

Transportation Commission Special Meeting Minutes

Wednesday March 22, 2017

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)
Christopher Miley (Vice Chair)
Jesus Vargas
Gregory Morgado
Thomas G. Bertken
Samantha Soules
Michael Hans

Staff Present:

Jennifer Ott, Base Reuse and Transportation Planning Director
Shahram Aghamir, City Engineer
Sergeant Ryan Derespini, Alameda Police Department
Gail Payne, Transportation Coordinator
Rochelle Wheeler, Transportation Planner

2. Agenda Changes

None.

Jim Strehlow, Alameda resident, said the minutes from last month's Transportation Commission meeting said that he spoke about the Posey Tube and the roadway and there was graffiti on the panels. He pointed out that graffiti existed on some of the panels, not all of the panels. Most importantly, last month he discussed AC Transit Line 19 where he presented a diagram and explained while driving that he was stopped behind the bus near the Stanton Street bus stop. He stated that during the meeting, *Sergeant Derespini*, stated that his comments were valid and Public Works staff promised that the issue would be resolved. The next morning, the bus operator stopped in front of him and this time he was riding his bicycle. He spoke to the operator and was told to contact the police if he felt it was an infraction. That morning, he called the Alameda Police Department and was told unless they are there to cite the behavior it is under the jurisdiction of the Sheriff's Department. He called the Sheriff's Department twice that day and the following Monday without any response since. He felt the contact number for the Sheriff's Department was like a straw dog set up to exist, but not to service citizens' needs. He asked the Transportation Commission if anything could be done to either relocate the bus stop or have

Public Works repaint the street and remove the double yellow lines that motorists illegally cross. He also asked the Commission if this issue was an action item or will it be left the way it is.

Commissioner Bellows replied the Commission could place this issue on the next agenda and she asked staff to address it.

Staff Payne said AC Transit will be rescheduling and shortening the route on Sunday, March 26. She explained that the schedule and route change would remove the operators waiting at that stop. She further said the buses were stopping because the operators were running hot and that caused them to wait at the time point, where Stanton Street is the designated time point.

Jim Strehlow said the officer stated that this behavior was creating a traffic hazard. Thus, Public Works should remove the double yellow line, enforce traffic, or relocate the bus stop.

Commissioner Bellows replied she would speak to staff about it.

Commissioner Miley stated that the Commission received a letter from *Nina Klem* and he wanted to make sure that Public Works staff received the letter as well. He asked staff to forward the letter to the appropriate parties at Public Works to see if spot treatments could be made to increase the safety of the bridge for students who ride their bicycles to and from Lincoln and Bay Farm Middle Schools.

3.A. Earth Day Festival: Saturday, April 22 – 10 a.m. to 3 p.m.

3.B. Transportation Commission Special Meeting: Wednesday, April 26 at 7 p.m.

3.C. Correspondence to Transportation Commission (Information)

3.D. Warm Springs Invitation (Information)

4.A. Approve Meeting Minutes – March 22, 2017 – Special Meeting Minutes (Action)

Commissioner Vargas followed up with *Jim Strehlow's* comments about the March 22, 2017 Commission meeting minutes. He said the meeting minutes need to be reviewed for accuracy and grammar. He said he would leave his notes with *Staff Payne* to review. Therefore, he asked that the Commission hold off on approving the minutes.

5. New Business

5.A. Approve Design Concept for Cross Alameda Trail Gap Closure on Atlantic Avenue between Webster Street and Constitution Way (Action)

Staff Wheeler, Transportation Planner for the Alameda Planning Division, presented the report.

Commissioner Miley asked *Rochelle Wheeler* about the delineation between the cycle track and the sidewalk.

Staff Wheeler replied the surfaces of the sidewalk and the protected bike lane would be different (concrete and asphalt, respectively), but they would be at the same grade without a vertical separation. She also noted that there would be striping along the protected bike lane, so pedestrians and bicyclists could visually see the difference.

Commissioner Vargas asked *Staff Wheeler* about the vast difference between the mid-block crossing cost that was estimated a year ago and the cost estimated now.

Staff Wheeler explained that, last year, the project without the mid-block crossing was estimated at \$200,000 to \$400,000. She said the project's current cost, based on a more detailed design, is approximately \$1 million and the mid-block crossing would cost approximately \$150,000.

Commissioner Bertken asked *Staff Wheeler* about the left turn movement on Constitution Way heading south, to eastbound Atlantic Avenue. He said there is a two-lane left turn pocket and the design concept appears to show an elimination of one of the two lanes on Atlantic Avenue. The result of widening the curb at Atlantic Avenue, which took out a traffic lane, would create a two-lane turn pocket that merges into one lane.

Staff Wheeler replied staff would look into this further.

Commissioner Bertken said he travels that way often and if he has to merge in the middle of the intersection that will be difficult. He also asked *Staff Wheeler* if a sign would be installed at the corner to alert cars to give way to bicyclists traveling behind them. However, he explained the underlying issue would be that motorists do not see bicyclists because they are moving behind them. So, he wondered if staff could address that by alerting bicyclists that cars are turning at this southwest corner of Constitution and Atlantic.

Staff Wheeler said she could include these ideas in the design concept.

Commissioner Bellows opened the floor to public comment.

Jim Strehlow stated that the Commission spoke about the Cross Alameda Trail design two years ago. He said he argued against that design because it did not include the bus stop. He said the Commission approved that design and he was not quite sure how that was going to work out. He pointed out that he was relatively happy with the current design with one exception. He felt bicyclists would not need separated bicycle lanes. He stated that many bicyclists ride on the sidewalks without protected bicycle lanes, sharing the space with pedestrians along Webster by the College of Alameda. He stated that he did not understand why bicycle lanes were needed on this one block of Atlantic Avenue, especially when he only sees one bicyclist and maybe five or six pedestrians every half hour.

He said the design on this one segment does not warrant taking away a traffic lane from Atlantic Avenue, especially a right-hand turn lane. He said as the cars move from two lanes into one lane, the staff report indicated that motorists would incur 1 to 7.5 seconds of delay at the intersection. However, he believed that was wrong and there will be over 2 minutes of delay because cars that want to make a right-hand turn onto Constitution Way would be prevented

from doing so. He requested that staff provide the number of cars heading eastbound in both lanes.

Susie Hufstader, Bike East Bay staff member and Alameda resident, thanked Alameda staff for providing a beautiful design given all the complications and constraints surrounding the area. She said when she moved to Alameda, she was impressed with the protected bike lanes on Shoreline Drive and Fernside Avenue. She mentioned that Alameda has always been a front-runner for these types of facilities and the City providing protected intersections would take it to the next level. She pointed out that this design would allow all types of bicyclists to use the protected bike lane. She noted that the city of Oakland's bike projects, especially on Fruitvale Avenue, would allow the entire Cross Alameda Trail to continue into Oakland and towards the Fruitvale BART Station.

Denyse Trepanier, Bike Walk Alameda representative and Alameda resident, said she would be a big consumer of the bike facility because she resides near the project. She voiced her full support towards staff's presentation and she felt this project is very forward thinking. She explained that this project would allow bicyclists to connect from Jean Sweeney Park to the Cross Alameda Trail from the west end. She also said having bicyclists ride in the door zone is dangerous and a stripe of paint does not suffice. She pointed out that the plan is very forward thinking because it offers protected facilities at the intersections where cyclists need the most protection. She thanked Alameda staff, the engineering firm and everyone who worked on the design for being creative because there were a lot of challenges to overcome. Additionally, she said the project was critical if Alameda is going to provide safe passage for bicyclists along the northern end of the island. Therefore, she asked the Commission to approve the design to close the Cross Alameda Trail gap.

Brian McGuire, Alameda resident, thanked staff and said it may seem like a small effort, but this was important when connecting Seaplane Lagoon to Fruitvale BART and beyond. He stated that connecting these segments was not only important, but it rebalanced the equity of the bicycle infrastructure within Alameda and that is important for residents in the west end. He explained that the biggest users of this path would be students going to and from Jean Sweeney Park to the Ralph Appezato segment. He exclaimed that the bike path would also alleviate congestion in and around the tube by moving users from cars to bicycles. He felt the project area was complicated, but staff got it right. Also, staff provided a safe bicycle facility without sacrificing too much from vehicles. So, he urged the Commission to approve the plan.

Commissioner Vargas complimented staff for bringing AC Transit, and Alameda Police and Fire Departments into the conversation when they were not initially engaged. He felt this is not just a multimodal corridor, but also a combination of funnels that are concentrated at a couple of points. He said a lot of attention should be placed on the design, so that staff do not favor one mode of transportation. He pointed out that the flow of freight trucks was mentioned briefly and he wanted to hear more about it. He indicated that he attended a conference in the Central Valley and he explained that the last mile of getting freight to the destination was a constant concern. He told *Staff Wheeler* that it was good to see the traffic lane widths were not substandard. He also echoed *Commissioner Bertken's* concerns about bicyclists' safety. He noted that the southeast corner of Atlantic Avenue and Constitution Way contained many opposing movements. So, he wondered if there's a way for staff to go beyond the standard traffic operations analysis for an

intersection and conduct a visual simulation for the various phases that are involved to see where conflicts reside. He also stated that he did not see signage planned for the driveway area.

Commissioner Bertken replied there is a warning sign just before the driveway that says you cannot move ahead unless the lane is clear. He then said there is a sign that says if you are a car making a turn you have to yield to pedestrians and he felt that was overkill.

Staff Wheeler replied that currently a stop sign is not present for cars exiting the driveway, but there will be and she said there would be a warning sign, showing that bicyclists are traveling two-ways, for cars entering and exiting the driveway. The information can be found call outs #6 and #7 of the staff report, Exhibit 5.

Commissioner Vargas stated that when looking at the traffic operations reports, the Level of Service (LOS) heading westbound would stay the same and he asked *Staff Wheeler* if anything could be done to improve it, since the City would be spending approximately \$1 million on this area. In addition, he said that since the project's costs are high, he would like to find out why they have increased. He understood that the design received significant changes while remaining cutting edge, but he wondered if it would make sense to spend the funds on testing the design with paint, rather than concrete work.

Staff Wheeler said in regards to *Commissioner Vargas'* questions, firstly, truck traffic was analyzed and that Public Works had been a great advocate for considering the truck routes. Staff also conducted counts of the number of trucks on this block. She stated that trucks would be able to make all of the turns from one truck route to another. Secondly, she said when looking at the traffic analysis, staff could look into that if there is more time and resources. *Commissioner Vargas* clarified that it would be a visual simulation at Constitution Way and Atlantic Avenue, and would be useful for the right-hand turns at the southwest corner. *Commissioner Vargas* echoed the same concern that *Commissioner Bertken* expressed at this intersection. Lastly, regarding the costs, *Staff Wheeler* stated that the project brought to the Commission over a year ago used the existing travel lanes and did not move the curb. She explained that the previous estimate did not include soft costs (i.e. construction support and management), nor did it include a 25 percent contingency, both of which are included in the current project cost. The concrete work alone, including building the facility on the south side of the street, but not including the demo work or staging work, is approximately \$260,000. She said that is one of the largest items, at a quarter of the project's total cost. She further explained that the largest cost is the signal work, estimated at \$270,000, because they have to install the protected left turn phases at Constitution, and physically move some of the traffic signal poles. She noted that both of these sub-costs are without the contingency added in.

Commissioner Vargas asked why the mid-block crossing was deleted.

Staff Wheeler replied the City did study this and was hoping to come up with a design that directly addresses the current illegal mid-block crossings. The City looked at different locations for the mid-block crossing and how it would impact traffic and safety. She said there are no strict warrants, so the project team looked at the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) for guidance criteria. They reviewed the factors such as the vehicle speed limits, collision history, visibility, pedestrian

volumes, and roadway width. She stated that the City's key guidance criteria were: pedestrian volumes, collision history and the distance to the signalized intersections. The crossing is not too far from the nearby signalized intersections and it would be safer for pedestrians to cross at one of them. She noted that if the City installed a rectangular rapid flashing beacon, the vehicles would be required to yield to pedestrians, but they may not stop. She indicated that the pedestrian guidance thresholds for a marked crossing are 20 total pedestrians, or 15 senior pedestrians, in the peak hour. Staff counted 12 seniors and 17 total pedestrians crossing when conducting pedestrian counts this year, during the highest peak hour - 11:45 a.m. to 12:45 p.m. Thus, she explained the pedestrian counts were just under the guidance thresholds. Finally, she stated that there was one pedestrian-involved collision in 10 years, even though pedestrians regularly cross there.

Commissioner Bertken asked *Staff Wheeler* if pedestrians do not press the pedestrian push-button, then does the crosswalk not exist?

Staff Wheeler replied no, since it would still be a marked crosswalk.

Commissioner Bertken replied that if the rapid flashing beacon lights are not blinking, then Atlantic is just a throughway and it does not delay motorists. So, it's only when the pedestrian presses the button to cross that motorists are delayed.

Staff Wheeler replied that the traffic impacts of the options with and without the midblock crossing are about the same, since cars only need to yield to pedestrians and are not required to stay stopped, as at a red traffic light.

Commissioner Miley stated that the priority tonight was to see the gap closed. Regarding the mid-block, he said he could take it or leave it and he questioned whether the mid-block crossing would be used more. He felt *Commissioners Bertken and Vargas* echoed his concerns about the turning actions at Constitution Way. He also noted that the staff report said during the peak p.m. hours there were 173 vehicular turns and during the peak a.m. hours there were 110 turns from Atlantic Avenue onto Constitution Way. He believed when looking at the drawings and conceptualizing the queuing concern, a simulation would be useful. He asked *Staff Wheeler* if staff looked at signalizing traffic so left and right turns could proceed simultaneously. He also wondered if there was a way to signalize the controls, like a scramble, to allow pedestrians and bicyclists to cross the intersection without any cars proceeding.

Staff Wheeler replied that the City explored the simultaneous right and left turn idea but that because there is a combined through and right turn lane eastbound on Atlantic Avenue, the right turns cannot proceed in a turn-only phase, because they might be stopped behind a through car.

Commissioner Bellows wondered if, rather than giving a lane to the left turns, could they use some of the median and make that a left turn lane and scoot everything over, thereby maintaining all three existing lanes. That would provide a free right turn lane.

Staff Wheeler said they also looked at that option, but rejected it because it increases the cost since they would have to remove the center median on both sides of the street, to make room and to allow for the alignment of lanes across the intersection. However, she explained that the traffic

analysis for future years shows there could be more traffic impacts, so that is something that could be considered in the future.

Commissioner Bellows said that regarding installing the midblock crossing later, if the Commission chose Option 1 that wouldn't really work because the overall project design would change.

Staff Wheeler replied the Option 2, with midblock crossing, includes a small bulb-out, which could be installed now, and the crossing could be installed later, if desired. She also noted that the area that would need to be changed to install the midblock crossing - between the driveway and where the protected bikeway straightens out - is not large, so it is not out of the question that it could be modified in the future.

Commissioner Bertken stated that there must be a way to have the bicycles gather and wait for a green signal, similar to when pedestrians gather and wait for the signal to change and then they cross the intersection. He felt installing signage there does not really solve the problem because many motorists won't see bicycles coming through.

Staff Wheeler said the turning vehicle warning signs would alert motorists that bicyclists may be approaching and they should proceed slowly.

Commissioner Soules asked *Staff Wheeler* about the enforcement plan, which she read as part of the public comment portion within the staff packet. She particularly wanted to know whether staff would be working with the Alameda Police Department to make sure vehicles comply with the California Vehicle Code. She also said the mid-block crossing could encourage greater use and that could affect traffic. She asked *Staff Wheeler* if the project team discussed how to implement enforcement and education.

Staff Wheeler replied they have not developed a plan yet and they would conduct public outreach to all of the groups using the area before, during and after construction.

Commissioner Soules replied it would be good to have additional information sent out to the community. She also said it would be good to understand the project's phasing and staff should include this information in the Commission's future agendas as well as update the community about the construction impacts. She asked *Staff Wheeler* if staff determined the project's maintenance costs.

Staff Wheeler stated that they have not worked on the calculations, but they have been thinking about maintenance costs as the design was being developed. Overall, there would be costs for landscaping and maintenance of the facility.

Commissioner Hans asked staff about that driveway on the southside of Atlantic Avenue. He asked *Staff Wheeler* if motorists would be able to make the left turn into this driveway.

Staff Wheeler replied yes.

Commissioner Hans said a similar turn exists in front of Lincoln Middle School where almost

every day he would see someone almost hit. He explained that it's easy for cars making a left turn to see the eastbound motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians. However, he felt it would be difficult for motorists to see the westbound bike lanes. Ultimately, motorists would be crossing two bike lanes and a sidewalk when they turn into the driveway and that's going to be difficult.

Commissioner Miley said *Commissioner Hans* made an excellent point. He wondered whether there was a way to prohibit this left hand turn, especially since it could be a potential safety issue.

Staff Wheeler said they have been looking at those turns into the driveway. She stated that one reason the bicycle facility is elevated across the driveway was to make sure the cars slowed down before getting to the facility. Signage was included to show motorists that the area contained a two-way bicycle facility. Further, she said staff considered closing off the turn both in and out of the driveway, but the property owner was against the idea.

Commissioner Vargas stated that he thought about having no left turns at certain times of the day and that should be analyzed and implemented in this design. Additionally, he asked *Staff Wheeler* if staff looked at implementing bicycle-only signals similar to the ones implemented in Davis, California and a few other cities.

Staff Wheeler replied staff looked at this idea, but they did not study it in detail. The project team understood that it would be expensive and there would be much larger vehicle impacts at both intersections from adding phases for bicycle and pedestrian crossings. She noted that the AC Transit Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project would travel down Ralph Appenzato Memorial Parkway and possibly make a left turn onto Webster Street. This project would allow staff to consider adding a bicycle signal on Webster Street in the future when they add a BRT project.

Commissioner Miley wondered if staff had studied the cost for *Commissioner Bellows'* idea to remove the center median to add back the third eastbound travel lane at the intersection on Atlantic Avenue at Constitution Way.

Staff Wheeler said staff looked at this during the project's earlier phase and before the detailed design was produced. She explained that the cost would be approximately \$400,000 to remove the medians on both sides of the street and to change the traffic signals.

Commissioner Bertken asked staff to include some of the provisions such as analyzing the movement of two left turn lanes coming into one lane, and including a warning for bicyclists that would show an approaching auto conflict.

Commissioner Bellows stated the Commission received nine letters of support and three letters that seemed to support the project, but included design comments.

<p><i>Commissioner Miley</i> moved to approve staff's design Option 1, but included the following additions: 1. an education and enforcement piece should be included in the project; 2. staff attempt to limit construction impacts to motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists and businesses in the area; 3. staff install appropriate signage to warn bicyclists about motorist conflicts; 4. staff evaluate including a "no left turn" sign at westbound Atlantic Avenue turning into the driveway</p>

during the highest peak hours; and 5. staff address the two left turn lanes merging into one within the intersection at Constitution Way.

Commissioner Soules seconded the motion.

Commissioner Vargas amended the motion for staff to consider including within the scope that moves forward, whether that is preliminary engineering or final design, visual simulation to assist with the refinement.

Commissioner Soules asked for clarification to the amendment.

Commissioner Vargas said the visual simulation should be considered within the scope of the next phase.

Commissioner Soules seconded the motion.

The motion was approved 7-0.

5.B. Review I-880/Broadway/Jackson Transportation Project (Information)

Commissioner Vargas stated that the Alameda County Transportation (ACTC) manages the project and will be presenting the report and update. He explained that since his firm is compensated by ACTC on some of the project's work, he has a financial conflict of interest and must excuse himself.

Jennifer Ott, Director of Base Reuse and Transportation Planning, introduced *Trinity Nguyen*, ACTC Director of Project Delivery.

Trinity Nguyen introduced the project team, *Susan Chang*, ACTC Project Manager, *Chadi Chazbek* HNTB, *Alice* community outreach and *Flora*, project support.

Chadi Chazbek presented the report.

Commissioner Bellows said she understood the concept of two-way bicycle traffic in the Posey Tube, but she asked *Chadi Chazbek* if any thought has been given to placing incoming bicycle traffic in the Webster Tube. Therefore, there would be one-way bicycle traffic in the Posey Tube and one-way bicycle traffic in the Webster Tube.

Chadi Chazbek replied the project team has not looked at this, but could.

Commissioner Bellows referred to slide 18 "Preliminary Traffic Analysis Results, AM Peak Hour" and asked *Chadi Chazbek* about the travel time for the Thru Tube. She asked if the Thru Tube would be a fixed distance. Therefore, she wondered why the results were 840 seconds versus 180 seconds.

Chadi Chazbek replied the slowdown in the tube would be longer under one alternative versus the other. He explained that the distance would be the same, but it would take longer to travel through the tube under one of the alternatives.

Commissioner Bellows replied both alternatives would have 25 miles per hour (mph) limit in the tube.

Chadi Chazbek said that was correct and even when traveling 25 mph in the tube motorists' travel time would be significantly less under alternative A1: Jackson Horseshoe.

Commissioner Bellows opened the floor to public comment.

Jim Strehlow felt the project would take a while to get going given the existing situation with bicyclists and motorists leaving the Posey Tube. He said first, given the current conditions, vehicles coming out of the Posey Tube and into Oakland have trouble getting over to the most right-hand turn lane even when traveling 5 mph. He further explained that vehicles have difficulty crossing a solid white line to get into the two right-hand turn lanes onto 6th Street because the paint starts way too soon out of the tubes. He wondered if the project team could paint dotted lines there because technically it is illegal for motorists to cross a solid white line. He expressed the issue now so the project team won't make the same mistake with the new design. Second, he noted that he's a cyclist and when traveling out of the Posey tube he would love to be able to go onto the roadway straight onto Harrison Street instead of being on the sidewalk and having to get up to the intersection and push the pedestrian crossing button. He sensed that it would be better for him to negotiate the traffic with the vehicles side by side then to wait and get to a point to push the pedestrian button and then cross the intersection. Third, he said he was happy with the project, including the way it's been put together and announced. Fourth, he said he would be interested in knowing more about the actual elevation/slope that bicyclists would have to negotiate with the switchbacks. He would also like the switchback concept to be presented clearly within the designs and for the project team to explain how bicyclists would negotiate the short distance elevation and loop-to-loop just to get through, because he's concerned that he would not be able to do it as his age. Fifth, he believed the 25 mph limit through the Posey Tube was strange and the police could not enforce the speed when motorists want to go 50 mph. Finally, he's interested to see if there will be any anti-occupy protests and if the project team could slope some of the off ramp at a certain point somewhere between 9 or 10 degrees to make it harder for protestors to go up the ramps and into the freeway.

Brian McGuire said as a Bike Walk Alameda Board member, he would normally get excited to see a \$10-15 million project move forward on a bicycle and pedestrian path that would open up the west side of Alameda to Oakland. He stated that recently, Bike Walk Alameda completed its 10-year anniversary of bike and pedestrian counts through the tube and over the Park Street Bridge. Consequently, they found three reasons why people do not use the tube: 1. when bicyclists pass one another that requires one of the bicyclist to lift their bike up and over the rail; 2. There is considerable noise in the tube; and 3. There is pollution and air quality issues within the tube. He believed that opening the west side path seems to be a type of mitigation for the impacts of the switchbacks. Therefore, he did not understand how this could be considered a multimodal improvement over the current situation. He explained that he took a poll on Alameda Peeps, a Facebook group, to see how people would spend \$10 million dollars to address

multimodal, pedestrian and bicycle issues. He said 55 people would like to see a down payment made to build a pedestrian and bicycle bridge from Alameda to Oakland, 20 people said it would be great to open the west side walkway and 17 people would like the funds to be used to purchase boats for water taxi service from Alameda to Jack London Square. He said most people want to do something else with the multimodal funds and felt the City needs to send that statement to ACTC.

Lucy Gigli, Bike Walk Alameda President, stated that this project has been around for a long time with multiple iterations. She said it was Measure B and then Measure BB funds and \$75 million was allocated for Alameda to use on this project. She explained that *Brian McGuire* mentioned if the project funds were partially used, there would be \$10-15 million left that could be used for the City. Thus, she encouraged the Commission to use the remaining funds for true multimodal projects that address issues that are across the Estuary.

Denyse Trepanier said the project is multimodal in name only and she felt walking her bicycle through the tube was a horrible experience. She explained that although connections to the tube might be improved, the switchbacks introduced would only make the situation worse. She referenced the Bay Bridge project, which was supposed to be multimodal. However, the path remains randomly open on weekend days to bicyclists. She also pointed out that the off ramp going through and cutting across the bicycle and pedestrian path within the tube would reduce all access across the west end of Alameda. Based on what she heard, this may be a great solution for vehicular traffic because they need to solve the congestion problem, but she felt the multimodal funds earmarked for this project should specifically improve multimodal connections.

Commissioner Morgado exclaimed that he was hearing a lot about the money and he wanted more information about the funding allocation.

Trinity Nguyen replied ACTC is working on the Comprehensive Investment Plan (CIP), which is done every two years for a 5-year programming period. She pointed out that there are Measure BB funds specifically related to multimodal access from Oakland to Alameda and vice versa and there are several components to that funding source. She went on to say that as cities submit projects and request funding, the programming team would evaluate the requests to make sure it meets the criteria such as: feasibility, the city's local match contribution and the current stage of the project. Afterwards, recommendations would be made for the ACTC to review for action and the next review period is scheduled for July 1, 2017 with a programming period of 5 years with a 2-year allocation window. She said they're going to provide recommendations for the ACTC to review in April and they will work with the cities that submit projects.

Commissioner Miley asked if the project is in the CIP.

Trinity Nguyen replied the project includes two funding components. She explained that the project was included in Measure B, so there were funds dedicated for the general Broadway/Jackson project. The second component, Measure BB, was included as a component to address multimodal access between Alameda and Oakland. The funds could be used for a variety of benefits, but has to fit into a certain description. Ultimately, she said the total on the Measure BB side is \$75 million and the Measure B is \$8 million.

Jennifer Ott stated that the City is working with Parsons to assist with evaluating alternatives if funds are available. She said they are also looking at how those remaining funds could be reprogrammed to fund multimodal improvement for Alameda, Oakland and potentially Chinatown. However, she explained that ACTC was just beginning their public process and Alameda staff would keep their eye on potential unused funds.

Commissioner Miley replied the way *Trinity Nguyen* spoke about the CIP process he felt the Transportation Commission would make the decision on what projects were funded. So, he wanted to know if this was an Alameda, Oakland or joint project.

Jennifer Ott replied *Trinity Nguyen* was speaking about any unused funds. However, the project that was presented this evening was under ACTC, the project sponsor, and any unused funds for multimodal improvements would have to go through a reprogramming process where Alameda would have to meet ACTC's criteria.

Trinity Nguyen replied the CIP process is all the funds within their measure and there are bike and pedestrian components as well as livable streets funding pots as well. She noted that the more broad the funding pot the more competitive it is. Yet, she said she would work with *Jennifer Ott* to see what project they would like to see move forward.

Commissioner Miley seconded *Trinity Nguyen's* comment about staff doing a good job and he pointed out that the public said the tube was not adequate for bicycling or walking. Nonetheless, he was excited to see the presentation that evening and he wanted to see the project move forward with the public's questions and comments addressed.

Commissioner Bellows replied there would be additional ACTC scoping sessions in May and during different points along the line.

Commissioner Bertken said the biggest benefit for Alameda would be to tackle the problem at the Jackson Street ramp going to the freeway during the a.m. peak period because currently the project does not address this issue. He explained that the project team left the conflict between the Jackson Street ramp and the Interstate 980 exit and there's not enough traffic on the Broadway ramp to cause a problem in the a.m. peak.

Chadi Chazbek asked *Commissioner Bertken* if he was talking about the northbound Broadway off ramp.

Commissioner Bertken said he was talking about the Broadway off ramp going to Broadway right alongside the Jackson Street ramp.

Chadi Chazbek replied he's heard this before and the weave is a problem. However, the real bottleneck is the two-lane ramp drop to one lane coming before the weave section and that's the capacity constraint within the corridor. He explained that the weave is the main constraining element and the project team conducted travel runs through the area with results showing motorists slowing down as they come up the ramp while the two lanes merge into one lane. Yet, he emphasized that the project would improve the issue.

Commissioner Bertken asked *Chadi Chazbek* if they are going to rebuild the Jackson on ramp so there are two lanes onto the freeway.

Chadi Chazbek replied no.

Commissioner Bertken asked *Chadi Chazbek* then what is the difference.

Chadi Chazbek replied the difference is that right now you have two lanes that come up, but the right lane puts motorists on Broadway and since there is a small volume of cars that go through the weave section they're going to remove that from the on ramp altogether.

Commissioner Bertken stated that it's important to understand that a good portion of the project has to do with Oakland's side of the tunnel rather than Alameda's side.

Commissioner Miley replied that *Commissioner Bertken's* comments were correct, but it's a matter of working with our neighbor.

Jennifer Ott reminded the Commission that there would be an approximate 3-minute travel savings to get to the freeway and that would be a significant amount of time saved even when the speeds are reduced within the tube. However, she agreed with *Commissioner Miley* that there are benefits for Oakland such as congestion improvements and pedestrian safety enhancements, especially in Chinatown. Consequently, Oakland and Alameda would see major improvements.

Commissioner Bellows thanked everyone for spending the evening with them and giving a thorough presentation.

Commissioner Soules said the improvements proposed in Oakland would not mean Alamedans wouldn't benefit. She explained that Alameda residents commute through the tube and travel onto Interstate 880 and that would impact Alameda. In addition, she mentioned that having to drive through Oakland Chinatown during peak hours can be intense because you have to watch out for pedestrians and bicyclists, so the improvement would also benefit Alamedans.

6. Staff Communications

6.A. BART 2017 Fact Sheet (Information)

6.B. Potential Future Meeting Agenda Items

1. Approve Transportation Projects in Alameda's 2017-2019 Capital Improvement Program and Provide Input on 2019-2027 Transportation Projects.

Staff Payne said there is a special meeting on April 26 to approve the Transportation Projects in Alameda's 2017-2018 Capital Improvement Program.

2. Accept the Annual Report on the Alameda Landing and Marina Shores Transportation Demand Management Program and Progress on the Citywide Transportation Management

Association.

3. Review Draft Transit/Transportation Demand Management Plan.
4. Approve the I-880/Broadway/Jackson Transportation Project.
5. Approve the TDA Bike/Pedestrian Grant Submittal.

7. Announcements/Public Comments

Jon Spangler, Alameda resident and a League of American Cycling Instructor, said he sits on the BART Bicycle Advisory Task Force and he invited the Commission and public to attend the next meeting scheduled for Monday, April 3 from 6-8 pm at the East Bay Paratransit office. He explained that the meeting would cover Project 529, a bike registration and theft deterrent program, created by *J Allard*, former Microsoft Xbox program manager with the assistance of Constable *Rob Brunst* from the Vancouver British Columbia police department. Under Project 529, bicyclists can register their bicycles with their cell phone, local bike shop or police department and the program includes superior database and social media components. He would like to see a regional program spearheaded.

Commissioner Vargas announced an event called Mobility 21, which is scheduled for April 3 in Sacramento. He said Mobility 21 is a Southern California nonprofit that allows Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to get together and strategize about ways to obtain funding for Southern California. He explained that's something that has been explored in Central and Northern California.

8. Adjournment

9:40 p.m.