

MEMORANDUM

January 11, 2017

Project #: 20172.0

Dipan Shah
 City of Berkeley, Public Works, Transportation Division

Leslie Mendez
 City of Berkeley, Planning and Development, Land Use Planning Division

RE: Response to Comments on 2190 Shattuck Avenue Draft 1 Transportation Study

Dear Dipan and Leslie,

Kittelison & Associates, Inc. (KAI) reviewed the City's comments on the 2190 Shattuck Avenue Draft 1 Transportation Impact Analysis report (dated December 16, 2016). Comments were received via email from Michael Vecchio on December 22, 2016. The comments and responses are summarized in the table below. Revisions are incorporated into the 2190 Shattuck Avenue Final Transportation Impact Analysis (submitted January 2017).

Table 1: 2190 Shattuck Avenue Draft 1 Transportation Impact Analysis – Comment Summary Matrix

#	Page, Location	City Comment	KAI Response
1	Page 6, Section 1.1.4, Commercial Loading	Technically, the TLZ (Truck Loading Zone) is permanently removed due to other construction project but the intent is to permanently replace it with red curb and a bus zone.	Additional text provided to describe the existing and intended future condition and elaborate on accommodation of truck loading.
2	Page 7, Section 1.1.5	Delete the last sentence of this section.	Sentence deleted.
3	Page 22, Section 2.2.2	Oxford Street is a four-lane divided street only between Hearst and Bancroft.	Text updated for clarification.

#	Page, Location	City Comment	KAI Response
4	Page 23, first full paragraph	The last sentence states that the Existing Conditions scenario reflects the temporary one-way operation of Center Street. However, Figure 4 appears to show, for that intersection with Shattuck as being two way. Please clarify. Unfortunately, I do not have time to review the LOS sheets so maybe the analysis is appropriate.	Text updated for clarification. Per previous direction regarding the analysis assumptions for the Existing Conditions scenario, Center Street was modeled as a two-way street to reflect pre-construction conditions. Traffic volumes from the 2129 Shattuck Avenue study were utilized in the analysis. Figure 4 reflects the geometry and lane configuration assumptions, as analyzed.
5	Page 24, Figure 4	Provide north arrow on this and all other similar figures.	North arrow added to all figures.
6	Page 25, Section 2.4.1	The bus stop on Allston in front of the project site is currently utilized by more than the one Line 12.	Text revised for clarification. The bus stop on Allston Way is currently utilized by AC Transit Lines 12 and 88, as noted on Page 61, Section 6.2.7.
7	Page 29, Section 2.5.1	The sidewalks on Shattuck are not forty to sixty feet wide.	Text revised for clarification. The sidewalks on Shattuck Avenue (west) on the project frontage at the BART Station entrance are between 40 and 60 feet in width. Sidewalks on Shattuck Avenue at mid-block locations are between 12 and 15 feet in width.
8	Page 29, Section 2.5.2	State that many of the pedestrians are associated with the Berkeley High School – only two blocks away.	Additional description of pedestrian origins/destinations provided.
9	Page 31, Section 2.1	Provide some additional discussion of parking conditions.	Additional discussion provided.
10	Page 35, Baseline Conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shattuck & University project is Acheson Commons - StoneFire Mixed Use project is 1974 University - Center Street Parking Garage is 2025 Center 	Project addresses and names provided for clarification.

#	Page, Location	City Comment	KAI Response
11	Page 44, Section 4.1	The analysis appears to assume, erroneously, that at the intersection of University/Shattuck for the Shattuck Reconfiguration project, the EB direction of University has a shared left-turn/through lane and a shared right-turn lane/through lane. However, that is not true. There is an EB left turn pocket. Review, correct, and update LOS analyses and all relevant portions of the text.	The lane configuration and assignments assumed in the analysis are consistent with the Shattuck Avenue Reconfiguration Plans. The EB University Avenue approach is coded correctly with one left turn lane, one through lane, and one through/right-turn lane. However, the corresponding text in the report refers to the eastbound movements instead of the westbound movements. The text in the report has been corrected. It should be noted that while reviewing lane geometry at this intersection we noticed that the existing WB lane configuration was coded as one right-turn lane, one through lane, and one shared through/left-turn lane – the geometry was corrected to reflect one right-turn lane, one shared through/right-turn lane and one shared through/left-turn lane and the text, tables, and figures for Existing Conditions updated accordingly.
12	Page 57, Section 6.2.4	Hearst is over 5 blocks away.	Text revised for clarification.
13	Page 59, Section 6.2.6	I am not familiar with the existing loading dock – does it even have the sufficient depth to meet current standards? That standard being 12' wide, 25' deep, 14' tall? The point being that is it even a usable dock that, if used, would not result in a truck blocking the very busy sidewalk?	Additional text provided to describe the current dimension and operations of the existing loading dock.
14	Page 66, Section 6.3	As previously noted, update this section to reflect the actual EB University lane geometry. Also, clarify that the AM and PM peak conditions to not result in a significant impact – if that is the case.	See response to Comment #11.

#	Page, Location	City Comment	KAI Response
15	Page 69, Section 7.1.3	- Clarify that it is the City that will determine the project's allowable beginning and ending work times. - The "provision of exclusive contractor parking on-street" is not allowed for their private vehicles – only for construction vehicles needing to deliver or pick up material on an active basis.	Text revised for clarification.
16	Page 70, Section 7.2.1	State that the previously implemented TDM measures must be continued into the future.	Text updated to include this statement.

In addition to the changes summarized above, the revise document reflects modifications to the unit mix. Specifically, the number of one-bedroom units was reduced by 10 units, from 103 to 93 units, and the number of two-bedroom units was increased by 10 units, from 51 to 61 units. The overall total number of residential dwelling units (274 units) remains the same.

Please let us know if you have any questions on these revisions. You can reach me via email at aleahy@kittelson.com or by phone at 510-433-8058.

Regards,



Amanda L. Leahy, AICP
Project Manager / Senior Planner