

City of Oakland | Pedestrian Master Plan
Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Community Advisory Committee (CAC)
Meeting Notes

The second meeting of each of the committees guiding the development of the Oakland Pedestrian Master Plan was in October. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met on October 13 and the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) met on October 14. These notes summarize the discussion that took place at these meetings. Although they occurred on different days, the memo is organized according to the Plan's tasks and presents guidance from members of both committees together. The memo concludes with action items from these meetings.

Technical Advisory Committee

(October 13, 2015 meeting participants)

- Nathan Landau, AC Transit
- Miguel Trujillo, Oakland Fire Department
- Marianna Parreiras, BART
- Matt Bomberg, Alameda CTC
- Wladimir Wlassowsky, Joe Wang, Peter Chun, Oakland Public Works, Transportation Services
- Dave Elzey, Oakland Police Department
- Zach Seal, Oakland Economic Development
- Rachel Flynn, Oakland Planning & Building
- Christine Calabrese, Oakland Public Works, ADA/BRT
- Naomi Wentworth, Oakland Environmental Services Division
- Anna Lee, Alameda County Department of Public Health
- Michelle Oppen, Carla Henderson, Oakland Unified School District
- Nora Cody, TransForm
- Plan Staff/consultant team: Iris Starr, Christina Blackston, City of Oakland; Victoria Eisen, Eisen|Letunic; Matt Braughton, Kittelson & Associates

Community Advisory Committee

(October 14, 2015 meeting participants)

- Rosa Villalobos, BPAC
- Diane Dohm, ChangeLab Solutions
- Graham Pugh, SPUR
- Elise Bernstein, Mayor's Commission on Persons with Disabilities
- Joel Ramos, TransForm
- Midori Tabata, BPAC
- Ryan Chan, BPAC
- Sarah Fine, Transport Oakland
- Matt Nichols, Oakland Mayor's office
- Maria Henderson, Council member Guillán's office
- Nayeli Maxson, Council member Campbell-Washington's office
- Nick Mosquera, Bloomberg Associates, New York City
- Plan Staff/consultant team: Christina Blackston, City of Oakland; Victoria Eisen, Eisen|Letunic

Item 1: Draft Existing Conditions chapter

Items to consider adding to chapter

1. Safer Streets and Low-cost Improvement pilot programs (e.g., bring crosswalks up to current standards and upgrade other safety-related improvements with planned roadway resurfacing projects; considering implementing road diets this way too since this wouldn't add significant cost).
2. Address maintenance, particularly as a consideration of how much new, inviting infrastructure the City can take on (p. 18).
3. Add a traffic calming section. The City's program is limited to neighborhood streets, not arterials, and is currently by request only. The program installs speed bumps, traffic circles and the like. Program was more robust at one time, but is smaller today due to budget cuts.
4. Discussion of regional stormwater requirements since pedestrian improvements can often be integrated if planned concurrently. Potentially integrate with Complete Streets paragraph (p.20).
5. In context of Complete Streets, discuss past successes and limitations of implementing the City's CS policy (e.g., TSD's pilots).
6. Table 1.2 (Neighborhood data):
 - Compare statistics to other cities
 - Breakdown by populations
7. Include in Plan Introduction that it focuses Plan should focus on meeting needs of seniors, people with disabilities, children, and low-income residents, since that is who walks primarily in Oakland, including walk trips to transit.
8. Flesh out connections of walking to bicycling (when cyclists feel unsafe on the street, they ride on the sidewalk, which threatens pedestrian safety; option: road diets, which prioritize walking and biking over vehicular speed). Mention recent cycling successes, like protected bike lanes on Telegraph, toward this end (p. 3).
9. Add discussion of OUSD safety patrols, which work with OPD's Traffic Section and involves students, rather than professional crossing guards.
10. Add City policies, strategies and design guidelines that relate to CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design).
11. Discuss potential conflicts on East Bay Greenway with trucks turning to/from San Leandro St.
12. Oakland Planning & Building is working with OFD to determine appropriate street widths.
13. Mention Sobrante Park in East Oakland/Elmhurst because it is so isolated and doesn't really feel like it's a part of East Oakland. Overall, mention that East Oakland/Elmhurst is a large area that encompasses many different neighborhoods, although walking conditions may be considered similar throughout the area.
14. Cite San Francisco General Hospital study that showed that SWITRS/TIMS data vastly underreports actual collisions with pedestrians.
15. Cite age of City policies (e.g., crosswalk-striping) and compare to other cities nearby or nationally to see if Oakland is ahead of or behind the curve.
16. Acknowledge that, without pedestrian counts, it's impossible to know actual exposure rate. Add other potential measures such as collisions/1,000 ADT and others.
17. Add percentage of bus stops that are flag-only, have benches and have shelters in each area. Justification is that, since walking to the bus is such a common destination, better facilities encourage more such trips.
18. In narrative, report walk-to-transit separately from walk-to-destination trips.

19. Add table/discussion of census demographic data that reflects equity (see Equity goal discussion; another source: Housing Equity Roadway).
20. Add discussion of parking enforcement to enforcement section.
21. Add discussion of parking requirements for new development (e.g., front or rear of businesses, number of spaces).
22. Try to bring land use into plan.
23. Table 1.4: Define “extrinsic” collision factors?

Item 2: Draft Vision & Goals outline

Items to consider adding to Vision

1. Add economic development benefits of walking: foot traffic generates sales tax revenue, which can be used to improve pedestrian environment. Cite data that support this observation (e.g., Temescal study).
2. Add health benefits (reduces obesity, heart disease, etc.).
3. Add environmental benefits (less driving, reduced VMT, reduced emissions).
4. Add community benefits (increased social interaction, reduced perception of crime).
5. Add access to jobs (or for workers) and to daily needs.
6. Replace “barriers to access for people of all abilities...” with “universal access.”
7. Include concepts of functional and recreational walking.
8. Add “well-maintained” to pedestrian amenities (maintenance of existing facilities is as important as new investments).
9. Be explicit that plan is intended to be implemented in five years, so vision should be consistent.
10. Change “enthusiastic” to a word that highlights the goal of getting more people walking.
11. Focus on seniors, people with disabilities, children, and low-income residents, since that is who walks primarily in Oakland, including walk trips to transit.
12. Keep vision short and succinct.

Items to consider adding to Goals

General Goals comments

1. Make bolder, stronger, less cautious goals (e.g., replace “consider” with achievable steps).
2. Goal will be for more people to be walking, with fewer/no collisions. Implementation chapter will include measurable steps towards these goals.
3. Consider prioritizing investments where people are already walking.
4. TAC suggested renaming first three groupings, “Safety & Security,” “Equity & Environment (or Environmental Justice).”

Goal 1- Safety goal comments

1. Mention that perception is as important as reality for traffic safety
2. Clarify that Goal 1 refers to safety and Goal 2 refers to personal security.
3. Even though City cannot guarantee safety (KAI’s concern), make goal “safe” not “safer”.
4. Replace “Consider adopting Vision Zero policy” with a recommended process to assess the policy, such as establishing a committee; making tremendous, measurable progress toward VZ goal in next five years; etc.

5. Is there a comparable measure for walking to bicycling's stress measure that could be used to evaluate pedestrian's perception of their safety?

Goal 2 - Security goal comments

1. Mention that perception is as important as reality for security (e.g., graffiti removal, blight, dumping).
2. Delete "opportunities for" or just change to "Reduce crime".
3. Clarify that "eyes on the street" does not refer to surveillance.
4. Replace "increase police presence..." with wording that communicates need for increased enforcement of street crime that deters walking,

Goal 3 - Equity goal comments

1. Clarify that we're talking about equal outcomes, not necessarily equal investments.
2. Clarify if we are talking about having sidewalks in all neighborhoods.
3. Add access to daily needs and jobs.
4. Add "Auto Ownership" data by neighborhood.
5. Reference Stephanie Pollack's data re zero- and one-auto households.
6. Other data to measure equity: income, home-ownership, race, ethnicity. Confer with new City Department of Race & Equity.

Goals 4 & 5 - Connectivity goals comments

1. Add making walking a legitimate mode of transportation.
2. Replace "Eliminate barriers" with positive phrase that includes "Universal access".
3. Include parking enforcement (e.g., blocking sidewalks) and daylighting (e.g., prohibiting on-street parking near some intersections) as strategies.
4. Goal 5: Add additional bus shelters as a strategy.
5. TAC suggests changing "Connectivity" to "Access," "Connectivity & comfort," "Vibrancy," "Universal Design," or "Accessible and enjoyable."
6. CAC likes "Connectivity" because, like "Safety" and "Equity," it is obvious that that's what we want. Potentially change to a stronger, less wonky word that avoids jargon, like "Convenience."