

Transportation Commission Special Meeting Minutes

Wednesday May 25, 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
Michael Hans
Thomas G. Bertken

Members Absent:

Christopher Miley
Gregory Morgado

Staff Present:

Staff Patel, Transportation Engineer
Staff Payne, Transportation Coordinator

2. Agenda Changes

None.

3. Announcements / Public Comments

Arnold Billinger, Vice Chair of the Commission for Disabled Issues (CDI), stated that the CDI is trying to setup greater visibility for the Estuary Crossing Shuttle and amongst the things that they are talking about is trying to get the shuttle to be part of the Alameda Fourth of July parade and at the various street festivals in Alameda like the Island Jam at Neptune Beach. The organization would like to have a backdrop and booth for the festivals and they would like to invite members of the Commission to ride the shuttle in the parade and man the tables in order to introduce people to the shuttle service. He hoped members of the Mastick Senior Center would come and share the booth as well. He asked if members of the Commission have handouts to provide at the event table. He also said he would keep the Commission updated when they are ready to proceed.

Commissioner Bellows said *Arnold Billinger* should let *Staff Patel* know and he will inform the Commission.

Jim Strehlow, Alameda resident, explained that he wanted to know the Caltrans notification process regarding the Posey Tube. He said the reason being was that he has attended past Commission meetings and he did not remember a discussion about the exact date of when the pedestrian and bicycle path would be closed down, especially since the path is used by people commuting to work. He has been on the bike forums the previous week and members of the forum did not know about the closure either. He went on to say that in the Alameda Sun newspaper, there was a short notice about the closure. He noted that this closure affects how much earlier people have to leave their homes in order to get to their destinations. Asked how can Caltrans give more advance notice and how was this information getting out to the people.

Staff Patel replied usually when Caltrans has a project they post construction activity one week in advance. He said there was advance notification near the tube and the press release was sent to the City and was on their website. However, he explained that there was some confusion about the construction timeframe and whether it would be done at night or daytime. So, staff included the information about the shuttle service once that was cleared up. He stated that the police department found some bicyclists riding in the tube on the roadway surface.

Commissioner Bellows asked if that was legal

Staff Patel replied that it is not legal because the signs were already posted at the mouth of the tube.

Commissioner Bellows replied that the City works with Caltrans' public information officers and it would be nice to know when that area will be reopened.

Staff Patel replied the project manager estimated that it would take a month or by the end of June depending on the railing items, meaning if they are going to fabricate the rails offsite.

3.A. Next Transportation Commission meeting would be Wednesday, July 27, 2016, 7 pm

3.B. Briefing by the Public Works Director

Liam Garland, Deputy Director of Alameda Public Works, said he was standing in for *Bob Haun*, Alameda Public Works Director, in order to brief the Commission about the three questions that came up at the last Transportation Commission meeting. The first question was about the Broadway/Jackson Project and *Bob Haun* reported that he was in negotiations with both the City of Oakland and Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC) and he will share a status report in July. He said the second question raised was about staffing within the City's Public Works Department. He stated that the department is short staffed for a few reasons, such as staff member *Gail Payne* is being lent over to assist with the Citywide Transportation Study and *Rochelle Wheeler* is back filling some of the work that *Gail Payne* was doing for Public Works. He went on to say that they are still short in terms of being able to respond to a lot of transportation issues but as the study and process moves forward they will have a sense of how the City is heading regarding transportation issues. Furthermore, he explained that a new 2-year budget is coming out in 2017, so that will be the time when they can assess the staffing needs within their unit and what they are going to need in the next two years. He noted that the

City charter requires new staffing to be approved by City Council.

Commissioner Bertken said funding is tight and having to wait until the next budget process is a natural occurrence. However, he was bothered about the fact that there isn't anything more important to this City at this particular time than solving a lot the transportation issues especially around the Cross Estuary transportation issue. So, he felt not having a full court press in doing so as soon as possible was troublesome.

Liam Garland replied staff is putting the pieces into place. He also explained that they just hired a city engineer and the new hire will help shape where the transportation unit heads and he will be instrumental on how the City is staffed on transportation issues.

Commissioner Vargas stated that follow up on these issues would be good since *Bob Haun* could not be attend this meeting. Additionally, he asked *Liam Garland* to invite the new hire to the next Commission meeting for an introduction.

4. Consent Calendar

4.A. Transportation Commission Minutes – Approve Meeting Minutes – March 23, 2016

Commissioner Schatmeier made a change to the minutes that was attributed to him. He said the change can be found on page 5, third line from the top “He explained that the Commission listened to a lot of public comments that were relative and caused some concerns.” The word relative should be changed to relevant.

<p><i>Commissioner Schatmeier</i> moved to approve the minutes. <i>Commissioner Hans</i> seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0.</p>
--

5. New Business

5.A. Approve Proposed Bus Stop Locations for the New Line 19

Rochelle Wheeler presented the report.

Commissioner Vargas asked staff if AC Transit was looped in about the last minute modification on Item 3 of the staff report.

Rochelle Wheeler replied yes, they reviewed the designs and felt it would work.

Commissioner Bellows opened the floor for public comment.

Rob Ratto, Executive Director of the Downtown Alameda Business Association, said as a charter member of the Commission many years ago he commended the Commission on the hard work they do. He also said that staff made his job very easy that night because he was present on behalf of the Downtown Alameda Business Association board of directors to endorse 4C and he was going to implore the Commission, AC Transit and staff to endorse 4c and now the plan has

changed to 3C. Therefore, he wholeheartedly endorsed 3C.

Jim Strehlow, Alameda resident, stated that he was trying to envision this layout because he rides his bicycle in the area all the time. He explained that usually a visual such as a cross section accompanies the presentation and staff report to show the curb footage, travel lane width and bus width before they set a barrier because it looks like staff is going to be carving out from the curb to be able make that turn. He said he was also trying to envision this because it was not included in the packet, thus the public was not aware of 3C and how this option would affect traffic. He explained that he may be in favor of 3C, but he was looking at 3B. He said it made sense to move it on the other side because there is a lot of parking on the near side of Park Street, so a bus could be placed there. He said when travelling through the section he knows the very narrow part near the driveway and when there are cars parked at that very narrow part it is often hard for bicycles to go along Buena Vista Avenue.

Commissioner Bellows asked *Jim Strehlow* if he was talking about traveling west.

Jim Strehlow replied yes, while traveling westbound it is very narrow and cars often have to look at him and he looks at them in order to go through because it is very narrow between the car and stripe. He felt it would have been beneficial for the public to view photos and see the cross section in advance because he was having some difficulty visualizing the new design.

Commissioner Bellows replied her sense is that it was recently developed.

Rochelle Wheeler replied this project has been in the works to square off that particular corner and this was from the packet that the Commission approved in March 2014. The project was put out to bid to make those improvements and last week the City Council approved the contractor to make this improvement. So, staff is now proposing a bus stop at this corner.

Commissioner Bellows asked staff when they were analyzing the placement of the bus stop were the dimensions calculated to have enough bus passing space.

Rochelle Wheeler replied staff looked at the widths and with a bus stopped there to pick up passengers vehicles cannot pass a stopped bus.

Staff Patel stated that staff checked with AC Transit's Traffic Engineering Department about the widths. He also explained that currently this is a concept approval and staff will be looking at some modification of stripping for the east bound approach right in front of the Chevron Gas Station. He noted that the bus stop would be very similar to the Buena Vista Avenue and Webster Street stop for the Line 51 changes that occurred and a similar setup was created there.

Laura Thomas, resident near Buena Vista Avenue and Chestnut Street, stated that she has lived in the neighborhood for 32 years and she was excited to see the Line 19 comeback. She said in the past she used the bus a lot and it will be a benefit for the entire neighborhood especially as more housing is built in that area. She said she's in favor of affordable housing and the City needs alternatives to car travel. She concluded that the bus must run regularly and be dependable. She hoped that in this case when the Line 19 comes back that it has 20-minute headways during peak hours to get to and from work and downtown Oakland.

Mike O'Hara, Tim Lewis Communities, stated that his organization is the developer of the Del Monte Warehouse Master Plan and the Encinal Terminal Site. He supported the Line 19 restoration and having worked with AC Transit to create the mechanism to decrease the headways to 20 minutes was vital to the northern waterfront. He went on to say they also reviewed the bus stop plan and support that as well.

Commissioner Schatmeier was gratified to see there was so much public support for the line restoration. However, he noticed one thing that was conspicuous of its absence in the pictures which are bus shelters. He explained this has been a cause of his for a long time because riders can go to BART stations, gas stations and other places and have a shelter, but when waiting for an AC Transit bus you are many times out in the open and this has been that way for many locations in Alameda and along the AC Transit system. He noticed in one picture in the staff report, where they now rejected 3B, one bus stop has awnings line on the Walgreens store. He felt the awnings were life savers for users and although not intended to be shelters they are. He recognized the same for the visual in 4A, which was rejected, there were awnings over the sidewalk. He was not sure what could be done about this, but he would like to see a commitment made by the City and others to figure out a way to finance and add bus shelters whenever they do something like this because it is a vital part of running a transit system.

Commissioner Vargas said he was glad to hear the homeowner have no questions or issues with the potential parking loss. He asked staff with the loss of parking are there any parking meters that would be potentially removed and a subsequent loss of revenue.

Rochelle Wheeler replied no.

Commissioner Vargas stated that this plan was restoring the operations of a line that had previous parking displacements, so there wouldn't be a net loss.

Rochelle Wheeler replied that is what they believe, but they do not have the exact stops from before.

Commissioner Vargas asked staff if there was an anticipated ridership projection for this line.

Austin Lee, AC Transit Planner, replied he does not have exact ridership projections or numbers to provide. However, he felt the line restoration would definitely alleviate crowding on the Line 51A and the Line 20 that go through Webster Street and provides an alternative to the Estuary Shuttle. On the east end it would help alleviate the crowding on the Line 20 and Line 21 to get to Fruitvale BART.

Commissioner Vargas asked if AC Transit will be able to report the distribution once the Line 19 is operating in order to get an idea of how everything else is coming through.

Austin Lee replied yes.

Commissioner Vargas moved to approve the modification of 3C in place of 3B. *Commissioner*

Bellows seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0.

5.B. Adopt the Proposed Plan for Harbor Bay Ferry Terminal Parking

Jennifer Ott, Alameda Point Chief Operating Officer, presented the first half of the report.

Liam Garland presented the second half of the presentation.

Commissioner Hans asked if staff have communicated with Alameda Police Department to see if they actually have the staffing to enforce this plan.

Jennifer Ott replied staff had a number of conversations with the Alameda Chief of Police and he evaluated the plan and felt this could be enforced with current staff levels. She explained the department would have additional revenues available from tickets to cover incremental increases, but he was comfortable with the plan. She pointed out that the plan was not to take patrol officers off their beats, but to utilize parking technicians who typically work part time.

Commissioner Bertken asked staff who has the authority to issue tickets on the private streets.

Jennifer Ott replied for the public streets the City has the authority to ticket vehicles and within the private streets the Homeowners Association (HOA) do not have authority to issue tickets, but can tow vehicles. However, the HOAs could create a relationship with the Alameda Police Department so when they call the police, parking technicians can go out and ticket. Therefore, if a relationship is established the City can issue tickets on private streets. She went on to say staff and the HOAs have talked about the implementation, but it would ultimately be up to the HOA's preference.

Commissioner Bertken asked who owns the big piece of property adjacent because it would be an obvious benefit to the ferry system.

Jennifer Ott replied SRMErnst, a commercial real estate development company.

Commissioner Bertken asked staff if the property has already been sold.

Jennifer Ott replied she does not think the property has been sold because the property is waterfront commercial land and extremely expensive. She pointed out that this option was reviewed by the Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA) in order to find out how much it would cost to lease the property, but the cost was outside WETA's budget. Also, providing that much parking would only create the same problem in a year or two, so that would be a short term solution for a long-term issue. She explained that staff is exploring the idea of having satellite parking areas along a shuttle route if they decide to go with a shuttle service.

Commissioner Bertken asked staff based upon the plan and the approach taken has anyone made an estimate on how the plan would impact the ferry patronage in the long run.

Jennifer Ott said from her standpoint in terms of ferry ridership they have discussed what if there is a decrease in ridership would parking charges be there as a contingency, but there are no

concrete estimates of that. She stated that their hope is that the demand has been so strong and people are already using alternative modes of transportation that ridership will not dip dramatically, but WETA is rightfully cautious about what happens if ridership decreases, so they have talked about those issues.

Commissioner Vargas said he was excited about the solutions to the challenges. He explained they may not be perfect yet, but they are getting a lot better. He said he met *Kevin Connolly*, Planning and Development for WETA, two years ago at the WETA Board meeting and invited him to continue this dialogue. He was excited to see WETA's board meeting was held at Alameda City Hall and there is more inter-activity between the two agencies. He stated that he would hold off comments on the ordinance until the public hearing because it is very detailed. He explained that it was good to see the three step solutions regarding the residential parking stickers, parking charges, and shuttle service as *Jennifer Ott* described. He went on to say that over the weekend, he spoke with a resident of Orange County who has a sticker program in their waterfront neighborhood. The Orange County resident said the program benefitted their family structure and if the policy was not implemented they would have moved out of the community. So, he explained although staff and WETA are working not to lose ferry riders they should also be cognizant to not lose members of the community.

Commissioner Bellows opened the floor for public comment.

George K, Executive Director of the Community of Harbor Bay Isle, said he represents 20 Homeowner Associations. He explained that he totally supports the ferry service, but unfortunately too much of a good thing has created a problem and this is a practical solution that will work. He felt in his opinion, the framework and the subsequent detailed plan must be implemented in its entirety. He pointed out that the master association has agreed to administer the program and if they do choose to tow, his security department will do so. However, they do not want to choose until they see the entire plan in place. He said they are created under the Davis- Stirling Common Act and they are essentially quasigovernment institutions that speak for members of their community. They have worked closely with the City, WETA and the residents and this solution will help everyone involved.

Charles Hodgkins, Chairman of the Board Community of Harbor Bay Isle Homeowners Association, stated that they pertain to the board side of the discussion. He explained that they have had good meetings with *Jennifer Ott*, *Liam Garland* and the Alameda Police Department. He pointed out that the visual in the presentation showing the land near the ferry terminal was not accurate because there is already development on the corner where Adelphian Way makes a turn onto Harbor Bay and there is not development next to it. So, he said what looks like a large chunk of land is about half of that. He believed a proposal exists to build a senior citizen center on the remaining land. He believed the solution presented was a long-term, rational and relatively well thought out plan that will in the long-term improve the viability of the ferry service. He said the ferry is a resource to the community and the people on the east end and if the City could get the shuttle sorted out with AC Transit or a private entity that would allow the community to feel they are not being imposed upon. He stated that from one of the community meetings one resident commented that motorists drive like lunatics to the ferry terminal and when they come around the corner, they cause potential collisions. He said the Columbia Headlines HOA would like to have a plan in place, but they reside on public streets. So, once this

whole framework comes into place they would be able to provide a solution for everyone.

Eric Schatmeier spoke as an Alameda resident and said he was in opposition to the staff proposal for three reasons: 1. The plan is inconsistent with the three elements the Commission specified should be a requirement for approval for any future plan; 2. The plan is technically flawed and incomplete and 3. He felt the plan was developed in a vacuum. He explained that in the proposal staff focused on one of the three elements included in endorsing the last plan and he wanted to emphasize the other two, which are maintenance and growth of ferry ridership and the provision of adequate parking at the ferry terminal. He felt if the plan is implemented in January 2017 as proposed there is a real danger of reversing ridership gains the ferry has achieved and pushing usage down that would result in eliminating 100 daily parking opportunities and then charging a fee for the few scarce spaces that would be left. He said the fee represents \$40 to \$80 per month added to regular ferry fares that are already higher than comparable BART and AC Transbay bus fares. He explained that he did not know of any demand modeling that would not predict the loss of ridership because of raising the fare 20-40%. The staff report explained that parking charges encouraged customers to look for alternative ways to get to the ferry station, but analysis, ridership surveys or demand modeling did not back up this assertion. Also, he said the plan does include what ferry customers who do drive would be willing to pay to park, what will result when various fee levels are implemented, or if there is a contingency plan to determine what the City and WETA would do to get ferry riders back if the program is scrapped because it failed. He stated that the Commission did not approve a principal that said provide adequate parking or shuttle services. The Commission focused on parking because the unfortunate reality is that shuttle services are not adequate alternatives. He provided a press release from Marin County where Golden Gate Transit under pressure of exploding ferry ridership implemented the Wave Shuttle service to meet peak period boats. The article said two of the three routes were being discontinued because of low ridership. He pointed out that the Golden Gate Ferry boats are double the size of Alameda's boats and run almost triple of the frequency, so how could the shuttle service work in Alameda. He said as a user of transportation he would love to get people to use public transit for their entire work trip, but many will not and if commuters opt to give half their trip to public transit than he called that a win. He felt the plan was devoid of details regarding the number of shuttle vehicles that would be deployed, how many motorists could park at the satellite parking areas, what capital resources would be available and how the parking charges would cover parts of the plan's costs. Furthermore, he said with the issue of planning in a vacuum the plan involves multiple constituencies, but the plan ignores ferry riders who should be part of the conversation. He believed the riders may react negatively and vent their anger at a public meeting or they will quit riding the ferry altogether. Ultimately, he felt the plan as implemented and written would be counterproductive to the City and state's transportation goals and the Commission should insist on something better.

Kevin Connolly thanked *Jennifer Ott* and *Liam Garland* for their hard work on this piece of planning. He emphasized that this plan is currently in the concept phase and the devil is in the details and he acknowledged the HOAs and their work. He explained that ridership is booming and a person not getting in their car to commute is a positive thing. He expected initially that ridership may flatten or reduce and there will be some short-term pain, but the activity is not sustainable and impacts the surrounding neighborhoods. He said alternative options are necessary and building structure garages is not an option, but satellite parking is potentially an option that must be paired with shuttle service. He explained that WETA ferry service operates

on a farebox recovery performance criteria. He said for years the Harbor Bay service found it hard to reach the farebox recovery requirement and was always on the chopping block, but it is now at a healthy percent. He pointed out that the board is sensitive to overcharging for ferry service, so they are looking carefully from a policy standpoint about the fare charges over the entire system. Also, he said how the revenues are being used will be carefully analyzed by the board. He appreciated the work that has occurred and it is the community's right to define how they interact with the ferry terminal and they do not want to impose their particular will if it is not satisfactory.

Commissioner Bellows asked *Kevin Connolly* if the WETA Board thought about imposing parking charges at Main Street or the new terminal.

Kevin Connolly replied they are approaching parking charges as a system wide policy, but first introducing the policy at Harbor Bay. He explained that Harbor Bay and Main Street terminals have different characteristics, so it is not easy to place a parking permit program at Main Street. Therefore, they would have to work with the City and that is a future prospect further down the line.

Jennifer Ott replied she agreed from the City's perspective Harbor Bay is more immediate due to concerns from the neighborhood. She said staff would conduct the same process of working with AC Transit and WETA.

Commissioner Vargas referred to the presentation and particularly the parking charge range of \$2.00 to \$4.00. He asked if WETA has implemented parking charges in another location within their system or could they talk about the \$2.00 versus \$4.00 charge.

Kevin Connolly replied City staff requested that the WETA Board consider parking charges rather than having the Commission adopt charges. WETA has parking charges in the city of Vallejo, but the City owns the parking lots and they charge on a monthly basis or \$5 for a daily rate. The policy direction is to keep the parking fees lower to make it accessible for public transit.

Commissioner Bertken asked about the funding and the fact that WETA has a 40 percent farebox recovery requirement, but what happens if it is not there.

Kevin Connolly replied the bulk of WETA's operational funding are fares and bridge tolls and the 40 percent threshold was created because of Harbor Bay and their struggle, but Harbor Bay has been a big surprise. He said their last ridership survey was in 2015 and they have grown 50 percent since that time and 94 percent of riders were from Harbor Bay and the east end of Alameda. So, he felt the key part of implementation is informing the riders and allowing them the opportunity to provide input. He explained that when they held their board meeting a month ago they heard from a lot of Harbor Bay residents who would be impacted. He also said people who drive and ride the ferry have no choice but to drive because they have children and need to bring them to school, so that aspect must be addressed carefully.

Commissioner Bellows replied so everyone who lives in a HOA is going to have to pay some amount of money for a residential parking permit sticker.

George K. replied the homeowners do not have to pay for the sticker because with their existing staff they would administer the sticker program for both public and private streets to make this as painless as possible on the City and their administrative workload. He said to make this as palatable as possible in order to get the all of the HOAs on board they would make this cost free for them and they can absorb the fees in their existing cost structure. He stated that currently they have 40 employees composed of security and administration and they can do this.

Commissioner Vargas asked about the ordinance and the map that was presented earlier. He said two HOAs have public streets and three HOAs have private streets. So, he wanted to know if the addition that is proposed within the ordinance applies to the three HOAs that have the private streets or does that apply to both.

Kevin Connolly replied the way the amended ordinance is written that would only apply to HOAs Headlines and Columbia because they are public streets within those two HOAs. So, the ordinance does not affect the HOAs with private streets.

Commissioner Vargas said a homeowner brought to his attention the seat clarification in Item C of the ordinance, which highlights that a 55 percent vote was required by the residents to make changes to the parking and with the new addition in blue and red text that the voting would be done by the HOAs. Thus, he wanted to know if that one vote now trumps the other vote.

Kevin Connolly replied there is a proposed amendment that does not require the petition, but requires the HOA boards' approval. So, he highlighted that the next step is not residential parking permit implementation, but having Public Works evaluate the ability to implement permit parking and then make its own recommendations on whether residential parking permits should be issued. He explained the next step is a triggering mechanism and the best representatives of the neighborhood is the HOA board who has legal authority.

Commissioner Vargas stated that since this is a new element in the ordinance could this be evaluated after one year or so after implementation to see how the program is working.

Kevin Connolly replied he and *Jennifer Ott* discussed this and evaluating the program makes sense to them.

Commissioner Bertken was looking at the three components of the plan and the element of reliable transit service and improved AC Transit service line means staff should have more outreach meetings with AC Transit before January 2017. He also explained that staff should also review opportunities for remote parking and shuttle services. He felt it would be nice to have the information during this period to show that losing patronage has been observed and taken into consideration.

Kevin Connolly said the current approval is for the concept to move forward and *Jennifer Ott* is in constant contact with AC Transit on this issue.

Commissioner Bertken replied the concept does not say a lot regarding outreach.

Jennifer Ott replied they have had a number of conversations with AC Transit and WETA about

these issues. She said if the vote moves forward they would continue the conversation with AC Transit and the Commission.

Commissioner Bellows stated that staff and WETA have done a lot of outreach already and the HOA are on board. She explained that the concept is not ideal, but it is better than the status quo.

Commissioner Bertken asked staff if they would see this plan again before it goes before the City Council.

Commissioner Bellows replied the concept would go before the City Council.

Jennifer Ott replied if the Commission approved the plan it would move forward to the City Council on June 7. She explained that in the fall, they would provide the Commission with an update on how the plan is going and answer questions and receive comments about the details of the plan.

Commissioner Vargas recommended to place on the top of the list to look at keeping the parking charges at the minimum or close to the \$2.00 range, similar to the Fruitvale BART and Vallejo Ferry parking models. Regarding the residential parking permit program, he would look to the HOAs to come up with a plan and he hoped to not scare motorists away with parking ticket prices, but maybe with a first offense issue a warning.

Commissioner Hans moved to approve staff recommendations. *Commissioner Vargas* seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0; 1 abstention by *Commission Schatmeier* who could not take part in the Commission discussion or vote.

5.C. Discuss the Citywide Transit and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plans Existing Conditions and Goals/Objectives

Jennifer Ott introduced the presentation.

Brian Sullen and Bill Hurl, CDM Smith, were hired to prepare the plan and they presented the report.

Staff Payne replied they were comparing apples and oranges a little bit when speaking about the “Travel within Alameda” slide. She said ultimately, staff is attempting to show the magnitude of the magnet schools and charter schools in the west end, but it became a little convoluted. However, she said the main point is Alameda Unified School District enrollment has been stable, but there has been an increase in student enrollment citywide because of this 1,500 students who are charter school students.

Commissioner Schatmeier asked if density was then the main indicator for success for the bike share stations.

Brian Sullen explained that he was referring to the bike share station density and how many stations there are in the area.

Commissioner Schatmeier said Bay Farm Island has extensive bicycle facilities, therefore creating a lot of opportunities to use bikes. He asked if a station would have more use than the population density would indicate because of the opportunities to use bikes.

Brian Sullen replied absolutely, but he would caution against just adding one bike share station, but including maybe three stations because when adding bike share stations you have to cluster a few out there to make it more viable.

Commissioner Bellows asked if the existing conditions includes Harbor Bay.

Brian Sullen replied they do.

Commissioner Bellows said she occasionally takes BART and the trains are more crowded than ever before. She asked if the crowding was due to less trains or increased ridership.

Brian Sullen replied BART boardings are not down. However, few Alameda residents are taking BART.

Commissioner Schatmeier asked about ridership from Alameda (note – inaudible dialogue)

Brian Sullen said he would provide the data to the Commission.

Jennifer Ott continued with the presentation's goals, objectives, and feedback.

Commissioner Vargas stated that the "Origins and destinations" slide was a useful slide and in the future he wanted staff to provide a slide about where people come from when they travel to Alameda. He also wanted to know at a future time why carpool levels dropped from 2000 to 2005. Furthermore, he said the additional bike share slides were not available in the previous packet, so having that included before the presentation would be good.

Commissioner Bellows opened the floor to public comment.

Denise Tropadea, Alameda resident, said safety is near and dear to my heart as it relates to the TDM. She explained that she recently moved into a Victorian home in Alameda and when she is not having to haul building material around than she is biking, walking or using public transit. She stated that she supported all the work that the City is doing to get people out of their cars. However, she explained as Alameda continues to grow the City needs to mitigate the number of cars on the street because it does not add to the quality of life. Therefore, the City needs to provide more options to get people out of their cars and those options are not in place. She is asked the Commission to add both the objectives to the TDM as well as the evaluation criteria to make sure safety and specifically bicycle, pedestrian and vehicle collisions are within the plan. She asked the Commission to adopt a goal similar to the Vision Zero policy in San Francisco to reduce deaths and serious injuries as part of the transportation goals. Additionally, she asked for the City to work on more or some egress off of the west end of the island for people who are not in a car. She pointed out that the extra four inches of sidewalk within the tube is good, but it's not a long-term solution and the City needs to plan for another way off the west end of the island. She felt the shuttles are good, but when riders have to put their bicycles on the back of the shuttle

going into Oakland and they are not able to lock it, well no one is going to do that.

Heather Little stated that six months ago she started speaking with key people around the City such as the City Council, Planning Board and Bike Walk Alameda about safety issues such as the lack of infrastructure for bikes linking one end of the island to the other and vehicles speeding. She said she was pleased about Central Avenue and the Bay Trail, but in the meantime something must be done about safety. She explained to the Commission that her husband was bicycling home from the ferry terminal and while traveling home, a car failed to yield to him and he was pushed off the road at Main Street. She said he now has a pretty serious collar bone fracture. She asked the Commission to make sure this plan is not just piecemealed together, but take into account all modes of transportation along with a policy such as Vision Zero. She brought up the fact that two fatalities occurred with a car involved in the past eight months. Also, when she quoted the last statistics on record from 2013 when comparing Alameda to 103 other cities similar to its population size, Alameda was rated eighth worse for injuries in car related versus pedestrian accidents. She liked the fact that this was being addressed before new development gets underway. Yet, the City is struggling because people want to get out of their cars, but the City needs to set the infrastructure and not have cars parked right on the intersections. She said this is not just on the Commission, but Alameda Police Department, Bike Walk Alameda, Planning Board and City Council.

Lucy Gigli, President of Bike Walk Alameda, said the plan was off to a great start and she has been part of the presentations in the past months. She said there is great stuff to move the City forward in active transportation. However, she has provided recommendations 1. Safety must be implemented on our streets and placing goals and objectives on how to encourage people to walk and bike in Alameda and get them there safely is paramount and 2. One of the largest impediments in encouraging people to bike and walk off the island on the west end is the Estuary Crossing. She said a feasibility study was conducted 8-10 years ago that talked about some of the alternative transit options to get people off the island. Consequently, the City implemented the Estuary Shuttle that fills a small niche during its run times, but that's it. She said the City needs to fix that critical link to get people off the island on the west end without having driving.

Jim Strehlow stated that you cannot just rubber-stamp the people because this plan is not one size fits all. He explained that his coworker has to drive his daughter to north Oakland to high school from South. He said she will not ride the AC Transit system or BART to 19th or 12th Stations because she feels uncomfortable and unsafe. So, he felt more consideration should be taken to the people who are using this infrastructure. He said he rides his bike daily and during the weekends, but four times a month, he is one of those evil single-occupant drivers leaving the island. He went on to say the reason being because he picks up three people, which includes two youths to go to a youth group meeting. Yet, he stated that he is one of the statistics that says he is driving alone, but he is actually transporting other people, bags of food and other supplies. He pointed out that visitors coming from other states to visit families will not want to spend their time taking public transportation all the time. He said he has a friend who goes to Napa and spends 8 hours on public transportation and that is horrible. The plan should also consider the elderly who need to get to medical appointments and need assistance. He noted that infrastructure is important, but do not forget about the people you are trying to serve and make it safe for all of them.

Commissioner Schatmeier said regarding the goals and objectives for public transit, he would like to see public become a multi-purpose and multi-destination phenomenon that serves a variety of destinations. He would also like to see transit attract choice riders, meaning people who choose to take public transit, because they think public transit is better for many trips. He said on the main island the Lines 51 and 851 service Santa Clara Avenue 24 hours a day. So, it is possible, but may not be as convenient to live on the corridor and now own a vehicle. He explained that planning is being done on Alameda Point in the hope that some people will move in without relying on cars for most of their trips. In order to do this, he said a structure must be put into place on day one that serves people for a variety of trips. As a result, he wanted to see that versatility reflected in the Commission's discussion on what they intend to do in the future because currently it is not explicitly laid out.

Commissioner Hans said he would like staff to review the transportation of children. He understood the fact that there is large number of interisland transportation of children to schools and as a crossing guard at Lincoln Middle School on Fernside Boulevard there are many potential vehicle caused collisions. He explained that a number of single-occupant drivers are commuting back and forth particularly from Bay Farm to the main island in order to transport their children to school. Also, he said that different youth organizations and events require families to do a number of back and forth commutes including on the weekends. He wondered if a kid's shuttle could be implemented to bring children to destinations or take kids to youth events or schools. He also stated safety is paramount and he has seen a number of incidents and that continues to increase with near fatalities almost every single day on Fernside Boulevard.

Commissioner Vargas stated that there was ditto between Goal 1 and 2 of the staff report except changing the last part, so take the comment mildly. He said looking at the creativity side, which was found on the back side of each of the goals there is more meat and inspiration. Regarding safety, he suggested that Goal 2 be amended to end with the word "safely" or "safety" and then adding the word "safely" to Goal 2F and possibly elsewhere. He went on to say that Item 1 addresses carpooling and staff should include the idea of promoting casual carpool or other elements such as online or smartphone app solutions because he personally had challenges with one of his sons trying to get to San Luis Obispo two weeks ago.

Commissioner Bertken asked about the feasibility study for the commercial bike rental and how was the level of detail placed into where they are today.

Staff Payne replied that was a last minute decision because staff has a deadline due June 15 or 17 for a Letter of Interest (LOI) to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and they wanted to get some kind of feedback. She said if they are selected in the fall there will be some time for outreach, but the LOI is due soon.

Commissioner Bellows asked staff about the car sharing discussion they had a while ago and whatever happened with that.

Staff Payne replied that was a point to point car share and staff decided that they could come without their involvement because that was the easiest way to proceed. She stated that since the City has so few parking meters that they would not be involved to trying up parking spaces.

Commissioner Bellows said regarding the objectives and goals, she was fully committed to multimodal travel, but the fact of life is present and will be interconnected, autonomous and driverless. Therefore, the goals and objectives should include accommodating for this because they are coming and it helps people particularly on the west end to get off the island because you can get a lot of capacity from those vehicles. She felt that was an aspect that the Commission should think about as well including other technologies such as ride sharing smart phone apps. She also explained that including safety into the plan is a primary goal.

Commissioner Vargas said that feedback on the bikes was way over his head, but he felt this topic was out of place and should be discussed separately.

Staff Payne replied *Commissioner Vargas* could provide input to staff at a later time.

Commissioner Bellows felt the bike share was a separate topic.

Staff Payne said the bike share portion was part of the consultant's work scope to do a conduct bike share feasibility study. Staff timed bike share portion to be prepared for MTC's LOI.

Commissioner Bellows asked staff if the intent was to say that the Commission supports a bike feasibility study.

Staff Payne replied the intent is to be considered for the MTC capital grant to help fund the majority of the capital costs in order to have bike share in Alameda.

Commissioner Bellows and *Commissioner Vargas* replied they did not pick up on the intent from the staff report.

Staff Payne replied staff would like to know what the Commission thinks about the LOI and what is needed.

Commissioner Bertken asked staff who will manage the bike share program.

Jennifer Ott replied the grant is a two-step process, meaning staff would put something forward as a proposal which is preliminary. She explained there wasn't time given the scope to have a full community process on bike share like staff normally would, so staff made a judgement call to submit the LOI or lose the opportunity.

Commissioner Bellows replied the LOI states that the City is interested in applying for a grant to investigate bike sharing in Alameda.

Jennifer Ott replied the LOI allows the City to be considered receiving funding for capital in order to implement the bike share program. She went on to say there are a lot of questions that staff has and they do not have many of the answers for implementation or operations yet.

Commissioner Vargas stated that he moved to exclude the bike share element so the Commission can at least comment on the goals and objectives.

Commissioner Bellows asked about the schedule for bike share plan.

Jennifer Ott replied bike share plan is due at the end of this month.

Commissioner Bellows asked about the due date for the LOI.

Jennifer Ott stated that the LOI is due in June and in the fall staff will apply for the grant. She said there was plenty of time to come back to the Commission and answer questions.

Commissioner Bertken asked staff if they receive the grant does that preclude the bike share program from being a commercial operation.

Commissioner Bellows replied there are different types of models, however, this bike share program needs to be more thought out.

Commissioner Schatmeier replied whether or not to submit the LOI is not on the agenda.

Commissioner Bellows replied the Commission would have to make the LOI a separate motion. However, right now she felt *Commissioner Vargas* was correct the bike share plan was not part of the goals and objectives. Thus, she proposed to have a new motion to consider the LOI.

Commissioner Schatmeier replied this is not an action item, so staff could submit the LOI with or without the Commission's approval.

Jennifer Ott said that was correct, staff would need a letter from the City manager, but they would like the Commission's feedback and staff would come back to the Commission with more detailed analysis about the bike share program.

Commissioner Bertken replied that he would feel better if they separate the feasibility study, which creates more confusion.

Jennifer Ott said if MTC accepts the LOI, staff would come back to the Commission as a separate agenda item potentially named the bike share feasibility study.

6. Staff Communications

6.A. Potential Future Meeting Agenda Items

1. AC Transit Major Corridor Study Analysis
2. Shoreline Bikeway Analysis
3. Broadway/Jackson Update
4. Cross Alameda Trail Preliminary Design between Webster Street and Constitution Way
5. Cross Alameda Trail, Atlantic Segment

Commissioner Vargas asked *Staff Patel* about item 3 of 6.A. and does he know when that will happen.

Staff Patel replied *Liam Garland* said they are continuing.

Commissioner Bertken asked about item 2 of 6.A.

Staff Patel replied this is an analysis looking at the results after implementation and staff has not completed the analysis yet. He said staff is in the process of gathering accident, ridership, crash and traffic data on Shoreline Boulevard.

7. Announcements/Public Comments

8. Adjournment

9:54 pm