

Transportation Commission

July 24, 2013

Item 4A

Action

Transportation Commission Minutes: Wednesday, June 26, 2013

Commissioner Jesus Vargas called the Transportation Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call

Roll was called and the following was recorded:

Members Present:

Jesus Vargas (Chair)

Christopher Miley (Vice Chair)

Michele Bellows

Eric Schatmeier

Thomas G. Bertken

Members Absent:

Sandy Wong

Staff Present:

Staff Payne, Transportation Coordinator

Staff Naclerio, Public Works Director

2. Agenda Changes

Commissioner Vargas explained that moderate modifications may be made to the consent calendar.

3. Announcements / Public Comments

Commissioner Vargas conducted transportation research with his family in the city of Orlando and rode the city's monorail.

4. Consent Calendar

4A. Meeting Minutes – April 24, 2013

No comments.

4B. Alameda Paratransit Shuttle – Thursday Central Loop Stop Changes

Staff Payne stated she received one email from a community member supporting the removal of the shuttle stop on Broadway at Lincoln Avenue. However, she explained the supporter would like to see space made available to view pedestrians and have general visibility. Overall, she said there is about 50 feet reserved at the bus stop. Staff wants to add one space and that is included in the staff report in Exhibit 2. Additionally, staff would reserve 20 feet for visibility, and the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) standard is 10 feet.

Commissioner Vargas called for a motion to approve the Consent Calendar.

<p><i>Commissioner Miley</i> moved to approve the Consent Calendar. <i>Commissioner Bertken</i> seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0; 1 abstention.</p>

5. New Business

5A. Posey and Webster Tube Rehabilitation Project

Commissioner Vargas said there has been discussion and letters written by the City Manager and Mayor.

Staff Payne introduced *Michael Nguyen*, Caltrans' Posey Webster Tube Retrofit Project Manager, who presented. She explained that public comments to date focus on three different areas: the retrofit project, ongoing maintenance issues and long range planning of the area.

Michael Nguyen presented information about the retrofit project. Also, *Elizabeth McKee*, the cultural resources representative for Caltrans, added information to the presentation.

Elizabeth McKee, Caltrans Office Chief of Cultural Resource Studies of the Environmental Division, stated she is part of a functional group that supports the office's engineers. She explained to the Transportation Commission that they evaluate the potential effects of projects on historical resources, especially when federal funds are involved. She presented a synopsis of the types of evaluations that are conducted.

Commissioner Schatmeier asked about the signs slide within the presentation and he asked if overhead lights would be removed on both sides of the tube.

Michael Nguyen replied that overhead lights would be removed on the Alameda side as well.

Commissioner Bellows asked about the closed-circuit television (CCTV) and whether that would translate to changeable message signs so there is warning in the tube.

Michael Nguyen replied that he is not sure, but Caltrans plans to connect them to the CCTV.

Commissioner Bellows asked if they monitor the CCTV on Grand Street.

Michael Nguyen replied yes.

Commissioner Bellows asked if someone had to physically type a message to show on the message board.

Michael Nguyen replied yes.

Commissioner Miley wondered when the signs are removed, where are they going to be positioned because it was not clearly outlined in the staff report.

Michael Nguyen replied that they are looking to combine the 45 mph speed limit sign and several other signs in the background. Additionally, they may combine them and mount them on the left because the 45 mph speed limit slightly blocks the building. Moreover, the two Emergency Message Signs (EMS) are proposed to move closer to the intersection to better serve motorists.

Commissioner Miley said he understood the intent, but he wondered at what intersection would the signs be located. He asked if they would be at the intersection at Constitution Way and Marina Village Parkway, because currently the signs warn drivers of a problem, but when drivers are at that point it is too late.

Michael Nguyen replied the signs are moving closer to the intersection by Marina Village Parkway by the shopping center.

Commissioner Miley asked in what direction would the lights on the towers would be illuminated.

Michael Nguyen stated the lights would be shining onto the building itself to illuminate the building.

Commissioner Miley asked about the building and its relation to the ventilation process.

Michael Nguyen stated that is more or less a question for the maintenance engineers, but he would relay the message to staff and get back to the Transportation Commission.

Commissioner Bertken explained to the Commission that there are big intake fans in the building and big channels go below the runway where fresh air comes in and there is an exhaust channel in the ceiling. So, essentially it is pushing air from the bottom and it is going up and getting a cross flow of air up and down the tube.

Commissioner Schatmeier wondered if the project included improvements to the ventilation system.

Michael Nguyen replied the fans are not in the scope of the project.

Commissioner Miley asked if it was possible to improve the ventilation system.

Michael Nguyen said the tube's fans are turned on at certain times, but rehabilitation of the vents

involve funding and resources that are not found, but they will coordinate with the City.

Commissioner Miley verified with *Michael Nguyen* that the tube's vents are not always on.

Michael Nguyen replied from his knowledge the vents are not always on, but again he would have to speak to the maintenance engineers.

Staff Naclerio responded by saying staff had a meeting with representatives from Caltrans and the City of Alameda Assistant City Manager and that was one of the concerns that was expressed. He explained that Caltrans measured particulates based on information from other tunnels from the state and the vents automatically turn on when they reach a certain threshold. He also pointed out that the tube serves vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians, so the threshold should be different and Caltrans would come back to staff about it.

Commissioner Bellows said the work put into the project is appreciated. However, if someone is in an accident, the driver and passengers should be able to hop over to the sidewalk and with the mesh on the rail, she does not think that it is possible. Also, she felt it was important for people to have access in case of conditions that may occur while traveling within the tube.

Michael Nguyen replied currently there is an opening so people can slide through and hop up. Then they changed the access to a gate and people can open it from the roadway. Overall, the gate provides a safety measure and it protects kids from falling through the gap in the guardrail.

Commissioner Bellows asked since the project is a yearlong construction project if Caltrans would have to close traffic in the tube.

Michael Nguyen replied yes they would have to close traffic in the tube and staff is discussing whether to close the lane adjacent to the sidewalk or close two lanes. He also said, they are looking at the traffic impacts and would have the lane closure reviewed by the City.

Commissioner Bertken said there was a letter addressed by the City Manager about the screening issues at the entrance on the Oakland side of the tube. He went on to say that in the late afternoon, it is difficult to see when entering and the Caldecott tunnel has a screening affect just before drivers enter the tunnel.

Michael Nguyen replied Caltrans received comments regarding visibility and they are reviewing it with staff.

Commissioner Bertken asked if the issue was included in the project.

Michael Nguyen replied that they do not know if the issue would cause minimal impact to the project especially since the funding is set. So, if funding allowed a screen for enhanced visibility then it would be added to the project.

Commissioner Bertken exclaimed visibility is a safety issue.

Staff Naclerio said the topic was addressed in the meeting with Caltrans earlier that day and

Caltrans indicated that they would look into it. He understood that it is not part of the project, but he asked if they could look into it as a subsequent project. Consequently, Caltrans mentioned that historic impacts would stem from the request.

Commissioner Vargas asked if Caltrans and Alameda have a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or Project Charter that highlights the communications of the project.

Michael Nguyen replied since he is the new project manager, he would have to look at the history of dialogue revolving around the project.

Staff Naclerio replied he is not aware of any agreement.

Commissioner Vargas asked *Michael Nguyen* to check with staff and come back to the Commission with an answer. Additionally, he understood there are funding limits of around \$8 million from the SHOPP fund. Yet, he wanted general background of the greatest expenses.

Michael Nguyen said the ballpark costs would be \$5 million with the tube's rail and two walkways, minor repair of the sidewalk and \$2 million for the Posey buildings.

Commissioner Bellows asked if work would be conducted on the building near the city of Oakland.

Michael Nguyen replied there would be work conducted on the Oakland and Alameda side.

Commissioner Vargas called for public comments.

John Knox White, City of Alameda Planning Board member, spoke as a citizen and felt the project will look great once it is done. However, he had a concern with the solid railing because it is at handle bar height and that may cause bicyclists to run their handlebars into it. He noted that around the year 2000, there was a major retrofit project underway for the tube. BikeAlameda went to Caltrans to request improvements for bicyclists and pedestrians in the tube and Caltrans replied that the design and construction process is already underway. In 2007, Caltrans decided to conduct additional work on the paths and BikeAlameda went to Caltrans to request the path be fixed. Again, Caltrans said it is designed and already underway. In 2013, Caltrans presented a previous version of the presentation at Alameda's Planning Board and Historical Advisory Board meeting and when the organization approached Caltrans they said sorry it is too late and we have moved forward. Overall, he felt Caltrans refused to work with the local community until Assemblymember Rob Bonta, City Manager John Russo, Mayor Marie Gilmore, City of Oakland, Alameda and Oakland bicycle and pedestrian advocacy groups wrote letters to highlight the outreach and communication issues. Overall, he asked the Transportation Commission to make a motion to ask the City Council to send a letter to Caltrans asking Caltrans to partner with the community at the beginning of a project.

Jon Spangler, Alameda resident and a League of American Cycling Instructor, said he sat in on the last couple of rounds when Caltrans was working on the tube and he endorsed Mr. White's comments. He felt Caltrans turns a blind eye to bicyclists and pedestrians, but he appreciated the historical aspects and the restorations of the project. Also, he would like to see the lighting on

the building directed downward due to visual pollution issues. Moreover, back in 2000, he talked to the Caltrans engineers at a public meeting and suggested they place a driveway to have an emergency egress out of the Posey Tube for any last minute bail outs. During the presentation, a Caltrans representative said the sidewalk/bike lane could not be widened because the roadway was already too narrow. Yet, he did not hear any reference of the California Legislation that requires Complete Streets approaches to every project that Caltrans undertakes or a reference to the possibility that pedestrians and bicyclists could have equal rights to automobiles.

Commissioner Vargas called for public outreach by Caltrans on all aspects of any project. He also wanted to review the comments sought from the City's community meetings by organizations such as the bicycle coalition.

Michael Nguyen replied during the environmental process that they worked with Alameda staff to post the project's description on their website and receive feedback about the project. Since the current project is programmed under SHOPP, Caltrans does not normally host the public meeting, but have the cities involved to take comments.

Commissioner Miley stated that Caltrans staff could involve the community during the scoping process and before the project is programmed.

Michael Nguyen replied that is correct.

Commissioner Miley emphasized to Caltrans that the underlining message is to involve the community early on before the environmental review.

Commissioner Bellows said under the project's schedule, there is ample time to have a public meeting to gain input. Also, she felt regardless of the funding source, this is a public project and although the environmental document typically dictates what type of outreach the sponsor does they can always conduct outreach.

Commissioner Schatmeier agreed with the need for public outreach, but outreach must be done at a point when change is possible. He also felt the Transportation Commission should be able to have input early in the process.

Commissioner Miley stated this happens a lot and has historically been an issue with projects and he knew the City was working on it. He agreed with the comments by the Commissioners and felt that with limited transportation dollars, it is critically important to be smart with investments.

Commissioner Schatmeier asked the Transportation Commission if they would like to make a motion to inform the City Council of the Commission's desire to be informed and have community involvement by Caltrans early on in the project process.

Commissioner Bertken asked *Staff Naclerio* how could the Transportation Commission get involved early enough to insert comments.

Staff Naclerio replied that once a preliminary plan is developed, staff would go to the public to

conduct a public meeting for input. Then staff would work with Caltrans to implement the public input as much as they could. Staff would then decide if additional public meetings are necessary and if not, the item would be brought to the Transportation Commission.

Commissioner Schatmeier said he would like to see the public input process happen along the way when the project sponsor and City are defining the project. Overall, he felt there must be a point that the Transportation Commission could comment on a range of improvements and other input.

Commissioner Miley replied he would like public input and the Commission's input conducted during the scoping process. He said in terms of making the motion, if the Commission was willing to incorporate language from *Staff Naclerio's* comments about involving the community and public process during the scoping phase, he would be willing to second the motion.

Staff Naclerio replied it is easier for the community to respond to a proposal compared to a nebulous idea of what may be happening. However, he does think part of the issue with this project is the funding source.

Commissioner Schatmeier made a motion for the Transportation Commission to request the City Council to communicate with Caltrans to conduct public input earlier on in the project process and especially at a time when public input can influence what is included in the project and the project's scope. *Commissioner Miley* seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0.

Staff Naclerio replied it might be effective to have that message relayed to the City Manager by staff and the City Manager would work with the Mayor to send the letter.

Commissioner Schatmeier made an amendment to the motion for staff to work with the City Manager and the Mayor who would draft a letter of intent to the City Councilmembers. *Commissioner Miley* seconded the motion moved to accept staff recommendations. The motion was approved 5-0.

5B. Draft Regional Transit Access Study (RTAS)

Staff Naclerio presented the background for the study.

Commissioner Bertken asked *Staff Naclerio* if only comments from the Transportation Commission were required after the presentation and public comment.

Staff Naclerio replied yes.

Commissioner Schatmeier asked what was the action.

Staff Naclerio replied staff was accepting comments and then they would forward those comments to the Planning Board and the Planning Board would review the document in light of those comments before forwarding their motion to the City Council for acceptance.

Commissioner Vargas asked staff if there was a deadline when the document must be ratified and approved by City Council.

Staff Naclerio replied it would be around the year 2014.

Commissioner Schatmeier stated the report has some recommendations to change the east/west transit corridor to another part of the City and that is a significant change in the City's transit service. He felt that since the recommendation is a radical proposal, it should be subject to debate and public hearing. He asked staff if the Transportation Commission endorsed the report would this be the last review and comment of the report. Additionally, he wondered if the Commission accepted staff recommendations then would the item become City policy.

Staff Naclerio replied once it goes to City Council for acceptance it would become official City policy. He went on to say if there are concerns or recommendations that need further input and vetting that could certainly be made. Prior to finalizing any recommendations, there would be public meetings informing residents on Lincoln Avenue about the proposed changes and their input incorporated into the final document. He introduced staff *Colin Burgett* from Nelson Nygaard Transportation Consulting Associates and subcontractor *John Atkinson* who are working on the study.

John Atkinson discussed his work with the grant proposal and Regional Transit Access Study (RTAS).

Colin Burgett, Principal at Nelson Nygaard Transportation Consulting Associates, presented the details of the RTAS.

Commissioner Vargas bequeathed the chair to *Commissioner Miley* because he is involved with AC Transit Line #51 project. He asked AC Transit representative *Linda Morris* to comment on the presentation and *Commissioner Miley* would facilitate the discussion.

Linda Morris, AC Transit Senior Planner, stated she was not there to comment on the draft report because it was her first time reviewing the report. However, AC Transit has been collaborating with the consultants prior to the draft report and they sent them a letter with their comments on the 1st draft in January 2013 and they will respond to the new draft soon.

Commissioner Bertken asked staff if the Transportation Commission received the comments made by AC Transit on the first draft report.

Linda Morris replied the letter went to City staff and the consultant.

Staff Naclerio replied the comments would be forwarded to the Commission for review.

Commissioner Schatmeier explained that he was asked by staff to comment on an earlier version of the report. He told the Commissioners that he and AC Transit provided comments and some of the comments were incorporated in the latest draft and others were not.

Commissioner Miley called for public comments.

Jon Spangler, Alameda resident and a League of American Cycling said he is glad that regional transit is getting attention in this study and BART acted as the pass through agency to get the money for the City. However, when he reviewed the study and heard the presentation, he heard nothing about Alameda's Housing Element and the Multifamily Housing overlay that was adopted last year. Nor did he hear a reference to them in the draft of study results in terms of trip generation. Furthermore, he did not see in the draft or presentation any reference of the scoping of the environmental impact statement for Alameda Point because there is an estimated 1,700 to 4,500 housing units up for development. So, he felt those issues needed to be accounted for in the final version of the study. In a procedural standpoint, he believed there was no mention of community meetings set for the study although this is technical study. Also, if the City is moving towards a longtime transit corridor, the community needs to be involved in evaluating that change in the beginning. Finally, he could not help but find misplaced quotation marks and commas in the first few pages of the report beginning on page two and the corrections should be taken care of when the report is presented to the City Council.

John Knox White, City of Alameda Planning Board member, speaking as a citizen said when he sat on the Transportation Commission with *Commissioner Schatmeier*, they conducted the Transportation Element and identified Lincoln and Clement Avenues as the two exclusive transit streets. So, he understood that the Transportation Element may be the driving factor of why they chose that location. Specifically, he noted the RTAS' analysis does not review the various alternatives that are identified in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for Alameda Point. He believes this is a problem because land use and transportation planning should be conducted together. Also, he points out that there is not analysis on how the plan will serve commercial areas that are not at the Seaplane Lagoon. He goes on to say this will be a driving plan for transportation solutions at Alameda Point and there should be some discussion on transportation integration of the various housing, mixed-use and commercial areas.

Commissioner Bertken said the presentation made him think that the Lincoln Avenue corridor would replace the AC Transit Line # 51 on Santa Clara Avenue. So, he wanted to know what would the City gain from this change. Based on the consultant's illustrations, the corridor was not serving Alameda Point based on the distance and travel to Fruitvale versus going directly to downtown Oakland. So, the corridor would take longer to travel and would not service Fruitvale BART Station. He noted the result would take the highest use transit corridor for AC Transit Line #51A and move it down a block without indicating how that would affect the patronage.

Staff Naclerio replied the purpose of the study was to enhance all transit access for all future developed areas. *Colin Burgett* presented the bubble illustrations that showed access to the Northern Waterfront site and the current location at Santa Clara Avenue does not catch it.

Colin Burgett explained the value would relate to the future development at the Northern Waterfront. If the City made the transit change and there is no change to development at the Northern Waterfront, the City would serve a similar ridership market, but not as centralized. Yet, with proposed residential development and job sites closer to the waterfront, that would be a value from a ridership perspective. Additionally, AC Transit would reduce travel time and costs. He was aware that AC Transit was conducting its own study on the Line #51 so there was no interest on the RTAS to say the line would be relocated. However, the expectation was that AC

Transit would conduct a focus study, so that would be the appropriate place for the discussion to occur.

Commissioner Bertken said it would be redundant to have both lines, so, which one is more viable.

Colin Burgett replied if AC Transit preferred the Lines #51A and O to operate on Santa Clara Avenue, then investing in rapid bus improvements on Lincoln Avenue become questionable.

Commissioner Bertken said based on the presentation illustration, moving the Line #51 down a block showed the influence lines for various transit. He exclaimed there was still a small island of no transit usage down the middle. So, if AC Transit moved the Line # 51 that would not be a little island anymore, but a large number of residents who would not be able to access the line.

Commissioner Schatmeier addressed the corridor concerns and said he understood the review of looking at Lincoln, Clement and other potential transit corridors. Yet, he pointed out the City would still establish an east and west transit corridor policy and that is an issue that was not settled by the report. He asked if the Transportation Commission adopted the report would that become City policy. He referenced the presentation's bubble illustration and how all transit lines are equal to each other (e.g. Line #51 operates throughout the day and with higher frequencies compared to Line #20). He also questioned the point of moving a transit line close to an employment center unless there were other reasons for justifying the line. He went on to say the initial transit study conducted by the City with AC Transit recommended a second trunk line for the City down the Buena Vista corridor, through west Berkeley and El Cerrito and on to the Oakland International Airport. Consequently, he exclaimed the City got the now defunct Line #19, which was not a trunk line, nor did it run everyday and had 30-minute headways.

Colin Burgett presumed the line did not survive because there was too much overlap with the Line #51 catchment area and it was essentially too close.

Commissioner Schatmeier said overall the report was reviewing the transit policy of the east and west corridor in Alameda and he hoped that passing on any information or endorsing anything going forward would not endorse policy for the City to move the main corridor.

Commissioner Bertken felt the report contained a lot of information and he would like to have time review the document again and make notes. Thus, he would like to delay the comment process.

Alex Nguyen, Alameda City Manager, replied that the outcome is contingent on AC Transit's response. So, he does not want the City to get so far into the planning process and at the end of the day AC Transit does not agree with the plan. He recommended staff have another study session with the Transportation Commission, community members and key members of AC Transit.

Commissioner Miley replied that based on *John Knox White's* comments, it might be useful to have a joint Transportation Commission and Planning Board meeting on items that deal with land use and transportation planning and this might be that item. He also asked the consultant if

they analyzed the inclusion of a BART Station at Alameda Point.

Colin Burgett said there were different ideas about constructing a second BART tube crossing, but realistically that would take a long time to be fully realized.

Commissioner Miley stated the study showed how the City would address transportation throughout the island, but the constraining point is the tube. So he felt queue jump lanes should be analyzed for the tunnel because when the tunnel is congested, it defeats the point of rapid bus service.

Commissioner Schatmeier replied he endorsed the idea of a joint meeting between the Transportation Commission and Planning Board because he would like the City to aim for higher transit usage.

Colin Burgett said if the City decided to go for an aggressive Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan, the system would have the capacity to accommodate double the ridership.

Staff Naclerio suggested to the Commission that staff meet with AC Transit to discuss the preferences on Santa Clara and Lincoln Avenues and staff would bring the comments back to the next Transportation Commission meeting. Additionally, staff would schedule a joint meeting with the Planning Board and Transportation Commission to discuss the results of the meeting with AC Transit.

5C. Guidelines for Installation of Parklets

Staff Naclerio presented the report.

Commissioner Vargas called for public comment.

Donna Eyestone, Alameda Resident, assisted with the Park(ing) Day installation on September 21, 2012. She saw a lot of people come by and create a community building experience. Furthermore, she believed it would be good to have this public gathering space so residents and visitors could see what businesses are along Park Street and talk with their neighbors. She also thanked *Staff Naclerio*, *Board member Knox White*, and *Board member Burton* for their support.

David Burton, President of the Alameda Planning Board and President for Community Action for a Sustainable Alameda, spoke as a citizen and resident architect to encourage the Commission to adopt the guidelines so one or two parklets could build around town as quickly as possible. He mentioned that parklets provide great opportunities for community building and casual encounters in the public realm. He thanked *Board member Knox White* and *Donna Eyestone* for their support. During Park(ing) Day, the installation setup began at 8 am and ended at 8pm and over 300 people came by to view the installation.

John Knox White endorsed the change that *Staff Naclerio* mentioned in terms of the approval because there was some concern that parklets would sprout up like tulips and parking would diminish. He noted the guidelines would create market forces that would prevent an

overwhelming construction of parklets.

John Spangler believed the guidelines make sense and thanked *Donna Eystone* and the Park Street Business Association for their support. He also noticed the top floor of the parking structure does not have a lot of pedestrian access, so it would create a great opportunity for a parklet and downtown park. Additionally, he would like to see some in street bike parking as the next logical step.

Commissioner Miley said one of the speakers addressed the temporary and permanent type builds of the parklets. He asked if there is any expectation on the length of time that they would be up and running.

Staff Naclerio replied it would be reviewed annually and parklet sponsors would apply through a temporary encroachment permit plus administrative and planning fees. Also, staff anticipated an average cost of \$500 for administrative and planning fees.

Commissioner Miley asked about the approval process and whether the policy would be in place after the Commission approved the guidelines or would it go to the City Council for review.

Staff Naclerio replied the City Charter gave the Planning Board the right for decisions involving landscape and public right of way. So, staff would work with the Transportation Commission for their recommendations and the recommendations would go to the Planning Staff and Planning Board would make an approval.

Commissioner Miley asked *Staff Naclerio* to incorporate all outcomes or next steps in future staff reports when the Commission is asked to make an approval. Overall, he supported the concept of parklets.

Staff Bellows asked if the parklets could be built in residential areas.

Staff Naclerio replied it is not prohibited, but it is unlikely.

Staff Bellows said that becomes an unintended consequence and if someone wanted to build a parklet then they could.

Staff Naclerio replied they would still need to fill out an application; staff would put out a notice of intent to approve and post the notice for 10 days and allow for public comment. He said if the Commission preferred, staff could limit the parklets to commercial areas.

Staff Bellows asked if there is a maximum length designated for the parklets.

Staff Naclerio replied the minimum length is one parking space and there is no maximum. However, the adjacent businesses that are fronting the parklet have to approve the construction.

Commissioner Vargas said he liked the parklet concept. However, based on other cities' financial challenges, he wondered if the parking permit fees increase to accommodate the loss of revenue generated from the parking space.

Staff Naclerio replied no and staff felt overall that would be nominal and the benefits of the public space would outweigh the costs. Also, the encroachment permit fee is in addition to the \$500 administrative and planning fee after the notice of intent has been approved.

Commissioner Bertken said if the parking meters have to be removed would that be part of the cost levied on the property owner.

Staff Naclerio replied the removal of the parking meters would be the responsibility of the sponsor of the parklet.

Commissioner Miley asked *Staff Naclerio* what is the process if the guidelines need to be revised in the future.

Staff Naclerio replied the process would be the same as they are following now. Staff would go to the Transportation Commission with a recommendation to the Planning Board for their approval.

Commissioner Miley stated he is willing to move forward while incorporating *Commissioner Bellow's* concerns regarding residential restriction on parklet construction.

Staff Bellows seconded the statement.

Commissioner Bertken agreed with the original motion, but wanted to include *Staff Naclerio's* comments about the $\frac{3}{4}$ or 75% response rate.

<p><i>Commissioner Miley</i> moved to approve the guidelines with two amendments, which are the restriction of parklets in residential areas and the language <i>Staff Naclerio</i> provided regarding 75 percent response rate on either side. The motion was approved 4-0; 1 abstention.</p>
--

6. Staff Communications

- **Local Rider Issues on AC Transit Transbay Routes**

City and AC Transit staff are working together to provide reminders about the procedures that local riders can ride on Transbay buses, with the exception of Line OX , which they are working to eliminate in late September 2013.

- **Status of AC Transit Lines 314 and 356 (Midday Shopper Shuttles)**

The lines will be eliminated at some point because they are under utilized and in September, there will be some additional studies.

Linda Morris, AC Transit Senior Planner, the lines are part of the restructuring plan that are going through the AC Transit Board right now, because they are the two lowest performers in the district. They are no longer in the restructuring plan going forward in

December 2013; however, they are in the Comprehensive Operations Analysis reports and have gone to the board earlier this month and in September. The lines are proposed to be eliminated in that report, but they don't have a timeline yet.

- **AC Transit Line 51A Performance Initiative Project (Community Workshop on Tuesday, July 9th at 7 p.m.)**

AC Transit is the lead on the project and City staff is working with AC Transit on the first community workshop on July 9th. Staff sent out notifications about that and received comments, but AC Transit is the lead and they are receiving most of the comments. Staff has a web page about the project for more information and the meeting results will come to the Commission in September.

- **Intersection Improvements at Central Avenue/Third Street/Taylor Avenue – Phase II (Community Workshop Comment Summaries)**

Staff Payne said City staff has been working at the intersection in front of Encinal High School and had a couple of community workshops there. So, the item will come to the Transportation Commission next month.

- **Bikes on BART**

Staff gave the Commission the information on BART's analysis on the pilot studies that have been conducted. BART board approved another bikes on board pilot study for 5 months from July 1st to December 1st of 2013. The pilot study allows bikes at all times with the exception of the first three cars during peak commute hours and bikes are never allowed in the first car and on escalators.

Commissioner Miley asked the Commissioners if they are on board with the Bikes on Board policy could they ask the City to send a letter of support.

Staff Payne replied the Commission should wait and see how the current pilot study plays out before they send a letter.

Commissioner Schatmeier wondered what BART's criteria for success was because the material showed that around 85% to 90% had no problem with bikes on board. So, he wanted to what is BART's reaction to the 10% to 15% of riders who either do not like the policy or are neutral.

- **Pedestrian Safety Campaign**

Staff Payne said a \$8,900 was awarded for the creation of pedestrian safety videos graphics with the City Public Works logo. They are creating four different videos that are 15 seconds long and would play before the start of a movie at the Alameda Theatre. The videos would appear later this summer or into the fall and will be played for 5 months.

- **Grant Submittal Update**

The City was awarded \$631,000 to resurface Pacific and Main to 3rd and Otis Park to Broadway. Staff would find out tomorrow (June 27th) if their recommendations to fund the Cross Alameda Trail were approved. The project ranked second under Measure B Bike/Pedestrian Discretionary fund. In addition, the Estuary Crossing Shuttle will increase in frequency and service would begin at 6:30 am to 7 pm with 30-minute frequencies for the next two years. Staff will also hear from Caltrans about the planning grant in August and staff submitted a TIGER grant for the San Francisco Bay Trail.

- **Potential Future Meeting Agenda Items**

- AC Transit OX- Opening to Local Riders
- Resident Appeal of Public Works Staff's Decision to Not Install Street Sweeping Signs on La Jolla Drive
- Traffic Control and Contingency Plan during Construction for I-880/29th Avenue/23rd Avenue Interchange Improvement Project in Oakland: Public Information Program and Transit Impacts
- Robert Davey Jr. Dr. at Channing Drive Traffic Calming – Phase II
- AC Transit Line 51A Performance Initiative Project
- Port of Oakland's Ron Cowan Parkway Proposed Class I Path

7. Announcements/ Public Comments

Jon Spangler wanted to address some issues regarding the Bikes on BART pilot since he is a member of the BART Bike Advisory Task Force. He was at the meeting on May 23rd and BART staff recommended that the pilot change be a permanent change, but the board was more conservative. He also understood that the operations managers of BART felt the bike pilot was a non-event and it is exactly what those people want everyday. He urged the Commission to write a letter or recommend the City to write a letter supporting bikes on board BART as a permanent policy change because the BART board will hold a meeting again in October to reconsider the pilot.

Commissioner Schatmeier stated that all through downtown San Francisco there were repeat examples of bikes getting on and off the wrong cars. He urged *Jon Spangler* to let the bicycle community know that they have to observe the rules whenever they can so they don't wreck the pilot.

Jon Spangler replied they do that and there are people that don't obey the rules in every aspect of our lives and bicyclist seem to be a lightning rod on BART in particular because they are an easy target, but rules are disobeyed and it's not always willful sometimes it just happens.

John Knox White spoke about a developed project coming before the Planning Board on Monday on the corner of Willie Stargell Avenue and Webster Street, which has significant access issues. He was concerned that the In and Out Burger development was moving in such a pace that the Transportation Commission may miss their window of opportunity to set necessary mitigation conditions to enhance access to Neptune Park.

Lucy Gigli, President of BikeAlameda, stated Neptune Park pathway is the alignment that was already approved by the Commission in January, but she felt the Commission has not looked at the access points at Marina Village Parkway and Constitution on the eastside and Stargell Avenue and Webster Street on the Westside. She said there could be an accessible throughway for bicycles and pedestrians between Marina Village, developed housing, the college, and Alameda Landing. However, the City is not improving those intersections so the path could be accessed safely. Three of the streets Stargell Avenue, Webster Street and Marina Village Parkway have double left turns or double right turns and there are four and five lane intersections, which are horrible for pedestrians and bicyclists to go through. Webster Street and Stargell Avenue only have one crosswalk and Marina Village and Constitution Way only have two crosswalks. She requested a big public meeting be held to discuss safe access to Neptune Park.

Commissioner Bellows asked if Webster Street is a state route because that would be an issue with Caltrans.

Lucy Gigli replied one of the intersections is a Caltrans intersection. However, they agreed that they would work better with them in the future and this is an opportunity to test this process.

Commissioner Miley asked staff if there are any plans to conduct public outreach on this access issues or was the intent to bring the topic to the Planning Board or the Transportation Commission for comment.

Staff Naclerio replied that the In and Out development is a project designated for the Planning Board and the Community Development Department is ushering that through. He knew that there was a presentation at the Planning Board that included comments and staff was trying to address those comments. He reminded the Commission that the Neptune Park has not been designed, but there was a review and approval of the preliminary alignment by the Commission. He said staff anticipated working on this project in the fall and staff would follow the standard process of presenting a preliminary design and then have a public meeting to elicit public comments. However, he was happy to make the first public meeting at the Transportation Commission meeting if the Commission desired.

Commissioner Vargas asked staff for bicycle route continuity to denote where there is a route or path and highlight a few participating projects underway so there is some education to the Commission about access issues.

Staff Naclerio replied within that location or throughout the City.

Commissioner Vargas stated throughout the City.

Staff Naclerio replied the Bicycle Master Plan shows the gaps and there is a map in the Bicycle Master Plan so maybe that is something to start with.

Commissioner Bertken highlighted the lack of adequate of pedestrian crossings coming out of the Webster Street on the side of the tunnel and the Wiley Stargell Avenue intersection that connect

with the Neptune Park pathway.

John Knox White explained that he hoped there are upcoming path improvements through Neptune Park because there are some real configuration issues.

Staff Naclerio replied if the nexus is with the In and Out Burger development that is not coming to the Transportation Commission it should be discussed at the Planning Board because the Commission does not have the authority to look over those permits.

Lucy Gigli replied the reason she felt the urgency to bring the topic up because the City is reviewing the design of the Neptune Park pathway after they approve the IN and Out Burger development.

Commissioner Miley made a recommendation to have this topic on the agenda for the next meeting to have an understanding with visuals of the proposal of In and Out Burger and how that relates to Marina Village Parkway and Neptune Park because that is a transportation issue.

Staff Naclerio replied the Planning Board will make a decision on the In and Out Burger development, which also includes a Safeway gas station and a Chase Bank on July 22nd. The Planning Board's meeting is two days before the Transportation Commission's meeting.

Alex Nguyen recommended that staff plan to bring the topic back to the Transportation Commission at the next meeting because there is no certainty that the Planning Board will make an approval at the next meeting. So, the timing would give the Transportation Commission time to make comments.

Staff Vargas replied that the Commission should leave it to staff to bring the topic to the Commission as a potential agenda item.

Staff Naclerio said staff will present what they know at the time of the packet about the In and Out Burger development and that would include the approved alignment for Neptune Park. Then staff will update the Commission on whether the Planning Board approved or continued that item again.

8. Adjournment

10:04 pm