

# BPAC Infrastructure Committee: May 2, 2024 minutes

\*This meeting was held in-person at the Lake Merritt Conference Room, 250 Frank Ogawa Plaza, Suite 4314, Oakland, CA 94612. [Original agenda page available here](#). Additional attendees, not committee members nor staff, also participated but are not noted here\*

## **Attendance**

### **Committee members:**

**Dianne Yee (BPAC Commissioner, Committee co-chair)**

**Robert Prinz (Committee co-chair)**

**Grey Gardner (BPAC Commissioner)**

**Priyanka Altman**

### **Staff:**

**Brian Soland (BART, Link21 item)**

**Darin Ranelletti (BART, Link21 item)**

**Acacia Dupierre (OakDOT, Embarcadero West item)**

**Crystal Wang (AC Transit, Transit-Supportive Design Guidelines item, AC Transit Board Policy 501 Update item)**

**Sarah Rau-Wolf (AC Transit, Transit-Supportive Design Guidelines item, AC Transit Board Policy 501 Update item)**

**Jason Patton (Oakland DOT)**

**Pierre Gerard (Oakland DOT)**

### **Acronyms:**

- BPAC = Bicyclist and Pedestrian Advisory Commission, a city-appointed volunteer group that meets monthly to discuss and advise staff on bike/walk projects, policy, and funding
- DOT = Department of Transportation
- ADA = Americans with Disabilities Act

## **3:30-3:45 pm Introductions and Updates on Previous Agenda Items**

- No updates
- Public comment:

## **3:45-3:55 pm Public Comment (for items not on the agenda)**

- Chair Yee: next full BPAC meeting May 23rd
- July BPAC infrastructure committee meeting: July 11th to accommodate holiday

## 3:55-4:25 pm Link21 (Brian Soland and Darin Ranelletti, BART)

[\(presentation file here\)](#)

### Presentation:

- Brian
  - Goal of providing more service, more destinations, new underground connection SF to East bay with connections to rail
  - Project team is taking info on project to public and joint power auth boards over next few months - here to coordinate with key stakeholders;
  - Background: analyzing how new crossing could benefit mega region
    - Inequitable service that doesn't meet needs of equity needs populations
    - Congestion on key corridors; existing transbay capacity insufficient
    - Limited service reliability
  - Vision: Link21 and its partners will transform BART and REgional rail network into more integrated system
  - Faster, more connected, more equitable and affordable train service
  - Reaching decision point: Either a standard gauge crossing connected with the regional rail network (such as Caltrain and Capitol Corridor); or a broad gauge connection to the BART network
  - Goal is to transform passenger experience, promote equity / livability, support econ opportunity;
  - Equity commitment: seeking to elevate equity in planning process - established an equity advisory council (including 4 members from Oakland)
  - Oakland engagement
    - Equity advisory council
    - Monthly meetings with Oakland and port
    - Community engagement events — such as rose foundation, open houses
    - Targeted engagement with some community based orgs and leaders
  - Feedback:
    - Need to improve rider experience, reliability, safety, affordability
  - Still in phase 1 of project planning (concept development and analysis, service planning, options eval, outreach);
  - Next steps:
    - Decision on train tech in the crossing (standard gauge v. Broad Gauge)
    - Further planning to define project (alignment, station locations)
  - Standard gauge crossing: connect with capitol corridor and caltrain - including caltrain in the urban metro service; gives a 2 for 1 opportunity - have 2 service types- could have fast BART like service using this service - potential for direct connections to peninsula;
    - Benefits for Oakland: potential one seat rides between Oakland and peninsula, emeryville, west berkeley; faster and better connected rails service to Sacramento, stockton, I-80 corridor; new rail transfer hub in downtown oakland; new alignment would be underground through oakland;
  - Broad Gauge crossing: (accommodate only BART):
    - Direct BART connection from Oakland to Alameda, mission bay, and SOMA - new transfer station at Jack London Square; heard interest in San Antonio infill station regardless of track gauge;
    - Alignment would be underground
  - Findings so far:

- Comparisons: both provide benefits beyond Justice 40 requirements
  - Majority of new trips in both options would be taken by low income households
  - Access to stations and jobs: both support economic opportunities
- Oakland considerations
  - A new central transportation hub for megaregions
  - Improved access to jobs / destinations
  - Alignment with Oakland plans
  - Improved safety, health and air quality
  - Substantial investment to advance equity
  - Potential new alignment and stations will be assessed in future phases (thinking about wider land use integration and designs)
- Next steps
  - May: update to BART board (may 23)
  - June: 27 - BART board crossing technology recommendation
  - Sept: back to BART board and Capitol Corridor for decision

#### Discussion:

- How will make decision?
- Are there going to be two transfer points? Yes, downtown oakland / salesforce ctr
- When say jack london, would be close to amtrak? A: too early to say (ideally would be aligned with existing station); potential for new below grade connection to Oakland (underground just south of emeryville and continues below grade and come up along corridor between coliseum and fruitvale);
- Standard gauge crossing: would that just be capitol corridor
  - A: Governance not yet determined - could be Caltrain crossing into East bay; capitol corridor trains could use - operator agnostic right now;
  - Still very early to determine operating costs
- Comment (Chair Yee): think regional rail makes more sense - to take super commuters off the freeways;
- Decision on track gauge is the primary issue for this year; the next stage is dependent on funding but could begin as early as this year or next year.
- Question about whether it would make sense to talk about i.e. adding bus only lane on bridge. A: there was a decision to focus only on rail in Stage 1.
- Is Caltrain a member: at this point it's just BART and Capitol corridor but have a robust community engagement;
- Comment (Commissioner Priyanka): no 24 hour service now - would like to address; and importance of clipper integration.
  - A: having a 2nd crossing connection could alleviate bottleneck for enabling late night service - discussing internally at BART - what other policy changes would be needed; it's a step in the right direction - one crossing could cover service when another is out of service;

4:25-4:35 pm, AC Transit Board Policy 501 Update (Crystal Wang, AC Transit)

([presentation file here](#))

Presentation:

- Samaeh Itani (AC Transit):
  - Overview
    - Existing bus stop policies and guidance: bus stop placement, spacing, location, length and accessibility
    - Why updating? Due for 5 year update; want to make the policy more customer focused, devel
  - Stakeholder engagement
    - Internal
      - Bus stop committee
      - Other stakeholders
    - External:
      - Hoping to have webpage, feedback form, social media, tech advisory committee, presentation to community based orgs, other existing bodies
  - Guiding principles for decisions on stop locations
    - Did peer review of similar agencies - noticed similar language on safety, comfort, accessibility, visibility...
    - Developed AC Transit guide : safety, comfort, accessibility, feasibility, reliability
      - Feasibility: “community input should play a pivotal role”
  - Timeline:
    - Currently developing draft policy
    - May: gather feedback on draft
    - June: present to board, finalize policy based on feedback
    - July: present final policy to board for approval

#### Discussion:

- Improvements to stop locations: A: Have grant for upgrading existing bus stops - take to board this summer; process underway in Hayward to examine existing conditions and upgrade;
- Incorporating guidelines now on stop designs; updating board policy 545
- Concern raised about safety of bus stops - complement inclusion of safety on guidelines;

#### 4:35-5:10 pm, Embarcadero West Rail Safety and Access Improvements (Acacia Dupierre, OakDOT)

[\(presentation file here\)](#)

#### Presentation:

- Acacia Dupierre (Senior Transportation Planner, OakDOT), Nina Chan
  - Requesting letter of support for grant
  - Overweight corridor - by creating it there will be public benefit of getting overweight
  - Market to Oak project most visible: redesign 8 intersections crossing the tracks - make safer - and corridor will get redesigned;
  - Design dates back to 1860s - pre-car;
  - Existing conditions:
    - 65 trains / day
    - One-mile segment account for 25% of all vehicle incidents on Amtrak’s 160 mile segment from san jose to auburn
    - Does not meet current rail safety standards; no accessible for persons with disabilities; not welcoming connection to waterfront

- Project goals:
  - Significantly increase rail crossing safety for all users on road
  - Improve reliability for freight and passenger rail operations
  - Enhance connections to waterfront
- Opportunities:
  - Placemaking - make more pleasant, easier to access waterfront
  - Leverage funding to bring once in century redesign to corridor
- Project scope:
  - Reconstruct at-grade crossings; gates, sidewalk bulb outs, ADA ramps, high-vis crosswalks;
  - Protective fencing along tracks between intersections
  - Mitigate vehicle train conflicts
    - North side - building access only - limited passenger and loading access - be slower and eliminate left turns over the tracks
    - Multi-use path on south side - separated
  - Both sides will maintain emergency access
  - Lighting and directional signage
  - At middle harbor - redesign of overweight truck corridor (big priority)- take out of residential areas
- Network to improve safety and
- Consolidated Rail Infrastructure
  - Grant app due at end of month: may 28
  - Denied previously
  - Seeking 45% of the \$96M cost
- Timeline:
  - Deep in project design now
  - conduct engagement until Aug 1st
  - Expect to finalize design in 2026 -
  - Broader community engagement mid-may
  - Project site: [www.oaklandca.gov/embarcaderowest](http://www.oaklandca.gov/embarcaderowest)

#### Discussion:

- Is the port paying for a portion of this? A: we're working together - been able to receive a lot of funding and will be the ones delivering; port delivering other projects (3rd St, adeline Street - all of it came from planning for ballpark)
- Are there limits for bikeway? (Commissioner Yee) A: other project on MLK to 11th st - this will tie into multi-use path on embarcadero - go through to webster - exploring extending to Oak
  - Q: Consider using this project to vision an extended bikeway (Commissioner Gardner): tie in to rail safety here so limited; but encouraged to vision that and use opportunity for public-private partnerships
  - Jason: embarcadero - looking for a project to come along to take that on - longshot opportunity here - one of the landing sites for alameda bridge is a - could help with the estuary crossing project
- Advise against the fencing
- Loading (i.e. bevmo) - A: their loading can happen on Clay
- Concern about fencing - will they work? Potential for people jumping fences; A: know fencing on roadways does not always stop people from jumping but opportunity to improve
- Is there a plan for tsunami evacuation?

- In San Diego there are pedestrian gates in fencing
- On multi-use path - agree would be great to have it go longer to south - but to north - project goes to MLK even though project goes to Market - A: connection to overweight corridor is hairy - want to dissuade)
- Concern about transition from bikeway at Webster - need to focus attention on that crossing of tracks; A: challenge at Webster - one of the trickier intersections - multiple driveways into parking lot now;
- Market street (Robert) - danger zone for bike riders for years; important to integrating mitigation of dangers as part of this project;
- Continued avoidance to do something significant on 3rd (Robert), which could be a lower stress facility;
- Agreement to recommend a letter from full BPAC at the May 23rd meeting (Commissioner Yee).

## 4:40-4:55 pm, Transit-Supportive Design Guidelines (Crystal Wang and Sarah Rau-Wolf , AC Transit)

[\(presentation file here\)](#)

### Presentation:

- Crystal Wang and Sarah Rau-Wolf (AC Transit)
  - In process of updating TRansit-Supportive Design Guidelines - update to 2018 multiple corridor guidelines
  - Design guideline
  - Chapter 1: Goals of guidelines
  - Chapter 2:
  - Chapter 3: corridor wide considerations
  - East Bay Paratransit vans cannot stop at bus stops - need designated zones
  - Chapter 4: gets into bus stop siteing (aligns with policy 501) - spacing, land use, connections between bus routes, transit centers, layover spaces, placement adjacent to intersections etc
  - Chapter 5: bus stop design elements - universal design, comfortable – talk about tradeoffs between in-lane v pull out stops; accessibility - detectable warning surfaces - separation between bikeway and stops; bus stop lengths
  - Chapter 6: bus stop design typology: something new for transit supportive design guidelines from 2018 guidelines, will provide guidelines for section of design types
    - Shared lane with class II bikeway - less preferred option
    - Floating bus stops - get into separation of buses and bikes
    - Constrained sstp-out floating bus stop
    - Class 1 (integrated shared use path)
  - Big focus on this update is addressing paratransit stop design and incorporating paratransit into fixed route stops
  - Considerations for bus stops on high-speed roadways, bus routes with frequent service, constrained right of way
  - Chapter 8: maintenance responsibilities

### Discussion:

- Will this effort include revisiting past decisions? I..e 73rd Ave (Chair Yee)

- A: Not that we're opposed to bulb outs - just want them longer - bus sized for stops
- When first brought to Board, concerns about not addressing speeds - speed cushions (George); other jurisdictions doing a process
  - Have draft submitted to cities now
- Nothing in here that urges cities not to use protection of peds and bicyclists: A: guidelines focused on making sure pedestrians biked
- Paratransit access w/ respect to bikeway designs (Robert) - with oakland's bus islands, a lot of experimentation - there is an opportunity to continue experimenting.
- [add] consideration of other types of users - analyzing on block by block basis and
- Bus stop siteing complicated by driveway - would be great to come up with
- Preferred opinion is sidewalk side siteing
- Would like strong language in design elements section on inclusion of traffic calming in the roadway
  - Talk about vertical traffic calming on streets - talk about preferences - considerations of placing upstream and downstream
- Timeline:
  - May-June 2024
  - Finalize by June 2024
  - Included in May 8th board meeting

## 5:15-5:30 pm, Future Agenda Item Suggestions

- No suggestions at this time