Item 1. Roll Call/Determination of Quorum/Introductions
At roll call, quorum was established with all Commissioners present except Kidd (excused) and Wheeler (who arrived shortly thereafter).

Introductions were made.
- Other attendees (who signed in): Tom Holub, Carol Levine, Scott Amundson
- Oak Knoll developers and consultants: Michael Olsen, Daniel Bucko, Sam Velty, Sam Tabibnia, Francisco Martin, Crescentia Brown, Hal Williams, Scott Gregory
- Staff: Sarah Fine, Iris Starr, Jennifer Stanley

Item 2. Approval of meeting minutes (Action Item)
→ A motion to adopt the Bicyclist & Pedestrian Advisory Commission meeting minutes from August 18, 2016 was made (Tabata) and seconded (Prinz), and approved with all present commissioners voting in favor except Hwang who abstained (wasn’t present at meeting).

→ Adopted minutes online at www.oaklandbikes.info/BPAC.

Item 3. Open Forum / Public Comment
No comments.

Item 4. Public Hearing: Oak Knoll Mixed use Community Plan Project (City Case Number PLN15378, PLN15378-PUDF01, ER15-004), Draft Environmental Report
Scott Gregory, planning consultant to the City, gave an overview of the project (see agenda packet for details). He explained that the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) includes a substantial section on transportation which looks at all transportation modes and includes issues of regional significance. The purpose of this meeting, he stated, is to collect comments. Comments are also being solicited from the City’s Landmarks Board, Planning Commission and the public at large, specifically as to whether the DEIR sufficient. But, all comments are welcome. [Note: this meeting was recorded by a Court Reporter.]

Scott gave an overview of the staff report and attachments included in the meeting agenda. He noted the steep site geography and that the project will construct public amenities including: rehabilitation of a section of Rifle Range Creek; a 14 ft ped/bike path along the creek from Mountain Blvd to Keller Ave; bike lanes on Mountain Blvd; improved sidewalks along the Mountain Blvd frontage; a Class 3 bike route with sharrows on Main St; 6’ sidewalks separated from traffic by planters throughout the development;
and a ped/bike-only bridge across the creek. Written comments can be sent to Heather Klein (see staff report).

Summary of discussion/comments:

- The DEIR estimates that the transportation mode share of this development is predicted to be 96.9% car trips. This ratio is due to the current lack of existing transit service in the area. The City should strive to reduce auto trips resulting from the development.
- Consider including internal stairways (like Oakland’s older street car neighborhoods) to facilitate walking throughout the development.
- Mountain Blvd bike lanes are minimum width—consider eliminating the proposed median to widen and buffer the bike lanes. Avoid making changes that would worsen conditions for cyclists. Scott noted that Jason Patton, Oakland’s Bicyclist & Pedestrian Program Manager, has been providing guidance on bikeway design and that significant and unavoidable impacts to traffic delay are not recommended for mitigation.)
- The City should find safe connections to neighborhood schools despite the freeway barrier.
- Include traffic calming measures on the internal streets (e.g. speed humps and traffic circles) especially where the speed differential between modes is likely to be high.
- There are no transit options and vehicular traffic in the area is congested particularly on the weekends (Oakland Zoo traffic). Traffic on Golf Links Rd should be evaluated on a Saturday (no weekend evaluation was performed for the DEIR), due to long freeway backups.
- The proposed retail will be good for the area.
- The project is required to have a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program. The goal is to increase the transit mode share to 20%, and includes a shuttle to the Fruitvale BART station which has the potential to increase mode share by 10%. The City is in discussion with AC Transit about increasing headways on an existing bus line that serves the area.
- Consider bike improvements along Keller Ave; such improvements have the potential to meet the mode split required by TDM plan.
- The draft TDM plan is in the DEIR appendix [online at www2.oaklandnet.com/oakca1/groups/ceda/documents/agenda/oak060438.pdf], and the goal is to release the final approved TDM plan with the final EIR. The TDM plan will be included in the Conditions of Approval (COA) for the development and will be approved by staff or the Planning Commission.
- There is a pinch point where Mountain Blvd crosses under I-580. On the west side of Mountain Blvd, the overcrossing is resting on piers. Consider a plan to widen the roadway under the overcrossing. If the plan could be cleared as part of DEIR, it could be funded either by the City or by the developer as part of the TDM.
- The ped/bike bridge width, shown in the plans at 8-10’, is not completely set. Consider bikeways on Creekside Parkway and Loop since bikes will use bridge anyway.
- Sign and name paths as well as streets. Include signage directing travelers to other nearby park areas (like Leona Park).
- Include lighting on the ped/bike bridge and elsewhere.
- Make sure to provide bike parking per the pending updated City Bike Parking Ordinance requirements.

The next public meeting is October 5, a comprehensive review at the Planning Commission. October 12 is the end of the public comment period. The Final EIR will respond to all comments received. Depending on the number of comments, the Final EIR could take several months. The project can return to BPAC if desired. The Planning Commission will certify the FEIR. Zoning changes will be submitted as an
Ordinance to the City Council for approval. City staff working on project is interested in hearing and incorporating comments on the design, and will work with applicant to address comments received.

Almost all of the permits and infrastructure plans are available on the project website at www2.oaklandnet.com/Government/o/PBN/OurOrganization/PlanningZoning/OAK052335.

Speakers other than Commissioners and staff: Carol Levine, Hal Williams

**Item 5. Proposed Implementation of Senate Bill 743: CEQA**
Sarah Fine, Senior Transportation Planner explained the background of City of Oakland’s proposed action to eliminate automobile delay from City of Oakland CEQA Thresholds, implementing the directive from Senate Bill 743 and applying proposed guidance from the Governor’s Office of Planning & Research (OPR). See PowerPoint.

A presentation to BPAC on this topic was made at the April 2016 meeting. Staff will be asking the Planning Commission to approve these changes next week on Wednesday, September 21. See staff report at www2.oaklandnet.com/oakca1/groups/ceda/documents/agenda/oak060721.pdf.

Sarah explained that OPR has engaged many stakeholders, including cities. For the purpose of project review under CEQA, OPR’s proposal is to replace motor vehicle Level of Service (LOS) with a new metric, Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). This reflects that the current metric of LOS penalizes infill development and rewards greenfield development.

The City proposal will codify the OPR’s new CEQA significance criteria and adopt thresholds of significance based on VMT rather than LOS. Sarah outlined how these requirements would affect different types of projects that require CEQA evaluation and how the thresholds would be calculated differently for residential, office, and retail projects. These changes are part of a more comprehensive set of changes that also include addressing development impacts outside of CEQA including: Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plans as part of the Conditions of Approval (COA) for development projects; the creation of a Complete Streets Evaluation Framework and design guidelines; and updating the City’s Transportation Impact Studies guidelines/manual. The goal is to have projects align with the larger City goals of Equity, Safety, VMT Reduction, and Cost/Maintenance.

**Summary of discussion/comments:**
- A project that generates VMT in excess of the thresholds could still be approved. Just like when LOS was the metric used to evaluate transportation impacts, City Council can approve projects that have significant but unavoidable environmental impacts as measured by VMT.
- The proposal for the road diet on 40th St, for example, might have been found to have no CEQA impacts. However, it would still have been subject to the new framework which requires the City to consider larger multimodal goals. The City will be using the Alameda County Transportation Commission’s priority networks for transit. Where modal conflicts arise, the City’s evaluation framework would help guide the project.
- The deadline for cities to comply with the OPR rules will be two years after the rulemaking is final.
- The City’s CEQA changes are scheduled to be approved next week. The Complete Streets Design Guidelines are hoped to be available this fall and the TDM guidelines sometime between those two.
- Road diets will be evaluated using a tool now under development as part of the Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Program’s “Bikeways 2.0” project, currently underway.
A motion to empower the BPAC Chair to write a letter in support of the proposed replacement of LOS with VMT was made (Chan), seconded (Tabata), and passed with seven commissioners voting in favor. (One had departed the meeting.)

Item 6. Three-month agenda look-ahead, suggestions for meeting topics, announcements

Suggestions:
- Report back on the changes to parks rules proposed by Oakland Parks and Recreation (October).
- Strategic Plan for the new DOT, Organization Chart (Jeff Tumlin).

Announcements:
- The OBAG-funded Lake Merritt Bikeways paving project is underway with Oak St and Madison St paved and striping layout underway.
- The Latham Square project won First Prize in the Urban Place Development category from the American Society of Civil Engineers. The Transportation Planning & Funding Division Manager recognized City staff members Nick Cartagena, Diane Tannenwald, and Alan Chiang for their work on this project.

Meeting adjourned at 7:45p.

Attachments
- PowerPoint: Aligning CEQA in Oakland; SB743 Implementation

Minutes recorded by Jennifer Stanley, City of Oakland Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Coordinator, emailed to meeting attendees for review on September 20, 2016, with comments requested by noon, Friday, September 23 to jstanley@oaklandnet.com. Revised minutes were attached to the October 2016 meeting agenda and adopted at that meeting.
Aligning CEQA in Oakland
SB743 Implementation

City of Oakland Bicyclist and Pedestrian Commission
September 15, 2016
Sarah Fine, Senior Transportation Planner
sfine@oaklandnet.com
510-238-6241

Today’s Goals:

Background
✓ Understand Senate Bill 743 and why it’s important for land use and transportation projects

Our Proposal
✓ Understand the changes the City of Oakland is proposing to make to local environmental analysis

Next Steps
✓ Learn about other parts of transportation studies that will change

SB743 Implementation

Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SB743</th>
<th>Senate Bill 743</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Level of Service (Automobile Delay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT</td>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Timeline: Senate Bill 743 and SB743 Implementation

2013

SB743 passed, directs OPR to amend CEQA guidelines to replace LOS

2014 - 2015

OPR issues discussion draft proposal identifying VMT as LOS replacement

2016

OPR issues draft proposal for changes to CEQA Guidelines

San Francisco updates local CEQA Guidelines to reflect OPR

Lead CEQA agencies comment on discussion draft
**State Level of Service Reform History**

**Revised Proposal on Updates to the CEQA Guidelines on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA**

Implementing Senate Bill 743 (Glenberg, 2013)

January 30, 2013

---

**Oakland Participated in State Reform Process**

**DEFINITION**

**Level of Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Average delay per vehicle</th>
<th>Description of motorist perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>&lt;10 seconds</td>
<td>Free-flow traffic; “Good” LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.1 – 20</td>
<td>Reasonable free-flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>20.1 – 35</td>
<td>Delay begins to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>35.1 – 55</td>
<td>Borderline “bad” LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>55.1 – 80</td>
<td>“Bad” LOS: long queues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>Unacceptable; very high delay, congestion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**How things are:**

**Level of service is the metric that determines significant impacts for transportation as part of environmental analysis.**

i.e., requiring mitigations

As required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
LEVEL OF SERVICE

Infill development

Relatively little travel loaded onto the network

But numerous LOS impacts

LEVEL OF SERVICE

Greenfield development

Typically 3 to 4 times the vehicle travel loaded onto the network, relative to infill

But relatively few LOS impacts

LEVEL OF SERVICE

Planning for the Peak of the Peak

Traffic Volume

Waste

2:00AM  8:00AM  Noon  5:00PM  Midnight

LEVEL OF SERVICE

Definition

Level of Service

Traffic engineer  A
Economist  F
How things are, since SB743:
The Governor’s Office of Planning &
Research has proposed replacing LOS
with vehicle miles traveled.

**DEFINITION**

Vehicle Miles Traveled

---

### Types of Projects Impacted by the Proposed Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Types</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Development Projects</td>
<td>Brooklyn Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Plans</td>
<td>Downtown Specific Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Plans</td>
<td>Pedestrian Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Projects</td>
<td>Telegraph Complete Streets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Significance Criteria

The project would have a significant effect on the environment if it would:

- Conflict with a plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the safety or performance of the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle lanes, and pedestrian paths (except for automobile level of service or other measures of vehicle delay); or

- Cause substantial additional VMT per capita, per service population, or other appropriate efficiency measure; or

- Substantially induce additional automobile travel by increasing physical roadway capacity in congested areas (i.e., by adding new mixed-flow lanes) or by adding new roadways to the network.

(Cont.)

- For residential projects, a project would cause substantial additional VMT if it exceeds both the existing City household VMT per capita minus 15 percent and existing regional household VMT per capita minus 15 percent.

- For office projects, a project would cause substantial additional VMT if it exceeds the existing regional VMT per employee minus 15 percent.

- For retail projects, a project that would cause substantial additional VMT would result in a net increase in total VMT. The City would use a VMT efficiency metric approach for retail projects consistent with residential projects: a project would cause substantial additional VMT if it exceeds the existing regional VMT per capita minus 15 percent.

Proposed Thresholds of Significance

The following are recommended as thresholds of significance related to substantial additional VMT and substantially inducing additional automobile travel:

- Any land use project or plan located outside of an area specified for development in the most recently adopted Sustainable Communities Strategy would cause substantial additional VMT.

(Cont.)

- A land use plan may have a significant impact on VMT if it is not consistent with the relevant Sustainable Communities Strategy.

- A transportation project would substantially induce automobile travel if it exceeds the fair share VMT amount allocated to transportation projects to avoid conflicting with California's long-term greenhouse gas emissions reduction goals.
How things would be:
Certain development projects (small, in low-VMT areas, near transit) would be presumed to have less than significant transportation impacts.

How things would be:
Transit and active transportation projects would be presumed to have less than significant transportation impacts.