

# TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MINUTES

## FEBRUARY 22, 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  
Pattianne Parker  
Michael Krueger  
Jeff Knoth  
Robert McFarland

Absent:

Robb Ratto  
Eric Schatmeier

Staff Present:

Barry Bergman, Program Specialist II, Public Works  
Andrew Thomas, Planning

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

*Commissioner Parker* moved approval of the minutes. *Commissioner Knoth* seconded the motion. Motion carried by a unanimous voice vote – 4 (Abstained – McFarland).

*Commissioner Parker* stated that there were items discussed at the meeting that were not reflected in the minutes, and asked if the Chair could maintain a record of items that require responses from staff.

*Chair Knox White* said he would discuss this with *Staff Hawkins*.

3. **AGENDA CHANGES**

*Staff Bergman* suggested the Staff Communications be moved up before the Northern Waterfront Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), so that Andrew Thomas from the Planning Department could be present.

*Chair Knox White* agreed.

4. **COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS**

*Chair Knox White* mentioned that the only thing not on the agenda was the Pedestrian Master Plan Subcommittee.

*Commissioner Knoth* said that he and *Commissioner Krueger* met with *Staff Bergman* and reviewed the comments from the last Task Force meeting, discussed the draft policies, and reviewed the schedule. A set date for the next task force has not been established yet.

*Chair Knox White* mentioned that the ILC's next meeting is March 22<sup>nd</sup> 10:00 a.m. at AC Transit.

*Commissioner Parker* said that she attended a recent Catellus presentation about the proposed Alameda Landing Development. She requested that the TC be given a brief presentation or white paper on transportation projects related to this project, which may also affect the Northern Waterfront project. This would help the Commission to understand what has been approved, what phases the projects are in, and how they fit together. Specifically, she referred to the construction of the Clement extension, Tinker Avenue, and Mitchell Mosley Avenue (note: most recent plans have Mitchell connecting directly with Main Street, not joining with Mosley).

*Chair Knox White* asked when the TC is supposed to be briefed on the Alameda Landing project.

*Commissioner Parker* said that it is her understanding that it is scheduled for April, following the Planning Board workshop on April 10.

## 8. **STAFF COMMUNICATIONS**

*Staff Bergman* presented information on the following items:

- A Request for Qualifications for on-call contracts has been sent out. It covered the range of Transportation Planning and Traffic Engineering activities including the completion of the Multimodal Circulation Plan.
- A final public meeting for the Park Street Triangle project was held on February 8<sup>th</sup> in the City of Oakland.
- The City Attorney's office had forwarded AB1234 to the Commission. *Staff Bergman* noted that it is not relevant to the Commission at this time, as it only pertains to Commission members that receive compensation for Commission related activities.
- The Bus Shelter Survey was posted on the City's web site the week of February 20<sup>th</sup> and also fliers were put up at the 22 bus shelters for residents to take. About 100 responses were received in the first week. The fliers are scheduled to remain at the bus shelters until the end of February.

## 5. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS – NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS**

None

## 7. **NEW BUSINESS**

### 7a. Northern Waterfront Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)

*Staff Bergman* said that Andrew Thomas from the Planning Department hopefully could stop in and answer Commission questions following another meeting he was attending. The TC had

reviewed and provided some comments to the General Plan Amendment in 2004. A sub-committee was formed and put together for comments. The EIR report has just been issued and will be available thru the end of March for comments. The packet included the Transportation and Circulation sector project description based on the General Plan Amendment that was circulated before. None of the comments have been incorporated as to this date. Once the EIR is finalized it will be forwarded to the Planning Board and Council. The TC members can review the comments, which they can modify.

*Chair Knox White* said that the members would like to review those comments.

*Commissioner Parker* had a question. In the Project Description, Page 7, there is a discussion of scattered residential properties. She expressed concern that some of these properties might block a future transit corridor.

*Chair Knox White* said that it should be on the next meeting for discussion.

*Commissioner Parker* said that the DEIR, Transportation and Circulation deal with impact fees. Some new developments have had their impact fees waived or reduced. Wants to make sure the DEIR is based upon assessment of impact fees to stand firm on its policy. She also stated that the DEIR indicates that the intersection of Clement and Park will be very congested in 2010 and 2025 whether the Northern Waterfront project is approved or not.

*Chair Knox White* responded that on Page IV.E-27, the baseline for 2025 with no project is Level Of Service B. *Commissioner Parker* responded that the text on Page IV.E-28 is not consistent with that. She noted that the report says “the impact of the Clement extension on the intersection of Park and Clement in 2025 is determined to be significant and unavoidable.”

*Commissioner Krueger* noted that on page 10, Line 19 runs on weekdays but also on weekends. Regarding the transit discussion on page 18, he asked if there is sufficient right of way for a future transit corridor.

*Staff Bergman* responded that cross-sections were developed as part of the Cross Alameda Trail Feasibility Study, which illustrate how vehicles, bicycle facilities, and a rail corridor could be accommodated. He indicated that along Clement Avenue the cross-sections located the rail corridor within the roadway.

*Chair Knox White* stated that he was not aware of this, and asked that the cross-sections be shared with the Commission for discussion at the March meeting.

*Commissioner Krueger* noted that there were originally three rail corridors through the Northern Waterfront area, and that there were a number of houses located on them. He asked how the development could have been approved when this area had been identified by the City as a future rail corridor.

*Commissioner Parker* noted that it is has been recommended by several Boards and Commissions that they reserve a continuous transit right of way.

*Commissioner Krueger* noted that this seems to be a pattern.

*Staff Bergman* said that the curb-to-curb cross-section for the section of Clement Avenue in Marina Cove is 48 feet, the same as it is east of Grand.

*Commissioner Parker* noted that at previous meetings, residents of Buena Vista Avenue had expressed their opposition to introducing rail service on the street.

*Chair Knox White* asked if the transit corridor would be located along the street, and *Staff Bergman* responded that it would. *Chair Knox White* asked that the TC be given an explanation of the right of way and how it changes along the corridor at the next meeting.

*Commissioner McFarland* stated that the data on page IV.E-6, Roadway Operations, include what seem like very high vehicle capacity numbers for the Posey/Webster Tubes. He noted that freeway lanes accommodate just over 2,000, and this is for facilities that are 12 feet wide with shy distance.

*Chair Knox White* asked that at the March meeting that staff present the assumptions underlying the peak hour capacity numbers for the Tubes.

*Commissioner Parker* wanted to know how “peak hour” is defined.

*Staff Bergman* said that it was not a specified hours based on what the count was but was the highest hour on the day it was collected.

*Commissioner Parker* asked if the Commission could look at the trend of traffic throughout the day instead of just the peak hour. This way the Commission could see how long the peak lasts.

*Chair Knox White* had a questions regarding Section 4, page 5. He noted that the Class II bike lanes on Tilden Way exist on only some of the roadway. On page 17 the Northern Waterfront Trip Distribution has 11% for trips coming from the south to Alameda and 7% trips going south from Alameda. He stated that in the Transit Plan and at the Alameda Point Preliminary Development Concept public meeting, the number used was 40%. He asked for clarification on which number is correct.

*Staff Bergman* said that at least part of the discrepancy is due to the 40% being a percentage of off-island trips, while the 11% is the percentage of all trips generated by the project. A significant number of trips are expected to begin and end in Alameda.

*Chair Knox White* had a question on Page 17, Impacts and Mitigation Measures. He stated that the TC had indicated during the discussion of the theater project that it would like to see Negative Declarations and EIRs address bicycle and pedestrian usability and access as one of the significance criteria.

*Chair Knox White* had a question on Page 19, Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation. It states that the removal of the truck route from Buena Vista will improve bicycle and pedestrian safety on Buena Vista, but does not mention that the trucks are moving to Clement where the bicycle lanes will be. The EIR should note this.

*Chair Knox White* had a question on page 22, Construction Traffic. It talks about re-routing of automobiles, bicycles, buses and emergency vehicles. He suggested that it should read that buses should only be rerouted as last resort to avoid confusion among riders. He asked if the items listed on Page 24 under the TSM/TDM Plan #7 are already in a City plan, or if they are being recommended for inclusion.

*Staff Bergman* responded that they are in an existing plan.

*Chair Knox White* stated that the DEIR should indicate that the elimination of the bike lanes on Atlantic and redirecting the bicyclists onto a trail through the former rail yard would be a hardship to bicyclists, as it would hinder bicycle access to, from, and within Marina Village. He also expressed concern that the language is overly aggressive in suggesting the conversion of Atlantic into a four-lane street. He asked staff to provide information on the level of service along four-lane streets throughout the City during their peak hour of usage.

*Staff Bergman* responded that in some locations there may be excess capacity in anticipation of future development.

*Commissioner Krueger* agreed with *Chair Knox White's* concern, and stated that he supported the off-road path, but that it should not be considered a substitute for the bike lanes.

*Chair Knox White* asked how important the need is for additional capacity at this location. He suggested that it may be worthwhile to allow the street to be congested for a short period of time in order to maintain the bicycle facilities.

*Commissioner Parker* suggested that rather than specifying the number of lanes, that the Commission could recommend a consistent width across the Island.

*Chair Knox White* expressed concern about the tendency to create more four-lane roads as part of new projects, as this will ultimately only increase the traffic volumes.

*Commissioner Krueger* questioned whether it makes sense, if the Tube is the primary bottleneck, to increase capacity along Atlantic to get to the Tube.

*Commissioner Knoth* moved that the TC is concerned with the consistency of the DEIR recommendations with the wording 4.1.C of the 1990 General Plan, “Do not increase through-traffic capacity on the Main Island”. *Commissioner Krueger* seconded. Motion carried by a unanimous voice vote – 5.

*Commissioner Krueger* moved that the TC would like the language clarified to point out that although desirable pedestrian and bicycle access through the belt line is not a substitute for pedestrian and bicycle access on Atlantic. *Commissioner Parker* seconded. Motion carried by a unanimous voice vote – 5.

*Commissioner Parker* moved that the TC recommends that the Tilden-Clement connection is extremely important to assure the success of the development of the Northern Waterfront under this GPA. *Commissioner Knoth* seconded. Motion carried by a unanimous voice vote – 5.

*Commissioner Krueger* noticed that there was a mentioned on page 30 of using developer fees on Broadway/5<sup>th</sup> Street and Jackson, but no mention of using them to pay for the extension of Clement for Tilden.

*Staff Thomas* said that it’s not the additional traffic generated by the redevelopment of the Northern Waterfront. The issue is that much of the traffic would be shifted from other streets, so the development cannot be required to pay for the improvements. He noted that all new development in Alameda pays Citywide Development Fees (CDF). The impact fees are directed to improvements at specific locations. Public Works is doing an update of the Citywide Fees to determine the most important projects to be funded.

*Staff Thomas* stated that since the funds are not currently in place yet for the Clement-to-Tilden connection, the DEIR recommends that it be included in the General Plan.

*Commissioner Krueger* moved that given the importance of the Tilden/Clement connection, the TC recommends to the City Council to direct staff to prioritize the connection and to identify the funding to make it happen. *Commissioner Parker* seconded. Motion carried by a unanimous voice vote – 5.

*Chair Knox White* asked for the GPA to come back to the TC in March in order to look review their previous comments on the General Plan Amendment.

## 9. **ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.