

FINAL MINUTES  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
CITY OF ALAMEDA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2019

Chair Miley convened the meeting at 7:00pm.

1. ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Miley, Commissioners Soules, Nachtigall, Hans, Johnson

Absent:

2. AGENDA CHANGES

**\*None\***

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS/PUBLIC COMMENT

3-A Horizon Long-range Planning Workshop: Tues, March 12 at 6 p.m. – BART in Oakland

3-B Otis Drive Traffic Calming Community Workshop #2: Wed, March 20 at 6:30 p.m. – Wood School

3-C Transportation Commission Meeting: Wed., March 27 at 7 p.m.

3-D Transportation Commission Special Meeting: Wed, April 24 at 7 p.m.

3-E Upcoming Grant-Funded Bicycle Safety Education Classes:

<https://bikeeastbay.org/alamedabikeed>

Commissioner Nachtigall gave a report on the 2nd Transportation Awareness Campaign Advisory Group meeting. They discussed the budget, plans, and next meeting scheduled for early May.

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

**4-A 2019-6591**

Draft Meeting Minutes - January 23, 2019

**Commissioner Johnson made a motion to approve the minutes. Commissioner Hans seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.**

5. NEW BUSINESS

**5A 2019-6589**

Transportation Commission Endorsement of the 2018 Transportation Choices Plan Annual Report and Work Program Priorities.

Staff Member Thomas gave a presentation. The staff report and attachments can be found at:

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3865608&GUID=80FF4F23-24E8-4BAE-9132-D864811B7ADB&FullText=1>

Chair Miley opened the public hearing.

Tony Kuttner said thanked staff for the effort that went into studying the free shuttle idea. He asked that the recommendations reflect the community's desire for a free shuttle as the top priority in the plan.

Jim Strehlow said that road diets make congestion and pollution worse. He said the bus lane on Webster makes it unsafe for northbound bicyclists. He said the Fernside homeowners would fight the removal of a lane on the Fruitvale Bridge for bike lanes. He suggested more signals in Alameda be timed for traffic flow.

Chair Miley closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Soules said the report is a good recap of the priorities. She said she does not see the goals and objectives from the TCP addressed in the annual report. She said the projects in the report should map to the goals and be benchmarked to keep us honest and transparent. She said we need data on mode shift results from our surveys and not just opinions. She expressed concern that favoring certain mode shares (ie- bike and pedestrian projects) without providing other options like transit, carpooling, etc., we would run into problems. She said not everyone has the luxury to walk or bike, and we need to serve all the segments of the Alameda population.

Commissioner Johnson asked if ten miles of repaving every two years is sufficient, calculating that it would take 25 years to do every road in the city.

Staff Member Wikstrom said that was just enough to "tread water." He said there are other ways to manage the street network and he is planning to bring an item to the next meeting to discuss those issues.

Chair Miley said he would like to see costs tied in to the listed priorities. He said if the OAAP can improve conditions for bicyclists and pedestrians inside the tube, we should take advantage of that. He said we should try and make use of and update the 2009 Estuary Crossing Study. He said finding funding to replace the Miller-Sweeney bridge to be a lifeline structure should be a top priority. He said he would like any action to include the input of both public speakers.

Commissioner Nachtigall said she would like to have a visual representation of what phase all the projects are at, rather than having to look at each one individually.

Commissioner Soules said she remembered the bridge study from when she first came on the board showed the bike/pedestrian bridge was cost prohibitive. She asked what has changed since then and also where other alternatives were at now.

Staff Member Thomas said the study was about 10 years ago. He said it was the first time they really tried to identify the scale of the project options to cross the estuary. He said Bike Walk Alameda made a political push with Council to keep studying the idea. He said they picked up where the old studies left off. He said the Oakland Alameda Access Project is a \$100 million project that presents an opportunity to advance work studying the bridge and other alternatives. He said that staff feels that they need to be ready to take advantage of the A's stadium and projects in Oakland that are moving forward now to see if they can make progress on these ideas.

Chair Miley said we have to stay in the conversation.

Commissioner Soules said she did not want to be in a position where we are deciding between funding for a bike/ped bridge and getting a multimodal lifeline bridge replacement.

**Commissioner Johnson made a motion to endorse the report with the input received this evening. Chair Miley seconded the motion while asking that staff to incorporate the commission and public comment. The motion passed 5-0.**

#### **5-B 2019-6590**

Otis Drive Traffic Calming and Safety Improvement Project Workshop and Survey Debrief

Staff Member Wikstrom gave a presentation on the informational item. The staff report and presentation can be found at:

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3865609&GUID=93D5DCC4-8A6E-49F2-8E14-3C28BF915796&FullText=1>

Commissioner Johnson asked how the cost of a roundabout compared to putting in new stop lights. He asked how a road diet road would enter a roundabout.

Staff Member Wikstrom said the signals cost \$400,000-450,000 and a roundabout would be on the same order of magnitude. He said the three lane road would become a two lane road going into the roundabout since there are no left turns in roundabouts.

Commissioner Johnson asked how the safety compared for pedestrians on a roundabout vs. a signalized intersection. He said he would wait for the consultant to come back in April to discuss the safety differences more closely.

Staff Member Wikstrom said that in a roundabout you only have to cross one lane of traffic from one direction at a time.

Chair Miley said that the safety for the school children crossing at that intersection would be his main focus.

Commissioner Nachtigall said that Grand is very wide in that area which makes it unsafe.

Commissioner Soules asked what the 13% of “hit objects” was in the data.

Sgt. Foster said a fixed object is what they check if someone hits something other than moving cars, pedestrians, or bicycles. He said it could be a house, parked car, pole, etc..

Commissioner Soules asked if drainage improvements on poorly design corners would be evaluated as an environmental improvement when considering bulb out projects.

Staff Member Wikstrom said that they have not considered that yet, but noted that dealing with drainage issues can get very expensive very quickly.

Commissioner Soules pointed out that the top five priorities from the workshop responses can all coexist together.

Chair Miley opened the public hearing.

Joe Keiser said he lives on Otis and is supportive of this project. He said he sees the high speeds all the time and is concerned for his two young children’s safety. He said a girl lives across the street from him and gets driven to her grandparents’ home next door to him because it is impossible to safely walk across Otis now.

Jim Strehlow said a roundabout at Grand and Otis would be incompatible with the trucks in the Fourth of July parade.

Chair Miley closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Johnson asked what would happen to the road diet and bike lane when it approaches Willow Street.

Staff Member Wikstrom said they have not gotten into that level of design detail yet and would have something when they come back in May with the preliminary design.

Chair Miley asked if the signals at the split Willow intersections would be altered at all in order to have better coordination between the signals.

Staff Member Wikstrom said that would likely be a phase II item because of the level of signal work and cost required.

## 6. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

### **6-A** Oakland-Alameda Access Project – Request Transportation Commission Member on Advisory Group

Staff Member Payne said that Commissioner Nachtigall has accepted the responsibility of serving on the advisory group.

### **6-B** Potential Future Meeting Agenda Items

1. Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update – Draft Work Scope
2. Miller-Sweeney Bridge Restriping
3. Resurfacing Plan
4. Draft Capital Improvement Program
5. Transportation Management Association Annual Reports
6. Draft Climate Plan Update Strategies
7. Emergency Plan with Transportation Annex

Staff Member Payne said the next meeting would be March 27th and the purpose of the special April meeting would be to review the draft CIP.

Staff Member Wikstrom asked what level of detail the board would like on the paving program when that item comes back.

Commissioner Johnson said he just wants a general understanding, and that he was just concerned that 25 years to cover every mile of road in Alameda seemed like a long time.

Chair Miley said he would like to know what level of investment would be necessary to get ahead of the curve instead of just treading water.

## 7. ANNOUNCEMENTS/PUBLIC COMMENT

Jim Strehlow, “thinking outside the box,” said that he was surprised there was no discussion of the possible BART extension tonight when discussing cross estuary solutions. He said the idea of a tunnel connecting Alameda to Jack London square with people movers does not need to wait until BART is built and could start now.

## 8. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Miley adjourned the meeting at 8:52pm.