BART Bicycle Advisory Task Force (BBATF)
Meeting Minutes: August 6, 2018

Task Force Members Present: Rick Goldman (Chairperson), Katie DeLeuw (Vice Chairperson), Jianhan Wang (Secretary), Allison Quach, Craig Hagelin, Jon Spangler, Mary Ann Blackwell, RD Frazier.

Absent: None

Item 1 Self-introductions
BBATF members
BART Staff: Susan Poliwka, Steve Beroldo, Heath Maddox
BART Board: Robert Raburn
Others: Tracy Jacks, Rahman Batin

Item 2 General Discussion and Public Comments
Robert Raburn commented that bike theft reports have been on a downward trend and thief arrests have been growing – 2 arrests were made in the past 2 months. Bike lockers were the target of a couple of attacks.

Item 3 Minutes of the previous meeting were unanimously approved

Item 4 Tracy Jacks’ application to join the BBATF was reviewed and unanimously approved

Item 5 Network Gap Study, presentation of project to date and next steps: Susan Poliwka
A. Phase 1 - being optimistic as if they would go through with it, starting with 10 focus stations
   a. Identifying system-wide recommendations
B. $77 (57%) of RR allocation towards investments ($135 M) are going to active access
C. Report will be given after completing the study
D. Reviewed BART Station Access Typology and Policy
   a. Station Types: Urban, Urban with Parking, Balanced Intermodal, Intermodal - Auto Reliant, Auto Dependent
   b. The 10 stations were selected based on where they are at and where they aspire to be in collaboration with the city they're in. A station of every type was also included.
E. Step 3 (current): Develop a list of recommended access investments and cost estimates for each Focus Station
F. Draft Global Recommendations
   a. Vision Zero
   b. High-visibility crosswalks over 2 stripes
   c. Traffic Signals
      i. Pedestrian countdown signals
      ii. Pedestrian clearance intervals (adjust for walking speed for children and elderly)
iii. Auto pedestrian recall - no need to detect pedestrians, the signal will be given automatically.
iv. LPIs (Leading Pedestrian Intervals)
v. Protected left turns
vi. Bicycle detection - inductive loops and camera
   1. Jianhan commented in favor of cameras, it's good for also detecting slower pedestrians.
vii. Station Area Wayfinding
d. Clearer directions for bicyclists and pedestrians to get into and out of the station safely.
e. Rahman asked about keeping light posts capped on the top to reduce light pollution towards the sky.
f. Make navigating routes through parking lots easier and clearer for those walking and biking.

G. The draft report is currently being reviewed by stakeholders.
H. Robert Raburn commented about creating a pedestrian-level mall at two BART stations.

Item 6 Irvington Station, review of access design elements: Susan Poliwka
A. It will be located halfway between the Fremont and Warm Springs stations.
B. It has a long history of being identified as a good station to construct.
   a. Due to limited funds, it was prioritized as an optional station, so the City of Fremont was on the hook for funding it.
   b. The approval of new measures led to the feasibility of bringing the station online.
C. Planning Phase - Scope
   a. Station Site & Area Plan; Environmental Review.
D. The station information site on the City of Fremont's website and will receive a major update soon - https://fremont.gov/2977/Irvington-BART-Station.
E. Heard a mix of feedback from the 2 community meetings so far.
   a. The City has committed to permit-only parking in the residential neighborhoods nearby due to concerns of their parking being overly used by BART riders.
   b. Feedback has been leaning toward less parking space so that there will be less impact on their neighborhoods.
F. The Hayward Fault Line runs right by the Irvington Station.
G. There are some property parcels that would need to be purchased depending on the station design.
H. The City of Fremont has been very active in improving bike infrastructure (protected bike lines, their first protected intersection, etc.).
I. East Bay Greenway (separate project) - looking into options to continue the path past the overpass where it stops currently.
J. Developed 3 alternatives (not developed in full detail); the difference depends on parking.
   a. Will not go over 925 car parking spots regardless of which alternative.
b. May include a pedestrian path on the east on the section that is already elevated at the Washington / Osgood intersection.
c. Alternative A; all parking spots are on the east side of the rail tracks and uses up the least amount of land.
d. Alternatives B and C have increased land use and a larger number of parking spaces.

K. All alternatives will have bike parking at ground level and in the elevated concourse.
L. Robert asked about the possibility of the City being able to rezone the land east of Osgood for high-density residential across from the station if the space was not used for parking.
M. Jon commented that Alternative A seems to be the most sustainable option of the 3 with the highest expected number of people getting to the station by walking and biking.
N. Due to Union Pacific's high clearance requirements, a pedestrian ramp is not feasible at adequate grade without making it a monster.
O. Katie commented that the BBATF can write about elements of the alternatives to support the selection of which alternative.

Item 7 BBATF Letter of Support to BART Board for station access project: Jon Spangler, Katie DeLeuw.
A. The letter was unanimously approved.
B. Jon commented that the point of the letter is to express appreciation for efforts to improve bicycle and pedestrian safety and access.
C. August 9th at 9 am is the next BART Board Meeting; Jon Spangler will be representing the BBATF to present the letter (recommended by Robert)

Item 8 Dockless Mobility Devices at BART stations, review of proposed BART policy: Steve Beroldo
A. The goal is to acknowledge the benefits and challenges shared mobility devices (electrically powered) bring.
B. Make sure that the companies provide proof of insurance.
C. There is great potential for good and bad.
D. If there are no bike racks that they can use without taking parking space from others, they will need to reimburse BART for the purchase of new racks.
E. Robert commented on the sharing of data - it is beneficial to BART as well as BART's partner, AC Transit; Uber, Lyft, etc. like to not disclose usage data as it is proprietary.
   a. There was a discussion about requiring it to gain better insight into the impact the devices make and bringing it up to an equal standard as with AC Transit.
F. Jon commented on the response time to be 2 hr response time 24/7 - the devices might be left in areas that block the paths of passengers with disabilities.

Item 9 BBATF by-laws, review of roles and responsibilities for staff and members – moved to be put on the agenda for the next meeting

Adjournment. Next meeting – October 1, 2018