

BPAC June Minutes

Attendees:

15 people attending, including staff

Carol Levine, Chris Andree, Chris Hwang, Chris Kidd, Daniel Schulman, Jason Patton, Jennifer Stanley, Midori Tabata, Robert Prinz, Ryan Chan, Tom Willging, Mike Jones, Brian Geiser, Wladimir Wlassowsky, Jesse Budlong, Jennifer Anderson

HSIP Update

Wlad gave an update on last year's HSIP applications and the status of the current applications, to be submitted in July.

Last Year's HSIP Projects:

[Link to Caltrans' HSIP site](#)

3 proposals were awarded funding, 2 of which have large bicycling & pedestrian components. They are (1) the Adeline/Market intersection and (2) West MacArthur Blvd from MLK to Market Street. All three HSIP projects have gone to council for approval and are receiving field review from Caltrans. Design will start in earnest in the late fall at the earliest, possibly at the start of the new year.

For the upcoming July application, Public Works is narrowing down a list of possible locations based upon injury and fatality data at specific intersections and along specific corridors. The maximum amount of funding allowed for each city has been increased by Caltrans this year, meaning that applications will be more competitive this year than in years past.

The City is currently narrowing down a list of 12 locations. International Blvd has already been eliminated, as the upcoming BRT project will make improvements there. Other locations have been eliminated because they either received HSIP funding in the recent past or some of the documented injuries were from DUI (meaning engineering won't solve it) or that the location is at a railroad crossing (different process).

Design is not yet complete for the application. Even the finalized locations for the application will have only cursory design before submission to Caltrans.

Comments:

- Worry that solution catered to low-volume intersections will no longer work as well when the area gets higher volumes of pedestrians or bicyclists. Wlad responded that the City met with many stakeholders (including Safe Routes to Schools) in order to select locations, and solutions, that would be bicycle and pedestrian friendly.

- What is the funding from HSIP used for? It's used for both construction and design.

Bike Plan 1.0 to 2.0

Jason Patton presented on the concept of redirecting implementation efforts away from new infrastructure to improving existing infrastructure from "standard" to "advanced" bikeways. The key question: Do we add more facilities, or improve existing facilities? Where do we spend our limited funding and staff time?

Jason developed a 10 year work plan, including "remedial work", "bike plan 1.0", and "bike plan 2.0". Remedial work is bringing current facilities up to minimum standards, bike plan 1.0 is completing key network gaps, and bike plan 2.0 is starting to use new and advanced treatments. Doing new things takes longer and is more difficult to complete, but it would represent the "NACTO-izing" of Oakland.

Remedial Work

- Repaving key bikeways that have deficient pavement quality
- Replacing all substandard storm grates
- Getting all traffic signals to pick up bicycles (detection)

Bike Plan 1.0

- Implementing all priority road diets, completing gaps
- Completing all bikeways wayfinding
- Complete all remaining bikeways lane striping

Bike Plan 2.0

- Get a Bike Boulevard policy that is cutting edge
- Implement green bike lanes
- Identify where there are gaps in existing facilities that deter less confident riders. Develop a prioritization matrix to make those gaps truly bike friendly
- Implement "super sharrows"
- Implement buffered bike lanes

Bike Plan 2.0

The goal is to get to fully "low stress" networks that all users can ride on comfortably. Using innovative treatments in a network-focused way. Currently, innovation is being implemented in a scattershot way. We'd like to do proactive traffic calming instead of responding reactively to neighborhood complaints. Stripe green pavement on bikeways in high-stress locations. ID the weak links in networks and develop priorities, take on the "hard spots" that were ignored during Bike Plan 1.0 in order to get facilities on the ground.

Discussion

What's more important: bringing current bikeways up to the standard set in the 2007 bike plan, or going for a more limited implementation of "2.0" style bikeways? Can we easily fold 2.0-style treatments into current projects? Would that cut into the retrofitting of existing facilities as 2.0? Are there planned facilities that have been

de-prioritized that should be given priority? If so, which planned facilities take a back seat? Adding more facilities to the list means that it takes that much longer to get to 2.0-style facilities.

Comments

- Some attendees wanted to see a full switch over to Bike Plan 2.0, creating truly bike friendly networks, albeit in only limited locations.
- Include adequate bicycle parking as part of 2.0
- Others wanted prioritization of completing the Bike Plan 1.0 network, especially in areas that haven't received as much investments/attention, like East Oakland. Staff noted that they wanted investments to reach the greatest numbers of bicyclists possible, and that bicycling rates are very very low in some areas of East Oakland.
- Staff asked to include some sort of equity measurement in any Bike Plan 2.0 priority matrix. That could be economic or geographical equity. Staff noted that ID'ing network gaps in Bike Plan 2.0 could also help prioritize Bike Plan 1.0 implementation.
- Staff asked to develop "Philosophy Statement" around what Bike Plan 2.0 means.
- Staff were asked to include Jaime Parks' Complete Streets work into any Bike Plan 2.0 work.

College Ave Bikeways

Staff has an old striping plan for College that they put on the shelf because they didn't like it – it had minimum width bike lanes in both directions, not ideal for an area with a lot of business and vehicle parking turnover.

Robert Prinz had previously floated the idea of an uphill bike lane and downhill sharrows. Staff liked the idea a lot. Bike lane would be on north side of the street except the few blocks before Broadway, where the bike lane would be on the south side. Staff will also get rid of the second southbound lane on College Ave at the Hudson Street intersection. There will likely be bike lanes in both directions under Highway 24.

Comments:

- Staff asked to consider additional treatments to complement sharrows and visually narrow the road for drivers.
- What is the plan for west of Claremont where the road narrows? There will be bike lanes at least until Alcatraz. After that, will need to coordinate with the City of Berkeley (to get to Woolsey)
- Some worried that a 15' shared downhill lane with sharrows will encourage cars to "squeeze" through. Staff suggested widening the parking lane by another foot.

Resurfacing Update

Staff keeps track of repaving projects to make sure that priority bikeways get implemented whenever possible. The BPAC decided it was worth staff time to provide these reports twice a year.

Attachment

Candidate HSIP Projects list

Candidate HSIP Projects List

- Hegenberger Road between I880 and Doolittle
- Bancroft Ave (64th to Hilton)
- 73rd Ave (Holly to Krause)
- 66th Ave
- High Street below I580 (Lyon to Redding/I580)
- Redwood Road/35h Avenue: Highway 13 to above MacArthur
- MacArthur Blvd between Fruitvale and Lincoln
- 38th Ave below I580
- Grand Ave between Harrison and Bellevue
- West Grand Ave between Adeline and Market/West
- Downtown: Oak to Harrison, 5th Street to 9th Street
- 22nd Avenue: E20th to E12th