

Transportation Commission

March 25, 2015

Item 4A

Action

Transportation Commission Minutes Wednesday, January 28, 2015

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

Michael Hans

Gregory Morgado

Staff Present:

Alex Nguyen, Assistant City Manager

Liam Garland, Deputy Public Works Director

Virendra Patel, Transportation Engineer

Gail Payne, Transportation Coordinator

2. Agenda Changes

None.

3. Announcements / Public Comments

Jim Strehlow, Alameda resident, said he visited Bay Farm Island and he was glad to see Public Works working on the bicycle/pedestrian walkways on Island Drive. He stated that Public Works should work on Golf Course Drive because it needs pothole repairs. Also, he felt that the Caltrans' signs posted in the Posey Tube that say "Walk bicycles on sidewalk" is a way to penalize bicyclists.

Commissioner Vargas stated that he was excited to see the movie theatre parking lot full lately and overfull in some cases where drivers have to go up and then down. When he talked to the movie theatre staff, he was told that the City operates the parking lot, but he felt it would be great to know how many parking spaces are available.

Staff Payne stated that the Cross Alameda Trail Community Workshop will take place on February 10, Harbor Bay Ferry Access Improvements meeting will take place on February 24 and the Joint Transportation Commission and Planning Board will take place on February 25.

Commissioner Miley stated that he spoke with *Councilmember Oddie* and thanked him for forwarding the letters from last month's council meeting focusing on traffic issues.

4. Consent Calendar

4A. Meeting Minutes – Approve Meeting Minutes – November 19, 2014

Commissioner Miley moved to approve Item 4A. of the Consent Calendar. *Commissioner Schatmeier* seconded the motion. The motion was approved 7-0.

5. New Business

5A. Discuss Transportation Projects in Alameda's Proposed Capital Improvement Program

Liam Garland, Deputy Public Works Director, presented the report.

Staff Payne presented the second half of the report.

Commissioner Schatmeier stated that the packet distinguished between rehabilitation and enhancement projects and the table provided to staff is only the enhancement projects. When he reviewed the enhancement table, staff numbered the projects and arranged the projects by time of funding or implementation. He also said that there were numbers associated to the priorities in the other table found at the end of the staff report. He wondered what relation could be found with the number system in the table.

Staff Payne replied that the numbering system in the ten-year list was a way to reference the projects for discussion purposes. She also mentioned that all projects are in alphabetical order in each of the sections.

Commissioner Schatmeier asked staff when choosing which projects would be implemented in the 2015 - 2017 timeframe and which projects would be implemented in the 2018-2020 timeframe was that a function of staff priority or envisioned funding.

Staff Payne referred to Figure 1 of the staff report and stated that staff used the prioritized transportation list and upcoming grants to compose the draft ten-year list.

Commissioner Bertken asked staff how the Commission could find the numbers for the various categories of rehabilitation projects identified and what were the amounts that go to each of those elements.

Liam Garland replied that staff would present that information at the March Transportation Commission meeting.

Commissioner Bertken asked *Staff Payne* about the capital improvements projects that were listed for the first two years and how staff would set up their resources such as scheduling city staff or consultants workload. Additionally, he wondered what are the actual priorities to push those projects forward.

Staff Payne replied that there are three projects presented for the first two years and the Cross Alameda Trail project is funded. She also explained that the Cross Alameda Trail project will lose the federal funding in December and that was the highest priority although it was second on the list because the list is alphabetical order.

Commissioner Hans felt the Shoreline Path should not be placed in the long-term 2021-2025 section and he wondered how to move the project up.

Commissioner Vargas noticed that the background found on Exhibit 2 dated back to March 2014 and he asked staff when the comments would be revised.

Staff Payne replied that the comments would be updated in March. She also said the Bayview/Shoreline Path study was placed in the long-term section of the ten-year plan and the project has proponents and opponents.

Commissioner Hans replied how could the Commission move projects from the long-term to the short-term timeframe.

Staff Payne replied the purpose of this month's meeting was to hear from the Commission and receive input and bring back a draft plan for approval in March.

Commissioner Schatmeier stated when talking about moving projects up or down was there a dollar trade off and would staff have to move another project to medium or long-term to move a project up.

Staff Payne replied yes because there is only a certain number of staff hours and available funds.

Mayor Trish Herrera Spencer introduced herself and said she was attending all Commission and Board meetings to know what the City was working on. She found the presentation to be informative, but she felt staff should develop a map to coordinate with the projects.

Commissioner Vargas opened the floor to public comments.

Lucy Gigli, Director of Advocacy for *Bike Walk Alameda*, stated that that her organization has been working for years with the City on the Capital Improvement Project (CIP) list and she found that this list has been the best one that aligned with the bicycle, pedestrian and transportation plans.

Commissioner Vargas asked staff how to move up Item 39, Bayfarm Island Path Improvements project.

Staff Payne replied that the project was a rehabilitation project and that would be part of complete streets under rehabilitation. She explained that staff would work on resurfacing projects for the next fiscal year and they would resurface in sections and look at the worst sections first.

Commissioner Bellows asked *Staff Payne* how could the Commission distinguish the project as a rehabilitation project.

Staff Payne referred to page 1 of the staff report under Complete Streets. She also referred to Exhibit 2, which shows the list and described how each project was categorized.

Commissioner Miley suggested categorizing the CIP and the priority lists so that they work across both lists regardless of what document he is viewing. Meaning, he could look at Exhibit 1 of the staff report and see the Cross Alameda Trail is in Category “X” and then he could see it in the priority list and find it in Category “X”.

Staff Payne replied that staff could reprioritize and re-categorize the list.

Commissioner Schatmeier asked if staff anticipated the same source of funding for the rehabilitation category and the enhancements projects or does it say in the staff report.

Liam Garland, replied that for most transportation projects the funding sources would be Measure BB, grant funding and gas taxes. He gave an example of the Urban Forest Management project, which was funded mostly by the gas tax.

Commissioner Schatmeier asked what are the sources for rehabilitation that are not sources for the enhancement projects.

Liam Garland, replied that there are rehabilitation projects that are not related to transportation such as sewer replacement projects. Pavement management is a rehabilitation project likely funded by Measure BB, gas tax and vehicle registration monies.

Commissioner Miley asked staff what was the City’s overall network in miles of pavement.

Liam Garland, replied the number was around 140 miles. He also said in the March Transportation Commission meeting the Commission will see a projection of the pavement condition index based on the amount of funding staff was proposing to allocate in the next two years and beyond.

Commissioner Miley asked if staff could provide an overview of the City needs and the unfunded portion of the pavement resurfacing.

Liam Garland replied there is a program called Street Saver, which figured which streets need resurfacing when.

Commissioner Miley said in the future it would be helpful to see the funding sources available and show the project worksheets or factsheets that give a synopsis.

Liam Garland replied that the submission in March would have three complements: 1. budget sheet where the dollars are allocated to which projects and funding sources; 2. narrative of the capital improvement project; and 3. underlying project sheet describing the projects.

Commissioner Miley stated that the document was a living document and reemphasized that generally projects move forward because they are on a list, but sometimes priorities change and he does not want to see the City locked into that view on projects. He also would like to see the Commission find linkages to projects that have shared goals or phased projects. He gave the example of Central Avenue projects, which could be a combined into phases.

Commissioner Schatmeier stated that he was concerned about using capital funding for street and roads maintenance and he understood that funding was hard to come by and that streets and roads have to be fixed.

Liam Garland asked *Commissioner Schatmeier* if a slurry seal was considered a maintenance project.

Commissioner Schatmeier stated yes.

Liam Garland replied that the City traditionally dealt with streets maintenance as part of capital projects.

Commissioner Schatmeier said calling street maintenance part of a capital project was a stretch and he had no idea how to fix the situation, he just wanted to comment.

Commissioner Bellows replied that Measure BB states that streets and roads could receive capital improvement funds.

Alex Nguyen, Assistant City Manager, said the Commission would have to discuss *Commissioner Hans'* request to move Bayview/Shoreline Path from long-term to short-term.

Commissioner Vargas asked staff when was the deadline for input.

Liam Garland replied that they could take in input over the next month or so.

Staff Payne said it would be helpful to receive the Commission's input on what *Commissioner Hans'* requested to proceed with the feasibility study.

Commissioner Bellows asked if the path was on the public right of way.

Staff Payne replied yes.

Commissioner Miley asked if City owned the right of way.

Staff Payne replied she would have to look into that.

Commissioner Miley replied to staff that if the intent was to first begin a study there should not be anything wrong with that. However, he felt as a Commission they need to talk about how projects move up and down the list.

Commissioner Hans replied that it would be good for the Commission to look at potential funding sources for the study grant and come back with that information.

Commissioner Vargas needed clarification on the Island Access studies found in the priority list. He wanted to know whether there was consideration from staff to be moving the project up.

Staff Payne stated the history of the study dates back to 2008 when the City conducted an effort called the Estuary Crossing Study to improve infrastructure for the Estuary and the west end. The highest priority project became the bicycle/pedestrian bridge, but because of the Coast Guard Island, it was a flaw for moving the project forward. So, staff is going back to the drawing board and moving the island access issue back to the forefront, especially in light of several Councilmember referrals related to island access.

Commissioner Vargas stated that he would like to see this earlier than later and he would like to see the other Commissioners weigh in.

Commissioner Bertken asked staff if the Commission wanted to start the study tomorrow could they.

Staff Payne replied that they have some resources in house they could start up a small effort and scope then they would have to look for grants to move forward.

Commissioner Miley stated that he agreed about the importance of the study, but he cautioned the Commission about moving things forward right now especially when they need to see where funding was coming from. He felt it was best for the Commission to look at the funding chart in March then decide.

Commissioner Vargas replied that he recalled a conversation of project prioritization and glanced at the minutes of the last meeting. He explained that the element of safety was also a factor into the ranking as well as air quality and vehicles miles traveled.

5B. Discuss Clement Avenue Complete Street Concept Proposal

Staff Payne presented the report.

Commissioner Schatmeier asked staff if the \$2.4 million estimate for railroad track removal included filling the holes and paving the street afterwards.

Staff Payne replied it does not.

Commissioner Bertken asked staff what was the plan for getting the funding to do construction.

Staff Payne replied the idea was to better understand what the community wanted and then cost it out once staff had consensus. She said staff would have a better understanding of the full cost and they could look at grant funding available and funding from adjacent developments in the area to pay their contribution for the project.

Commissioner Hans asked when working with the utility company do they have a say or obligation to fund the project in some way.

Staff Payne replied staff is working with Alameda Municipal Power on this issue and they are still looking to see what funding sources they could bring to the table.

Commissioner Morgado asked how many residents versus businesses live on this section of Clement Avenue.

Staff Payne replied that the area is in transition because it was once industrial, but there are more residents on the eastern end. She saw the corridor as mixed residential and commercial, and expected the corridor to become more residential in the future.

Commissioner Vargas opened the floor to public comments.

Dorothy Freeman, Alameda resident, said Clement Avenue was a major street and when she went to the workshop meeting, she was pleased to see people come out. She further said the overall trail would create a three-mile long stretch where a good portion will link east Alameda with the west creating a safer way to travel to get to the ferry terminal and BART station.

Jim Strehlow wondered if the railroad tracks could be paved over to create 3-4 inches of additional pavement and the utilities would need to work around it.

John Spangler, Alameda resident and a League of American Cycling Instructor, stated that he was on the Cross Alameda Trail Steering Committee for a number of years along with Lucy Gigli. He felt all the utilities should be grounded including the high voltage because the sidewalks on Clement Avenue are not wide enough to present a safe passage for people on wheelchairs or someone walking next to someone with a wheelchair. The City would have to take one side of parking out to install a fully buffered bike lane with three feet on each side of the lane similar to San Francisco.

Staff Patel said staff could not pave over the railroad tracks because the tracks are sitting in the center of the street and the crown of the street would be too high.

Commissioner Schatmeier stated that staff has used Fernside Drive as an existing example of their draft preferred idea. He said Fernside Drive was currently working, so why would not this tactic be applied to Clement Avenue.

Jon Spangler replied if you look at Shoreline and Fernside Drives there are no driveways on Shoreline Drive where the dunes are. He felt, the same goes for Fernside Drive between the bridge and Lincoln Middle School. There was one intersection, but for the short length of the cycle track it is protected fully on the right side from the bridge to the school. So, there was a different curbside issues, which concerned him.

Commissioner Miley stated for future renderings it would be helpful to see those types of conflicts.

Staff Payne replied that there was one type of conflict that is in the background of the presentation and staff chose to treat it with the green pavement driveway in the upper left corner of the corridor. She said this was the common type of treatment happening throughout the country and it was seen as best practices at this point.

Commissioner Hans said when he worked at Alameda High School he remembered a severe accident on Clement Avenue with an adult riding his bike home from work and his tire became locked into the railroad track. So, he appreciated the plan.

Commissioner Vargas asked about the new item where there were several attendees at the January 21 meeting. He wanted a summary of the meeting and he asked staff if that was where the traffic-calming item came up.

Staff Payne replied there were approximately 40 attendees and they broke out in groups and ranked goals. She said 80-90 percent approved the San Francisco Bay Trail to be moved from Buena Vista Avenue to Clement Avenue. A majority of the participants ranked the two-way parking protected bikeway as the preferred idea. She stated that staff would come back with all of the input on March 25.

Commissioner Vargas asked if *Bike Walk Alameda* placed input as well.

Staff Payne replied that *Bike Walk Alameda* attended the meeting and weighed in.

Lucy Gigli, of *Bike Walk Alameda*, stated that most community input aligned with their recommendations. She advocated for the two-way parking protected bike lanes because that was the only way to get more people out on bikes.

Commissioner Miley said it was exciting to see the project moving forward in the early stages.

5C. Review Quarterly Report on Activities Related to Transportation Policies and Plans

Staff Payne presented the report.

Commissioner Vargas asked staff about the Park Street Streetscape project, which came before the Commission last July. He wanted to know if there were any changes in the concept.

Staff Patel stated there were no changes since the Commission approved the plan and staff will go out to bid very soon.

6. Staff Communications

6A. Chair and Vice Chair Elections

Commissioner Vargas made a motion for *Commissioner Bellows* to become Chair and called for other nominations.

Commissioner Bellows accepted the nomination. *Commissioner Bertken* moved to approve the nomination and *Commissioner Hans* seconded the motion. The motion was approved 6-0; 1 abstention.

Commissioner Miley made a motion for *Commissioner Schatmeier* to become Vice Chair and called for other nominations.

Commissioner Schatmeier accepted the nomination. *Commissioner Bertken* moved to approve the nomination and *Commissioner Vargas* seconded the motion. The motion was approved 6-0; 1 abstention.

6B. Update on Ferry Terminal Access (from Ad Hoc Committee)

Staff Payne presented the next steps of the ad hoc ferry access committee with the Harbor Bay meeting on February 24.

Commissioner Schatmeier said he favored having one or two representatives from the Planning Board sit on the Ad Hoc Transit Committee. He also wanted to establish City priorities to guide AC Transit in its service planning effort.

6C. Potential Future Meeting Agenda Items

- The next Commission meeting will be Wednesday, February 25
- AC Transit Service Plan Update

Commissioner Miley asked staff when will the priority I-880 Broadway/Jackson project come up for discussion.

Alex Nguyen replied Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC) would have their staff and consultant give an update to the Commission in March.

Commissioner Vargas asked staff what is the City's policy and technical role providing input in the ACTC.

Alex Nguyen replied that they are opening up that process and inviting City staff to their meetings. So, their job is to show up to the meetings and speak on Alameda's behalf.

Commissioner Vargas asked if there have been appointments in the past for representation from them.

Alex Nguyen replied yes, there was a subcommittee of ACTC to get the study to happen. So, that job is complete and now there is an outreach component.

7. Announcements/Public Comments

Jon Spangler stated that he talked to Jackie Krause from the Mastick Senior Center to allow bicycle parking for up to 12 bicycles. He also said Otis Drive needed traffic calming so every street will be safe for pedestrians and bicyclists. Furthermore, he said he was part of the Kickstarter for Zackees lighted bicycle turn signal gloves and excited about this product.

Commissioner Miley thanked *Commissioner Vargas* for his service and he looked forward to working with the new Chair and Vice Chair.

Commissioner Vargas concurred.

8. Adjournment

9:01 pm