TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
AGENDA
October 20, 2016

North Berkeley Senior Center
MULTI-PURPOSE ROOM
1901 Hearst Ave. (at MLK)
Berkeley, CA 94709

Thursday
October 20, 2016
7:00 PM

A. PRELIMINARY BUSINESS
1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Public Comment on items not on the Agenda
4. Approval of Draft Action Minutes of September 15, 2016*
5. Approval and Order of Agenda
6. Update on Administration/Staff
7. Announcements

B. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS
  * Written material included in packet
  ** Written material to be delivered at meeting
  *** Written material previously mailed

The public may speak at the beginning of any item.
1. Draft Berkeley Bicycle Plan *
   a. Presentation by Alta Planning
   b. Public comment
   c. Discussion and recommendations to Council
   Staff: Eric Anderson, Bicycle and Pedestrian Planner
   Link to 300-page Bike Plan update:
   Link to Responses to Public Comments:
2. Telegraph Avenue Public Realm Plan *
   Presentation and discussion only.
   Staff: Jordan Klein, Office of Economic Development
3. Pedestrian Subcommittee Recommendations on Sidewalk Repair Policies
   Discussion and possible recommendation to Council
   Sidewalk Program PowerPoint slides received at 7/21 meeting; published in
   9/15/16 agenda packet:
   http://www.cityofberkeley.info/Clerk/Commissions/Commissions__Transportation_Commiss ion_Homepage.aspx
   Pedestrian Subcommittee

C. INFORMATION ITEMS AND SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS
   Information items can be moved to Discussion or Action by majority vote of the TC.
   1. Subcommittee Reports (Verbal reports from Bicycle and Pedestrian
      Subcommittees, and Liaisons to PWC, COD, and goBerkeley Advisory Group)
Transportation Commission Agenda
Thursday, October 20, 2016

2. Council Summary Actions 2016*
3. Link to Council and Agenda Committee Agendas and Minutes
   http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/citycouncil/

D. COMMUNICATIONS
   1. Alex Jonlin 10/9/16 email re Pedestrian buttons*
      Received at September 15 meeting; published in 10/20 web packet:
   2. Hwy 13 Corridor Improvements Project, funded by Caldecott 4th Bore Settlement-
      Staff recommendations and cost estimates dated 3/21/13 - Spreadsheet
   3. 9/13/16 letter from William A. Falik re Tunnel Road improvements affecting Oak
      Ridge Road

E. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

| Ashby/Hwy 13 Corridor Projects (qtrly) | 2017 Budget, Work Plan - Fall |
| goBerkeley Parking Program Updates   | Undergrounding Utilities Discussion |
| Bike Share Program - Updates         | I-80/Gilman Interchange Updates   |
| Downtown Projects Updates            | Point-to-Point CarShare update    |
| goBerkeley Parking Program Updates   |                                 |

F. ADJOURNMENT
Agenda Posted: October 14, 2016

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

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 981-6346 (V) or 981-
6345 (TDD) at least three business days before the meeting date. Please refrain from
wearing scented products to this meeting.”

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: Farid Javandel, Transportation Division Manager, 1947 Center
St., 4th Floor, Berkeley, CA, 94704, Telephone (510) 981-7061, Fax: (510) 981-7060
TDD: (510) 981-6345 email: Fjavandel@ci.berkeley.ca.us
DRAFT ACTION MINUTES
Transportation Commission
Regular Meeting
September 15, 2016

North Berkeley Senior Center
1901 Hearst Avenue (at MLK)
Berkeley, CA

A. PRELIMINARY BUSINESS
1. Call to Order
   Meeting called to order by Chair Zander at 7:05 PM
2. Roll Call
   Commissioners Present: Anthony Bruzzone, Ben Gerhardstein (Arr. 7:08), Barnali Ghosh,
   Katherine Howe, Mark Humbert, Donald Lathbury (Lv. 8:40) Karen
   Parolek, Ghanya Thomas, Sofia Zander
   Commissioners Absent: None
   Staff Present: Farid Javandel, Tamlyn Bright
3. Public Comment on items not on the Agenda
   Speakers: 5
4. Approval of Draft Action Minutes: It was M/S/C (Bruzzone/Thomas) to approve
   the July 21, 2016 minutes as written. Unanimous (9-0-0-0)
5. Approval and Order of Agenda It was M/S/C (Bruzzone/Gerhardstein) to move
   Subcommittee Reports from Information C1 to Action item B2.
   Unanimous (9-0-0-0)
6. Update on Administration/Staff
7. Announcements

B. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS
1. Ashby Avenue/Highway 13 Projects
   Speakers: 16
   Action: It was M/S (Humbert/ Bruzzone) that the TC recommend maintaining the
   established priorities for implementing the Highway 13/Tunnel Road (Caldecott Tunnel
   mitigation) projects with the exception of Ashby/9th and Ashby/Telegraph, which
   should be moved to the bottom of the list if funds run short. Unanimous.
   Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

2. Subcommittee Reports and Assignments:
   Action: It was M/S (Bruzzone/Parolek) to assign review the current Sidewalk
   Program policies (presented at July meeting) to Pedestrian Subcommittee to bring a
   recommendation to the October 20 meeting.
   Ayes: Bruzzone, Gerhardstein, Ghosh, Howe, Humbert, Parolek, Thomas, Zander
   Noes: None Abstain: None Absent: Lathbury Motion carried (8-0-0-1)

3. Referral from Community Health Commission requesting Transportation
   Commission send a letter of support for proposed African American Resource
   Center to be considered at 9/27 Council meeting.
It was M/S (Howe/Thomas) that the Transportation Commission support the creation and development of an African American Resource Center in Berkeley and request Secretary Javandel transmit this action to the Community Health Commission. Ayes: Bruzzone, Gerhardstein, Ghosh, Howe, Humbert, Parolek, Thomas, Zander Noes: None Abstain: None Absent: Lathbury  Motion carried (8-0-0-1)

C. INFORMATION ITEMS AND SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS
1. Subcommittee Reports (Verbal reports from Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittees and Liaisons to PWC, COD, and goBerkeley Advisory Group)
2. Council Summary Actions 2015
3. Link to Council and Agenda Committee Agendas and Minutes: http://www.cityofberkeley.info/citycouncil/
4. Community Health Commission requesting TC letter of support for proposed African American Resource Center (9/27/16 Council Meeting)
Action: It was M/S (Howe/Thomas) to reconsider the Order of Agenda in order to discuss and take action on Information Item C4: Community Health Commission referral requesting support for African American Resource Center under B3.
Ayes: Bruzzone, Gerhardstein, Ghosh, Howe, Humbert, Parolek, Thomas, Zander Noes: None Abstain: None Absent: Lathbury  Motion carried (8-0-0-1)

D. COMMUNICATIONS
Received at July 21 Meeting; Included in Web Agenda packet 9/15/16: http://www.cityofberkeley.info/Clerk/Commissions/Commissions__Transportation_Commission_Homepage.aspx
1. PowerPoint Slides- Pavement Maintenance Program and Use of Cape Seal by Tracy Clay, Supervising Civil Engineer
2. PowerPoint Slides- Sidewalk Program Presentation by Tracy Clay, Supervising Civil Engineer

E. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS
| Ashby/Hwy 13 Corridor Projects (qtrly) | 2017 Budget, Work Plan - Fall |
| Presentation on Updated Bicycle Plan 2016 - Oct | Undergrounding Utilities Discussion |
| goBerkeley Parking Program Updates | I-80/Gilman Interchange Updates |
| Bike Share Program - Updates | Point-to-Point CarShare update |
| Downtown Projects Updates | Telegraph Public Realm Project Presentation |

F. ADJOURNMENT
It was MSC (Bruzzone / Gerhardstein) to adjourn the meeting at 9:42 PM. Approved by Unanimous Consent. Absent: Lathbury

Public Present: 22  Speakers: 21

Commission Secretary: Farid Javandel, Public Works/Transportation Division, 1947 Center St. 4th Floor, Berkeley, CA, 94704, Telephone (510) 981-7061, email: fjavandel@ci.berkeley.ca.us, Fax: (510) 981-7060

Minutes on the web: http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/ContentDisplay.aspx?id=13086
To: Berkeley Transportation Commission

From: Bicycle Subcommittee Members (Ben Gerhardstein, Karen Parolek, and Mark Humbert)

Re: Berkeley Bike Plan Update

Date: October 6, 2016

**Background**

The Berkeley Transportation Commission’s (TC’s) Bicycle Subcommittee has provided input to city staff and contractors at every stage of the Berkeley Bike Plan update process. Most recently, the subcommittee’s May and September 2016 meetings provided key opportunities to review and comment on the a preliminary map of the proposed future bikeway network, and the initial (public comment) draft bike plan (hereafter initial draft), respectively. The initial draft was available for public comment from August 29 - October 4, 2016.

This memo summarizes the subcommittee’s main comments (and recommendations to staff) on the initial draft bike plan. Staff are revising the initial draft of the bike plan and will provide in the TC’s October 20 meeting packet a revised draft, a summary of comments received, and staff’s responses to those comments. The subcommittee plans to review the revised draft bike plan and provide another report to the TC (at the October 20 meeting) with our comments and recommendations.

**Bicycle Subcommittee Comments on Initial Draft Bike Plan**

1. **Open, inclusive public process**
   The city’s process was inclusive, open, and transparent. It provided many opportunities for public input in various forums.

2. **Needs assessment and existing conditions**
   The city used robust, innovative methods to understand the types of cyclists in Berkeley, Berkeley residents’ preferences for bicycle infrastructure, and how well the current bikeway network meet the cycling needs of Berkeley residents (e.g. a statistically representative survey of Berkeley residents and a Level of Traffic Stress analysis). This information was used to inform the primary purpose of the plan - to put in place infrastructure that will encourage more Berkeley residents to take bicycle trips.

3. **The bike plan is a policy document**
   The bicycle plan is primarily a policy document. Though the plan presents design ideas, it does not set design details in stone. Neighborhoods will be consulted about the design of specific projects.
4. **Executive Summary to communicate demand and vision**

The plan is important for communicating a shared vision for Berkeley’s future bicycling environment. It needs to include an executive summary, effectively summarizing (likely in graphic format) the demand analysis (71% of population wants to bike but doesn’t feel safe currently) and the vision [an LTS 1-2 (safe) network throughout Berkeley and including the “last block” to activities to encourage the mode shift needed to meet our city’s climate action plan].

5. **Complete low stress bikeway network**

The plan needs to include a map and description of a recommended citywide LTS 1-2 network. These were absent from the initial draft.

6. **Traffic calming on bike boulevards**

The plan needs to reference a broader range of traffic calming options and highlight the pedestrian and bicyclist co-benefits of traffic calming. The Subcommittee suggests including the following measures as bicycle boulevard traffic calming options: bulb-outs, four-way stops, stop signs on streets intersecting the bike boulevards, and traffic circles, among others.

7. **Stop sign removal on bike boulevards**

The Subcommittee generally supports removal of stop signs along bikeways in the direction of bike flow, except at major intersections, to facilitate flow of bicycle traffic. Stop signs can be problematic for cyclists, forcing them to make choices between riding less safe routes, running the stop sign, or taking excessive time and effort to travel through the city. At the same time, cyclists and pedestrians all need safe roads with limited traffic volumes and speeds. Therefore, whenever possible on bicycle boulevards, the subcommittee encourages the use of traffic calming and diversion methods that will fulfill the city’s bicycle and pedestrian safety goals without the use of stop signs.

When considering the removal of any stop sign, we believe that it is critical that the plan clearly state that the city will:

- a. Make use of the full range of traffic calming measures (see #5) to ensure that current levels of pedestrian and cyclist safety are maintained or improved.
- b. Engage in substantial public outreach with affected neighborhoods to discuss traffic calming options.
- c. Consider implementing stop sign removal and traffic calming projects using “pilot project” standards (i.e. collect before and after data, then regroup with the community afterward to see if more changes are needed) until the safety goal in item “a” is reached.

Stop sign removal itself is not a traffic calming measure and thus should not be included in the “Bicycle Boulevards Traffic Calming Enhancements” section.
8. **Bike boulevards & major street intersection treatments**
   The plan should include 4 way stops in the list of possible intersection controls. In addition the plan should indicate that 4 way stops will be considered as an alternative to RRFBs, where appropriate. The subcommittee remains concerned about the use of RRFBs for controlling bike boulevard intersections and looks forward to reviewing the results of evaluations of this treatment at various locations in Berkeley.

9. **Complete street corridor studies**
   The plan needs to clearly recommend the addition of modern bicycle facilities, where possible, to key arterials (especially commercial corridors). Staff’s proposal to identify the type of facility recommended for each corridor is a step in the right direction.

10. **Bikeway pavement conditions**
    The plan should better characterize existing pavement conditions on bikeways and address the city’s plans for maintaining good pavement conditions on bikeways. Specifically, the subcommittee does not believe that “Cape Seal” is an appropriate paving method for bike boulevards; it is too rough, in the subcommittee's experience, and also mirrors the defects and unevenness previously existing on the street.
MEMORANDUM

October 14, 2016

TO: Transportation Commission

FROM: Farid Javandel, Transportation Manager
       Eric Anderson, Associate Planner, Pedestrian and Bicycle Program Coordinator

SUBJECT: Berkeley Bicycle Plan Update

The Transportation Division of Public Works began work on an update to the City’s Bicycle Plan in early 2015, with the goal of completing the plan by the end of 2016. The Bicycle Plan Update is the end product of a 2-year planning process that has involved extensive needs analysis and public process, culminating in a set of recommended policy actions, programs, and projects. Table 1: Berkeley Bicycle Plan Update Project Schedule summarizes the schedule of the plan development and public involvement process.

Background, Vision, and Purpose
The current City of Berkeley Bicycle Plan was adopted by Berkeley City Council in 2005, as an administrative update of the previous Plan adopted by Council in 2000. The 2016 Bicycle Plan is a comprehensive update of the 2000 and 2005 Plans, reflecting the substantial evolution of bicycle policy, planning, and design over the last 16 years. The Plan builds on the previous vision of a citywide network of low-speed, low-traffic-volume neighborhood street Bicycle Boulevards, expanding it to a citywide network of "low-stress" bikeways that serve all Berkeley neighborhoods, commercial areas, Downtown, and the UC Berkeley campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Development and Public Process</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Conditions/Data Collection</td>
<td>January-April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Survey</td>
<td>March-April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Subcommittee Meeting</td>
<td>March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #1</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Analysis</td>
<td>April-November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Pop-Up” Public Outreach (tabling at Street Fairs; Markets; Events)</td>
<td>May 2015-May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Commission Meeting</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Recommendations</td>
<td>November 2015-July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Subcommittee Meeting</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Subcommittee Meeting</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Subcommittee Meeting</td>
<td>September 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Commission Meeting</td>
<td>October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Draft Preparation</td>
<td>October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council Adoption (anticipated)</td>
<td>December 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1947 Center Street, 4th Floor, Berkeley, California, 94704
Telephone: 510.981.7010 TDD: 510.981.6903 Fax: 510.981.7060
E-mail: transportation@ci.berkeley.ca.us
The Bicycle Plan Update both provides a new vision for bicycling in Berkeley and helps the City to meet grant funding eligibility requirements. The Plan’s Vision statement is that “Berkeley will be a model bicycle-friendly city where bicycling is a safe, comfortable, and convenient form of transportation and recreation for people of all ages and abilities.” In addition, all local agencies are required to update their bicycle, pedestrian, and active transportation plans every 5 years in order to maintain eligibility for County, Regional, and State competitive grant funding sources such as the Active Transportation Program.

Public Outreach
The Bicycle Plan Update project undertook an ambitious and innovative public outreach process, with the goal of reaching Berkeley community members who are less likely to attend one of the Open House events, or a Transportation Commission or Bicycle Subcommittee meeting. The goal of this outreach strategy was to bring the plan process to the public, rather than expecting the public to come to plan meetings.

As detailed in Chapter 4 of the draft plan, City staff and consultants undertook an extensive public survey, as well as "Pop-Up" tabling at nearly a dozen different farmer’s markets, street fairs, and public events:

- Bike to Work Day Milvia Street Demonstration Project, May 14, 2015
- Bike to Work Day After Work Party, May 14, 2015
- Adeline Corridor Community Outreach Event, June 13, 2015
- Juneteenth Festival, June 21, 2015
- Caltopia (UC Berkeley), August 23 & 24, 2015
- Downtown Berkeley Farmer’s Market, October 10, 2015
- Sunday Streets Berkeley, October 18, 2015
- South Berkeley Farmer’s Market, October 27, 2015
- Bike to Work Day After Work Party, May 12, 2016

Summary of Major Recommendations of the Plan
Chapter 2 of the plan describes the recommended Vision Statement, three overarching goals (including specific performance metrics), and a series of specific policies and actions. Specific policies and actions to achieve the above goals are organized by the various phases of project delivery to align with the City process to implement this Plan, and include Planning, Design, Funding, Project Delivery, Operations & Maintenance, Programs, and Evaluation.

Chapter 5 and 6 and Appendices D and E of the Plan provide details on the capital projects, prioritization, and implementation for the citywide bikeway network in order to meet the Plan’s Vision and three measureable performance metrics. Recommendations are grouped into the following five categories:

- Bicycle Boulevards
  - New and Enhanced Bicycle Boulevard Segments
  - Bicycle Boulevard Crossing Improvements
- Downtown and UC Berkeley Campus Area Projects
- Ohlone Greenway Improvements
- Upgrades to Existing Class II Bike Lanes and Class III Bike Routes
- Citywide Recommendations
- Complete Street Corridor Studies and Overcrossings

The draft plan can be found at http://www.bikeberkeley.com/resources/public-draft-plan-revised-for-transportation-commission/
Summary of Public Comments on Draft Plan
As of the close of the public comment period on the Public Review Draft of the Plan on Monday, October 3, 2016, City staff and consultants had documented nearly 350 comments, some specific to a particular plan element or issue and others addressing multiple issues. Some of the major issues included:

- Comment: Stop Sign Removal Neighbor Concerns
  - Response: Figure 5-10 was updated to remove reference to stop sign removals. Chapter 5, Section 5.2.3 Bicycle Boulevard Traffic Calming Enhancements has been revised to refocus on traffic calming and bicycle right of way, and clarify that potential changes to stop signs will not be considered until future study and neighborhood level public process has occurred.

- Comment: Complete Streets Study Corridors
  - Response: Figure 5-1 was updated to show each Complete Streets Corridor’s proposed low-stress Bikeway Facility Type.

- Comment: Flashing Beacons for Bike Boulevard Crossings
  - Response: The Bike Boulevard Crossing treatment selection matrix is a progression from low to high-cost interventions. As a general rule, Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) are planned for 2-lane street crossings and Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons (PHBs, also known as “HAWK” signals) are planned for wider streets; the City will study the effectiveness of lower cost interventions and progress to higher cost solutions when needed.

- Comment: School Access to Bike Network
  - Response: Additional School Access Figure will be provided showing distance from each school to low-stress bikeways (Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) 1 or 2).

- Comment: Addison vs. Allston as new Bike Boulevard
  - Response: Both corridors were studied, and Addison was found to be more appropriate as a low-stress bikeway compared to Allston, which serves higher volumes of motor vehicle traffic and is farther from University Avenue.

- Comment: Santa Fe Railroad Right-of-Way (RR ROW) Reuse potential
  - Response: Santa Fe RR ROW is discontinuous and does not offer an opportunity for a bicycle transportation through-route; not appropriate for this Plan.

- Comment: Relationship of LTS Analysis to Berkeley public survey/4 types of cyclists
  - Response: Chapter 4, Figures 4-12 and 4-13 have been revised to show the % distribution of the different types of cyclists among Berkeley residents in relation to the LTS ranking of particular streets.

- Comment: Importance of pavement quality and repaving
  - Response: Chapter 2, Operations and Maintenance Policy OM-1 has been strengthened to recommend specific pavement quality standards for low-stress bikeways.

City staff and consultants have prepared a comprehensive matrix of the public comments on the draft plan, including responses, available on the project website at http://www.bikeberkeley.com/public-comment-responses/.

Next Steps
Following the October 2016 Transportation Commission meeting, staff anticipates taking the final draft Bicycle Plan Update to the Berkeley City Council for consideration for adoption at the December 13 meeting. Once City Council has adopted the Plan, staff will submit a Categorical Exemption filing under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Public Resources Code § 21080.20, which exempts from CEQA review bicycle transportation plans prepared pursuant to California Streets and Highways Code § 891.2. When implemented, individual projects from the Bicycle Plan will still need CEQA analysis and clearance as appropriate.
Telegraph Avenue Public Realm Plan

May 2016

Prepared for the City of Berkeley, Telegraph Business Improvement District, and UC Berkeley
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Executive Summary

Berkeley’s iconic Telegraph Avenue hosts a high volume of daily visitors, is surrounded by high density neighborhoods, and abuts UC Berkeley, yet the district has suffered from disinvestment, which has been exacerbated by relatively few public realm improvements and the lack of an overall vision for the area. In this context, the Telegraph Business Improvement District, the City’s Office of Economic Development, UC Berkeley’s Physical & Environmental Planning Office, and Berkeley Design Advocates partnered on a grant application for UC Berkeley’s Chancellor’s Community Partnership Fund, and secured funding for the Telegraph Public Realm Plan (TPRP).

TPRP provides design and implementation guidance for public realm improvements that will enhance Telegraph Avenue as a pedestrian-friendly place and distinctive destination. It focuses on four and one-half blocks of Telegraph – from below Dwight Way to Bancroft Avenue and UC Berkeley’s Sproul Plaza. From Dwight to Bancroft, Telegraph’s right of way narrows and creates a “main street” setting that has high levels of activity, and proximity to UC Berkeley.

Phasing Strategy. TPRP addresses near-term improvements but in the context of an ultimate vision. Near-term improvements must be affordable and may be made incrementally, as funding allows. To initiate and learn from near-term improvements, two prominent “demonstration projects” are proposed at “Durant Plaza” and “Dwight Triangle.”

TPRP also establishes a long-term vision for a more dramatic transformation of Telegraph, as funding becomes available. A “shared street,” with a plaza-like surface that extends seamlessly across Telegraph, forms the centerpiece for ultimate conditions. Design elements must, therefore, be affordable in the near-term, while also composing design elements within an ultimate vision.

Design Elements. The Telegraph Public Realm Plan proposes the following design elements, each of which is described and illustrated on the following pages:

1. Sidewalk Etching. Sidewalk surfaces will be made even and chemically stained for a clean and enhanced walking surface.
2. Public Art. Public art will add visual and cultural interest, with temporary installations considered for more immediate change.
4. Scramble Intersections. “Scrambles” allow pedestrians to cross diagonally at intersections and calm traffic.
5. Parklets. Parklets extend sidewalks to create small amenity areas with features like public art, landscaping, and seating.
6. Street Trees. New trees will be planted where trees are missing or in poor condition using a consistent palette of species.
7. Street Lighting. Lighting will be retrofitted for a vibrant environment, and may be replaced with pedestrian-scaled lighting in the long term.
8. Shared Street. Plaza-like paving will extend across the street to reinforce Telegraph as a pedestrian-oriented place.
9. Green Infrastructure. Improvements may necessitate new stormwater drains, which present opportunities for features that filter urban runoff.

Demonstration Projects. Demonstration projects focus on affordable but high-impact transformations, and offer an opportunity to test and refine design features. Two target areas have been identified for making low-cost, high-impact improvements. “Durant Plaza” and “Dwight Triangle” offer wider sidewalks extra right-of-way in highly visible locations, which allow these demonstration areas to incorporate place-making features that can leverage limited near-term resources.

Implementation. TPRP also provides guidance on how features will be implemented, such as by assigning responsibilities, refining design concepts, estimating costs, identifying funding sources, and anticipating critical decisions by interested stakeholders.
Planning Area. TPRP focuses on four and one-half blocks of Telegraph, from below Dwight Way to Bancroft Avenue and UC Berkeley’s Sproul Plaza. Adjacent to the street, there are vacant and one-story buildings that may be considered as development opportunity sites.
Background

Purpose

Telegraph Avenue hosts the highest density of daily visitors of any district in Berkeley. Yet the district and its public realm suffer from years of disinvestment, which has been exacerbated by relatively few public realm improvements and the lack of an overall vision for the area.

Critical to the revitalization of Berkeley’s Telegraph Avenue is its success as a vibrant people-friendly place. The “public realm” – the shared space between buildings – represents a significant community asset that can promote further revitalization and respond to community needs. At the same time, private vehicles, transit, pedestrians, bicycles, street vendors, businesses and infrastructure compete for space within the public right of way.

The Telegraph Public Realm Plan (TPRP or “the Plan”) provides design and implementation guidance for public realm improvements. Proposed improvements address both functional needs and perception-changing enhancements. It covers unifying features (such as sidewalk paving), recurring elements (such as regular pause points), and specific place-making opportunities.

TPRP offers a comprehensive vision for the Avenue that can help secure funding for near- and long-term improvements. In the near-term, TPRP provides a blueprint for “demonstration areas” for attainable and transformative projects. These demonstration areas will showcase new design features that can be refined and implemented elsewhere as funding becomes available. Two target areas have been identified for making affordable high-impact improvements:

- “Durant Plaza” takes advantage of Durant’s unusually wide sidewalks and heavy foot traffic to create a special urban place through public art and other features; and

- “Dwight Triangle” is an underutilized open space that can be a southern gateway and pedestrian-friendly amenity.

TPRP also establishes a long-term vision for what Telegraph can become ultimately, as funding becomes available. A “shared street,” with a plaza-like surface that extends seamlessly across Telegraph, forms the centerpiece for ultimate conditions. Incrementally, and over time, proposed design elements will create a more unified and distinctive sense of place.

A roadmap for implementation is provided in the final chapter. Near-term and long-term improvements are noted along with their relative importance, necessary actions, key partners, and potential funding sources. For near-term projects, ballpark cost estimates have been developed and are available as an appendix.

Telegraph Vitality. The Telegraph district remains a recognized destination with high activity on some days and in certain locations. TPRP creates a blueprint for improvements to accelerate Telegraph’s revitalization.
Conditions in 2016

Telegraph Avenue offers an urban “main street,” where shops and buildings frame the street, and the street sets the stage for pedestrian activity. A range of activity can be observed, as Telegraph is enjoyed by Berkeley residents, vendors and merchants, visitors from around the world, and UC Berkeley faculty, staff and students.

Telegraph continues to be a significant commercial destination, in spite of growth in internet sales of books and music. Retail activity is highest near UC Berkeley’s campus, between Bancroft and Durant, with moderate activity extending to Channing. At the intersection of Haste and Telegraph, retail activity has been impeded, as three of the four corners have lacked active building fronts. At Dwight, at the southern end of the planning area, retail activity is moderate.

While Telegraph is lined by active shops, the condition of sidewalks and other public realm elements is poor. The streetscape has not been improved comprehensively since the 1970s. Piecemeal improvements have occurred with little aesthetic coordination. Sidewalks have multiple concrete segments poured at different times without a common pattern of concrete joints. Furthermore, many street trees have aphids that leave a sticky residue on sidewalks, and gives them an unclean appearance in spite of regular washing.
General Character. The key map above corresponds with photos at left. TPRP’s northern boundary is Sproul Plaza on UC Berkeley’s campus (A). The typical condition is a “main street” environment where buildings frame Telegraph and ground-floor retail activates sidewalks (B, C). South of Dwight, Telegraph widens and becomes less active and intimate (D).

Telegraph also has light poles from when engineering concerns overshadowed aesthetics and pedestrian scale. Refuse containers share this spare functional appearance. In addition, Telegraph lacks art or other features to add interest. Together, current features make the street environment relatively unremarkable and less attractive than is possible.

Buildings abut and spatially frame the street environment. Buildings are in generally good condition and many offer architectural interest. Some buildings are relatively plain, however, and may present development opportunities (see page 2 diagram). Street improvements, in combination with private development, will re-generate the Telegraph Avenue district over time.
Process

Motivated by deep concern about the Telegraph area, including a dramatic drop in retail sales, homelessness, and a decline in the quality and character of Telegraph, Berkeley Design Advocates (BDA) conducted two design charrettes (workshops) in 2012 and 2013. These charrettes resulted in creative design insights and guidance in the form of “Seven Principles for Bettering Telegraph”:

1. Enhance Telegraph’s sense of place.
2. Calm traffic and increase pedestrian space.
3. Strengthen Telegraph as a destination.
4. Make a center for music & the arts.
5. Increase activity by adding intensity.
6. Address social needs.
7. People Peoples Park (i.e. make it attractive to a broader range of users).

BDA’s principles helped generate important zoning changes and spurred other initiatives, but a vision for public improvements remained missing. Consequently, the Telegraph Business Improvement District (TBID), the City’s Office of Economic Development, UC Berkeley’s Physical & Environmental Planning Office, and Berkeley Design Advocates partnered on a grant application to UC Berkeley’s Chancellor’s Community Partnership Fund, and secured funding for the Telegraph Public Realm Plan (TPRP).

Initiated in spring 2015, the TPRP was developed with significant guidance from the TBID, City departments, University planners, and other community partners. A technical advisory committee comprised of planners and professional staff from the City of Berkeley, UC Berkeley, and AC Transit vetted initial ideas and reviewed recommendations.

Early ideas were presented for feedback at a community workshop in June 2015. Another community workshop was held in September 2015, as draft design concepts emerged. Both workshops were widely advertised and hosted by TBID. They were attended by vendors, merchants, property owners, and community decision-makers. As a top priority, community members complained about the poor condition of sidewalks and asked that sidewalks be attractive and easy to clean. After the September 2015 community workshop, local vendor Evan Linden told the Daily Californian

"Years ago, (Telegraph Avenue) used to be a hub for intellectual and creative expression. To see them put an effort towards the arts and that type of energy can be exciting - I just want to see that excitement turn into action."

- The Daily Californian, September 16, 2015

Following the September workshop, preliminary drawings were displayed in a storefront at 2499 Telegraph for two months through winter 2016. An electronic survey of residents and stakeholders was conducted by TBID. In January 2016, the TBID Board of Directors met to review the Plan and agreed on final recommendations.
**Design Objectives**

Throughout the process, these design objectives provided an important touchstone.

- *Give Telegraph a fun, welcoming, people-friendly sense of place that attracts attention and strengthens Telegraph as a destination.*

- *Make Telegraph a center for art by supporting ongoing activities and art installations that help unify the street while allowing for diverse ideas and expression.*

- *Incorporate innovative features that echo Telegraph’s cultural themes, such as through the incorporation of “green infrastructure” and other best practices.*

- *Make Telegraph a safer, more inviting pedestrian corridor, while accommodating efficient reliable transit and bicycle access, and discouraging pass-through and fast-moving private vehicle traffic.*

- *Address commercial loading and other functional needs through programming, scheduling, and physical design.*

**Stakeholder Input.** TPRP was developed with significant stakeholder input, such as with a September 2015 workshop that examined draft design elements. Photos show groups discussing sidewalk etching (top) and public art (below).
Design Elements
Overview

The Telegraph Public Realm Plan provides design and implementation guidance for public realm improvements. Proposed improvements address both functional needs and perception-changing enhancements. In the long-term plan, recurring design elements and features contribute to a unified sense of the district.

Several design elements have been developed. Many of them will be combined within the Durant Plaza and Dwight Triangle Demonstration Projects. Other elements will happen incrementally as funding becomes available. “Shared street” and other improvements will occur during a final phase.

Sidewalk Etching. Currently, many sidewalks are broken, sticky and stained. A concrete grinding machine will be used to remove dirt and level surfaces, and a colorful permanent chemical stain will be applied to the exposed sidewalk aggregate to create an enhanced easy-to-clean sidewalk surface.

Public Art. Public art is proposed to enhance Telegraph’s reputation as an engaging cultural destination. The TPRP makes recommendations consistent with Berkeley’s recently adopted “Telegraph Public Art Plan.” An artistic “way-finding cabinet” is envisioned near Bancroft.

Modular Stations. “Modulars” that will be made of corrugated metal and be brightly colored will combine trash and recycling receptacles, story-telling panels, and sidewalk lighting. By combining these elements, the modulars will help reduce visual clutter and add design consistency along Telegraph. Located near cross streets, the modular stations will create visually-distinct and rhythmic accents.

Scramble Intersections. Scramble intersections emphasize pedestrian safety and convenience by allowing pedestrians to cross diagonally at an intersection by adding an additional pedestrian-only phase to traffic lights. A colored pattern would highlight scramble intersections.

The intersection at Bancroft can be implemented more immediately, as it already has a pedestrian-only phase. The technical feasibility of other scramble intersections requires further study.

Street Lighting. Light fixtures and light poles contribute to a street’s character. Existing lighting will be retrofitted to be part of Telegraph’s new visually-engaging composition. In the long term, lighting may be replaced to be more pedestrian in scale.

Shared Street. Telegraph north of Dwight Way can become more pedestrian-friendly while still accommodating traffic. A shared street is a shared circulation space used simultaneously by pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists. It is a plaza-like place with a single ground plane, storefront to storefront, without being interrupted by a curb. Permeable pavers can be used to capture urban run-off and create an attractive ground plane.

Green Infrastructure. Along east-west side streets, curbside drainage will be interrupted if raised intersections accompany the shared street concept. This will necessitate new stormwater drains where side streets to the east (upslope) intersect with Telegraph. The new drains offer opportunities for urban runoff filtration features. These green infrastructure features can be compact with little vegetation or can be associated with large “rain gardens.”
Phasing Strategy

Many of the aforementioned design elements will be combined within the “Durant Plaza” and “Dwight Triangle” Demonstration Projects, as part of an initial phase. After the Demonstration Projects are completed, design elements will be installed in other locations incrementally as ideas are tested and funding becomes available.

Shared street and green infrastructure improvements will require major funding, and are therefore assumed to occur during a final phase. A “shared street,” with a plaza-like surface that extends seamlessly across Telegraph, forms the centerpiece for ultimate conditions. TPRP must, therefore, emphasize near-term improvements but in the context of an ultimate vision. If major funding is secured early on, these “final phase” improvements can be accelerated, and the TPRP’s emphasis on incremental change can be replaced with an emphasis on a more unified palette of features (such as by using new pedestrian-scaled street lighting and replacing all street trees to install a single species). Over the long term, TPRP may also need to be updated to address the possibility of dedicated bus lanes, 2-way traffic, or other conditions that may require extensive decision-making and community input.
Ultimate Condition. TRPR proposes a plaza-like shared street and new lighting as a final phase. Sidewalk etching may remain or, if necessary, sidewalks can be replaced.

Modular Station. Modular stations will be comprised of colorful metal panels that enclose trash and recycling compactors. Placed near every intersection, modular stations will give visual interest and rhythm to the district.
Sidewalk Etching

The poor condition of sidewalks is a top complaint among Telegraph stakeholders. In many places, Telegraph’s sidewalks are broken, stained, or sticky from tree aphid secretions. Most sidewalks are comprised of coarse exposed aggregate intermixed with fine sands that have deteriorated over time. Even after cleaning, the surface appears unclean and the surface is uneven. A disordered patchwork of different types of concrete and scoring patterns adds to sidewalks’ unappealing appearance.

TPRP proposes “sidewalk etching,” where sidewalks receive a permanent chemical stain. A grinding machine will prepare sidewalks for staining by removing dirt and leveling uneven surfaces. A goal is to create smooth, stable, slip-resistant, durable, attractive sidewalks, to eliminate tripping hazards that is comfortable to traverse for those using wheelchairs, walkers or canes. The etching process will create a visually distinct walking surface that will approach terrazzo in appearance.

The TBID already has a sidewalk steam cleaning program in place, which is frustrated by the present extent of sticky grime. Expand the existing sidewalk cleaning program to maintain the appearance of sidewalks once they are etched and stained. Consider replacing street trees infested with aphids, which drop sticky litter (see “Street Trees”).
Public Art

Public art is vital to Telegraph’s identity as a cultural center. It is an important place-making element that can integrate easily into Telegraph’s urban environment and limited right-of-way. It can emphasize and celebrate that it is the intersection of “town and gown.”

“The Telegraph District Public Art Plan” was created in parallel with the TPRP and adopted by Berkeley’s Civic Arts Commission in 2015. The Public Art Plan proposes themes and strategies that intersect with the TPRP’s focus on place-making and celebrating the arts. Consider both permanent art (selected through Berkeley’s public art process) and temporary art (which might be sponsored by UC Berkeley’s Department of Art or a local art organization). “Functional art,” such as decorative bike racks and trash cans, are desired. Address ongoing concerns around vandalism and maintenance.

Funding and programming for permanent public art can take time. Consider interim installations to boost Telegraph’s identity as a cultural destination in the near term.

Examples of Public Art. The sculpture, “Street Life” (at left), is an example of permanent “signature” art. More informal art, such as musical use of artifacts (at right), should also be considered, particularly in the near term.
Artifacts at Corporation Yards. Unused granite and concrete pieces that are stored at UC Berkeley’s Richmond Field Station (lower left) can be used to retain a new berm at Dwight Triangle (simulated at right). Also present are structural steel pieces from the Golden Gate Bridge (top left). Elements like these can add local historical richness to the storytelling of Telegraph.
Modular Stations

“Modulars” are an organizing element intended to give order to the existing happenstance array of furnishings and create rhythmic accents for the district. The modular units will be comprised of corrugated metal decking panels brightly painted to create a visually-engaging design element. Modulars will enclose trash and recycling compactors, such as the “Big Belly” brand. Modulars will also incorporate LED lighting and story-telling exhibits that will tell Telegraph’s stories in photographs and words. LED lighting will be concealed near the top of each station to illuminate the adjacent sidewalk.

Modulars’ system of corrugated panels and L-shaped corner connections will make them easy to assemble, and allow for easy maintenance of lighting and trash/recycling compactors. To resist tagging and vandalism, modulars will have an enamel finish and can be easily touched up.

While modulars have potential as a rhythmic element along Telegraph Avenue, community stakeholders questioned their value. Before committing to their wide spread use, the performance of modulars will be tested as part of the Durant Plaza demonstration area (see “Durant Plaza”). Modulars may need to be adapted to particular locations due to unique space constraints and conditions.

*Multi-Purpose Modulars.* The colorful modular units will provide an artful and organizing element. The units will be made using low-cost but attractive decking panels.
Modulars. Modular units will incorporate functional elements, interpretive exhibits, and lighting that will light adjacent sidewalks and uplight trees.

Bike Racks. Metal panels can be welded or bolted to standard bike racks for a more artistic custom look. Bike racks will accompany most modular stations.

Art Tree. Some modular station locations have missing street trees. Art trees, such as is depicted, might be installed with uplighting.
Scramble Intersections

Scramble intersections are proposed at all five intersections of the planning area, but especially at Bancroft Way and Durant Avenue because of high foot traffic. Scrambles allow pedestrians to cross diagonally at an intersection, as well as parallel with vehicle traffic. Diagonal crossing is accommodated by adding an additional and pedestrian-only phase to traffic lights.

Scramble intersections calm traffic and yield a more pedestrian-oriented environment. Giving priority to pedestrians, similar to shared streets. By combining scramble intersections with shared street improvements, upper Telegraph can become a one-of-a-kind destination that capitalizes on its biggest advantage — being a place for people. (See also “Shared Street Improvements”)

Special paint treatments, such as vibrant thermoplastic paints, accompany scramble intersections so motorists know to yield. The special paint treatments also present a place-making opportunity. Scramble intersections will be visually distinct and reinforce Telegraph as a unique destination. At intersections where pedestrian counts do not warrant a scramble, distinctive, artfully-designed crosswalks can be used.

Artful Crosswalk. If a scramble is not possible at an intersection, consider crosswalks with bold colors and artistic patterns.
Parklets

A parklet is a sidewalk extension that provides more space and amenities for people using the street. Parklets may incorporate seating, plants, and a protective barrier where adjacent to traffic, such as a railing or planter box. Parklets can also be artistic expressions that further strengthen Telegraph as a cultural destination.

Each parklet can be programmed and designed to complement nearby businesses. Food-serving businesses may especially benefit from adjacent parklets.

In the planning area, parklets might be installed where there are loading zones, if loading needs are adequately addressed. Parklets would need to be durable but designed for easy removal, if the loss of a particular loading zone proved to be problematic, or to make way for permanent improvements.
Street Trees

Street trees are critical to making Telegraph more attractive and inviting. A consistent rhythm and canopy of street trees can unify character. In addition, while most trees are reasonably healthy, many drop sticky litter from the secretion of tree aphids, which blackens sidewalks and is a nuisance for vendors.

For near-term benefits, street trees will be planted where missing and replaced where in poor condition or drop sticky litter due to aphids. The TBID will keep an inventory of trees and their health in the planning area. The City will continue efforts to improve tree health, such as by expanding tree wells, loosening soil, or installing heavy-duty tree guards. Installing trees and tree well treatments will follow the City Urban Forestry Division’s standards and guidelines.

The City’s Forestry Division, in consultation with UC Berkeley’s Landscape Architect, recommends new tree species: “Street keeper” Honeylocust or Pyramidal European Hornbeam. Their yellow fall foliage will complement and reference the sycamores at Sproul Plaza. The long-term vision of TPRP may include replacing all trees to create a more unified and dramatic setting.

The City will continue to emphasize tree care for tree health and public safety. The top surface of tree basins will be kept the same level as surrounding grade, such as by topping the tree basin with decomposed granite (DG), covering the basin with sand-set paving stones, or with a metal grate. Note that new trees are vulnerable and water them regularly during the dry season.

Trees Missing and in Poor Condition. Along upper Telegraph, several street trees are missing and several more are in poor condition. The location of trees missing and in poor condition was mapped preliminarily by TBID, the City’s Forestry Division, and UC Berkeley’s Landscape Architect.

 Telegraph Street Trees. Where they are present, street trees contribute to Telegraph’s welcoming people-friendly atmosphere.

Tree Grates and Tree Guards. A long-term vision may include distinctive tree grates and guards. However, tree grates and guards often have a short life span and can conflict with trees. Decomposed granite offers a more affordable alternative.
Pedestrian-Scaled Lighting

Light fixtures and light poles are among a street’s more visible features and contribute to each street’s character. Existing automobile-scaled cobrahead lighting will be replaced by or enhanced with new pedestrian-scaled lighting. To be more human in scale, light poles will be eighteen feet or less. A light illumination analysis may identify locations where additional poles are needed.

New lighting will be consistent in character with other street improvements, as is illustrated below. A comprehensive long-term planning and construction program is recommended (see “Implementation”), and would provide an ideal opportunity to select light fixtures and poles in a coordinated way.

Light pole replacement also presents an opportunity for wiring sound systems, outlets for holiday lights, and Wi-Fi antenna.

*Existing Lighting.* Existing light poles and fixtures are purely utilitarian and distract from creating a more coherent sense of place.

*Placemaking Role.* Lighting can be used architecturally to shape pedestrian space. In the near-term, the lower part of existing light poles can be retrofitted with LEDs. Long-term planning can coordinate the style of lighting with the motif of the Avenue as a whole.
Shared Street Improvements

The TPRP proposes that, ultimately, Telegraph north of Dwight Way will become a “shared street.” A shared street is a shared circulation space used simultaneously by pedestrians, bicyclists, transit and motorists. It is a plaza-like place with a single ground plane, storefront to storefront, without being interrupted by a curb.

With shared streets, pedestrians can cross safely midblock while slow moving vehicular traffic is also allowed. Shared streets slow traffic by using visual and physical cues to communicate to motorists that pedestrians have priority: by extending plaza materials and features across the shared street, by ramping traffic up to the same level as pedestrian space on either side, and by presenting boundaries to traffic with bollards and tactile warning strips.

While a shared street is designed to allow private vehicles and transit traffic, it can be closed to traffic to create a temporary pedestrian-only plaza, such as during Telegraph’s holiday sales, street fairs and music events.

Ideally, a shared street would extend from Dwight Way to Bancroft Avenue, to help make Telegraph a distinctive, pedestrian-focused destination. The block between Bancroft and Durant presents a unique opportunity to create a shared street because of high pedestrian volumes.

Shared Street Examples. Shared streets are common in Europe and Asia (at left), and are increasingly found in the United States (at right). Shared Streets work best when they have a single horizontal surface with pavers. Bollards, rather than curbs, delineate where vehicles can pass.

Shared Street Cross Section. Shared streets will be accompanied by bollards to delimit vehicles and tactile warning strips so visually-impaired persons can distinguish where motor vehicles may be present. In phase 2, the existing sidewalk concrete can be replaced with pavers.
Along east-west side streets, curbside drainage will be interrupted if raised intersections accompany the shared street concept. This will necessitate new stormwater drains where side streets to the east (upslope) intersect with Telegraph. The new drains offer opportunities for “green infrastructure.” Green infrastructure filters “urban runoff” that would otherwise carry pollutants into storm drains. Green infrastructure can be compact with little vegetation or can be associated with large “rain gardens.”

Rain Gardens. Rain gardens are suggested on Channing and Haste adjacent to the scramble intersections at those corners.

Green Infrastructure. “Rain gardens” offer an attractive way to filter urban runoff as it flows through vegetation and soil. Rain gardens have been used in urban settings in Portland, Oregon (at left), and El Cerrito (at right). Design development can address wear and tear that may be expected along Telegraph. Photos shown are illustrative and options exist which cost less and would be easier to maintain.
Demonstration Projects

Overview

Demonstration projects focus on attainable low-cost projects that can effect high-impact transformations. The demonstration projects also provide an opportunity to test and refine design features that will be repeated along Telegraph Avenue to implement a long-term vision.

Two target areas have been identified for making low-cost, high-impact improvements. “Durant Plaza” and “Dwight Triangle” offer wider sidewalks extra right-of-way in highly visible locations, which allow these demonstration areas to incorporate place-making features leveraging limited near-term resources.

Demonstration projects also include the scramble intersection at Bancroft Avenue, where heavy pedestrian traffic and the phasing of light signals indicate that a scramble intersection is already feasible.

Durant Plaza Opportunity. The intersection of Telegraph Avenue and Durant Avenue presents a special opportunity for improvements because Durant has a wider right-of-way and wider sidewalks east of Telegraph. On Telegraph, a bus stop pull-out can be replaced with a parklet (i.e. curb extension).
Dwight Triangle. Telegraph Avenue’s right of way widens south of Dwight Way, where a large traffic island can be redesigned to make a pedestrian-friendly passage and distinct landscaped passage.
**Durant Plaza**

Durant Avenue is just one block from the UC Berkeley campus and has wider right of way and sidewalks than other cross streets. The northeast corner of Telegraph and Durant presents a unique opportunity to create a small plaza comprised of art and artifacts and demonstrates proposed new features for Telegraph, including sidewalk etching and the modular units.

Art will be framed by the ornate architectural bays of the adjacent Bank of America building. Art will have a narrow profile and be located to provide ample room for pedestrian circulation. To accelerate improvements, temporary installations might be until permanent art can be selected and installed.

A modular unit will be built on a concrete sidewalk extension on the northeast corner of Telegraph and Durant, where a bus stop has been vacated. The remainder of the extension would be used by vendors. Another modular will be constructed on the northwest corner where it will not intrude on favored vendors’ locations. Care will be taken so that street vendors are not displaced by the modulars.

To accentuate Durant as a special place, sidewalk etching will occur on three corners of the intersection, with the mosaic sidewalk on the southwest corner remaining in place. The southeast corner presents a special opportunity for outdoor dining if sponsored by the adjacent restaurant.

**Public Art**

Visually interesting public art can make an immediate sense of place framed by the ornate architectural bays of the adjacent Bank of America building (view from north at left, view from east at right).

**Art Panels.** With limited sidewalk space, public art must have a relatively shallow depth but striking appearance.
Durant Plaza near-term improvements.

Cross Sections and Elevation. Cross sections (at left) and a south-facing elevation (at right) show how pedestrian paths will be enhanced by art/artifacts.
**Dwight Triangle**

At the southern entrance to the district, Dwight Triangle is presently surrounded by cars, trucks and buses. Pedestrians pass across the island to get between the northwest and southwest corners of the Dwight/Telegraph intersection. Otherwise, the island is poorly used with a small bench several yards from pedestrian movement.

Proposed improvements for Dwight Triangle fall into two categories: enhancing the well-used pedestrian passage, and creating a heavily landscaped berm across the southern poorly-used part of the island.

---

*Passage and Berm (Plan View).* Dwight Triangle will enhance the heavily used pedestrian “passage” using lighting, sidewalk etching and art. The remainder of the Triangle will be a berm with landscaping to beautify this prominent gateway location. Options for how to suspend the light cables will explored during design development, as to affix lighting to trees can affect tree health and pose maintenance concerns.
To create a safer more active passage, a canopy of light will be formed along cables suspended by existing trees and poles. A 4-foot corrugated metal wall will be brightly painted and separate the passage from a landscaped berm. Tree branches are not shown to make other features more visible.

To create the island’s berm, a large amount of soil will be brought in and retained by retaining walls, which might be substantial concrete or stone blocks from the City’s or UC Berkeley’s corporation yards. Between the passage and berm, a 4-foot corrugated metal wall will retain soil and have an appearance similar to modular units (see “Modulars”). A visually interesting plant palette will be selected during design development, with thorny and prickly plants recommended to make it difficult to loiter on the berm. The berm might be created at relatively low cost by leaving existing concrete in place and going over it with imported soil.

Art will be installed in two Dwight Triangle locations. Art will be placed on the southern tip of the Triangle for a distinctive gateway; also consider a Telegraph District identity sign in this conspicuous location. Another location is along the pedestrian passage; a large concrete drinking fountain may be respurred as a pedestal.
Bancroft Scramble

A scramble intersection will be implemented at Bancroft as a near-term demonstration project. Scrambles allow pedestrians to cross diagonally at an intersection, as well as parallel with vehicle traffic. At Bancroft, scramble signal phasing is already in place, in response to relatively high pedestrian volumes in this location. A vibrant combination of thermoplastic paints will be used, such as a white crosshatch across “UC Berkeley blue.” The design shown in the photograph is illustrative and a custom design may be developed.

Bancroft Scramble. These “before” and “after” images reveal the visual impact that a vibrant scramble intersection can have, in addition to associated pedestrian safety and convenience benefits.
Implementation

The Telegraph Public Realm Plan is not simply an academic document; the plan should inform the activities of public and private sector partners that are committed to increasing the vitality of the Telegraph district, in 2016 and beyond. This section (summarized in Table 1) describes how the design elements can be implemented, including a suggested time horizon for each element, cost estimates, implementation partners, and potential funding sources.

Time Horizon

The time horizon for implementing the design elements ranges from spring 2016 to as far out as five to ten years for the most ambitious projects. Fundraising and planning has already begun for some near-term projects, including Durant Art Plaza and sidewalk etching.

The timing of implementation of public realm improvements will depend in large part on the availability of funding. Generally, projects indicated in Table 1 as ‘Near-term’ can be completed by 2016 or 2017; projects indicated as ‘Medium-term’ may require three to five years for implementation; and projects indicated as ‘Long-term’ require significant additional study, planning and fundraising, and may require five to ten years for implementation.

Implementation Partners

The Telegraph Public Realm Plan can only be implemented through the cooperation of a diverse set of public, private and nonprofit sector partners:

- **Telegraph Business Improvement District (TBID)** is a nonprofit organization committed to improving the pedestrian environment in the district. TBID will play a vital role in coordinating individual projects, recruiting partners, attracting funding, and championing implementation of the TPRP.
- **The City of Berkeley**, in particular the Public Works department (and its Transportation Division), plans and implements a number of public realm maintenance and capital projects, using both municipal general funds and grant funding from a variety of sources. The City should incorporate these design elements into future improvements in the Telegraph district. Other departments, such as Economic Development and Planning and Development, can also contribute to implementation by leveraging private sector funding and partners.
- **Local property owners** are often responsible for public realm improvements adjacent to their property, particularly when they are implementing major development projects.
- **UC Berkeley** makes significant investments in its property adjacent to the study area, provides grant funding for neighborhood improvement projects in Berkeley, and represents an enormous source of human capital that can be leveraged for the implementation of individual projects (e.g., production of art, additional design needs). UC Staff at the Office of Physical & Environmental Planning can advise on project implementation.
- **Artists, Designers, Architects and Arts Organizations** from the local community can be recruited to develop additional designs and construction documents for funded projects.
- **Private contractors** can be engaged as needed for installation and construction.
Potential Funding Sources

Implementation partners can leverage a variety of funding sources to support the construction of the proposed public realm improvements:

- **Public funding for infrastructure projects.** In addition to City of Berkeley general funds for capital projects, the City is eligible for a number of public grant programs and special funds for infrastructure projects, many of which are administered by the Alameda County Transportation Commission. The recent designation of Telegraph as a Priority Development Area qualifies the district for One Bay Area Grants. And other public agencies outside of the City, such as AC Transit and Stop Waste, may be willing and able to align their infrastructure spending with the projects proposed here.

- **Grant Programs and Foundations.** There are a number of local and national grant programs that support public art and neighborhood improvement projects, such as the Chancellor’s Community Partnership Fund, the Civic Arts Grants Program, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the Walter & Elise Haas Fund.

- **Private funds.** TBID has funded several small scale public realm improvements in the past, and could leverage funding not only from its own budget but also from local property owners that are willing to invest in projects that will benefit the district and their own property value.

Technical Adequacy

Features noted in the Public Realm Plan are subject to further analysis and refinement, such as adjustments to address traffic operations and other functional concerns. Users of this Plan should also refer to the Municipal Code, Pedestrian Master Plan, Bicycle Master Plan, Transportation Element of the General Plan, and Berkeley’s Southside Plan. If a provision of this Plan conflicts with standards found in one of these documents, the other document shall govern until it is amended by City Council. Where these documents allow flexibility, the City should strive to meet the design objectives contained in this Plan.

Telegraph Ambassadors. Telegraph’s Ambassadors provide enhanced maintenance and a welcoming atmosphere. Photo by Ted Friedman.
### Implementation Matrix

The Implementation Matrix represents point-in-time estimates and suggestions, as of March 2016, for how each design element can be implemented. This is a dynamic document that can be updated as new opportunities arise and implementation partners advance toward completion of these projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Elements</th>
<th>Phasing</th>
<th>Implementation Partners</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Potential Funding Sources</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Etching</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>TBID, private property owners, COB Public Works</td>
<td>$161K</td>
<td>Per Block</td>
<td>Private property owners</td>
<td>Test chemical stain at Sather Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>TBID, UC Berkeley, COB Civic Arts Commission, MoreLab, property owners, project developers</td>
<td>$1K-$25K</td>
<td>Per Piece</td>
<td>Private foundations, COB Civic Arts Grants Program, 1% for Art program, project developers</td>
<td>Funded projects: Publicize Calls for Artists, make committees to approve designs, sign agreements w/ artists setting timelines for project completion. Unfunded projects: Seek out and complete grant applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modular Stations</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>TBID, Big Belly, COB Public Works</td>
<td>$22K</td>
<td>Per Unit</td>
<td>Private foundations, COB Civic Arts Grants Program, 1% for Art program, project developers</td>
<td>Funded projects: Publicize Calls for Artists, make committees to approve designs, sign agreements w/ artists setting timelines for project completion. Unfunded projects: Seek out and complete grant applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scramble/Art Intersections</td>
<td>Medium-Term</td>
<td>TBID, COB Public Works, UC Berkeley</td>
<td>$54K</td>
<td>Per Xing</td>
<td>Alameda County Transportation funds</td>
<td>Develop guidelines w/ Transportation Division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parklets</td>
<td>Near-Term/ Ongoing</td>
<td>TBID, COB, OED, COB Public Works</td>
<td>$50K</td>
<td>Per Parklet</td>
<td>Local property owners, grants, AC Transit</td>
<td>Develop curb extension plan and timeline w/ AC Transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Trees</td>
<td>Near-Term/ Ongoing</td>
<td>COB Public Works, TBID</td>
<td>$8K</td>
<td>Per Tree</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting</td>
<td>Medium-Term</td>
<td>TBID, COB Public Works</td>
<td>$2K</td>
<td>Per Light</td>
<td>Regional transportation grants, private bond funding</td>
<td>Research technology and options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>Medium-Term</td>
<td>TBID, COB Public Works</td>
<td>$10K</td>
<td>Per Xing</td>
<td>Federal green infrastructure funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Street</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>COB Public Works</td>
<td>$5790K</td>
<td>Total All Blocks</td>
<td>Regional transportation grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration Projects:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durant Art Plaza</td>
<td>Near-term (2017)</td>
<td>TBID, UC Berkeley, Bank of America, Livable Berkeley</td>
<td>$279K</td>
<td>Total All Plaza</td>
<td>UC Berkeley, Haas Fund</td>
<td>Draw up agreement w/ Bank of America and building owner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwight Triangle</td>
<td>Near-term (2018)</td>
<td>TBID, UC Berkeley (art), Livable Berkeley, COB Public Works</td>
<td>$156K</td>
<td>Total All Triangle</td>
<td>Peets Coffee, Vine Street Investments, Regional transportation grants</td>
<td>Finalize w/ Transportation Division options for slip turn lane from Dwight onto Telegraph.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Operational Needs

Modifications to the public right-of-way, such as the proposed parklets or shared street enhancements, will likely require operational and programmatic changes to accommodate the street’s many users. Two immediate examples include:

- **Bus Service.** Telegraph is a key transit corridor; AC Transit’s 1 and 1R bus lines are crucial lines serving the East Bay. The implementation of a shared street may be accompanied by programmatic interventions (e.g. “smart signals”, dedicated transit lanes) that minimize net impacts on transit accessibility.

- **Loading Zones.** The small businesses on Telegraph generate regular commercial loading traffic that is crucial to the economic vitality of the district. Currently, dedicated loading zones in the Telegraph district are underutilized and loading has a direct impact on traffic flow and the pedestrian environment. These impacts could be mitigated by restricting loading to designated hours, and increasing enforcement of parking restrictions in loading zones.

- **Emergency Response.** Life safety officials warn that shared streets, green infrastructure, and other vehicle lane modifications can have the unintended consequence of reducing response times for fire prevention and ambulances. These impacts can be mitigated through the adoption of adaptive traffic control systems that respond to feedback from emergency vehicles.

Cost Estimates

Using the Implementation Matrix (on the previous page) schematic cost estimates have been created for each design element, based upon the preliminary sketches of this overall planning design package.

These “ballpark” costs can be replaced by more exact estimates as assumptions for construction methods and materials are refined. Furthermore, costs will change based upon how many of the individual elements are done per phase and the lapse time intervals between each phase. Protection of pedestrians and through-traffic will be a factor in each project, so greater efficiency can be achieved by clustering project elements.

Most of the work will be constructed by outside contractors with the TBID ambassadors used for prep, clean-up and unskilled labor wherever possible. Power for the lighting projects will be obtained from existing adjacent underground powerlines running along the inside of the existing curb lines, so no additional power feeds are included in the estimates.

Although the most efficient approach would be to construct design elements as part of a single shared street repaving project, this would not allow for a more immediate but incremental project completion, which is a goal of this TPRP project as a whole.

To help accelerate TPRP’s implementation, ballpark construction cost estimates are provided (pages 34 and 35). Hard construction costs and soft costs, such as construction administration, are noted. All estimates are approximate and measured in 2016 dollars.
Water Filling Stations. Water filling stations add amenity. While not among major design elements, they can be considered as TPRP is implemented.
## Telegraph Public Realm Plan

### TPRP PROJECT Construction Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Element</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Area/Length/Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Etching</td>
<td>$4,00</td>
<td>$/sq ft</td>
<td>11,424</td>
<td>$45,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stain Application</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$/sq ft</td>
<td>11,424</td>
<td>$34,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sealer Application</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$/sq ft</td>
<td>11,424</td>
<td>$22,848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Construction Cost**:

- $102,816

**Total Project Cost**:

- $23,905

### Public Art

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Element</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Area/Length/Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fabrication of Module unit</td>
<td>$1,628</td>
<td>$/sq ft</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$23,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabrication of Module unit</td>
<td>$1,552.95</td>
<td>$/sq ft</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$23,905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Construction Cost**:

- $149,530

**Total Project Cost**:

- $149,530

### Modular Stations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Element</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Area/Length/Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening up of tree well from 4' x 4' to 4' x 8'</td>
<td>$46,903</td>
<td>$/sq ft</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>$39,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of soil w/ new scarified &amp; amended soil</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$/lnl ft</td>
<td>64' x 40 $/lnl ft</td>
<td>$32,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Construction Cost**:

- $112,520

**Total Project Cost**:

- $112,520

### Scramble Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Element</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Area/Length/Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fabrication of specific road intersection area</td>
<td>$7,514.84</td>
<td>$/sq ft</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>$50,030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Construction Cost**:

- $7,514.84

**Total Project Cost**:

- $7,514.84

### Parklets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Element</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Area/Length/Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fabrication &amp; Installation of Decomposed granite at tree well base</td>
<td>$17,173.14</td>
<td>$/sq ft</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>$85,907</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Construction Cost**:

- $85,907

**Total Project Cost**:

- $85,907

### Street Trees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Element</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Area/Length/Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plant new tree including deep water pipe and tree support.</td>
<td>$5,450</td>
<td>$/lnl ft</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>$22,809.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Construction Cost**:

- $22,809.73

**Total Project Cost**:

- $22,809.73

### Street Lighting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Element</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Area/Length/Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New pole</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$/lnl ft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Construction Cost**:

- $4,500

**Total Project Cost**:

- $4,500
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## TPRP PROJECT Construction Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Element</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Area/Length/Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOTE: All $’s include material &amp; labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavate &amp; set drywell w/biofilter at top of wall</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>per piece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forming &amp; pouring of raised planter curb at transition to roadway</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>per piece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add soil amendment &amp; plant bio-grasses</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>per piece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction Cost Fees</td>
<td>23.25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost Fees</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,442.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>in units of $</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary diversion of traffic around block</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>$/day</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blocking of vehicular traffic / isolation of pedestrian traffic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$/sq ft</td>
<td>15,900</td>
<td>238,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of street paving and base</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>per piece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-up connection points to existing power lines for street amenities</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$/lnl ft</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>7,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of underground water drain pipe for swale water retention</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$/sq ft</td>
<td>15,900</td>
<td>79,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recomposition of soil w/geotextile underlayment</td>
<td>13850</td>
<td>per piece</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regrading of street to transform crown into swale at roadway center</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$/sq ft</td>
<td>15,900</td>
<td>79,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install baserock</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$/lnl ft</td>
<td>15,900</td>
<td>79,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install permeable pavers from building front to building front</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$/lnl ft</td>
<td>15,900</td>
<td>397,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-up of all street modular stations &amp; amenities per TPRP Plan</td>
<td>6500</td>
<td>per piece</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green infrastructure @ each uphill side of intersection street</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>per piece</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>42,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of boltards along street edges</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$/lnl ft</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>13,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of tactile street markings along street edges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hard Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$178,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwight Triangle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New stained &amp; etched sidewalk treatment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$/sq ft</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 outdoor art display pieces within the BoA building column niches</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>per piece</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 expanded concrete curb for future pedestrian lane</td>
<td>6750</td>
<td>per piece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 modular station with built-in:  Pedestrian lighting</td>
<td>13850</td>
<td>per piece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 new Big Belly trash &amp; Recycle bins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegraph story board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 new bike racks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 future scramble intersection (+ 1 scramble at Bancroft intersection)</td>
<td>36120</td>
<td>per piece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 new street trees w/ expanded tree well (or &quot;art trees&quot;)</td>
<td>5288</td>
<td>per piece</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 new mosaic waste bins</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>per piece</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 vendor / performance space</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>per piece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No actual work for this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 music element sculpture</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>per piece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hard Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$178,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction Cost Fees</td>
<td>23.25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$204,599.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$258,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durant Art Plaza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New stained &amp; etched sidewalk treatment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$/sq ft</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained berm planted area at center of triangle</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>$/sq ft</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining wall for berm @ passageway edge</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$/lnl ft</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement of UC artifact columns for soil retention along street</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$/lnl ft</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Outdoor art display pieces:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 focal point piece at southerly tip of triangle</td>
<td>25000</td>
<td>per piece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pedestrian scaled piece over existing pedestal</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>per piece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Light canopy along main sidewalk passageway</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>per piece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Artificialized bike lane w/ Street painting</td>
<td>36120</td>
<td>per piece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Outdoor art display pieces:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 vendor / performance space</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>per piece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No actual work for this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 music element sculpture</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>per piece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hard Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$23,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction Cost Fees</td>
<td>23.25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$23,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$39,096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### To add to Total Construction and Sitework costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Rate</th>
<th>Soft Costs to add to Total Construction Cost Fees</th>
<th>% Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Construction Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor’s Overhead Fees &amp; Insurance</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3rd Party Inspections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Bond</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>Total Project Cost Fees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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From: City Manager

**Recommendation:** Adopt second reading of Ordinance No. 7,508-N.S. adding Berkeley Municipal Code Chapter 14.62 to establish a two-and-a-half-year pilot program for qualified organizations operating a one-way car share model (also known as “point-to-point”).

**First Reading Vote:** Ayes – Maio, Arreguin, Capitelli, Wengraf, Worthington, Droste, Bates; Noes – None; Abstain – None; Absent – Anderson, Moore.

**Financial Implications:** See report

Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300

September 27, 2016


From: City Manager

**Recommendation:** Conduct a public hearing and upon conclusion:
- Adopt a Resolution approving a Car Share Policy, establishing fees for the pilot program, and designating the City Manager as custodian of the program;
- Adopt first reading of an Ordinance adding Berkeley Municipal Code Chapter 14.62 to establish a two-and-a-half-year pilot program for qualified organizations operating a one-way car share model (also known as “point-to-point”).

**Financial Implications:** See report

Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300

**Public Testimony:** The Mayor opened the public hearing. 8 speakers.

M/S/C (Bates/Arreguin) to close the public hearing.

**Vote:** Ayes – Maio, Arreguin, Capitelli, Wengraf, Worthington, Droste, Bates; Noes – None; Abstain – None; Absent – Anderson, Moore.

**Action:** M/S/C (Arreguin/Capitelli) to:
1. Adopt Resolution No. 67,696–N.S. approving a Car Share Policy, establishing fees for the pilot program, and designating the City Manager as custodian of the program.

**Vote:** Ayes – Maio, Arreguin, Capitelli, Wengraf, Worthington, Droste, Bates; Noes – None; Abstain – None; Absent – Anderson, Moore.
24. **Southside Project Phase I on Bancroft Way West Between Dana and Fulton Streets**

From: City Manager

Recommendation: Conduct a public hearing and upon conclusion, adopt a Resolution approving the Southside Project Phase I on Bancroft Way West between Dana and Fulton Streets, including installation of a bikeway and transit-only lane and the removal of traffic lanes and on-street parking as necessary per the decision of the City Traffic Engineer.

Financial Implications: See report

Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300

Public Testimony: The Mayor opened the public hearing. 13 speakers.

M/S/C (Bates/Wengraf) to close the public hearing.

Vote: Ayes – Maio, Arreguin, Capitelli, Wengraf, Worthington, Droste, Bates; Noes – None; Abstain – None; Absent – Anderson, Moore.

Action: M/S/C (Bates/Wengraf) to adopt Resolution No. 67,697–N.S. approving the Southside Project Phase I on Bancroft Way West between Dana and Fulton Streets, including installation of a bikeway and transit-only lane and the removal of traffic lanes and on-street parking as necessary per the decision of the City Traffic Engineer.

Vote: Ayes – Maio, Arreguin, Capitelli, Wengraf, Worthington, Droste, Bates; Noes – None; Abstain – None; Absent – Anderson, Moore.

26a. **African American Holistic Resource Center in South Berkeley** *(Continued from July 19, 2016)*

From: Community Health Commission

Recommendation: That the City of Berkeley take immediate action steps towards the development and support of an African American Holistic Resource Center in South Berkeley as outlined in the report.

Financial Implications: See report

Contact: Tanya Bustamante, Commission Secretary, 981-5400

(Note: TC’s 9/15 action was sent to CHC

26b. **Companion Report: African American Holistic Resource Center in South Berkeley** *(Continued from July 19, 2016)*

From: City Manager

Recommendation: Direct the City Manager to study the feasibility and potential impact of creating and operating an African American Holistic Resource Center in Berkeley.

Financial Implications: See report
Transportation Commission
Excerpts of Council Actions 2016

Contact: Paul Buddenhagen, Housing and Community Services, 981-5400

**Action:** 5 speakers. M/S/C (Maio/Bates) to 1) direct the City Manager to study the feasibility and potential impact of creating and operating an African American Holistic Resource Center in Berkeley, 2) include community participation in the process for the stakeholders recommended by the Commission including the NAACP, African American Black Professionals and Community Network, Black Lives Matter, and Healthy Black Families, and 3) authorize the commission to communicate directly in the Adeline Corridor planning process.

**Vote:** Ayes – Maio, Arreguin, Capitelli, Wengraf, Worthington, Droste, Bates; Noes – None; Abstain – None; Absent – Anderson, Moore.

29a. **Southside Pilot Project**
**From:** Transportation Commission

**Recommendation:** Adopt a Resolution approving a three- to six-month pilot project designed to demonstrate and evaluate dedicated bicycle and transit lanes in the Southside area.

**Financial Implications:** See report

Contact: Farid Javandel, Commission Secretary, 981-6300

29b. **Project Phasing and Public Engagement for the Southside Pilot Project**
**From:** City Manager

**Recommendation:** Adopt a Resolution dividing the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District’s Southside Pilot Project into three implementation phases over a three-year period; and conduct thorough public engagement to develop more robust elements for each phase.

**Financial Implications:** See report

Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300

**Action:** Item taken up with Item 24. M/S/C (Worthington/Droste) to approve Item 29b and adopt Resolution No. 67,699–N.S. dividing the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District’s Southside Pilot Project into three implementation phases over a three-year period; and conduct thorough public engagement to develop more robust elements for each phase. Direction to staff for an expedited public process before the end of the UC spring semester.

**Vote:** Ayes – Maio, Arreguin, Capitelli, Wengraf, Worthington, Droste, Bates; Noes – None; Abstain – None; Absent – Anderson, Moore.

30. **A.C. Transit “Southside Pilot Project” for Transit Improvements** *(Continued from September 13, 2016)*
**From:** Councilmember Worthington

**Recommendation:** Approve the AC Transit “Southside Pilot Project” for transit improvements.

**Financial Implications:** Minimal

Contact: Kriss Worthington, Councilmember, District 7, 981-7170

**Action:** Item taken up with Item 24. No action taken.
September 20, 2016 – Regular

5. Preferential Parking Zone on Sixth Street for City Cars

From: City Manager
Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution establishing a preferential parking zone consisting of six spaces for City car parking on the west side of Sixth Street south of Hearst Ave. in front of the West Berkeley Service Center (WBSC), as allowed by Vehicle Code § 22507. The zone will include the current passenger loading zone and four additional spaces.

Financial Implications: None
Contact: Paul Buddenhagen, Housing and Community Services, 981-5400
Action: Adopted Resolution No. 67,668–N.S.

22. Amending Council Rules Regarding Removal of Commissioners

From: Open Government Commission

Recommendation: Direct staff to return with proposed revisions to the Berkeley City Council Rules of Procedure and Order (Council Rules) consistent with the recommendations in this report, i.e., noting that as a matter of courtesy and respect, Councilmembers are expected to set the date a commissioner is to be replaced on a commission and communicate that date to the commissioner two weeks from the official date of replacement.

Financial Implications: Staff time
Contact: Savith Iyengar, Commission Secretary, 981-6950
Action: Moved to Consent Calendar. Approved revised recommendation as written below:
Direct staff to return with a policy recommendation consistent with the recommendations in this report, i.e., noting that as a matter of courtesy and respect, Councilmembers are expected to set the date a commissioner is to be replaced on a commission and communicate that date to the commissioner not less than two weeks from the official date of replacement.

September 13, 2016 – Regular

35. A.C. Transit “Southside Pilot Project” for Transit Improvements (Continued from July 12, 2016)
From: Councilmember Worthington
Recommendation: Approve the AC Transit “Southside Pilot Project” for transit improvements.
Financial Implications: Minimal
Contact: Kriss Worthington, Councilmember, District 7, 981-7170
Action: Item held over to September 27, 2016.

43a. Additional Parking Spaces for Persons with Disabilities at the New Center Street Garage
From: Commission on Disability
Recommendation: Add five (5) parking spaces to the sixteen designed spaces for a minimum of twenty one for persons with disabilities.
Financial Implications: Unknown
Contact: Carmella Rejwan, Commission Secretary, 981-6300

43b. Companion Report: Additional Parking Spaces for Persons with Disabilities at the New Center Street Garage
From: City Manager
Recommendation: Reconfirm the approved Center Street Garage Plans and maintain the recommended number of disabled accessible parking spaces in accordance with the design, and direct the City Manager to monitor demand and revisit the number of disabled accessible parking spaces if needed.
Financial Implications: See report
Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300
Action: Item 43.b. moved to Consent Calendar.

July 19, 2016 – Regular

D. Update Rate Setting Authority at On-Street and Off-Street Parking Facilities
From: City Manager
First Reading Vote: Ayes – Moore, Anderson, Arreguin, Capitelli, Wengraf, Worthington, Droste, Bates; Noes – None; Abstain – None; Absent – Maio.
Financial Implications: None
Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300
Action: Adopted second reading of Ordinance No. 7,498-N.S.

14. Major Encroachment Permit: Center Street Parking Garage
From: City Manager
Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution authorizing issuance of a major encroachment permit to the City of Berkeley for the Center Street Parking Garage, the permit to cover architectural and artistic design features in the public right of way on Center and Addison Streets including the second floor balcony and a portion of the second floor staircase; a metal screen projecting over the second floor balcony; parking and bicycle signs; and the roof canopy (roof “brow”) over the staircase.
Financial Implications: Off-Street Parking Fund - $2,228
25. **Referral to the Public Works Commission to Evaluate the New Cape-Seal Pavement Practices in Berkeley**

*From: Councilmember Worthington*

**Recommendation:** Refer to the Public Works Commission to investigate the unintended impacts of its use of Cape Seal pavement on the quality of its streets and safety of its residents, and consider whether or not to use other asphalt concrete pavement treatments.

**Financial Implications:** Unknown

*Contact: Kriss Worthington, Councilmember, District 7, 981-7170*

**Action:** Approved recommendation.

---

33. **Commission Work Plans**

*From: Councilmembers Droste, Wengraf, Maio, and Worthington*

**Recommendation:** Commissions – with the exception of the Board of Library Trustees, Design Review Committee, and the Zoning Adjustments Board – will submit a work plan detailing their goals and objectives for the year. Plans will be submitted at the start of the fiscal year, annually.

**Financial Implications:** See report

*Contact: Lori Droste, Councilmember, District 8, 981-7180*

**Action:** Approved recommendation.

---

40. **Berkeley Strategic Transportation (BeST) Plan**

*From: City Manager*

**Recommendation:** Adopt a Resolution: 1. Approving the Berkeley Strategic Transportation Plan; and 2. Authorizing the City Manager to submit the Five-Year Priority Projects listed in the Berkeley Strategic Transportation Plan to the Alameda County Transportation Commission for inclusion in the County’s FY 2018 – FY 2022 Comprehensive Investment Plan.

**Financial Implications:** See report

*Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300*

**Action:** Moved to Consent Calendar. Adopted Resolution No. 67,645–N.S. 1. Approving the Berkeley Strategic Transportation Plan; and 2. Authorizing the City Manager to submit the Five-Year Priority Projects listed in the Berkeley Strategic Transportation Plan to the Alameda County Transportation Commission for inclusion in the County’s FY 2018 – FY 2022 Comprehensive Investment Plan.

---

**July 12, 2016 – Regular**

10. **Purchase Orders: Western Pacific Signal Traffic Signal Equipment Upgrades**

*From: City Manager*
Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution authorizing the City Manager to execute multi-year purchase orders with Western Pacific Signal for the purchase of equipment and parts to upgrade and enhance existing Traffic Signal equipment at street intersections citywide in an amount not to exceed $800,000 for FY 2017 through FY 2021.

Financial Implications: Measure BB Local Streets & Roads Fund - $800,000
Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300

Action: Adopted Resolution No. 67,607–N.S.

19. A.C. Transit “Southside Pilot Project” for Transit Improvements
From: Councilmember Worthington
Recommendation: Approve the AC Transit “Southside Pilot Project” for transit improvements.
Financial Implications: Minimal
Contact: Kriss Worthington, Councilmember, District 7, 981-7170
Action: Item held over to September 13, 2016.

30. Update Rate Setting Authority at On-Street and Off-Street Parking Facilities

From: City Manager
Recommendation: Conduct a public hearing, and upon conclusion
1. Adopt first reading of an Ordinance amending Berkeley Municipal Code Chapter 14.52 Parking Meters to update parking policies and rate setting authority for on-street meters managed under the goBerkeley Program; and

2. Adopt a Resolution updating parking policies and rate setting authority for on-street parking meters and off-street parking facilities managed under the goBerkeley Program; and rescinding Resolution Nos. 66,245-N.S. (goBerkeley Pilot Off-Street Policies) and 66,357-N.S. (goBerkeley Pilot “First Hour Free” Policy).
Financial Implications: None
Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300
Action: M/S/C (Moore/Arreguin) to:

3. Adopt Resolution No. 67,613–N.S.
Vote: Ayes – Moore, Anderson, Arreguin, Capitelli, Wengraf, Worthington, Droste, Bates; Noes – None; Abstain – None; Absent – Maio.

33. Extending Operating Hours in Commercial Districts (Continued from June 28, 2016)
From: Councilmember Arreguin
Recommendation: Refer to the Planning Commission to review and amend the Zoning Ordinance to extend operating hours of businesses in commercial districts throughout Berkeley as follows: 24 hours in the Downtown and Northside (Euclid Avenue between Hearst and Ridge) commercial districts seven days a week, however pursuant to state law the sale of alcoholic beverages is limited to 2 a.m.; Friday and Saturday to 2 a.m. in the Elmwood and North Shattuck districts. However, sales and
service of alcoholic beverages is limited to full-service restaurants; Seven days a week to 2 a.m. at nodes of the San Pablo district.

Consider applying in these districts the existing regulations in the C-T district on off-sale of alcoholic beverages and on premise consumption of distilled alcoholic beverages at full-service restaurants.

Similar to the existing 24-hour zoning designation in the Telegraph Commercial District, these amendments will allow businesses in these areas to remain open later without an additional Use Permit.

**Financial Implications:** Staff time
Contact: Jesse Arreguin, Councilmember, District 4, 981-7140

**Action:** 7 speakers. M/S/C (Arreguin/Bates) to Refer to the Planning Commission to consider amending the Zoning Ordinance to extend operating hours of businesses in commercial districts as follows: 24 hours in the Downtown and until 11:00 p.m. in Northside (Euclid Avenue between Hearst and Ridge) commercial districts seven days a week, however pursuant to state law the sale of alcoholic beverages is limited to 2 a.m.; However, sales and service of alcoholic beverages is limited to full-service restaurants; Consider applying in these districts the existing regulations in the C-T district on off-sale of alcoholic beverages and on premise consumption of distilled alcoholic beverages at full-service restaurants. Similar to the existing 24-hour zoning designation in the Telegraph Commercial District, these amendments will allow businesses in these areas to remain open later without an additional Use Permit.

**Vote:** Ayes – Maio, Moore, Arreguin, Capitelli, Wengraf, Worthington, Droste, Bates; Noes – None; Abstain – None; Absent – Anderson.

---

**July 7, 2016 – Special**

2. **Creation of Transportation Impact Fee** *(Continued from June 28, 2016)*

- **From:** Councilmember Arreguin

  **Recommendation:** Refer to the City Manager to: 1. Update the November 2005 Nexus Study on the Transportation Impact Fee (also known as the Transportation Services Fee); and 2. Initiate a Process to Establish a Transportation Impact Fee.

  **Financial Implications:** Staff time

- **Contact:** Jesse Arreguin, Councilmember, District 4, 981-7140

  **Action:** 2 speakers. M/S/C (Arreguin/Moore) to direct the City Manager to update the 2005 Nexus Study on the Transportation Impact Fee, and to return to Council with the results of the Study, along with a list of current non-transportation fees, and a fee comparison with neighboring jurisdictions. To the extent that it is possible, the referral is to be incorporated into staff’s current work relating to the review of development fees, otherwise the referral will be included in the Council’s referral prioritization process.

  **Vote:** Ayes – Maio, Anderson, Arreguin, Capitelli, Wengraf, Worthington, Bates; Noes – None; Abstain – None; Absent – Moore, Droste.
June 28, 2016 - Regular

18. Grant: Alameda County Transportation Commission for Measure B and Measure BB Paratransit Revenue
From: City Manager
Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution authorizing the City Manager to receive funds and execute any agreements and amendments with the Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) for the renewal of Measure B (estimated $271,267) and Measure BB (estimated $282,010) annual pass-through funds, and execute resulting contracts for services.
Financial Implications: See report
Contact: Paul Buddenhagen, Housing and Community Services, 981-5400
Action: Adopted Resolution No. 67,551–N.S.

30. Contracts: Bike Share Temporary Staff Support
From: City Manager
Recommendation:
  4. Adopt a Resolution authorizing the City Manager to sign a Fund Transfer Agreement with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for receipt of Transportation Fund for Clean Air grant revenue in an amount not to exceed $85,000 to support continued staff resources needed for Bay Area Bike Share’s expansion to Berkeley.
  5. Adopt a Resolution authorizing the City Manager to execute an Agreement for Management and Administrative Services with Regional Government Services (RGS), a governmental joint powers authority, in an amount not to exceed $85,000 in order to provide continued temporary staff support for Bay Area Bike Share expansion to Berkeley.
Financial Implications: See report
Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300
Action: Adopted Resolution No. 67,582–N.S. (Fund Transfer) and Resolution No. 67,583–N.S. (Agreement).

64. Creation of Transportation Impact Fee (Continued from May 31, 2016)
From: Councilmember Arreguin
Recommendation: Refer to the City Manager to: 1. Update the November 2005 Nexus Study on the Transportation Impact Fee (also known as the Transportation Services Fee); and 2. Initiate a Process to Establish a Transportation Impact Fee.
Financial Implications: Staff time
Contact: Jesse Arreguin, Councilmember, District 4, 981-7140
Action: Item held over to July 7, 2016.

June 14, 2016 – Regular

1. Adding Berkeley Municipal Code Chapter 2.07, Revolving Door Restrictions
From: City Manager
Transportation Commission
Excerpts of Council Actions 2016

former City of Berkeley employees, elected officials and commissioners from lobbying city staff and officials for a period of one year after leaving city employment or service. 

First Reading Vote: Ayes – Maio, Moore, Arreguin, Capitelli, Wengraf, Worthington, Drost, Bates; Noes – None; Absent – Anderson

Financial Implications: See report
Contact: Zach Cowan, City Attorney, 981-6950

Action: Adopted second reading of Ordinance No. 7,476-N.S.

4. Authorizing a Disposition and Development Agreement with BRIDGE Housing for the Parking Lot at 2012 Berkeley Way
From: City Manager
Recommendation: Adopt second reading of Ordinance No. 7,480-N.S. authorizing the City Manager to execute a Disposition and Development Agreement (DDA) for the parking lot at 2012 Berkeley Way with the BRIDGE Housing Corporation (BRIDGE) for the purpose of maintaining “Difficult to Develop” status which is expected to increase by $5 million the value of low income housing tax credits to redevelop the site in partnership with Berkeley Food and Housing Project (BFHP), creating temporary, affordable and permanent supportive housing, and homeless services to help address Berkeley’s current homeless and affordability crisis.

First Reading Vote: All Ayes.

Financial Implications: See report
Contact: Paul Buddenhagen, Housing and Community Services, 981-5400

Action: Adopted second reading of Ordinance No. 7,480-N.S.

22. Contract: C. Overaa & Co. for the Center Street Parking Garage
From: City Manager
Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution: 1. Approving the plans and specifications for the Center Street Parking Garage, Specification No. 16-10996-C; and 2. Accepting the bid of C. Overaa & Co. as the lowest responsive and responsible bidder for the amount of $31,928,000; and 3. Authorizing the City Manager to execute a contract and any amendments, extensions or other change orders until completion of the project in accordance with the approved plans and specifications with C. Overaa & Co. for the Center Street Parking Garage at 2025 Center Street in an amount not to exceed $33,524,400 which includes a contract amount of $31,928,000 and a 5% contingency in the amount of $1,596,400.

Financial Implications: See report
Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300

Action: Moved to Action Calendar. M/S/C (Bates/Maio) to adopt Resolution No. 67,532–N.S.

Vote: Ayes – Maio, Moore, Anderson, Arreguin, Capitelli, Wengraf, Worthington, Bates; Noes – None; Abstain – None; Absent – Drost.
23. Contract No. 9626A Amendment - Conversion Management Associates, Inc. for the Center Street Garage Replacement Project
From: City Manager
Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution authorizing the City Manager to amend Contract No. 9626A with Conversion Management Associates, Inc. to: 1. Include phase III, Construction Administration and Construction Management, and other related services for the Center Street Garage Replacement project; and 2. Increase the contract amount by $1,195,625 for an amended total not to exceed $4,521,625, for the existing contract period ending December 31, 2018.
Financial Implications: Off Street Parking Fund - $1,195,625
Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300
Action: Adopted Resolution No. 67,533–N.S.

25. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 Consultation - Shattuck Avenue Reconfiguration and Pedestrian Safety Project
From: City Manager
Recommendation: Consider the Landmarks Preservation Commission comments and adopt a motion concurring with the Finding of No Adverse Effect under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 for the proposed Shattuck Reconfiguration and Pedestrian Safety Project.
Financial Implications: None
Contact: Carol Johnson, Planning and Development, 981-7400; Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300
Action: Approved recommendation.

39. Authorizing the Issuance of Up to $40,000,000 in Parking Revenue Bonds for the Center Street Garage Construction Project and Approving Center Street Garage Parking Rate Structure
From: City Manager
Recommendation:
1. Conduct a public hearing and upon conclusion, adopt a Resolution authorizing the issuance of up to $40,000,000 principal amount of parking revenue bonds (Center Street Garage Financing Project), approving an official statement and legal documents, and authorizing actions related thereto.
2. Approve the new proposed goBerkeley parking rate setting authority for the City Manager with the following limits: hourly meter rates $0.50-$8.00; hourly garage rates up to $10; monthly garage rates $170-$380; early bird rates $9-$28 (or rescind); daily maximum garage rates $17-$55; evening flat rates $5-$15; special event rates $5-$30; and monthly parking reserve 20%-50% and set a fee hearing for July 12, 2016 to formally adopt this rate setting authority.
Financial Implications: See report
Contact: Henry Oyekanmi, Finance, 981-7300

Public Testimony: The Mayor opened the public hearing. 6 speakers.
M/S/C (Bates/Maio) to close the public hearing.
Vote: All Ayes.
**Action:** M/S/C (Worthington/Arreguin) to:

3. Adopt Resolution No. 67,542–N.S. authorizing the issuance of up to $40,000,000 principal amount of parking revenue bonds (Center Street Garage Financing Project), approving an official statement and legal documents, and authorizing actions related thereto.

4. Approve the new proposed goBerkeley parking rate setting authority for the City Manager with the following limits: hourly meter rates $0.50-$8.00; hourly garage rates up to $10; monthly garage rates $170-$380; early bird rates $9-$28 (or rescind); daily maximum garage rates $17-$55; evening flat rates $5-$15; special event rates $5-$30; and monthly parking reserve 20%-50% and set a fee hearing for July 12, 2016 to formally adopt this rate setting authority.

**Vote:** All Ayes.

**June 14, 2016 Joint Powers Financing Authority Meeting**

2. **Authorizing the Issuance of Up to $40,000,000 in Parking Revenue Bonds for the Center Street Garage Construction Project and Approving Center Street Garage Parking Rate Structure**

   **From:** Chief Administrative Officer

   **Recommendation:** Conduct a public hearing, and upon conclusion adopt a Resolution authorizing the issuance of up to $40,000,000 principal amount of parking revenue bonds (Center Street Garage Financing Project).

   **Financial Implications:** See Report

   **Contact:** Henry Oyekanmi, Finance, 981-7300

**Public Testimony:** The Chairperson opened the public hearing. 0 speakers.

**M/S/C (Maio/Moore) to close the public hearing.

**Vote:** Ayes – Maio, Moore, Arreguin, Capitelli, Wengraf, Droste, Bates; Noes – None; Abstain – None; Absent – Anderson, Worthington.

**Action:** M/S/C (Maio/Moore) to adopt Resolution No. 19.

**Vote:** Ayes – Maio, Moore, Arreguin, Capitelli, Wengraf, Droste, Bates; Noes – None; Abstain – None; Absent – Anderson, Worthington.

**May 31, 2016 – Regular Meeting**

13. **Grant Applications: Active Transportation Program Funds/Sacramento Street and North Berkeley BART Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements**

   **From:** City Manager

   **Recommendation:** Adopt a Resolution authorizing the City Manager to submit a grant application to the Caltrans Active Transportation Program totaling $1,530,000 for Sacramento Street and North Berkeley BART pedestrian and bicycle traffic safety improvements to accept the grants if awarded; and to execute any resultant agreements and amendments.

   **Financial Implications:** See report
Transportation Commission
Excerpts of Council Actions 2016

Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300
Action: Adopted Resolution No. 67,513–N.S.
14. Grant Application: Active Transportation Program/Safe Routes to School
From: City Manager
Recommendation: Adopt two Resolutions authorizing the City Manager to submit
grant applications to the Caltrans Active Transportation Program for traffic safety
improvements and to accept the grants if awarded, and execute any resultant
agreements and amendments for:
   3. John Muir Elementary School for up to $268,800; and
Financial Implications: See report
Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300
Action: Adopted Resolution No. 67,514–N.S. (John Muir) and Resolution No.

24. Transportation Commission Referral: Support the “Southside Pilot Project”
for Transit Improvements
From: Councilmember Worthington
Recommendation: Refer the “Southside Pilot Project” to the Berkeley
Transportation Commission.
Financial Implications: Minimal
Contact: Kriss Worthington, Councilmember, District 7, 981-7170
Action: Councilmembers Capitelli, Droste, and Arreguin added as co-sponsors.
Approved recommendation.

37. Budget Referrals for FY 2017
From: Councilmember Moore
Recommendation: Refer the following items to the FY 2017 budget process:
$35,000 for the Berkeley Drop-in in recurring funds to restore it to full funding, the cost
to install hawk lights at the Addison crosswalk on 6th, and $5,000 to K to College for
dental kits for youth.
Financial Implications: See report
Contact: Darryl Moore, Councilmember, District 2, 981-7120
Action: Councilmember Anderson added as a co-sponsor. Amended
recommendation to include beacon lights on 6th and Addison. Moved to Consent
Calendar.

40. Creation of Transportation Impact Fee
From: Councilmember Arreguin
Recommendation: Refer to the City Manager to:
Update the November 2005 Nexus Study on the Transportation Impact Fee (also
known as the Transportation Services Fee); and
Initiate a Process to Establish a Transportation Impact Fee.
Financial Implications: Staff time
Contact: Jesse Arreguin, Councilmember, District 4, 981-7140
Transportation Commission
Excerpts of Council Actions 2016

Action: Item held over to June 28, 2016.

May 31, 2016- Special - Worksession

1. goBerkeley Program Update
From: City Manager
Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300
Action: Presentation made and discussion held.

2. Citywide Residential Preferential Parking Expansion
From: City Manager
Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300
Action: Presentation made and discussion held.

May 24, 2016 Regular Meeting

3. Adding Berkeley Municipal Code Chapter 2.07, Revolving Door Restrictions
From: City Manager
Recommendation: Adopt first reading of an Ordinance adding Berkeley Municipal Code Chapter 2.07, Revolving Door Restrictions, prohibiting former City of Berkeley employees, elected officials and commissioners from lobbying city staff and officials for a period of one year after leaving city employment or service.
Financial Implications: See report
Contact: Zach Cowan, City Attorney, 981-6950
Action: Moved to Action Calendar. 2 speakers. M/S/Failed
(Worthington/Arreguin) to amend the ordinance to change the prohibition from one year to two years in Sections 2.07.030 and 2.07.040.
Vote: Ayes – Arreguin, Worthington; Noes – Bates; Abstain – Maio, Moore, Capitelli, Wengraf, Droste; Absent – Anderson.

Action: M/S/Carried (Arreguin/Capitelli) to adopt first reading of Ordinance No. 7,476–N.S. amended in Section 2.07.040 to read “A former member of a commission may not lobby the commission on which the former member served, for a period of twelve (12) months immediately following the termination of service on that commission. No other provisions of this Chapter shall apply to persons serving on a commission who are not otherwise City officials or designated employees.”
Second reading scheduled for June 14, 2016.
Vote: Ayes – Maio, Moore, Arreguin, Capitelli, Wengraf, Worthington, Droste, Bates; Noes – None; Abstain – None; Absent – Anderson.

18. Community Workforce Agreement Exemption - Hearst Avenue Complete Street Project
From: City Manager
Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution exempting the **Hearst Avenue Complete Street Project**, Federal Aid Project STPL 5057(044) 16-11031-C, from the City's Community Workforce Agreement in order to be eligible for an award of $2,115,712 of federal funding.

Financial Implications: See report
Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300

Action: Adopted Resolution No. 67,492–N.S.

20. Budget Referral: Police Foot Patrol in Downtown
From: Councilmember Arreguin

Recommendation: Refer to the FY 2016/17 Budget Process establishing a police foot patrol officer to cover the Downtown Area as defined in the Downtown Area Plan. Explore the possibility of a deputized Community Service Officer, who can issue citations and make arrests. **Potential revenue sources could include parking revenue if Downtown meters are extended from 6-8 p.m.**

Financial Implications: Unknown
Contact: Jesse Arreguin, Councilmember, District 4, 981-7140

Action: Councilmember Moore added as a co-sponsor. Approved recommendation revised to include additional locations: San Pablo and Delaware, Ohlone Park, Strawberry Creek Park, San Pablo Park.

May 24, 2016- Special Meeting

City Council Referral Prioritization Process Using Re-Weighted Range Voting (RRV)
From: City Manager

Recommendation:
1. Review the completed Re-Weighted Range Voting rankings for all outstanding City Council referrals;
2. Approve the removal of referrals that have been marked as rescinded by the sponsoring Councilmember;
3. Adopt a Resolution approving the list of prioritized referrals to city staff.

Financial Implications: None
Contact: Mark Numainville, City Clerk, 981-6900

Action: M/S/C (Worthington/Wengraf) to accept supplemental material from Councilmember Worthington on Item 1.

Vote: Ayes – Moore, Arreguin, Capitelli, Wengraf, Worthington, Droste, Bates; Noes – None; Abstain – None; Absent – Maio, Anderson.

Action: M/S/C (Maio/Moore) to:
- Approve the removal of referrals that have been marked as rescinded by the sponsoring Councilmember in Attachment 2.
- Adopt Resolution No. 67,476–N.S. approving the list of prioritized referrals to city staff.

Vote: Ayes – Maio, Moore, Arreguin, Capitelli, Wengraf, Worthington, Droste, Bates;
Transportation Commission
Excerpts of Council Actions 2016

Noes – None; Abstain – None; Absent – Anderson.

May 10, 2016

18. **City Manager Referral: Installation of Flashing Pedestrian Lights at MLK and Virginia**

From: Councilmembers Maio and Capitelli

Recommendation: Refer to the City Manager to install as soon as possible a flashing “School Crossing” light, or something similar, at Martin Luther King, Jr. Way and Virginia Street.

Financial Implications: See report

Contact: Linda Maio, Councilmember, District 1, 981-7110

Action: Approved revised recommendation to refer the item to the budget process.

30. **Fulton Street Bikeway**

From: City Manager

Recommendation: Conduct a public hearing and upon conclusion, adopt a Resolution approving the installation of a bikeway on Fulton Street between Bancroft Way and Channing Way by Bike to Work Day, May 12, 2016, or as expeditiously as possible thereafter, including the removal of traffic lanes and parking as necessary per the City Traffic Engineer and according to the plans approved at the public hearing.

Financial Implications: See report

Action: M/S/C (Wengraf/Droste) to open the public hearing on Item 30.

Vote: All Ayes.

Public Testimony: The Mayor opened the public hearing. 1 speaker.

M/S/C (Bates/Droste) to close the public hearing.

Vote: All Ayes.

Action: M/S/C (Bates/Anderson) to adopt Resolution No. 67,474–N.S. approving the installation of a bikeway on Fulton Street between Bancroft Way and Channing Way by Bike to Work Day, May 12, 2016, or as expeditiously as possible thereafter, including the removal of traffic lanes and parking as necessary per the City Traffic Engineer and according to the plans approved at the public hearing.

Vote: All Ayes.

April 26, 2016

4. **Contract: NBS for West Berkeley Transportation Property Based Business Improvement District (PBID) Formation Services**

From: City Manager

Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution authorizing the City Manager to execute a contract and any amendments with NBS for Consulting Services for the formation of a Property Based Business Improvement District (PBID) to support expanded shuttle services in West Berkeley from May 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017.

Financial Implications: Bayer (Miles Lab) Fund - $75,000

Contact: Michael Caplan, Economic Development, 981-7530

Action: Adopted Resolution No. 67,432–N.S.
40.  **Budget Referral: John Muir Pedestrian Safety Improvements in the 2016-17 Budget Process**  
From: Councilmember Droste, and Mayor Bates  
**Recommendation:** Refer to the 2016-17 budget process proposed improvements for John Muir Elementary School pedestrian safety at the Claremont Ave/Claremont Crescent intersection, including installation of new masts, poles, RRFBs, warning signs, and push buttons on poles.  
**Financial Implications:** $312,000  
Contact: Lori Droste, Councilmember, District 8, 981-7180  
**Action:** Approved recommendation.

51.  **Referral to Planning Commission: City-Wide Green Development Requirements**  
From: Councilmember Arreguin  
**Recommendation:** Refer to the Planning Commission to draft an ordinance requiring the same Green Building and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures required in the Commercial Downtown Mixed Use District (C-DMU) for projects of 75 units or more throughout the City of Berkeley’s commercial zoning districts. Standards as outlined in the report would apply to larger projects city-wide and pertain to: bicycle parking spaces, vehicle sharing spaces, Residential Parking Permits, required parking spaces, LEED rating, Stopwaste Small Commercial Checklist standards, and transportation benefits.  
**Financial Implications:** Staff time  
Contact: Jesse Arreguin, Councilmember, District 4, 981-7140  
**Action:** 4 speakers. M/S/C (Arreguin/Worthington) to Refer to the Planning Commission, Energy Commission, and the Community Environmental Advisory Commission to consider requiring the same Green Building and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures required in the Commercial Downtown Mixed Use District (C-DMU) for projects of 75 units or more throughout the City of Berkeley’s commercial zoning districts. The commissions are to consider the standards as outlined in the report which would apply to larger projects city-wide and pertain to: bicycle parking spaces, vehicle sharing spaces, Residential Parking Permits, required parking spaces, LEED rating, Stopwaste Small Commercial Checklist standards, and transportation benefits. In addition, the commissions are to also consider the following 1. that transit passes would only be required for projects within a quarter of a mile of a bus stop; 2. a square-footage threshold, in addition to the unit threshold, for projects to which the requirements would apply; 3. the validity of the LEED certification; and 4. the impact on the financial feasibility of proposed requirements on the development of housing and affordable housing in particular.  
**Vote:** All Ayes.

April 5, 2016

9.  **Refer to Transportation Commission to Reassess UC Berkeley Game Day**
Parking Fines in RPP areas A, B, D, F and G Surrounding Campus  From: Councilmembers Droste, Wengraf, and Capitelli Recommendation: Refer to the Transportation Commission to review current parking fines ($72) for UC Berkeley Football game day parking in RPP zones A, B, D, F and G and recommend higher fees to deter visitors from parking in those RPP zones. Financial Implications: See report Contact: Lori Droste, Councilmember, District 8, 981-7180 Action: Approved recommendation.

March 29, 2016 – Special Work Session

1. Berkeley Strategic Transportation Plan (BeST) From: City Manager Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300 Action: Presentation made and discussion held.

March 29, 2016

City Manager Comments:
1. Pedestrian safety improvements completed on Claremont Avenue near John Muir School.

30. Extend Residential Preferential Parking Permit Program (RPP) on Sections of Blake Street, Parker Street, Cedar Street, Harper Street and Shattuck Avenue From: City Manager Recommendation: Conduct a public hearing and upon its conclusion, adopt a Resolution amending Resolution No. 56,508-N.S. Sections 25C, 25E, 25J and 25M by adding subsections to extend Residential Preferential Permit Parking on six city blocks. Financial Implications: General Fund - $2,078.52 Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300

Public Testimony: The Mayor opened the public hearing. 3 speakers. M/S/C (Maio/Moore) to close the public hearing. Vote: All Ayes.

Action: M/S/C (Bates/Arreguin) to adopt Resolution No. 67,422–N.S. revised to to state that the Harper Street block is between Russell Street and Ashby Avenue. Vote: All Ayes.

35. Point-to-Point Car Share Program From: City Manager Recommendation: Adopt two Resolutions:
   4. Approving a Car Sharing Policy;
   5. Identifying dedicated money from the general fund to revise ordinances and implement protocols that allow for point-to-point car share operations in Berkeley, and designate the custodian of the program.
Financial Implications: General Fund - $120,500  
Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300

**Action:** Item removed from the agenda by the City Manager.

42. **goBerkeley Parking Management Program Recommended Rate Adjustments for May 1, 2016** From: City Manager  
Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300

**Action:** Moved to Consent Calendar. Approved the revised materials correcting the Downtown and Southside/Telegraph Premium goBerkeley areas parking meter rate to $3.25 per hour, not $3.00 per hour and to reduce time limit in the Value Area from 8 hours to 4 hours.

**March 15, 2016**

6. **Prioritize Installation of Bicycle Lane on Fulton Street**  
From: Mayor Bates and Councilmember Arreguin

**Recommendation:** Direct the City Manager and Transportation staff to prioritize and expedite the installation of a bicycle lane on Fulton Street between Bancroft Way and Channing Way.

**Financial Implications:** See report  
Contact: Tom Bates, Mayor, 981-7100

**Action:** Moved to Action Calendar. M/S/C (Bates/Moore) to approve the recommendation with the inclusion of the full version of the letter in attachment 2 as printed in the supplemental material.  
**Vote:** All Ayes.

8. **City Manager Referral: Plan for Lighting and Signage at the Ohlone Greenway at Cedar, Rose, and Hopkins**  
From: Councilmember Maio

**Recommendation:** Refer to the City Manager to develop a plan to improve the lighting and signage (e.g. stop signs) at the Ohlone Greenway crossing at Cedar, Rose, and Hopkins, particularly for bicycle transit.  

**Financial Implications:** Minimal  
Contact: Linda Maio, Councilmember, District 1, 981-7110

**Action:** Approved recommendation.

9. **Sunday Streets Berkeley and Love Our Neighborhood Day: Co-sponsorship and Relinquishment of Council Office Budget Funds to General Fund and Grant of Such Funds**  
From: Councilmember Moore

**Recommendation:** Adopt a Resolution approving the expenditure of an amount not to exceed $1,000 per Councilmember to Walk Oakland Bike Oakland (the fiscal agent) to be used for the 2016 Sunday Streets Berkeley (October 2016) and Love Our Neighborhood Day (June 2016) events. Funds will be relinquished to the City’s general
fund for this purpose from the discretionary Council Office Budgets of Councilmember Moore and any other Councilmembers who would like to contribute.

**Financial Implications:** Councilmember’s Discretionary Funds - $1,000

Contact: Darryl Moore, Councilmember, District 2, 981-7120

**Action:** Adopted Resolution No. 67,400–N.S. revised to include contributions from the following Councilmembers up to the amounts listed: Councilmember Wengraf - $250; Councilmember Moore - $100; Councilmember Capitelli - $100; Councilmember Anderson - $100; Councilmember Droste - $100; Mayor Bates - $100; Councilmember Maio - $100.

---

March 8, 2016

**30a Recommendation for the Five-Year Paving Plan** (Continued from February 9, 2016)

**From:** Public Works Commission

**Recommendation:** Adopt a Resolution approving the first two years (2016-2017) of the Five Year Paving Plan as proposed by staff. The Public Works Commission recommends further consideration of the last three years (2018-2020) of the plan to: Better incorporate potential changes due to on-going drought; Assure the City of Berkeley takes full advantage of lessons learned from prior test sites; Best optimize green infrastructure to provide multiple benefits, and Better evaluate full life-cycle costs, especially of alternative treatments.

**Financial Implications:** Unknown

Contact: Sean Rose, Commission Secretary, 981-6300

---

**30b Draft Mid-Program Review Report for Measure M Integrated Streets Investment Plan and Update of the 5-Year Street Paving Plan, FY 2016 to FY 2020** (Continued from February 9, 2016)

**From:** City Manager

**Recommendation:** 1. Adopt the recommendation from the Public Works Commission; and

**Financial Implications:** See report

Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300

**Action:** 4 speakers. M/S/C (Wengraf/Worthington) to adopt Items 30.a. and 30.b. including Resolution No. 67,395–N.S. approving the first two years (2016-2017) of the Five Year Paving Plan as proposed by staff. The Public Works Commission recommends further consideration of the last three years (2018-2020) of the plan to: Better incorporate potential changes due to on-going drought; Assure the City of Berkeley takes full advantage of lessons learned from prior test sites; Best optimize green infrastructure to provide multiple benefits, and Better evaluate full life-cycle costs, especially of alternative treatments.
From: Councilmember Droste
Recommendation: Adopt a system of Reweighted Range Voting to prioritize
Council referrals and refer to city staff to develop the following:
1) A schedule of annual meetings for Council to hold prioritization sessions.
2) A system of Reweighted Range Voting (RRV) for Council to identify and
establish priorities among all existing and unaddressed referrals at prioritization
sessions.
   a) If a Councilmember does not rate a specific referral, the Councilmember’s
default score for that referral is a zero (0).
3) Protocol for referrals passed after a prioritization session takes place. “New”
   referrals – those passed between one prioritization session and the next, will go
   into a holding position until they can be prioritized at the following session, unless:
   a) Council designates a referral as urgent if the referred work is necessary to
      protect life safety or is necessary to secure or avoid losing time-sensitive funding
      (e.g., grant funding that the funding agency may take back unless a specific action
      is taken).
   b) Staff designates an item as “short term” that can be addressed within a three
      month time frame.
4) Basic background information on referrals prior to prioritization sessions,
   including but not limited to a broad indication of staff time and financial resources
   required to complete a referral, an estimate of the impact of each referral in terms
   of citywide outcomes.
5) A window, prior to prioritization sessions, in which sponsoring Councilmembers
   can identify any referrals that are no longer needed and should be removed from
   the prioritization process.
6) Once a Strategic Plan is completed, all referrals should have a nexus to the
   Strategic Plan.
Contact: Lori Droste, Councilmember, District 8, 981-7180

Action: Moved to Consent Calendar. Approved recommendation.

February 23, 2016
14. Grant Award: Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s Climate Initiatives
Parking and TDM Grant Program
From: City Manager
Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution authorizing the City Manager or Designee to file
an application for $950,000 of funding assigned to the Metropolitan Transportation
Commission and committing any necessary matching funds equivalent to 33% of the
total project costs and stating assurance to complete the project known as the goBerkeley Residential Shared Parking Pilot.

Financial Implications: See report
Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300
Action: Adopted Resolution No. 67,382–N.S.

26. Refer $50,000 to the FY 2016/2017 Budget Process to Install Beacon Lights at Oxford Street and Addison Street, Near the Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive
From: Councilmembers Arreguin and Worthington
Recommendation: Refer $50,000 to the FY 2016/2017 mid-biennial budget process to improve the pedestrian safety at Oxford Street and Addison Street by installing beacon lights at the cross walks.
Financial Implications: General Fund - $50,000
Contact: Jesse Arreguin, Councilmember, District 4, 981-7140
Action: Approved recommendation.

33. Referral to the City Manager to Co-Sponsor the “Shared Street” Pilot Program on Addison Street for Community Events with BAM/PFA
From: Councilmembers Worthington, Arreguin, Wengraf, and Capitelli
Recommendation: Referral to the City Manager to Co-sponsor the "Shared Street" pilot program on Addison Street for Community events hosted by BAM/PFA.
Financial Implications: Staff time
Contact: Kriss Worthington, Councilmember, District 7, 981-7170
Action: Approved recommendation.

February 9, 2016

22. Restrict Parking in the Hills Hazardous Fire Area (Continued from January 12, 2016)
From: Disaster and Fire Safety Commission
Recommendation: Refer to staff the design of a parking restriction program in the Hills Fire Zone to ensure access for emergency vehicles and to allow for safe evacuations in an emergency and to hold public meetings to get community input in the design of such a program.
Financial Implications: See report
Contact: David Brannigan, Commission Secretary, 981-3473
Action: Moved to Consent Calendar. Approved recommendation.

24. a. Recommendation for the Five-Year Paving Plan (Continued from January 12, 2016)
From: Public Works Commission
Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution approving the first two years (2016-2017) of the Five Year Paving Plan as proposed by staff. The Public Works Commission recommends further consideration of the last three years (2018-2020) of the plan to:
Better incorporate potential changes due to on-going drought; Assure the City of Berkeley takes full advantage of lessons learned from prior test sites; Best optimize green infrastructure to provide multiple benefits; Better evaluate full life-cycle costs, especially of alternative treatments.  

**Financial Implications**: Unknown  
Contact: Sean Rose, Commission Secretary, 981-6300

b. **Draft Mid-Program Review Report for Measure M Integrated Streets Investment Plan and Update of the 5-Year Street Paving Plan, FY 2016 to FY 2020** (Continued from January 12, 2016)  
**From**: City Manager  
**Recommendation**:  
1. Adopt the recommendation from the Public Works Commission; and  
**Financial Implications**: See report  
Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300

**January 19, 2016**

4. **Bike Share Franchise Public Hearing and Coordination Agreement**  
**From**: City Manager  
**Recommendation**: Adopt second reading of Ordinance No. 7,454-N.S. granting a franchise agreement with Bay Area Motivate, LLC, to operate a bike share program in Berkeley, which would be part of a regional system including the cities of Emeryville, Oakland, San Francisco and San Jose.  
**First Reading Vote**: All Ayes.  
**Financial Implications**: See report  
Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300  
**Action**: Adopted second reading of Ordinance No. 7,454-N.S.

14. **Contract No. 8746 Amendment: Edenred Commuter Benefit Solutions (ECBS) as Third-Party Administrator of the Employee Commute Benefit Program**  
**From**: City Manager  
**Recommendation**: Adopt a Resolution authorizing the City Manager to execute an amendment to Contract No. 8746 with Edenred Commuter Benefit Solutions, formerly known as Commuter Check Services, to provide third-party administrator services for the City of Berkeley’s Employee Commute Benefit Program to increase the contract amount by $120,000 for a total contract amount not to exceed $240,000 and to extend the term of the contract through June 30, 2019.  
**Financial Implications**: Payroll Deduction Trust Fund - $120,000  
Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300  
**Action**: Adopted Resolution No. 67,342–N.S.

16. **Contract: Fehr & Peers for On-Call Traffic Engineering Services**  
**From**: City Manager  
**Recommendation**: Adopt a Resolution authorizing the City Manager to execute a
contract and any amendments with Fehr & Peers for on-call traffic engineering services in an amount not to exceed $1,000,000 for three years from February 1, 2016 to January 31, 2019 with two one-year options to extend.  
**Financial Implications**: Various Funds - $1,000,000  
Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300  
**Action**: Adopted Resolution No. 67,344–N.S.

18. **Amendment to California Vehicle Code for Electric Vehicle Charging**  
**From**: Energy Commission  
**Recommendation**: Urge the Governor and State Legislature to amend the California Vehicle Code to authorize local jurisdictions to designate on-street parking spaces exclusively for charging plug-in electric vehicles (PEVs), including plug-in hybrids.  
**Financial Implications**: None  
Contact: Neal DeSnoo, Commission Secretary, 981-7400  
**Action**: Approved recommendation.
Hi Farid-

I'm a Berkeley resident working in transportation planning in San Francisco. About a year ago, the City of Berkeley started to make changes to traffic signals across Southside and Downtown Berkeley, among other neighborhoods, requiring pedestrians to press a button to cross the street at most times of the day and night. At these intersections, drivers are able to cross the street on a regular signal cycle, while pedestrians automatically receive a "red" signal unless they push a button when they arrive at the intersection.

At intersections like Bancroft and Telegraph or Shattuck and Durant, which likely see some of the highest pedestrian volumes in the entire state, pedestrians are forced to request permission to cross the street while drivers are automatically allowed to proceed through the intersection on a regular cycle.

Theoretically, people walking along the street would press the button every time they arrive at the intersection, and would receive a signal allowing them to cross the next time the signal lets them. In practice, because these intersections have such high pedestrian volumes, people walking along the street assume they will be legally able to cross the street just as cars can. When the light turns green for cars but remains red for pedestrians, people who want to cross the street get confused, and start crossing the street too late, getting stuck in the middle of the intersection when the light turns green for cross traffic, creating significant safety issues.

The 2010 Berkeley Pedestrian Master Plan seeks to "ensure that walking in Berkeley is safe, attractive, easy, and convenient for people of all ages and abilities." There are many safety issues for people walking and biking in Berkeley that will require huge amounts of money and effort to fix. This issue is not one of them. It simply requires that the City of Berkeley retime traffic signals such that they work just like they did for the last several decades, giving pedestrians a walk signal whenever private vehicles get a green light.

Please work with the Transportation Commission, city staff, and the City Council to adopt a policy of timing traffic signals such that pedestrians are allowed to safely and legally cross the street whenever private vehicles can. This issue may seem minor, but could go a long way towards ensuring the safe and convenient movement of people walking to work and school in Berkeley.

I would like to speak to the Transportation Commission about this issue. Is the next Transportation Commission meeting Thursday, October 20 at 7pm at the North Berkeley Senior Center?
Thanks,

Alex Jonlin
### Staff Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Total Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Cost to Complete</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ashby/Claremont</td>
<td>Implement Protected/Permissive Phasing for Eastbound and Westbound Approaches  Install new east leg crosswalk  Install video detection  Install new curb ramp on southeast corner  Modify existing pedestrian refuge island on northeast corner</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>$258,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$213,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Tunnel/Uplands</td>
<td>Install HAWK TRFF Device (pending Caltrans special approval)  Install new curb return  Install new crosswalk and striping  Install new curb ramps and sidewalks</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$298,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$233,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ashby/College</td>
<td>Implement Protected/Permissive Phasing for Northbound Approach  Install video detection  Install truncated domes on all curb ramps  High Visibility Crosswalks</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
<td>$337,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$287,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Russell/Domingo between Tunnel and Claremont</td>
<td>Install Sharrow (Both directions) on Domingo north of Tunnel, Domingo between Tunnel and El Camino, El Camino Real between Domingo and Uplands, and Uplands between El Camino Real and Tunnel</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Tunnel Road between Claremont and City Limit</td>
<td>See Exhibit for details on bike improvements by segment. Includes, but not limited to:  Green back sharrow, green pavement markings through intersections and bus stops, parking removal, bike lanes, and buffered bike lanes</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Tunnel Road between Domingo and Claremont Hotel</td>
<td>Relocate Signs  Remove trees/plantings as necessary  Minor Concrete repairs</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>State Route 24</td>
<td>Work with Caltrans to Add a Sign on Eastbound 24 to alert motorists that Tunnel Road isn’t the only entrance to Berkeley</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Tunnel/Domingo</td>
<td>Install new curb returns on northeast and southeast corner  Relocate signal poles and equipment</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$162,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$117,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Tunnel/Oak Ridge</td>
<td>Install signal interconnect to Claremont Driveway intersection and advanced flashing lights and signage for each direction.</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td>$234,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$214,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Ashby/Martin Luther King Jr. Way</td>
<td>Install high visibility crosswalks, advance limit lines, and pedestrian warning signage</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Ashby/Telegraph</td>
<td>Install left turn signal heads  Install pedestrian countdown heads</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Ashby/Ninth</td>
<td>Install bicycle/pedestrian crossing for Ninth Street Pathway  Install traffic signal improvements</td>
<td>$380,000</td>
<td>$378,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$318,000</td>
<td>$380,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ashby/Hillegass</td>
<td>Install HAWK Device (pending Caltrans special approval)  Install concrete channelized island for bike detection  Study potential turning movement restrictions (pending further analysis/study)</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$247,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$197,000</td>
<td>$273,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Cost:** $2,230,000  
**Other Funding Sources - Safeway Expansion Project:** $279,399  
**Surplus (Shortfall):** $49,399  
**Total:** $2,180,601  

- Shortfall Eng. Est. vs $1,600,000 remaining budget  
- Shortfall Bid Est. vs $1,600,000 remaining budget
September 13, 2016

Farid Javandel and
Members of the Berkeley Transportation Commission
2180 Milvia Street
Berkeley, CA 94704

RE: Tunnel Road Traffic Improvement Mitigations

Dear Farid and Members of the Berkeley Transportation Commission,

I live at 100 Tunnel Road and have been working with Farid, Ann Smulka, and our neighbors for the past six years to implement certain critical traffic improvement mitigations along Tunnel Road to make Tunnel Road much safer for our neighbors and the public. I have just learned from Farid that CalTrans has finally issued the Encroachment Permit, which is critical for the implementation of the Tunnel Road mitigation measures which the Berkeley Transportation Commission has approved a considerable time ago.

I understand that Farid will be going over the cost estimates and project priority order with the Commission on Thursday, Sept. 15 and the City will be preparing to put the mitigation improvements out to bid. Unfortunately, I have a long standing conflict this Thursday and I will not be able to attend this meeting.

The particular improvements which affect our neighbors are the synchronization of the traffic light at the Claremont Hotel with cars exiting from Oak Ridge Road as well as the installation of flashing Beacon warning signs both east and west of the intersection. Because of increased amount of traffic and the speed with which that traffic is moving, exiting from Oak Ridge Road has become a hazardous undertaking leading to serious traffic accidents in which my neighbors have been hit broadside. Unfortunately the KEEP CLEAR writing on the road surface is ignored more frequently than not by cars speeding west down Tunnel Road, so there is no space for drivers exiting Oak Ridge to pull into when the eastbound direction is clear. To compound the problem, drivers traveling in the eastbound direction on Tunnel Road accelerate well beyond the posted
25 mph speed limit, so there often is little break in traffic to allow a safe exit. I have lived adjacent to Tunnel Road for almost 30 years. I can attest to how much more traffic there is on Tunnel Road and how traffic congestion and speeding have increased. As you know, getting funds for improvements like this are hard to obtain. I ask that the Commission continue to rate the Oak Ridge project as a priority project for the Caldecott Fourth Bore settlement funds.

I appreciate this Commission's consideration and implementing appropriate traffic mitigation measures along Tunnel Road.

Sincerely,

William A. Falik