



# TRANSPORTATION and INFRASTRUCTURE COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, February 20<sup>th</sup>, 2025, 6:15 pm

*Mission: The Berkeley City Council established this Transportation and Infrastructure Commission to advise the City Council on matters related to transportation and public works infrastructure policies, facilities, and services in the City. In addition, the commission functions as the City of Berkeley's Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC).*

**North Berkeley Senior Center  
Aspen Room  
1901 Hearst Avenue  
Berkeley, CA 94709**

## **A. PRELIMINARY BUSINESS – 6:15 pm**

1. Call to order
2. Roll call
3. Public comment on items not on the agenda
4. Approval of minutes from January 16<sup>th</sup>, 2025 meeting
5. Approval and Order of Agenda
6. Update on administration and staff
7. Announcements

## **B. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS – 7 pm**

\* Written material included in packet

\*\* Written material to be delivered at meeting

The public may speak at the beginning of any item.

### **1. Chair and Vice Chair elections – 7 pm**

*Commissioners*

Commissioners will act on the nominations made at the January 16, 2025 commission meeting and elect a chair and vice chair. Action requested.

### **2. Informational presentation on Restrooms in the Public Right of Way\* – 7:25 pm**

*Public Works' Staff*

In 2018, the City initiated a Citywide Restroom Study, which was completed in 2020. Based on the study's recommendations, the design and construction of three new public restrooms is planned at the following locations: 1. Telegraph-Channing, 2. Alcatraz-Adeline and 3. San Pablo-University.

Transportation and Infrastructure Commission  
Thursday, February 20<sup>th</sup>, 2025

More details are available here:

<https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/our-work/capital-projects/restrooms-3-public-right-way>

3. **2025 Transportation and Infrastructure Commission Work Plan Discussion**  
– 8 pm  
*Commissioners and Secretary*  
Commissioners and Secretary discuss the commission's work plan for calendar year 2025.

**C. INFORMATION ITEMS AND SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS** – 8:30 pm  
*Information items can be moved to Discussion or Action by majority vote of the TIC*

1. Subcommittee reports & assignments: verbal reports from subcommittees
2. TIC Mission Statement (enclosed)
3. Council Summary Actions 2024\*
4. [Link to Council and Committee Agendas and Minutes](#)

**D. COMMUNICATIONS** – 8:40 pm

**E. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS** – 8:42 pm

**F. ADJOURNMENT** 8:45 pm

Agenda Posted: February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2024

*The next meeting of the Transportation and Infrastructure Commission is scheduled for Thursday, March 27<sup>th</sup>, 2025 at 6:15 pm.*

**A complete agenda packet is available for public review at the Main Branch Library and at the Transportation Division and Engineering Division front desks.**

**ADA Disclaimer**

** This meeting is being held in a wheelchair accessible location. To request a disability-related accommodation(s) to participate in the meeting, including auxiliary aids or services, please contact the Disability Services specialist at 981-6418 (V) or 981-6347 (TDD) at least three business days before the meeting date. Please refrain from wearing scented products to this meeting.**

Transportation and Infrastructure Commission  
Thursday, February 20<sup>th</sup>, 2025

**SB 343 Disclaimer**

Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection at the Public Works Transportation Division offices located at 1947 Center Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor.

**Communications Disclaimer**

*Communications to Berkeley boards, commissions or committees are public record and will become part of the City's electronic records, which are accessible through the City's website. **Please note: e-mail addresses, names, addresses, and other contact information are not required, but if included in any communication to a City board, commission or committee, will become part of the public record.** If you do not want your e-mail address or any other contact information to be made public, you may deliver communications via U.S. Postal Service or in person to the secretary of the relevant board, commission or committee. If you do not want your contact information included in the public record, please do not include that information in your communication. Please contact the secretary to the relevant board, commission or committee for further information.*

Commission Secretary Wahid Amiri  
Deputy Director, Engineering and Transportation, Public Works  
Telephone (510) 981-7061 / Fax: (510) 981-7060 / TDD: (510) 981-6903  
Email: wamiri@berkeleyca.gov



TRANSPORTATION and INFRASTRUCTURE COMMISSION  
**REGULAR MEETING**  
**DRAFT MINUTES**

Thursday, January 16<sup>th</sup>, 2025, 6:15 pm

North Berkeley Senior Center  
1901 Hearst Avenue  
Berkeley, CA, 94709

**A. PRELIMINARY BUSINESS**

**1. Call to order**

**6:15 pm:** Chair Zaro called the meeting to order.

6:15 pm: Two members of the public present.

**2. Roll call**

**6:15 pm:**

Commissioners Present: Ben Gerhardstein (substitute for Karen Parolek), Arsh Singh  
Hothi, Adrian Leung, Liza Lutzker, Julia Moss, Ren Zaro

Excused: Kim Walton

Staff Present: Wahid Amiri, Ron Nevels, Noah Budnick, Elliott Schwimmer,  
Dani Dynes, Elaine Hargraves, Charmine Solla (consultant),  
Christopher Kidd (consultant)

**3. Public comment on items not on the agenda**

No public comments.

**4. Approval of minutes from November 21<sup>st</sup>, 2024 meeting**

**6:16 pm Action:** It was Moved / Seconded (Moss / Lutzker) to approve the minutes with the following changes:

- Under agenda item A7, Announcements, Commissioner Lutzker asked that the minutes state that Ben Brown was struck at the intersection of Josephine and Rose streets; and,
- Under agenda item B3, Commissioner Lutzker asked that “Commissioner applauded...” be changed to “Commissioners applauded...”

**6:16 pm: Vote:**

Ayes: Hothi, Leung, Lutzker, Moss, Zaro

Noes: None

Abstain: Gerhardstein

Absent: None

Excused: Walton

Recused: None

**6:16 pm Motion passed 5-0-1-0-1-0**

**5. Approval and Order of Agenda**

**6:18 pm Action:** It was Moved / Seconded (Zaro / Lutzker) to move chair and vice chair nominations to the first item on the Discussion/Action section of the agenda.

**6:18 pm: Vote:**

Ayes: Gerhardstein, Hothi, Leung, Lutzker, Moss, Zaro

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

Excused: Walton

Recused: None

**6:18 pm Motion passed 6-0-0-0-1-0**

**6. Update on administration and staff**

**6:18 pm:** Deputy Director Wahid Amiri provided updates and answered Commissioner questions about the Transportation Division's staffing and vacancies, including recruiting for a Parking Services Manager, working with a firm to recruit engineers and non-engineers to hire a Transportation Division Manager and on on-boarding a new Senior Transportation Planner for Vision Zero, Associate Transportation Planner for transit and an Assistant Traffic Engineer for traffic calming.

Engineering Division Manager Ron Nevels provided updates and answered Commissioner questions about the Engineering Division's hiring and recruitment efforts, six vacancies out of thirty-eight staff, including Engineering Inspector, Chief of Party, Associate Engineer and Supervising Civil Engineer.

**7. Announcements**

**6:25 pm:** None.

**B. DISCUSSION / ACTION ITEMS**

**1. Chair and Vice Chair nominations**

**6:25 pm:** Commissioners discussed new people to serve as Commission Chair and Vice Chair.

**6:26 pm Action:** It was Moved / Seconded (Lutzker / Zaro) to nominate Commissioner Leung to serve as vice chair.

**6:26 pm: Vote:**

Ayes: Gerhardstein, Hothi, Leung, Lutzker, Moss, Zaro

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

Excused: Walton

Transportation and Infrastructure Commission  
Thursday, January 16<sup>th</sup>, 2025  
Recused: None

**6:26 pm Motion passed 6-0-0-0-1-0**

**6:27 pm Action:** It was Moved / Seconded (Gerhardstein / Lutzker) to nominate Commissioner Zaro to serve as chair.

**6:27 pm: Vote:**

Ayes: Gerhardstein, Hothi, Leung, Lutzker, Moss, Zaro

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

Excused: Walton

Recused: None

**6:27 pm Motion passed 6-0-0-0-1-0**

**2. MTC grant review: San Pablo Ave/Ashby Ave and 7th Street/Anthony intersections**

**6:27 pm:** Public Works staff presented on the MTC Complete Streets Checklists for the Housing Incentive Pool grant applications for the San Pablo Avenue/Ashby Avenue Intersection Improvements Project and the 7th Street/Anthony Street Complete Intersection Project. Staff requested that the Commission, in its capacity as the City of Berkeley's Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, support the project.

6:34 pm: Four members of the public present.

6:37 pm: Five members of the public present.

6:38 pm: Six members of the public present.

**6:41 pm:** Commissioners asked clarifying questions about whether or not the City gathered information about bicycle and pedestrian volumes at the two intersections and if there's already a protected left turn signal for southbound turns at San Pablo and Ashby.

**6:43 pm:** Members of the public commented on whether or not the lane markings will shift.

**6:43 pm:** Commissioners commented on having protected turns in both directions, strong support for a protected left turn for northbound traffic on Ashby, reducing the crossing distance for pedestrians at 7<sup>th</sup> and Anthony, desire for more pedestrian and bicyclist safety measures at 7<sup>th</sup> and Anthony and that a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) isn't a bicyclist safety improvement.

**6:50 pm Action:** It was Moved / Seconded (Zaro / Moss) to support the City Manager and Department of Public Works' statement of compliance that the San Pablo Ave. and Ashby Ave. Intersection Improvements Project and the 7th and Anthony Complete Intersections Project both meet the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Complete Streets Policy (MTC adopted Resolution 4493) for the Metropolitan

Transportation and Infrastructure Commission  
Thursday, January 16<sup>th</sup>, 2025

Transportation Commission's Housing Incentive Pool program, in the Commission's capacity as the City of Berkeley Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)..

**6:51 pm: Vote:**

Ayes: Gerhardstein, Hothi, Leung, Lutzker, Moss, Zaro

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

Excused: Walton

Recused: None

**6:51 pm Motion passed 6-0-0-0-1-0**

**3. Informational presentation on daylighting implementation, outreach and enforcement**

**6:52 pm:** Public Works staff updated the Commission on the City's progress implementing California's new Daylighting Law (AB 413). Staff briefed commissioners on work since the November 21, 2024 Transportation and Infrastructure Commission meeting (when staff last briefed the Commission on daylighting). Staff also presented on daylighting-related communications, enforcement and implementation plans.

6:55 pm: Seven members of the public present.

**6:57 pm:** Commissioners asked clarifying questions about the number of warnings that have been issued.

No public comments.

**6:58 pm:** Commissioners commented on and asked questions about public participation in implementing daylighting, partnering with the community to address scarce resources, putting objects in daylighting areas such as San Francisco's use of boulders, appreciation for the community messaging and warnings, how the community can help the City identify areas that need more robust daylighting treatments, using SeeClickFix to collect data on repeated illegal parking, adding bikeways and areas near parks as secondary priority locations for daylighting, changing the messaging from "one car length" to "one and a half car lengths," deploying parking enforcement offices to schools at drop off times, giving warnings to delivery drivers, translating the materials into multiple languages, coordinating with the Planning department to get developers to install on-street bike parking in daylighting areas, the schedule for repainting red curbs, the budget referral on the January 21 City Council meeting agenda, appreciation for daylighting safety improvements and related communications, the need to educate the public about why parking is being removed, putting up signs to this effect during implementation with a blurb or QR code, the timing of painting priority areas, the City Council's action in December 2024 to issue tickets starting on April 1 regardless of whether or not red curbs are painted, the need for the City Manager to communicate about how enforcement saves lives, the process for implementing more robust daylighting treatments, examples of community engagement from Portland and Oakland

## Transportation and Infrastructure Commission

Thursday, January 16<sup>th</sup>, 2025

and Berkeley's community-based traffic circle maintenance and storm drain clean up programs.

### 4. Informational presentation on the process to update the Bike Plan

**7:29 pm:** Public Works staff and their consultant provided an informational presentation on the status of the citywide bike plan update, shared the update schedule, process and progress to date. Staff also shared material to be presented to the public as part of winter/spring 2025 public outreach activities and informed the Commission and the public about these upcoming outreach events and other opportunities to provide input on the plan.

**7:51 pm:** Commissioners invited commissioners and the public to send letters with robust thoughts on the content of the Bike Plan update, stating that they should send super-detailed comments to staff to disseminate to the entire commission.

**7:54 pm:** Members of the public commented on and asked questions about how feedback will be incorporated into the plan, appreciation, the desire to have as many in-person events as possible, hosting hybrid virtual and in-person workshops, concerns about fewer traffic circle recommendations because traffic circles help make left hand turns safer, how listening sessions will be advertised, encouraging neighbors to participate, reaching out to UC Berkeley and King Middle School, collecting data on where people are biking and taking alternate routes to bike boulevards, how bike lane progress is measured.

**8:03 pm:** Commissioners commented and asked questions about how the City is incorporating Berkeley's changing political climate into the Bike Plan update; communicating that Berkeley has very high bicycle use; showing who bicycles in Berkeley, the different types of bicycles that people use, including mothers and older people; showing pictures of who bikes to set the stage for public engagement sessions; people bike and driver on different streets, so drivers don't always see the large number of people who bike; mixing map slides with photo slides; maps are overwhelming; biking to school is about proximity to schools and routes to schools; listening session advertising should be inclusive; whether or not accommodations are required; getting information to City Councilmembers about the Bike Plan update and ask them to include it in their newsletters; excitement that the Bike Plan update is moving forward; create a map that highlights changes to the bike network as compared to the 2017 Bike Plan; confusion around traffic calming recommendations and bike boulevard designs; the end of the Bike Plan update process is on a tight timeline since the City Council needs materials so far in advance; students are excited about the Bike Plan update.

### C. INFORMATION ITEMS AND SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

**8:17 pm:** The Bike Plan subcommittee reported that the public and commissioners should send detailed comments to the subcommittee via Public Works' staff.

Transportation and Infrastructure Commission  
Thursday, January 16<sup>th</sup>, 2025

#### **D. COMMUNICATIONS**

**8:18 pm:** None.

#### **E. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

**8:18 pm:** Measure FF update; daylighting update after the red curb funding is in place.

#### **F. ADJOURNMENT**

**8:19 pm:** Chair Zaro adjourned the meeting.

*The next meeting of the Transportation and Infrastructure Commission is scheduled for Thursday, February 20<sup>th</sup>, 2025 at 6:15 pm, at the North Berkeley Senior Center, 1901 Hearst Ave, Berkeley, CA 94709.*

#### Administrative Procedures

From the City of Berkeley Commissioners' Manual, 2019 Edition, page 70 regarding minutes:

Although the Brown Act does not require minutes, except for closed sessions, the Commissioners' Manual does require minutes of commission meetings but not for subcommittee meetings. When required, minutes are limited to action minutes only. Minutes are unofficial until approved by the commission. The minutes are converted to PDF and posted on the City's website.

The secretary shall keep an accurate record of the commission's proceedings and transactions. The secretary shall provide action minutes similar to those provided to the Council by the City Clerk. Action minutes list the date, time, and place of the meetings; the staff in attendance; the commissioners present and absent; and a clear and concise description of final actions taken. Approved motions are indicated by "moved, seconded, and carried" and include a breakdown of the vote. The vote breakdown includes the commissioners voting yes, no, abstain, absent, recused, and reason for recusal. Reasons for making a motion, debate, content of public comments, and audience reaction are not to be included.

Commission Secretary: Wahid Amiri, Deputy Director  
Engineering and Transportation Divisions, Public Works  
1947 Center St., 4th Floor, Berkeley, CA, 94704  
Telephone (510) 981-7061 / Fax: (510) 981-7060 / TDD: (510) 981-6903  
Email: wamiri@berkeleyca.gov

# Restrooms in the Public Right of Way

Berkeley Public Works, Engineering Division

Transportation & Engineering Commission

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 2025

# Introduction

- ▶ Berkeley Public Works Facilities Team:
  - ▶ Elmar Kapfer, Supervising Civil Engineer, Facilities
  - ▶ Uriel Gonzalez, Assistant PW Engineer, Facilities
  - ▶ Selam Mehari, Junior PW Engineer, Facilities

# Agenda

1. Project Purpose
2. Locations
  - a. Telegraph-Channing
  - b. San Pablo-University
  - c. Alcatraz-Adeline
3. Discussion

# Project Purpose

- ▶ Measure T1 – Infrastructure & Facilities Bond
- ▶ 2019-2020: W.A.S.H (Water Access, Sanitation and Hygiene) Assessment
  - ▶ Data collecting & Mapping
  - ▶ Community Engagement
  - ▶ Master Plan & Recommendations
  - ▶ Identified the need for a public restrooms
- ▶ Goal: Improving access to public sanitation facilities

# Telegraph-Channing

5

- ▶ Portland Loo Design
  - ▶ 24/7 Restroom
  - ▶ Exterior Hand Wash
  - ▶ UV Light
  - ▶ ADA accessible
- ▶ Public Meeting
  - ▶ October 4, 2021
  - ▶ Channing Way
- ▶ Construction
  - ▶ August 2024–January 2025
- ▶ Ribbon Cutting
  - ▶ February 11, 2025



Portland Loo Restroom on Channing Way, Berkeley

# Telegraph-Channing



# San Pablo-University

7

- ▶ Portland Loo Design
- ▶ Public Meeting
  - ▶ June 9, 2022
  - ▶ February 4, 2025
  - ▶ North East Corner
  - ▶ South West Corner
- ▶ Design Phase
  - ▶ Cal Trans Encroachment Permit



# Alcatraz-Adeline

- ▶ Exeloo Design
  - ▶ Modern Design
  - ▶ Fully Automated
  - ▶ ADA Accessible
- ▶ Public Meeting
  - ▶ June 9, 2022
  - ▶ February 18, 2025
  - ▶ North East Corner
- ▶ Design Phase
  - ▶ PG&E



Exeloo Restroom in Hayward, Ca

# Thank You

## Questions

[pwengineering@berkeleyca.gov](mailto:pwengineering@berkeleyca.gov)

**From:** Charles Siegel  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 14, 2025 3:33 PM  
**To:** Amiri, Wahid <WAmiri@berkeleyca.gov>  
**Subject:** Bicycle Plan Update: Agenda of Jan 16, 2025

**WARNING:** This is not a City of Berkeley email. Do not click links or attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

To: Transportation and Infrastructure Commission and Transportation Staff

I appreciate the suggested improvements proposed for the 2025 Bicycle Plan, but I think a few significant changes are needed to give us a Bicycle Boulevard network that will attract people of all ages and abilities.

### **Make Crossings Safer:**

- **Add Four-way stops:** The proposal does not include four-way stops as an item in the Low-Stress Intersection Toolkit (p. 67 of the packet). Four-way stops should be added to the toolkit, because they are the most cost-effective way to make some crossings safer. In fact, the city is already using four-way stops at bike boulevard crossings: one has been installed at Virginia/Oxford, and one is proposed at Mabel/Dwight/Bonar.
- **Remove RRFBs:** RRFBs are included in this toolkit, and six crossings are protected with only an RRFB in the map on p. 68. RRFBs alone are not enough to provide safe and convenient crossings for bicyclists, and the RRFBs at these crossings should be replaced with either RRFBs+Medians or four-way stops.

During public input on the 2017 Bike Plan, many members of the public said that RRFBs were inadequate and that four-way stops should be used instead. As a result, a note was added to that plan saying that, if the plan calls for an RRFB, a four-way stop can be used instead. The current proposal says that one change in the plan is "Fewer rapid rectangular flashing beacons (RRFB) due to resident and City staff concerns about effectiveness for bicycle crossings" (p. 68). Let's really address these concerns by eliminating RRFBs from the plan and replacing them with something more effective.

### **Add More Speed Tables:**

- **Add More Speed Tables on Russell, California, Channing and Ninth:** The proposal says "Speed tables on every block of Bicycle Boulevards," and does show those speed tables on most Bike Boulevards, but it has far fewer speed tables in these four bike boulevards. Is this just an error in the drawing?
- **Include Speed Tables on Bike Boulevards with Class 2 Bike Lanes:** These Bike Boulevards should have speed tables even where they also have striped Class 2 bike lanes, since the striped lanes alone are not enough to make them secure bike routes. In fact, a member of Walk Bike Berkeley was overtaken from behind and severely injured by a driver while bicycling in one of the striped bike lanes on Ninth St, as you can see at <https://www.berkeleyside.org/2021/03/19/driver-strikes-berkeley-bike-safety-advocate-hours-after-she-met-with-the-city-to-discuss-bike-safely> Unless we also use speed humps to slow traffic, these striped lanes do not provide the security we expect from Bike Boulevards.

With these changes to create safer crossings and to calm traffic, the Bike Boulevards could provide a network of secure streets that would attract people who are now unwilling to bicycle because it is dangerous.

Thanks,  
Charles Siegel



Walk Bike  
Berkeley



February 7, 2025

To: Transportation and Infrastructure Commission and Transportation Planning Staff  
cc: City Council, City Manager, Public Works Director, Public Works Deputy Director

Walk Bike Berkeley strongly supports many of the City's draft Bicycle Plan Update network, intersection, and traffic calming recommendations. But some significant changes are needed to deliver a network of safe, low-stress bikeways that will attract people of all ages and abilities.

## Protected Bike Lanes

- “Complete Street Corridor Study” should be defined to allow the City to use quick-build materials to pilot test one or more cycletrack designs along a corridor as part of the study in situations where staff has the capacity and the design considerations warrant it.
- The recommended network improvement maps should recommend facilities, not processes.. To that end, the network maps should simply recommend “Class IV Cycletrack” rather than include the two additional confusing and unnecessary indicators: “Complete Street Corridor Study - Primary Transit Route” and “Complete Street Corridor Study.” We agree that building cycletracks requires careful analysis, but most other city Bicycle Plans do not recommend studies on their network maps. Rather, they recommend protected bike lanes on the maps while also outlining, in other sections of the plan, studies and public engagement steps needed to implement those facilities.
- The Bicycle Plan should recommend cycletrack design standards that are wide enough to be (1) comfortable for families using cargo bikes or biking side-by-side with young children and (2) used occasionally by emergency responders and for evacuations.

## Bicycle Boulevards

Clarify that RRFBs alone are no longer a recommended intersection treatment

- Walk Bike Berkeley appreciates that the City has removed Rectangular Rapid-Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) as a stand alone bike boulevard crossing treatment. We support using RRFBs with medians as a low-stress crossing treatment in some situations.
- For RRFB-alone recommendations for already approved and funded projects (e.g., the San Pablo Parallel Bikeways project), the plan should indicate that those improvements

are approved/funded and thus will be built, but also indicate the City's desire for longer-term improvements, consistent with the updated Bicycle Boulevard Crossing Treatment Progression.

## Add four-way stops to the Bicycle Boulevard Crossing Treatment Progression and to the Low-Stress Intersection Toolkit

Four-way stops are only in the Bicycle Boulevard Crossing Treatment Progression as a footnote. Four-way stops should be clearly listed in the Bicycle Boulevard Crossing Treatment Progression because they are an effective way to make some crossings safer. Four-way stops already work well at existing bicycle boulevard crossings, for example, at Milvia/Cedar and Ninth/Dwight. Further, the City has recently added new four-way stops at Virginia/Oxford and Virginia/California and will soon add one at Mabel/Dwight.

## Lower Design Speeds and Speed Limit

Set an explicit goal of creating a design speed of 20 mph on Bike Boulevards. Lower the legal speed limit on Bike Boulevards to 20 mph or less, which we believe would be allowable under AB 43, 1938 and 321 in almost every instance (with the possible exception of Milvia from Dwight to Delaware).

## Traffic Calming:

- **Clarify that speed tables are recommended for all bicycle boulevards:** The proposal says "Speed tables on every block of Bicycle Boulevards," and does show those speed tables on most Bike Boulevards, but it has far fewer speed tables on some bike boulevards. We recommend applying a highlight or some other map overlay indicating where speed tables are recommended rather than mapping individual speed tables.
- **Include Speed Tables on Bike Boulevards with Class 2 Bike Lanes:** Bike Boulevards should have speed tables even if they also have striped Class 2 bike lanes, since the striped lanes alone are not enough to make them secure bike routes. If we just stripe lanes, they are just Class 2 Bike Lanes. If we keep the striped lanes and also add speed humps, they become secure Bike Boulevards.
- **Space Speed Tables Effectively.** The guidelines call for "Speed tables on every block of Bicycle Boulevards," but Berkeley's blocks vary dramatically in length. In the flatlands, there are two main lengths of blocks, one twice as long as the other. Eg, Channing to Dwight east of MLK is two blocks, but west of MLK is one block. The standard should be: "one speed table per block or one speed table every 300 feet, whichever is the shorter distance."

- **Update City Policy on Vertical Deflection Devices.** The plan should recommend studying modern vertical deflection device design, including but not limited to speed humps and speed cushions in accordance with recommended guidance from NACTO and FHWA. With the aim to seek approval from city council as potential exceptions to moratorium on vertical deflection devices.
- **Keep recommending traffic calming at intersections:** We are concerned with plans to make fewer traffic circle recommendations. Effective traffic calming must be done both mid-block and at intersections. Use of mid-block speed tables does not obviate the need for traffic circles or other intersection treatments to reduce vehicle speed and tighten vehicle turns. Raised intersections or crosswalks may be more effective than traffic circles, because they do not make cars swerve into the space where bicycles ride.
- **Collect and use vehicle volume and speed data to determine treatments.** Bicycle boulevard treatments should have the goal of meeting NACTO's guidelines for vehicle speeds and volumes recommended to design Bike Boulevards for all ages and abilities, and the Vision Zero goal of eliminating severe and fatal crashes. The plan should say that the City will collect traffic volume and speed data for bicycle boulevards or obtain this data from third parties (such as Streetlight). The plan should outline how the City will evaluate those data to determine what diversion and/or traffic calming treatments are needed to meet low-stress bikeway standards.
- **Public notification prior to installing traffic calming features:** Consistent with Council direction to develop bicycle boulevard implementation guidelines similar to Oakland's, the plan should indicate that public notification, but no other public process, is needed before installation of basic traffic calming features along bikeways (e.g., speed tables and traffic circles) as part of any capital project.

## Individual Crossings

Walk Bike Berkeley's suggestions below include upgrades of some intersection designs that are currently funded/approved. We support these projects moving forward as is, but the Bike Plan should include recommendations for future improvements. For example, the city will soon install an RRFB at Adeline and Russell, which is being used because there are not adequate funds for a PHB. We should go ahead with installing the RRFB there, but the plan should designate it for a PHB, so it can be upgraded at some time in the future.

The proposed recommendations for the following intersections are inadequate:

- **Alcatraz/Idaho:** Proposed: RRFB. Should be: Four-way stop or RRFB+median. Just an RRFB is not adequate to create a safe and convenient crossing.
- **Shattuck/Woolsey:** Proposed: RRFB. Should be: Median+RRFB or PHB. Just an RRFB is not adequate to create a safe and convenient crossing of Shattuck.

- **California/Ashby:** Proposed: Median+RRFB. Should be: PHB. Crossing a street with heavy traffic like Ashby, a median+RRFB is not adequate. It should be a PHB or Signal, as where other Bike Boulevards cross Ashby.
- **Russell/Adeline:** Proposed: Median+RRFB. Should be: PHB. A median+RRFB can work on a two-lane street, but not on a four-lane street like Adeline. The median is already there and does not make it a safe and convenient crossing.
- **Addison/MLK:** Proposed: Median+RRFB. Should be: PHB. The median+RRFB already exists here is not adequate to make the crossing safe, so it should be upgraded to a PHB. A PHB is proposed for Addison/Sacramento and is the appropriate treatment for crossing MLK too.
- **Virginia/MLK:** Proposed: Median+RRFB. Should be: PHB. Crossing a street with heavy traffic like MLK, a median+RRFB is not adequate.
- **Stannage/Cedar, Stannage/Hopkins, Kains/Gilman, Milvia/Hopkins:** Proposed for all: RRFB. Should be: Four-way stop or median+RRFB. Just an RRFB is not adequate to create a safe and convenient crossing.
- **King/Alcatraz, Milvia/Rose,, Milvia/Hopkins, Dwight/Bowditch-Hillegass:** These intersections should have four-way stops as an option.
- **Ninth/Delaware:** Shift the diverter so it goes from the southeast to the northwest corner, instead of from the northeast to the southwest corner. Currently, many drivers take a shortcut to the freeway by going west on Delaware, turning left at this corner, and entering University Ave. at Ninth St., creating dangerous traffic for bikes using the Ninth St. Bike Boulevard and the class 2 Bike Lanes on Delaware. Shifting the diverter would force cars to turn right at this corner, eliminating this shortcut.
- **9th/Virginia:** Proposed: No improvement. Should be: A four-way stop at this intersection of two bicycle boulevards.
- **Addison/Curtis/Lehua Way:** Proposed: No improvement. Should be: A four-way stop and/or raised intersection. This improvement is needed to facilitate a safe route to Oxford Elementary.
- **Ohlone Greenway at Cedar, Rose and Santa Fe:** Proposed raised intersection. Should be: Raised intersection plus RRFB or stop signs.
- **West St Path/Delaware:** Proposed: No improvement. Should be: A median or raised crossing plus the existing RRFB.
- **Emeryville Greenway/Folger:** Proposed: No improvement. Should be: A raised crossing plus the existing RRFB.

With these changes to create safer crossings and to calm traffic, the Bike Boulevards could provide a network of secure streets that would attract people who are now unwilling to bicycle because it is dangerous.

## Network Recommendations

- Use the Term Class 2 Bicycle Boulevard for Bicycle Boulevards with striped lanes. Current terminology on the map is inconsistent. Class 3 Bicycle Boulevard is used to

mean a bike boulevard with no striped lanes. Class 2 Bike Lane and Class 2 Upgraded Bike Lane are used for parts of bike boulevards that have striped lanes (like California north of Dwight) without clearly indicating that they are bike boulevards. These should be called Class 2 Bicycle Boulevards instead, 1) for consistency with the term Class 3 Bike Boulevards, 2) because it is not the bike lane that is upgraded but the whole street, and 3) to assure that they are not confused with ordinary Class 2 Bike Lanes (like on Delaware). This terminology makes it clear that they get full bike boulevard treatment with traffic calming.

- Consistent with the 2017 bicycle plan, show how Berkeley's recommended network improvements connect with those in Oakland, Emeryville, and Albany.
- Upgrade the bike lanes on all Class 2 Bicycle Boulevards by adding buffered lanes where street width permits. Buffered bike lanes are needed to provide a lower-stress experience when vehicles pass. (See the note above about calling these segments Class 2 Bicycle Boulevards.)
- Spruce St and Arlington: Add a class 2 upgraded bike lane for the uphill (climbing) direction on Spruce and Arlington. Frequent vehicles passing in a shared lane make cycling in the uphill direction high stress, both of these streets would better support Northeast Berkeley
- Designate Josephine St to be a Class 3 bicycle boulevard from Virginia to Sonoma. This would create low-stress connections to bikeways recommended on Hopkins, Rose, and Grant.
- Designate Berryman St to be a Class 3 bicycle boulevard from Shattuck Ave. to Josephine St. Add RRFB+Median or PHB at Henry St.
- Extend the Camelia Street Bike Boulevard from 8th Street to 4th Street, then from Camelia St to Gilman St to connect to the protected cycle track starting at 4th and Gilman.
- Upgrade Bay/Shellmound from Aquatic Park south the city line from class 3 bike route to class 4 cycletrack. This change is consistent with ACTC plans for the Ashby interchange project.
- Upgrade Heinz Street from 7th to San Pablo and 9th Street from Heinz to the greenway entrance from class 3 bicycle boulevard to class 4 cycletrack. These segments are unlikely to ever meet bicycle boulevard traffic volume goals due to Berkeley Bowl West traffic.

## High Priority Projects:

The following should be included in the list of highest priority projects:

- **Protected Bike Lanes on Hearst from California to Milvia:** This low-stress bikeway would connect the Ohlone Greenway with the existing protected lanes on Milvia and on Hearst, creating a continuous secure bikeway connecting downtown Berkeley and UC Campus with the cities to the north and with the new housing coming at NB BART. Our goal should be to complete these lanes by the time the housing at NB BART is complete.

- **Reduce all LTS4 intersections on the Bicycle Boulevard network to LTS2. This high-priority project would include both the Sacramento/Channing and Sacramento/Russell intersection improvements.** Berkeley has had a Bicycle Boulevard network since the 1990s and it is partly successful. But safe crossings of intersections have been neglected, causing network-wide harmful effects. To encourage city-wide cycling, the city must create a connected, city-wide network of traffic-calmed Bike Boulevards.
- **Protected Bike Lanes on Gilman from 4th St to at least the Ohlone Greenway:** This is already becoming a primary route for soccer players as young as 11 years old getting to and from the Pedestrian and Bike bridge across I-80. Creating this as a primary path would build biking into a common daily activity for many children and families. These should connect with protected bike lanes on Hopkins to create a continuous secure route.

## Errors

- Oxford Elementary School's location is incorrect on the draft maps. It is shown at its former location (1130 Oxford). Oxford is now located at 1222 University Ave, between Curtis and Bonar.
- The presentation and intersection map indicate that the City has 6 protected intersections, however several are not protected intersections. We don't not consider believe the following intersections to be protected, though they support certain turning maneuvers
  - Milvia/Bancroft
  - Bancroft/Shattuck
  - Bancroft/Barrow

Thank you for considering these suggestions.

Charles Siegel, Ben Gerhardstein, Rebecca Mirvish, Brandon Yung, Benjamin Fry, Phyllis Orrick, Barnali Ghosh  
For Walk Bike Berkeley

Robert Prinz  
Advocacy Director, Bike East Bay

*[Walk Bike Berkeley](#), an all-volunteer group founded by Berkeley residents, advocates to make walking and biking in Berkeley safe, low-stress, and fun for people of all ages and abilities. We want a healthy, just, and sustainable transportation system in Berkeley.*