Board Secretary

2016-09

END

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board Members

FROM: Nina Rannells, Executive Director
Kevin Connolly, Manager, Planning & Development
Michael Gougherty, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Approve a Memorandum of Understanding with the City of Alameda for Future Seaplane Lagoon Ferry Service Project

Recommendation

Adopt the attached Memorandum of Understanding with the City of Alameda for a future Seaplane Lagoon Ferry Terminal Service Project.

Background

The WETA Board of Directors adopted a System Expansion Policy in June 2015 that requires a Project Agreement between expansion partners and the WETA Board prior to entering into significant project development activities associated with environmental clearance, design and construction. The Project Agreement – also referred to as a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) – is intended to establish a service plan, define roles and responsibilities and identify funding strategies for project partners.

The City of Alameda has had a long-standing project concept that envisioned closing the Main Street terminal and constructing a new ferry terminal on the former Alameda Naval Air Station now renamed Alameda Point. The relocated terminal would serve as a catalyst for redevelopment of Alameda Point and allow industrial development on the existing Main Street terminal site. The 2011 Transition Agreement between the City of Alameda and WETA considered the possibility of a new ferry terminal at Alameda Point and committed both the City and WETA to exploring the possibility at a future date.

In the summer of 2014, staff from WETA, the City of Alameda and the City of Oakland met in a series of workshops to discuss future ferry service scenarios for Alameda and Oakland. A chief concern of WETA and the City of Oakland associated with the relocation of the Alameda Main Street terminal was the possibility of “bifurcating” what is today an efficient “linked” service that supports both cities. Surging ridership growth was occurring during this period and the conditions that are still present today – significant spillover parking and crowded peak period vessels – were another concern brought up in the workshops. Future capacity limitations within the Oakland estuary were within sight and the workshops served as a forum for ways to address the need for more ferry service and improvements to access and parking in Alameda.

The conclusion of these staff meetings was that the old concept of closing Main Street in favor of a replacement terminal at Alameda Point would have the effect of degrading ferry service for both Alameda and Oakland. The limited parking available at the Alameda Point location and the implication for Oakland in bifurcating the service led the group to conclude that Main Street should remain open and that a new Alameda Point terminal will serve as the necessary expansion of ferry service that will be needed over the next ten years to accommodate increased service demand.

Approximately a year after these meeting on June 16, 2015, the Alameda City Council approved a Disposition and Development Agreement (DDA) with a private developer, Alameda Point Partners, LLC (APP), for redevelopment of a portion of Alameda Point. The development site – referred to as “Site A” -- consists of a 68-acre mixed-use project at the gateway of Alameda Point. Contingent upon the closing for the City’s transfer of the Site A property, APP is obligated to pay \$10 million towards the costs incurred for permitting, design and construction of a new Ferry Terminal and associated parking improvements at Seaplane Lagoon, which borders the Site A property on the south-facing shore of Alameda Point.

The City of Alameda and APP agreed to cooperate in the construction of a permitted and operating ferry terminal at Seaplane Lagoon. In accordance with the DDA [Article 5.1(b)(1)], a Ferry Terminal Plan shall be developed with a reasonable conceptual design and the Parties’ best estimate of the schedule and costs based on available information. Upon approval of the Ferry Terminal Plan, the City will obtain third party permits and approvals necessary for construction and operation of the Ferry Terminal. The Ferry Terminal Plan and Project MOU are scheduled for adoption by the Alameda City Council on April 5, 2016.

Discussion

The draft Memorandum of Understanding formalizes the partnership between the City of Alameda and WETA and provides a common understanding of the project and the future service at the conceptual level. Both the City and WETA will actively pursue additional funding needed to support the terminal, vessels and service.

The Seaplane Lagoon project differs from recent WETA projects such as Richmond in terms of roles and responsibilities of the project partners. The terminal will be constructed by a private entity, Alameda Point Partners, in conjunction with the City of Alameda, which is also responsible for environmental clearance and permitting. WETA would be the owner and operator of the waterside assets (float, gangway, pilings, and pier) once built, consistent with other terminals that WETA operates to in Alameda, Vallejo and South San Francisco. There is also a relationship between an existing nearby terminal (Main Street) and the expansion terminal (Seaplane Lagoon) that will influence access improvements such as parking and feeder bus service as well as ferry service. Finally, the Seaplane Lagoon ferry terminal has been planned as an integral part of a large mixed-use development, meaning that it will serve not just an existing residential population but new residents and employees.

The attached site map identifies the location of the proposed Seaplane Lagoon terminal and a rendering of the Site A development plan. The location was selected with the input of WETA staff, considering both land side and water side context. On the land side, the terminal will serve both the Site A mixed-use (largely residential) development and a future commercial development referred to as Site B. Feeder bus service from AC Transit has been designed into the development and will stop immediately in front of the terminal. There will be a 400-space temporary parking lot when the terminal opens and a permanent surface lot or structure will be constructed when the Site B development is completed. On the water side, the terminal has been sited to avoid conflicts with recreational use of the Lagoon on the northern and western shores and provides the fastest route to San Francisco.

Other highlights of the MOU include:

- The target date of initial operations is 2020. However, there is flexibility that operations can commence once both capital and operating funds are identified and a vessel is available for the service. While it may be possible that funding becomes available from

a new source and a vessel can be constructed prior to 2020, the terminal must still go through permitting, design and construction activities that the City is projecting will be completed in mid-2019.

- Service to Seaplane Lagoon will be weekday, commute-period only with a minimum of three departures in both the AM and PM periods. Midday and late night service will still operate out of the Main Street terminal, along with additional peak period service.
- The MOU formalizes a partnership between WETA and the City of Alameda to collaborate in pursuing grant funds to support the various project components. A first step in this partnership could be WETA support of the City's proposed TIGER grant application for federal funds to support multi-modal transportation improvements for this development.
- The MOU defines the City of Alameda as the lead in securing environmental clearance and permitting required for the facility. WETA will be consulted and all facilities must be constructed to WETA standards.
- Fares for the new service will be the same as Main Street, to ensure that passengers choose a terminal based on schedule convenience, not expense.
- In the event that a Seaplane Lagoon terminal has not been constructed by 2021, a clause in the MOU allows WETA, funding provided, to make necessary capital improvements at Main Street to accommodate additional service expansion at the Main Street Terminal, in consultation with the City.

The draft MOU was developed over a series of meetings between staff from WETA and the City of Alameda. The City is scheduled to bring the MOU along with adoption of an addendum to the Alameda Point Environmental Impact Report to the City Council on April 5, 2016.

Fiscal Impact

The draft Memorandum of Understanding assumes that new funding sources will be identified and secured for both the capital and operating expenses required for the Seaplane Lagoon terminal.

END

Seaplane Lagoon Ferry Service Project Memorandum of Understanding

March 15, 2016

Term, Parties

General	This document establishes the framework for development of a future Seaplane Lagoon ferry terminal and new ferry service connecting Alameda Point and San Francisco that may be implemented as early as FY 2020.
Term	This agreement shall commence on MONTH, DATE, YEAR and shall remain in effect from the first day of operations through the first 10 years of Seaplane Lagoon Ferry service operations.
Parties	<p>This agreement is between the San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA) and the City of Alameda (City).</p> <p>WETA was established in 2008 as the successor agency to the Water Transit Authority with a mission to consolidate and operate certain existing publicly operated ferry services on San Francisco Bay, expand new routes, and coordinate ferry services in the event of an emergency.</p> <p>The City of Alameda is a charter city and municipal corporation located within Alameda County. The City is an island jurisdiction and acknowledges ferry service as an important mode of regional transit access and traffic congestion relief and desires to initiate new ferry service between Seaplane Lagoon and San Francisco in support of its plans to develop the western area of Alameda commonly referred to as Alameda Point.</p>
Transition Agreement	The City and WETA executed a Transition/Transfer Agreement on February 25, 2011 and the Alameda/Oakland and Harbor Bay Ferry Services were transferred to WETA on April 29, 2011. The Agreement provides for continued operation of the existing ferry vessels and waterside facilities under the management of WETA, and continued operation of the City's landside ferry terminal assets by the City, with reimbursement from WETA. The Agreement also acknowledges the City's desire to have ferry service to San Francisco from Seaplane Lagoon at Alameda Point and sets forth that WETA and the City will work together in good faith to establish a Seaplane Lagoon ferry service and to explore the viability of such a service.
WETA System Expansion Policy	On June 4, 2015 the WETA Board of Directors adopted a System Expansion Policy to serve as a framework for evaluating the feasibility of new ferry projects. This MOU has been developed based on this framework and it is the intent of the City and WETA to further develop a future Seaplane Lagoon ferry service consistent with WETA's System Expansion Policy.

Seaplane Lagoon Ferry Service Plan

<p>Western Alameda Service Strategy</p>	<p>This Agreement acknowledges the City’s and WETA’s intent to have ferry service to San Francisco from Seaplane Lagoon at Alameda Point and sets forth that WETA and the City will work together in good faith to establish a Seaplane Lagoon ferry service.</p> <p>The City is currently served by three ferry routes operated by WETA, including the Alameda/Oakland Ferry Service. The Alameda/Oakland Ferry Service, which originates at the Main St. Ferry Terminal, represents an effective and long-standing mode of regional transit access between the western portion of Alameda and San Francisco. Service is provided during weekday commute and midday periods, as well as weekends. During peak operating periods, the Alameda/Oakland Ferry Service is provided by the concurrent operation of two vessels. The Main St. ferry terminal is also served by the South San Francisco Ferry Service, which operates during weekday commute periods to and from Oyster Point Marina in South San Francisco. Approximately 800 parking spaces are available for ferry patrons at or in close proximity to Main St. ferry terminal.</p> <p>WETA and the City acknowledge that a future Seaplane Lagoon ferry terminal represents a strategically beneficial opportunity for enhancing ferry service between the western portion of Alameda, currently served by the Alameda/Oakland Ferry Service, and San Francisco. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that, during the commute periods, the existing Main Street ferry terminal service has limited ridership capacity. Continued ridership growth is anticipated not only from increasing residential and job growth at Alameda Point, but also from the rest of Alameda/Oakland.</p> <p>WETA and the City studied three ferry service expansion alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Adding a third vessel to the existing service at Main Street• Shifting all service to Seaplane Lagoon• Expanding service to Seaplane Lagoon while maintaining the existing Main Street service <p>After evaluating the alternatives, expansion service to Seaplane Lagoon while maintaining the existing Main Street service was identified as a mutually beneficial approach to accommodate ongoing demand for ferry service in West Alameda.</p> <p>In response to existing and projected ridership demand, WETA and the City agree to make it a priority to establish a commute-oriented ferry service between Seaplane Lagoon and San Francisco. The Seaplane Lagoon ferry service will be initiated once operating funds and terminal and vessel assets are secured to operate the expansion service. The City and WETA agree that, at a minimum, the existing levels of service and current amenities, including both the quantity of on-street and off-street parking facilities, will be maintained at the Main St. ferry terminal irrespective of future Seaplane Lagoon ferry service being implemented.</p>
-----------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>Seaplane Lagoon Service Plan</p>	<p>Commuter-oriented Seaplane Lagoon ferry service will include AM peak period departures to San Francisco and PM peak period return trips to Seaplane Lagoon. Reverse-commute service will also be offered, primarily to reposition the vessel to make the maximum and optimal number of peak trips. At the outset, service will operate approximately 253 days per year. Weekend or holiday service is not anticipated initially, but may be provided as demand increases.</p> <p>Special event service may be considered on a case-by-case basis and subject to WETA's board policy for special event service cost recovery. Due to dock capacity constraints at AT&T Park, the service plan does not envision AT&T ballgame service from the Seaplane Lagoon Ferry Terminal.</p> <p>WETA will endeavor to link Seaplane Lagoon service to other terminals in the WETA network in an effort to find cost efficiencies through interlining, vessel sharing and crew sharing.</p> <p>Non-WETA vessel operators will be permitted to call on the Seaplane Lagoon Ferry Terminal provided they do not interfere with regularly scheduled WETA service and sign WETA's standard landing rights agreement.</p>
<p>Initial Ferry Service Level</p>	<p>The Initial Ferry Service Plan defined herein represents the minimum level of service required to operate an effective commuter service and shall be provided upon the initiation of Seaplane Lagoon ferry service and throughout the 10-year operating plan, consistent with WETA's System Expansion Policy.</p> <p><u>Peak Period Service</u> A minimum of three departures between the hours of 6-9 AM from Seaplane Lagoon and two reverse peak departures from San Francisco between the hours of 6-9 AM.</p> <p>A minimum of three departures between the hours of 4-8 PM from San Francisco and two reverse peak departures from Seaplane Lagoon between the hours of 4-8 PM.</p> <p><u>Midday Service</u> Initially, none anticipated. Midday service will continue to be provided from the Main Street ferry terminal and may be added to the Seaplane Lagoon service level as demand warrants.</p> <p><u>Weekend Service</u> Initially, none anticipated. Weekend service will continue to be provided from the Main Street ferry terminal and may be added to the Seaplane Lagoon service level as demand warrants.</p>

<p>Expansion of Schedule and Service Plan</p>	<p>The Initial Ferry Service Level defined for Seaplane Lagoon service may be expanded as necessary. All service adjustments, including possible 30-minute or faster headways in the peak hour and initiation of midday or weekend services, shall be consistent with the WETA System Performance Targets Policy adopted by the WETA Board on June 4, 2015 and other WETA service planning policies in effect at the time of adjustment, as applicable.</p>
<p>Fares</p>	<p>The fares for the proposed Seaplane Lagoon service will be the same as those approved for the Alameda/Oakland Ferry Service by the FY2015-FY2020 Fare Program adopted by the WETA Board. It is anticipated that the WETA Board will adopt a new 5-year fare program in Fiscal Year 2020 that will set fare rates for the period FY2021 – FY2026.</p>
<p>Emergency Response and Recovery</p>	<p>In the event of a natural disaster or disruptive regional event, WETA ferries may be called upon by the California Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) to provide service from the Seaplane Lagoon ferry terminal for both emergency response and recovery after the event.</p> <p>In the immediate aftermath of an event, Cal OES will determine how to allocate regional transportation resources including ferries. The Seaplane Lagoon terminal will be an asset in this emergency network however it will be a state and regional decision as to how this asset will be used.</p> <p>In the weeks and months following an event as the Bay Area recovers, ferry service will play a critical role as a component of the regional transit network that can be quickly operationalized at terminals like Seaplane Lagoon. Decisions regarding funding and asset deployment during the recovery phase will also likely take place at the state and regional level.</p>

Operations Funding

<p>Estimated Operating Expenses</p>	<p>Operating Expenses are defined as those expenses required to operate and maintain a primary vessel and a pro rata allocation of a spare vessel from WETA’s fleet for the initial service level as defined in this agreement. General maintenance and repair of vessels, as well as terminal and berthing facilities, such as parking lots, signage, ticketing facilities, floats, piles, gangways and other service equipment will also be considered operating expenses. Finally, a portion of WETA administrative staff time and expense is included in the estimate of operating expenses.</p> <p>Attachment A presents a conceptual estimate of annual vessel operating expenses and revenues based on existing FY 2015 costs and assumptions regarding regulatory requirements, fuel and labor rates for commute-only services as described in Initial Ferry Service Level above. Actual expenses may vary from this estimate and would be updated as services are developed and operation is implemented. Significant or structural changes to the regulatory environment governing crew levels will cause a revision of this agreement.</p>
<p>Operating Funding</p>	<p>An operational subsidy will be required to initiate and sustain Seaplane Lagoon ferry service. The operational subsidy is defined as the amount required to fund the excess of operating expenses over revenue generated by passenger fares, parking fees or other service-generated revenue. Seaplane Lagoon ferry service shall be initiated when sufficient operational funding has been secured for a minimum service period of ten years. As of the time of this MOU’s execution, no sufficient operating funding is available.</p> <p>WETA and the City agree to collaborate in seeking regional and other funding sources for operational subsidies for WETA ferry service at Seaplane Lagoon, including any funding from a potential regional funding measure. WETA and the City will actively advocate for Seaplane Lagoon ferry service, and will support one another’s efforts to obtain regional and other funding.</p>

Capital Funding, Maintenance and Rehabilitation

<p>Vessels</p>	<p>The Seaplane Lagoon service will require a dedicated vessel to ensure reliable operations. It is estimated that a vessel will cost approximately \$16 million (FY 2015 dollars). The utilization and cost allocation of a spare vessel could be shared between Seaplane Lagoon ferry service and other WETA services, subject to future availability. WETA is working to secure funds to expand its fleet to accommodate strong service demand in Oakland and Alameda. Fleet expansion would provide the opportunity to allocate a dedicated vessel and pro rata allocation of a spare vessel to Seaplane Lagoon ferry service. WETA will undertake the design and procurement of new vessels, which will require approximately a 2-year lead time prior to the anticipated start of Seaplane Lagoon ferry service. As necessary, the City commits to evaluate the feasibility of contributing to the cost of new vessels through fees and other potential revenues generated through the development of Alameda Point, subject to these fees and other revenues being available and eligible for such use.</p> <p>In the event an additional vessel becomes available prior to FY 2020, that additional vessel may be allocated to Seaplane Lagoon ferry service, at WETA’s discretion, to initiate ferry service prior to 2020, provided that construction of the Seaplane Ferry Terminal is complete and operating subsidies are in place.</p>
<p>Ferry Terminal - General</p>	<p>The Seaplane Lagoon Ferry Terminal will be built along the eastern extent of the Seaplane Lagoon located at Alameda Point at a precise location to be proposed by the City and approved by WETA. The terminal shall be designed as an unmanned facility, only open when a vessel is at the terminal, generally for 5-10 minutes. Clipper™ will be primary fare media utilized for ticket sales. Ticket sales at a landside facility are not anticipated at this time; however, WETA commits to working cooperatively with the City and other stakeholders (AC Transit) to evaluate the feasibility of a terminal ticket and passenger information office as part of a potential ferry and bus intermodal terminal facility.</p> <p>The City will be responsible for funding and contracting for terminal construction, including both landside and waterside facilities. Anticipated sources of funding include developer contributions and other public and private sources of funds that WETA will cooperate with City in seeking.</p>
<p>Ferry Terminal Facilities</p>	<p>The Ferry Terminal Facilities of the Seaplane Lagoon ferry terminal is defined as all ferry-related facilities and amenities provided upland of the access control gate. At its discretion, the City may elect to phase construction of terminal facilities and amenities in a manner that is consistent with its overall development plans for Alameda Point, provided such facilities meet WETA’s standard operating requirements, including but not limited to the provision of adequate passenger waiting areas, weather protection, security, and possible future ticketing facilities.</p>

	<p>The City shall retain ownership of and responsibility for the operation and maintenance of all landside assets constructed as part of the ferry terminal, including terminal parking, unless negotiated otherwise with WETA. Ownership and maintenance of waterside assets (pilings, piers, docks and floats) shall be retained by WETA as set forth below.</p>
<p>Terminal Access</p>	<p>The City agrees to provide parking facilities for a minimum of 400 cars within 1/4 of a mile from the access control gate with priority given to ferry patrons accessing the terminal during weekday commute periods. The full number of required parking spaces shall be made available upon the initiation of Seaplane Lagoon ferry service. The parking lot shall be owned, maintained, and operated by the City or its designated representative. The City will evaluate the possible implementation of parking fees, of which all proceeds, if any, would be committed back to support ferry parking, maintenance and operations.</p> <p>The City and WETA agree to work collaboratively to advocate for and coordinate with AC Transit and other potential local transit operators to provide frequent, reliable, and convenient bus service to the Main Street Terminal and future Seaplane Lagoon ferry terminal.</p> <p>Transit service required and implemented under the Transportation Demand Management Program for Alameda Point shall be designed to provide direct access to the future Seaplane Lagoon ferry terminal.</p>
<p>Berthing Facilities</p>	<p>The berthing facilities associated with the ferry terminal are defined as all ferry-related facilities extending bayward of, and including, the access control gate. These facilities will be designed and built by the City to WETA's standard operating specifications. It is the intent of the City and WETA to work collaboratively throughout the design process to ensure that facilities are designed to WETA's standards. WETA acknowledges the City's desire for a cost efficient design to stay within available funding estimates and avoid, if possible unnecessary cost due to non-essential design elements. Upon completion of the design and prior to the release of a Request for Proposals for construction, the City will provide WETA with a 30-day period to review design specifications and shall obtain written confirmation from WETA that the design meets WETA's standard operating specifications.</p> <p>The City will undertake any initial dredging required to ensure adequate depth within Seaplane Lagoon to support WETA operations, although none is currently expected.</p> <p>Upon completion of construction, and assuming that vessels and operating funds have been secured and WETA will begin operating a ferry service, WETA will assume control of all waterside assets through transfer of ownership with the City, whereby WETA will be responsible for operating and maintaining these facilities. WETA shall allow waterside ferry facilities to</p>

	<p>be available to private operators on an occasional basis, provided those landings do not conflict with WETA operations and the private operator enters into and meets the terms of WETA's standard Landing Rights Agreement.</p>
<p>Service Expansion at Main Street Terminal by 2021</p>	<p>If by 2021 the Seaplane Lagoon Terminal has not been constructed, but regional operating funding is available for additional service to Alameda, WETA may elect to make any necessary major capital improvements to accommodate additional vessels and service expansion at the Main Street Terminal and reconfirm the validity of this MOU at that time.</p>
<p>Capital Rehabilitation</p>	<p>The City and WETA will work collaboratively to secure funds to support capital rehabilitation needs associated with service vessels along with waterside and landside assets. WETA will take the lead in implementing capital rehabilitation of vessels and waterside facilities. The City will take the lead in developing, constructing and securing future funds to support the rehabilitation and replacement of landside capital facilities, including terminal amenities and parking facilities.</p> <p>The City and WETA shall coordinate efforts to secure funding and permits to undertake future maintenance dredging, as required. Specifically, the parties will seek to leverage opportunities to combine this work with other dredging efforts undertaken in the project area.</p>

<p>Partnering</p>	<p>Federal, state, regional or local funding for transit capital and operations may become available during the term of this MOU. The City and WETA will work in partnership and coordinate closely to actively pursue capital and operating revenue sources for the Seaplane Lagoon ferry service. WETA and the City agree to work collaboratively to support one another in seeking and securing ferry grant funds (e.g. TIGER, Measure BB, regional transportation measures, etc.) to support delivery of the Seaplane Lagoon ferry service project and ongoing operation of the service and maintenance of vessels and facilities. Such support may include, but not be limited to: application support letters, provision of ridership data, operating or capital cost information or other technical information required by funders, and WETA Board or City Council resolutions in support of one another’s funding applications.</p>
<p>Environmental Review and Permitting</p>	<p>The City and WETA agree to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (and the National Environmental Policy Act, if federal funds are obtained) in construction of the ferry terminal and in initiation of new ferry service at the Seaplane Lagoon.</p> <p>The City will be responsible for project permitting, including but not limited to approvals required by the National Marine Fisheries Service, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Bay Conservation and Development Commission. WETA shall provide technical support for environmental review and permitting, as requested.</p> <p>The City and WETA shall mutually agree to any and all mitigation measures committed to during project environmental review and permitting processes unless already adopted by the City in its Alameda Point Final Environmental Impact Report (2014).</p> <p>The City will clear increased service under CEQA at a future date.</p>

WETA and The City of Alameda have entered into this Memorandum of Understanding as of the last date set forth below.

The City of Alameda, a charter city
and municipal corporation

**San Francisco Bay Area Water
Emergency Transportation
Authority**

By: _____
Jill Keimach
City Manager

By: _____
Nina Rannells
Executive Director

Recommended For Approval:

Recommended for Approval

By: _____
Jennifer Ott, Chief Operating Officer,
Alameda Point

By: _____
Kevin Connolly, Manager of
Planning and Development

Approved as to Form:

Approved as to Form

By: _____
Janet C. Kern
City Attorney

By: _____
Stanley S. Taylor III
Legal Counsel to Authority

ATTACHMENT A - Seaplane Lagoon Operating Expense & Revenue Projection

(prepared March 8, 2016)

Expenses	Year 1 2020	Year 2 2021	Year 3 2022	Year 4 2023	Year 5 2024	Year 6 2025	Year 7 2026	Year 8 2027	Year 9 2028	Year 10 2029	10-year Totals
Vessel Expenses (1)	\$ 2,384,243	\$ 2,479,613	\$ 2,578,797	\$ 2,681,949	\$ 2,789,227	\$ 2,900,796	\$ 3,016,828	\$ 3,137,501	\$ 3,263,001	\$ 3,393,521	\$ 28,625,477
Non-Vessel Expenses (2)	\$ 43,870	\$ 45,624	\$ 47,449	\$ 49,347	\$ 51,321	\$ 53,374	\$ 55,509	\$ 57,730	\$ 60,039	\$ 62,440	\$ 526,704
Fixed Contract Operator Fees (3)	\$ 210,510	\$ 218,930	\$ 227,687	\$ 236,795	\$ 246,267	\$ 256,117	\$ 266,362	\$ 277,017	\$ 288,097	\$ 299,621	\$ 2,527,404
WETA Direct Expenses (4)	\$ 555,114	\$ 566,217	\$ 577,541	\$ 589,092	\$ 600,874	\$ 612,891	\$ 625,149	\$ 637,652	\$ 650,405	\$ 663,413	\$ 6,078,347
Contingency @ 10%	\$ 319,374	\$ 331,038	\$ 343,148	\$ 355,718	\$ 368,769	\$ 382,318	\$ 396,385	\$ 410,990	\$ 426,154	\$ 441,900	\$ 3,775,793
Total Expenses	\$ 3,513,111	\$ 3,641,422	\$ 3,774,623	\$ 3,912,902	\$ 4,056,458	\$ 4,205,497	\$ 4,360,233	\$ 4,520,889	\$ 4,687,696	\$ 4,860,895	\$ 41,533,725

Revenues

Fare Revenue (5)	702,622	837,527	943,656	1,056,483	1,176,373	1,303,704	1,438,877	1,582,311	1,734,448	1,944,358	12,720,359
Operating Subsidy Required (6)	2,810,488	2,803,895	2,830,967	2,856,418	2,880,085	2,901,793	2,921,356	2,938,578	2,953,249	2,916,537	28,813,366
Farebox Recovery (7)	20%	23%	25%	27%	29%	31%	33%	35%	37%	40%	
Required Average Daily Ridership (8)	493	571	625	679	734	790	846	904	962	1,047	
Average Fare (9)	\$5.63	\$5.80	\$5.97	\$6.15	\$6.33	\$6.52	\$6.72	\$6.92	\$7.13	\$7.34	

NOTES:

- 1) Vessel Expenses include crew & maintenance labor, fuel and urea, vessel repair and materials, and vessel insurance. Vessel Expenses are escalated at 4% annually
- 2) Non-vessel Expenses include non-vessel materials and supplies, and professional fees. Non-vessel Expenses are escalated at 4% annually
- 3) Fixed Contract Operator Expenses include administration services, dispatch and supervision services, insurance deductibles, and profit. Fixed Contract Operator Expenses are escalated at 4% annually
- 4) WETA Direct Expenses include administration, facility O&M, lease costs, facility insurance, docking fees, marketing, and other miscellaneous services. WETA Direct Expenses are escalated at 2% annually
- 5) Fare revenues are calculated based on assumed target farebox recovery ratio
- 6) Operating subsidy represents operating funding required, but not yet secured, to provide Seaplane Lagoon Ferry Service
- 7) Farebox recovery assumed increase from 20% to 40% over 10-year operating horizon.
- 8) Ridership calculated by dividing anticipated fare revenue by assumed average fare by 253 operating days per year
- 9) Calculated based on AOSF service and escalated at 3% annually.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board Members

FROM: Nina Rannells, Executive Director
Kevin Connolly, Manager, Planning & Development

SUBJECT: Current State of Alameda Ferry Service

Recommendation

There is no recommendation associated with this informational item.

Background

The April 2016 WETA Board meeting is scheduled to be held at City Hall in the City of Alameda. This meeting is an opportunity for WETA Board members to meet and hear from Alameda ferry riders and the Alameda community.

Discussion

WETA Staff will provide a presentation on the state of Alameda ferry service including the following highlights:

- Current ridership and recent ridership trends
- South San Francisco service
- Recent and planned capital investments
- Upcoming Spring/Summer ferry schedules
- Future service improvements and expansion plans
- Seaplane Lagoon Ferry Terminal
- New Alameda Point Maintenance Facility
- Access needs and planned improvements
- WETA Strategic Plan

Fiscal Impact

There is no fiscal impact associated with this informational item.

END

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board Members

FROM: Nina Rannells, Executive Director
Kevin Connolly, Manager, Planning & Development
Michael Gougherty, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Landside Access Status Report for Main Street and Harbor Bay Terminals

Recommendation

There is no recommendation associated with this informational item.

Background

Ferry ridership at both the Main Street and Harbor Bay terminals has continued its strong growth, with Alameda/Oakland ridership growing at a 30 percent rate and Harbor Bay at 20 percent over last year. Ridership has continued to grow despite capacity constraints both on board vessels and in the parking supply at both terminals. This memorandum summarizes some of the recent activity to improve access and looks forward to potential improvements in the coming months.

WETA staff has been engaged in a three-year effort to improve access to both terminals through a working partnership with both the City of Alameda and AC Transit staff. This effort has involved reaching out to both communities and ferry riders either through WETA's own planning study or the efforts of the City or AC Transit.

According to WETA's 2014 Onboard Passenger survey, 94 percent of ferry riders at the Harbor Bay terminal have a home origin of Harbor Bay or eastern Alameda. For Main Street, 85 percent of riders come from the City of Alameda. The pie charts in attachments one and two present the mode of access for each terminal, again based on data collected as a part of the 2011 and 2014 Onboard Passenger Surveys. For Harbor Bay, 46 percent of ferry riders walked, rode their bike or were dropped off at the terminal. At Main Street, 31 percent walked, rode their bike or were dropped off. Forty eight percent of Harbor Bay riders and 66 percent of Main Street riders drove alone to the ferry terminal.

There are 250 parking spaces at the Harbor Bay terminal and 324 at the Main Street terminal. However, both terminals experience a significant amount of spillover parking onto nearby streets and informal lots. At Main Street, there are approximately 400 spaces within a 10 minute walk to the terminal that are on unmarked sections of the Main Street shoulder or City-owned dirt and asphalt lots adjacent to the Oakland Estuary. The terminal lot is typically full by the 7:45 AM departure on most week days and there can be as many as 400 cars parked on the street or informal lots. At Harbor Bay, the lot is full by the 7:30 AM departure and spillover parking is occurring on nearby Adelpian Way and within residential neighborhoods near the terminal. There is no resident permit parking program on Harbor Bay.

AC Transit provides bus service to the Harbor Bay terminal through its local Line 21. Drop-offs and pickups are timed to meet the ferry schedule. Ridership is low on AC Transit partly due to 66 percent on-time performance for buses dropping passenger off at the terminal. Through a cooperative agreement with AC Transit, fares are free on AC Transit when

transferring to WETA if using a Clipper Card. There is no bus service at the Main Street terminal, where service was discontinued in 2009.

Discussion

There have been recent improvements and setbacks for passenger access at both Alameda terminals. WETA has been working closely with counterparts at both the City and AC Transit and will continue to advocate for access improvements.

At Harbor Bay, the City of Alameda initiated a planning effort in the fall of 2014 and winter of 2016 working with nearby Homeowners Associations and the City's Transportation Commission to address spillover parking in residential neighborhoods. WETA staff participated in the effort and provided data and input through a working group established by the City to address ferry terminal access issues. The plan adopted by the Transportation Commission recommended adding 46 parking spaces along Harbor Bay Parkway and eliminating on-street parking on Adelphian Way. However, in order to implement these improvements, the City was required to amend a permit with the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC). Staff from BCDC has been slow to act on the City's permit request and have recently indicated that only a limited number of parking spaces will be allowed on Harbor Bay Parkway. The City and WETA will continue to work together and with Harbor Bay residents to explore alternatives for improving access to the ferry based on the leadership of the Alameda Transportation Commission.

At Main Street, the City of Alameda and WETA have worked together to improve access through increased bicycle parking, conversion of a city-owned parking lot and exploring possibilities for bus service. The City and WETA executed a License Agreement to improve the parking lot for the old Officer's Club across Main Street from the ferry terminal, which will then become available for overflow ferry parking. The capital improvements include repaving and lighting along with the installation of a new cross walk to improve safety for people accessing the terminal. WETA has also recently installed 12 electronic bicycle lockers and increased the number of bike racks at the terminal to encourage bicycle access to the terminal.

AC Transit recently conducted outreach to increase local bus service throughout its service area using new sales tax revenues. For Alameda, AC Transit was able to introduce one new bus route and the City was given a choice of routes that served schools and the ferry terminal or a route that served future development on the northern waterfront. The City staff and City Council recommended that AC Transit direct resources to the future development so the ferry terminal will continue to not be served by AC Transit buses. However, WETA staff is continuing to meet with City and AC Transit staff to develop new proposals for AC Transit or private shuttle service to the terminal.

Fiscal Impact

There is no fiscal impact associated with this informational item.

END

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board Members

**FROM: Nina Rannells, Executive Director
Kevin Connolly, Manager, Planning & Development
Chad Mason, Senior Planner**

**SUBJECT: Update of Harbor Seal Haul-Out and California Least Tern Habitat Restoration
as Part of the Central Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility Project**

Recommendation

There is no recommendation associated with this informational item.

Background/Discussion

The Central Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility project required permit approval from multiple resource agencies. In particular, permits were required from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC). The USFWS and BCDC permits included a conservation/mitigation measure requiring WETA to enhance California least tern nesting habitat at Alameda Point. The BCDC permit also included a measure requiring WETA to study, design and construct a replacement harbor seal haul-out. WETA staff has made substantial progress on implementation of these permit requirements. A summary of the progress is provided below.

California Least Tern Habitat Restoration

The California least tern habitat enhancement mitigation measure required that WETA procure, deliver and spread sand over half of the tern colony nesting area at Alameda Point. WETA purchased approximately 3,000 tons of Angel Island coarse sand for this project. A trucking company was hired to deliver and spread the sand. The effort required WETA staff to coordinate logistics between the aggregate provider, trucking company and USFWS staff. WETA obligations under this mitigation measure were completed in March 2016.

Replacement of Harbor Seal Haul-Out

The BCDC permit requires WETA to fund the study, design and construction a replacement seal haul-out. If feasible, the replacement haul-out would be provided prior to removal of the dilapidated structures currently used as a haul out by harbor seals. WETA completed a study of the haul-out with a marine mammal expert and it was determined that a replacement haul-out could be provided. A conceptual design was developed as part of the study. The concept design was used as a basis for obtaining resource agency permits for the haul-out. Permits were required from the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). Permit approval has been received from both agencies. BCDC permit approval is also required now that the Corps and NMFS permits have been approved. A California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) finding is required as part of the BCDC permit. Documentation for a CEQA categorical exclusion is underway. The BCDC permit application will be complete after the float is designed. WETA has explored design options for the haul-out float including new construction and rehabilitation/reconfiguration of an existing used marina float. WETA is moving forward with design and construction of a new concrete float, as the end product of the rehabilitated float option would create a float with less open and usable haul-out space. Design and construction of the new float is anticipated to take up to two months.

Staff will provide a verbal report at the meeting to augment this written report.

Fiscal Impact

There is no fiscal impact associated with this informational item.

END