

DRAFT
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MINUTES
December 13, 2006

Chair Knox White called the Transportation Commission to order at [7:30] p.m.

1. ROLL CALL: Roll was called and the following recorded.

Members Present:

John Knox White

Michael Krueger

Robb Ratto

Eric Schatmeier

Srikant Subramaniam

Members Absent:

Jeff Knoth

Robert McFarland

Staff Present:

Obaid Khan, Supervising Civil Engineer

Barry Bergman, Program Specialist II

Eric Fonstein, Economic Development Coordinator, Development Services Dept.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Approval of October 25 and November 15, 2006 Minutes. *Chair Knox White* advised that there was not a quorum to vote on the minutes of October 25, 2006.

Chair Knox White advised that there was not a quorum to vote on the minutes of November 15, 2006 minutes.

3. **AGENDA CHANGES**

There were none.

4. **COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS**

- a. Multimodal Circulation Plan
- b. Pedestrian Plan
- c. TSM/TDM Plan

Chair Knox White advised that none of the subcommittees had met yet. He noted that he received a letter advising that AC Transit was having a proposed review of ____ *[[burst of static on*

tape) service deployment policies. He understood that those meetings would commence in January 2007.

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

6A. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE MULTIMODAL CIRCULATION SUBCOMMITTEE ON RECONCILING TMP POLICIES WITH THE 7 NEW POLICIES.

Staff Khan presented the staff report. He noted that on October 17, 2006, City Council approved the initiation of the process for a General Plan Amendment to incorporate the Transportation Master Plan policies and the seven additional policies recommended by the Transportation Commission. Following the meeting, the Transportation Commission met in October, and the Commissioners asked the Multimodal Circulation Subcommittee to examine the TMP policies to determine whether any conflicts existed. If conflicts did exist, they were requested to address and reconcile the policies. The Subcommittee met after that meeting and developed recommendations, including minor changes to the TMP policies, as well as a substantial change to Policy 7 of the EIR policies. He detailed the changes in the policies as described in the staff report. The staff recommendations were intended to ensure that if Policy 7 were to be implemented, and if a certain level of congestion were to be accepted in certain locations in the City, some thresholds would be established that would take into account the impacts that may be generated from the increase in congestion.

Staff Khan described the current CEQA process in detail. Staff recommended that Policy 7 be strengthened so that if the TSM or TDM measures were implemented, they would be verifiable on an annual basis. If they were not being met, additional measures would be implemented. Staff requested that the Commission examine the changes recommended by the Subcommittee and by staff, and to approve the changes with the changed policies as recommended by staff.

Public Comment

There were no speakers.

Closed Public Comment

Commissioner Krueger noted that he was trying to reconcile how staff's wording related to the goal of strengthening the TDM language. He noted that the second set of language seemed to put conditions on when unmitigated congestion could be accepted with TDM. He believed that weakened the intent of Policy 7 as he understood it.

Staff Khan noted that Policy 5 addressed the issue of pedestrian and bicyclist impacts, which they tried to tie to Policy 7, and which strengthened Policy 7 in establishing thresholds.

A discussion of the impacts and thresholds ensued.

Chair Knox White noted that the Subcommittee had addressed Item B-2.1 by email, and came to the consensus that changing “*protect*” to “*promote* residential neighborhood integrity” actually weakened the proposed language. He believed that the following four lines appeared to be editorializing, rather than making a policy statement. He did not believe it was necessary, and did not believe it added anything to the policy. Regarding Item 7, he recalled that Commissioner McFarland stated that the first part of it was nearly a duplication of the next statement regarding the implementation and verification of a quantifiable TSM. He believed the language as written, which included words such as “could be” instead of “are going to be,” significantly reduced the effectiveness of Policy 7.

Commissioner Schatmeier agreed with the lack of necessity on Item B-2.1 in Policy 7, and believed that the first sentence was superfluous.

Commissioner Krueger noted that the word “yearly” was included to specify a timeline for verification, and inquired how important the yearly verification was.

Chair Knox White inquired once the EIR was passed, and the mitigations accepted, what the addition of the language would do in terms of the City’s ability to do anything differently.

Staff Khan advised that if the EIR had indicated thresholds, such as a 10% reduction in trips, and if there was only a 5% reduction after the first year, the next level of TSM/TDM measures may be required.

Chair Knox White believed the intent of Policy 7 was to bring the City out of having to mitigate every possible piece of congestion at every possible intersection, which created an uncrossable environment at some intersections. He believed this language may be appropriate for the TDM plan, which would say that the TDM plan should have various phases to help achieve the TDM plan goals.

Staff Khan noted that there were two aspects of the language: to ensure the measures were verifiable and quantifiable, and to ensure that when the EIR was done, that the public would be fully aware of the impacts if a certain level of congestion were to be accepted.

Chair Knox White noted that part of the EIR process was to identify and call out congestion. He did not understand how the additional language accomplished that goal, other than to say it “can be decided.”

A discussion of level of service language and other wordsmithing items ensued.

Commissioner Krueger noted that he was inclined to accept Attachment 1 as it is, and he suggested that specific language be added to state that the congestion should be quantified. He believed the City should have clarification on the number of minutes traffic would be delayed. He suggested that language be added explicitly stating that the facts would be put on the table.

Chair Knox White inquired whether the following language would be acceptable: “During the EIR process, the full extent of congestion at intersections will be disclosed beyond the LOS letter.”

Commissioner Krueger concurred with that suggestion.

Chair Knox White suggested the following language, “This unmitigated congestion should be expressly evaluated and disclosed during the EIR process, and acknowledged as a byproduct of the development.”

Commissioner Krueger suggested adding the following language, “The alternate methods of transportation, impacts of pedestrians, bicycles, queues at intersections, driveway access” as examples of the kind of disclosure being discussed. He added that including the language, “could be included, but not limited to...” as an example of the kind of things to be disclosed.

Staff Khan thanked the Commissioners for the specific language, and believed that would be useful.

Chair Knox White suggested: “This unmitigated congestion should be evaluated and disclosed,” and if staff wished to discuss queues at intersection, that would be included in the LOS discussion.

Staff Khan noted that LOS addressed delays, but did not take queues into account. He noted that the queue analysis was performed as part of the model that examined LOS at intersections.

Commissioner Ratto moved to accept staff recommendation with the changes discussed by the Commission, including the addition of the language “This unmitigated congestion should be evaluated and disclosed (including intersection delay length of time) during the EIR process, and acknowledges a byproduct of the development.”). *Commissioner Schatmeier* seconded. Motion passed, 5-0.

6B. REVIEW AND PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS ON DRAFT FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM CONCEPTS * 2ND PRESENTATION.

Staff Khan presented the staff report, and noted that the consultant, DKS, would continue the presentation. He noted that DKS had examined what other cities throughout the country had done. They reviewed the cities’ existing functional classification systems, and discussed them with personnel from the other cities, resulting in recommendations and changes to the functional classification maps and overlays. Staff requested the Commission’s recommendations and input for staff and the consultant. Staff would return with the final recommendations and changes in January 2007, and would present the final report at that time.

Mark Spencer, DKS Associates, continued the presentation on the Street Functional Classification System work that they had undertaken with City staff. He presented the overview of the material covered in the previous meeting, and displayed a PowerPoint presentation

discussing the candidate streets and the primary concerns for each street, such as speed, access, function, design features, land use and other elements explained in the report. This information was compiled into a matrix table, which *Mr. Spencer* displayed on the overhead screen. He described the methodology for creating the report and the maps. He noted that the pedestrian access layer was removed, as all streets have pedestrian access and are integrated in the grid system. *Mr. Spencer* indicated that there are two key recommendations: 1) implementation policy to recommend design standards, and 2) prioritization and decision-making framework to address stakeholder concerns and conflict resolution.

Chair Knox White noted that one step recommended an implementation process for creating design standards, and inquired whether it was intended to accomplish that before or after the EIR process. *Staff Khan* believed it would be more beneficial if it was part of the GPA, and that staff recommended it be accomplished before that. Staff was in the RFP process for the consultant, and hoped that by the end of January, a consultant would be found for the GPA analysis. If the Multimodal Circulation Subcommittee could meet within the next month and provide some recommendations, he hoped staff could return in January to discuss the implementation policies.

Public Comment

Jim Strehlow inquired whether the map depicted existing or proposed streets, because the Clement Avenue went all the way through. *Mr. Spencer* replied that it depicted proposed streets. *Mr. Strehlow* inquired whether the street segments would be published in a PDF file so the public could comment on the classifications. *Mr. Spencer* replied that would be possible, although they were currently unreadable; a new PDF version would be posted on the TMP website on the City's website. A higher resolution version would be posted for readability.

Commissioner Krueger noted that a PDF file would have more flexibility for the user to zoom in on a segment of the map.

Closed Public Comment

Commissioner Krueger noted that Alameda had very mixed land uses, and inquired whether some cities had a mixed use classification, or whether the predominant use in a given area was used. *Mr. Spencer* replied that most cities had mixed use land uses, and that most cities have not undertaken this on a citywide basis; rather a more focused scope was used, within a neighborhood or street corridor-type basis, which can change from block to block.

Commissioner Ratto noticed that on the land use map, part of Park Street was designated as a school and recreational area, which he noted was not correct. *Mr. Spencer* noted that was because of Island High, which would be moving. *Commissioner Ratto* added that Park Street was still not a school zone. He noted that it was a Commercial zone, and inquired why it was labeled that way. *Staff Khan* noted that the way the Transportation Commission looked at the zones, there was a two-block radius around the school. *Mr. Spencer* noted that the zones were layered on top of the other, and that the classification on top was the most visible.

Commissioner Ratto noted that he had an issue with respect to the maps regarding the proposal to extend the truck route all the way down Park Street, from the bridge to Alameda Towne Center. He agreed with the changing classification of Park Street, noting that from the Encinal to Otis Drive, it changes into residential, as well as one lane in each direction. He had a huge problem with that being designated a truck route so that it would increase the truck congestion during the day. After Alameda Towne Center finishes its improvements, he believed the congestion could become severe.

Staff Khan noted that was a very good point, and added that staff would examine it further.

Mr. Spencer added that staff questioned them on that item as well, and he noted that the alternative was more circuitous truck routing. Normally, they would want to take a more direct route.

Commissioner Ratto noted that his association, the Park Street Business Association, would fight that tooth and nail.

Staff Khan noted that if trucks made deliveries to a certain destination, they would be allowed to use that street for delivery access. Truck routes were defined as handling through traffic.

In response to an inquiry by *Chair Knox White* whether the City had truck count information, *Staff Khan* replied that classification counts were performed as part of City studies, and that he could look into it further.

Commissioner Schatmeier complimented DKS on the quality of the report, and added that he had questioned the need for hiring a consultant to do this kind of work. He had previously expressed dismay at duplicating work that had been already done by the Transportation Commission. He believed that the work shown at this meeting had not substantially added to the work previously done by the Transportation Commission. He noted that the subcommittee consisting of *Commissioners Knox White, McFarland* and himself had been cognizant of the funding needs, and also vetted their work with community workshops and other Commissions within the City.

Commissioner Krueger inquired whether the arterial spacing guidelines on Table 3-2 (page 7) referred to a national standard designed to apply to all cities. *Mr. Spencer* confirmed that was correct. *Commissioner Krueger* was surprised to see on page 8 the spacing of arterials that seemed very dense, given the Alameda population of 70,000 people. He would have expected to see that spacing for New York or Chicago, and inquired about the thinking behind the number of arterials. *Mr. Spencer* replied that Alameda had very short blocks with tight spacing and a lot of traffic interruption. In addition, the grid pattern was very dense. He noted that Alameda did not have many collectors, and that the main part of the Island was mostly grid.

Commissioner Krueger noted that given that Alameda was not an intense, highly dense urban core, it may make sense to make some of the streets collectors, and have fewer arterials. He inquired about the rationale behind not doing that. *Mr. Spencer* replied that it was not just the density, but also how the street functioned. Regardless of the amount of volume, the traffic experienced in Alameda was set up so that most of the streets functioned in a very equivalent

manner. He noted that if Alameda doubled in population, and if the traffic doubled, the streets would still function similarly, but with much more volume, and assuming they could handle the capacity.

Chair Knox White expressed concern about the way arterials were currently defined, and believed that the current plan as set up seemed to completely contradict one of the main themes of the Alameda General Plan, which was de-emphasis of the automobile. He believed that, as proposed, the plan was completely out of compliance with the current, as well as the soon-to-be-updated, General Plan. Regarding the classifications, he was surprised that there was a lot of landscaping design, and that street widths were not called out in the matrix, that the work from the subcommittee regarding the number of lanes for various types of arterials was left out, and that the traffic calming had been left out as well. He inquired why the lanes and the traffic calming had been left out. *Staff Khan* thanked *Chair Knox White* for his comments, and did not see any reason why that could not be included. He noted that the consultant tried to incorporate that by examining the buffers, including landscaping, for residential. He noted that by reducing the street grid, the perception of the motorists would result in traffic calming. *Chair Knox White* noted that he liked the landscaping very much.

A discussion of the subcommittee's work as it related to this current report ensued.

Chair Knox White noted that on page 10, two goals were expressed in 3.2, "preserving arterial functionality" and "improving residential livability." He was not sure that they were not opposing goals. He suggested that the Transportation Commission hold further discussion regarding those two goals. He noted that it was difficult to back out of your driveway into fast-moving traffic.

With respect to land use overlays, *Chair Knox White* believed the gateways were a landscaping category, which was acceptable to him. He believed that gateway prioritization should start with the highest occupancy vehicles and zero-emission modes, in other words, not moving the most cars, but the most people.

With respect to residential corridors, *Chair Knox White* inquired whether they were only for arterials, because he believed the map contained collector streets that were not called out as residential corridors, despite being 100% residential. *Mr. Spencer* noted that he would look at that issue on the map, and added that many arterials were also residential corridors, which led to the conflict pointed out by *Chair Knox White*.

Chair Knox White noted the language on page 13 read, "On-street parking preservation is to be encouraged over other pedestrian and bicycle improvements if there is insufficient right of way." He noted that the Transportation Commission had attempted to address that issue in a slightly different way, which was, "The preservation of on-street parking should be encouraged when there is no adjacent off-street parking available and additional width is needed for pedestrian and bicycle..." He noted that if you were next to a parking lot or garage, it should be acceptable to install the bike lanes as a buffer, or other improvements.

Chair Knox White noted that on page 25, the arterial overlay matrix, the automobile column essentially focused on peak vehicular mobility and capacity at all times. He noted that the original intent of the TC Subcommittee, using the modal overlays, was to outline a network of usable bike and transit systems that allowed for the City to create that system, including bike lanes. He noted that for the bicycle priority overlay, the intent was to prioritize the streets for bike improvements. He was concerned that by naming every street in Alameda that went across the Island an arterial, and then stating that the street would be designed to carry as much traffic as possible to meet the capacity and maximize flow, the City was limiting itself in the ability to do any bike or transit planning.

Chair Knox White noted that on page 31, he believed the language, "...providing a comfortable pedestrian environment," should be more fully fleshed out.

Chair Knox White noted that the parking part of the matrix was the same everywhere, and he believed that there should be street parking wherever it is feasible.

Chair Knox White noted that he was willing to accept that there would not be pedestrian zones, and noted that the definition of a pedestrian zone was difficult to define. He noted that the subcommittee was not particularly supportive of the idea of pedestrian corridors as a meaningful concept. He complimented the consultant on reflecting that in the matrix. Regarding the bike map, he would like to see the subcommittee's bike map, which included new streets for future use. He noted that they did not call out the classifications. He asked that the transit overlay be called "transit priority" instead of "transit preferred", and that the original subcommittee's definition of a primary transit street be included in the documentation. He complimented the consultant on the transit map, and noted that the consultants elevated Lincoln from a primary transit street to an exclusive transit right of way street, which he would not argue with. He noted that there was a caveat after the description of the three kinds of street which said, "Streets not classified as either primary, secondary or exclusive transit right of way could nevertheless be used by such nontraditional transit services as neighborhood shuttles, paratransit, electric buses, etc. Nonclassification does not preclude specialized school routes of full-size buses as necessary."

Chair Knox White believed that if the multimodal overlays were prioritized, he believed most of the conflicts between the uses should be discovered before the document is adopted. He summarized the approaches taken by several other cities that were studied. He believed that any process that goes forward should honor and acknowledge the Transportation Master Plan that was passed by the City Council. He concurred with *Commissioner Schatmeier's* statement that the document was well-done and readable, and added that the matrices enhanced the clarity of the work. *Staff Khan* thanked the Chair for his comments.

Commissioner Krueger noted that he would submit further comments to staff via email. *Staff Khan* requested that *Chair Knox White* submit his comments and modifications to staff as well.

Commissioner Schatmeier supported the idea of developing an implementation policy, and would like to participate in that. He inquired what that would be based upon.

Chair Knox White suggested that the Commission address that issue during the January 2007 meeting, after the proposal final draft is distributed. *Staff Khan* requested that the additional information be returned to staff by February in order to be included in the GPA process.

Mr. Spencer thanked the Commission on the level of effort and detail in responding to the document. He noted that the use of the terms “arterials,” “collectors” and “local streets” would be difficult to precisely define, and noted that the use of the terms allowed eligibility for funding and consistency with County-wide, regional, and state plans. He noted that funding was the primary reason for continued use of those terms.

No action was taken.

7A. CITY OF ALAMEDA BUSINESS AREA PARKING STUDY

Eric Fonstein, Economic Development Coordinator, Development Services Department, presented the staff report describing the parking study for the two business districts. He described the study’s background and scope, and advised that the goal was to provide a framework for a comprehensive strategy to manage and regulate parking in the rejuvenating business districts. He noted that the Park Street business district had changed since the last study with the additions of many new retail businesses such as Starbucks and Peet’s Coffee. He noted that the consultant, Wilbur Smith, was completing the first technical memo, which reviews and analyzes the existing parking conditions for both on- and off-street parking, including public and private lots. He noted that the study would eventually contain five technical memos: Existing Conditions, Demand, Loading Zone, Analyzing the Parking Code/Alternative Code Requirements, and Parking Management Plans/Incentives for Parking Facilities.

Staff Fonstein noted that after the findings were concluded in the spring, staff would return to the districts and community workshops to present the findings. Staff would then come before the Transportation Commission, EDC, Planning Board and the City Council to present the final report for approval.

Commissioner Ratto suggested that the study area be extended up to the estuary.

Staff Fonstein noted that the first task, data collection, was nearly complete, and that it would stretch the study budget to return to the field and extend the study area.

Commissioner Ratto noted that data was collected between 7 and 9, he suggested that the hours be extended to 10. He also suggested that the weekend hours be earlier. He requested an updated work schedule.

Commissioner Krueger was surprised that the study area for Park Street (Figure 3 map) went so far west, near Walnut Street, but did not extend as far east to Broadway. He inquired why the study area was so lopsided. *Mr. Fonstein* noted that the map was drawn erroneously.

Commissioner Krueger asked why the Webster Street area is so much narrower than the Park Street area.

Staff Fonstein responded that study areas respond to the areas where there are parking restrictions. He advised that a draft recommendation would be presented to the Commission in the spring.

There was no action.

Chair Knox White requested a motion to continue the meeting.

<p><i>Commissioner Schatmeier</i> moved to continue the meeting past 10:00 p.m. <i>Commissioner Krueger</i> seconded. Motion passed, 5-0.</p>

7B. STATUS OF RED-CURBING FOR BUS STOPS

Staff Bergman provided an update on the efforts to improve accessibility at the City's bus stops. Based on guidelines and discussions with AC Transit, it was determined that 55 feet of red curb was sufficient at the nearside bus stops, and 65 feet at the far side stops; the City began to provide those improvements. The table attached to the report indicated where there were deficiencies. At 23 of the locations, additional red curb was required; some of those could be addressed administratively because only one space was required; the other locations would be brought to the TTT. Twenty-seven of the stops on the list were only served by either school routes or Transbay peak hour-only routes; signage would be used to have minimal impact to allow parking on the weekends and other times when buses were not running. Ten other stops had individual situations that needed to be resolved. The staff report indicated that the 60 locations will be taken to the TTT beginning in February, and after internal discussion, it would be done more quickly than originally planned if there was not significant opposition. The staff report indicated that red curbing was removed from some locations, and after further investigation, it was determined that nearly all of them resulted from bus stop consolidations. The only stops affected by that were those that were being relocated.

Commissioner Ratto noted that in the staff report it states that red curb was removed after it had previously been approved. *Staff Bergman* replied that was the result of an internal miscommunication, and investigation of most of those sites were the result of consolidation.

Commissioner Krueger inquired whether there were any instances where the red curbs were removed, but the bus stop signs were not; he recalled that there were several instances on Encinal. *Staff Bergman* noted that at Mound, there was a bus stop, and that red curb needed to be put in.

Chair Knox White thanked staff for compiling the database.

No action was taken.

7C. SELECTION OF A TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM MANAGEMENT/TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (TSM/TDM) SUB-PLAN SUBCOMMITTEE.

Staff Khan presented the staff report, and noted that staff would like to complete the TSM/TDM plan by the end of 2007, with implementation anticipated to begin by the end of 2007. Staff requested that the Transportation Commission appoint a subcommittee to work on developing the policy's objectives for this sub-plan. He noted that the subcommittee would participate in identification of thresholds for peak hour trip reduction, revise existing Citywide ordinance on TSM/TDM programs, develop management and operation procedures for the Transportation Management Associations, and support the establishment of fees to administer the TSM/PDM programs. Staff would work with the subcommittee to establish the policies, goals and objectives as soon as possible.

Chair Knox White noted that he would be willing to participate in the subcommittee, and that this was an issue of interest to him. He anticipated one meeting per month.

Commissioner Ratto volunteered to participate in the subcommittee.

Commissioner Subramaniam volunteered to participate in the subcommittee.

8. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

Staff Khan inquired whether the Commissioner s had taken the ethics training course. He noted that they were due by the end of the year, and could be taken online.

Meeting adjourned at 10:25 p.m.