

Transportation Commission Minutes

February 23, 2011

Kathy Moehring called the Transportation Commission to order at 7:31 p.m.

1. Roll Call

The roll was called and the following was recorded:

Members Present:

Philip Tribuzio
Thomas G. Bertken
Jesus Vargas
Kathy Moehring
Kirsten Zazo- absent

Staff Present:

Obaid Khan, Supervising Civil Engineer
Gail Payne, Transportation Coordinator
Daraja Wagner, Administrative Assistant

2. Minutes

| |
|---|
| <p><i>Commissioner Moehring</i> moved approval of the minutes for the January 26, 2011 meeting. <i>Commissioner Bertken</i> seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0.</p> |
|---|

3. Oral Communications – Non-Agenda

None.

4. New Business

4A. Alameda Employee Survey Results

Staff Payne summarized the staff report.

Open public hearing.

Commissioner Moehring asked *Staff Payne* out of the surveys that were sent out, how many responses were received and also if she was satisfied with the results of the survey. *Moehring* also expressed her concern about if the respondents really represented enough commuter employees.

Staff Payne responded that she was satisfied with the results of the survey. *Payne* stated that according to Dowling Associates, who are the experts in surveying, the results were good and just about met their target of 1,000 responses.

Staff Khan responded that it was not a scientific survey, but it did capture the different work locations of main employment areas around the city like Towne Centre and Harbor Bay.

Staff Payne stated that she did have that information and invited people to come to the stakeholder meeting on March 10, 2011 for more information.

Commissioner Vargas asked if there would be any benefit to finding out what the youth thought. He stated that if youth were walking or taking the bus then they would have less of a dependency on their parents.

Staff Payne responded that they did capture some youth responses yet the focus was on employees, which tend to have an age cluster corresponding with the baby boomers.

Commissioner Bertken asked what the total employment in Alameda is. *Bertken* stated that he wanted to make sure that the survey got answers from the appropriate employees according to geographic area.

Staff Payne responded that the next step will be to look at the answers from the specific areas to see how the people responded and see what will best meet their needs. *Payne* stated that she would follow up with this topic at the next meeting.

Commissioner Bertken asked how the plan ultimately would be used. What will it address?

Staff Khan responded that the plan will be used to reduce single driver vehicles and also will create a list of strategies to help reduce traffic.

Commissioner Bertken stated that people who have cars available to drive are not going to want to stop using their cars especially since 95 percent of the people who work in Alameda receive free parking.

Staff Khan responded that a better alternative must be provided and that people must be able to see the advantages of it.

Commissioner Tribuzio asked if there was anything that asked people who commuted on bikes how often they commuted that way. *Tribuzio* stated that eventually people would return to their cars.

Staff Payne answered yes, that there was a question asking if they biked more than once a week.

Commissioner Vargas asked if *Staff Payne* could elaborate on why there were 29 comments under bike related to the Posey Tube.

Staff Payne responded that these comments were from bicyclists traveling between Oakland and Alameda on the west end of the city. The Posey Tube has a narrow path and buses only have two slots for bikes on the racks. The City will begin a shuttle between the College of Alameda and Laney College to address this issue starting this summer.

Close public hearing.

No action was taken.

4B. “Going Forward” Community Planning Strategy for Alameda Point

Staff Khan explained the “Going Forward” effort and assisted the Commission members in completing the transportation and access section of the workbook.

Open public hearing.

Commissioner Tribuzio stated that bicyclists want a bridge across the estuary and it would be very important for future planning. Due to the future building on Alameda Point, there will be more traffic. However, the bridge is a conflict with the relocation of the Coast Guard.

Jon Spangler – as a charter Transportation Member – stated that he has a problem with the zero sum ranking order. It is clear that if all ten elements with high density housing units are implemented then it will have a significant impact on traffic; however, if one is missing then the whole thing will go up in smoke. However, all ten elements can reduce Alameda’s carbon emissions. All the elements are critical. He also stated that he hoped that it would not exclude development to Alameda Point.

Jim Straelo stated that he valued the “additional comments” section the most. He liked that he could add additional comments. He found fault that it was not possible to rank others additional comments. He wants everyone to come up with comments that are outside the box like:

- Circulator Systems that would allow buses to go around Alameda Point and bring them to the buses on Webster Street
- More pedestrian walkways through the tubes
- Instead of one central hub, he liked the idea of having several neighborhood hubs spread throughout the city to match the housing that will be there

He also thought that it was not smart to not have parking for townhomes. Even if residents did not need it, their guests might. Jim restated to not just limit ideas to the workbook.

Commissioner Tribuzio responded that the design is to get people out of their cars. Building townhomes where people cannot park does not make sense due to the high prices for the homes and the fact that people have cars and will drive them. *Tribuzio* also stated that the ranking order did not make sense.

Staff Khan responded that he just wanted to encourage the community participation to see where priorities lie. *Khan* reassured them that all written comments will be taken in consideration and will not be ignored.

Commissioner Bertken agreed with Spangler that it is not consistent, and it is not good to have trade offs.

Commissioner Vargas asked that the youth be considered and wanted to make sure to accommodate skateboarders. Since the average age is growing higher, it is important to have ADA standards.

Commissioner Moehring stated that the intention is not to pick one and solve the problem, but to create alternatives.

Commissioner Bertken asked how will the trade offs be done.

Staff Khan gave an example that the BRT forum thought it was a good idea for the BRT to go to 12th Street BART but BRT to Fruitvale BART did not come up as a higher priority.

Commissioner Moehring stated that the City cannot develop it all at once. It is a matter of gauging the impact and figuring out where to start. *Moehring* stated that it all had to be done at some point.

Close public hearing.

5. Staff Communications

Request to Start Transportation Commission Meetings at 7:00 PM

Commissioner Vargas moved to recommend that the meetings begin at 7:00 p.m. *Commissioner Tribuzio* seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0.

511 SchoolPool RideMatch (<https://www.schoolpool.511.org>)

Staff Payne explained the new program.

Future Meeting Agenda Items

Staff Payne stated that future meeting agenda items for the March meeting look to be as follows:

Countywide Transportation Plan/Transportation Expenditure Plan
Quarterly Report
TSM/TDM Plan – Preliminary Alternative Strategies

6. Announcements

Jon Spangler stated that \$5,000 was in the budget for new bicycle parking. It would be an excellent use to install new bike racks. Spangler suggested that the staff and community take it into consideration.

Commissioner Moehring stated that Webster Street has more bike racks. With more awareness, more will come.

Jim Straehlo stated that some bike racks are preferred over other types depending on how many can be parked at a time.

7. Adjournment

8:45 PM