

**Minutes—October 21, 2010 Meeting of the
Oakland Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
City Hall Hearing Room 4, 5:30-7:30 pm**

Attendees: Jonathan Bair, Chris Hwang, Daniel Schulman, Carol Levine, Brian Toy, Jason Patton, Joe Wang, Wlad Wlassowsky, Jim Muir, Nora Cody, Kassie Rohrbach, Ruth Miller, Matt Bonnano, Robert Prinz, Brett Hondorp

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
1. Introductions, Appointment of Note Taker	
2. Approval of Meeting Minutes:	September meeting minutes approved by consensus
3. Draft crosswalk policy – see draft attached to agenda:	<p>Joe Wang, Transportation Engineer walked through the two main decision trees that are used in combination to determine the type of crosswalk that is implemented: one is based on crosswalk location, another on the treatment options at crosswalk locations. Mid-block crossings require Council resolution.</p> <p>The goal of the policy is to provide guidance in ongoing streetscape, redevelopment and repaving work, as well as aim for a standard for future planning and development. Policy will require approval from department head. No Council approval is required.</p> <p>General consensus from BPAC that the draft policy is a tremendous accomplishment, BPAC appreciates greater transparency in decision-making.</p> <p>How many crosswalks requests are made each year, by type?</p> <p>Kassie: Would like to see the number of pedestrian accident data reflected as a percentage (instead of number) relative to automobile traffic volume to more accurately reflect the need for crosswalk.</p> <p>Nora: School safety walk audits reveal that cross-hatch markings are much safer. Would like to be flexible with treatment options around schools, e.g., allow for both treatments with yellow transverse lines as well as cross hatch lines. Also, schools could be located near residential streets as well as busy thoroughfares, so consider broadening the treatment matrix.</p> <p>Dan: What is the budget for fulfilling crosswalk requests based on these decision trees? How will the department be able to fulfill project requests using the crosswalk policy as a guide?</p> <p>Joe/Wlad: We will need to explore our capacity based on current demand. There is always a possibility that we will not be able to meet all the need depending on the type and scale of projects requested.</p> <p>Brett: Would like to see available enhancements such as beacons, in-pavement signage, etc. listed in the treatment option decision tree.</p> <p>Jonathan: How are implementation decisions made for scramble crosswalk designs?</p> <p>Joe: We want the policy to reflect broad guidelines. As such, scramble crosswalk treatments are not included in the decision tree. Decision would be determined on a case-by-case basis, primarily influenced by the traffic flow, wait times for both auto and pedestrian traffic, and</p>

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p>traffic engineering constraints.</p> <p>Carol: Consider practice of staggering the spacing or wider spacing between cross-hatch markings to reduce wear.</p> <p>Send comments to Joe Wang at (jswang@oaklandnet.com) by Friday, November 12, 2010.</p>
<p>4. 53rd St Bikeway Alternatives Analysis</p>	<p>Jason reviewed the process of recent community engagement activities that led to the write-up and presentation of alternatives to the proposed bikeway design on 53rd St which connects Bay Street Emeryville, the San Francisco Bay Trail, Emeryville Amtrak, and Rockridge BART. This segment of the bikeway serves the North Oakland neighborhoods of Golden Gate, Santa Fe, Idora Park, and Rockridge.</p> <p>Alternatives range from diverting bikeway to (close-to) parallel routes on 45th/47th, 54th, 55th, 56th, Stanford, or a combination of 54th and 53rd.</p> <p>Carol: It's important to really listen to the concerns from the residents so that a few opponents to the plan do not derail the intention of building connecting bikeway segments. Would it be helpful to have BPAC members at the neighborhood meetings?</p> <p>Jim: A couple of residents are extremely concerned that the design process deliberately left out resident feedback. The opposition reflects more on the process rather than the design itself. Since 53rd is fairly narrow, many bicyclists already use 54th until Gaskill. The crossing from 54th to Adeline involves a difficult crossing.</p> <p>Robert: This bikeway segment is critical in funneling bike flow from Oakland through Emeryville and on to the Bay Trail, near the gateway to the Bay Bridge. There are design concerns with the suggested alternatives: at the intersection at San Pablo; auto traffic moves pretty quickly at Lowell; Gaskill is an uncontrolled intersection; on paper, intersection at San Pablo looks like a straight shot, but is really a bit offset.</p> <p>Jason is accepting additional comments on the alternative designs through Friday, November 5. Expected implementation of bikeway will be May through November 2011.</p>
<p>5. Bicycle detection: Prioritizing traffic signals for upgrades</p>	<p>\$100,000 is available in FY 2010-11. The project list was prioritized based in relative risk and likelihood of bicyclist presence. Bike detection on streets that are on the repaving schedule will include "bike detector symbol" on the pavement.</p> <p>Dan: Should we prioritize fixing all existing cameras with the available funding? Bicyclists can then rely on all cameras to work.</p> <p>Kassie: We need some public education on the bike detector symbol since it is not readily understandable unless you're specifically looking for it.</p> <p>Carol: Can we use paint to write "Bikes Wait Here" near the detection symbol?</p>
<p>6. Annual bike projects status update</p>	<p>Jason Patton sought feedback from BPAC members regarding which projects to prioritize for design review. Completing projects in 2010 was more challenging due to shifting of staff resources to fulfill projects</p>

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p>funded through time-sensitive American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.</p> <p>Projects identified as priorities by attendees:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Jonathan: 2nd Street at Jack London Square</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Brian: Hollis/32nd from San Pablo to Emeryville</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Kassie: Upper Broadway above 40th</p> <p>Chris: Are there future plans to preempt neighborhood concerns by building in processes that is open and welcoming to the affected neighbors?</p> <p>Jason: About 50+ neighborhood groups were engaged during the writing of the Bicycle Master Plan; it might be worthwhile to explore a more intentional neighborhood engagement process as projects are designed.</p> <p>Please send feedback to Jason</p>
<p>7. Announcements, suggestions for next meeting topics</p>	<p>Announcements:</p> <p>An agenda item next month is a presentation by CalTrans on designs for path to the Bay Bridge.</p> <p>Organizing potential for local groups who want to help identify drainage grates that pose a danger to bicyclists.</p>

ADJOURN: 7:35 p.m.
Respectfully submitted by Chris Hwang

Attachment: Agenda item #5 handout

Bicycle Actuation at Traffic Signals: TDA Article 3 Grant FY10-11

Overview of Need versus Budget

Overview of Need

# of traffic signals in Oakland:	629
# of signals on the proposed bikeway network:	466
# of signals on bikeways with potential issues:	210
Available funding (TDA Article 3 FY10-11):	\$100,000
Estimated need for bikeway network:	\$500,000

Proposed Budget		# signals improved
Planning and coordination	\$5,000	2
Verify/configure existing hardware	\$15,000	58
Upgrade existing hardware	\$80,000	8

		Signal/intersection actuation status for signals on the Proposed Bikeway Network (466)					
Category	Category description (bikeway status by street)	fixed time (not actuated)	approach off limits to bicyclists	already corrected (including stencil)	existing video, may need adjustment; needs stencil	existing video, may need adjustment; stencil pending scheduled construction project	in pavement loop/s
1	existing-existing	12		2	12		1
2	existing-in progress	24		2	6	3	1
3	existing-not in progress	12		3	11	1	1
4	existing-no proposed bikeway	47		5	24	1	11
5	in progress-in progress	8			3	1	4
6	in progress-not in progress	20			13	3	6
7	in progress-no proposed bikeway	43	1	1	15	4	19
8	not in progress-not in progress	17		1	7		8
9	no proposed bikeway-not in progress	56	1	1	33		22
		239	2	15	124	13	73
				256			210

No modification needed
 Priority

**Bicycle Actuation at Traffic Signals: TDA Article 3 Grant FY10-11
Priority Locations for Hardware Upgrades**

Category	MAJOR_STREET	MINOR_STREET	# of loops and actuated approach	# cameras needed	Cost @ \$4k/camera	Proposed Priorities
1	BANCROFT AVE	106TH AVE	Full Loop	4	\$ 16,000	\$16,000
2	E.18TH ST	LAKESHORE AVE	left turn off Lakeshore only (bad loop)	1	\$ 4,000	
3	INTERNATIONAL BLVD	105TH AVE	Caltrans signal / loops	see note *		\$0
4	ALAMEDA AVE	K-MART DRWY	Full Loop	4	\$ 16,000	
4	FRUITVALE AVE	E.8TH ST & ELMWOOD ST	Full Loop	4	\$ 16,000	
4	MARKET ST	10TH ST	Full Loop	4	\$ 16,000	
4	GRAND AVE	EUCLID AVE	Full Loop	4	\$ 16,000	
4	SKYLINE BLVD	BALMORAL DR	Full Loop	4	\$ 16,000	
4	SKYLINE BLVD	REDWOOD RD	Full Loop	4	\$ 16,000	
4	7TH ST	CEDAR ST	loops on Cedar (T intersection)	2	\$ 8,000	
4	MARKET ST	12TH ST	<i>data pending; loops on 12th St or no loops</i>	2	\$ 8,000	
4	MARKET ST	18TH ST	Loop on 18th St	2	\$ 8,000	
4	MOUNTAIN BLVD	SNAKE RD	Loops on Snake	2	\$ 8,000	\$8,000
4	FRUITVALE AVE	E.9TH STREET	Full Loop	4	\$ 16,000	
5	MACARTHUR BLVD	ARDLEY AVE	Full Loop	4	\$ 16,000	\$16,000
5	FOOTHILL BLVD	48TH AVE	Loops on 48th St	2	\$ 8,000	\$8,000
5	FOOTHILL BLVD	LAKESHORE AVE	Loops on Foothill	1	\$ 4,000	\$4,000
5	FOOTHILL BLVD	16TH AVE	Loops on 16th Ave	2	\$ 8,000	\$8,000
6	E.12TH ST	23RD AVE	Full Loop	4	\$ 16,000	
6	SAN LEANDRO ST	75TH AVE	Loops bad	4	\$ 16,000	
6	E.12TH ST	22ND AVE	W/B left-turn on E.12th st	1	\$ 4,000	
6	SAN LEANDRO ST	85TH AVE	Loops bad	4	\$ 16,000	
6	FOOTHILL BLVD	14TH AVE	Full Loop	4	\$ 16,000	\$16,000
6	GRAND AVE	LAKE PARK_SANTA CLARA AVE	Grand Ave N/B Left-turn	1	\$ 4,000	\$4,000
7	MACARTHUR BLVD	SHEFFIELD AVE	Full Loop	4	\$ 16,000	
7	SAN LEANDRO ST	81ST AVE	Bad loops	4	\$ 16,000	
7	MARITIME ST	14TH ST	Full Loop	4	\$ 16,000	
7	MARITIME ST	BATAAN AVE	Full Loop	4	\$ 16,000	
7	MACARTHUR BLVD	PIERSINS_RICHARDS RD GATE	Full Loop	4	\$ 16,000	
7	SAN PABLO AVE	53RD ST	Full loop (Caltrans intersection)	see note *		\$0
7	FOOTHILL BLVD	42ND AVE	Loops on Foothill left-turns, 42nd left turn	3	\$ 12,000	
7	FOOTHILL BLVD	47TH AVE	Loops on 47th	2	\$ 8,000	
7	FOOTHILL BLVD	28TH AVE	Loops on 28th Ave	2	\$ 8,000	
7	FOOTHILL BLVD	42ND AVE_COURTLAND AVE	Left-turn pockets only	2	\$ 8,000	
7	FOOTHILL BLVD	8TH AVE	Loops on 8th Ave	2	\$ 8,000	
7	FOOTHILL BLVD	5TH AVE	Loops on 5th Ave	2	\$ 8,000	
7	FOOTHILL BLVD	23RD AVE	Loops on E 16th	1	\$ 4,000	
7	TELEGRAPH AVE	18TH ST	Loops (on 18th St) bad	1	\$ 4,000	
7	BROADWAY	MANILA & MONROE AVE	Loops on Manila/Monroe	3	\$ 12,000	
7	BROADWAY	KEITH	Loops on Keith	1	\$ 4,000	
7	E.12TH ST	2ND AVE	Bad loops (2nd Ave)	2	\$ 8,000	
7	SAN LEANDRO ST	SEMINARY AVE	Loops on Seminary	2	\$ 8,000	
7	MARITIME ST	17TH ST	<i>data pending</i>	2	\$ 8,000	
				113	\$ 452,000	\$80,000

Bikeway Status

existing
in progress
not in progress
no proposed bikeway

* Caltrans signal; confirm detection with Caltrans staff.