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 November 17, 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. T-1 Bond: Recommendations for allocating and managing Measure T-1
      General Obligation Bond Funds*
      a. Presentation by Public Works Director Phil Harrington
      b. Public Comment
      c. Discussion of Transportation projects eligible for T-1 funds and
         recommendation to Public Works Commission
      Link to Berkeley Strategic Transportation (BeST) Plan adopted by Council 7/19/16:
      http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/recordsonline/export/16973179.pdf
      Staff (Javandel)

   2. Council Referral: Undergrounding of Utility Wires*
      Discussion of joint PWC/DFSC/TC progress report and proposed
      recommendation to Council: that TC concurs with and co-sponsors the Progress
      Report for the Development of a Comprehensive Plan for the Funding of
      Undergrounding Utility Wires in Berkeley and forward the report and its
      recommendations the City Council for further consideration.
      The complete Utility Undergrounding Report is posted in the 1/12/17 PWC Agenda Packet:
      Commissioner Bruzzone, Liaison to PWC

   3. Adopt 2017 Regular Meeting Schedule*
      Proposed: Retain current monthly schedule on the 3rd Thursday at 7:00 pm,
      except August and December.
      Commissioner Zander

   4. Sidewalk Repair Policy *
      Pedestrian Subcommittee Update; Discussion and possible recommendation
      Commissioner Thomas and Bruzzone
5. **Bike Plan- Verbal Update**  
   Scheduled for February 14 Council agenda  
   Staff (Javandel)

6. **2017 Project Delivery Subcommittee Report**  
   Discussion and possible recommendations  
   Commissioners Gerhardstein, Parolek and Bruzzone

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, Pedestrian, and Project Delivery Subcommittees, and Liaisons to PWC, COD, and goBerkeley Advisory Group)

   2. Council Summary Actions November, December 2016*  
      *(Complete 2016 list is included in the web packet; Council is currently on recess)*

   3. Link to Council and Agenda Committee Agendas and Minutes  
      [http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/citycouncil/](http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/citycouncil/)

D. **COMMUNICATIONS**

   1. 12/21/16 email and letter from Preston Jordan on behalf of Albany Strollers and Rollers re Draft Berkeley Bike Plan*  
      *(Received at 11/17/16 meeting and posted in the web agenda packet):*

   2. 11/17/16 Memo from Farid Javandel – Update on goBerkeley Program Expansion

   3. 11/17/16 Draft Transportation Division Analysis (Mission, Vision, Functions, Structure)

   4. 10/14/2016 Council Referrals to Transportation Division (ranked)

   5. 10/31/2016 Transportation Division Projects Tracking Calendar/Log

   6. 2016 COB Priority Transportation Project Applications for ACTC CIP Funding 2018-2022

E. **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ashby/Hwy 13 Corridor Projects Update (qtrly)</th>
<th>Subcommittee Appointments - Feb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopt 2017 TC Work Plan - Feb</td>
<td>Bike Plan Update - Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update: Measure BB-funded projects, annual report - Feb</td>
<td>Election of Officers - Feb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. **ADJOURNMENT**

   Agenda Posted: January 13, 2017

   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 981-6341 (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
November 17, 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 7:07 PM
2. Roll Call
   Commissioners Present: Anthony Bruzzone (Lv 8:35), Ben Gerhardstein, Katherine Howe, Mark Humbert, Karen Parolek, Ghanya Thomas, Sofia Zander
   Commissioners Absent: Barnali Ghosh (L/A) , Donald Lathbury
   Staff Present: Farid Javandel, Tamlyn Bright

3. Public Comment on items not on the Agenda – No speakers
   It was M/S/C Unanimous (Gerhardstein/Parolek) to approve the Minutes of October 20, 2016. Absent: Lathbury Motion carried.
5. Approval and Order of Agenda
6. Update on Administration/Staff
7. Announcements

B. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS
1. Sidewalk Repair Policies
   Speakers: 0
   Actions: No action; Carried over to January meeting

2. Undergrounding of Utility Wires (Council Referral) – Progress Report
   Speakers: 0
   Actions: No action; Pedestrian Subcommittee will continue work to develop recommendations for January TC agenda.

3. Operations and Capital Budget 2017
   1) Staff Overview
   2) Discussion and possible recommendations on policies needed to ensure staff budget ensures project delivery
   Action: It was M/S (Gerhardstein/Howe) to create an FY 2017 Project Delivery Subcommittee to report back to the TC in January.
   Ayes: Gerhardstein, Howe, Humbert, Parolek, Thomas, Zander Noes: None
   Abstain: None Absent: Bruzzone, Lathbury
   Action: It was M/S (Humbert/Gerhardstein) to appoint Commissioners Parolek, Gerhardstein and Bruzzone to the Project Delivery Subcommittee, to propose recommendations and report back to the TC in January 2017. Motion carried.
   Ayes: Gerhardstein, Howe, Humbert, Parolek, Thomas, Zander Noes: None
   Abstain: None Absent: Bruzzone, Lathbury Motion carried.
3) Begin developing TC 2017 Work Plan to include Vision Zero, Data Collection, Pedestrian Plan Update, Strategic Plan, Project Coordination, and Complete Streets Implementation

Speakers: 0

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 2016
3. Link to Council and Agenda Committee Agendas and Minutes: http://www.cityofberkeley.info/citycouncil/

D. COMMUNICATIONS

Received at October 20 meeting; Published in 11/17/16 web packet:

Bicycle Plan Update:
1. 10/19/16 Bike Subcommittee- Additional Summary Recommendations
2. 10/15/16 Anuja Mendiratta – Crossing San Pablo Avenue
3. 10/20/16 S. Thompson- Russell Street opposes Stop Sign Removal
4. 10/18/16 Robert Strong – Comments on Revised Public Review Draft
5. 10/20/16 Dave Campbell, Bike East Bay- Support for Bicycle Plan

Pedestrian Push Buttons:
7. 10/20/16 memo from Farid Javandel “Pedestrian Push Buttons installed by Line 51 Corridor Delay Reduction & Sustainability Project”

Game Day Parking:
8. 11/7/16 Letter signed by residents of 2415 Prospect Street

E. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ashby/Hwy 13 Corridor Projects (qtrly)</th>
<th>Election of Officers - February</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>goBerkeley Parking Program Updates</td>
<td>Point-to-Point CarShare update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Share Program - Updates</td>
<td>2017 TC Work Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Projects - Updates</td>
<td>Project Delivery Subcommittee Report - Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80/Gilman Interchange Updates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. ADJOURNMENT

It was MSC (Parolek /Howe) to adjourn the meeting at 9:32 PM.

Ayes: Gerhardstein, Howe, Humbert, Parolek, Thomas, Zander
Noes: None
Absent: Bruzzone, Lathbury

Public Present: 4 Speakers: 0

Commission Secretary: Farid Javandel, Public Works/Transportation Division, 1947 Center St., 3rd 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
All,

The meeting* went well. Farid contacted Phil in Public works prior to the meeting regarding the related TC (engineering and enhancement) items he mentioned in the earlier email. Phil will attend our next [TC] meeting and provide an overview of the T1 Bond project, as well as answer any questions.

Basically the group is responsible for overseeing and coordinating the voter approved $100 million bond which will be allocated in (3) phases over a six year period. Phase 1 is $32 million; however, the time frame in which to spend it is limited. Many of the projects are carry-overs from Measure M, which received heavy input from the public. They are authorized to start spending the money in mid-February. The good news is that TC has already prioritized (ACTC & BeST) several ready-to-go projects.

We can submit our recommendations in person at a Public Works or Parks & Waterfront commission meeting. Or we can draft a response and send it to the respective commission secretaries. The deadline for TC to respond is March.

Questions for TC
1. What (projects, locations) are missing from the story map?
2. How should the projects be coordinated as they relate to TC
3. What other funding opportunities can we identify?

You can find the interactive map of the projects they have identified here via this link. Story Map Tour

Phil will review and discuss at the meeting.

*1/5/17 meeting of Parks and Public Works Department staff with participating City Commission Secretaries and Chairs to discuss Community Process for allocating and managing Measure T-1 Bond Funds --TB
Okay, it's been a long day. Gotta go.
Have a great weekend everyone and stay dry.

Best,
Ghanya

*Smile and let everyone know that TODAY, you're a lot stronger than you were yesterday.*
December 22, 2016

To:       Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
From:     Dee Williams-Ridley, City Manager
Subject:  Recommendations for allocating and managing
          Measure T1 General Obligation Bond funds

SUMMARY
This report provides a proposed outline for implementation of Measure T1, which staff have been working to prepare for since August.

As you know, the measure provides up to $100 million to fix unfunded infrastructure: storm drains, sewers, sidewalks, streets and public facilities. The measure addresses retrofitting of key structures, such as senior and recreation centers. These projects are not the most high profile, but, by helping create safe and durable infrastructure, they provide a foundation for the community.

The City has more than $500 million in unfunded infrastructure needs, the deferment of which adds long-term costs. The first phase of the bond is expected to be about $32 million. Staff prioritized potential T1 projects using the City’s Resilience Strategy¹ criteria, which focus on addressing many infrastructure challenges at once to provide multiple benefits for our community. In this case, safety, financial, social, and environmental criteria were used. An interactive map of these projects and their location in Berkeley is available at the following website: http://arcg.is/2hc5Qfp.

The Phase 1 projects proposed here are in addition to projects that are currently funded or will be proposed for funding in the City’s FY18/19 capital improvement budget.

These projects should be addressed quickly. Staff have spent the past four months developing a commission process that would incorporate a robust public process while delivering projects in an efficient manner.

¹ The Resilience Strategy is available at www.CityofBerkeley.info/resilience
In addition, staff has sought to be mindful of:

- The requirements embedded in Measure T1
- The Fair Representation Ordinance
- Obtaining input from all commissions
- Creating a coordinated, central way for information to flow to Council.

A summary of staff’s recommendation for the public process is explained in greater detail further below.

BACKGROUND
On Tuesday, November 8, 2016 Berkeley voters passed Measure T1 with an 86.5% approval. The measure needed a 2/3 vote to pass. This measure authorizes the City to sell $100,000,000 of General Obligation Bonds (GO Bonds) to repair, renovate, replace, or reconstruct the City's aging infrastructure and facilities, including sidewalks, storm drains, parks, streets, senior and recreation centers, and other important City facilities and buildings.²

At the October 18, 2016 worksession³, the Public Works and Parks, Recreation and Waterfront Departments presented a report that detailed funded and unfunded facility and infrastructure needs. This report cited over $500,000,000 in unfunded need. Other reports to Council in the last several years have detailed the vast needs in the City's aging infrastructure, whose repair or replacement has been too long deferred and whose failure would have substantial impacts on our community (see Attachment 2).

On September 13, 2016, Council adopted Resolution No. 67,666-N.S.⁴, which established guidelines for prioritizing these needs for the $100,000,000 infrastructure and facilities bond. The report noted that staff would provide a T1 Program Plan that prioritizes improvements, and present the plan to commissions and the public. This report, compiled by staff from Public Works, Parks Recreation & Waterfront, Health, Housing & Community Services, and the Office of Energy & Sustainable Development, provides that T1 Program Plan.

PROPOSED T1 PROGRAM PLAN

Phasing
Staff recommends that the $100 million bond be allocated over 3 phases spanning a total of 12 years, which enables the City to evenly distribute workload over time, and to minimize disruption to the public as City services and facilities are renovated.

---

² See Attachment 1 or http://www.cityofberkeley.info/recordsonline/export/16955084.pdf.
Re: Recommendations for Allocating and Managing Measure T1 General Obligation Bond Funds

- Phase 1: $32 million allocation for fiscal years 2018 – 2021
- Phase 2: $40 million allocation for fiscal years 2022 – 2025
- Phase 3: $28 million allocation for fiscal years 2026 – 2029

This phasing also helps the City comply with bond requirements that 85% must be spent within 3 years of each issuance.

Community Process
The bond measure requires subcommittees of the Public Works Commission and the Parks & Waterfront Commission to engage in a robust public process to receive input, and jointly report to the City Council on an annual basis.

To facilitate public input, staff recommends that the two lead commissions gather and synthesize input from the community and from other participating commissions, as follows:

The Parks & Waterfront Commission solicits input from:
- Children, Youth, and Recreation Commission; Civic Arts Commission; Community Environmental Advisory Commission; Disaster & Fire Safety Commission; and Energy Commission.

The Public Works Commission solicits input from:
- Commission on Aging; Commission on Disability; Housing Advisory Commission; Transportation Commission; and Zero Waste Commission.

Other interested commissions are welcome to provide input through the two lead commissions.

In addition to the public engaging through individual commission meetings, staff recommends holding two well-publicized joint lead commission meetings in March.

Timeline
Starting in January 2017, staff will brief each participating commission on Measure T1 and on staff recommendations for Phase 1 projects. Lead commissions will review staff’s recommended criteria and projects, hold meetings to gather commission and community input, and then deliver synthesized input to City Council by April 2017. City Council will provide direction to City staff on Phase 1 project prioritization between May and June 2017. This timeline is summarized below.
Table 1 - Timeline for T1 Program Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Mar 2017</td>
<td>Staff holds detailed discussions with lead Commissions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks &amp; Waterfront Commission and Public Works Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2017</td>
<td>Staff provides T1 Program Plan to 10 additional participating Commissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2017</td>
<td>Additional participating Commissions provide feedback to their lead Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2017</td>
<td>Lead Commissions hold two well-publicized joint Commission meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2017</td>
<td>Staff and lead Commissions prepare a joint recommendation for T1 Program Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-Jun 2017</td>
<td>Council considers and approves T1 Program Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reporting and Oversight**

Staff recommends that the Parks & Waterfront Commission and Public Works Commission will continue to serve as the lead commissions for facilitating public input on a plan for later phases of Measure T1 implementation, in addition to facilitating public and commission input on recommendations for early phase investment.

Over the course of the multi-phase Measure T1 implementation process, staff will provide bi-annual reports (typically in March and September) to the Lead Commissions and a yearly report to City Council (typically in April) of each year. Staff will also utilize the City website and social media to provide ongoing updates to the community and to gather community input.

During Phase 1 discussions, staff will engage the Public Works and Parks and Waterfront Commissions in a discussion about additional oversight and evaluation for all bond measure projects and phases.

**Criteria**

Staff applied the following criteria to determine proposed T1 projects:

- **Prioritizes safety improvements**: for example, upgrades to building alarms, sprinklers, mechanical and electrical systems that pose safety concerns.
- **Addresses critical infrastructure needs**: for example, prioritizing improvements to infrastructure whose life cycle is long-expired.
- **Meets community needs**: impacts the greatest number of Berkeley residents, and considers Berkeley’s changing demographics.
• **Advances equity**: creates benefits for all communities, including communities of color; considers geographic and economic equity.
• **Advances environmental sustainability**: for example, through increasing energy and water efficiency and renewable energy use.
• **Improves preparedness**: contributes to community preparedness for disasters.
• **Leverages funding**: uses T1 dollars to compete for or compete grant-funded projects or projects using other financing.

The above list of criteria are not listed in a prioritized order. Each project meets at least one or more of the criteria.

In Phase 1, an additional consideration is *project readiness and sequencing*. Projects proposed in Phase 1 must be completed within three years of bond issuance; and should include planning or design projects to prepare construction projects for Phases 2 and 3. Finally, to be eligible for bond funding, projects must be on property either owned or under a long-term lease by the City, (see “Limitations on Use of Bond Proceeds” later in this report).

**Projects**
A $32 million package of projects is proposed for completion in Phase 1. An interactive map of these projects and their location in Berkeley is available at the following website: [http://arcg.is/2hc5Qfp](http://arcg.is/2hc5Qfp). Proposed funding allocations are summarized in Table 2, and described in more detail below.

Together, these Phase 1 projects encompass all of the criteria listed above, and some will provide short-term, visible improvements in the community. Proposed projects include a mix of construction projects that can be entirely designed and built within Phase 1, and design/planning for more complex projects that can be constructed in Phases II and III.
Table 2 - Proposed Allocation: Phase 1 $32M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Categories</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>$14,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Streets</td>
<td>$5,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>$5,950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing/project management</td>
<td>$4,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. transaction costs from bond sale</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$32,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Phase 1 projects proposed here are in addition to capital projects that are already funded or will be funded by the City’s existing capital improvement budget.

The estimated funding for each proposed project identified below includes all project costs, except project management staff. A more detailed description of staffing is included below.

**Facilities Projects ($14,150,000)**

**Senior Centers and Community Centers ($12,600,000)**

Staff recommends that one senior center and one community center be improved in each of the three phases. Staff proposes staggering these projects so that residents do not have to endure multiple disruptions to similar services at the same time. These centers provide essential services on a daily basis to thousands of community members. They also serve as the City’s designated care and shelter sites in the event of a disaster. The conclusion of seismic evaluations conducted in 2015 is that each of the facilities requires significant upgrades. A report to Council summarizing the needs in these facilities was presented to City Council in January 2016.5

To determine how best to phase the senior and community center projects, staff considered several factors. The South Berkeley Senior Center is not proposed for Phase I because it is already undergoing extensive interior renovation this year with a $500,000 Community Development Block Grant. The James Kenney Community Center is not proposed for Phase 1 because it is in the process of a $4M renovation that

5 See [http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/WorkArea/linkit.aspx?LinkIdentifier=id&ItemID=114427](http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/WorkArea/linkit.aspx?LinkIdentifier=id&ItemID=114427)
includes a seismic retrofit, new siding and ADA upgrades that are, in part, funded with a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) grant. The Martin Luther King Youth Services Center is not proposed for Phase I because it is Berkeley United School District (BUSD) property, and currently on a month-to-month lease (see “Limitations on Use of Bond Proceeds” later in this report). If this lease status changes, it can be considered for Phase 2 planning and design.

Improvements to each facility will include seismic upgrades, energy and water efficiency upgrades and operational upgrades. The proposed upgrades will address deferred maintenance in the facilities and the associated costs of repeated repairs and system inefficiencies.

**North Berkeley Senior Center ($6,800,000): Planning, Design and Construction**
The City has the ability to leverage a time-sensitive $2 million grant from FEMA to complete a seismic upgrade for the N. Berkeley Senior Center.

**Live Oak Community Center ($4,900,000): Planning, Design and Construction**
Of the three community center sites, this facility has the greatest potential to complete planning, design, and construction within a 2-3 year period.

**Frances Albrier Community Center ($750,000): Planning and Design**
This project is to develop the plans and design for multi-benefit upgrades in this facility. Construction would occur in Phase 2 or 3.

**West Berkeley Service Center ($150,000): Conceptual Design**
This site has multiple potential future uses; T1 funds would be to conduct a visioning process to evaluate alternative uses and associated capital improvements.

**City-Wide Facility Improvements ($1,000,000)**
The City commissioned condition assessments of several critical public facilities. Those assessments identified specific upgrades needed to make the buildings safe and available for continued public use, and to address long-deferred maintenance concerns. In Phase 1, staff recommends dedicating funds to address high-priority improvements at the following facilities:

- **Berkeley Health Clinic**: Electrical upgrades
- **Public Safety Building**: Mechanical/HVAC upgrades
- **Willard Clubhouse**: Roof and restroom improvements
- **Corporation Yard Equipment Maintenance**: Roof improvements
- **Marina Corporation Yard**: Electrical upgrades
**Old City Hall and the Veterans Memorial Building ($300,000): Conceptual Design**

Staff recommends allocating T1 funds to conduct a visioning process to determine the best future use of Old City Hall and the Veteran's Building. These are large civic buildings which have substantial capital upgrade needs. A conceptual design process would help the City determine a direction for future capital improvements to restore and secure the facilities, and maximize their community benefit.

**Transfer Station Modernization ($250,000): Master Plan**

Staff recommends developing a master plan for the redevelopment of the City's Waste Transfer Station, including the recycling center, with the goal of creating a new facility that would promote recycling and promote elimination of solid waste. The Master Plan will be developed collaboratively with the Zero Waste Commission, Community Conservation Center, Ecology Center, City staff, and all interested groups and individuals.

**Street Improvement Projects $5,500,000**

Staff recommends allocating funding in each of the three phases to improving City streets and adjacent infrastructure, such as sidewalks, street gutters, curb ramps, retaining walls, and drainage. Streets are selected for rehabilitation each year based on pavement condition and field assessments performed by Public Works staff.

**City-Wide Street Improvements ($5,000,000): Design and Construction**

For Phase 1, staff recommends the following street segments shown in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Adeline St.</td>
<td>Derby St.</td>
<td>Ashby Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Hearst Ave.</td>
<td>Milvia St.</td>
<td>Henry St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bancroft Way</td>
<td>Milvia St.</td>
<td>Shattuck Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hopkins St.</td>
<td>San Pablo Ave.</td>
<td>The Alameda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Monterey Ave.</td>
<td>The Alameda</td>
<td>Hopkins St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 2nd St.</td>
<td>Delaware St.</td>
<td>Addison St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Ward St.</td>
<td>San Pablo Ave.</td>
<td>Acton St.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Street segments 1-6 above were part of a Council adopted paving plan, which was developed as part of the Measure M outreach process led by the Public Works Commission. Street selection was prioritized utilizing a scorecard, and other criteria in accordance with the City’s Street Rehabilitation and Repair Policy and 5-Year Street Paving Plan. Street segments 1-6 above were initially planned to be completed with Measure M. However, during the design of the Measure M funded paving projects, Public Works staff transitioned from strictly paving
projects to taking a more comprehensive street improvement program approach. This approach included repairs to adjacent failing infrastructure, such as sidewalks, curbs, gutters, curb ramps, retaining walls, and drainage. Therefore, while fewer streets segments were paved because of additional costs, the projects that were completed are of better quality. Staff is recommending the same comprehensive street improvement approach for the proposed T1 projects. Staff also recommends adding the Ward Street segment from San Pablo Avenue to Acton Street in order to balance out the street improvements geographically throughout the City. This segment of Ward Street will provide a much needed upgrade to the connection to San Pablo Park from San Pablo Avenue.

**University Avenue Street Reconstruction ($500,000): Planning and Design**
The segment of University Avenue leading to the Berkeley Waterfront (West Frontage Road to Marina Boulevard) has a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) of 9 out of a possible 100, rendering it one of the worst in the City. The two east-bound lanes run directly above portions of the old Berkeley pier. Over time, the pavement has settled around the pier beams, creating large bumps in the road. The proposed reconstruction of this road would shift the lanes to the north, off of the old pier. The project is currently in conceptual design, and alternatives for lane shifting are being developed. This planning and design project would consist of public process, design, obtaining permits, and preparation of construction documents for the pavement reconstruction. This project is expected to mitigate the poor pavement condition, improve intersection operation safety and efficiency, and provide roadway beautification improvements.

**Green Infrastructure Projects - $1,000,000**

Green Infrastructure (GI) describes a strategy that uses small-scale stormwater controls to mimic natural hydrologic patterns in residential, commercial and industrial settings. GI measures entail managing runoff as close to its source as possible using landscape-based practices to promote the natural processing (removal of pollutants) of runoff by filtration, infiltration, adsorption, and/or evapotranspiration.

Staff recommends allocating funding to green infrastructure projects in all phases of the bond measure. Proposed Phase 1 projects include those GI projects identified in the Mid-Program Review Report for Measure M Integrated Streets Investment Plan and that are consistent with the City’s Watershed Management Plan. Proposed projects are located in high-use areas to achieve the multiple benefits of cleaning and slowing stormwater runoff, preventing trash from entering storm drains, and educating the community about environmental stewardship. Two GI projects will be fully constructed; and four bioswale projects will be planned, designed and permitted for construction in future phases.
Dwight and Sacramento Bus Stop Permeable Pavers ($100,000): Design and Construction
Permeable pavers will be installed at this bus stop to infiltrate water and capture trash associated with this heavily used intersection.

Civic Center Park Bioswale ($200,000): Design and Construction
This bioswale will serve a high-use park in a densely populated area of downtown. Educational signage will foster stewardship with nearby high schoolers, residents, business employees, and downtown visitors.

San Pablo Park Bioswale ($200,000): Planning and Design
This project is proposed because of its potential to relieve downstream flooding in the Potter Watershed, and offer educational opportunities to park users and residents. The site is also a potential candidate for a cistern, which would help decrease peak stormwater flows.

Willard Park Bioswale ($150,000): Planning and Design
This project is proposed because of its proximity to the Potter Creek Watershed, and its potential to offer educational opportunities for Willard Middle School students, UC Berkeley students, park users and residents.

North Branch Berkeley Library Bioswale ($150,000): Planning and Design
This project is proposed because of its potential to protect the steelhead habitat of Codornices Creek, as well as offer educational opportunities for library visitors and residents.

King School Park Bioswale ($200,000): Planning and Design
This project would similarly protect Codornices Creek and its steelhead habitat, as well as offer educational opportunities for King Middle School students, park users and residents. This site is also a potential candidate for a cistern.

Parks Projects $5,950,000
The following list contains geographically-disbursed, diverse improvements that are priorities for completion in Phase I. T1 park projects include upgrades to aging infrastructure at the City’s highest-use parks, safety improvements at Aquatic Park which provide flood protection to West Berkeley, and an irrigation overhaul to help the City manage long-term drought conditions.

Grove Park Phase 2 - Restroom/Sports Field - $1,000,000
The Grove Park ball field, adjacent to the MLK, Jr. Youth Services Center, is a high-use sports field in a low-income area that also has low park density. This project would include improvements to the existing ball field, dugouts, site lighting
and accessibility for safety and energy savings, including improvements to site drainage. The project would also include renovation of the existing bathroom building.

**San Pablo Park Tennis Courts - $800,000**
This is a high-use sports facility serving residents from nearby low-income areas of the City. This project would reconstruct or renovate the existing six (6) lighted tennis courts at San Pablo Park.

**Rose Garden Drainage, Pathways and Tennis Courts - $2,000,000**
Berkeley's historic Rose Garden was originally constructed in 1922. A number of the pathways have fallen into disrepair, drainage problems have emerged, and the tennis courts have cracked surfacing and require repair. This project would include: renovation of existing site pathways and construction of new pathways to provide a safe and accessible path of travel throughout the Rose Garden; improvements to site drainage and irrigation for preservation of the site and Codornices Creek; and reconstruction of the tennis courts for safety due to natural earth movement.

**Berkeley Municipal Pier Structural Renovation - Planning and Design $900,000**
In 2015, the Berkeley Pier was permanently closed after being evaluated as structurally unsound. The City is currently undertaking a study to develop repair alternatives and cost estimates for restoring the Pier. This project would provide final design and construction documents for the structural repairs to restore the pier for recreational use. The project would also acquire regulatory permits and environmental documents for construction work in San Francisco Bay.

**Gilman North Restroom and Storage - Planning and Design $250,000**
The Gilman Sports Fields annually accommodate 18,000 community members, including 4,000 children and youth. There are no permanent restrooms at this sports field. This project consists of architectural programming, supporting infrastructure study, and final design. The architectural programming will determine the building space criteria necessary to serve the needs for restroom and storage from the understanding of functional and operational requirements. Supporting infrastructure will analyze the most practical and economical approach for the utilities required to support the use of the building. With these limitations identified, the design phase will provide final design and prepare construction documents for the construction of the building, and its associated site work to meet accessibility requirements.

**Aquatic Park Tide Tubes Replacement - Planning and Design $250,000**
Three of the existing five tide tubes have failed. The tide tubes perform a critical function for West Berkeley, by providing an outlet for storm water during
significant rain or flood events. This project consists of providing final design, acquiring regulatory permits and environmental documents for construction work in San Francisco Bay, and for the preparation of construction documents for replacement of collapsed tide tubes connecting the main lagoon in Aquatic Park to Bay water, and dredging operation to remove sediment collected near the tubes.

**Irrigation System Modernization - $750,000**

This project would provide the software and equipment to replace the City’s 230 irrigation controllers and timeclocks, which are almost entirely individually controlled, with a centrally-controlled, cloud-based irrigation system. This system would have the ability to adapt to weather station technology and would enable the City to better respond to drought conditions, and optimize watering and water conservation.

**Staffing for Measure T1 Project Management**

Project management staffing costs for bond projects are estimated to be between 14% and 15%. Over the next 12 years, and with the phasing proposed above, staff estimates that the equivalent of 5 full-time employees (FTEs) will be required to manage the work. In Phase I, staffing costs, including office space rental, equipment, and supplies, are estimated to be $4.6 million.

**BOND DETAILS**

**Limitations on Use of Bond Proceeds**

- **Expenditure timing requirement:** Bond funds must be spent (not merely encumbered) promptly: 85% must be spent within 3 years of each issuance. If 85% is not spent the balance must be income-restricted, i.e., invested in a manner that does not generate income. When the bond is issued, the City will need to provide a draw down schedule, which reflects our reasonable expectation of expenditures as of the closing date of the issuance.

- **Staffing:** Bond proceeds can be used for hiring staff to work on projects and for soft costs, but not for purely “community process” efforts. For instance, a bond-funded project manager is not prohibited from talking to residents or attending meetings, but proceeds should not be used to, for instance, hire consultants to run public outreach or participation. Bond funds may be used to pay administrative costs (including staff time) directly related to bond-funded projects.

- **Leased property:** Bond proceeds may only be spent for the improvement of real property with “municipal improvements” as defined in BMC Section 7.64.020. Expenditures are limited to property owned or leased by the City. Thus, bond funds may not be spent to improve real property that is not owned or under a long term lease by the City. Accordingly, properties owned by the school district that are not under a long term lease to the City are not eligible. Nor are Berkeley
Tuolumne Camp or Echo Lake Camp, since the real property where they are located is owned by the federal government and the City operates the camps under a special permit, not a lease.

- Interest rate: The maximum rate of interest to be paid on the bonds shall not exceed six percent (6%).
- Debt service limit: The tax rate for debt service of these bonds should not increase beyond the average 10 year rates currently in effect with the outstanding general obligation bonds.

**Bond Financing**

- Tax rate: The proposed plan for financing these bonds is to maintain the combined tax rate that citizens pay at the current 10-year average in effect for the outstanding City general obligation bonds throughout the life cycle of the bond issued. The actual tax rates and the years in which they will apply may vary from the current estimates, due to variations in the timing of bond sales, the amount of bond sold, market interest rates at the time of each sale and the actual assessed valuations over the term of repayment of the bonds. These variations and variables might impact the City’s bond capacity at a specific time and might change the proposed staff recommendation of the Phases above, (Phase 1 – Phase 3).
- Cost of issuance: While there are multiple factors that affects cost of issuing bonds, a typical issuing cost is up to 3% of the bond value.

**Reimbursement Resolution**

At the December 13, 2016 City Council meeting, Council adopted a reimbursement resolution authorizing charges to T1 Bond projects.\(^6\) This item allows staff to start working on potential T1 bond projects after sixty days of its approval.

**Attachments:**

1. Resolution No. 67-522-N.S.
2. Recent reports to Council on City infrastructure and facilities needs

**cc:**

Jovan Grogan, Deputy City Manager
Phillip Harrington, Director, Public Works
Scott Ferris, Director, Parks, Recreation and Waterfront
Ann-Marie Hogan, City Auditor
Mark Numainville, City Clerk
Timothy Burroughs, Assistant to the City Manager
Matthai Chakko, Assistant to the City Manager/Public Information Officer

---

\(^6\) See [http://www.cityofberkeley.info/Clerk/City_Council/2016/12_Dec/Documents/2016-12-13_Item_17_Reimbursement_Parks_Infrastructure.aspx](http://www.cityofberkeley.info/Clerk/City_Council/2016/12_Dec/Documents/2016-12-13_Item_17_Reimbursement_Parks_Infrastructure.aspx)
RESOLUTION NO. 67,522-N.S.

DETERMINING PUBLIC INTEREST AND NECESSITY FOR ISSUING A GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING CITY INFRASTRUCTURE AND FACILITIES AND SUBMITTING TO THE BERKELEY ELECTORATE A MEASURE TO AUTHORIZE A GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND FOR CITY INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS

WHEREAS, the City Council has proposed for voter approval a general obligation bond measure to pay for Improvements to existing city infrastructure and facilities; and

WHEREAS, the Council has requested that the Alameda County Board of Supervisors consolidate the General Municipal Election with the Presidential General Election; and

WHEREAS, the Council desires to submit all measures to be placed upon the ballot at said consolidated election; and

WHEREAS, this resolution is adopted pursuant to and in conformance with Chapter 7.64 of the Berkeley Municipal Code; and

WHEREAS, the City's existing infrastructure is critical to protecting the public safety and welfare and enabling the residents of Berkeley to have a high quality of life:

- Streets and sidewalks provide for transportation and accessibility for both the general public and public safety personnel.
- Storm drains and green infrastructure projects protect the public from flooding and improve the quality of runoff into San Francisco Bay.
- Senior Centers provide important services for the City's seniors, including educational courses, activities, social support, emergency shelters in disasters, and meals.
- Parks and recreation centers and facilities provide recreational, educational and social opportunities and support for children and families, and recreation centers can also function as emergency shelters in disasters.
  - The City's public buildings and other facilities are both important cultural resources in themselves and provide public services to the residents of Berkeley.

WHEREAS, the City's existing infrastructure and facilities, including the types of infrastructure and facilities listed above, are in need of significant repair, renovation, replacement, or reconstruction (the "Improvements") so that the public can continue to benefit from them; and

WHEREAS, existing funds and funding sources are inadequate to pay for the Improvements that are necessary in the short term; and

WHEREAS, documented existing infrastructure and facility needs substantially exceed $100,000,000; and
WHEREAS, the City Council has therefore determined that the public interest requires additional funding for the Improvements.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Berkeley that the public interest requires the issuance of a general obligation bond to fund the Improvements.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the Council of the City of Berkeley that:

A. Proceeds of bonded indebtedness shall be used to fund the Improvements. In addition, 1% of the bond proceeds shall be available for functional art integrated into Improvements that are paid for by bond proceeds, as and to the extent determined by the City Council.

B. Each year as part of the budget process the City Manager shall provide to the City Council a comprehensive report of funds received pursuant from any bonded indebtedness authorized by this resolution and how they have been expended in an equitable manner throughout the City, listing all specific projects on which they have been expended.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the Council of the City of Berkeley that:

A. A general obligation bond to fund the Improvements shall be placed before the voters at the election on November 8, 2016.

B. The estimated cost of the Improvements to be funded by any bonds issued pursuant to this measure is $100 million, although the total cost of all identified infrastructure and facility needs is substantially in excess of $100 million.

C. The amount of the principal of the general obligation indebtedness (the "Bonds") to be incurred shall not exceed $100 million.

D. The estimated cost may include legal and other fees and the cost of printing the Bonds and other costs and expenses incidental to or connected with the issuance and sale of the Bonds.

E. The proceeds of the Bonds authorized to be issued by this resolution shall be used to finance construction of the Improvements and functional art integrated into the Improvements, to pay any fees and costs in connection with the issuance of the Bonds, including but not limited to, legal fees and bond printing costs.

F. The maximum rate of interest to be paid on the Bonds shall not exceed six percent (6%).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Berkeley that the Board of Supervisors of Alameda County is hereby requested to include on the ballots and sample ballots the measure enumerated above to be voted on by the voters of the qualified electors of the City of Berkeley.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the full text of the measure shall be printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet mailed to all voters in the City of Berkeley.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the above enumerated measure requires a two-thirds vote threshold for passage.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Clerk is hereby directed to cause the posting, publication and printing of notices, pursuant to the requirements of the Charter of the City of Berkeley, the Government Code and the Elections Code of the State of California.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Clerk is hereby directed to obtain printing, supplies and services as required.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Clerk is hereby authorized to enter into any contracts necessary for election consulting services, temporary employment services, printing services, and any such other supplies and services as may be required by the statutes of the State of California and the Charter of the City of Berkeley for the conduct of the November General Municipal Election.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Pursuant to Elections Code Section 9285 (b), the City Council hereby adopts the provisions of Elections Code Section 9285 (a) providing for the filing of rebuttal arguments for city ballot measures.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that said proposed bond measure shall appear and be printed upon the ballots to be used at said election as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF BERKELEY BOND MEASURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shall the City of Berkeley issue general obligation bonds not exceeding $100,000,000 to repair, renovate, replace, or reconstruct the City’s aging infrastructure and facilities, including sidewalks, storm drains, parks, streets, senior and recreation centers, and other important City facilities and buildings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Implications: The average annual cost over the 40-year period the bonds are outstanding would be approximately $21, $90, and $128, respectively, for homes with assessed valuations of $100,000, $425,000 and $600,000.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the text of the bond measure be shown as Exhibit A, attached hereto and made a part hereof.

* * * * *
The foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Berkeley City Council on May 31, 2016 by the following vote:

Ayes: Anderson, Arreguin, Capitelli, Droste, Maio, Moore, Wengraf, Worthington and Bates.

Noes: None.

Absent: None.

Tom Bates, Mayor

Attest: Mark Numainville, City Clerk
TEXT OF MEASURE

RESOLUTION NO. ##,###-N.S.

AUTHORIZING THE CITY OF BERKELEY TO INCUR BONDED DEBT AND ISSUE A GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING CITY INFRASTRUCTURE AND FACILITIES

WHEREAS, this resolution is adopted pursuant to and in conformance with Chapter 7.64 of the Berkeley Municipal Code; and

WHEREAS, the City’s existing infrastructure is critical to protecting the public safety and welfare and enabling the residents of Berkeley to have a high quality of life:

- Streets and sidewalks provide for transportation and accessibility for both the general public and public safety personnel.
- Storm drains and green infrastructure projects protect the public from flooding and improve the quality of runoff into San Francisco Bay.
- Senior Centers provide important services for the City’s seniors, including educational courses, activities, social support, emergency shelters in disasters, and meals.
- Parks and recreation centers and facilities provide recreational, educational and social opportunities and support for children and families, and recreation centers can also function as emergency shelters in disasters.
- The City’s public buildings and other facilities are both important cultural resources in themselves and provide public services to the residents of Berkeley.

WHEREAS, the City’s existing infrastructure and facilities, including the types of infrastructure and facilities listed above, are in need of significant repair, renovation, replacement, or reconstruction (the "Improvements") so that the public can continue to benefit from them; and

WHEREAS, existing funds and funding sources are inadequate to pay for the Improvements that are necessary in the short term; and

WHEREAS, the City’s existing and future infrastructure is critical to protecting the public safety and welfare; and

WHEREAS, documented existing infrastructure and facility needs substantially exceed $100,000,000; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has therefore determined that the public interest requires additional funding for the Improvements.
NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the People of the City of Berkeley that the public interest requires the issuance of a general obligation bond in the amount of $100,000,000 to fund the Improvements.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the People of the City of Berkeley that:

A. Proceeds of bonded indebtedness shall be used to fund the Improvements. In addition, 1% of the bond proceeds shall be available for functional art integrated into Improvements that are paid for by bond proceeds, as and to the extent determined by the City Council.

B. Each year as part of the budget process the City Manager shall provide to the City Council a comprehensive report of funds received pursuant from any bonded indebtedness authorized by this resolution and how they have been expended in an equitable manner throughout the City, listing all specific projects on which they have been expended.

C. Subcommittees of the Public Works Commission and the Parks and Waterfront Commission shall engage in a robust public process to obtain input, and will jointly report to the City Council on an annual basis regarding projects funded by the bond and bond expenditures.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the People of the City of Berkeley that:

A. The estimated cost of the Improvements to be funded by any bonds issued pursuant to this measure is $100,000,000, although the total cost of all identified infrastructure and facility needs is substantially in excess of $100,000,000.

B. The amount of the principal of the general obligation indebtedness (the “Bonds”) to be incurred shall not exceed $100,000,000.

C. The estimated cost may include legal and other fees and the cost of printing the Bonds and other costs and expenses incidental to or connected with the issuance and sale of the Bonds.

D. The proceeds of the Bonds authorized to be issued by this resolution shall be used to finance construction of the Improvements and functional art integrated into the Improvements, to pay any fees and costs in connection with the issuance of the Bonds, including but not limited to, legal fees and bond printing costs.

E. The maximum rate of interest to be paid on the Bonds shall not exceed six percent (6%).
Recent reports to Council on City infrastructure and facilities needs

In an April 5, 2016 off-agenda report, Parks, Recreation & Waterfront detailed capital and major maintenance projects and unfunded needs.

A January 19, 2016 report to Council on City care and shelter sites described $16.8M in needs at senior centers and community centers for seismic upgrade & deferred maintenance repairs.

The Council-adopted FY16-FY17 Capital Improvement Program provided an overview of planned projects and unfunded needs.

In two March 24, 2015 worksession reports, Parks, Recreation & Waterfront and Public Works presented capital improvement and major maintenance needs and 5-year plans.

---

1. [http://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Clerk/Level_3_-_General/Parks%20CIP%20Plan%20FY16-FY19%20040516.pdf](http://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Clerk/Level_3_-_General/Parks%20CIP%20Plan%20FY16-FY19%20040516.pdf)
2. [http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/WorkArea/linkit.aspx?LinkIdentifier=id&ItemID=114427](http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/WorkArea/linkit.aspx?LinkIdentifier=id&ItemID=114427)
3. [http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/uploadedFiles/Manager/Budget/FY%202016%20and%20FY%202017%20Final%20Adopted%20CIP%20Book.pdf](http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/uploadedFiles/Manager/Budget/FY%202016%20and%20FY%202017%20Final%20Adopted%20CIP%20Book.pdf)
CONSENT CALENDAR
January 31, 2017

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
From: Public Works Commission, Disaster and Fire Safety Commission, and Transportation Commission

Submitted by: Andy Kelley, Chair, Public Works Commission


RECOMMENDATION
That Council approve the following work items:
1. An updated work plan to develop a comprehensive plan (the "Undergrounding Plan") for the funding of undergrounding utility wires in Berkeley. See Attachment 1.
2. Add the Energy Commission, utilizing their expertise in emerging technologies, to work on the development of an undergrounding program.

That Council accept the following informational items:
1. A baseline study for the development of an undergrounding program, prepared by Harris and Associates, dated July 22, 2016. See Attachment 2.
2. An application to U.C. Berkeley's Goldman School of Public Policy to conduct Phase 2 studies for the development of an undergrounding program. See Attachment 3.
3. Hold a workshop with service providers, such as PG&E, AT&T, Comcast, in early 2017 to get their input on the development of an undergrounding program.

FISCAL IMPACTS OF RECOMMENDATION
There are no immediate fiscal impacts of the recommendation. There will be a need to fund a consultant study in Phase 3 of the work plan, if the study moves to that stage. This will occur in fiscal year 2018.

CITY POLICY
Berkeley has established policies that prioritize public safety and seek to create a ready, resilient and responsive community, and an infrastructure that responds to this policy objective.

BACKGROUND
The City Council, at their meeting on December 16, 2014, referred to the Public Works Commission, Disaster and Fire Safety Commission and Transportation Commission to
develop a comprehensive plan for the funding of the undergrounding of utility wires on all major and collector streets in Berkeley. The major (arterial) and collector streets were identified as a priority for the movement of emergency vehicles and the evacuation of residents in the event of a major disaster. The commissions responded with a workplan and it was approved by Council on September 29, 2015. Since that time, substantial progress has been made. The representatives from the three commissions have been meeting monthly. Key to our progress has been the development of a four phase program approach. In summary, these are:

Phase 1:  Conduct a baseline study to summarize Berkeley’s current status of undergrounding utilities, cost to complete the undergrounding of arterial and collector streets, and examples of where undergrounding programs have been implemented. This study has been completed.

Phase 2:  Work with U.C. Berkeley’s Goldman School of Public Policy to conduct specialized studies. These studies will be conducted in the 2016 – 2017 school year. The results from the baseline study and Goldman school studies will be combined into an overall recommendation for Phase 3. Included in Phase 2 will be community outreach and a workshop with utility service providers.

Phase 3:  Prepare a comprehensive funding and implementation plan for undergrounding utility wires in Berkeley. This is planned for March 2018 – March 2019.

Phase 4:  Implementation

This phased approach allows the public and the Council to have input at multiple points along the evaluation process.

Attached to this report is a baseline study prepared by Harris and Associates. In summary, the report estimated the cost to underground Berkeley’s arterial and collector streets as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Length, miles</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Cost to underground</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arterial streets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently undergrounded</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not undergrounded</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>$43 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collector streets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently undergrounded</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The estimated cost to underground the remaining arterial and collectors streets is about $135 million. The cost to underground residential streets was not included in this work scope. By extrapolating the cost of collector streets, the estimated cost for the approximate 150 miles of residential streets might be in the range of $600 million. This estimate is order of magnitude and is prepared without field surveys or detailed analysis.

Also attached to this report is the work scope to be conducted by U.C. Berkeley’s Goldman School of Public Policy. An application has been made to them and moving forward with the studies is subject to matching students with the projects. In summary, the three study areas are:

**Study Area 1 – Future Technologies**
This component will evaluate how PG&E, service providers (such as Comcast, AT&T, etc.) and street lighting may change in the next 50 years. As an example, the benefit of distributed rooftop PV solar is constrained by the design and operation of the existing electrical grid. This will help with forecasting the type of undergrounding methods to be used and the type of above ground poles that will remain.

**Study Area 2 – Funding Alternatives**
This component will evaluate the range of funding alternatives for Berkeley to consider in implementing an undergrounding program.

**Study Area 3 – Benefit/cost Analysis and social/geographic equity**
This component will evaluate the benefits and costs of an undergrounding program. Also included will be considerations for social/geographic equity for implementation.

**RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION**
The updated workplan more accurately reflects the project work scope and schedule to prepare the Undergrounding Plan. It incorporates input from the commissions, Public Works staff, and the consultant. The recommendations were discussed by the Public Works Commission at their November 10, 2016 meeting and they made a motion to recommend the Progress Report for the Development of a Comprehensive Plan for the Funding of Undergrounding Utility Wires in Berkeley.
Action: M/S/C (Schueler/Smith)
Vote: (8 Ayes: Kelley, Frieberg, Smith, Henry, Schueler, Yep, Elgstrand, Dominguez; 0 Noes; 1 Absent: Swift; 0 Abstain)

The recommendations were discussed by the Disaster and Fire Safety Commission at their October 26, 2016 meeting and they made a motion to recommend the Progress Report for the Development of a Comprehensive Plan for the Funding of Undergrounding Utility Wires in Berkeley.

Action: M/S/C (Grimes/Smukler)
Vote: (6 Ayes: Grimes, Golomb, Smukler, Couzin, Flasher, Legg; 0 Noes; 3 Absent: Jones, Degenkolb, King; 0 Abstain)

The recommendations were discussed by the Transportation Commission at its November 17, 2016 meeting, and while no action was taken, the commissioners were fully briefed and no objections were raised to continuing the study of undergrounding. The Transportation Commission continues to endorse participation in further study of the issue.

An update will be provided to Council in the fall of 2017.

CITY MANAGER
Dee Williams-Ridley

CONTACT PERSON
Tracy Clay, Public Works Commission Secretary, (510) 981-6406
Ray Yep, Public Works Commissioner
David Brannigan, Disaster and Fire Safety Commission Secretary, (510) 981-5508
Paul Degenkolb, Disaster and Fire Safety Commissioner
Farid Javandel, Transportation Commission Secretary, (510) 981-7010
Tony Bruzzone, Transportation Commissioner

Attachments:
1: Workplan (Undergrounding Plan)
2: Harris and Associates’ Baseline Study for Undergrounding Program
3: Application to U.C. Berkeley Goldman School of Public Policy

Commented [TR2]: Report cannot be from the TC unless they took action to co-sponsor. If the TC did not take action to endorse, this sentence should not be included.

Commented [TR3]: This section must state that the CM concurs or takes no position. Otherwise, a companion report is required.
Attachment 1

WORK PLAN
To prepare a comprehensive plan for the funding of undergrounding utility wires in Berkeley

Program Phases
The Berkeley City Council has asked the Public Works, Disaster and Fire Safety, and Transportation Commissions to develop a comprehensive plan for the funding of undergrounding utility wires in all major and collector streets in Berkeley. This is potentially a large undertaking with impacts on City policies, work priorities, resources to conduct the work, cost to perform the planning and engineering, and the need for community input. It would be prudent to conduct the planning in multiple phases. The following is a phased programmatic approach.

Phase 1: Prepare Baseline for the Undergrounding Program (Harris and Associates)
This phase will develop baseline information for the undergrounding program. The work shall focus on the arterial and collector streets in Berkeley. The work scope shall include:

- Summarize the history of undergrounding in Berkeley
- Develop preliminary cost estimate for undergrounding
- Review available funding alternatives
- Summarize what has been done in other cities
- Summarize the status of 20A, 20B, and 20C funding in Berkeley
- Summarize the pros/cons of undergrounding the arterial and collector streets
- Prepare a report of the findings

This work has been assigned to Harris and Associates. The schedule for Phase 1 is from March to July, 2016.

Phase 2: Conceptualize the Undergrounding Program
This phase will conceptualize some of the broad longer term issues facing the undergrounding program in Berkeley. This phase will be completed in two parts, as follows.

Phase 2A (Goldman School of Public Policy)
This phase will utilize the expertise of the U.C. Berkeley Goldman School of Public Policy in these key study areas:
Study Area 1 – Future Technologies and Social/Geographic Equity
This component will evaluate how PG&E, service providers (such as Comcast, AT&T, etc.) and street lighting may change in the next 50 years. As an example, the benefit of distributed rooftop PV solar is constrained by the design and operation of the existing electrical grid. This will help with forecasting the type of undergrounding methods to be used and the type of above ground poles that will remain. The work will involve talking with PG&E, utility providers, and research into technologies. Also included shall be considerations for social/geographic equity for implementation. For example, the utility wires in the Berkeley hills are a hazard due to their proximity to earthquake faults and heavy vegetation. Undergrounding in these areas would not only protect the homes in the area, but the City as a whole. How would this and other examples be evaluated from a social/geographic equity viewpoint?

Study Area 2 – Funding Alternatives
This component will evaluate the range of funding alternatives for Berkeley to consider in implementing an undergrounding program. Included shall be:

- Range in cost of funding needs
- Long term bond financing
- Revenue generation potential from utility corridors
- Utility service charge funding
- Options for home owner funding
- Pros/cons of funding alternatives used by other cities
- Other

Study Area 3 – Benefit/Cost Analysis
This component will evaluate the benefits and costs of an undergrounding program. The benefits shall include:

- Value of greater emergency access in an emergency
- Value of avoided catastrophic financial losses from an emergency
- Value to property values
- Other

Traditional methods of calculating benefit/cost ratios shall be used.

This work shall be performed by the U.C. Berkeley Goldman School of Public Policy. The schedule for Phase 2 is from September 2016 to June 2017.
Phase 2B (Public Works Department and Commissions)
This phase will pull together the work done in Phase 1 and Phase 2A into a cohesive Concept Plan for Berkeley. It is at this point where decisions should be made on the feasibility of undergrounding in Berkeley and if future studies are warranted. A summary report shall be written for the City Council’s consideration. Included in the report shall be the following:

- Objectives for undergrounding
- Summary of utility undergrounding completed in Berkeley
- Summary of undergrounding programs by other cities
- Future technologies of utility and service providers
- Future technologies of utility and service providers
- Potential undergrounding corridors and costs
- Community meetings and input from the public.
- Input from stakeholders.
- Recommendations for future studies, costs, schedule, and resources needed
- Decisions required of City Council and staff

The schedule for Phase 2B is from June 2017 to March 2018.

Phase 3: Comprehensive Funding and Implementation Plan
City Council approval of the Concept Plan is needed before moving forward with this phase. This phase will prepare a detailed Comprehensive Funding and Implementation Plan. The work scope shall include:

- Conduct a series of community meetings.
- Conduct a detailed evaluation of project funding and recommended actions.
- Prepare a detailed plan for implementation.
- Recommend organizational needs for implementation, including staffing and other resource needs.
- Prepare an overall program plan.
- City Council adoption of the Comprehensive Funding and Implementation Plan.
- Identification of voter requirements before proceeding.

The schedule for this phase shall be March 2018 to March 2019.

Phase 4: Program Implementation
This phase will implement the recommended undergrounding program. This will be a long-term effort.
Attachment 2

Baseline study for the development of an undergrounding program
Prepared by Harris and Associates, dated July 22, 2016

PLEASE SEE THE SEPARATELY ATTACHED REPORT
The following are the Phase 2A project descriptions proposed to be conducted by U.C. Berkeley’s Goldman School of Public Policy.

Phase 2A
Study Area 1 – Future Technologies

Project Description & Goals
The City of Berkeley is investigating the cost and advisability of moving overhead wiring underground. This action will have a number of benefits, both in terms of a friendlier environment, and in increased safety for the city as a whole. However, the process is fairly expensive, and the construction process will be disruptive to the neighborhood while being undergrounded. The primary technologies being undergrounded are power (which includes power for street lighting), telephone, Internet and cable TV. At this time, the primary study area to consider is the undergrounding process on arterial and collector streets in Berkeley. A further discussion is also ongoing about undergrounding the remainder of the streets in Berkeley. As part of the investigation, we are looking into the benefit versus cost of the project, which raises a number of issues. One issue that has been raised is how future technologies will affect the long term value of the project.

The question should focus on how the technologies being undergrounded are likely to change in the next fifty years, how those changes could be enhanced or degraded by undergrounding. Suggestions for specific needs in undergrounding such as conduit size and utility vaults should be at least discussed. The possibility of technological changes which make undergrounding obsolete should also be studied. The primary technologies being undergrounded are power, Telephone, Internet and Cable TV however, if during the course of study other technologies emerge and are expected to reach wide spread adoption by municipalities those technologies should be considered in this undergrounding study i.e. fiber optic internet cables.
Technologies which should be considered should include, but not be limited to:

- The potential use of micro-grids and the impacts to power transmission lines. As an example, the benefit of distributed rooftop PV solar is constrained by the design and operation of the existing electrical grid.
- The trend to wireless internet service and the impacts to traditional and fiber optic cable transmission.
- Other

Phase 2A
Study Area 2 – Funding Alternatives

Project Description & Goals
The City of Berkeley is investigating the cost and advisability of moving overhead wiring underground. This action will have a number of benefits, both in terms of a friendlier environment, and in increased safety for the city as a whole. However, the process is fairly expensive, and the construction process will be disruptive to the neighborhood while being undergrounded. The primary technologies being undergrounded are power (which includes power for street lighting), telephone, Internet and cable TV. At this time, the primary study area to consider is the undergrounding process on arterial and collector streets in Berkeley. A further discussion is also ongoing about undergrounding the remainder of the streets in Berkeley. As part of the investigation, we are looking into the benefit versus cost of the project, which raises a number of issues. One of these issues is funding. This project will evaluate the range of funding alternatives for Berkeley to consider in implementing an undergrounding program.

Funding alternatives that have been discussed include:

- Range in the amount of funding needed
- Long term bond financing
- Transfer tax on real estate sales
- Revenue generation potential from utility corridors
- Utility service charge funding
- Options for homeowner funding
- Pros/cons of funding alternatives used by other cities
- Potential private sector funding options
- Any other options not included above, but which seem appropriate

Along with the sources of funding, there should be at least some evaluation of the equity of the funding. For instance, should the entire population be responsible for paying for the
undergrounding even if parts of the city are not undergrounded? How does timing of the project (possibly a thirty-year project) affect this?

Phase 2A
Study Area 3 – Benefit/Cost Analysis and Social/Geographic Equity

Project Description & Goals
The City of Berkeley is investigating the cost and advisability of moving overhead wiring underground. This action will have a number of benefits, both in terms of a friendlier environment, and in increased safety for the city as a whole. However, the process is fairly expensive, and the construction process will be disruptive to the neighborhood while being undergrounded. The primary technologies being undergrounded are power (which includes power for street lighting), telephone, Internet and cable TV. At this time, the primary study area to consider is the undergrounding process on arterial and collector streets in Berkeley. A further discussion is also ongoing about undergrounding the remainder of the streets in Berkeley. As part of the investigation, we are looking into the benefit versus cost of the project, which raises a number of issues. Two issues are the evaluation of the overall benefits and costs of and social/geographic equity of an undergrounding program.

To assist in this project, a Benefit/Cost Analysis needs to be performed. The costs and benefits being evaluated should be looked at both in terms of the entire city, but also in terms of individual neighborhoods. The benefits shall include:

- Value of greater emergency access in an emergency
- Value of avoided catastrophic financial losses from an emergency
- Increase to property values
- Value of prevented power loss due to undergrounding
- Aesthetic value of undergrounding power lines
- Other

A consideration of the benefits to those areas already undergrounded may be possible if real estate sales in a particular neighborhood are studied before and after undergrounding but it gets complicated when one considers that every house is different. Berkeley, like the rest of the country, has had to work our way out of a recent housing bubble bust, and we haven’t had significant power outages or disasters to compare one neighborhood to another. Traditional methods of calculating benefit/cost ratios shall be used, although alternatives may also be discussed.

Also included will be the social and geographic equity of any proposed undergrounding project. Where will the undergrounding have the greatest benefit to the city? Where will it have the
least impact? What are the benefits and costs to the city as a whole, and what are the benefits and costs to the local neighborhood being undergrounded? If only part of the city is to be undergrounded, what benefits are gained by those not being undergrounded? For that matter, what have the benefits and costs of undergrounding been in those areas of Berkeley where it has already been accomplished?
Phase 2A
Study Area 3 – Benefit/Cost Analysis and Social/Geographic Equity

Project Description & Goals
The City of Berkeley is investigating the cost and advisability of moving overhead wiring underground. This action will have a number of benefits, both in terms of a friendlier environment, and in increased safety for the city as a whole. However, the process is fairly expensive, and the construction process will be disruptive to the neighborhood while being undergrounded. The primary technologies being undergrounded are power (which includes power for street lighting), telephone, Internet and cable TV. At this time, the primary study area to consider is the undergrounding process on arterial and collector streets in Berkeley. A further discussion is also ongoing about undergrounding the remainder of the streets in Berkeley. As part of the investigation, we are looking into the benefit versus cost of the project, which raises a number of issues. Two issues are the evaluation of the overall benefits and costs of and social/geographic equity of an undergrounding program.

To assist in this project, a Benefit/Cost Analysis needs to be performed. The costs and benefits being evaluated should be looked at both in terms of the entire city, but also in terms of individual neighborhoods. The benefits shall include:

- Value of greater emergency access in an emergency
- Value of avoided catastrophic financial losses from an emergency
- Increase to property values
- Value of prevented power loss due to undergrounding
- Aesthetic value of undergrounding power lines
- Other

A consideration of the benefits to those areas already undergrounded may be possible if real estate sales in a particular neighborhood are studied before and after undergrounding but it gets complicated when one considers that every house is different. Berkeley, like the rest of the country, has had to work our way out of a recent housing bubble bust, and we haven’t had significant power outages or disasters to compare one neighborhood to another. Traditional methods of calculating benefit/cost ratios shall be used, although alternatives may also be discussed.

Also included will be the social and geographic equity of any proposed undergrounding project. Where will the undergrounding have the greatest benefit to the city? Where will it have the least impact? What are the benefits and costs to the city as a whole, and what are the benefits and costs to the local neighborhood being undergrounded? If only part of the city is to be undergrounded, what benefits are gained by those not being undergrounded? For that matter,
what have the benefits and costs of undergrounding been in those areas of Berkeley where it has already been accomplished?

Please briefly describe the work of your organization/department as it relates to the project. In what way is your organization in a position to take action based on findings of the IPA?

The Undergrounding Subcommittee of the Public Works Commission is tasked with preparing a recommendation to the Berkeley City Council on the advisability, cost and funding methods related to undergrounding utilities in Berkeley. This research report will be used as a basis for specific discussions within that recommendation. Final approval of the undergrounding project, along with specifics of how it will be accomplished will be up to the City Council, but will be guided by the recommendations from this and other research projects.

Descriptive Project Title, under 15 words
Perform a benefit vs. cost analysis of utility undergrounding in the city of Berkeley.
2016 Commission Meeting Dates

Please complete this form and email it to the Commission Inbox by: Thursday, January 7, 2016

Name of Commission: Transportation Commission

Commission Secretary: Farid Javandel

Please Note the Commission Meeting Dates for 2016 Below

Please fill in meeting date below. If no meeting for the month is scheduled please note as "No Meeting."

"Example"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Meeting Day and Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>Tuesday 1/05/16</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Meeting Day and Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016 Meeting Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Meeting Day and Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>Thursday 1/19/17</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Meeting Day and Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td>Thursday 2/16/17</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Meeting Day and Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Thursday 3/16/17</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Meeting Day and Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>Thursday 4/20/17</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Meeting Day and Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>Thursday 5/18/17</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Meeting Day and Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>Thursday 6/15/17</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Meeting Day and Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td>Thursday 7/20/17</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Meeting Day and Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 2016</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Meeting Day and Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 2016</td>
<td>Thursday 9/21/17</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Meeting Day and Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 2016</td>
<td>Thursday 10/19/17</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Meeting Day and Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 2016</td>
<td>Thursday 11/16/17</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Meeting Day and Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 2016</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please Return via Email to:
The Commission Inbox-City Clerk Department
Email: Commission@CityofBerkeley.info Please contact Sheila Soo at x6916 with questions.
2017 Holiday Schedule

1. January 2, 2017 (Monday) – New Year’s Day Observed
2. January 16, 2017 (Monday) – Martin Luther King Jr. Birthday Observed
3. February 13, 2017 (Monday)\(^1\) – Abraham Lincoln Birthday Observed
5. May 19, 2017 – (Friday) – Malcolm X Birthday
6. May 29, 2017 – (Monday) - Memorial Day
8. September 4, 2017 (Monday) – Labor Day
9. October 9, 2017 (Monday) – Indigenous People’s Day
10. November 10, 2017 (Friday) – Veteran’s Day
11. November 23, 2017 (Thursday) – Thanksgiving Day
12. November 24, 2017 (Friday) – Day after Thanksgiving Day
13. December 25, 2017 (Monday) – Christmas Day

\(^1\) VTO is Thursday, February 9, 2017.
Commissioner Request for Excused Absence: Religious and Cultural Holidays

(Must Be Requested in Advance of Scheduled Board/Commission Meeting)

I, _____________________________________, respectfully ask to be excused
(Name of Commissioner to be excused)

from the ___________________________________________ meeting
(Name of Board/Commission)

scheduled for __________________________ due to a conflict with the
(date of Board/Commission meeting)

following religious or cultural holiday which is of great personal significance and
important for me to observe:

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

Note: the following may be considered an illustrative but not exclusive list of religious
and cultural holidays: Al Hijrah New Year, Ash Wednesday, Chinese New Year, Diwali,
Easter Sunday, Eid Al Fitr, Eid Al Adha, Good Friday, Hanukkah, Holi, Kwanzaa, Palm
Sunday, Passover, Rosh Hashanah, St. Patrick’s Day and Yom Kippur.

__________________________________________ ____________
Signature            Date

Secretaries: Pursuant to BMC § 3.02.030, dates of absence requested above shall not
be counted against the attendance record of the Commissioner. The request shall not
be subject to the approval of the Commission but shall be accepted upon request. The
definition of a religious or cultural holiday is to be left to the individual Commissioner.
Section 3.02.030 is retroactive to October 24, 2000.

G:\CLERK\COMMISSIONS\Admin\Attendance\Excused Absence Form for Religious & Cultural Holidays.doc
RESOLUTION NO. 67,771–N.S.

2017 COMMISSION MEETING FREQUENCY SCHEDULE

WHEREAS, on June 13, 2005, the City Council adopted a plan which created three categories of meeting schedules and a process for requesting Council or Agenda Committee approval of any extra meetings; and

WHEREAS, Council also directed commission secretaries to submit an information report whenever a commission cancels two consecutive meetings for lack of quorum and an annual attendance report; and

WHEREAS, on January 15, 2008, the City Council adopted a plan which created a fourth category of meeting frequency; and

WHEREAS, adopting a commission meeting schedule will provide commissions with direction to set their respective regular meeting schedules for subsequent years.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of the City of Berkeley directs that commission secretaries shall submit an information report to Council whenever a commission cancels two consecutive meetings for lack of quorum.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that commissions may request that the Council approve extra meetings by placing a report on the City Council agenda for consideration.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that commissions will meet according to the following categories:

Category A. These commissions will meet on their own schedule.
- Board of Library Trustees
- Design Review Committee
- Fair Campaign Practices Commission
- Housing Advisory Commission
- Landmarks Preservation Commission
- Open Government Commission
- Personnel Board
- Planning Commission
- Police Review Commission
- Zoning Adjustments Board

Category B. These commissions will have a maximum of ten meetings per year.
- Civic Arts Commission
- Children, Youth, and Recreation Commission
- Commission on Aging
- Commission on Disability
- Commission on Labor
- Commission on the Status of Women
- Community Environmental Advisory Commission
- Community Health Commission
Disaster and Fire Safety Commission
Energy Commission
Homeless Commission
Human Welfare and Community Action Commission
Medical Cannabis Commission
Mental Health Commission
Parks and Waterfront Commission
Peace and Justice Commission
Public Works Commission
Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Product Panel of Experts
Transportation Commission
Youth Commission
Zero Waste Commission

Category C. These commissions will meet as necessary to fulfill their legal requirements as determined by the board chair and/or staff.
Elmwood Business Improvement District Advisory Board
Loan Administration Board
Solano Avenue Business Improvement District Advisory Board

Category D. These commissions will have a maximum of six meetings per year.
Animal Care Commission

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that commission secretaries will submit an annual commission attendance report for the period November through October to the City Clerk in November of each year.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a report presenting commission attendance and meeting frequency will be submitted to the City Council for review in December of each year.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the meeting frequency schedule contained herein shall remain in effect until superseded by Council resolution.

The foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Berkeley City Council on December 13, 2016 by the following vote:

Ayes: Bartlett, Davila, Droste, Hahn, Maio, Wengraf, Worthington and Arreguin.

Noes: None.

Absent: None.

Jesse Arreguin, Mayor

Attest: Mark Numainville, City Clerk

Resolution No. 67,771-N.S.
From: Anthony Bruzzone [mailto:anthonybruzzone@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2016 4:30 PM
To: Anderson, Eric <EAnderson@ci.berkeley.ca.us>; Bright, Tamlyn <TBright@ci.berkeley.ca.us>; 'Ghanya Thomas' <ghanyathomas@sbcglobal.net>
Cc: Karen Parolek <karen.parolek@gmail.com>; Thomas, Beth A. <BAThomas@ci.berkeley.ca.us>
Subject: Re: Pedestrian Subcom. Mtg.

Thanks Eric. I read through the 2014 report to the Council quickly, so maybe I missed something, but here is my take:

1. In Oct 2011, PW changed from the spiral program (with the city paying 100% of street tree damage and residents paying all the other damage) to the current 50/50 program. There is no reference to an adopted policy change on this.

2. In 2014, PW sent another memo (the one attached) that made minor changes to the program as an information item to the council. I see no reference to any recommendations of the PWC or any other body.

I'll reserve the policy issues that I had concerns with to the meeting, but the policy direction from proper authorities appears very weak. I suppose you can say the Council accepted it by saying nothing in the 2014 information item, but that seems like a stretch.

Thanks

Tony

On Monday, October 24, 2016 4:15 PM, "Anderson, Eric" <EAnderson@ci.berkeley.ca.us> wrote:

The Spiral Sidewalk program was retired in place of the current sidewalk repair program, structured as follows:

- Proactive Program: Annual repairs are performed within specific areas of the City and in commercial and other high-pedestrian volume areas. Rather than repairing sidewalks citywide according to geographic equity, this approach focuses on targeting the locations with the highest volumes of pedestrians to maximize ROI. I collaborated with Engineering Division staff and the City Attorney’s office to help develop this program, which is based on the Pedestrian Master Plan’s High Pedestrian Activity Areas map: http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/uploadedFiles/Public_Works-Level_3_-_Sidewalks,_Streets_-_Utility/Proactive%20Sidewalk%20Map%20Final%20Version%202.pdf

- Responsive Program: This request-based annual program repairs sidewalk at locations outside of the Proactive Program that are reported to the City.

See links below, including a council report that provides more background and information.

http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/ContentDisplay.aspx?id=7974
FYI I will not be able to attend a Pedestrian Subcommittee meeting on November 10th.

Best,

Eric Anderson  
Associate Transportation Planner  
Pedestrian and Bicycle Programs Coordinator  
City of Berkeley Dept. of Public Works  
1947 Center St. 4th Floor  
Berkeley, CA 94704  
510-981-7062  
Fax: (510) 981-7060  
eanderson@ci.berkeley.ca.us  

As a cost savings measure, City offices are closed the second Friday of every month. We appreciate your patience with any resulting delays.
December 13, 2016

6. Annual Commission Attendance and Meeting Frequency Report  
   From: City Manager  
   Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution approving a revised commission meeting frequency schedule, and accept the annual attendance report.  
   Financial Implications: None  
   Contact: Mark Numainville, City Clerk, 981-6900  
   Action: Adopted Resolution No. 67,771–N.S.

23. Contract No. 9499 Amendment: San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) District for Implementation of the Downtown Berkeley BART Plaza and Transit Area Improvement Project  
   From: City Manager  
   Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution amending Contract No. 9499, and authorizing additional expenditure of $387,000 on the Downtown Berkeley BART Plaza and Transit Area Improvement Project to fund renovation of the BART street entrance on the east side of Shattuck between Center and Allston, and authorizing the City Manager to amend the Cooperative Agreement with the San Francisco BART District for grant administration and project implementation. This amendment increases the not-to-exceed amount of the City’s direct funding contribution to the BART plaza project to $944,000. All other provisions of this Agreement will remain unchanged.  
   Financial Implications: Parking In-Lieu Fee Fund - $387,000  
   Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300  
   Action: Adopted Resolution No. 67,787–N.S.

40. Establishment of a Joint Subcommittee for the T1 Infrastructure Bond  
   From: Mayor Arreguin  
   Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution establishing a Joint Subcommittee that will create a public process and advise council on how to spend funds from the Measure T1 infrastructure bond, which was passed by the voters of Berkeley in November 2016.  
   Financial Implications: Staff time  
   Contact: Jesse Arreguin, Mayor, 981-7100  
   Action: Item removed from the agenda by Mayor Arreguin.

November 29, 2016

Information Report

43. goBerkeley Parking Management Program: Recommended Adjustments for January 1, 2017  
   From: City Manager  
   Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300  
   Action: Received and filed.
November 15, 2016

3. **Formal Bid Solicitations and Request for Proposals Scheduled for Possible Issuance After Council Approval on November 15, 2016**

From: City Manager

**Recommendation:** Approve the request for proposals or invitation for bids (attached to staff report) that will be, or are planned to be, issued upon final approval by the requesting department or division. All contracts over the City Manager’s threshold will be returned to Council for final approval.*

**Financial Implications:** Various Funds - $1,490,000

Contact: Henry Oyekanmi, Finance, 981-7300

**Action:** Approved recommendation.

*Excerpted from attachments:

| 17-11096-C | Tunnel Road Access Improvements | Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Intersection improvements related to the Caldecott 4th Bore Settlement Project. Includes signals, sidewalk, crosswalk, signing, and striping improvements |

October 18, 2016


From: City Manager

**Recommendation:** Conduct a public hearing and upon conclusion:
Transportation Commission
Excerpts of Council Actions 2016

- 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.
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)*


**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

(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
Transportation Commission
Excerpts of Council Actions 2016

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
Contact: Phillip Harrington, Public Works, 981-6300
Action: Adopted Resolution No. 67,632–N.S.

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

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 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  
**Recommendation:** Adopt second reading of Ordinance No. 7,476-N.S. 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.  
**First Reading Vote:** Ayes – Maio, Moore, Arreguin, Capitelli, Wengraf, Worthington, Droste, 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 – Droste.

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.
Transportation Commission
Excerpts of Council Actions 2016

**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

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. 67,515–N.S. (Oxford & Jefferson)

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

**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.
Transportation Commission
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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; 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; Noes – None; Absent – 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.
Transportation Commission
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**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
Transportation Commission
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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
Excerpts of Council Actions 2016

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
2. Review the attached Draft Mid–Program Review Report for Measure M
Integrated Streets Investment Plan.
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.
Vote: Ayes – Maio, Moore, Arreguin, Capitelli, Wengraf, Worthington, Droste, Bates;
Noes – None; Abstain – None; Absent – Anderson.

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.
Financial Implications: Staff time
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


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
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.
Hello Council members, Transportation Commissioners, and Transportation Planning staff-

The attached letter has Albany Strollers & Rollers (AS&R) input regarding the draft Berkeley Bike Plan. AS&R is a service and advocacy group supporting active transportation that was founded in 2004. It currently with over 650 member households, including many in Berkeley in the vicinity of Albany.

AS&R hopes you will make the adjustments to the plan it recommends.
Thank you for your consideration.

Preston Jordan
Co-founder
Albany Strollers & Rollers
City Council
Transportation Commission
Transportation Division
Berkeley, CA  94720

Re: Draft Berkeley Bike Plan

Dear Council members, Commissioner, and Transportation Division staff,

Albany Strollers and Rollers (AS&R) appreciates that Berkeley is updating its Bicycle Plan in order to take the next steps encouraging the interested majority to give biking for transportation a try. As the city with the second highest share of people biking to work in the Bay Area, and one of the top ten bike commuting rates in the country, how Berkeley further accommodates cycling contributes to how the country accommodates cycling.

Albany has the fourth highest biking to work mode share in the Bay Area. Together with Berkeley it forms one of the two areas with the highest biking to work mode shares in the Bay Area, the other being Palo Alto/Mountain View/Menlo Park.

In the rest of this letter AS&R offers input it believes would improve the draft Berkeley Bicycle Plan if incorporated, and result in greater utilization of cycling as a means of transportation in both Albany and Berkeley.

**Albany/Berkeley connections**

To the second of these, Albany’s Active Transportation Plan (ATP) defines separate relaxed and rapid cycling networks (termed “slow” and “fast” in the document). The former appears to be equivalent to the low-stress network proposed in the Berkeley Plan draft. In response in part to prior input from AS&R at the open house, the draft plan includes connections to all but one of the routes proposed in Albany. Thank you. The only missing connection is on Portland. Albany’s current striping plan for this route is a cycling lane in the uphill (eastbound) direction and sharrows in the downhill (westbound) direction. AS&R requests Berkeley continue this route east to Colusa.

Even though the Berkeley plan includes all but one of the connections with Albany, it does not include many of the connections to relaxed routes in Albany in the proposed Berkeley low-stress network. AS&R asks that the connections on Talbot, Curtis, Posen, and Sonoma be added to the low-stress network.
While the route connection at Sonoma is included in the plan, and is connected to a route on Josephine, AS&R requests including a route on Berryman connecting Josephine and Milvia. This connection minimizes climbing as compared to connecting to Milvia on either Hopkins or Rose. Both Hopkins and Rose also have far more motorist traffic, and require waiting at signals at Martin Luther King Avenue as compared to the faster crossing provided by the four-way stop on Berryman.

If Berryman is included as a route, AS&R suggests upgrading its entire length to a bike boulevard. Besides providing the best connection in north Berkeley between Josephine and Milvia, it connects to two schools and a city park with a recreation center beyond those two cross streets.

The Berkeley plan does propose one route to the border with Albany that is not currently in the ATP: Curtis. For its part, AS&R is committed to advocating for Curtis to be included as a relaxed route in the upcoming Albany ATP update. The current ATP designates Peralta as the relaxed route in eastern Albany, but AS&R has since realized its combination of hills and higher motorist volume and speed makes it more suited to inclusion in the rapid network. Because Curtis connects to Westbrae to the south, Marin Elementary School in the middle, and Colusa Circle to the north, AS&R had already decided to advocate for its designation as the relaxed route in eastern Albany in the ATP update. Berkeley’s independent decision to designate its portion of Curtis as a cycling route further supports this goal. Thank you.

**Bike Boulevard treatment**

AS&R encourages Berkeley to take its bike boulevards the next step to fully becoming such facilities as pioneered on Bryant Street in Palo Alto. Specifically, provide for non stop cycling between arterial crossings while preventing through motorist travel. This entails removing stop signs, and optimizing existing and installing new barriers to motorists that allow people biking to pass.

AS&R believes it would be useful to organize this work around the vision that it is faster to bike than drive across town to the west, north, or south for the average person. The more this achieved by improving the bike boulevards for cycling, the more people will naturally choose to cycle. Short of such improvements, the potential of cycling to reduce greenhouse pollution, improve public health, and improve quality of life for neighborhoods will remain unfulfilled because most people will continue to choose to drive everywhere to save time.

One aspect of optimizing the bike boulevards is replacing the diagonal diverters with a mix of semi- or other diverters to achieve the same effect. Even though their installation was a novel advance in the 1970s, they are not a low-stress feature for people cycling. Passing through them safely requires focusing on three areas at different distances in orthogonal directions simultaneously or almost so. The person biking must focus in the near field straight ahead on steering through the barrier safely. At the same time they must focus on the far field straight ahead and hard right or the far field both hard right and left to avoid colliding with a motorist approaching the barrier from those directions, depending upon the direction of the barrier.

The current draft proposed rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs) on arterials where most bike boulevards cross. Yet in the October 20th Transportation Commission meeting,
Director Javandel stated that these beacons do not change the right of way. This means that if someone cycling activates a beacon and then gets hit by a motorist as they ride across the arterial, the person cycling is at fault. Consequently AS&R strongly recommends against proposing RRFBs to enable cycling crossing anywhere. The perhaps of RRFBs is to facilitate street crossing by sidewalk users.

Rapid network

The draft plan does not define a rapid network. While the minority of people riding use such a network (counts in Albany suggest 20%), it is likely a higher percentage of miles ridden on bikes are on this network. Consequently AS&R recommends defining this network in the plan.

For the most part, this network can be defined from the routes already proposed in the plan, and so does not require much effort to incorporate into the plan. By and large these are the routes proposed for cycle tracks in the plan. While those will be components of the relaxed network when implemented, even if and when those are built on such streets as San Pablo years to decades from now, faster riders will likely still choose the general traffic lanes because they are safer at those speeds.

There are a few additional routes AS&R recommends if a rapid network is defined. Faster riders in Albany regularly use Sacramento instead of California. In south Berkeley, the combination of Haste transitioning to Dwight at Martin Luther King is the fastest route westbound (there is no need to define fast routes in the uphill eastbound direction because the low-stress network routes accommodate most fast riders well also given the climb).

Finally, the fastest route in Berkeley is the combination of the Eastshore Highway connected West Bolivar via Addison, 2nd, and Hearst. There are only six stops along this 2.7 mile route across town currently, which is far less than any other route beside the Bay Trail and perhaps Grizzly Peak. Unlike the Bay Trail though, this route is designed for higher speeds, and unlike Grizzly Peak, it has almost no relief and is more readily accessed. Consequently AS&R recommends designating it the East Bay Biking Highway, akin to the southern portion of the I-80 Bikeway in El Cerrito and Richmond.

AS&R will advocate for the addition of Albany’s portion of the Eastshore Highway to Albany’s rapid network during the ATP update. This route will connect via Buchanan to Pierce to the north, which is already designated a rapid route in the ATP.

The utility of designating a rapid network is that there are improvements that can be made that facilitate fast cycling. For instance sharrows can be added along rapid routes to indicate proper road position to fast riders and to indicate to motorists to expect riders to be in that position.

It can also reduce the likelihood of this network being degraded. For instance the last draft of the Gilman interchange reconstruction plan proposed prohibiting people from cycling along Eastshore Highway across Gilman. This would have severed this route at the worst, or required a time-consuming detour at best. At last report, responsible staff reported this feature has been eliminated in response to advocacy. However until a new plan is presented that provides documentation that this aspect has been eliminated, vigilance is still required. If this
AS&R is a service and advocacy group founded in 2004 to support active transportation in Albany. It has over 650 member households.

route had already been designated for biking, the responsible agency would not have been so readily able to proposed eliminating this connection.

**Bike route signage**

There is currently detailed and visible route designation signage on Berkeley’s bike boulevards. In contrast, there is no or little such signage on the Ohlone Greenway. Yet from the potential rider’s perspective, these are components of the same low-stress network.

Also, there is a tendency for signage color and other design elements to indicate the type of route rather than the network of which the route is a part. This is contrary to people’s need to understand how to follow the lowest stress route to their destination.

This need would be better served by making all the signs in a network the same color without regard to the type of route. For instance low-stress network signage would all be purple and rapid network signage would all be green. This would allow people to more smoothly understand how to follow the route along the Greenway around the North Berkeley BART station: just follow the purple signs! Under the existing approach, different segments of this route would have signs with completely different designs, and some segments have no signs at all.

**Plan name**

The draft plan name is “Berkeley Bicycle Plan.” While this name follows traditional practice, it is a misnomer as it could be interpreted by someone unfamiliar with such plans as containing advice on how to build bikes in Berkeley, how Berkeley is going to accommodate bicycle manufacturing or retail, or some other mistaken understanding.

The ultimate goal of the Plan is make biking safer and get more people biking. Consequently AS&R suggests naming the plan the “Berkeley Cycling Plan” or “Berkeley Bicycling Plan” to indicate both the active and human rather than machine focus of the Plan.

Thank you for considering AS&R’s input. If you have any questions or feedback, please feel free to reach me at pdjordan@lbl.gov or 510 418-9660.

Respectfully,

Preston Jordan
Co-founder
Albany Strollers and Rollers
MEMORANDUM

Date: November 17, 2016

To: Transportation Commission

From: Farid Javandel, Transportation Division Manager

Subject: Update on goBerkeley Program Expansion

On October 27, 2016, Public Works Transportation Division staff provided an update on the goBerkeley program to the goBerkeley Community Advisory Group (CAG). This group consists of members from the Downtown Berkeley Association, Telegraph Business Improvement District, the Elmwood Business Association, and the Transportation Commission. At this meeting, staff informed CAG members of efforts underway to expand goBerkeley parking management to the south and west of Downtown Berkeley, including:

- 1700 & 1800 Blocks of University Avenue, from Martin Luther King Jr. Way to McGee Avenue
- 2500 Blocks of Shattuck Avenue, from Dwight Way to Parker Street

Staff presented a draft proposal for these areas, which would tentatively include longer time limits and no change to current hourly rates in order to provide additional parking options for visitors to the downtown area. However, this proposal was preliminary and did not reflect current parking occupancy rates or feedback from merchants in these areas.

Staff have submitted a Council Report for the December 13th meeting which will make these areas eligible for goBerkeley parking management. In the interim, staff are conducting extensive outreach to businesses in the proposed expansion areas to better understand local conditions and needs. Staff are also reviewing the results of parking occupancy data collected in October 2016 in these areas. Our final recommendations for hourly rates and time limits in the expansion areas will be based on the results of this comprehensive analysis. Staff anticipate that these recommendations could go into effect on March 1, 2017, following Council approval on January 24, 2017.

Attachment: Map of Recommended goBerkeley Expansion Areas (March 2017)
Attachment: Map of Recommended goBerkeley Expansion Areas (March 2017)
Office of Transportation Analysis

• Transportation - Mission, Vision, and Values
• Functions served by Transportation
• Top Concerns from Council and Customers
• Obstacles
• Current structure

DRAFT
Transportation

Mission – Provide services, projects, and policies that support safe and effective movement of people and goods.

Vision – A Berkeley where transportation is easy and sustainable, regardless of their resources, abilities, or purpose.

Values – Safety, Mobility (equitable and effective movement of people and goods), Sustainability (environmental and financial).

Through Berkeley making effective use of available resources, safe and effective movement of people and goods can be enjoyed daily life and where people using equitable, not an obstacle to daily life and where people using the public right of way can enjoy the journey as much as the destination, regardless of their resources, abilities, or purpose.
Functions served by Transportation Commission

- Respond to Council requests
- Maintain eligibility for Federal, State, and Regional funding for Local Streets & Roads, and other programs necessary to maintain infrastructure and services

Policy and Planning

- Education and outreach (purpose of stop signs, can you park across a driveway, etc.)
- Respond to customer inquiries & requests (PRAs, traffic and parking issues)
- Permits (trucks, events, traffic control plans, car share, RPP, parklets, curbside EV charging)
- Commute benefits for staff and support for ordinance development support

Services

- Scoping/environmental/design/construction
- Grant funding
- Advance Planning (GP Traffic element, Bike, Red Bus management (bus stops, red curb, green/white/yellow/blue/charging/etc.)
- Traffic Control Devices (signals, signs, markings)
- Parking (Garages, meters, RPP, goBerkeley)

Operations
Top Concerns from Council and Customers

- Traffic Safety and Complete Streets implementation
  - Calming, control devices, SR2S, hillside access, low stress pedestrian and bike routes, disabled access

- Simplicity & Clear Communication of Policies
  - Improved signage, web site

- Parking Availability
  - Bikes, disabled, loading, bus stops, red curb for sight lines

- Want Better Technology and Services
  - Pay-by-phone, EV charging, electronic traffic and parking devices, GIS

- Traffic Safety and Complete Streets Implementation
Obstacles

• Not enough project delivery capacity
• Some work not performed at the right level
• Need more effective allocation of specialized skills
• Some work not performed at the right level
• Not enough project delivery capacity
• Differentiate between what is mandated, needed, or wanted
• Policy implementation needs to Council adopted priorities
• Staff needs to communicate realistic maintenance and work plan and staffing need to be aligned to Council priorities
• Still developing management tools and clear work status communication methods
• Need more effective allocation of specialized skills
Current Transportation Structure

[Diagram showing organizational structure with names and roles]

Updated November 17, 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Initial Rank</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Primary Department</th>
<th>Secondary Departments</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Transportation Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Analyzing All City-Owned Properties for Potential for Housing Development</td>
<td>Request that the City Manager explore the opportunity for the City of Berkeley to build housing on city-owned property: conduct an inventory of city owned properties and return to City Council as soon as possible with an evaluation and analysis of those properties that are</td>
<td>HHCS</td>
<td>CMO; OED; PLNG</td>
<td>List from PW; Reviewing Sites; Internal Review</td>
<td>Started</td>
<td>possible parking impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Improve Conditions on Our Community Sidewalks; Amending Berkeley Municipal Code Chapters 13.36 and 14.48</td>
<td>Discuss and refer the following services and ordinances to the City Manager for implementation, and adopt first reading of three Ordinances: 1. Adding Section 13.36.085 to the Berkeley Municipal Code prohibiting urination and defecation in public places. 2. Amending Sections</td>
<td>HHCS</td>
<td>BPD; CA; PRW; PW</td>
<td>Storage Lockers First, then enforcement; Lockers on 11/17</td>
<td>Started</td>
<td>possible TE impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>City Manager Referral: Implement the PayByPhone Parking Technology as Used by San Francisco and UC Berkeley</td>
<td>Refer to the City Manager to examine the feasibility of implementing the PayByPhone parking technology as used by the City of San Francisco and UC Berkeley.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>FINANCE; IT; PW</td>
<td>Will be implemented as part of residential shared parking pilot grant due to begin FY17</td>
<td>Started</td>
<td>Gordon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>City Council Referral to Develop a Comprehensive Plan for Funding the Undergrounding of Utility Wires on All Major and Collector Streets in Berkeley (Continued from July 14, 2015)</td>
<td>Postpone implementation of a Utility Undergrounding Work Plan and direct the City Manager to return to Council in Fall 2015 with a report detailing the budget and staffing required to implement a Utility Undergrounding Work Plan and Special Commission. The report would also identify</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>CA; FIRE; PW</td>
<td>Preliminary undergrounding study almost complete. Public Works Commission item to the City Council in Fall 2016.</td>
<td>Started</td>
<td>Transportation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>City Manager Referral: Implementing BigBelly Solar Compactor Bins</td>
<td>Refer to the City Manager to examine the feasibility of procuring BigBelly Solar Compactor Bins to save money, meet zero waste goals, and reduce Berkeley’s greenhouse gas emissions.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>IT; PLNG; PRW; PW</td>
<td>Big Belly business model only offers lease; pilot to install 10 units on Telegraph; Contract pending; tentative</td>
<td>Started</td>
<td>reallocated to Dionne Early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9. Portable Sign Pilot Program</td>
<td>Refer to the City Manager, the Commission on Disability, and the Transportation Commission for consideration the expansion of the existing portable sign program that enables businesses to place portable signs on sidewalks and medians.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>CA; PLNG; PRW; PW</td>
<td>Transportation Commission report recommends standards for placement of portable sign pilot; staff report is on hold, but will</td>
<td>Started</td>
<td>Farid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Restrict Parking in the Hills Hazardous Fire Area (Continued from January 12, 2016)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>BPD; CA; FIRE; PW</td>
<td>Public meetings; DFSC taking the lead; PW on hold pending DFSC action</td>
<td>Started</td>
<td>Hamid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Initial Rank</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Primary Department</td>
<td>Secondary Departments</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Transportation Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31. City Manager Referral: Refer CPTED Streetscape for Action and Exploration of Grant or Other Funding Opportunities to Find the Funds to Construct the Proposed Improvements</td>
<td>Refer the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) streetscape to the City Manager for action and exploration of grant or other funding opportunities to find the funds to construct the proposed improvements.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>BPD; PLNG; PRW</td>
<td>On hold per April 7, 2015 Council report (absorbed into Telegraph Public Realm?)</td>
<td>Started</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48. City Manager Referral: Preparations to Apply for Telegraph Pedestrian Safety Funds (Continued from December 3, 2013)</td>
<td>Refer to the City Manager to apply for Telegraph Ave pedestrian safety funds and to produce a preliminary plan for Telegraph pedestrian safety improvements as requested by the Telegraph Merchants Association.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>BPD; OED</td>
<td>Will be implemented as part of residential shared parking pilot grant due to begin FY17</td>
<td>Started</td>
<td>Beth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Request that the City Manager work with Caltrans to upgrade the intersection at San Pablo and Cedar</td>
<td>Request the City Manager analyze the subject intersection and work with Caltrans to make improvements to prevent long back-ups at the intersection of San Pablo and Cedar, particularly focused on the need to create a left-turn lane onto San Pablo heading north.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td></td>
<td>Signal upgraded by Caltrans January 2014; turn lane would have eliminated 1 block of parking; City will need to fund the upgrade</td>
<td>On hold</td>
<td>Hamid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>City Manager Referral: Plan for Lighting and Signage at the Ohlone Greenway at Cedar, Rose, and Hopkins</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>PLNG; PRW; OESD</td>
<td>Referred to Bike Plan Update. To Council December 2016</td>
<td>Started</td>
<td>Beth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Expansion of Residential Preferential Parking Citywide, Adjacent to Commercial Areas</td>
<td>The City Manager should examine the costs and time associated with yellow-zone conversion and present to the City Council a cost and implementation plan including recommended hours for restricted commercial loading.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>CA; PLNG</td>
<td>Council report drafted; Worksession 5/31/16; Report in Q3 FY17</td>
<td>Started</td>
<td>Gordon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9. Conversion of Loading Zones on Telegraph Avenue between Bancroft Avenue and Dwight Way into Regular Metered Parking with Morning Commercial-Loading Hours</td>
<td>The City Manager should examine the costs and time associated with yellow-zone conversion and present to the City Council a cost and implementation plan including recommended hours for restricted commercial loading.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>OED</td>
<td>On hold per April 7, 2015 Council report</td>
<td>Started</td>
<td>Hamid, Beth, Danette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>City Manager Referral on &quot;Digital Divide&quot; in Ultrafast Fiber Optic Internet Technology</td>
<td>Refer to the City Manager to address the growing &quot;Digital Divide&quot; through making ultrafast fiber technology available to middle class and low income residents.</td>
<td>Office of Economic Development</td>
<td>IT; PW</td>
<td>Master Plan; RFP; Multi-Year expensive project; Info Report by March 2017</td>
<td>Started</td>
<td>Hamid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Westbrae Traffic Plan</td>
<td>Refer to the Transportation Commission and City Manager the development of a traffic management plan for the Westbrae Area.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td></td>
<td>On hold pending clarification of scope and detailed objectives</td>
<td>On hold</td>
<td>Hamid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Establish Pedicab Policy and Regulations</td>
<td>Refer to the City Manager and Transportation Commission the creation of an ordinance that would establish regulations for pedicab operators.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Report removed from 12/15/15 Council agenda per City Manager</td>
<td>On hold</td>
<td>Beth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Jun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09761086</td>
<td>Transport AGH/E-GAV PUBL STP IMPROV</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11710089</td>
<td>Transport BRTF - PARKING MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11710098</td>
<td>Transport BTAP - Transportation Demand Mgmt (TDMM)</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11715010</td>
<td>Transport ASHBURY CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12715010</td>
<td>Transport ROADWAY THOMPSON MARKINGS</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13220000</td>
<td>Transport COOP PIA PROJECT</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13420000</td>
<td>Transport CENTER ST GARAGE RECONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13420010</td>
<td>Transport SHATTOCK RECONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13520000</td>
<td>Transport GO BERKELEY IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13520010</td>
<td>Transport TRANSPORT PLANNING DECS</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13710000</td>
<td>Transport CIVIL ENGINEER SERVICES &amp; CSET</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13710010</td>
<td>Transport VRA STREETS</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13710020</td>
<td>Transport TRANSFORMER PLANS</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13710030</td>
<td>Transport DOWNTOWN HANDYS AREA</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13710050</td>
<td>Transport AREA WIDE AIR QUALITY</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13716000</td>
<td>Transport WEST SIDE PROJECT</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13718000</td>
<td>Transport CALIF BEAR CRAWFORD</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13718010</td>
<td>Transport THERIO TRAFFIC IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13720000</td>
<td>Transport MOPPAN ROADWAY QMTS</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13720010</td>
<td>Transport CENTER ST PARKS</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13722000</td>
<td>Transport PAVEMENT PARKING METER &amp; REVERSERS</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13723000</td>
<td>Transport PARKING ACCESS &amp; REVENUE</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13724000</td>
<td>Transport GO BERKELEY GEP - RESIDENTIAL PARKING</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Project status and due dates are subject to change.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AS OF DATE</th>
<th>PROJECT CODE</th>
<th>DIVISION</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>PROJECT MANAGER</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Invest. Object</th>
<th>ASSOCIATED GRANT(S)</th>
<th>CONTRACT(s)</th>
<th>ASSOCIATED PC#(s)</th>
<th>FUND NO.(s)</th>
<th>FUND BUDGET</th>
<th>PROJECT TO DATE (FDP)</th>
<th>FUND PRIOR YEARS EXPENSES</th>
<th>TOTAL EXPENSES</th>
<th>START PROJECT</th>
<th>START DESIGN</th>
<th>EST. END OF CONSTRUCTION</th>
<th>EST. END OF CONTRACTION</th>
<th>PROJECT CLOSUR</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS / NEXT STEPS</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/05/2023</td>
<td>2023-01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Transpartition</td>
<td>Aviva Battin</td>
<td>New Technology To be Developed in the Next 12 Months.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/05/2023</td>
<td>2023-02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Transpartition</td>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td>New Technology To be Developed in the Next 12 Months.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/05/2023</td>
<td>2023-03</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Transpartition</td>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
<td>New Technology To be Developed in the Next 12 Months.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/05/2023</td>
<td>2023-04</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>Transpartition</td>
<td>Michael Brown</td>
<td>New Technology To be Developed in the Next 12 Months.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/05/2023</td>
<td>2023-05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>Transpartition</td>
<td>Emily White</td>
<td>New Technology To be Developed in the Next 12 Months.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Invest. Object: A three-letter code indicating the type of investment.
- ASSOCIATED GRANT(S): Details of any grants associated with the project.
- CONTRACT(s): Details of any contracts associated with the project.
- ASSOCIATED PC#(s): Details of any permanent control numbers associated with the project.
- FUND NO.(s): Details of any funding numbers associated with the project.
- FUND BUDGET: Details of the budget allocated for the project.
- PROJECT TO DATE: Details of the project's progress to date.
- FUND PRIOR YEARS EXPENSES: Details of prior year expenses.
- TOTAL EXPENSES: Details of total expenses incurred.
- START PROJECT: Details of the start date for the project.
- START DESIGN: Details of the start date for the design.
- EST. END OF CONSTRUCTION: Details of the estimated end date for construction.
- EST. END OF CONTRACTION: Details of the estimated end date for the contract.
- PROJECT CLOSUR: Details of the project's closure.
- CURRENT STATUS / NEXT STEPS: Details of the current status and next steps.
- Comments: Any additional notes or comments relevant to the project.
City of Berkeley Applications for Funding from Alameda County Transportation Commission  
2018-22 Comprehensive Investment Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Amount Requested Escalated $</th>
<th>Unescalated 2017 $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9th Street Bicycle Boulevard Pathway Extension Phase II</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$699,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Railroad Crossing Safety Improvement Project</td>
<td>$13,153,000</td>
<td>$11,189,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Southside Complete Streets</td>
<td>$50,972,000</td>
<td>$44,524,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Citywide Bikeway Intersections Project</td>
<td>$7,563,000</td>
<td>$6,706,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Downtown Berkeley Multimodal Area Improvement Program</td>
<td>$74,452,000</td>
<td>$64,291,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Multimodal Corridor Signal Interconnect &amp; Transit Signal Priority</td>
<td>$8,613,000</td>
<td>$7,665,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Citywide High Priority Pedestrian Plan Projects</td>
<td>$8,882,000</td>
<td>$7,729,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Milvia Bikeway Project</td>
<td>$8,237,000</td>
<td>$7,275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Gilman Street Multimodal Railroad Grade Separation Project</td>
<td>$34,175,000</td>
<td>$29,781,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>West Berkeley Areawide Pedestrian &amp; Bicycle Improvements</td>
<td>$28,785,000</td>
<td>$24,894,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Downtown Berkeley Transit Center &amp; Streetscape Improvements</td>
<td>$6,566,000</td>
<td>$5,850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ohlone Greenway Rehabilitation Project</td>
<td>$3,159,000</td>
<td>$2,640,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>West Berkeley Area Improvement Program</td>
<td>$228,000</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Citywide Bicycle Parking Program</td>
<td>$845,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$246,380,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$214,188,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council Authority (July 2016): up to $222 million in applications in 2017 (unescalated) dollars