

Transportation Commission

January 13, 2013

Item 4A

Action

Transportation Commission Minutes

Wednesday, November 28, 2012

Commissioner Jesus Vargas called the Transportation Commission to order at 7:03 p.m.

1. Roll Call

Roll was called and the following was recorded:

Members Present:

Michele Bellows

Christopher Miley (Vice Chair)

Eric Schatmeier

Jesus Vargas (Chair)

Sandy Wong

Members Absent:

Thomas G. Bertken

Staff Present:

Gail Payne, Transportation Coordinator

Matt Naclerio, Public Works Director

2. Agenda Changes

None.

3. Announcements / Public Comments

Commissioner Wong commented that she is a representative for the Alameda Unified School District. She received letters from students indicating their concern of the five-legged intersection in front of Encinal High School. She mentioned that the intersection has received many accidents and near misses. Furthermore, there is a concern around the Boys and Girls Club, Woodstock Education Center, Woodstock Park, and Ralph Appezato Memorial Parkway onto Third Street. She will monitor the situation and look into the concern further.

Commissioner Vargas acknowledged the recent election results from Measure B1 and he asked staff to schedule an agenda item to discuss the results and next steps.

Commissioner Schatmeier asked staff at some point to share their knowledge of next steps for Measure B1 and potential strategies for supporters of Measure B1.

Commissioner Vargas explained that dozens of letters and emails were sent to staff regarding the agenda items and he opened the floor to public comment.

Jim Strehlow, Alameda resident and local employee, asked if there was an update regarding the I-880/23rd Avenue/29th Avenue project coming before the City Council.

Commissioner Vargas replied an update would be given towards the end of the agenda in Staff Communications.

Jon Spangler, Alameda resident and a League of American Cycling Instructor, asked staff to present feedback and strategies after the failure of Measure B1. He attended the last Planning Board meeting and there was a discussion on the new leasing strategy for Alameda Point. He felt the City was now stuck without any option besides the tubes. He stated that the City needs better transportation options before going further with the development of Alameda Point.

4. Consent Calendar

Commissioner Schatmeier brought up a technical concern regarding item 4C. Generally, the audible voices for the signals at Park Street and Santa Clara Avenue are indistinguishable. He was not sure if the problem existed in the microphone or the signal equipment. Going forward, he would like staff to improve the quality of the signal's information.

Staff Payne explained that the new standard is to not have the voice because it is too difficult to understand. As part of state regulations, staff uses the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and the manual does not require that voice as part of the new pedestrian push button equipment.

4A. Meeting Minutes – September 26, 2012

4B. Mandatory Ethics Training Requirements

4C. Accessible Pedestrian Signals – New Freedom Grant

<p><i>Commissioner Vargas</i> made a motion to approve the consent calendar. <i>Commissioner Schatmeier</i> seconded the motion. The motion was approved 3-0; 2 abstentions.</p>

Staff Naclerio explained that the Alameda Municipal Code requires a minimum of 4 affirmative votes to approve an action item.

<p><i>Commissioner Schatmeier</i> made another motion to approve the consent calendar. <i>Commissioner Miley</i> seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0; 1 abstention.</p>

5. New Business

5A. Shore Line Drive/Westline Drive Proposed Bikeway Project

Staff Payne presented the staff report.

Commissioner Vargas opened the floor to public comment.

David Duffin, 30-year Alameda resident, felt City staff did an incredible job to develop the project. Although the overall impact certainly satisfies a need for more bicycle access, there are thousands of people in the area who have no idea about this project. He has spoken to many people in the area and they have no idea about the project's concept. Alternatively, he proposed that the City leave the area as is or double the pedestrian path within the area to take bicycles off the road and put them within a safe space.

Carol Gottstein grew up near Shore Line Drive and she felt the comparisons presented in the study are invalid because they compare Alameda to large cities such as San Francisco, Long Beach and Seattle. She felt the project would not work on a narrow and short street and she felt the new infrastructure would create an enormous amount of clutter and future dependency and funds to maintain.

Jeanne Lahaie, member of Team Alameda and Bike Alameda, spoke before the Commission independently. She went to three of the meetings and applauded staff Payne and her team for their thorough outreach. She lives at Broadway and Shoreline Drive and brought a few outcomes from the breakout sessions. First, there are no curb ramps on the sidewalks from the crosswalks. So, it is difficult for individuals with disabilities residing around the area to travel safely. Furthermore, she would like to see the bikeway extended to Washington Park. She mentioned the City adopted that idea under the long-term plan and with community support and volunteers the start up costs should be small. She highlighted that bicyclists become confused about where to go at the corner of Broadway and Shore Line Drive, and signs should be posted to address it. She is in favor of the plan, but she would like to see two motor vehicle travel lanes so as not to create more congestion.

Bruce Kibby, resident of Santa Clara Avenue, believed the process and project design was great and he supported the project wholeheartedly. He knew that many people had input on the Shore Line Drive bikeway. He urged the Commission to review the priorities of the proposed project that show the proposed bikeway meets them such as improves resident access to apartment/condos, reduced conflicts on path, improves safety and maintains bay views.

Randy Rentschler, 20-year resident of Alameda, works in the field of transportation for 20 years. He felt City staff worked hard on the project to create an effective plan, which he fully supported. He pointed out that new Bay Area communities such as Danville have installed bikeways on many of their streets. Currently, new collector streets only would be built with a bikeway. The Commission and the community should support this project and similar actions on other streets in the future.

Jon Spangler explained that he was born and raised in Redwood City, which is similar to Alameda in size. He hoped that the community could recognize improvements that could be made through City staff's hard work. He urged staff to consider creating additional adequate disabled parking access for residents in the neighborhood. Also, stop signs on Shore Line Drive and Westline Drive are needed on Shorepoint Court where Westline crosses it and at the U.S. Post Office. Lastly, the barriers for the cycle tracks should be raised similar to the Belgium example for the entire length of the cycle track.

Commissioner Vargas asked Mr. Spangler's opinion on delineators.

Jon Spangler replied that he would rather see a rigid concrete barrier that is usually found in parking lots to absolutely stop or slightly deflect a car that is spinning out of control.

Jim Strehlow was satisfied with the City staff's community process and the way they addressed the community. However, he was a bit concerned on a couple of items. First, he acknowledged a safety issue in Figure 1 at Shore Line Drive, Broadway and Bayview Drive. When traveling down Shore Line Drive, hitting the stop sign and then making a right hand turn on Bayview Drive, there should be more of a buffer like a green box or sharrows. Overall, he did not understand how the flow would work in the area and he is concerned with the pedestrian crossings at Park Street and Grand Street. He urged staff to consider budgeting for yield to pedestrian signs or markings.

Lucy Gigli, President of Bike Alameda, she would like to thank the staff for taking the time to engage the community. She felt the project took all community viewpoints into account and the project will be a model for the rest of Alameda County. Her only concern was the cost, which doubled, and may slow the implementation of the project. She suggested phasing and prioritizing actions such as moving the bollards to a later phase. She also suggested reducing the priority for landscaping such as on Fernside Drive and to produce less costly alternatives in the interim to get the project moving along to not lose funding.

Warren Vegas, Alameda resident and bicyclist, supported the measure and wanted to see the barrier along the cycle track buffered at 4 to 5 feet. He also asked the Commission and staff to think about adding an additional crosswalk near the McDonalds, which can be dangerous to pedestrians.

Randall Block, Alameda resident and bicyclist, felt that Alameda is a great place to bicycle and the proposal creates a separation between bicyclists from cars. He reiterated the belief that City staff had done an excellent job with the community's concerns and question about the project overall. Overall, he was speaking for other bicyclists and families about how phenomenal the project was and how much he fully supported the project.

Catherine Egelhoff, Alameda resident and bicyclist, believed City staff conducted a great job with community input especially given resident's individual needs and concerns. Overall, she supports the project.

Joyce Larrick, Alameda resident and pedestrian, stated that City staff had done a great job. She

mentioned that it was hard to walk on the beach on the weekend due to a large volume of cyclists with their children on the path. She questioned the project's timeframe from start to finish and whether the Commission would make a decision that night or would they continue to review the documents. She hoped that the project finds sufficient funding to maximize the full benefits to the community.

Susan Sperry, 30-year Alameda and Shore Line Drive resident, voiced her disapproval of the project because her financial investment is tied to her home. She felt the proposal would reduce the value of her home and would bring vehicle and bicycle congestion to the area. She suggested that the project move to Alameda Point and wondered if the project description and community meetings were sent to residents around the area.

Staff Payne replied all residents within 300 feet of Shore Line Drive and all residents within the single family housing area between Shell Gate Road and Sunset Road were sent notifications about the project.

Commissioner Wong asked if the following cycle track buffers (white pavement markings, car stops, and raised curbs and medians) found on page 6 of 15 in the staff report were suggestions or would actually be implemented.

Staff Payne replied the white pavement markings would be at 24/7 parking spaces. The parking would create an extra buffer so the City does not have to invest in extra funding in those sections. When there is not 24/7 parking within the area, staff recommends the car or wheel stops at each end of Shore Line Drive and at the north section of Westline Drive. Staff also recommended even wider physical barriers along the curves. She pointed out that there are two curves – Shore Line Drive/Westline Drive and Shore Line Drive/Broadway – where the median would be 3 feet wide and 6-8 inches in height.

Commissioner Wong questioned whether the raised curbs and medians would have a drainage issue.

Staff Payne replied staff is recommending the car stops because they do not have to provide additional gutter and drainage, which would be another underground expense.

Commissioner Miley questioned whether bicycles would be prohibited from the path once the cycle track is installed.

Staff Payne replied no.

Commissioner Miley reviewed the illustration of a left-turn pocket, straight lane and right-turn lane in Figure 8 of the staff report. He wanted to know if that was a right-turn lane into the state park.

Staff Payne replied that it is a right-turn lane because the lane helped the City align southbound vehicles in the right space away from the cycle track.

Commissioner Miley wanted to know if the Caltrans grant had deadlines that meant the project needed to move forward or the City would lose funding.

Staff Payne replied that yes in a little over a year from now the City would need to request authorization from Caltrans for construction.

Commissioner Miley wondered whether the project would move forward to City Council if the Commission approved it.

Staff Payne stated that staff would move forward with the final plan. Since the City obtained federal monies for the project, they will go through a federal process to go out to bid. Before staff releases the request for proposals (RFP) on the construction work, staff will request City Council approval and then will release the RFP and select a contractor. Staff will go back to City Council for approval of the contractor that staff recommends for construction.

Commissioner Miley asked if the process would occur over a year.

Staff Payne replied yes.

Commissioner Miley wondered whether the City offered residents parking placard during this time.

Staff Payne explained that the City offered placards and the community has to go through a process to have a certain number of residents interested in the idea.

Staff Naclerio stated that the residents would initiate the process, which would require a petition and a deposit. The process would require the creation of a self-supporting Assessment District approved by a majority residential vote.

Commissioner Miley asked staff how many parking spaces currently exist on Shore Line Drive and once the project moved forward as proposed what would the number then be.

Staff Payne replied that the exact number of parking spaces is not available to her at this moment, but she knows that the project area consists of 1.6 miles and parking spaces are 20 feet long. Overall, the project would provide 125 additional 24/7 parking spaces on the beach side of the street on Shore Line Drive and on Westline Drive on the west side of that street.

Commissioner Miley asked if that is a net gain or a reduction because some parking spaces may be eliminated.

Staff Payne replied during 9 am to 5pm loading zone parking spaces in front of multi-unit complexes would be for loading purpose only. After 5pm, the parking spaces would be open to residential parking.

Commissioner Bellows stated that staff worked hard to gather community input and ideas. She was curious about the funding since they had to work within the federal grant terms within one

year and they are around \$400,000 short. She asked staff if they considered phasing as part of the project.

Staff Payne replied staff should have the funding without seeking additional grants. A large number of monies would come from Measure B Bicycle/Pedestrian pass through and Vehicle Registration Fee pass through monies.

Staff Naclerio replied that the City is looking to construct this project within the grant deadlines. Until the bids come in, the City will not know what funds are needed. The City recently received Vehicle Registration Fee monies. If used, then City would have to reduce its resurfacing project funding.

Commissioner Schatmeier echoed the tremendous effort made by staff to pull all of the community's comments together. He spoke about a public comment regarding signage. He wondered whether the Commission would see appropriate wayfinding signage included in the project.

Staff Naclerio said signage requested by tonight's speaker is not included in the project currently.

Commissioner Schatmeier questioned the bus shelters on Webster Street and Park Street. He assumed that the shelters were funded and maintained by the business association.

Staff Naclerio replied no.

Commissioner Schatmeier asked if the City maintains the shelters.

Staff Naclerio replied yes the City erected and maintains them.

Commissioner Schatmeier stated that the bus shelters should be constantly maintained or they would detract from the project.

Commissioner Vargas encouraged staff to find additional funds for the project. He considered safety as an important factor for the project as well as personal safety while riding a bike and the bicycles themselves.

<p><i>Commissioner Miley</i> made a motion to approve staff recommendations. <i>Commissioner Bellows</i> seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0.</p>

5B. Traffic Calming Improvements on Fernside Blvd. between Versailles Avenue and High Street

Staff Naclerio presented a summary of the report.

Commissioner Miley referred to page 9 of 16 of the Fernside Boulevard Staff Report under Additional Residents' Requests- Phase II # 4 "Install Additional Red Curb to Improve Visibility on Fernside Boulevard at Harvard Drive" and asked if that recommendation would be implemented.

Staff Naclerio replied that is correct and confirmed with staff seated at the meeting that one parking space would be removed.

Commissioner Vargas opened the floor to public comment.

Lester Cabral, 38-year resident of Versailles Avenue, stated that they had three community meetings at Edison School and they concluded that the main issue was a traffic issue. On Fernside Boulevard, traffic moves very fast and he is generally in favor of the project. Yet, he felt the curb extension would not be beneficial on the southeast corner and it would be best served with striping the other side of the street. He also opted for a crosswalk on the northwest side because disabled residents reside in the area and catch the bus at the northwest side of Versailles Avenue. He noted that the curb extension would eliminate a parking space found on page 7, Figure 2 of the staff report. He considered the extension problematic because cars are always parked around the area and the future development plan at 2001 Versailles Avenue would amplify parking demand.

David Commerford, Alameda resident, approved of the restriping at High Street and Fernside Boulevard. He commented that the bike lane ends half way down the block and that would correct that issue because traffic is so vigorous around that area. He did not believe installing speed signs would be an effective speed deterrent. Yet, he highly approved of the Phase III stop signs at Harvard and Cambridge because that it is a long and wide street. Moreover, he felt police enforcement should be extended past 5pm and there should be signage by the left-turn lane onto High Street.

Warren Vegas thanked the City, Public Works Department and the Police Department for their work. He chaired the group that brought the petition forward a year and a half ago and he was speaking on behalf of the six residents that worked with staff to come up with a proposal for the community meetings. He noted that within the six-month survey, there were 6 accidents and 44 traffic tickets given on that block. Consequently, there are significant speeding incidents occurring on that stretch, which causes increased noise. Also, there is a bicycle lane and families residing around the street with children use the bicycle lane to ride to Edison Elementary School. He believed that speed feedback signs, the light at Versailles Avenue and restriping on High Street are important. Car mirrors are ripped off yet are not reported.

Commissioner Vargas asked for input on the curb extension comments from *Mr. Vegas*.

Warren Vegas replied that there is some concern for reduced parking, but the only concern brought up by the traffic team was that it allowed kids crossing at Versailles Avenue to be more visible to motorists.

Gayle Ewe, Marina Drive resident, supported the project as proposed. She walked her children to Edison Elementary School for 11 years and was almost hit by a truck as they entered the crosswalk. She believed that the entire proposal would increase safety and visibility of pedestrians by motorists.

Dorothy Owens, Versailles Avenue resident, explained that her area contains a lot of cars parked all the time. At one point, she asked the employees of the insurance company nearby to park on the other side of Versailles Avenue or Fernside Boulevard, close to the empty lot. In the future, she believed that as development increased, so would the demand for parking. She wondered if the new beacon could go on the insurance company side to keep the parking space.

Jim Strehlow, Gibbons Drive resident, explained that when he gets off at Gibbons Drive and eventually onto Fernside Boulevard going north he really enjoyed the double dashed center merged lanes that are along Fernside Boulevard whether in the car or the bicycle. While cycling on Harvard Drive or Fremont Drive, he has the opportunity to turn safely into the center lane because he could see traffic each way. He heard mention of medians, but he really liked the buffer area on Fernside Boulevard as a bicyclist or motorist. Regarding the Fernside presentation, there is a solid white line separation on Fernside Boulevard - when coming from Tilden Way onto Fernside Boulevard near Pearl Street - he wished it were a dashed line.

Jon Spangler supported the project and he is familiar with this neighborhood. He has been on buses that seem to go well over 25 mph heading towards the Fruitvale BART station and he has driven and cycled in the area. He wanted the area to mimic the other part of Fernside Boulevard along the Estuary towards Doolittle Drive. He questioned whether the striping in Phase II and III could be combined or could jump to Phase III to save some money on the project.

Commissioner Wong wanted to know if the Rapid Fire Beacon would be active all day and whether pedestrian pavement signals could be placed at this location similar to Encinal Avenue near Franklin School.

Staff Naclerio replied that In-Pavement Crosswalk Lights are not as effective as the Rapid Fire Beacons at having motorists yield to pedestrians. He noted that 80 percent of motorists yield to Rapid Fire Beacons, which catch their attention and are activated by pedestrian push button.

Commissioner Schatmeier stated that a pedestrian button activates the beacon. He felt it may cause motorists to only look for the light and not the pedestrian who crosses without having activated the light.

Staff Naclerio replied that he does not have the statistics to that statement, but the intention is to train pedestrians and especially school children to press the push button to activate the light.

Commissioner Wong stated that pedestrians step on a pad at Washington Park to activate the

light and she wondered if that could be an alternative to the push button.

Staff Naclerio replied he is not sure if this technology could include stepping on a pad, but mentioned that on Pacific Avenue, the City installed a step pad in front of the school and they had to add the pedestrian push button because pedestrians would walk beyond the stepping pad.

Commissioner Miley stated that the overall cost of Phase II would be about \$115,000 to \$150,000. He commended staff with approaching the project as phases and bringing in the community for comment. He noticed that a stop sign or speed bumps was the best way to stop vehicular traffic. He was concerned about costs for Phase II and he did not know what the overall maintenance costs would be to maintain pedestrian safety and visibility within the area.

Staff Naclerio replied that it is not a huge maintenance cost for the speed feedback sign and the cost was incorporated within the annual maintenance budget. The City does not have experience with the Rapid Fire Beacons so he is not certain what the ongoing or increased maintenance costs associated with the technology would be. Also, the curb extension would have nominal maintenance and the restriping lasts for 5-7 years when using thermoplastic materials. He pointed out that the high side costs for Phase II would be \$135,000, and they could prioritize Phase II improvements and may reduce the priority of the speed feedback signs.

Commissioner Miley asked if Phase II would have the bike lanes go all the way through or would it go into Phase III.

Staff Naclerio replied for the most part there are bike lanes and a couple of areas with sharrows. He confirmed with staff seated at the meeting that the restriping of High Street would create a continuous lane from the entire length of the bike lane.

Commissioner Vargas asked if *Sergeant Simmons* would make a quick overview about the Neighborhood Speed Watch Program, especially where it is deployed and the costs to the City.

Sergeant Simmons explained that the City had the Neighborhood Speed Watch Program for many years, but when they tried to get the neighborhood mobilized enough to deploy the program, they were met with a bit of resistance. There are a couple of groups in the works and they used it once on Central Avenue with positive results. There are zero costs to the police department because they partner citizens with volunteers in policing who are with them when they choose to run the program. The volunteers use radar guns - there are ten in total - and the department had the guns for many years. When the community deploys the program, the department mails non-punitive letters to the registered owners of vehicles and they had success with reducing speeds. The department is currently working on that stretch of Fernside Boulevard and spoke with two people who expressed interest in volunteering and they plan to conduct training within two weeks.

Commissioner Miley brought up public comments about a concern for loss of parking spaces on Versailles Avenue. He asked if there are any other types of curb extensions that could be used to prevent the elimination of the parking space. He suggested a similar copy of the bulb outs along Park Street's mid-block area.

Staff Naclerio replied staff could look at that, but it will be expensive because it would completely change the drainage of that intersection. He suggested the Commission ask staff to look at additional options. One option would be to re-do the width of the travel lanes, but that may run into problems at a very busy intersection.

Commissioner Bellows heard that people park there all day and if there was any way to create parking limitations (2 hour or 4 hour limit) to promote higher parking turnovers.

Staff Naclerio replied their concern is when they install the curb extension they do not want to direct vehicles into it. They want to provide a way to direct motorists away from the curb extension to the center.

Commissioner Bellows asked if the beacon could be moved more to the other side of the intersection.

Staff Naclerio said the beacon is being installed in the curb extension that would be raised. They are applying an advance warning to the west and east of it.

Commissioner Vargas asked about implementing Phase II and what is the duration of measuring the performance.

Staff Naclerio recommended at least a year and to go through all the seasons to assess behavior.

Commissioner Wong stated that staff mentioned prioritizing the list of the approval process so when would it be in the future or currently how would it work.

Staff Naclerio felt that it could be done and he would start by suggesting the red curb for visibility and the restriping of the lane be done first. He pointed out that unlike item 5.A., this project does not have funding in place and staff would have to apply for grants. However, the community supported the Rapid Fire Beacons and that should be installed. If they do not find all the money, the speed feedback sign would be prioritized last and moved to the third phase.

Commissioner Miley stated in terms of priority suggestions, the question to the Commission would be what two curb options should be prioritized. Either they move forward with the one with extension and lose a parking spot or not lose the spot.

<p><i>Commissioner Bellows</i> moved to accept the loss of the parking space (option 1) because it would ultimately be safer and to go with the recommended approach. <i>Commissioner Schatmeier</i> seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0.</p>

5C. Complete Streets Policy Resolution

Staff Payne presented a summary of the report.

Commissioner Miley moved to adopt the policy resolution. *Commissioner Vargas* recommended they make an amendment before taking the vote. For clarification, the following statement found on page 2 “First City and the County of Alameda to install and operate a bus priority signal” whether it is first or not should be clarified or modified by staff.

Commissioner Miley moved to approve the item and to direct staff to amend or clarify the following statement “First City and the County of Alameda to install and operate a bus priority signal” to determine if that is accurate and to make the necessary corrections before moving the item to the City Council.

Commissioner Schatmeier seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0.

Commissioner Vargas asked the Commission to vote to move Item 7 – Announcements / Public Comments - before moving to Item 5D.

Commissioner Miley made a motion to move item 7 up and *Commissioner Wong* seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0.

7. Announcements/ Public Comments

Christina Trotter, Billy Truong, Reggie Hubbard (students) and Joan Schwartz (teacher) from Encinal High School were concerned with street traffic in front of their school, especially where the five streets including Central Avenue come together. There are no crossing guards and traffic is consistently dangerous throughout the day. They wanted to voice their concern and have the Commission come up with a viable solution.

Commissioner Vargas asked if it was a daytime or after school issue.

Joan Schwartz stated her class goes out a lot during the day so the motorists are consistently dangerous in their behavior regardless of congestion.

Commissioner Vargas stated that he would ask staff to look into opportunities to highlight this concern.

Staff Naclerio replied that based on the comments received, staff would look at the issue. He stated that traffic incidents are based on a first in first out process and they would estimate coming back to the group within a few months.

Commissioner Schatmeier asked if the Safe Routes to School Program could be incorporated within the area.

Staff Payne stated yes high schools are part of the Safe Routes to School Program. There is a

state and federal program, but one of the two does not fund improvements to high schools.

Jim Wullschleger, Broadway and Central resident, was glad to see the Commission approve the pedestrian buttons and he is fully in support of the action. He noticed that the pedestrian button could be a nuisance if the locator button is too loud or not adjusted correctly. He felt *Staff Payne* did a great job on the Shore Line project and he is in support of a volunteer based traffic program. He would like to see a speed tracker use flash photography to capture speeders once technology becomes cheaper.

5D. Revised Draft Prioritized Transportation Project Lists

Staff Payne presented a summary of the report.

Commissioner Vargas asked if staff was seeking the Commission's approval of the list so it could move forward to the Planning Board and then the City Council.

Staff Payne replied the item would go to the Planning Board on December 10, 2012 and the City Council on January 14, 2013.

Commissioner Miley thanked staff for taking feedback from the Planning Board, Transportation Commission and City Council and incorporating the comments into the list.

Commissioner Schatmeier asked about the paratransit shuttle listed as a project within the list.

Staff Payne replied the paratransit shuttle is listed on page 1 of the Implementation List right after Exhibit 1.

Commissioner Schatmeier stated that he was against the shuttle service before its implementation because he was skeptical about the way it would be deployed. Thus, he would like to have some performance data since its implementation.

Staff Payne replied that the performance report would be provided at the next meeting as part of the annual review of the Paratransit program.

Commissioner Vargas stated that he noticed that part of the next action after implementation is a quarterly report coming back to the Commission and Planning Board. Yet, he remembered that some comments provided by others such as the Planning Boardmember John Knox White recommended a report annually or biannually. So, he wanted to know why staff decided on a quarterly report.

Staff Payne stated that staff will present a quarterly report on project updates and they plan to update the list annually.

Commissioner Vargas asked how the list considered Assembly Bill 32 and Senate Bill 375.

Staff Payne replied that these bills are highlighted in the Complete Street Policy Resolution (item

5C) and the Transportation Element is one of the best practices because it is multimodal. The Transportation Element's goals add up to eight points of the evaluation criteria. Additionally, the City created Bicycle, Pedestrian and Public Transportation Plans and all of these different modal plans receive rankings. So, the list does capture and represents all the modes.

Commissioner Schatmeier moved to accept staff recommendations. *Commissioner Bellows* seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0.

6. Staff Communications

Staff Payne and *Staff Naclerio* presented the following updates on activities related to transportation policies and plans:

- ***On-going Traffic Calming Projects***

Otis Drive Traffic Calming will come to the Commission in January 2013.

- ***AC Transit Line OX- Reconsider Opening to Local Riders***

AC Transit re-opened up the Transbay Line OX to local riders in the afternoon. AC Transit issued public announcements on November 9 and the maintenance crew updated the decals at all Line OX stops. Emails and 511.org announcements were created.

Commissioner Schatmeier stated that he used the Line OX last week for the first time after the implementation. The driver let him on and he clicked his Clipper Card and it presented the local fare. He complimented AC Transit staff for their flexibility, but noticed the sign at the Park Street and Santa Clara Avenue bus shelter still says "Drop Off Only" and he does not know what other signage should be changed.

- ***Status of Recruitment for the Supervising Civil Engineer***

Staff Naclerio stated that the City recently closed the submission of applications and they would conduct interviews with the top candidates from the ten applications received in the upcoming weeks.

- ***Potential Future Meeting Agenda Items***

Commissioner Miley would like to schedule a briefing and next steps on the results of Measure B1 sometime in January 2013.

Commissioner Vargas seconded the recommendation on speaking about Measure B1.

Staff Payne stated that the topic would be placed on the agenda for 2013. The next meeting would take place on January 23, 2013. Other items, as listed on the agenda, include:

- *Additional Proposed City CarShare Pod on Santa Clara Avenue at Webster*

- *Estuary Crossing Shuttle Final Report for First Year Operations*
- *Proposed Neptune Park Path Conceptual Layout*
- *Traffic Control and Contingency Plan during Construction for I-880/29th Ave./23rd Ave. Interchange Improvement Project in Oakland: Public Information Program and Transit Impacts*
- *Draft Regional Transit Access Study (RTAS): Overview of Study Corridors, Transit Demand, and Service Examples, Part II*
- *Traffic Calming Projects regarding the Fernside Boulevard Project – Staff scheduled a meeting at the Edison School on Thursday, September 27th at 7pm.*
- *The last meeting the Commission approved a midblock crossing between Franklin School and Franklin Park and staff installed the crossing with help from Alameda Unified School District staff.*

8. Adjournment

9:39 pm