

**Transportation Commission**  
**March 23, 2016**  
**Item 4A**

**Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes**  
**Wednesday January 27, 2016**

*Commissioner Michele Bellows* called the Transportation Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

**1. Roll Call**

Roll was called and the following was recorded:

Members Present:

Michele Bellows (Chair)  
Eric Schatmeier (Vice Chair)  
Jesus Vargas  
Christopher Miley  
Gregory Morgado  
Thomas G. Bertken

Members Absent:

Michael Hans

Staff Present:

Staff Patel, Transportation Engineer  
Staff Payne, Transportation Coordinator

**2. Agenda Changes**

*None.*

**3. Announcements / Public Comments**

*Arnold Brillinger*, Alameda Resident, said he was recently appointed to the Commission on Disability Issues (CDI) and he wanted to introduce himself. He explained that the CDI wanted members of the Commission to attend other Alameda Commissions and Boards in order to network. He went on to say that he will be attending the Transportation Commission meetings from now on and another member, *Tony Lewis*, would also like to attend.

*Jim Strehlow*, Alameda resident, said last year he highlighted the fact that a sign on High Street and San Leandro Boulevard was in disrepair and he wanted to publically thank *Staff Patel* for replacing the sign. He also explained that there was an unfinished business item at the stretch between Webster Street along Atlantic and Willie Stargell Avenues. He said the section where

there is a bus only lane and two 45 mph traffic lanes creates discomfort for bicyclists who are comfortable on Webster Street because there is no other safe place to go when riding down towards the tube. He suggested that AC Transit consider sharing the bus only lane with cyclists and there are other places in Alameda that share the lane with cyclists.

*Commissioner Miley* asked staff if that could be reviewed and eventually brought back as a future agenda item. He also asked staff if Alameda Public Works controls the striping.

*Staff Patel* replied that the bus only lane would be Caltrans, so he would have to approach them.

Next Transportation Commission meeting would be **Wednesday, March 23, 2015**

## **4. Consent Calendar**

### ***4.A. Transportation Commission Minutes – Approve Meeting Minutes – May 27, 2015***

*Jim Strehlow* referred to the May 27, 2015 minutes. He explained that it was not until the July meeting that the Commission decided to rescind the approval of the meeting minutes. Additionally, he said the revised minutes did not state that *Jim Strehlow* made corrections to the minutes after the Commission approved the minutes and then the Commission decided to rescind the minutes until further review.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* replied the minutes are a sense of the meeting and the Commission does not approve a transcript.

### ***4.B. Transportation Commission Minutes – Approve Meeting Minutes – November 18, 2015***

<p><i>Commissioner Miley</i> moved to approve the minutes of May 27, 2015 with the notation that when the Commission originally approved the minutes <i>Jim Strehlow</i> then spoke and made corrections. The Commission then rescinded the vote and reviewed the minutes. <i>Commissioner Miley</i> also moved to approve the minutes of November 18, 2015 and <i>Commissioner Schatmeier</i> seconded the motions. The motions were approved 6-0.</p>
---

## **5. New Business**

### ***5.A. Election of Chair and Vice Chair***

*Commissioner Miley* felt that the Commission recently voted around mid-last year.

*Staff Patel* replied he was not involved in that process.

*Commissioner Bellows* replied because *Commissioner Vargas* took more responsibility with High Speed Rail it was around January 2015.

*Commissioner Miley* said he would like to nominate *Commissioner Bellows* as chair since she has been doing such a great job.

*Commissioner Vargas* replied he seconded the nomination.

*Commissioner Bellows* asked for nominations for Vice Chair.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* said he was happy to serve, but if someone else wanted the position he would not mind.

<p><i>Commissioner Bellows</i> moved to approve the re-election of chair and vice chair. <i>Commissioner Miley</i> seconded the motion. The motion was approved 6-0.</p>
--

### ***5.B. Quarterly Report***

*Staff Patel* presented the report.

*Commissioner Bellows* asked staff about the historic lights at the tubes project and wondered if there would be changeable message signs around a week or two ahead.

*Staff Patel* replied yes.

*Commissioner Bellows* asked staff to have the Broadway/Jackson project team come to speak at a future Commission meeting.

*Commissioner Miley* asked staff when the project will be presented to the Commission.

*Staff Patel* replied he would ask the project team, but right now the team is preparing a hybridized version of the project.

*Commissioner Bellows* asked staff since the Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC) would present, would the city of Oakland present as well.

*Staff Patel* replied only ACTC.

*Commissioner Vargas* stated that the report was comprehensive, but there was a need to update the report with the status of target dates. He explained that the next steps for some did not have target dates, for instance the Webster Street Smart Corridor Project.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* stated that the next steps for the Transit and the Transit Demand Management (TDM) plans were well out of date since the Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued.

*Staff Payne* replied that the update on the transit plan and TDM was taken last week where the City approved the consultant team and that it now starts out with an 18 month effort. She also explained that the agreement was signed last week, so the first deliverables will be a near term solution and that will require input from the Commission four different times.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* said in regards to the Estuary Crossing Shuttle he saw an AC Transit

route that was duplicative of the shuttle. So, he wanted to know the funding plan and if staff conducts the coordination of the shuttle and AC Transit route. He requested that staff report on that issue.

***5.C. Approve City of Alameda Paratransit Program Plan for Fiscal Year 2015/2016 (Rochelle Wheeler, Public Works)***

*Rochelle Wheeler*, Alameda Public Works Transportation Planner, presented the report.

*Commissioner Bellows* asked *Rochelle Wheeler* about the \$217,000 balance and whether there was a use or lose it provision stated in Measure BB.

*Rochelle Wheeler* replied there are requirements for not having more than 50 percent of your funds in reserves and 10 percent in unallocated reserves. She went on to say that this program has been established to make sure they stay within those requirements. So, ultimately they could keep the money that was not spent.

*Commissioner Bellows* asked for the timeline of hiring a transportation expert.

*Rochelle Wheeler* replied they expect this position to be advertised in the next month and then they would conduct interviews and hire someone. Overall, she said it should be a fairly quick process.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* asked *Rochelle Wheeler* if there were one or two stops that dominate the use of the shuttle, meaning were there places that people board on and off board consistently.

*Rochelle Wheeler* replied she cannot speak to the data on the top of her head. Yet, she explained that the contractor provides ridership on people who are boarding at every stop for each shuttle run and they will look at this closely.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* asked *Rochelle Wheeler* if there was specific data or survey information to make Fruitvale BART the right place to extend this service.

*Rochelle Wheeler* replied she works with the staff at the Mastick Senior Center and they interface quite a bit, so there is a high demand for that location.

*Commissioner Vargas* stated that he was glad to see the graphs and data. He asked *Rochelle Wheeler* if there was new data beyond January 2015 to get an idea of what occurred in the last year. He also, inquired about the volunteer driver program, Mobility Matters, especially regarding the insurance covered.

*Rochelle Wheeler* replied data was available and she could compile the information for a future meeting. She stated that the information reported for this meeting was using data for the fiscal year of June 2015. Regarding insurance, she explained that this was an ongoing issue which they

are concerned about. However, she said the standard practice when providing service within Alameda County was to check for requirements in order to maintain driver standards. She also mentioned that ACTC contracts with them.

*Commissioner Miley* referred to the budget and he wondered how much they are expecting annually from Measures B and BB. He asked *Rochelle Wheeler* if the \$360,000 is to remain flat or grow or are they conservative with those estimates. He further explained that currently they are spending \$100,000 over revenues if you do not count the surplus. So, he was concerned that the City may expand and grow the service faster than the revenues coming in.

*Rochelle Wheeler* replied the revenue goes up and estimates are received every year from ACTC and go up minimally each year. She acknowledged *Commissioner Miley's* point and said staff would analyze this.

*Commissioner Miley* stated that getting to BART is important to provide connections to regional services. He inquired about whether the program provides travel training to work or offer travel training services.

*Rochelle Wheeler* said they are not conducting travel training now. Yet, that could be something they look into or they could partner with some of the groups that are currently doing this.

*Commissioner Bellows* opened the floor for public comment.

*Arnold Brillinger* stated that he uses the Thursday shuttle and most of the passengers get on and off at the Trader Joes at South Shore Center and Mastick Senior Center.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* replied that the reason he asked about the data because way back when the City considered implementing a shuttle he voted against the proposal because the shuttle design breaks a whole lot of transportation rules. He explained that the shuttle schedule had limited days and hours and required lots of money for service that is less than the disabled should have. He thought the City could beef up other paratransit services, but he has been pleasantly surprised by the ridership although they break all the rules. He felt maybe there is a way to fix the service by looking to see if there are single destinations and origins that dominate. He believed three different routes are not necessary if the Mastick Senior Center and Trader Joes dominate every route. He said to send these shuttles where no one is going does not make sense to him. He would like to see higher frequencies where the same route runs on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday every 30 minutes then passengers can count on something. He thought a consultant could look into this idea.

*Arnold Brillinger* replied they do have a tally that the shuttle drivers mark down when the riders board. He said there is a stop near his home and for a year, he called *Staff Payne* once a month asking when the stop become active. *Staff Payne* eventually said they have to change the schedule and a few other things, but she did call him back to state that his persistence paid off and the stop will be there.

*Commissioner Miley* stated that he was encouraged to hear this factored into the TDM transportation planning process because it is important. He reiterated the questions about the

budget and how staff should be mindful if the economy takes a dip because the service is tied to sales tax dollars. He said he would like to see the reserves stay as close to the allowable limit as possible in order to have it for a rainy day. Additionally, he said he would like to see travel training included as part of the outreach and marketing effort. He mentioned that he knows Alameda County has an open data initiative in order for the public to view and download information. He would like, if possible, to provide that information some how on the City's website on a rolling basis to see how the City's programs are working.

<p><i>Commissioner Schatmeier</i> moved to approve staff recommendations. <i>Commissioner Miley</i> seconded the motion. The motion was approved 6-0.</p>
---

#### ***5.D. Cross Alameda Trail – Atlantic Segment (Rochelle Wheeler, Public Works)***

*Rochelle Wheeler* presented the report.

*Commissioner Bellows* said the total traffic delay was measured in hours and she understood that, but she wanted to know what the total delay in number of stops would be. She asked staff to clarify.

*Staff Patel* replied the table that was shown in the exhibit pertains to conducting an arterial level of service analysis. Therefore, it was looking at the average speed base Level of Service (LOS) in the existing condition versus the delay.

*Commissioner Bellows* asked staff what was the delay in number of hours. She said the information says eastbound equals one hour and with the recommended option, it increases to 2 hours, but that does not make sense.

*Staff Patel* replied it does not make sense in this case because staff is only looking at speed and how the speed drops with the lane configuration.

*Commissioner Bellows* replied so what is the number of stops.

*Staff Patel* replied the number of stops is how often the traffic was stopped and what the queuing impact was. He went on to say that staff will have to explain this more carefully. He stated that staff has not done the detail analysis for the LOS at the intersection. However, he said staff will come back to the Commission and report the LOS including queuing in more detail.

*Commissioner Bertken* asked staff if they actually made the traffic volume counts on the movements and if that information was available.

*Staff Patel* said yes and staff has traffic volume, pedestrian, bicycle and transit counts.

*Commissioner Bertken* explained to staff that it would be helpful to review the data available in order to review the impacts.

*Commissioner Morgado* asked staff if they looked at the number of people driving out of the driveway next to Starbucks.

*Staff Patel* replied yes they did.

*Commissioner Vargas* asked staff about the costs, approximately \$200,000, with regard to the median barrier. The report indicated that it could be a median barrier or delineator, but he wanted to know if there was a cost difference between the two.

*Staff Patel* said staff looked to make sure the drainage was not disrupted. He explained the type of delineators they are looking at are similar to the ones at Jackson and 5<sup>th</sup> Streets, which are mountable and close to each other so they do not get knocked down.

*Commissioner Vargas* asked staff about whether the cost was already covered in the \$200,000.

*Staff Patel* replied yes.

*Commissioner Bertken* said he was concerned about the safety of the bicyclists in connection with the right turn onto Constitution Way. He said he has seen this problem in San Francisco where they have a through street where motorists drive fast and pedestrians get hit when they step off the curb. He felt this was a particular problem when cyclists are traveling fast and the driver cannot see behind him and try to turn. He wondered how the traffic control that has been identified protects the bicyclists cycling straight across.

*Staff Patel* replied staff would look into erecting signage with a time limit on right turn restrictions or possibly a right turn on red.

*Commissioner Bertken* replied then the bicyclists cannot go straight.

*Staff Patel* stated that the bicyclists could go straight if they have a non-conflicting movement. However, he understood his point with an issue of conflict.

*Commissioner Bertken* felt this was an important issue because this area has a number of problems.

*Staff Patel* replied the Atlantic Avenue and Constitution Way intersection only has 40-50 vehicles making right turn movements per hour during peak times.

*Commissioner Bertken* said he would like to possibly see the bicyclists receive a straight go through signal, which would prevent the right turn for automobiles.

*Rochelle Wheeler* stated that staff would look into this further and they would make sure to reduce those conflicts. She went on to say that another option would be to bring cyclists further up towards the intersection so they are visible to turning cars.

*Staff Patel* replied there are other options such as a bike box.

*Commissioner Bellows* opened the floor to public comments

*Austin Lee*, AC Transit Transportation Planner, said he would like to work with City staff to develop an alternative to the proposal because AC Transit staff was not aware of the design concepts until that day. He explained that although they have not fully reviewed the design, upon initial glance the proposal presented would remove a lane of traffic and remove a bus stop. He stated that this bus stop has the third highest boardings for this particular route. He also exclaimed that the Estuary Crossing Shuttle stops at the bus stop on Atlantic Avenue and Webster Street headed eastbound. Yet, he felt there are alternatives and they could look at this further in order to ensure that everyone benefits from the project.

*Jim Sweeney*, representing Jim Sweeney Open Space Park Public Charitable Non profit foundation, stated that the foundation's purpose is to raise money for the park and maintain the park. He said he strongly endorsed staff's report and design and he believed the design met the many challenges and complexities while creating a practical and safe trail through the Alameda Trail gap and with the most reasonable impact on motor vehicle traffic. He looked forward to the refinement and implementation of the details and he urged the Commission to approve the recommendations.

*Brian McGuire*, Alameda resident, stated that staff made a cost affective solution to close the Cross Alameda Trail while having a key bike facility on this block. He said this option would be utilized by students and people headed to the ferries. He felt the presentation was a good example of why the state has stopped using LOS to evaluate some of these impacts. He pointed out that on this block, traffic calming on a two-way cycle track when mentioning speed not talking about cars flowing through was a feature not a bug. He said a protective bike facility was part of the grant application, which is part of the Jean Sweeney section of the path. So, when the project came before the Commission that disappeared and the City owes it to the project funders and users of the trail to do this. He exclaimed that without a dedicated bike facility here there would be a gap with people using the sidewalks and others all over the place because the area is not clearly defined. He ultimately felt that there are solutions to these problems and if motorists expect bikes there, then cars will see that and this will prevent accidents. He noted that one benefit would be once there is AC Transit service coming down that lane they could just shift over and you could add a left queue jump lane on Webster Street. Therefore, you are not really losing a lane here because this is not traffic going to the tube, but actually local traffic.

*Lucy Gigli*, President of Bike Walk Alameda, said she was pleased that staff worked with stakeholders to find a solution to serve the neighborhood and create a safe corridor. She could not stress the importance of this solution to connect the two pieces of the Cross Alameda Trail. She stated that without a simple and safe solution the intersection would create chaos. Thus, she asked the Commission to move this concept forward noting that some of the details like traffic and bicycle signals and moving the bus stop could be analyzed later.

*Michelle Ellison*, said providing a safe and continuous route for those who walk and bike was important. She explained that this plan was something that the City committed to, but the block proved to be challenging to deal with. She felt moving forward City staff has done a great job to quickly pull together a solution to a vexing problem by speaking to stakeholders and finding money to fund this and maintain the landscaping that merchants really value. She went on to say that it was not about the details of the plan, but to say to City staff that the Commission would like to move forward. Therefore, she urged the Commission to tell staff to develop this further.



*Jim Strehlow* stated that the Alameda Transportation Commission would soon become the Alameda Traffic Creation Congestion Commission with this type of design. He felt this was the worse type of design he has seen. He said to put up a cycle track would give a green light for cyclists to go faster than the vehicles that would be stopped in traffic along Atlantic Avenue. He said the reason the data was not shown in vehicle figures per hour, per minute because they are 100:1 of vehicles to bicyclists if not 200:1 on that section. Furthermore, he said if they take away a lane on Constitution Way there would be many vehicles making a right turn from Atlantic Avenue to Constitution Way because they are headed to South Shore and other locations. He explained that currently 6-7 cars back up trying to make a right turn. He said with one lane closed to Webster Street, cars will back up all the way to the driveway next to Walgreens and this will create a traffic nightmare. He pointed out that he uses the bus stop frequently in front of Walgreens that would be taken away. He suggested that staff design something using paint instead of a cycle track and staff would almost have to make a special traffic signal for bicycles and one for cars.

*Jon Spangler*, Alameda resident and a League of American Cycling Instructor, said he has been involved in this project since he joined the Cross Alameda Trail steering committee in 1999 or 2000 and served with *Lucy Gigli*. He stated that he was happy to see this interim proposal come before the Commission. He pointed to the fact that there was no law prohibiting cyclists to go faster in a safe way than the cars stuck in traffic next to them. He explained that the intersections of Atlantic Avenue, Webster Street and Constitution Way are already jammed up, so there would not be a huge difference in the future. He felt more people on transit would help the situation that is why AC Transit should be included in the discussion. As a lead cycling instructor he understood the need for bicyclists moving at the speed of traffic to be assured access to through traffic lanes and automobiles do not own those lanes. He noted that when the Webster Plaza was approved by the City Council around 1998, they removed the traffic access, 11-12 feet of easement, on the south side of Atlantic Avenue in order to provide enough parking to meet current code. He went on to say that City Council removed a legitimate Cross Alameda Trail right of way from the belt line railway access, which should be considered when looking at removing the sidewalk, landscape, and parking spaces in the Webster Square development in order to restore what was taken away. Otherwise, the City will never see a Bus Rapid Transit line across the island of Alameda, which was envisioned from the beginning. He stated that the data only included vehicle LOS and staff did not talk about pedestrian or bicycle speeds increasing in the area or increased safety and must be included in the final report. He felt the mid-block crossing was a good idea, as well as the cycle track and he suggested a lane configuration adjustment to reduce the traffic median from 6 feet to 4 or 3 feet. He believed that would give a 12-foot traffic lane going eastbound for automobiles and consequently make the cycle track 11 or 12 feet wide, which is safer. He explained that right hand turns from Atlantic Avenue to Constitution Way would be a legitimate issue. He felt a bike box could be a viable option or they could prohibit right turns from Atlantic Avenue to Constitution Way because there are other ways to get onto Constitution Way. Also, a pedestrian and bike scramble could work.

*Commissioner Miley* said *Jon Spangler* had many good ideas and he should share them with staff. He explained that he supported a cycle track because the track would be a safe, consistent and continuous trail all the way through. However, he was concerned with questions surrounding the data in order to understand the situations happening within the area. He was unaware of the

history surrounding the easement and that should be reviewed. He explained that although there's limited room because the community has been built out, the City has a right to the space and that should be considered and included in the staff report. He would like to know the limitations and concerns for the area and he felt staff would bring this back to the Commission because there is more to understand about the data and the right turn onto Constitution Way.

*Commissioner Vargas* said he supported many of the comments that *Commissioner Miley* made. He said in order to move this concept forward the Commission has to look at the analysis of removing one of the eastbound traffic lanes and that removal would be replaced with an 11-foot lane. He went on to say for the record he does not like narrow lanes for safety reasons especially since this is a heavy truck lane and there is no shoulder. He was concerned about the fact that AC Transit, Alameda Fire Department, or emergency responders were not brought to the table to collaborate because this is a safety facility that needs to be maintained. He would like staff to define the project because he heard the addition of a mid-block crossing, so would the City attempt to solve a number of things and if that was the case then put it out on the table to let the Commission analyze everything. However, he said the Commission was not ready to address this tonight.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* replied that he does not believe the concept was ready. He noted that staff recommendations state refine and implement the attached design concept. He said refinement was needed before implementation would take place, so he was not prepared to vote for both. Additionally, he was unsure when reviewing the design where the AC Transit bus stop would be placed due to safety concerns. He explained the concept could move forward, but the refinements were an important aspect of the plan and should be reported back to the Commission.

*Commission Bertken* replied the Commission could not go forward at this point in time because it would be a slap in the face towards AC Transit.

*Commissioner Bellows* stated there would be plenty of time because the two trail segments are currently being worked on. She noted that 14 emails were sent to the City in support and one email did not support the project. Yet, from what she has heard from the Commissioners was there should be more refinement, including discussions with AC Transit, Estuary Crossing and the Alameda Fire Department. She said the crosswalk concept and using some of the easement discussed should be analyzed further. Ultimately, she would like these issues to come back to the Commission for review.

*Commissioner Morgado* made a motion to approve the idea, but the Commission needs more information to be included in the update and AC Transit and the Estuary needed to be involved in the discussion. *Commissioner Miley* seconded the motion with an amendment to include staff to review the topics that were brought up by the Commission and speakers. The vote was approved 5-1. *Commissioner Vargas* voted no.

***5.E. Recommend Approval of the AC Transit Service Expansion Plan Buena Vista Avenue/Line 19 Alternative (Gail Payne, Community Development Department)***

*Staff Payne* presented the report.

*Commissioner Bellows* opened the floor to public comment.

*Jim Strehlow* said he would be speaking for a couple of his coworkers who explained that their teenagers are scolded from taking AC Transit because it is dangerous along 12th Street in downtown Oakland. He went on to say that the area and the bus stops are dark and there are unruly passengers on board. He exclaimed if AC Transit would like to be successful and get people to ride, then they have to be aware of the safety factor.

*Brian McGuire* stated that based on the choices for the staff report this was the best option. He said he would love nothing more than to go to Encinal and Versailles Avenues to the ferry station. He explained that the service to get from Fruitvale BART to the waterfront was a big winner in terms of reliability and as the developments come on line they will work to get peak hour headways shortened to become a viable option for new residents. Ultimately, he said this makes sense for alleviating the island crossing issue.

*Jon Spangler* stated that 14 years ago as member of the original Transportation Commission the Line 19 was suggested by AC Transit as a one way to salvage service in Alameda and he was glad to see the line coming back. He stated that the City should expand AC Transit service to restore all the losses suffered in Alameda. He urged the Commission to work with AC Transit to keep adding service to restore something that use to be normal. He also would like to see 8 to 10 minute headways rather than 15 or 30 minute headways.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* referred to the November 2015 meeting where he summarized the fact that the transit subcommittee pointed out the following priorities that were included in their memo and included in the staff report: 1. Funding in Alameda stay local and reallocated to some other Alameda services; 2. Route O stays the same and that has happened with the AC Transit Board's action and 3. Restoring free or low cost transfers for residents of Alameda. He said the reason he brought this up because he was hoping to include this as part of the review at the City Council and then forwarding the recommendation to AC Transit.

*Commissioner Vargas* asked staff and AC Transit about the current status and where is AC Transit at based on input they received from the City, because a letter was written on November 5, 2015 to AC Transit asking for restoration of Line 19, alternative 3 and various other recommendations.

*Commissioner Bellows* replied this month the AC Transit Board approved everything, but left the Alameda part out. So, what the City recommended within the letter was still open.

*Commissioner Vargas* asked if AC Transit could address that.

*Staff Payne* replied that staff was not sure if they would have time to come before the Commission because originally the AC Transit Board was expected to approve the service expansion plan in December 2015. So staff provided the letter at their public hearing in November and after going through the inter-liaison committee in October and received the transit committee's blessing staff felt they were all on the same page. However, she said there was a lack of time for coming before the Commission and City Council, so staff provided the letter.

Now that the AC Transit Board has allowed staff more time this will allow staff to come before the Commission this evening and then City Council meeting February 2.

*Commissioner Vargas* recognized that there were numerous comments provided with various alternatives. He said a lot of students and parents supported alternative #1 and alternative #3 was a good alternative. He wondered if there was a summary of the fiscal implications available.

*Staff Payne* replied that was a good point that she had not considered and the shuttle is mainly provided by grants with local funding match and Wind River provides their TDM monies. Therefore, that would be an additional savings of \$50,000 annually.

*Commissioner Bellows* replied Wind River would not necessarily give them the money anymore.

*Staff Payne* replied what the City would end up doing would be to request to see if Wind River would be interested in being part of a TDM Association. She said they gave the City \$20,000 a year and maybe a better way would be for all of the development monies to go into a separate nonprofit that would be in charge of all the TDM monies in a more comprehensive way.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* said he was attracted to the idea to bring the Line 19 and priorities together before the Council because the line is a concrete service proposal that the Council will pass and adding the priorities will bring more attention than doing so later.

*Commissioner Bellows* stated that *Commissioner Schatmeier* has put together a motion with the add-ons.

*Staff Payne* replied that she would provide the content of the memo including the acceptance of Line 19.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* explained that the issue of transit was bigger than one line. He applauded the City for getting involved in public transit issues and how they would like the City to be in the future.

*Staff Payne* replied the only item that was not included is the Clipper card item that will be reviewed.

*Commissioner Miley* agreed with *Commissioner Schatmeier* and said there was some weight in the motion. He was also glad AC Transit staff was at tonight's meeting.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* replied he was right they did not change the Line O and the Line 21 cut away from the Oakland airport, but he explained the principal was if AC Transit plans to cut services to the airport or ferries keep the money in the City.

<p><i>Commissioner Schatmeier</i> moved to approve the restoration of Line 19, but to also convey to the Council the Commission's priorities for future transit action within the City. <i>Commissioner Miley</i> seconded the motion. The motion was approved 6-0.</p>
---

## ***5.F. Annual Report on Alameda Landing Transportation Demand Management Program and***

***a Recommended Citywide Transportation Management Association (Gail Payne, Community Development Department)***

*Staff Payne* presented the report. *Staff Payne* also introduced *Steve Buster*, Vice President of Catellus Development Corporation, who spoke.

*Commissioner Vargas* stated there was a comment in the annual report about the feasibility of the water shuttle. He wanted to know if the numbers shown do not support the water shuttle. He also asked if the service will be analyzed in the future.

*Steve Buster* replied right now they are going through Phase 1 and Phase 2 of Alameda Landing shopping center and the TRI Pointe development, which is currently under construction. He stated that the last phase would be the 40 acres on the waterfront, which is currently closed off to the public. He said he is hoping that one day they will develop the area and continue the Bay Trail. He also explained that 5th Street will extend into the waterfront and have an eight acre park, with part of the area containing a floating dock and a water taxi that runs to Jack London Square. However, it takes time to coordinate with Jack London and other developers on the waterfront that may want to participate and they would have to analyze a potential funding mechanism.

*Commissioner Bertken* said the waterfront development was mentioned and he has driven towards the end of 5th Street and saw an earth filled surcharge sitting on this piece of property. He wondered why the 10-foot surcharge was needed for what he was talking about building.

*Steve Buster* replied they use the mound of dirt as a surcharge for Phase 1 and Phase 3 for the TRI Pointe plan. He said the dirt was compiled 6 feet in the area in order to compress the bay mud under the housing units. He went on to say that the dirt was taken off and they had to find a place for it temporarily. However, he said there is good news because the waterfront area is low and needs to be raised to be developed and the dirt could be used to raise the grade to where it needs to be.

<p><i>Commissioner Miley</i> moved staff recommendations. <i>Commissioner Schatmeier</i> seconded the motion. The motion was approved 6-0.</p>
--

***5.G. Review of Potential City of Alameda Projects for a Regional Measure 3 Reauthorization (Gail Payne, Community Development Department)***

*Jennifer Ott*, Chief Operations Officer for Alameda Point, presented the report.

*Commissioner Bellows* asked staff when they were involved in the other two measures was there a call for projects or did they unilaterally decide.

*Jennifer Ott* replied she was unsure. However, she said there are three major priorities that were included in the staff report which are: 1. Regional transbay service; 2. Funding for ferry service and bus service and 3. Developing the bay trail to create bicycle and pedestrian connections.

*Commissioner Bellows* asked staff what the expectations were for the Commission's input.

*Jennifer Ott* replied staff would keep the Commission updated throughout the process. However, she did not know if the Commission would ratify or approve priorities.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* stated that he was very interested in this process, especially how projects become included. He pointed out that there may not be a call for projects, but someone or some public body would be responsible for projects being approved and included.

*Jennifer Ott*, replied that would be the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the state legislature.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* asked staff if the MTC and state legislature respond to staff recommendations or do they have pet projects.

*Commissioner Bellows* asked staff what is our representation on MTC.

*Jennifer Ott* replied she was unsure.

*Commissioner Miley* stated the MTC representatives are *Scott Haggerty*, Alameda County District 1 representative, Tom Bates, City of Berkeley Mayor, and Libby Schaaf, City of Oakland Mayor. So, Alameda has three seats. He said as *Jennifer Ott* indicated this would be a political process and if the City is not at the table then the City is on the menu. He felt staff put together a balanced priority list based on the existing document. He stated there has to be something for staff to advocate for even if there is not a specific call for projects.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* said from his point of view one of their elected representatives, council members or City mayor could be inspired and champion a project, which would be important.

*Commissioner Bertken* asked staff if this measure was another bond issue and when will it come up for vote. He pointed out that the tolls back the measure up, but others indicated bond approval.

*Commissioner Miley* replied the tolls allow the MTC to bond in order to deliver the projects faster. The state legislature puts this on the ballot, so MTC would draft the measure and the state would have to approve it. So, he hoped the assembly member and senator would look at this and advocate for it.

*Jennifer Ott*, said this may not happen during this election year, but they want to be ahead of the curve.

*Commissioner Vargas* felt it was good to see a list of projects. He referred to the three categories in the staff report and noted that another way to look at this would be to have the projects separated underneath a category. He said there was a list that may have been called the project categorization list presented to the Commission six, seven or eight months ago which contained categories and staff could pull out projects from certain categories. Additionally, he asked staff if the priorities would go before the MTC. He explained the MTC has a certain perspective of

subsidizing ferry service and he does not want to say they support a lot or a little, but looking back at history, he suggested staff not put that as the first request.

*Commissioner Bertken* replied they put a lot of money into the ferry and they still are, but the point that was being talked about was only so much would be allocated. Also, this does not get project specific until later and it would be geographically based.

*Commissioner Bellows* opened the floor to public comment.

*Jon Spangler* stated that he was contacted by BART Board Director *Robert Rayburn* about this agenda item a few days ago and he was concerned about the lack of specific access to transit items in the plan. He said as it was originally prepared he does not know what changes were made in the last few days. He conveyed this to *Staff Payne* to make sure this was known and she responded quickly on ways to include transit connections especially the leg of the Cross Alameda Trail, the need to replace Miller Sweeney Bridge and possibly make better transit connections across the new lifeline span. When hearing *Jennifer Ott's* priorities, he liked the ferries, but the service is much dirtier per passenger mile than other forms of transit. He suggested they look at capital expenditures that are a lot greener such as Hydrogen Fuel Cell powered or sail powered ferries that get off the carbon emissions conveyor belt. He explained that access to BART is a key part of this Cross Alameda Trail, which connects Alameda Point to Fruitvale BART. He went on to say that including pedestrian and bicycle access that feeds into Tilden Way from downtown and the east end, Fenside as well as the northern waterfront is Alameda's part of the pie and part of Regional Measure 3. He also noted that transbay bus service is something to support and he will do his own work with his contact to get more information on what is behind the green curtain in Sacramento and elsewhere.

*Lucy Gigli* stated that two places that critically need improvement is off island access to Fruitvale BART, Tilden Way and Fruitvale Bridge from the east end. She explained it was critical for bikes to be able to travel from the east end to BART, plus it is part of the Cross Alameda Trail. She also mentioned the Estuary Crossing because the service is not a real long-term or medium range solution because it has limited hours and is overall cumbersome. Yet, the Estuary Crossing is number one in the biking and pedestrian plan so she urged staff to keep looking for solutions. She heard that the Alameda Landing and shuttle is way off in the distance, so she asked staff to keep the number one item in the forefront because the City has other challenges that need to be fixed.

*Commissioner Miley* thanked staff for bringing this forward and thanked the speakers who made great points. He said his experiences with regional measure specifics are important for the City, but the MTC and state legislature look at the broad funding categories. He said their hope would be that they create categories and hopefully they fund the categories to the extent that City staff could submit a competitive application. He also felt that BART to Alameda was a real long-term goal and solution for transit issues, but the project will be so expensive and they are not considering this project in this measure, but do not forget BART to Alameda.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* stated that he would like to see *Jon Spangler* and *Lucy Gigli's* recommendations for emphasis on Fruitvale BART, Tilden Way and access to the trail section of this added to the staff presentation.

*Jennifer Ott* replied absolutely.

*Commissioner Miley* moved to agree with staff's document and include *Commissioner Schatmeier's* comments about specific language to Fruitvale BART and the trail improvements. *Commissioner Schatmeier* seconded the motion. The motion was approved 6-0.

## **6. Staff Communications**

*Commissioner Miley* said there might have been some confusion on item 5D. Cross Alameda Trail segment. He clarified the motion that *Commissioner Morgado* made by stating that the Commission accepted staff's concept, but staff should include the discussion topics and points made by the Commissioners and speakers, so when it comes back to the Commission they could see those details and have a report on what was missing. He explained, when he stepped out of the room there was some confusion from some members of the audience.

### **6.A. Potential Future Meeting Agenda Items**

None.

## **7. Announcements/Public Comments**

*Jim Strehlow* said last week he heard a news item that gas revenues are down and MTC had to notify different groups that 40 percent less will be available to fund projects. So, he wanted to know how that would affect Alameda's budget such as public work's pothole budget.

*Commissioner Bellows* replied because the price of gas is low, sales tax is low. Consequently that would affect Measure BB monies. However, she said the Commission could put this item on the agenda.

*Jon Spangler* stated that the Commission might find the following information interesting. He said since last fall he and two friends who are also League Cycling Instructors have been going to Los Angeles for certification to teach public school teachers how to teach bicycling on the school grounds as a physical education class. He further explained that they have been teaching middle school students and parents in Palo Alto and they are interested in expanding the program to cities such as Redwood City and Alameda to be able to implement at least some pilot programs through the school districts in the next year or so. He said this March there will be a physical education teacher's conference in Santa Clara and the guest program will be represented there. He explained to the Commission that there is no public funding for bike safety education and although they have a lot going on through Bike East Bay he will be looking for a champion and partners within the school district to get to the next step.

## **8. Adjournment**

9:57 p.m.