

Attendees: Brian Toy, Carol Levine, Casey Hildreth, Chris Hwang, Daniel Schulman, Jason Patton, Jennifer Stanley, Jonathan Bair, Karen Smulevitz, Kassie Rohrbach, Midori Tabata, Rebecca Saltzman, Robert Prinz, Ron Bishop, Ruth Miller, Sarah Kuehl, Max Allstadt, Nathan Landau

1. Meeting called to order at 5:35. Introductions were made. Carol Levine volunteered to take minutes
2. Minutes from the February meeting were approved
3. Recommended projects for TY 2011-12 TDA Article 3 Ped/Bike Funding
See attachment for listing of projects. The TDA funding comes from a portion of the gas tax and looks to be approximately \$300K this year to Oakland. At the January meeting, the committee brainstormed on projects that we would like to see included on the list. The City generally uses this funding source for smaller projects since it is more flexible and easier to manage than other potential sources that the City might tap into. Based upon the January discussion, City staff has recommended 3 projects: Bicycle wayfinding signage, Bonham Way stairs and path rehabilitation, and Harrison/Oakland St bikeway. For this funding, MTC requires that projects be reviewed by a Bicycle Advisory Committee. Discussion following Jason Patton's presentation included.

Q: Since so much of Measure B projects go to pedestrian projects, why are we funding a ped project with TDA funds? A: The City tries to fund equitably between bike and ped projects. The stair projects have been a good fit since there are not a lot of other sources for these projects. Attempts to use the Measure B pedestrian streetscape funds have not generally been successful because projects typically need more funding than is available through TDA. Q: Where do funds for curb ramps generally come from? A: Measure B pedestrian streetscape and repaving projects. TDA funds can also be used (and have been). Q: Can the TDA funds be used to replace old or damaged street furniture? A: TDA funds can be used to remove hazards so in some cases they would apply. However, they could not be used for new furniture. Also it is difficult to allocate staff time to develop these projects. Q: Why is TDA the only funding source we as BPAC are asked to review? A: TDA is the only source that requires BAC review. However, Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Program staff makes every attempt to bring projects in front of the BPAC such as for BAAQMD projects. Often, funding schedules don't often leave enough time to include BPAC review as they have short deadlines to prepare funding requests.

4. Gateway Park Project
Sarah Kuehl from PWP Landscape Architecture brought this item to the BPAC to make sure that we know what is going on with this project. The Oakland Bicycle Master Plan includes dashed lines where connections to the Bay Bridge Bicycle path would be made. A major concern for this park is access so the project designers are looking at the journey to the park as part of the park experience. The park started as a 15 acre parcel but this has now been expanded all the way to Wood Street with a bike/ped connection from West Grand. The following questions were asked of Sarah.

Q: Who or what is affecting bike access to the Bay Bridge? A: There are three groups: part of the bridge project itself, the coalition of agencies involved in the bridge project, and City of Oakland. Q: How does the Oakland Army Base project relate to Gateway Park? A: Half the land was given to the Port and half to City. They are just beginning the master planning process so timing is not working to coordinate at this time. Q: There has been discussion of 3 connections to the park. 1. From Emeryville, 2: from Grand Avenue, and 3. From Maritime. However, the Grand Avenue connection seems to be falling through the cracks. A: The Emeryville connection is happening. It is understood that the Grand Avenue connection should be part of the first phase of the project but a stronger public voice is needed to support this. Q: One reason that people don't go more to Middle Harbor Park has been the loss of bus service to the park. What are the plans to serve the new park with transit? A: The project is looking at possibilities including using old key cars for a connection to West Oakland BART but transit connections are still a work in progress. Q: Who will be doing the project EIR? A: That is not decided yet. Q: What can we do to get more involved? A: Contact Sarah Kuehl at sarahk@pwpla.com and she will connect you to the mailing list and to the new group FOG (Friends of Gateway Park).

There are 2 ways to stay in contact with the park development:

1. For more information about the Gateway park, please contact Mark Hoffheimer at Perkins and Will or me (Sarah Kuehl). Please note that we are nearing the end of this conceptual planning phase of work. Much more detailed planning and design of Gateway Park will be undertaken, with many opportunities for refinements and resolution of potential issues. Please access the project website at <http://baybridgegatewaypark.org/> to review project materials, join the project e-mail list and stay informed.

2. FOG (FRIENDS OF GATEWAY PARK) We hope to have FOG's website up and running by April. In the meantime, the way to join and get on our Google Group is to send an email either directly to one or the other of us (karin@friendsofthegateway.org or leslie@friendsofthegateway.org) or to info@friendsofthegateway.org.

5. Policy Forum on Bikeway Corridor Studies

This idea was presented by BPAC member Casey Hildreth in the interest of understanding how corridor studies are done now and how they are affected by current methodologies for projecting and evaluating level-of-service (LOS). Using the 40th Street/MacArthur Boulevard study and the findings for future year 2035 as an example of how future year traffic projections can affect the feasibility of projects. It was questioned how we should deal with the modeling forecasts for future years. Is it necessary to go out to Year 2035 for a striping project? Are pedestrian needs being met? This project is the perfect opportunity for the next generation of bicycle improvements as well as an important issue for coordination of transit.

Q: What policy are we looking at? Why are we having this discussion at all? A: Issue is whether there are additional factors (such as public support, Complete Streets concerns, smart growth considerations) that should affect or alter the current bikeway planning and environmental policies. Since City staff have stated they are reluctant to fund future bikeway feasibility studies due to LOS concerns, it seems worthwhile to explore alternative strategies like seeking City Council approval for a statement of overriding considerations or potentially installing "temporary" bikeway striping projects and monitoring the impacts in real-time.

Discussion continued to mention the findings of WOBO's recent survey of local residents to gauge their support of bike lanes, reduction in travel lanes, and reduction in width of median. The County Transportation Plan update is currently looking at including a multi-modal LOS element. But do these models reflect our goals and policies? According to Nathan Landau of AC Transit, complete streets scenarios often do not give adequate consideration to transit. AC Transit would like to see corridor planning based on what modes can or cannot do. To make a complete streets argument for this or any project is to ensure that the project must, at minimum, 'do no harm' to transit. AC Transit has significant concerns that reduction to one travel lane will have more impact than what is currently shown by the model. Another member commented that CEQA is currently undergoing changes and we will have to see how this affects how we do business. The medians on 40th Street are now a hazard for pedestrians and this space could be better used to move traffic through the corridor. If 41st Street is to truly be bike blvd, then more treatment is needed than is currently in the plans to divert traffic and give bicycles priority. It was also a question about how you accommodate bicycles that do and will continue to ride on 40th Street. It was noted that many cities have developed a priority system for streets, i.e. transit street, bicycle street, etc. That was the function of streets could be protected. City of Oakland is considering this. It was asked if there was any way the methodology for evaluating and using LOS could be changed. It was also commented that this is one project that really needs to be completed to fill in the gaps. A principal concern is removing a travel lane and thereby increasing congestion, particularly problematic for bus service (which is why the proposal maintains the two lanes). In Oakland it is often not possible to separate modes because of the limitations of topography and roadway continuity. The City has policies for pedestrians and bikes as well as a transit first policy. The challenge is to decide how to fit these uses together. A suggestion that the BPAC write a statement of concern regarding the regional travel demand model to send to the Alameda County Transportation Commission was generally supported.

6. BPAC Chair and Vic-Chair Elections

Chris Hwang and Rebecca Saltzman were unanimously elected Chair and Vice-Chair, respectively. Thank you to Jonathan Bair for his years of service.

7. Announcements, suggestions for next meeting topics

Oaklavia is scheduled for October 2

Oakland Marathon is March 27

Opening ride of the season of Oakland Yellow Jackets is April 9

Meeting adjourned at 7:30

Minutes respectively submitted by Carol Levine