



**ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
(ATPAC)**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**THURSDAY, AUGUST 25, 2016**

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 7:01 PM by Chairperson Howard, in Conference Room B, Livermore Civic Center Library, 1188 South Livermore Avenue, Livermore, CA 94550

**2. ROLL CALL**

**Members Present:** Chair Steve Howard, Vice Chair Kimberly Schertzer, Mike Ansell, Maria Dawson, Connie Campbell, and Lara Leininger

**Members Absent:** Michael Hardin

**Staff Present:** Associate Planner Debbie Bell, Assistant Planner Andy Ross, Alta Planning + Design Staff Lisa Beyer and Brett Hondorp

**3. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Chair Howard asked if there were any changes to the minutes from January 21, 2016. Seeing none, Chair Howard asked if there was a motion to approve minutes.

**MOTION BY COMMITTEE MEMBER ANSELL, SECONDED BY COMMITTEE MEMBER LEININGER, APPROVING MEETING MINUTES. MOTION CARRIED (6-0)**

**5. CORRESPONDENCE**

None

## **6. REPORT ON OLD BUSINESS**

None

## **7. NEW BUSINESS**

7.01 Discussion regarding the Active Transportation Plan

7.01a. Working Paper #1 – Draft Existing Conditions and Needs Analysis

Debbie Bell started the meeting and asked everyone to introduce themselves. Lisa Beyer from Alta Planning + Design presented a PowerPoint on the Livermore Active Transportation Plan. The presentation reminded the committee members of their role and the current status of the project. She presented the data and analysis summary of Working Paper #1 – Existing Conditions and Needs Analysis.

Chair Howard noted that there are several areas that people would want to bike or walk, but they don't have facilities, so the collision volumes are skewed. Member Leininger followed up on that and asked how the collision data should be interpreted. Brett Hondorp from Alta Planning + Design explained that the team could run a collision per capita analysis, but it's better to look at per user. Lisa Beyer explained that the collision clusters help to identify locations where we may want to focus projects.

Member Leininger suggested noting that I-580 cuts off connectivity as part of the Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress analysis.

Lisa Beyer completed the presentation on Working Paper #1.

Chair Howard noted that the tourism component is not well represented. He suggested including wineries and the downtown events center, which is promoting wine and other events. He noted the major barrier created by I-580 and suggested that safe crossings should be a primary focus of the plan's recommendations.

Chair Howard asked for comments from the committee.

Vice Chair Schertzer asked how the plan addresses the Downtown Specific Plan and the Isabel/BART Neighborhood Plan. Andy Ross explained that this plan will make certain assumptions about the Isabel Neighborhood Plan in developing recommendations and will be updated regularly allowing adjustments to be made when more details about BART are developed.

Member Ansell explained that he works at Las Positas College and thought Portola would work well for bike access, but it becomes the overflow for I-580 traffic. He agreed

that downtown is surrounded by uncomfortable facilities. He also noted that East Avenue with several schools and access to the labs is high stress, as well as Hillcrest where there are no sidewalks on the south-east side.

Member Campbell asked if the labs aren't showing up on the demand analysis maps, what else isn't showing up. She noted that the north-east Livermore Safeway isn't showing.

Member Dawson stated that access to Las Positas College is a major challenge. She also noted that building the infrastructure facilities is not enough, there needs to be maintenance and care.

Member Leininger noted that the presentation helped clarify that recommendation priorities should be focused on areas of High Demand and High Stress. She also noted that there is a big building boom in the City and asked how this will be addressed.

After the committee members had commented Chair Howard opened the discussion for public comment.

An unidentified Community Member asked why the labs are not showing on the Work demand map.

An unidentified Community Member asked why Safeway, Costco, and other grocery stores are not showing on the Shopping demand map.

An unidentified Community Member asked if the conditions of the facilities are accounted for in the level of traffic stress and level of service. Brett Hondorp noted that the factors include, number of lanes, traffic speed, presence of buffer, but do not note the condition of the facility, which is not available data. Debbie Bell noted that the City of Livermore is undergoing an asset management project that will inventory facilities and conditions for maintenance.

Katheryn Barker commented that the plan doesn't reflect the experience of those who currently walk. She asked whether that group was consulting in the process. She stated that the level of service doesn't account for the differences between daytime and nighttime. Walking from downtown at night is not safe and lighting needs should be taken into account. The pedestrian islands should highlight the gaps traveling to and through the islands.

Brian Yoxall commented that the plan should consider regional sports field facilities, which are a significant regional draw. Also the plan should consider recreational routes for road riders and how riders access those routes from and through Livermore.

Joe Ledbetter suggested adding traffic volumes to the Collision Map to show where densities of traffic are high.

David Lunn walks everywhere and commented that the maps should show the access points for trails and encourage biking rather than driving to trails. He noted that LARPD and EBRPD use the term “gap” in the network to prioritize improvements and suggested identifying these on the maps. He asked the team to add trails to the Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress maps and remove the streets in the lab campuses.

Greg Davis explained that he is supportive of the effort, but concerned about the data tools. He noted that roadways identified as unsafe (uncomfortable) are not actually problems. He noted that the map quality did not allow detailed review and requested that the team provide high resolution maps on the website. He also noted that the Master Plan link was not working.

Zaf Demir explained that in Alameda County, they are using crowd sourcing and suggested it could be used to get information on the conditions of facilities. He commented that the Level of Traffic Stress does not account for the time of day and should be included in this discussion. He noted that East Avenue operates as an I-580 bypass at times. He asked whether maintenance is considered in existing conditions.

Barbara Hill commented that several areas shown as low stress don't have sidewalks, for example, the Hillcrest Avenue and Nielsen Lane.

#### 7.01b. Working Paper #2 – Draft Goals and Policies

Lisa Beyer presented Working Paper #2, Goals and Policies.

Member Leininger asked whether the goals should be prioritized or weighted. Brett Hondorp explained that the policies are meant to guide measurable actions, rather than prioritize.

Member Schertzer commented that Policies 2.3 and 2.4 recommend increasing the supply of bike parking and public restrooms, however we need to know the existing conditions for these items before we build more.

Chair Howard invited the public to comment.

Barbara Hill explained that LARPD has removed a number of restrooms where illicit activities were taking place. May not want to recommend new restrooms in Policy 2.4.

Greg Davis noted that it is most important to get people from where they live to where they want to go.

David Lunn suggested changing Policy 1.6 to prioritize reducing gaps. He noted that an imperfect, but connected network is better than none. He suggested inputting everything into a GIS system to share with other agencies and connect with maintenance activities.

Joe Ledbetter asked the group how these recommendations will interface with motorist needs. He suggested that the plan should consider vehicles.

Brian Yoxall asked the group whether other programs would be part of the plan as Policy 3.4 noted only Safe Routes to Schools. He asked why Goal 4 included equestrians. He mentioned that the 2001 Goals were very detailed and asked when the plan will develop those details.

Andrew Barker commented that he was concerned about the lack of detail in these goals and objectives. He described an example from the circulation element and suggested that these goals should have detailed funding sources and responsible parties that will be held accountable for implementing.

## **8. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Howard asked if there was a motion to adjourn.

**MOTION BY VICE CHAIR SCHERTZER, SECONDED BY COMMITTEE MEMBER CAMPBELL, TO ADJOURN. MOTION CARRIED (6-0)**

Meeting was adjourned at 8:38pm.