NOTICE OF MEETING AND AGENDA
BART Bicycle Advisory Task Force (BBATF)

December 5, 2022
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

BBATF Members: Jon Spangler (Chairperson), Rick Goldman (Vice Chairperson), Jianhan Wang, Jeremiah Maller, Phoenix Mangrum, Bill Pinkham, Francisco Muñoz, Tyer Morris.

Chairperson Jon Spangler has called a meeting of the BART Bicycle Advisory Task Force on December 5, 2022, at 6:00 p.m.

Please note, pursuant to all necessary findings having been made by the Board of Directors of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (for itself as well as all subordinate legislative bodies) to continue remote public meetings in the manner contemplated under urgency legislation Assembly Bill No. 361, public participation for this meeting will be via teleconference only.

Presentation materials will be available via Legistar at https://bart.legistar.com

You may join the Committee Meeting via Zoom by calling (833) 548 0282 and entering 816 6628 7147 or typing this Zoom link into your web browser:

https://us06web.zoom.us/j/81666287147

If you wish to make a public comment:

1) Submit written comments via email to hmaddox@bart.gov using “public comment” as the subject line. Your comment will be provided to the Task Force and will become a permanent part of the file. Please submit your comments as far in advance as possible. Emailed comments must be received before noon on December 2, 2022 in order to be included in the record.

2) Call (833) 548 0282 enter 816 6628 7147, dial *9 to raise your hand when you wish to speak, and dial *6 to unmute when you are requested to speak or join the Committee Meeting via the Zoom link (https://us06web.zoom.us/j/81666287147) and use the “raise hand” feature.

Public comment is limited to two (2) minutes per person.

BART provides service/accommodations upon request to persons with disabilities and individuals who are limited English proficient who wish to address Committee matters. A request must be made between one and five days in advance of Board/Committee meetings, depending on the service requested. Please contact the Office of the District Secretary at (510) 464-6083 for information.
AGENDA

1. Self-introductions of members, staff, and guests: All. (For Information) 5 min.
2. General discussion and public comment: Jon Spangler. (For Information) 5 min.
3. Approval of May, June, August & October 2022 BBATF minutes: Jon Spangler. (For Action) 5 min.
4. BBATF bylaws revision: Jon Spangler. (For Action) 10 min.
5. Clement/Tilden Way Extension Project: Gail Payne, City of Alameda. (For Information) 25 min.
7. San Francisco Active Communities Plan: Christopher Kidd, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency. (For Information) 20 min.
8. Executive Committee for Off Agenda Letters: Tyler Morris. (For Action) 15 min.
9. BART Bike Program Updates: Heath Maddox. (For Information) 5 min.
10. Future Agenda Items: All. (For Discussion) 5 min.
Chairperson Jon Spangler called the special meeting to order at 6:10PM via ZOOM (https://us06web.zoom.us/j/880 358 02213).

Attendees

BBATF: Jon Spangler (Chairperson, Alameda), Rick Goldman (Vice-chair, At Large), Jianhan Wang (Alameda), Jeremiah Maller (at-large), Phoenix Mangrum (Alameda).

BART Staff: Heath Maddox, Norman Wong (Office of the District Architect), Siew Chin Yeong (BART Design & Construction)

BART Board of Directors: Robert Raburn

GUESTS: Francisco Muñoz (prospective member, San Mateo County), Jackie Phillips

First-time guest and prospective member Francisco Muñoz of Redwood City introduced himself and indicated his interest in joining the BBATF.

Chair Jon Spangler agreed to take minutes in lieu of a Secretary not having been elected.

ITEM 3: BART Facility Standards (BFS) Overview

Norman Wong, Principal Engineer with the BART Office of the District Architect, (ODA), offered the BBATF’s first detailed presentation on BART’s Facility Standards (BFS). The ODA has just completed its annual partial revision of the BFS, which it does incrementally each year.

New elevator and station specifications were part of this year’s update. (The new elevator standard calls for all BART elevators to be able to fit a loaded gurney and be at least 87 inches in length, which is much longer than many existing ones at BART’s older core stations such as Fruitvale and Embarcadero.)

The BFS manual includes specifications for all of BART facilities, including train and station design - everything from fare gates, construction standards, materials and finishes, platform size, and vertical access to mechanical and plumbing systems. (See the agenda attachments for more on the BFS’ scope.)
Many design details in the BFS are kept confidential to protect the security of BART patrons, power supplies, computer systems, and stations: it is not considered a public document, although portions are available for review.

As this was the first detailed presentation to the BBATF on the BFS, which guides many BART decisions, a lively discussion ensued. It was suggested that the BBATF receive an annual update from BART’s ODA at the beginning of its annual BFS update process in order for the BBATF to offer its input on the BFS.

ITEM 4: Introduction to Transbay Corridor Core Capacity Program (TCCCP)

Siew Chin Yeong from BART Design & Construction presented the BBATF with an overview of BART’s TCCCP.

The Transbay Corridor Core Capacity Program is a package of strategic investments to increase BART’s capacity from 24 trains/hour through the Transbay Tube to 30 ten-car trains per hour (300 cars) in each direction through the existing tube, the most heavily used part of its system. Despite the pandemic, long-term ridership trends at BART require additional capacity. As the system expands and as the core continues to attract development, further increases in ridership are expected. She described the four elements of the TCCCP:

1) Procuring 306 additional railcars to provide the additional trains needed,
2) Developing a new communications-based train control system that will allow closer headways (shorter wait times between trains) to replace BART’s outdated and overtaxed 1970s system.
3) Adding a new railcar storage yard at the Hayward Maintenance Complex (Phase 2), and
4) Installing additional traction power substations to provide the additional power needed for more frequent service.

Preliminary research is also underway into building a second Transbay Tube that might also serve California’s high-speed rail system or other transit but that is not a major part of the TCCCP now.

More details on the TCCCP are on BART’s website: https://www.bart.gov/about/projects/corecapacity
ITEM 6: BART Bike Program Updates

Heath Maddox presented the latest occupancy data at BART’s secure bike parking facilities through March 2022. Occupancy of BART’s eLockers and bike stations mirrors that of BART ridership. Elocker data as reported was misleading since there is a 6-month data collection lag for the lockers.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

The BBATF’s next meeting is its regular meeting on June 6, 2022, 6:00 - 8:00 pm., via ZOOM.
BART Bicycle Advisory Task Force (BBATF)

Meeting Minutes: June 7, 2022

Task Force Members Present: Jon Spangler (Chair), Rick Goldman (Vice-chair), Tyler Morris, Jeremiah Miller, Phoenix Mangrum, Jianhan Wang, Bill Pinkham, Francisco Muñoz

Absent: None
BART Staff: Heath Maddox, David Silva, Paul Med, Sadie Graham
BART Director: Robert Raburn
Public attendees: Patricia S (Oakland BPAC)

1: Self introductions:
Proposal: Recording Meetings
Jianhan volunteered for rough June minutes.

2: General discussion / public comment:
1. Robert Raburn: Announcement - smartphone app for eLockers and eLockTechnologies; contract approved May 12th to retrofit lockers to use mobile app for access along with bluetooth technology. Encourage everyone to keep it brief as the agenda is jam packed for 2 hours.
2. Phoenix - visited Warm Springs last month; been selling it as a tourist destination. Was concerned about the elevator size. There were 2 cargo bikes along with some people. They met standards - moved fast, too.
   1. Out in the back, there is a cycletrack, car lanes, and sidewalks for pedestrians.
   2. The bridge is wide and comfy.
   3. Hope to not have too many stairs as it is a lot to carry up and down.
   4. Learned that the BART station won a national award.
3. Jon Spangler: Tilden upgrade bridge across the estuary. Unfortunately, it is far off.

3: Approval of April minutes:
Tyler and Jon proposed amend the minutes to include names of those in attendance. Phoenix moved. Jianhan seconded. With the amendments, all present voted yes.

4: Warm Springs/South Fremont BART Station West Access Bridge & Plaza Project: David Silva, BART Presentation:
Truss bridge across to the west side of the station for increased accessibility.
City of Fremont Project - led construction - ultimate owner & maintainer of plaza. BART provided oversight.

Bike features:
   Bike channels on both sides
   New elevator: 8’ 5” x 5’ 0” with passthrough configuration - enter on one side and exit out the other.

Will be open for service again in early February.

Q&A:
Bill: How much did it cost?
- David: Roughly $24 million including change orders.

Jon: Are the stair channels on the west side of the bridge as the eastern side that we did not like?
- David: They are very similar - 4.5" wide. Same as the new standards that were created.
- Jon: We didn't like them and we got them fixed. The best stair channels are still at 16th and Mission.

5: Irvington Bike Station: David Silva, BART.
Presentation:
Started with a refresher on context on the station.
Close to Washington Ave and Osgood Road.

Intended to connect with East Bay Greenway - extend the existing East Bay Greenway South, crossing the bridge on the south side and onto Osgood Road to the extent adjacent to the station.

Gallegos Winery Site - collapsed during a prior earthquake. Planned to be turned over to the City of Fremont and renovated to become a park space.

Showed two video simulations
2 elevators on the east side.
One bike station on the east side.

2 elevators down to the platform on each side.
No escalators as...
- The height difference from concourse level and the platform level is not as much as some other stations.
- Escalators are very expensive to acquire and maintain. They break a lot.
- BATF feedback: redundant elevators are way more important than escalators.

No cabled bridge design.

Went over bike improvements nearby outside the project scope by the City of Fremont

East Bay Greenway:
The Bikeway will be constructed out of asphalt. Want to indicate sidewalks are for pedestrians.

Q&A:

Jon: How wide are the stairs?
- David: enough for one bike. Don't recall if it was ~6-7 ft.
- If you can look at widening the stairs - 9-10 ft. 6-7 ft is one person traveling in each direction.
- David: Unfortunately, it is not possible to widen the stairs connected to the platforms.

Francisco Munoz: Bike parking utilization expectation?
- 37,000 passengers; ~15% expected to be arriving by bicycling by 2040
- Follow up question:Was valet parking considered?
  - Not something that has been discussed.
6: Link 21: Sadie Graham, BART
Director for the Link21 program - led by BART and Capitol Corridor with oversight by the State Northern California Megaregion. Disconnected train/transit system - not competitive with cars. Increased trips between the 9 Bay Area counties and the counties nearby. Aim to transform the various rail networks to be more connected for easier, more convenient, and increase ridership.

Contact information:
sgraham@bart.gov
Link21Program.org

Questions and Answers:
Bill: Will we be able to use all these forms of transportation using our Clipper card?
Sadie: Hopefully! Ideally before these all come on board. MTC is planning something. Don't know whether it will be Clipper or another card system.

Jon: Are you envisioning BBATF and BATF to advise Link21 from the beginning rather than during the process. How should we advise you about bikes? Or should there be a new advisory task force
Sadie: Have a lot of faith in BART with the BFS being continually updated. The input taken here will affect the BFS and that will impact how designs and construction goes down the line. Will engage with community members. Will be a few years before we get to station design - integrate

Tyler Morris: What in the end is the actual user-end result of integrating all of the broader regional transit systems and the impact of the systems that don't like to share budgets and funds and railway.
Sadie: New right of way between San Francisco and Oakland. The state is involved and gives funds through Capitol Corridor. The state rail plan is being updated.

Francisco Munoz: If I remember correctly, this will be the greatest greenhouse gas reducer with transit. What factors and scenarios were evaluated
Sadie: MTC did the model and methodology that I do not know the details of. Crossings 4:1 the traffic of other corridors.

Jon Spangler: Reading between the lines as everything is conceptual. Am I correct in assuming that the 2nd transbay tube will include something in addition to BART?
Sadie: They will likely not be all in the same tube. Their customer base can be different in different markets. Color of money is important during rail crossings. Want to make sure everyone is treated fairly. Long way of getting to yes.

Sadie: would love for you to sign up for updates on the project site to be notified of updates and when to be updated.

7: BART Bicycle Advisory Committee Application—Francisco Munoz: Heath Maddox, BART.
Grew up in Southern California. Never owned a bike as Los Angeles is very car-centric. Seeing the Bay Area and how much less car dependent it is with bicycles and transit being accessible.
Jon moved; Tyler seconded
Yes's: Jianhan, Jon, Phoenix, Bill, Tyler
No's: -
Abstains: -

8: BART to Silicon Valley II: Jon Spangler
Wanted to bring up VTA.
Tyler: It seems like they want to build the station they want to build within the BART guidelines. Wary of the changes we can swing.

Jon: Wanted to bring up to VTA other possibilities. Twin bore and allow access on both sides of the street. We might not have weight as an individual group. A lot of transit advocates are concerned about the single bore process. What important issues do we see? What are we going to do about it?

Phoenix: We should have a presence there to be informed of the process. I don't mind.

Jon: Context: vertical layout is not preferred.
Preserves downtown activity during construction a bit better.
Shared the pros and cons of single bore vs twin bore. Differences in construction speed, affecting local, ADA access.
Find members who will engage closer with other influencers and stakeholders. Invite VTA back.

Francisco: Would like to know more about the impact of construction on the local residents. BATF involvement progress?
Jon: Their concerns are very similar to ours. Will draft a letter at night.

9: BART Elevators Upgrade & Replacement: Jon Spangler.
Jon shared that there were changes to fix typos and make the letter more concise.
Tyler motions to approve the letter with amendments.
Yes's: Jianhan, Jon, Bill, Phoenix, Tyler, Francisco
No's: -
Abstains: -

Jon volunteered to present the letter at the next board meeting - Thursday 9 am.

10: BBATF Member Local Updates: All
Updates by Heath:
● Change order contract with eLockTechnologies. Their app is fully functional - used the app to open at Ashby. None of the lockers can be read yet. Will be turning on access for all lockers all at once. Should go quick - by late summer and early fall to come online. Will be able to use the mobile app; upgrade the Ashby kiosk. Paid for by Measure RR funds.
● 19th Street Bike Station: Lease and Cooperative Agreement with City of Oakland have been updated for the current location for three more years, through June 2025. The Berkeley Bike Station will be open in July. New operator; considering some new ones.
● Ashby & Millbrae keyed lockers: 24 decrepit keyed lockers at Ashby were recycled. All but three were unrented. Six keyed lockers at Millbrae were recently replaced with BikeLink lockers, so the Millbrae
keyed lockers were moved to Ashby. BART has around 400 aging keyed lockers and over 1,800 eLockers. Keyed lockers are being phased out but are being left in place as long as they are functional and demand remains. ...

- Ashby Bicycle Boulevard Connector - drawings to be seen in August.
- From bike locker data: ridership seems to be rebounding more quickly than eLocker usage. Possible reasons for this are Remote and hybrid work models and it may be easier to bring bikes on trains with depressed ridership.

11: Recording BBATF Meetings: Jon Spangler
   Secretary election scheduled for the next meeting.
   Predict no further special meetings unless we take a field trip.

Adjournment. Next Scheduled Meeting August 1, 2022
BART Bicycle Advisory Task Force (BBATF)
Meeting Minutes: August 1, 2022

Task Force Members Present: Jon Spangler (Chair), Rick Goldman (Vice-chair), Tyler Morris, Jeremiah Miller, Phoenix Mangrum, Jianhan Wang, Bill Pinkham, Francisco Muñoz

Absent: None

Item 1 Introductions

Item 2 General Discussion and Public Comments
   a. Tyler raised an issue with low visibility on the stairs at the Embarcadero Station due to scaffolding and other equipment related to elevator renovation. Heath to forward to customer service.
   b. Jon Spangler reported from last SFBAC meeting with an update about new turnstiles/elevators in SF stations.

Item 3 Election of BBATF Secretary – no volunteers, so deferred. Rick agreed to take minutes for this meeting.

Item 4 BBATF Member Application for Tyler Morris was motioned, seconded, and approved (possibly for a 2nd time).

Item 5 Draft minutes of the May and June meetings had not been shared. Approval deferred until October 2022 meeting.

Item 6 Dublin-Pleasanton Iron Horse Trail Improvement: Mariana Parreiras, BART staff.
   A. Iron Horse Trail – 30+ mile trail in the East Bay. BART focus is on a small segment north and south of the BART station and 580.
   B. Goal is to close a gap in the Iron Horse Trail with separated cycle track, pedestrian paths, improved lighting, and secure bike parking.
   C. Estimated cost: $15 million – so far have $7.5 million from Measure RR, and applied for grants for the remaining, including to cover increased costs.
   D. 95% of Design done – if get funding, construction would start Fall of 2023 and take about one year to complete.
   E. City of Dublin has already started construction on a bike/ped bridge over Dublin Boulevard (closes another gap in the Iron Horse Trail).

Item 7 Ashby Bicycle Boulevard Connector: Mariana Parreiras, BART staff.
   A. Improve access/safety to/from the Ashby BART station.
   B. Cycle tracks in station parking lot to improve access to BART, reduce conflicts with cars, and provide connectivity across BART property.
   C. 95% Design, Estimated Cost: $947,000; $600,000 from Measure RR, and rest form other Grants.
D. Working on Flea Market Relocation Study – no construction until an alternative site for the Flea Market is found.

Item 8 El Cerrito Del Norte TOD Complete Street Project: Jason Chen/Robert Stevens, Anchor Consulting.
   A. Complete Street Improvement Project, focusing on San Pablo Ave a little north and south of the Del Norte BART station
   B. Del Norte station is a big transportation hub – need to accommodate lots of buses into and out of the station – try to minimize conflict with pedestrians and bicyclists.
   C. San Pablo Ave. is a state route, so some additional requirements from CalTrans
   D. New Bike Lanes to station, including a shared bus/bike lane.
   E. Project includes some E-W improvements on streets that cross San Pablo (big changes at Cutting/San Pablo).
   F. Cost Estimate: $12 million. Close to being fully funded. If funded, construction to begin in Spring of 2023.

Item 9 BART Bike Program Updates: Heath Maddox
   A. BART ridership slowly going up, but Bike locker usage staying flat.

Item 10 BBATF Meeting Format Changes: Heath Maddox
   A. BART is moving all BART meetings to Zoom Webinar. Provides more tools for hosting meetings
   B. We still want all participants to be visible on Zoom and keep the meetings as open as possible.

Adjournment. Next Scheduled Meeting October 3, 2022
ARTICLE I – NAME OF TASK FORCE
The name of this task force shall be the BART Bicycle Advisory Task Force (BBATF).

ARTICLE II – MISSION STATEMENT AND ROLE
A. The mission of the BBATF is to advise the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) staff and the BART Board of Directors on ways to maintain and improve the convenience, accessibility, safety, and security of the BART system for all bicyclists and their bicycles.

B. The BBATF shall serve as BART’s Bicycle Advisory Committee, satisfying the requirements of MTC Resolution 875 (Revised) and MTC Resolution 2178 (Revised), which establish funding criteria required by applicable state and federal laws.

ARTICLE III – RESPONSIBILITIES
A. Review and advise on priorities for BART projects that affect bicyclists using the BART system.

B. Evaluate and advise on the impact of BART plans, policies, procedures, programs, maintenance activities, and facilities on bicyclists who use BART and recommend improvements to bicyclists’ ability to access and utilize BART stations and trains.

C. Provide a public forum for and encourage public participation in the discussion and resolution of all BART-related bicycle safety, security, and access issues.

D. Consider and support the access needs of all bicyclists who use BART, including commuting, transportation, recreational, racing, and utilitarian bicyclists.

E. Collaborate with other citizen’s advisory committees as appropriate, e.g., the BART Accessibility Task Force (BATF), in order to consider the needs and safety concerns of other passengers such as wheelchair users and those with mobility impairments who may interact with cyclists or use facilities with bicyclists on BART trains and around BART stations.
ARTICLE IV – MEMBERSHIP

A. COMPOSITION

1. Members of the BBATF shall be unpaid volunteers.
2. The BBATF shall have up to fifteen (15) county-specific members and up to three (3) At-large members, for a total of up to eighteen (18) members.
3. Three (3) county-specific members shall represent each of the five (5) counties served by BART: Alameda, Contra Costa, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and San Francisco. (See Article IV.B.1-7.)
4. BBATF members representing specific BART counties shall live or work in the county they represent during their term(s).
5. If one or more positions representing a county served by BART remains unfilled after every reasonable recruiting effort has been made for at least six (6) months, At-large members from another BART county may be appointed to reach a total of fifteen (15) members. (See Article IV.A.6-10 and IV.C.11-13.)
6. No more than three (3) At-large members may serve at any one time and no more than two (2) At-large members may reside or work in any single BART county.
7. The number of At-large members on the BBATF shall not limit each county’s ability to have three (3) county-specific representatives on the BBATF.
8. If the three (3) At-large positions have been filled and all of the county-specific positions are subsequently filled by nominees who live or work in those counties, the BBATF may temporarily have up to 18 members until the expiration of the At-large members’ original terms. (See Article IV.B.4-7.)
9. At-large BBATF members shall live or work within one (1) of the counties served by BART.
10. If a serving BBATF member representing a particular county moves and is no longer living or working in that county, they may become an At-large member as long as they still live or work within the five (5)-county service area.
11. If a serving BBATF member representing one county moves to or begins work in a different BART county with a county-specific vacancy, they may represent their new county of work or residence, pending the approval of both the new county’s nominating agency and the BBATF.
12. If a serving BBATF member representing a county moves to or begins work in a
different BART county without a county-specific vacancy, they may become an At-
large member as long as they meet the other requirements of Articles IV.A and IV.B
of these bylaws, pending the approval of both the new county’s nominating agency
and the BBATF.

40.13. Currently-serving BBATF members who move between counties and/or shift
between county-specific and At-large status shall retain their BBATF membership
and voting rights, pending the approval of the member’s status change(s) by both the
new county’s nominating agency and the BBATF.

41.14. If a serving At-large BBATF member moves to or begins working in a county with
a county-specific vacancy, they may relinquish their At-large membership and
represent that county, pending the approval of that county’s nominating agency and
the BBATF.

42.15. The BBATF shall not discriminate based on race, color, national origin, sex,
religion, sexual orientation, disability, or age in its membership.

B. TERM OF OFFICE

1. BBATF members shall serve three (3) year terms beginning on January 1.

2. The three (3) members representing each county shall rotate the beginning of their
terms to avoid all three (3) terms ending at the same time in a manner to be
determined by a vote of the BBATF.

3. At-large members shall rotate the beginning of their terms to avoid their terms ending
at the same time in a manner to be determined by a vote of the BBATF.

4. In the event that additional nominees are appointed to fill all 15 seats from the five
current BART counties according to Article IV.A.2, any currently-serving At-large
members may complete their terms as members 16, 17, and/or 18 of the BBATF.
(See Article IV.C.11-13.)

5. There is no limit on the number of terms a BBATF member may serve.

6. If a member resigns, is removed from office, or is unable to complete their term, a
new member shall be sought to complete the remainder of that term.

7. If a member who represents a particular county moves or changes their work location between BART service area counties during their term, they may complete
their original term pending the assent of the BBATF and the nominating agency in
the member’s new county. (See Article IV.C.)
8. If a BBATF member changes their status during their term (from representing a BART county to At-large or vice-versa) their original term of office shall apply.

9. If, after the three (3) At-large positions have been filled, the county-specific positions are all subsequently filled by nominees who live or work in those counties, the At-large members of the BBATF may complete their original terms of office as members in good standing. (See Article IV.A.7.)

C. MEMBER NOMINATION AND SELECTION PROCESS

1. The BBATF shall inform the nominating agencies in each county when vacancies occur or when a member moves to a different county or changes their membership status as described in Article IV.A and IV.B. The nominating agencies shall be defined as a county’s Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) and a county’s bicycle advocacy organization.

2. In the event of an At-large position vacancy, the BBATF shall inform the nominating agencies in every BART county. Nominations for At-large positions may be submitted by the nominating agency(ies) in any BART county. (See Article IV: A.5-8, B.4-9, and C.11-13.)

3. Nominees must have attended one (1) BBATF meeting prior to their nomination. Failure to meet this criterion will render the nomination void, and the nominating agency must nominate another member.

4. Prospective BBATF members must apply to the appropriate nominating agency for the position they seek (representing a BART county or At-large).

5. Current BBATF members who wish to serve a subsequent term must reapply to their county’s BAC or bicycle advocacy organization.

6. Vacancies occurring in BBATF seats representing a particular county shall be filled, on an alternating basis, by nominations from the county’s bicycle advocacy organization or by the county’s Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC).

7. If a county has multiple bicycle advocacy organizations resulting in more than the required number of nominations for that county, then the BBATF shall select by majority vote the bicycle advocacy organization(s) that shall serve as that county’s nominating agency.

8. If a county does not have a BAC or the BAC chooses not to make nominations, the bicycle advocacy organization may nominate all members for that county.
9. If a county does not have a bicycle advocacy organization or the bicycle advocacy organization chooses not to make nominations, its BAC may nominate all members for that county.

10. The BBATF will ratify BBATF member nominees selected by the appropriate agency or agencies from each county served by BART.

11. Whenever possible, vacancies on the BBATF shall be filled first by someone from a BART county that is under-represented on the BBATF. Nominees for At-large BBATF positions may only be accepted after every reasonable effort has been made for six (6) months to recruit members to fill vacancies in under-represented counties served by BART.

12. If there are no nominees available from any county that is currently under-represented on the BBATF and vacancies exist for that county, a nominee from a fully-represented county may be accepted as an At-large member, so long as no county has more than two At-large representatives in addition to its three (3) county representatives.

13. At-large nominations and appointments to fill out the BBATF’s membership shall be made in the same manner as any other nomination. The nominees for At-large positions shall meet the same prerequisites as other BBATF nominees.

D. RESIGNATION

1. Members of the BBATF may resign by notifying the BBATF Chair or BART staff liaison, who will then inform the BBATF and the nominating agency that nominated the member.

2. If a member misses three or more consecutive meetings without officially notifying the BBATF Chair by email or letter regarding both a) the reason(s) for those absences, and b) addressing the member’s intent to continue on the BBATF, the member shall be considered to have resigned.

E. TERMINATION OF MEMBERSHIP

1. A member’s appointment to the BBATF may be terminated upon a determination by the BBATF that:
   a. A member has missed a majority of meetings in a calendar year,
   b. A member materially misrepresents themselves, or
   c. A member has engaged in a consistent pattern of disruptive behavior in BBATF
or other BART-related meetings.

2. A member may be removed only by a two-thirds majority vote of the remaining members of the BBATF at a duly noticed meeting. The individual member subject to removal shall be notified by BART staff both in advance of such a vote and following any action(s) taken regarding their membership status.

ARTICLE V – OFFICERS

A. CHAIR

1. The BBATF shall elect one member to serve as its Chair (“Chair”).

2. The Chair shall work with BART staff to develop an agenda for BBATF meetings.

3. The Chair shall lead meetings and keep order, appoint members to ad hoc committees, and represent the BBATF before the BART Board.

4. The Chair shall perform other duties necessary or customary to the office.

B. VICE-CHAIR

1. The BBATF shall elect one (1) member to serve as its Vice-chair (“Vice-chair”).

2. If the Chair is absent or unable to serve, the Vice-chair shall have all of the powers and perform all of the duties of the Chair.

C. SECRETARY

1. The BBATF shall elect a Secretary.

2. The Secretary shall record and provide draft meeting minutes or delegate the task to another member.

3. If the Secretary fails to delegate this task to another member prior to a meeting and is absent, a temporary Secretary may be selected from among the BBATF members present.

4. If both the Chair and the Vice-chair are absent or unable to serve, the Secretary shall have all of the powers and shall perform all of the duties of the Chair.

D. ELECTION OF OFFICERS, TERMS, AND VACANCIES

1. Officers shall be nominated and elected at the first meeting of each calendar year.

2. Officers shall be elected by a simple majority vote of current members of the BBATF.
3. The officers of the BBATF shall serve for one (1) year or until the next election is held.

4. If the BBATF fails to elect an officer, the current officer shall continue to serve until the BBATF elects a successor.

5. A vacancy in any office shall be filled at the next BBATF meeting by an election to fill the unexpired term.

6. If the Chair, Vice-chair, and Secretary are all absent from any meeting, the meeting shall be called to order by the staff liaison. Staff shall immediately call for the selection of a Temporary Presiding Officer.

7. There is no limit on the number of terms a BBATF officer may serve.

E. TERMINATION OF OFFICERS

1. Two-thirds of the current members may remove an officer from office by a motion at a regular meeting for which the proposed removal is an item on the agenda published before such meeting.

ARTICLE VI - STAFF SUPPORT

A. At least one (1) staff member shall be assigned to work with the BBATF as staff liaison.

B. The staff liaison shall collaborate with the Chair and other officers as needed to prepare, compile, and distribute agendas and related materials for BBATF meetings.

C. The staff liaison shall be responsible for posting BBATF agendas, minutes, and related materials on the BART website.

D. The staff liaison shall forward minutes of BBATF meetings to the BART Board.

ARTICLE VII – TRANSPARENCY IN BBATF MEETINGS AND DOCUMENTS

A. TRANSPARENCY

1. Meetings shall be conducted in accordance with BART transparency rules.

2. Agendas and minutes shall be made public in accordance with BART transparency rules.

B. MEETINGS
1. BBATF meetings shall be open to the public and held within the boundaries of the BART service area.

2. Meetings shall be held in a location accessible to people with disabilities that also has secure bicycle parking sufficient for both BBATF members and the public.

3. Members of the public have the right to directly address the BBATF during an agendized public comment period on issues that are not on the agenda. Members of the public also have the right to address any item on the agenda before or during BBATF consideration of the item. Comments from the public shall be subject to reasonable time limits, established at the discretion of the Chair at each meeting.

4. Regular BBATF meetings shall be held at least six (6) times per year.

5. To accommodate individual BBATF members and members of the public with and disability or impairment, BART staff shall provide minutes, correspondence, exhibits, and other graphic information in alternative accessible formats as well as sign language interpreters or captioning when requested.

6. Routine and one-time (non-routine) requests for disability or limited English proficiency accommodation must be made to BART staff liaison in a timely fashion and no later than five (5) business days in advance of BBATF regular meetings and one business day in advance of BBATF special meetings.

7. Virtual (electronically or digitally hosted or broadcast) meetings, if necessary, shall be conducted in accordance with all applicable state mandates and BART Board procedures.

C. SPECIAL MEETINGS

1. The BBATF Chair may call special meetings when the work of the BBATF requires it.

2. The BBATF Chair shall identify the purpose of the special meeting at the time it is called.

D. AGENDAS

1. At least seventy-two (72) hours prior to a regular BBATF meeting or twenty-four (24) hours prior to a special BBATF meeting, an agenda shall be posted on the BART website and in a public place in the same manner as the BART Board.
2. Agendas and related materials shall be emailed to BBATF members and to members of the public requesting said agendas at least seventy-two (72) hours prior to each regular meeting.

3. Staff reports shall be included with all public postings of BBATF agendas and be available in print and/or electronic versions to members of the public attending any BBATF regular meeting.

4. Only items on the posted agenda shall be discussed or acted upon at meetings by BBATF members, except BBATF members shall be allowed to briefly respond to non-agendized comments made by members of the public.

5. Meeting agendas for virtual meetings shall include all necessary information for anyone to view, attend, or participate in the meeting.

E. MINUTES

1. Draft minutes shall be distributed, together with the agenda, for review and approval by the members at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

2. Final (approved) minutes shall be posted on the BART website within one (1) week following approval by the BBATF.

F. RULES OF CONDUCT

1. All regular and special meetings of the BBATF shall be conducted in accordance with these bylaws.

2. Unless they are speaking in support of a recommendation or position that has been approved by a majority of the BBATF, members should make it clear in any public statements that they are speaking as individuals and not as representatives of the entire BBATF.

3. Members shall recuse themselves from any matter before the BBATF in which they have a financial interest.

ARTICLE VIII – VOTING PROCEDURES AND OFFICIAL DECISIONS OF THE BBATF

A. A simple majority of the appointed current members of the BBATF shall constitute a quorum.

B. A quorum shall be necessary to hold a vote or transact any other official BBATF
business.

C. Each member shall be entitled to one vote.

D. A simple majority vote of all current BBATF members is required to take official action, except as specified in Article IV.E.2, Article V.E, and Article X.A of these bylaws.

E. Proxy, telephonic, electronic, or absentee ballots shall not be permitted, except when necessary under Article VII.B.7.

F. The number of members present and a record of the vote on actions taken shall be included in the minutes and with all official BBATF recommendations to the Board or BART staff.

G. An officer or other designee of the BBATF may present decisions of the BBATF to the BART Board or to an appropriate committee, or officially represent the BBATF in person or in writing as needed.

ARTICLE IX - BBATF MEETING EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT

A. To defray public transit travel costs to BBATF meetings, BBATF members shall receive a travel stipend for each BBATF regular or special meeting attended.

ARTICLE X - APPROVAL AND AMENDMENT OF BYLAWS

A. These bylaws may be approved or amended at any properly noticed regular or special meeting of the BBATF following a three-fourths (3/4) vote of all current BBATF members.

B. Written notice of the proposed bylaw approval or amendment shall be placed on the agenda and copies of the proposed bylaws or amendment distributed at the meeting prior to the one at which action is to be taken.

C. The notice at both the prior meeting and the meeting at which the vote is scheduled shall include both the original text of the bylaws and the text of any proposed bylaw amendment(s).

D. Proposed BBATF bylaws and bylaw amendments shall be subject to review by the BART Office of the General Counsel.
Clement Avenue/Tilden Way Project

Monday, December 5, 2022
Agenda

1. Introduction & Background
2. Existing Conditions
3. Concept Development
4. Input
5. Next Steps
Introduction

Clement Avenue Extension Alternatives at Tilden Way

Project Team:
- City of Alameda
- Kittelson & Associates, Inc
- Stakeholder Participants: City, AC Transit, Alameda Housing Authority, BART, Bike Walk Alameda, County, Edison School, Members of the Public

Engagement and Outreach Update:
- Letter to adjacent properties
- Outreach via social media, emails and sandwich boards
- Website: www.alamedaca.gov/ClementTilden
Project Goals and Intended Outcomes

- Prioritize safety
- Improve mobility for all roadway users
- Provide flood reduction and landscaping opportunities
- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions
- Comply with City plans and policies
Background

- Measure BB grant for $10 million
- Union Pacific property acquisition
- Environmental clean-up
- Fill gap in active transportation and truck network
# Project Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early 2022</td>
<td>Brainstorming Initial Ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2022</td>
<td>Gather and compile stakeholder input</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Late 2022/Early 2023 | Existing Conditions Analysis  
Existing conditions and project outcomes  |
| 2023            | Project Development                                                       |
|                 | Identify and refine preferred alternative                                 |
| 2024            | Final Design                                                              |
|                 | Begin final design for preferred alternative                              |
|                 | Construction                                                             |
|                 | Begin construction of preferred alternative                              |

Project webpage: [www.alamedaca.gov/ClementTilden](http://www.alamedaca.gov/ClementTilden)
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Safety

Reported Injury Collisions 2011-2020

- High injury corridor and high crash intersection (21 reported injury crashes)
- Pedestrians and bicyclists account for 38% of total injury crashes but only 9% of study area trips
- Pearl Street access to Tilden is high conflict movement
Traffic Operations - Existing

- Adjusted 2022 traffic counts to approximate pre-COVID levels
- All study intersections operate at or below 75% of their capacity during the weekday AM and PM peak hour
Study Area AC Transit Bus Service
Truck Connections

Designated Truck Routes

- Alameda: Park St. Bridge and Miller-Sweeney Bridge
- Oakland: Park St. Bridge, Miller-Sweeney Bridge, and High St. Bridge

Truck Usage

- Trucks east of Broadway are funneled to Miller-Sweeney Bridge
- Trucks west of Broadway use Park Street (heavy truck usage on Park St)
- Clement eastbound truck extension may be redundant

Note: Sharp right turn from Tilden to Broadway is on designated truck route.
Truck Volumes

Miller-Sweeney Bridge 2022 Truck Volumes

- Trucks account for 3.2% of daily traffic to/from Alameda (537 daily truck trips across bridge)
- Majority of truck volume along bridge is entering and exiting Broadway on Blanding Ave.
- Nearby Bridge Access:
  - Park Street Bridge (To the North)
  - High Street Bridge (To the South)
- The project should continue to provide truck access to/from Nob Hill shopping center.
- Eastbound truck connections along Clement may be less important than westbound.

Weekday AM/PM Peak Hour Truck Volumes

Note: For legibility, truck movements with 0 or 1 truck in both peak periods are excluded.
Public Input (2nd round of outreach)

Virtual Open House
- 31 attendees and 21 responses

In-Person Open House
- 19 attendees

Online Survey
- 175 respondents

- Most people supported a roundabout
- Many people favored one-way extension over a two-way extension of Clement Ave.
- Project team received requests to consider extension for only biking and walking.

Desires:
- Safety improvements and slower speeds
- Better connectivity for bicyclists
- Better crossings for pedestrians
- More greenery and community space

Concerns:
- Through traffic and speeding on Clement Ave.
- Increase of truck traffic with extension
- Drivers’ unfamiliarity with roundabouts
- Speeding along Pearl St and Fernside Blvd

How satisfied are you with the Clement/Tilden project area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Draft Concepts

Cross Alameda Trail Clement Extension
Roundabout with active transportation Clement Extension (not motorists/trucks)

Westbound Clement Avenue Vehicle Extension w/ Cross Alameda Trail
Roundabout and one-way Clement extension for westbound motorists and both directions for active modes

Question: What are the pros and cons of draft concepts?
Alternative A - Cross Alameda Trail Clement Avenue Extension

DRAFT Roundabout Concept Design - Phase 1

Legend:
- Pavement
- Landscape
- Sidewalk
- Bike Lane/Path
- Multiuse Path
- Roundabout Apron
- Driveway

Scale: 1" = 100'

Clement Avenue & Tilden Way
Alameda, CA
Alternative B - Westbound Clement Avenue Vehicle Extension with Cross Alameda Trail
## Overall Evaluation

No clear “winner” – there are tradeoffs!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits Both Options Provide</th>
<th>Alternative A: Cross Alameda Trail Extension</th>
<th>Alternative B: Westbound Clement Vehicle Extension with Cross Alameda Trail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce speeds improve safety for everyone</td>
<td>• Improves truck connections by providing one-way extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve biking/walking facilities and connections in study area</td>
<td>• Completes General Plan truck network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve bus access</td>
<td>• Reduces volumes at Broadway/Blanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Add pocket park areas and reserves space for dog park</td>
<td>• Reduces truck volumes along Park Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Considerations</th>
<th>Alternative A: Cross Alameda Trail Extension</th>
<th>Alternative B: Westbound Clement Vehicle Extension with Cross Alameda Trail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Open space, landscaping opportunities</td>
<td>• Improves truck connections by providing one-way extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No right-turn vehicle conflict at Clement/Tilden</td>
<td>• Completes General Plan truck network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Westbound trucks continue to use existing paths (Park Street, Blanding, Tilden)</td>
<td>• Reduces volumes at Broadway/Blanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does not complete General Plan truck network</td>
<td>• Reduces truck volumes along Park Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lane Reduction

Reduce number of travel lanes (commonly called “Road Diet”)

• Lower speeds
• 19–47% crash reduction (right-angle, turning, rear end crashes)
• Shorter pedestrian crossings

Source: FHWA
Why Build Roundabouts?

Roundabout benefits include:

- Safety performance
- Lower delay
- Environmental benefits (emissions, fuel savings)
- Access management
- Operations and maintenance costs
- Aesthetics
Separate Bike/Ped Options

When protected bike lanes are provided at roundabouts, they should be continuous around the intersection, parallel to the sidewalk (see EXHIBIT 45). Protected bike lanes should generally follow the contour of the circular intersection.

The design of the street crossings should include the following features (see EXHIBIT 47):

- The bicycle crossing should be immediately adjacent to and parallel with the pedestrian crossing, and both should be at the same elevation.
- Consider providing supplemental yield markings at roundabout exits to indicate priority at these crossings.
- Bicycle stop lines should be placed near the edge of the crossing road.
- The separated bike lane approach to the bicycle crossing should result in bicycles aligning at the opening area at a perpendicular angle to approaching motorists.

EXHIBIT 45: Design for Roundabout with Separated Bike Lanes

4.3.4 ROUNDABOUT DESIGN WITH SEPARATED BIKE LINES

- Curb radius should be a minimum of 6 ft. to enable bicyclists to turn into the opening area.
- Channelizing islands are preferred to maintain separation between bicyclists and pedestrians, but may be eliminated if different surface materials are used.

At crossing locations of multi-lane roundabouts or roundabouts where the exit geometry will result in faster exiting speeds by motorists (thus reducing the likelihood that they will yield to bicyclists and pedestrians), additional measures should be considered to induce yielding such as providing an activated device such as a Rapid Flashing Beacon or Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon.

San Luis Obispo, California
Source: Brian Ray

Source: Massachusetts DOT Separated Bike Lane Planning and Design Guide
Vehicle Speeds: Reduced

- Geometry controls speeds
  - Max entry speed:
    - 25 mph for single-lane
    - 30 mph for two-lane
  - Circulating speeds 10 to 12 mph
- Increased time for driver reaction
- Decreased chance for injury or fatality
Safety Performance

Safety Statistics
• 90-100% reduction in fatalities
• 75% reduction in injuries
• 35% reduction in total crashes
• Lack of pedestrian and bicyclist crash frequency
• Reduction in conflict number and speeds

Source: NCHRP Report 572, NCHRP Report 672
Roundabouts and Pedestrians

• Benefits:
  • Slow vehicle speeds
  • Two-stage crossing

• Considerations:
  • Crosswalk alignment
  • Width of splitter island
  • Space for exiting vehicles to yield to pedestrians
  • Yield-controlled crossings
Roundabouts and Large Vehicles

- “Design” versus “accommodate” larger vehicles
- Accommodations include:
  - Truck aprons
  - Placement of landscaping
  - Reinforced curbs
Reduced Travel Delay

- May solve existing or projected operational problem
  - Heavy delay on minor road
  - Large traffic signal delays
  - Heavy left-turning traffic
  - Stop control with large delays

Source: NCHRP Report 672, NCHRP Exhibit 3-19
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Next Steps

- Transportation Commission: Wed, Jan 25
- City Council: Tues, March 7
- 2023: Design
- 2024: Construction

- Project webpage: www.alamedaca.gov/ClementTilden

Gail Payne
Senior Transportation Coordinator
gpayne@alamedaca.gov or 510-747-6892
Background

- Project extents:
  - Battery and Sansome streets from Market to Vallejo streets
- Quick-Build Scope: install northbound and southbound protected bikeways on one or both corridors
  - Project will serve as a bike connection to the Sansome/Battery Connections Project, north of Vallejo Street
Background

• The Battery/Sansome Quick-Build Project is in support of the city’s commitment to Vision Zero to reduce traffic related injury collisions and fatalities
• Between January 2017 and December 2021:
  • 62 reported injury collisions on Battery Street
  • 34 reported injury collisions on Sansome Street
What are Quick-Build projects?

- Reversible, adjustable traffic safety improvements
- Can be installed relatively quickly (weeks or months) by MTA shops
- Intended to be evaluated and reviewed within the initial 24 months of construction; adjustments made accordingly
- Typical quick-build type improvements include:
  - Paint, traffic delineators, and street signs
  - Parking and loading adjustments
  - Traffic signal timing
Battery and Sansome Streets Today

Battery Street looking south towards Market Street

Sansome Street looking north towards Vallejo Street
Upcoming design on Battery Street
Two-way bikeway with Commute Hour Tow-Away and Left-Turn Restrictions

- Two-way protected bikeway (northbound and southbound)
- Consolidates bikeways onto one corridor resulting in few impacts on Sansome
  - Sansome will focus more on pedestrian safety improvements
- Design accommodates three lanes during peak hours (Market to Washington)
- Minimal transit impacts
- Wider bikeway can be used for emergency response vehicles
- At least half of parking will be removed
- Left turn restrictions at Broadway and California streets

Looking south, towards Market Street
Sample block of Battery Two-Way Bikeway Design

- No left turns at Broadway and California streets
- Tow-away no stopping during morning/evening peak hours (Market to Washington streets). Regular parking/loading during other times
- Two-way protected bikeway. East side parking removed
- Two travel lanes available during most of the day

A full corridor illustration is available on the project webpage at SFMTA.com/BatterySansomeQB under the “Related Reports and Document” section
Battery at Sacramento: Existing
Battery at Sacramento: Upcoming
Next Steps

• Implementation ongoing through December 2022
• Data collection and evaluation Spring 2023
Thank you!
SFMTA.com/BatterySansomeQB
SFMTA Active Communities Plan
ACTIVE COMMUNITIES PLAN
First citywide Bike Plan since 2009
Year-long public engagement starting January 2023
Plan adopted at SFMTA board in March 2024

PLAN OUTCOMES
New proposed citywide bike network & prioritized investment plan
Policy & program recommendations
Deep engagement in Equity Priority Communities
Accommodation of all devices that can legally use the bike network
ACTIVE COMMUNITIES PLAN

Plan Goals

Support Climate Action: Help achieve 80% low-carbon trips by 2030.

Support Vision Zero: Achieve safety for all users of the bike network.

Advance Equity: Align projects with community values & needs; increase overall mobility for those most vulnerable to transportation challenges.

Support Access: Plan for a bike network that can accommodate a broad range of mobility devices and be used by all residents.

Accountability: Ensure a clear path for funding and project delivery.
TEAM PARTNERS

SFMTA
Livable Streets, Planning, Curb Management & Communications
Technical Advisory Committee includes representative from Accessibility Services & MOD

Consultant
Toole Design – Lead consultant
Interethnica – Outreach, engagement & translation services
EMC Research – Citywide polling & survey work
Safe Streets Research – Technical analysis

Contracted Community Partners
PODER/Bicis del Pueblo – Mission District & Outer Mission/Excelsior outreach
BVHP Community Advocates – Bayview-Hunters Point outreach
Tenderloin Community Benefits District – Tenderloin outreach
SOMA Pilipinas – Western SOMA outreach
New Community Leadership Foundation/Influx – Western Addition & Fillmore outreach
San Francisco Bicycle Coalition – Citywide outreach & policy recommendations
EXISTING CONDITIONS

Tasks:
• Data collection
• Bicycle Comfort Index update
• Review of past plans

The Existing Conditions task is largely completed, with work meant to set up analysis and public outreach tasks.
ANALYSIS

Tasks:
• Bike Network & Bike Count Analysis
• Equity Analysis
• Collision Analysis
• Network Connectivity Analysis
• Resident Preference Survey

The Analysis task will help identify areas of focus for bike network improvements, as well as potential changes to policy & programs.
PUBLIC OUTREACH

Tasks:
• Public Outreach Plan
• Community Interviews
• Equity Priority Community Engagement
• Citywide Outreach & Engagement
• Interactive Web Tools

Year-long public outreach process, Jan 2023 to Jan 2024
• At least 12 interviews with community leaders & elders
• 30 citywide outreach events
• 24 partnership events in Equity Priority Communities
• Statistically-significant polling & survey work

January to June: community needs, challenges & values
July to January: draft plan recommendations
DRAFT & FINAL PLAN

Tasks:
• Goals & Vision
• Draft Bike Network
• Parking & Support Facilities
• Policy & Programmatic Recommendations
• Implementation, Cost & Funding Plan
• Personal Mobility Device Guidelines
• Draft & Final Plan

Draft Plan anticipated for Fall 2023

Includes developing new guidelines for mobility devices & how bike network can be designed to increase mobility for users with a disability
Required approval path for the Active Communities Plan:

- Hearing at SF Bicycle Advisory Committee
- Hearing at SFMTA Policy & Governance Committee
- Hearing at SFMTA Community Advisory Committee
- Hearing at SFMTA Board

Approval path to start roughly December 2023, with MTA Board adoption no later than March 31, 2024.

Active Communities Plan will seek Statutory Exemption under SB 288, which provides an exemption for Bicycle Transportation Plans.
ACTIVE COMMUNITIES PLAN
Input from BART Bike Advisory Task Force & Next Steps

• What are Task Force priorities or desires for the ACP?
• What policies or programs would improve multimodal connectivity with the BART system?
• What are opportunities for more engagement?
• What engagement methods have been most successful to you?

Sign up for mailing list & updates at https://www.sfmta.com/projects/active-communities-plan

Citywide outreach kick-off coming in January
SFMTA Active Communities Plan

Christopher Kidd
SFMTA, Transportation Planner
christopher.kidd@sfmata.com
415.646.2852 | 213.304.7768

ActiveCommunities@sfmata.com
Monthly Rentals at all BikeLink Bike Lockers and BART Bike Stations vs. BART Ridership
Jan 2019-Oct 2022

BART Ridership (scale on right)

All BART BikeLink Lockers*

All BART Bike Stations

*BikeLink data lags by 6 mos.
Hi Ruby,

Thanks for your comments on BART’s on-car bike accommodations. As you might imagine, it’s a multi-faceted issue and coming up with a solution involves tradeoffs that ultimately do not please everyone all the time, but I remain convinced that the current approach is the best one given what we have to work with.

All that said, I’m surprised that your observation is that only one bike can fit with the latest bar and straps. One of the reasons we reverted to a lean bar with straps is that we felt it was a much more space-efficient approach. The clamping racks were problematic for a variety of reasons, and one of them was that, although there were three parking spaces, due to design compromises there really was not sufficient room in the rack to accommodate three bikes. Because the spacing was so tight, the second customer with a bike to arrive at a rack inevitably chose not to use the space closest to the already occupied one. Rather, they skipped a spot, leaving a very tight space between the two bikes that was impossible to use without moving one of the already parked bikes, creating a headache for everyone and a very real source of conflict. The original design for the clamper rack featured a larger gap between the individual spaces, but this led to an unacceptable level of encroachment on the aisles, so the gap was narrowed, detracting from the rack’s usability. With the current lean bar, the space between bikes is reduced to zero by design, which means more bikes can be accommodated in the same space. This design does require customers’ bikes to be touching, but we deemed this to be an acceptable tradeoff. Aside from bikes needing to touch one another, the major drawback of the lean bars and straps is that, although we have included three straps, the unfortunate reality is that the third strap is usually not long enough to reach the third bike. This has been the source of many complaints, and in fact, similar to the compromise on the clamper rack spacing, the initial design for the lean bar had longer, more useful straps, but we were again forced to compromise during implementation due to the fact that the cars have ventilation intake grates located directly below the lean bar. Our car engineers would not allow longer straps due to the potential for the hanging straps to be sucked onto the grate and negatively affect the air circulation and purification system. Ultimately, I believe the lean bars make it possible to have more bikes out of the way per car, as three or four bikes can be stacked in this space, even if not all of them can be secured.

There is a lot of planned work on faregates throughout the BART system, but I don’t know the details of what’s planned for where. I will inquire with my colleagues who are knowledgeable and get back to you about MacArthur.

Regarding your minutes and empty seats questions, I assume you are talking about the BBATF? Ideally, the minutes should be on the web within a few days or at most a week after approval at the next meeting. However, the BBATF has not had a secretary since fall of 2021 and preparation of minutes has been less reliable, resulting in some delays and missing minutes. And regarding empty seats, I am not able to put in a lot of effort to fill them, but I do reach out periodically to our partner agencies and the bicycle advocacy organizations. Other than that, we rely a lot upon word of mouth and referrals from existing members that I follow up on. We have a fairly good record filling seats for SF and Alameda Counties. It’s a little harder to consistently fill all seats for CoCoCo, and the reality is that it’s very hard to find representatives for San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties. Hanging flyers at Berryessa certainly could not hurt, thanks for the offer. Attached is an updated flyer you are welcome to use.
Hi Heath,

First off, I want to thank you for all the work you do advocating for bikers on BART! I'm sure there are lots of interests to balance and concerns to address. I have a couple of questions about bikes on BART, mostly because I take my bike 4x per week to commute between Oakland & San Jose, so these patterns are pretty common.

I've noticed that, with the strap-style bike racks, only one bike can fit per rack, unless someone is willing and able to squeeze in another bike (which is rare). I've ended up in cars where there are lots of bikers and not enough space on the rack, and people will have to block several seats in order to safely hold their bikes. Are there any plans to increase bike rack density to deal with this? I know the clamping racks are being phased out again (and I get why), but they at least made it possible to have more bikes secured per car.

I'm also frustrated by the gates at MacArthur station -- there's only one wide gate for bikes, wheelchairs, people with luggage, etc. but there are lots of trains going in and out with lots of people who need to use that gate. Most days there's a small line to exit because so many people need to go in or come out with their bikes. Is there anything in the pipeline to add more gates at MacArthur BART?

Thanks so much for your time and advocacy!
Best,
Ruby

P.S. Some administrative Qs as well -- when do meeting minutes typically go up on the website? And is there any concerted effort to fill the empty representative slots? I'd be happy to put up some posters around Berryessa BART if that would be helpful.
Dear Andrew,

Please forgive my late response, your email was not forwarded to me with the complaint initially and it took some time to get it.

Thanks for reaching out regarding the different bike racks on BART cars. FYI, all new cars are now shipping with the bara and straps, but we are in the middle of an extended change order and retrofit process for the earlier new cars, so you may encounter some cars that were shipped without one of the (now discontinued) bike racks but without straps as well. Also, we have found that some of the straps do go missing and we are replacing them as needed.

Your experience notwithstanding, feedback we have received on the straps to date has been overwhelmingly positive and reinforces the decision to halt installation of the clamper-style racks that were initially deployed on the new cars and replace all existing racks with bars and straps.

Regarding broken or missing straps, if you suspect a car has an issue such as missing straps or any other problem, the best way to report it is to note the 4-digit car number and contact the Train Operator via the intercom while you are on BART and the Operator will report the problem to our Operations Control Center.

Sincerely,

Heath Maddox
Manager of Bicycle Access Programs
Bay Area Rapid Transit District
2150 Webster Street, 8th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612
415.728.1352

-----Original Message-----
From: Michelle Pallen <webcustomerservices@bart.gov>
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2022 11:27 AM
To: Heath Maddox <hmaddox@bart.gov>
Subject: RE: Case 00286128: Bike racks [ ref:_00Dd0hrYV._5006T1zV8YO:ref ]
Hi Heath,

Customer Service received email below on 6/23.

Regards,

Michelle
BART Customer Services

===========================================
Case 00286128: Bike racks

Why do the new Bart cars have two versions of bike racks? The version that just has a bar and stamps is terrible. Often the buckles on the straps are broken and it is awkward to stack multiple bikes. You should get rid of these and put in the ones that have spots for 3 bikes that clamp on the front tire.

ref:_00Dd0hrYV._5006T1zV8YO:ref
Hi Lisa,

There are no plans to add the bike bars and straps to the eBART trains. Bike bars would go in the disabled area, which would require removing the folding seats there currently. We can explore some additional signs to make it clear that area should be prioritized for disabled passengers AND bikes.

Thanks,

Heath

-----Original Message-----
From: BART Customer Service <webcustomerservices@bart.gov>
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2022 10:56 AM
To: Heath Maddox <hmaddox@bart.gov>
Subject: RE: Case 00288114: Bike rack on E-BART Train [ ref:_00Dd0hrYV._5006T20ZViv:ref ]

Hi Heath,

Hope all is well. It's Lisa from Lake Merritt Customer Services. I'm temporarily helping out at BHQ with the comment and complaint cases.

I have a customer asking about bike racks on the eBART. Are there plans to install them on these trains?

Thank you,

Lisa Gomez-Delgado
BART Customer Services

M-F 8am to 5pm

510-464-7134

===========================================

Case 00288114: Bike rack on E-BART Train

I appreciate having designated bike racks on the regular BART train. However there is no designated bike rack in the eBART train coming from and to Antioch station. We bikers often have to compete with other passengers who chose to crowd by the entrance and not to sit even though seats are available. If we want to encourage people to drive less and commute by BART, including bikers like me, can you please install bike racks on the E-BART trains? Thank you!

ref:_00Dd0hrYV._5006T20ZViv:ref
Dear Carrie,

Thank you writing us about your experience with the BART bike straps, and please accept my apologies for not responding earlier—your email got lost in my inbox after I was out with an injury.

We are aware that the straps would be more useful for the outer bikes, and I sincerely wish there were a simple solution I could offer. The straps went through extensive and iterative testing but I'm afraid that, as is often the case, the final result was a compromise that responded to a number of competing priorities.

Our initial design for the straps was in fact longer, to better accommodate wider or loaded bikes. Unfortunately, however, we were unable to implement the longer straps due to the potential for the straps to be sucked onto and obstruct the air intake grate immediately below the bike lean bar on both old and new BART cars (see attached photo). Due to the very real potential for compromising the climate control and air filtration system on the cars, having longer straps was unfortunately non-negotiable. We did try a number of different buckle and strap configurations to address the issue while still providing sufficient length for wider bikes, but were ultimately unsuccessful.

All that said, and your experience notwithstanding, the feedback we have received on the straps so far has been overwhelmingly positive and reinforces the decision to halt installation of the clamper-style racks that were initially deployed on the new cars and replace all existing racks with bars and straps.

A few final things to consider:
• One observation that my colleagues and I made during testing was that if the bike nearest the lean bar is secured with a strap and additional bikes are leaned against this secured bike without being strapped themselves, the outer bikes are actually fairly stable since the handlebars, pedals, etc tend to keep them from rolling away.
• When I load my bicycle for touring or carrying a lot of cargo, I will almost always have an extra strap or bungee which can easily be put into service tethering my bike. If you know you will be riding BART with a loaded bike, bringing an extra strap is a good idea, just in case you can’t get the spot closest the rail. In a pinch, a helmet strap can sometimes work to tether to the adjacent bike.
• As a longtime BART-with-bike user, before the straps were implemented, I would try to sit in the seat nearest to my bike so I could keep a hand on it to keep it from rolling away. If a seat were not available, I’d either stand near my bike, or sometimes politely ask the person sitting nearest the bike area if they could perhaps move to a nearby seat.

Sincerely,

Heath Maddox
Manager of Bicycle Access Programs
Bay Area Rapid Transit District
2150 Webster Street, 8th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612
Hello Carrie,

Thank you for contacting BART Customer Services. We will forward your suggestion to our bike team.

Regards,

Samson Wong
BART Customer Services

M-F 8am to 5pm

510-464-7134

cc: Bike Access team

===========================================
Case 00291180: Straps on bike racks on new trains

Good morning! The straps on the bike racks are only long enough to attach the bike that’s closest to the rack itself. Could you please add longer straps?

ref:_00Dd0hrYV._5006T21qLc7:ref
Dear Alden,

Thanks for your comment regarding student pricing bike spaces on the new BART trains. I don't work on BART fare pricing, but I can respond to your concerns about the bike spaces.

There are some (76) new BART cars that have no special bike accommodations on them, but this is a temporary situation that we are working to remedy.

By way of background, originally, the new "Fleet of the Future" cars included an impressive-looking yet unfortunately difficult to use and widely disliked wheel-grabbing bike rack. Based upon positive customer feedback on the bicycle straps that were added to the bicycle area lean bars of BART's older cars in 2019, as well as a survey of more than 3,000 BART riders, the BART Board decided to discontinue the wheel-grabbing racks in favor of a simple lean bar and straps on the new cars as well. This decision necessitated a change order with the manufacturer of BART's rail cars. Because change orders of this magnitude take time to implement, there was a period of some months during which new cars were shipped and put into service without either the wheel grabbing rack or the lean bars with straps. BART maintenance crews are currently working to retrofit these new cars that shipped after the decision was made to discontinue the wheel grabbing racks but before the new lean bar was included on new cars from the factor.

Thanks for your patience while we get all the new cars properly equipped with the lean bars and straps.

Sincerely,

Heath Maddox
Manager of Bicycle Access Programs
Bay Area Rapid Transit District
2150 Webster Street, 8th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612
415.728.1352
Hi Heath,

See customers concern below regarding bike areas not available in some new trains.

Regards,

Michelle
BART Customer Services

===========================================
Case 00292682: Bikes and Student Pricing

Alden Gendreau

To whom it may concern...I ride BART almost everyday. I also bike to and from BART. There are new trains that do not have bike spots in them. This is super frustrating. Additionally, I am a student. BART is expensive for me. BART should offer a student discounts to all school in the Bay Area. Thanks for listening. Please help to create better spaces for bikes and students! Thanks!

ref: _00Dd0hrYV._5006T22hOvs:ref
Dear Mr. Baumann,

Thanks for the feedback on the bicycle priority areas on the new BART railcars. I am sorry that you find them lacking, but, compared to the new cars' original wheel-grabbing racks, the lean bars and straps have been largely well-received by our customers. The decision to discontinue the wheel-grabbing racks in favor of a simple lean bar and straps on the new cars was based upon positive customer feedback on the straps that were added to the bicycle area lean bars of BART's older cars in 2019, as well as a survey of more than 3,000 BART riders.

The one major drawback of the straps is that some customers find that they are not long enough to accommodate a third bike. Unfortunately, we cannot make the straps longer due to the presence of an air intake on the wall of the car in the bicycle priority area and the very real possibility that the straps could be sucked onto the air intake and compromise the train's climate control and air purification system.

Sincerely,

Heath Maddox
Manager of Bicycle Access Programs
Bay Area Rapid Transit District
2150 Webster Street, 8th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612
415.728.1352

-----Original Message-----
From: Michelle Pallen <webcustomerservices@bart.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 3, 2022 3:01 PM
To: Heath Maddox <hmaddox@bart.gov>
Subject: RE: Case 00292753: Bike racks on new Bart trains [ ref:_00Dd0hrYV._5006T22hX3a:ref ]

Hi Heath,

See customers feedback below.

Name: Andrew Baumann
Regards,

Michelle Pallen
BART Customer Services

===========================================
Case 00292753: Bike racks on new Bart trains

The bike racks with straps on the new Bart cars are terrible. The other bike rack configuration with the three bike clamps is much better.
ref:_00Dd0hrYV._5006T22hX3a:ref
Dear Roger,

Thanks for your inquiry about bike stair channels at BART.

Of the stations listed in the large bikes article you cited, only 19th St. Oakland has been completed. The other seven stations are designed and we hope to put them out to bid for construction in 2023.

The following stations also have stairway channels on some of the stairs:

1. 16th Street Mission
2. Downtown Berkeley
3. Lafayette
4. Warm Springs

Of these four, only the channels at 16th Street are very usable, however. The older ones do not benefit from more recent design features (mainly width) that improve usability.

Sincerely,

Heath Maddox
Manager of Bicycle Access Programs
Bay Area Rapid Transit District
2150 Webster Street, 8th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612
415.728.1352
The customer below is inquiring about the bike stair channels being installed at 19th Street/Oakland, 12th Street/Oakland, Lake Merritt, Coliseum, Walnut Creek, Embarcadero, Civic Center, and 24th Street Mission
Do you know what the timeline for this project looks like? Which stations have them installed? Project completion date? Etc.

Thank you!
Lisa
BART Customer Services

M-F 8am to 5pm
510-464-7134

===========================================
Contact Name Roger Not Given
Contact Email [redacted]
Received Date 10/12/2022

Description Hello, would like to find out at which stations Bike Stair Channels have been installed already.
I am referring to this article: https://www.bart.gov/news/articles/2022/news20220518-0

thank you

ref: _00Dd0hrYV._5006T23kEGY:ref
The radrunner is too tall and long. The mtb is too long.

Looking forward to the new lockers. This is great news! Any timeline on when they will be setup and ready to use? Will they use bike link card as well?

On Mon, Oct 3, 2022 at 5:12 PM Heath Maddox <hmaddox@bart.gov> wrote:

I think I’d call the Radrunner a cargo bike even though it doesn’t have a box or a super long wheel base. I’m surprised it doesn’t fit!

Can you tell me if your bikes are too tall or too long?

Is the MTB a particularly large frame size?

Thanks,

Heath
Thank you for the quick response!

They are larger standard ebikes. One is a radrunner (very popular in berkeley and they even opened up a store on san pablo) and the other is a mountain ebike with 29in tires.

On Mon, Oct 3, 2022 at 4:58 PM Heath Maddox <hmaddox@bart.gov> wrote:

Hi Moses,

One question for you: is it just a larger standard electric bicycle, or is it a cargo bike? (Either way, I think we should have you covered, but I’m curious what kinds of bikes don’t seem to fit in our existing lockers.)

As part of the NB Access Improvements currently underway at the station, we will be adding a new generation of eLocker. Some, but not all, of these eLockers will be implemented without the diagonal center dividers inside the lockers which will mean they can accommodate cargo bikes, although not the largest ones. We have not yet tried this newer locker, so this is a bit of a pilot in terms of cargo bikes, but we are excited to offer this option.

I am raising two kids on Rose Street myself, and they’re too big to carry around on the back of our Extracycle now, but it sure would have been nice to have more secure cargo bike parking at NB 5-10 years ago.

I’m cc’ing my colleague Mariana Parreiras, PM for the project, in case she has anything to add.

Thanks,

Heath Maddox
Manager of Bicycle Access Programs
Bay Area Rapid Transit District
2150 Webster Street, 8th Floor
Hi Heath,

I am a BART rider with an ebike and was surprised that I could not fit my bike in the bike link lockers at North Berkeley BART station. Unfortunately parking on the racks is a no go given the high bike theft rate in the area.

Are there any plans to upgrade bike parking at North Berkeley to accommodate larger ebikes? I would love to bike to the station but at the moment it’s a no go and I’m forced to drive.