Approved Minutes Transportation Commission Wednesday, August 28, 2024

Time: 6:30 p.m.

Location: Alameda City Hall, 2263 Santa Clara Avenue, Council Chambers The City allows members of the public to participate in person or remotely via Zoom. For information to assist with Zoom participation, please click: https://www.alamedaca.gov/zoom.

Zoom Attendees: 68

Legistar Link (Agenda and Video):

https://alameda.legistar.com/MeetingDetail.aspx?ID=1226984&GUID=9A99F597-8AB5-4C88-A33A-2A707CC625C2&Options=info|&Search=.

1. Roll Call

Present: Chair Weitze, Vice Chair Suthanthira and Commissioners Dara-Abrams*, Johnson, and Kim.

Absent: Commissioners Nachtigall and Gloyne

2. Agenda Changes

Chair Weitze made a motion (0:55*) to continue approval of the minutes to the next meeting due to needing more commissioners for a vote. Vice Chair Suthanthira seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion passed 4-0.

3. 2024-4340 - Staff Communications

Lisa Foster, Acting Transportation Planning Manager, gave the Staff Communications update (*1:34).

Staff Communications came be found:

https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=6839312&GUID=0B676CC4-08F4-4CA9-9173-9BC958F6B573&FullText=1.

TC Minutes 1 8/28/24

^{*}Commissioner Dara-Abrams was absent for role call but joined later

4. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT - Anyone may speak for 3 minutes regarding any matter not on the agenda

2024-4341 – *Public Comment*

Public Comment can be found:

https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=6839313&GUID=6157EF76-A869-4111-AD8E-0954418AE926.

Jim Strehlow, in person, (*3:30) said how much he disliked having so many important items in one meeting. He then addressed how much he dislikes that there is not a speed limit in the bike lanes, mainly for e-bikes. He then called for more traffic enforcement, not just design changes to address safety concerns.

5. Consent Calendar

5A 2024-4326 - Approve Draft Minutes of the June 26, 2024, Transportation Commission Meeting (Action)

The approval of the minutes was moved to the next scheduled meeting.

5B 2024-4327 - Receive an Update on the AC Transit Realign Draft Final Plan (Information).

Public Comment for 5B

Jim Strehlow, in person, discussed (6:08*) how much he used the 51 A and discussed how inconvenient it would be not to take people all the way to Kaiser on Broadway. This would be a hardship on many people, people rely on the 51.

6. Regular Agenda Items

6A. 2024-4328 - Update on Link21 Transbay Rail Crossing Technology Choice (Discussion)

Link 21 Staff (*9:04) introduced this item and gave a presentation. Attachments can be found at:

https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=6837852&GUID=FC534FC3-8E94-4CF6-9AD2-8DCEF54EB1EE.

Public Comment for Item 6A

Paul B, via Zoom, (*29:37) asked about a dual use for track crossings.

Lo Lowland, via Zoom, (*33:21) wanted clarification that both concepts affected both Alameda and different points in San Francisco.

Marco, via Zoom, (*34:22) wanted to know if there was anything that citizens of Alameda could go to encourage having a rail station in Alameda.

Action for Item 6A

Commission discussion and clarifying questions start at the 35:20-minute mark in the video.

This was a discussion item, and no formal action was taken.

6B. 2024-4329 - Receive an Update on Neighborhood Greenways Implementation and Slow Streets Barricade Removal (Discussion)

Rochelle Wheeler, Senior Transportation Coordinator, introduced (*54:58) this item and gave a presentation.

The staff report and attachments can be found at:

https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=6837853&GUID=08213190-C9F5-4945-84D7-4E4FE467F595&FullText=1.

Commissioner Dara-Abrams arrived during the presentation.

Commissioner clarifying questions start at the 1:18:39-min mark in the video.

Public Comment for Item 6B

Jim Strehlow, in person, (*1:24:40) said again how important enforcement was over design. He questioned if this was really something that neighborhoods wanted or was in being forced by the City. He didn't feel that Slow Streets were any safer, and he used Pacific Ave as an example. He felt that the City also didn't maintain its bike lanes. He

wanted the barricades removed as quickly as possible; he felt the presentation was unreadable tonight.

Christy Cannon, in person, (*1:27:32) really enjoyed being able to walk down these Slow Streets. She felt that most drivers don't realize what the City's vision was and that's why they were confused by the barricades. She felt that was the city's biggest hurdle, getting information out.

John Spangler, in person, (*1:30:20) wished his street Encinal was a slow street. He discussed the dangers of walking in the morning. He was strongly in favor of slower, safer streets. He felt that slowing down is the only answer and felt the barricades needed to stay in place until another design was implemented.

Jay Garfinkle, via Zoom, (*1:33:28) felt that City staff were manipulating Council members and citizens to do what they want them to do. He said the surveys were not true and were influenced by special interest groups. He felt this plan was too complex and added that Slow Streets were supposed to be temporary.

Quinton Larson, via Zoom, (*1:36:34) discussed walking his child to daycare every day. He said that even on a slow street people will not go slow and will drive through stop signs and barriers going 50-60mph. He wanted designs that take that into account. He discussed ways to address those issues that also considered noise for people living near these intersections.

Anne Wittington, via Zoom, (*1:39:51) who lives near Speaker Larson. She was not happy with the Slow Streets and did not see a purpose for them outside of lock down. She had not seen any studies on the usage of these Slow Streets. She discussed her observations on who was using the Slow Streets.

Marco Zivanovic, via Zoom, (*1:43:20) discussed his observations of unsafe behavior on his street (San Jose & Regent St). He wanted cyclists and pedestrians to feel safe and urged the commission to go with Option 1. He discussed the other safety options he wanted to see.

Cyndy Johnson, via Zoom, (*1:45:30) from Bike Walk Alameda, urged the City to go with Option 1. She discussed why this option worked best and seconded many of the points made by the previous speaker.

Sean Reynolds, via Zoom, (*1:46:23) felt that a con of the first plan was that people were going to complain. He discussed the flex posts in Oakland and how they did not last long.

Gabriella Dela Riva, via Zoom, (*1:49:46) discussed issues of traffic on her street (San Jose Ave) near St Joseph's school. She felt that it was much improved with the Slow Streets and wanted to see the barricades kept in place. She also wanted to see more traffic control.

Andrew Dickey, via Zoom, (*1:51:48) discussed traffic issues near San Jose and Regent. He discussed the multiple car accidents he has seen and blamed them on lack of speed bumps and stop signs. He also believes this has added to the crime on the block since people were able to speed away. He was open to any action as long as something was being done.

Action for Item 6-B

Commissioner clarifying questions start at the 1:54:07 minute mark in the video.

This was a discussion item, and no formal action was taken.

6C. 2024-4330 - Review and Discuss Caltrans' State Route 61 Otis Drive/Doolittle Drive/Broadway Preventative Maintenance Project (Discussion)

Manager Foster introduced (*2:22:32) this item, Caltrans presented. The Staff Report and attachments can be found:

https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=6837854&GUID=91AAC5B4-12D2-4E69-8689-1D15EA268DB5&FullText=1.

Staff Member Wheeler also discussed (*2:41:33) the City's actions.

Commissioner clarifying questions start at the 2:44:23 minute mark in the video.

Public Comment for Item 6C

Jim Strehlow, in person, (*2:52:06) discussed a new protected left turn signal on Encinal made turns intolerably slow, and now he avoids it on his way to and from South Shore.

John Spangler, in person, (*2:54:55) was thrilled with the new improvements Caltrans had implemented on Encinal and were now discussing for Otis. Unlike the previous speaker, he has no problem waiting to turn left. He discussed the struggle of getting people out of their cars and recognized this was a bigger problem and not something Caltrans can do on their own. He discussed other design options to stop speeding.

Peter Musio, via Zoom, (*2:58:10) said he never saw any accidents until there were road improvements. He felt that the real issue was the frustration of the drivers and that was what was causing accidents. He wanted 20 blocks with no stops signs. He said that flow was more important than slow.

Allan H, via Zoom, (*3:00:26) discussed the dangers of crossing Otis and how cars do not stop. He wanted to see speed bumps or something that would slow drivers where people were crossing. As a cyclist he was cautious of biking on Otis, he did want to see more enforcement.

Action for Item 6-C

Commissioner discussion start at the 3:02:35 minute mark in the video.

This was a discussion item, and no formal action was taken.

Chair Weitze called a 5-minute recess (*3:29:00).

6D. 2024-4331 - Receive an Update on Construction Impacts from the Oakland Alameda Access Project (Discussion)

Manager Foster introduced this item (*3:30:53). The Staff Report and attachments can be found:

https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=6837855&GUID=37CE6ACE-615B-4A4C-8E0D-46EAC3DFB5CD&FullText=1.

Commissioner clarifying questions start at the 3:38:05 minute mark in the video.

Public Comment for Item 6D

Jim Strehlow, in person, (*3:45:23) was glad to see the 4ft lane was in the tube and wanted to see the bike lanes be one way each way in the tube. He understood the 25mph speed limit but mainly wanted it to be very clear to drivers. He then discussed the importance of flow.

Karen, via Zoom, (3:48:46) stressed the importance of keeping transportation open to Oakland to access Kaiser. She said this project will strongly affect people's lives and will frighten people who need to get off the island.

Action for Item 6D

Commissioner discussion start at the 3:58:30 minute mark in the video.

This was a discussion item, and no formal action was taken.

6E. 2024-4334 - Accept Status Report on Transportation (Action)

Chair Weitze made a motion to continue this item to the next meeting due to the lateness of the hour and Vice Chair Suthanthira seconded the motion. A vote was taken by a raise of hands and the motion carried 5-0.

7. Commission Communications

None

8. Adjournment

Chair Weitze adjourned the meeting at 10:28 p.m.

*Shows minute mark in video to hear comments in full.