

**TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
MINUTES
February 25, 2004**

The Transportation Commission (TC) was called to order by *Chair Knox White* at 7:39 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL – Roll was called and the following recorded:

Members Present:

<i>Shirley Clem</i>	<i>Michael Krueger</i>
<i>Chair John Knox White</i>	<i>Robert McFarland</i>
<i>Pattianne Parker</i>	<i>Eric B. Schatmeier</i>
<i>Jon M. Spangler</i>	

Members Absent:

Vice Chair Robert Ratto

One position vacant

Staff Present:

Barbara Hawkins, Supervising Civil Engineer
Michelle DeRobertis, Associate Civil Engineer

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

<p><i>Commissioner Krueger</i> moved approval of the minutes, which was seconded by <i>Commissioner Spangler</i>. Motion carried by the following voice vote: 6-0. (Absent: Vice-Chair Ratto-1; Abstain: <i>Commissioner Parker</i> -1).</p>
--

3. AGENDA CHANGES

Chair Knox White suggested taking Item 5C first since there were citizens present that wished to speak on this issue. All agreed.

4. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS – NONAGENDIZED ITEMS

Mr. Neil Garcia-Sinclair, Cybertrans, stated that he recently met with *Mayor Johnson* on the status of his firm's product. Their modular light rail system has a very small footprint. They did a study with BART assessing connecting Fruitvale BART with Alameda Point. However, BART has asked that the study not be released until BART's internal review is complete. That is why Cybertrans has not yet presented the study to the TC. He also clarified that a developer had proposed to use their system, but they were not a part of that proposal. He invited all the commissioners to their site at Alameda Point where they have full-scale test vehicles (see www.cybertrans.com).

5. OLD BUSINESS

5C. Recommendation to Form an Interagency Task Force To Develop a Uniform Plan of Action To Enforce Safety Issues on the Oakland Estuary

Staff DeRobertis provided a summary of the staff report, which stated that the TC's recommendation for an interagency task force could not be implemented.

Commissioner Parker asked if fees paid were in proportion to services received.

Staff DeRobertis replied that, according to the police and fire departments; the services received exceeded the fees and taxes paid.

Commissioner Spangler asked if staff had considered using traffic calming funds on the estuary.

Staff DeRobertis replied traffic calming funds were for capital projects not enforcement.

Secretary Hawkins added that the Measure B fund allocated to traffic calming is limited to streets, roads, bicycles and pedestrians.

Public Comment

Mr. Chris Gaskill stated that the estuary was their street, and their property was being damaged by wakes. A fee on boat slips would not be fair since the problem is caused by boats using the public launch ramp. A better solution would be to charge a fee to use the launch ramp or restrict it to City residents. Slip users already spend money in Alameda shopping, dining, etc.

Ms. Elaine Lutz, Grand Marina, thanked staff for their efforts to date and asked if the calls to the marinas/estuaries referred to in the staff report were fire or police? (Fire). She stated she had never seen the fire department respond, although there was one marina she knew that had a lot of police calls. She would like to see data supporting that assertion. She likes the idea of a multi-jurisdictional task force, especially since one of the worst offenders is the United States Coast Guard (USCG). The City's fireboat is no longer one of the problems. She strongly supports a large educational sign at the public launch ramp with safety and boat information; she offered to print up pamphlets. She then asked if this would go to the City Council? (No).

Could the TC write a letter to the USCG? (TC is a policy body only).

A fee on slips means the very people being hurt would be paying the fee. Would marina citizens be able to comment on any surcharge or fee before it is adopted? (Yes but it would not come before the TC).

Close Public Comment

Commission Discussion

Chair Knox White asked why their recommendation for an interagency task force did not get presented to the Council.

Secretary Hawkins replied that the City Manager made the decision since staff had determined other agencies would not participate.

Commissioner Parker asked if we could not get money from federal agencies like the USCG or the Army Corps of Engineers?

Secretary Hawkins replied that the USCG's primary enforcement responsibilities are not speed violations and the Corps of Engineers is not an enforcement agency.

Commissioner Parker then stated that since the other agencies are not conducting enforcement they should assume liability and responsibility as a result and that she would like our City Attorney's opinion on this.

Commissioner Spangler stated that we should not ask the victims to pay for the crime. He added that since Coast Guard Island is in the city limits, perhaps we could get them to the table. Also any potential fees should address only motorized craft.

Chair Knox White advised the citizens that they might take their concerns directly to the Council since the TC's recommendation did not go to Council; maybe pressure could be put on the other agencies to come to the table.

Commissioner Krueger added that a letter from the mayor to the USCG might be effective.

Commissioner Parker stated she would like the TC recommendation to be reiterated.

Commissioner Spangler asked that staff report back to the TC.

Chair Knox White said that he would write a letter to the Council.

5A North Waterfront Specific Plan (NWSP)– Policy Recommendations

Chair Knox White stated that a subcommittee (*Ratto, Krueger, Schatmeier and Knox White*) met with Planning staff member *Andrew Thomas* and Public Works staff member *Michael Margulies* to discuss proposed policies for a General Plan amendment for the Northern Waterfront Area, to be Chapter 10. Their recommendations are in the staff report but *Chair Knox White* added that they suggest two revisions to what is presented in the staff report: Item # 2- add "in single-occupant vehicles "after trip reduction and Item # 6-remove "and Lincoln (Avenue)".

Public Comment

None

Commission Discussion

Pattianne Parker, in regard to Item #1 in the staff report, asked why not have a Citywide transit District?

John Knox White stated this document only addresses NWSP area so we can only specify NWSP. We can add "citywide" when we do the full General. Plan.

Commissioner Krueger suggested adding explanatory text, *Commissioner Parker* suggested citing additional destinations and *Commissioner Clem* suggested citing the idea that a corridor was being served.

Commissioner Schatmeier suggested the following wording revision:

"Establish a Northern Waterfront Transit District or amend the Citywide Development Fee Ordinance to fund expanded Northern Waterfront transit services *in corridors through and between* the Northern Waterfront and *the high ridership generators inside and outside the City such as* Oakland BART stations, airport, transit hubs, etc."

Commissioner Parker stated that regarding Item #5, which would delete proposed policy 10.6.i, the “constituency” were adamant about not running north-south streets through the greenbelt, they are now cul-de-sacs, and there is a significant grade differential.

Commissioner Spangler stated the housing element says that one acceptable use for the greenbelt is housing, and he suggested modifying the wording of the policy instead of deleting it.

Commissioner Krueger stated this policy is in direct violation of the General Plan and if it is not feasible then it won’t happen; exceptions are unnecessary; this policy sets a bad philosophical precedent and should be deleted.

Chair Knox White asked for a straw vote on Item 5, deleting policy 10.6.i; as recommended in staff report: (5 in favor, 2 opposed).

Chair Knox White asked for a straw vote on Item 5, deleting policy PS-3: (6 in favor, 1 abstain).

Chair Knox White asked for a vote on Item 2 with the change described above, and Items 3 and 4 as described in staff report (7 in favor).

Commissioner Spangler moved to accept the staff recommendation for Item 6, adding a new policy substituting Sherman Street for Grand Street which was seconded by *Commissioner Parker* and carried by unanimous voice vote: - 7. [Absent: *Vice Chair Ratto* -1].

Chair Knox White moved to extend the meeting to 10:15 pm which was seconded by *Commissioner Schatmeier* and carried by the following voice vote: Ayes- 6; Noes - *Parker* -1. [Absent: *Vice Chair Ratto* -1.]

5B. Transportation Commission Size

Staff DeRobertis explained that staff would like the TC to take three actions to finalize the reduction of the committee size to seven (7) and to coordinate it with the first turnover of the Commission in July 2004 when four terms expire.

Public Comment

None

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Parker stated she prefers continuity for the commissioners who represent school and business groups, i.e. their terms should not all expire simultaneously.

Commissioner Schatmeier moved to accept the staff recommendation (Option A) to reduce the TC size from 9 to 7 by allowing all nine to continue to serve until July 1, 2004, but only fill two of the four positions, one of which would be a representative of the school community and one of which would be a representative of the business community, which was seconded by *Commissioner Spangler* and carried by the following voice vote: Ayes -- 6, Abstain – *Clem* -1. [Absent: *Vice Chair Ratto* -1].

Staff DeRobertis explained the options to have a more balanced turnover of commissioners. If nothing is done, two terms would expire in 2004 and five terms would expire in 2006. Option A would select, by random drawing, two of the five to be appointed in 2006 to serve three-year terms rather than four-year terms.

Commissioner Parker moved to accept the staff recommendation (Option A), so that one-third of the commission would turnover in three consecutive years, which was seconded by *Commissioner Spangler* and carried by unanimous voice vote: - 7. [Absent: -*Vice Chair Ratto* -1].

Staff DeRobertis explained that since the commissioner size was being reduced by two positions effective July 2004, there would only be two positions to fill not four. She presented two options.

Commissioner Parker moved to accept the staff recommendation (Option A) to recommend that *Ratto* and *Clem* be reappointed should they choose to remain on the Commission, which was seconded by *Commissioner Krueger* and carried by unanimous voice vote: - 7. [Absent: -*Vice Chair Ratto* -1].

6. NEW BUSINESS

None

7. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

None

8. COMMISSION ANNOUNCEMENTS

None

9. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Parker moved to adjourn the meeting, which was seconded by *Commissioner Spangler* and carried by unanimous voice vote - 7. (Absent: *Vice Chair Ratto* -1).

Meeting adjourned at 10: 15 P.M.