

**Minutes—January 15, 2009**  
**Meeting of the Oakland Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee**  
**City Hall Hearing Room 4, 5:30-7:30 p.m.**

**Members attending:** Jonathan Bair, Ron Bishop, Dave Campbell, Jim Dexter, Mark Dieter, Chris Hwang, Carol Levine, Jason Patton, Jennifer Stanley, Midori Tabata, Brian Toy

**Guests attending:** Eric Uddenberg, Daniel Schulman, Rebecca Saltzman, Isaac Rodriguez, Josh Abrams, Paul Rosenbloom, Charlier Bowen, Alec Berger

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
<p><b>1. Introductions, Appointment of Note Taker</b></p> <p>Administrative item.</p>	<p>Jim Dexter was appointed to prepare the minutes.</p>
<p><b>2. Approval of Meeting Minutes</b></p> <p>Action item.</p>	<p>Discussion to approve the December Oakland BPAC meeting minutes. The draft of the December minutes arrived too late for detailed review. There was a motion to continue reviewing the minutes. A new review of the minutes was requested, and will be performed prior to the February meeting. At that meeting, the minutes will be motioned for approval.</p> <p><i>Motion: <b>Continue review of December minutes</b> made by Midori Tabata.</i></p> <p><i>Motion seconded by Mark Dieter.</i></p> <p><i>Discussion: None.</i></p> <p><i>Motion passed without objection.</i></p>
<p><b>3. Oakland's Walkway Rehabilitation Program</b></p> <p><b>PRESENTER:</b></p> <p><b>Eric Uddenberg,</b>  Architect with the City's Engineering Design and Right of Way Management Division, CEDA</p> <p>Informational Item</p>	<p>Eric Uddenberg, who leads the City of Oakland's efforts to maintain and improve the city's stairways and pathways, presented information on the state of the facilities. There are more than 500 stairways and paths within the City of Oakland. Over 200 of these are 'developed.' There was an inventory done in 1956, and a re-inventory done in 1998. Currently, there is no organized pool of Oakland volunteers to work on the stairways and paths. (It was noted by meeting participants that Berkeley has had success in getting volunteers to work on stairways and paths.) Currently, there is a continuing source of funding for paths and stairways from the ACTIA. Recently, the Oakland funding was increased from \$250,000 to \$400,00 per year. ACTIA funds are currently running between 8 and 12 million a year, and are also known as the Measure B funds. Each year, at least one million of these funds are appropriated to pedestrian and bicycle projects within Alameda County.</p> <p>A number of recent Oakland stairs/paths construction/rehabilitation projects were mentioned, including the first recent project at the Upper/Lower Merriewood Stairs, the major new construction at</p>

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p>Oakmore, and the major new construction at Trestle Glen. The Merriewood stairs were initiated by citizens who wanted the stairs re-built, and with years of difficulty was able to get the stairs acted upon. Citizens of Oakmore who wanted the Oakmore stairs re-built, through years of determined action with the City, got the project enacted. Citizens of Trestle Glen, who finally went to the Chronicle Watch to get action when all other appeals failed, were able to get action on the Trestle Glen stairs. In all recent cases, the City was in a response mode, not a pro-active mode. Currently, the basic construction estimates are from \$250.00 to \$500.00 per linear foot, depending upon many factors including terrain and materials. The more expensive of the estimates is for concrete with drilled piers.</p> <p>Mr. Uddenberg made a request of BPAC to assist the City of Oakland in being more pro-active about the stairs/paths within the city. He asked BPAC to participate in creating a list of qualitative variables to be used to evaluate potential stairs/paths projects in advance of citizen requests, so that the city can be ahead of the potentially-negative citizen/city situations. By being more pro-active, the City won't have to respond to appeals through the Chronicle Watch again, which will be better for all concerned.</p> <p>Mr. Uddenberg made an additional request to BPAC to assist the City in prioritization of the new possible projects.</p> <p>A number of qualitative variables that were discussed included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Getting children to school.</li> <li>• Social equity.</li> <li>• Improving an already-existing network of stairs/paths.</li> <li>• Safety access for emergencies (fire, earthquake).</li> <li>• Proximity to transit.</li> <li>• Equality of development in all Council Districts of Oakland</li> </ul> <p><b>Motion: Create a BPAC Sub-Committee to work on paths/stairways</b> made by Jim Dexter.</p> <p><i>Motion seconded by Midori Tabata.</i></p> <p><i>Discussion: A quick evaluation of the BPAC bylaws indicated that there were no guidelines existing to guide creation of sub-committees. There was a discussion about the size of such a sub-committee, with the intent to ensure efficient operability of the sub-committee by limiting the number of members of the sub-committee. There was a discussion about the possible need to meet notice requirements of the Brown/Sunshine acts, but this was felt unnecessary at this time. The potential members of the sub-committee were defined as Jim Dexter (Chair), Mark Deiter, Paul Rosenbloom, Alec Berger, Daniel Schulman, and Jonathan Bair (ex-officio), with the participation of Eric Uddenberg as City staff.</i></p> <p><i>Motion passed without objection.</i></p>

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
<p><b>4. Bikeway Projects Status</b></p> <p><b>PRESENTER:</b></p> <p><b>Jason Patton, Transportation Services Division, CEDA staff.</b></p> <p>Action item.</p>	<p>90% of projects are listed on the handout, with 10% of the projects not listed, including the Measure DD and Bay Trail and some other projects.</p> <p>Jason asked the BPAC to prioritize the outstanding projects for presentation to BPAC. Ron Bishop cited a number of criteria for consideration in prioritization. Jim Dexter indicated that only those projects that had some element of general commonality should be considered for prioritization; those projects that were localized to a specific area should not be prioritized for BPAC presentation. Others wanted to see presentations on all projects listed as “to be accomplished” in 2009/2010.</p> <p>Mention was made of the Telegraph project, still delayed after six years. Jason gave a short history of the Telegraph project.</p> <p>Mention was made of the Webster/Franklin project as very important, one that deserves a quick presentation to BPAC.</p> <p>Mention was made about one specific prioritization parameter: improving OPD bicycle officer access.</p> <p>City Council directed staff to prepare the next year's CIP budget to include funding for a transportation engineer dedicated to the bike program. If the CIP budget (and the position) is approved, this staff person will take a lead role in bike project study and design, greatly facilitating implementation of bike projects.</p> <p>No formal action was taken by BPAC.</p>
<p><b>5. Projects for FY 2009-10 TDA Article 3 Bike/Ped Funding</b></p> <p><b>PRESENTER:</b></p> <p><b>Jason Patton, Transportation Services Division, CEDA staff.</b></p> <p>Action item.</p>	<p>Our state gas tax revenue generates the TDA funds, and the funds are administered in Alameda County by the MTC. There is a mandate for a BPAC review of all projects funded by TDA.</p> <p>There was a request for a straw poll of the priorities.</p> <p>There was a request for design presentations for projects in advance of prioritization, when the designs are available.</p> <p>There was a discussion of stimulus projects funding.</p> <p>There was a request for defining the context of the project states, to assist in the project prioritization. For instance, it would be good to know when a project was ‘easy’ to finish design or ‘easy’ to develop, or if a project was ‘hard’ to finish/develop.</p> <p>Members voiced their opinions on some of the potential projects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Citywide Curb Ramp Program is important.</li> <li>2. Mountain Boulevard path is important</li> <li>3. Pedestrian countdown signal heads are important.</li> </ol>

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p>4. Walkway rehabilitation is important.</p> <p>No formal action was taken by BPAC.</p>
<p><b>6. 27<sup>th</sup> Street / Bay Place, Broadway to Grand Avenue, Bikeway Design Review</b></p> <p><b>PRESENTER:</b></p> <p><b>Jennifer Stanley, Transportation Services Division, CEDA staff.</b></p> <p>Action item.</p>	<p>A presentation of the design was made, with projected illustrations of previously distributed design plans. Specific issues were discussed, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the use of sharrows</li> <li>• lane width</li> <li>• the intersection of 27<sup>th</sup> and Valdez</li> <li>• 8' parking stalls</li> <li>• possible movement of curbs to make room for bike lanes</li> <li>• colored bike lanes</li> <li>• skip striping issues</li> </ul> <p>No formal action was taken by BPAC.</p>
<p><b>7. Announcements, suggestions for next meeting topics</b></p> <p>Administrative item.</p>	<p><b>Announcements:</b></p> <p>Interesting YouTube video on Oakland pedestrian safety in 1948.</p> <p>Positive interest was expressed for a BPAC ride to examine Market Street signage.</p> <p>Next month is BPAC officer elections.</p> <p><b>Meeting Topics:</b></p> <p>Possible Topics for Future BPAC Meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central Estuary bike/ped plan street design standards.</li> <li>• Crosswalk standards.</li> <li>• Commercial parking on city streets.</li> <li>• Traffic signal prioritization</li> <li>• Hill area parking PWA processes</li> <li>• Space pedestrian issues on MacArthur</li> </ul>

**ADJOURN:** 7:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Jim Dexter