CITY OF HAYWARD

STAFF REPORT

AGENDA DATE 04/24/03

AGENDA ITEM 5

TO: Route 238 Working Group

FROM: Director of Public Works

SUBJECT: Comments regarding Sherman Lewis' March 24, 2003 E-mail

Staff has reviewed Mr. Lewis' e-mail and developed the following general comments on four significant issue areas: Relinquishment, County Coordination, CEQA Alternatives, and Traffic Modeling. This is not intended to be a point-by-point response to Mr. Lewis' entire e-mail, but the information provided may be of value to all of the Working Group Members. A similar process will be followed on other requests for information submitted by Working Group Members.

1. Relinquishment

   a. Relinquishment by Caltrans to the City of all three state highways within the City's borders, Routes 238, 92, and 185, is being studied because of several factors related to the Corridor Improvement Project scope and because of other benefits derived from having city control of roadway modifications along these routes. It is, however, a complex issue.

   b. Under the proposed Corridor Improvement Project, increased traffic capacity is to come from peak hour parking prohibitions. Although Caltrans has permitted such prohibitions in certain areas in the past, it would require a major exception to their standards to allow it along the entire route; whereas, the city may find this non-standard design feature acceptable. Lane widths, especially in the segments without right-of-way takes, will require major exceptions to Caltrans lane width standards, which they have firmly rejected in the past (CATS proposal).

   c. The grade separation is another area that is likely to require exceptions in order to fit within limited available space. These exceptions to Caltrans highway design criteria would likely be in such categories as grades, super-elevation on ramps, and lane transition lengths. It took several years to get Caltrans to finally agree to similar City proposed design exceptions for Alternative H of the SR92/I-880 Interchange Project.

   d. With regard to extending the relinquishment proposal to beyond our city boundaries, we will inform cities to our south of our plans. We will also discuss such issues with the county as indicated below.

   e. Route signage is certainly just one of many issues that would need to be addressed during detail design that would be affected by Relinquishment.

2. City-County Coordination

   a. Alameda County has been invited to participate in the Technical Working Group, and will have the opportunity to review and comment on the study and the associated issues on an ongoing basis.

   b. Recognizing that the Corridor Improvement Project cannot have the same capacity as the Route 238 Bypass, the preliminary development of the Corridor Improvement Project did not include the westbound I-580 to southbound Route 238 flyover. This flyover would encourage more traffic that is bound for the Hayward-San Mateo Bridge to cut through downtown Hayward rather than taking I-238 once it is widened. Addressing the appropriate use of the STIP funds presently available for the I-580/Route 238 interchange improvements, as well as the county's position on the flyover, will be part of the study process.

3. CEQA Alternatives

   a. During the consensus process, Parsons Transportation Group completed a preliminary traffic analysis for both the proposed project and the reduced right-of-way alternative. An updated analysis will be performed of both during this study process.

   b. There will be the opportunity to analyze an additional improvement variation, so long as it can be modeled and done so within available funding constraints. An analysis of transit issues will be included as part of the overall traffic analysis and particular attention is to be given to the transit service needs of Cal State Hayward. Smart Growth is a land use policy already incorporated in our land-use assumptions.

4. Traffic Model

   a. The model used is a gravity model. It is based on the location of housing and employment and finds the shortest travel time route from one to the other, based upon the identified network. The model does account for transit usage and uses the Metropolitan Transportation Commission Model's mode split. The MTC model has been used widely, and was used in the BART to San Jose study. We are going to base our mode split on the MTC model since detailed journey to work data from the 2000 Census is not yet available. The base land-use inputs are the ABAG Projections 2000, for the year 2000 base year, and Projections 2002, for the 2025 forecast year. The City, in cooperation with the Alameda County CMA and the other jurisdictions, used the ABAG data and the TAZ zones from the County model and disaggregated the data to the City model zones, and this data is currently being entered into the updated City model. As such, we are consistent with the CMA and MTC. The model is also being revalidated based on year 2000 traffic counts.

   b. The primary data generated by the model is traffic volumes between nodes, which can used to calculate intersection levels of service and can be used to calculate volume to capacity ratios. Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) can also be calculated. The model can also identify sources of trips on specific links. Many of the other elements mentioned by Mr. Lewis are criteria established for the MTC region and used in our model.

Although there are separate programs that will do air quality analyses, MTC does this on a regional basis for the air quality conformity analysis for the RTP and TIP. The basis for MTC's analyses is VMT, which is a model output.

c. The analysis will look at the base year, 2000, as well as the future year, 2025, and will look at the proposed project as well as identified variations.

Prepared by:

_____

Robert A. Bauman, Deputy Director of Public Works

Recommended by:

_____

Dennis L. Butler, Director of Public Works

Approved by:

_____

Jesús Armas, City Manager

Attachment: Exhibit A: Sherman Lewis' March 24, 2003 E-mail