

Transportation Commission

May 27, 2015

Item 4A

Action

Transportation Commission Minutes Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Commissioner Jesus Vargas 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)

Thomas G. Bertken

Michael Hans

Christopher Miley

Gregory Morgado

Jesus Vargas

Staff Present:

Alex Nguyen, Assistant City Manager

Liam Garland, Deputy Public Works Director

Virendra Patel, Transportation Engineer

Gail Payne, Transportation Coordinator

2. Agenda Changes

Chair Bellows explained that she would postpone Item 5A (Harbor Bay Ferry Area Parking Recommendations) because any Transportation Commissioner who lives near Item 5A may not be able to participate in the debate or vote. The Transportation Commissioners will work with City staff, and then will reschedule the 5A item as a special meeting at the end of April. She apologized for the inconvenience, and stated that the public comment period will be open until the special meeting.

<p><i>Commissioner Miley</i> moved to have a special meeting for Item 5A. <i>Commissioner Vargas</i> seconded the motion. The motion was approved 7-0.</p>
--

3. Announcements / Public Comments

Dorothy Freeman, Alameda resident, said one week ago she attended a meeting about the I-880 and 23rd/29th Avenues Overcrossing Project. She observed people asking questions and the standard reply from Caltrans staff and contractors were that traffic studies were conducted. She felt although the traffic studies were conducted 3-5 years ago, they may not have looked at the new construction work on the northern waterfront. She requested that the traffic study be updated and that the study look at new housing coming on board. She also was concerned with the Ford Street intersection across from the Park Street Bridge and wondered whether there would be pedestrian or bicyclist controls at the intersection.

Staff Patel replied that staff was aware of the new traffic arrangement that would occur and staff reviewed the traffic signal plans and the new studies that Caltrans provided to them. Pedestrians crossing the intersection could activate the signal. Regarding the traffic studies, he said the studies include Alameda Landing, Alameda Point and road projects for the City.

Jim Strehlow, Alameda resident, referred to the Cross Alameda Trail project at Ralph Appezzato Parkway and during last month's Transportation Commission meeting a plaza area was mentioned. He spoke to staff person Michelle Berner of West Alameda Business Association (WABA), and she said a consultant designer was working with the City, but she does not know the details. He urged staff to have the designs of the Webster Street plaza area fully vetted by WABA members.

Staff Payne replied that the WABA design committee - not Michele Berner - has been working with the City and they have forwarded their design sketch for the Neptune Tower and plaza area.

3A. Central Avenue Complete Street Concept Proposal Workshop #: Tuesday, April 14 at 6:30 p.m. (Encinal High School Cafeteria, 210 Central Avenue)

Staff Payne stated that the meeting would introduce the idea of a proposed bikeway along Central Avenue between Pacific Avenue/Main Street and Encinal Avenue/Sherman Street.

3B. Clement Avenue Complete Street Concept Proposal Workshop #3: Wednesday, April 29 at 6:30 p.m. (Main Library, 1550 Oak Street)

Staff Payne stated that this meeting would be the third and last workshop.

3C. Transportation Commission Meeting: Wednesday, May 27 at 7 p.m. (City Hall Council Chambers)

Staff Payne stated that a special meeting will be held at the end of April and the regularly scheduled meeting will be held on May 27.

4. Consent Calendar

4A. Transportation Commission Minutes – Approve Meeting Minutes – January 28, 2015

4B. Joint Meeting Minutes of the Transportation Commission and Planning Board – Approve Meeting Minutes – February 25, 2015

Commissioner Miley moved to approve Item 4A and 4B of the Consent Calendar. *Commissioner Schatmeier* seconded the motion. The motion was approved 7-0.

5. New Business

5B. Approve 2015-2017 Transportation Projects in Alameda’s Proposed Capital Improvement Program and Provide Input on 2017-2025 Transportation Projects

Staff Garland and *Staff Payne* presented the report.

Commissioner Vargas referred to page 7 of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) document and stated that the gas tax revenue was projected to drop to \$1.6 million dollars per year, and wanted to know why the gas tax revenue was reduced.

Staff Garland replied that the gas tax was calculated with a state formula and the formula reduced the revenue received by the City. He also mentioned that hybrid vehicles are part of the reason for the reduction of gas tax revenue.

Commissioner Miley referred to page 15 of the CIP document regarding a facility study that the Department of Public Works was conducting. He wanted to get an idea of what the schedule looked like.

Staff Garland replied that the facility study should be completed by the fall. Furthermore, he said that his staff procured a third party expert on facility assessment to identify all deficiencies and costs to remedy the facilities. He said that staff would turn the results into a ten-year capital plan.

Commissioner Miley referred to page 17 of the CIP document and asked if the \$13 million needed to get the City’s roads in “good” condition was per year or over two years.

Staff Garland said the figure was an upfront investment of over two years with a big push on street resurfacing to make that big jump to “good” condition.

Commissioner Bellows asked *Staff Garland* if the City was aiming for the current level, which was at the high end of “fair.”

Liam Garland replied yes to maintain the current level.

Commissioner Vargas referred to the bar chart on page 25 of the CIP document and said the chart outlined \$19 million in funds, but the text stated by the end of fiscal year June 30, 2017 the

remaining funds would be \$20 million.

Liam Garland replied the numbers should be consistent and the \$20 million in funds is a typo.

Commissioner Schatmeier stated that some funds, which were initially devoted to street paving and road rehabilitation, have been reallocated to transportation. Therefore, he asked for the dollar amount.

Liam Garland replied that the funds have not been reallocated, but moved from rehabilitation to transportation and that would be a \$10 million project.

Commissioner Schatmeier said the change would cause the remainder of the other transportation projects to have \$9 million for funding.

Liam Garland replied yes.

Commissioner Schatmeier explained that part of the short-term capital project plan was updating the pedestrian and bicycle plans, which were completed in 2009 and 2010, respectively. Thus, he wanted to know if the transit plan also would be updated since the last update was in 2001 and if there was another source of funding to update the plan.

Staff Payne replied that the transit plan update was currently going through a separate process with City Council and staff would have a special City Council meeting about this soon. She explained for now there was a placeholder project called the Island Access Study for that item because staff was not sure what the City Council would approve.

Commissioner Schatmeier asked staff if the Island Access Study would be multimodal.

Staff Payne replied that the City Council would discuss whether to have a separate transit plan and a separate Transportation Demand Management plan.

Commissioner Schatmeier asked staff if they have identified funding for the study.

Staff Payne replied no.

Commissioner Vargas referred to the City's Transportation Element within Exhibit 3 and he wondered if there have been changes to the street classification system that described the street types.

Staff Payne replied that the Transportation Element was passed in 2009 and the document was a significant effort. She said if the Transportation Element was to be revised, the Transportation Commission would have an active part in the process and staff does not plan to change the document any time soon.

Commissioner Bertken said the staff report and presentation was the best presentation of a budget plan that he has seen in the many years that he has worked in this profession.

Commissioner Bellows opened the floor to public comments.

Don Sherratt, Alameda Resident and member of Alameda County Fairgrounds Association, said that he was a member of the Alameda Traffic Advisory Committee and Recreation and Park Commission for eight years. When he was on the Recreation and Park Commission, there was an issue about funding the bike bridge and there was a promise to continue the bike trail all the way around Alameda. He spoke with *Commissioner Hans* and he mentioned a safety issue near the bridge and that it was hard to travel by bicycle on that path. He explained that there are four speed humps that slow the speed, so when you go from the bridge to Shore Line Drive there was a gap. He also said that when he was on the Recreation and Park Commission, funding was promised to continue the bike path from the East Bay Regional Parks District and the City, but the funding did not come through because of political reasons.

Commissioner Bellows explained to *Don Sherratt* that the Commission moved the project from long-term to short-term so that project could begin with a feasibility study.

Jim Strehlow referred to Exhibit 2 found on page 5, item 53 of the staff report. He wanted to know the timing of the traffic signals and the flow for cars, bicycles and pedestrians because when talking about major funding and long-term projects residents need to understand the flow of transportation.

Lucy Gigli, Bike Walk Alameda Advocacy Director, reviewed the plan with staff and she asked that Central Avenue and Fifth Street to Sherman Street be pushed up to the short-term projects.

Staff Payne replied that the Central Avenue project was in the conceptual phase and that was the basis for the meeting on April 14. It was hard to know if the community will accept a bikeway along Central Avenue. She felt it was hard to place the corridor, but staff felt the section between Pacific Avenue and Fifth Street should be placed in the short-term and the project will be submitted as part of a TIGER grant even though they have not gone through the concept proposal since this section is part of the Bay Trail and adjacent to Alameda Point.

Commissioner Bellows asked staff if the approval and vetting phase were deemed viable could staff move the project from the long-term to the short-term in the next round.

Staff Payne replied yes.

Jon Spangler, Alameda resident and a League of American Cycling Instructor, said he hoped that staff was putting as much effort into obtaining transit funding as they were with the capital funding. He understood that the operations and capital funding rules were different, but the City should attempt to rebalance the funding scales.

Commissioner Miley echoed *Commissioner Bertken's* comments about staff's excellent work on the report. When he reviewed the priority list, and listened to the various residents, he found that traffic calming and pedestrian safety on Otis Drive was not listed.

Staff Payne replied that the project was on the long-term list as part of the Otis Drive Bikeway. She also explained that when staff looked at the bikeway proposal, they also reviewed the corridor

as a complete street. She said staff might change the project name to Otis Drive Complete Street.

Commissioner Miley echoed *Jon Spangler's* comment about how seeking various funding options were imperative. He said Cal Fire recently had a call for projects for urban greening and it may be out of staff's purview, but Cap and Trade funding may bring more revenue for urban forestry projects.

Commissioner Schatmeier stated that the City needed to make transit more user friendly and the capital program could address the transit issue. He suggested that the City could possibly subsidize transfers by AC Transit within City limits.

Commissioner Vargas said he enjoyed the pictures in the report and he noticed a Geographic Information System (GIS) project that would identify utilities, maintenance and overall infrastructure, which was helpful.

Commissioner Miley replied that *Jim Strehlow* brought up a light signalization plan and that should be addressed.

Staff Patel said staff could address the traffic signal synchronization program.

<p><i>Commissioner Bertken</i> made a motion to approve Item 5B. <i>Commissioner Miley</i> seconded the motion. The motion was approved 7-0.</p>
--

5C. Approve the Clement Avenue Complete Street Concept Proposal and the Active Transportation Program Grant Submittal

Staff Payne presented the report.

Commissioner Schatmeier referred to the PowerPoint slide showing the existing section and proposed section. He asked staff if the location of the railroad tracks would be unacceptable to motorists.

Staff Payne replied motorists tend to travel away from the railroad tracks and veer off into the bike space. She also said the street would need resurfacing to make the road smoother. Furthermore, she stated that the removal of the railroad tracks was ranked highest on the goals for the community.

Commissioner Vargas asked staff about the Navy and businesses' views of the proposal. He referenced the city documents and NACTO guidelines relative to challenges of putting a cycle track in an industrial designated street. He also expressed concern over the quality of the technical document supporting the recommendations.

Staff Payne said the Navy restricted parking in front of their facility, so staff planned to work with them to reduce the restriction because it was right near Thompson Field. Regarding the businesses, she stated that staff had several meetings and some businesses were in favor and others were opposed. Businesses on the north side had the most significant comments. She explained that the businesses at Alameda Marina were opposed to the bikeway on the north side. The owner of the property, *Shawn Murphy*, supported the project because he was working with the Planning Department to redevelop the property as a multi-use development in the future.

Commissioner Bellows opened the floor to public comments.

Shawn Throwe, business owner at the Alameda Marina, said he received a lot of boats on trucks and some of the boats are over 15 feet wide. He found the proposal misplaced because the area was zoned industrial and the cycle track should be moved to Buena Vista Avenue. He felt the City was attempting to drive out the boat industry from the island.

Jim Strehlow said Clement Avenue was his secret highway as a child. He stated that he was against the protected bikeway proposal because it was not designed the right way and the bikeway should be placed on the south side not the north side. He told the Commission to ignore the community consensus survey because anyone could have stuffed the comment box. He urged Commission to look at the safety issues and how the businesses use the street.

Sean Svendsen, owner of Svendsen's Boat Works, said he was opposed to the plan because Alameda used the corridor as a viable truck route going east to west. He explained to the Commission that his business off loads a couple of hundred boats per year and the boats range from 40-50 feet in length and weigh 20-30 tons. He also said that sometimes the trucks that haul the boats have a wide load escort. He felt it made no sense to create a blind spot for truckers, RVs and trailer boats coming in and out of the marina. He believed it was a good idea to remove the

railroad tracks and make the sidewalk improvements. He was in favor of bike lanes on each side. However, when looking at objective #8, improving truck access, he does not see that happening.

Zach Kaplan, Alameda resident and bicycle rider, said he was in favor of removing the railroad tracks and making the sidewalk improvements, but he was opposed to the cycle track. He explained that he used to own a Class A motor home and the two-way bike track will produce a fatality. Also, if he attempted to use the cycle track in the wrong direction he would have to cross a lane of traffic to get to the other side and then cross another traffic lane to get back, so there would be two additional conflicts with motor vehicles.

Sara Sanchez, Alameda Marina business owner, said she was excited for the planned street improvements and she has seen an increase in bicycle activity. She looked forward to the cyclists having their own space, but she opposed the plan because the corridor is designated as an active truck route. She noted that if the railroad tracks were removed and Clement Avenue was striped like Broadway Avenue then the flexibility for motorists would be preserved and cyclists would have a safe space to ride. She urged the Commission to only approve the street and sidewalk improvements and wait for more data before implementing the cycle track.

Liz Taylor, Alameda Marina business owner, said there are large trucks that come into the facility and people from all over the world come because they have space to offload trucks. She went on to say that cyclists generally avoid Clement Avenue. She also noted that Clement Avenue was an emergency access route. She felt it was more sensible to have better connectivity between Fruitvale BART and the Ferry Building through a resource going down Lincoln Avenue.

John McKeon, Alameda resident, former sailor, truck driver and avid cyclist, said that the concerns about the railroad tracks for cyclists are true because the tracks are dangerous. He believed there was a lot of reactive thinking from the public because as a former truck driver, he could envision better access and egress to the Marina if staff implemented the two-way bikeway proposal in a smart way. He explained that there would be extra room to make a right turn say at Shiller Street if the parking spaces were buffered back to allow more of a turning radius. He also did not see a continuous flow of truck or bicycle traffic throughout the day. The two-way bikeway would make truck drivers more aware of the presence of bicyclists. The two-way bikeway would be safer for bicyclists without close to car doors.

Lucy Gigli stated that protected bike lanes and cycle tracks separate and protect people from faster moving traffic. She explained that vehicles going 75 mph zoom by cyclists and the cycle tracks separate cyclists from car doors. Furthermore, she said that 81 percent of respondents were in favor of the cycle track for Clement Avenue. She stood out on Shore Line Drive to obtain people's opinions and they were happy about this cycle track plan.

Dorothy Freeman stated that a new development came before the Planning Board labeled as 2100 Clement Avenue and this project would hold 58 new condos between Willow Street and the Thompson High School football field. However, she said the address is actually 2100 Eagle Avenue. All of the traffic would be going down Eagle Avenue and the City will have to construct a three-way traffic signal for people to go in and out of the development.

Ginni Dofflemyer, Alameda resident, said the new development planned at 2100 Eagle Avenue would create more traffic at Buena Vista and Eagle Avenues. Regarding the Alameda traffic study, she wanted to know when the document was published and she wanted to know where she could read the document. She also asked staff if the rails on Clement Avenue could be repaired or used for transportation because that may be cheaper than taking them out. Furthermore, she requested that the Commission schedule a time to speak about the 2100 Eagle Avenue development so that her neighbors can come out to speak.

Bruce Kibby, Alameda resident, felt that the Clement Avenue proposal was a well thought out plan. He said as part of the Cross Alameda Trail, the City should be building a trail through the Clement Avenue section and the protected bike lane would create a feeling of a trail rather than a regular bike lane. He appreciated the thorough outreach effort, which was similar to the Shore Line Drive outreach effort. When traveling down Shore Line Drive, he sees the changes that were made based on the input at the workshops for that project.

Jon Spangler said that he disagreed with those who support the cycle track. He explained to the Commission that the buffer zone was two feet wide between the parked cars and the cycle track and that meant people would get “doored” when heading towards Park Street. He felt the truck traffic issue needed to be dealt with and the way the parking spaces are away from the curb will not work unless there are police escorts and wide load escorts, which is not acceptable. He suggested that staff go back and review implementing Class 2 lanes in either direction and add buffers by taking parking off of one side of the street.

Trish Herrera Spencer spoke in her individual capacity as a citizen, and said that she echoed most of *Jon Spangler’s* comments. She also questioned the reliability of the resident survey because it did not outline the use of the road and the critical components. As mayor, she received comments that not all bicyclists use the cycle tracks and some bicyclists actually prefer to be in the road.

Donna Eyestone, Alameda resident, said she biked to work to Harbor Bay and took the Shore Line Drive protected bikeway all the way there, which is wonderful. She stated that the cycle track allowed her to get out of her car and on to a bike. She mentioned that the door zone was an important issue and she liked the cycle track on Shore Line Drive when going in the direction of cars because she can see whether doors are in the process of being opened. Also, when going the opposite direction, a motorist in the passenger seat who is opening the door could see her coming.

Sam Hensley, Alameda Resident, stated that he has two sons that go to the Academy of Alameda, and they are huge bikers. He said that he could not think of sending them on Clement Avenue without them being protected with a two-way bikeway. He suggested that some of the parking spaces be removed because the parking demand is not heavy.

Commissioner Morgado said the railroad tracks have to go and he requested additional street information from staff. He wondered if staff could look into how removing parking spaces would work out while constructing bikes lane on both sides of the street. He asked staff if the Commission needed more information would that preclude them from submitting an application for the grant.

Staff Payne replied eliminating parking was not an option to pursue because it was not high priority to remove parking in front of someone's home or business.

Commissioner Bellows replied that she heard the businesses say they wanted to maintain flexibility. She wondered if staff could work with them to identify off-street parking at Svendsen's Boat Works. She asked staff to think of any creative options, especially since there are homes and business on both sides of the streets.

Commissioner Morgado said staff should even consider reducing parking on the north side to increase the turning radius.

Staff Payne replied that was something that she did bring up in the presentation and staff would consider the idea because of visibility and the fact that the project was part of the complete street program.

Commissioner Bellows said she was concerned about the wide load issue and she asked staff if they could eliminate parking during date time hours when most deliveries occur.

Staff Payne replied deliveries occur throughout the day.

Commissioner Hans stated that the street width was 13 feet across and the 6 foot rail road tracks acts as a buffer. He went on to say that staff was looking into reducing the street width to 11 feet, so he wondered if parking was needed on the north side in order to increase some of the turning areas.

Commissioner Miley referred to the City's Transportation Element objective 4.1.7 and objective 4.3.3. He felt the project was adhering to the objectives, but he was willing to approve the concept with some modifications for staff to look at Class II bike lanes. Ultimately, he worried that the cycle tracks were being shoehorned on Clement Avenue and given the current land use the idea may not work.

Commissioner Bertken said that removing the railroad tracks was important and he was glad to hear from both opposing and proposing views on how the cycle track would work. However, he said reducing the street width on Clement Avenue for truck traffic was not positive and he wanted further analysis on having bike lanes on either side of the street.

Staff Payne replied the grant that staff would be applying for was for the design and construction of the proposal and there could be modifications.

Commissioner Bertken asked staff about the amount of the grant.

Staff Payne replied once staff received direction on how to move forward then they can cost out the concept for the grant application.

Commissioner Bellows said voting on the agenda item was to move the project forward with an application to the grant. Furthermore, she said the grant amount was on a sliding scale, meaning

the City may not receive all of the funds they initially requested.

Commissioner Vargas said he was happy to see the diverse responses and found eight speakers not for the cycle track and four speakers for the cycle track and a few other comments. He explained that he grew up in Chicago and he used to bike ride from the north to south side for many hours alongside heavy truck traffic. He felt the most important thing he was trying to bring to the conversation was that the community contained industrial traffic. There are numerous driveways, and the trucks have large turning radii. He related a conversation that he had with NACTO advocates from Chicago that implemented a lot of cycle tracks and their biggest lesson to him was to be careful when putting too many bicycle facilities in industrial areas. He said carving in too much into the truck traffic would be dangerous. Additionally, he noted that there were public concerns of placing cycle tracks on one side where the destination was on the opposite side of the street. He re-stated that the NACTO component needed to be factored in and he felt the consulting firm should have done more homework regarding the City's policy. There are heavy traffic volumes and ultimately, he felt staff should keep all the modes of traffic in mind and there must be a balance.

Commissioner Schatmeier stated that this is a designated bicycle, truck and transit route and the City must find a way to allow all of the transportation needs to coexist. He asked staff why the cycle track was on the north side rather than the south side, which would eliminate many truck conflicts on south side. He summarized a business owner's comment regarding how truck access would be improved, and asked for more information. He also questioned the parking demand in the area and he requested that staff provide data on who parked in the area.

Staff Payne replied that the south side contained a number of dead-end streets and many more street conflicts since the streets end on the south side of Clement Avenue. Regarding truck access, in the future Clement Avenue would extend from Tilden Avenue to Sherman Street. She explained Clement Avenue would be a through route for trucks in the long term. She also said staff wanted to make sure the turning radii was sufficient for the trucks and a loading zone is proposed near Oak Street. Additionally, she said staff would consider eliminating parking spaces on the street. To eliminate parking on one side of the entire street would not be possible.

Commissioner Schatmeier asked staff if they eliminated parking on one side of the street how many parking spaces would be taken out.

Commissioner Bellows said there are 220 parking spaces in total on the street.

Staff Payne replied divide the 220 parking spaces by half for each side of the street.

Commissioner Schatmeier asked staff who is using these parking spaces.

Staff Payne stated that the area is zoned as multi-use and commercial and residential and used to be industrial. The long-term vision of the street is to be more multi-use (commercial, residential retail and some industrial). Currently, it is a mixed corridor.

Commissioner Miley asked staff what is the parking demand.

Staff Payne stated that she does not have it in front of her yet it is not anywhere near 100 percent, and the demand depends on the section of Clement Street. She requested that the Transportation Commissioners consider approving the traditional bike lane concept.

Commissioner Miley stated that while the zoning may change, we have existing users and the City needs to balance equity and accommodate all users, but maintain their safety.

Commissioner Miley moved to approve the concept so that staff could move the item forward to the City Council, but the concept should be focused on traditional Class II lanes. He also hoped the design would not preclude the City from being able to install cycle tracks in the future.

Commissioner Bellows stated the motion should also make sure that truck traffic is accommodated and that the wide loads needed to be accommodated safely.

Commissioner Bertken asked if the proposal also includes all the key features in the staff report.

Commissioner Schatmeier wanted more information on parking demand. If the parking is used only 50 percent then staff should consolidate parking on one side of the street and have the cycle track.

Commissioner Miley stated that a cycle track could go in the future, pending more information.

Commissioner Bellows wanted to include more parking information and utilization rates with a feasibility study to see if parking could be consolidated.

Commissioner Miley made a motion to approve staff concept recommendations with the exception of item b, instead make the lanes traditional Class II bike lanes. He also requested that staff accommodate truck access. Also, staff would look into parking demand and provide the parking information moving forward. *Commissioner Morgado* seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-2, 1 abstention.

5D. Approve Point-to-Point Car Sharing Policy

Staff Payne presented the report.

Commissioner Bertken told staff that a car sitting in front of someone's home for three days could be a bit onerous.

Commissioner Schatmeier asked staff if he reserved a car after 10 pm and parked the car close to his home would he be charged just for driving the car to his house.

Staff Payne replied that was exactly how you would use the car, and the rental would end once you arrive at home.

Commissioner Morgado requested that the review occur after one year.

Walter Rosencrantz of car2go introduced himself and provided a brief overview of the car2go operation including an explanation that it makes business sense to move car2go vehicles that are not moving after 24 hours.

Commissioner Miley moved the staff report with an amendment that staff reviews the progress within one year rather than within two years. *Commissioner Hans* seconded the motion. The motion was approved 7-0.

5E. Approve City of Alameda Paratransit Program Review for Fiscal Year 2015/2016

Staff Payne presented the report.

Commissioner Miley moved to approve the staff report. *Commissioner Hans* seconded the motion. The motion was approved 7-0.

6. Staff Communications

6A. Update on Ad Hoc Transit Committee

Staff Payne replied that *Board member Knox White* is interested in joining the committee and *Commissioners Miley* and *Schatmeier* are interested. *Staff Payne* suggested that *Commissioner Hans* participate because of the school trips within the area.

6B. Potential Future Meeting Agenda Items

1. Review Quarterly Report on Activities Related to Transportation Policies and Plans
2. Proposed I-880/Broadway/Jackson Multimodal Transportation and Circulation Improvements
3. AC Transit's Comprehensive Operations Analysis

7. Announcements/Public Comments

Commissioner Miley announced that Assistant City Manager, *Alex Nguyen*, will be leaving to the city of Riverside and he thanked him for his service to the City.

8. Adjournment

10:07 pm