

Thursday, July 19, 2007, 6:00 pm to 9:00 pm
Hearing Room 1, City Hall, One Frank H. Ogawa Plaza

Members:

Jane Seleznow	District 1	Mike Petouhoff	At Large
Louise Bedsworth	District 2	Parin Shah (Chair)	Mayor
Ian Kim (Vice Chair)	District 3	<i>Vacant</i>	Mayor
James Lutz	District 4	Richard Heinberg	Mayor
Shannon Graham	District 5	Patrick Tang, Esq.	Deputy City Attorney
David Room	District 6	Alice Glasner	Public Works Legislative Analyst
Richard Register	District 7		

Task Force Members Present: Bedsworth, Heinberg, Kim, Lutz, Graham, Room, Petouhoff, Shah
Task Force Members Absent: Register, Seleznow
Staff Members Present: Alice Glasner, Public Works Committee Legislative Analyst

BUSINESS MEETING

1. Roll Call and Establishment of Quorum.
 - a. Meeting was called to order at 6:10 pm. Roll was called and a quorum was established.
 - b. It was announced that Tom Radulovich has resigned from his position; consequently, there is a vacancy for a Mayoral appointment, hopefully with transportation experience.

2. Open Forum.
 - a. There was one speaker for Open Forum: Sanjiv Handa

3. Approval of Draft Minutes of June 21, 2007 meeting.
 - a. The Draft Minutes of the June 21, 2007 meeting were unanimously approved as amended. The amendments were to Section 5.a.ix.4, to read, “Perhaps Oakland could assist a startup company that would transform hybrids to electric plug-in hybrids,” and section 9.b.x, as follows: “Key messages: (1) public should be informed about the history of our dependency on cars; (2) density is environmentally friendly; (3) changes in society should facilitate changes in zoning to make workplaces able to be near living and shopping places; (4) the public currently subsidizes urban sprawl (e.g., highway infrastructure).”

4. Power Point and Video Presentation: ***Solving Transportation, Land-Use, and Energy Issues Using Personal Rapid Transit (PRT)***.
 - a. Robert Baertsch of UC, Santa Cruz, and his research partner, received a grant from Google to look at a wide range of alternative energy solutions.
 - i. One of the project’s goals was to engage interest at NASA to work on alternative energy issues.
 - ii. This presentation is on PRT because it seems like a viable transportation option.
 - iii. A two-minute video produced by the Swedish Institute for Sustainable Transportation introduced PRT to the Task Force.
 - iv. The animated video showed small individualized vehicles moving together on a solar-fueled sky-rail. Individual cars could leave the group of vehicles for its own destination — the routes controlled by computer technology rather than human drivers.
 - v. This system could be designed to be built above streets or in highway medians; it is 19 times less expensive than light rail.
 - vi. The system is point-to-point, so the travel time is less.

- vii. Payback time for solar installation is 3.5 years or less; cost of solar installation is \$1.8 million per mile.
 - viii. Other advantages of the PRT System include: safety; the new technology is quiet and fast; allows you to reclaim parking lots and roads (adding taxable property); cheaper in terms of infrastructure, energy use, and operation, compared to personal autos.
 - ix. Disadvantages: initial cost outlays; requirements of sophisticated technology and software (akin to air traffic control); visual impacts; requires government approval.
- b.** The next presentation was given by Ron Swenson, advisor to the Swedish Institute for Sustainable Transportation.
- i. This institute, which started as an NGO, is now acting as a commercial entity, with the goal of bringing together research, advocacy, and investment, for more sustainable transportation systems.
 - ii. There are a number of good reasons that Oakland should join forces with the General Transportation System (GTS) project (as it appears that Santa Cruz has done) to get PRT up and running locally: in order to tap into venture capital, to meet the City's environmental goals, and to "enhance local economy with transportation that is innovative, clean and green."
 - iii. Construction can occur quickly — 10 miles of track in one day has been done.
- c.** General questions by Task Force Members (TFM) for Robert Baertsch and Ron Swenson.
- i. TFM Bedsworth asked about battery storage capacity for the PRT system. Swenson responded that storage technology is not yet available but in the meantime PRT could send excess energy to the grid, lowering fossil fuel (FF) consumption, and would use standard grid electricity at night (low peak time).
 - ii. TFM Bedsworth also asked if, in the airport connection example, the system is meant to replace private vehicles or the buses. Baertsch stated that PRT could move faster than the bus option, but it also appeals to people who are resistant to public transit because of the preference for 'personal space'.
 - iii. Baertsch further stated that ideally City Council would get behind this idea, as that would bring out venture capitalists.
 - iv. TFM Kim asked for an explanation of the ratio of people to pod-cars. The presenters say that the conservative 20:1 ratio represents the number of people who would use the car throughout the day, contrasted by people who drive to work and leave it there all day (1:1).
 - v. TFM Lutz asked about existing US system operators and their openness to PRT. Baertsch responded that we need to accustom people to a new technology.
 - vi. TFM Petouhoff asks about the calculations for net zero solar/energy use, and the area of solar panels that would be required. Swenson responded that one could look at his website: <http://www.solarevolution.com>, to test a variety of assumptions. It can be 3 to 4 feet wide, to move 20,000 people per day or greater for more people.
 - vii. TFM Kim asked about existing prototypes. Swenson remarked that there is an old one in Morgantown, VA, and one under construction at Heathrow airport in London.
 - viii. TFM Kim also asked about next steps if the TF would decide to recommend PRT to City Council, and then, whether funding is available. Swenson said that his group will soon be available to make presentations to City Council and that there are potential investors.

- ix. TFM Graham asked about overcoming populace objections to PRT. Swenson explained the footprint of the system is smaller; it's quieter, safer, cleaner, and more energy and economically efficient. Baertsch stated that once people see the first one, everyone will want it for their home towns.
 - x. TFM Kim remarked that the Transportation Working Group should check to see who the decision-makers would be for an airport project, and if there are too many distinct bodies perhaps another location would be better. There should be a focus on financing and the approval process. Baertsch mentioned that California Proposition 1B bond funds could be available for this type of project.
 - xi. TF Chair Shah remarked that if a formal proposal were available from any advocates of projects, such as this, it would be helpful to the Task Force.
- d.** There were three speakers on this item:
- i. Sanjiv Handa.
 - ii. George Nesbitt.
 - iii. Jan Lundberg.
- 5.** DVD Presentation Regarding Transportation Coordinated with Land Use, Specifically, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) — Case Study: Curitiba Brazil.
- a.** TFM Petouhoff introduced a portion of this documentary focusing on land use and transportation infrastructure in a Brazilian city of 1.6 million people.
 - i. Highlights from the film include:
 1. The city's transit and land use corridors were designed in the early 1970s to shift the focus away from personal auto use.
 2. The designers changed the street network to facilitate bus transport.
 3. They closed a busy downtown street to all traffic (and characterize this as a social and commercial success).
 4. They only allowed large building development on principal transit lines outside the downtown core.
 5. They integrated efficient and reasonably-priced public transportation with exclusive bus lanes, efficient access, and altered through traffic for cars.
 6. There is a coded bus system connecting regional and intra-city buses.
 7. They have an extremely high level of use from all sectors of society, despite high auto ownership.
 8. The bus system is a public-private partnership between bus companies and government. It costs government nothing.
 - b.** Comments from Task Force Members.
 - i. TFM Lutz mentioned that the system seems to utilize different doors for entering/exiting, increasing efficiencies.
 - c.** There were two speakers on this item:
 - i. Sanjiv Handa.
 - ii. George Nesbitt.
- 6.** Working Group Status Reports:
- a.** Transportation Working Group.
 - i. Letter discussed at June meeting (requesting input from other interested parties) is complete and was sent out. Continued internal discussion on metrics and baseline indicators.
 - b.** Land Use and Infrastructure Working Group.
 - i. TFM Petouhoff presented both a mapping effort and a display of the outline included in Agenda Packet.
 1. The GIS maps show land use and transportation hubs in Oakland.

2. The Working Group projects that they will propose an amendment to the City's General Plan, Land Use and Transportation Element (LUTE).
3. The Working Group is looking at relatively self-contained communities — those that already have services like retail, libraries, transportation.
4. Map “layers” include zoning, development, undeveloped areas, transportation network, creeks/watersheds. These have been overlaid to find “vitality nodes” — areas where one finds high density and high diversity of uses.
5. As an example of a potential outcome of this project, Task Force recommendations could prompt the Planning Commission to focus future development where transit is located, or alternatively, combine uses so less transportation is needed overall.

ii. Outreach

1. Letters have gone out as a community outreach effort.
2. Specific outreach to groups that are active at one or more specific Vitality Nodes is being considered.
3. Proposal of a “charrette” working or brainstorming session, to be conducted with BART, AC Transit, and Oakland Planning Department staff to discuss the interplay of transit and urban planning. Design professionals would be invited (e.g., AIA). TFM Lutz suggested including Port Staff.
4. The working group could also solicit ideas from the Planning Commission in one of their occasional “study sessions.”
5. Possibly greater public outreach in seminar fashion.

iii. Revision/Update on Scope of Work

1. Amendment to General Plan.
2. Review of current zoning (look at combining uses in some locations). BART has been looking at mixed use issues.
3. Look at updating design standards for high density. Chair Shah suggests looking at the City of San Jose's standards.
4. Look at mechanisms for increasing funding for infrastructure and guidelines/plans for streetscapes (e.g., pedestrian-friendly or plug-in capabilities). Funding possibilities include developer impact fees or improvement agreements, Redevelopment Funds, Prop 1B bond funds, external transit agencies.
5. Transfer of Development Rights — for focusing development.
6. Create public messages.
7. TFM Kim suggested as a resource: Urban Strategies Council and their interactive website, <http://infoakland.org/>, to find demographic and other local information. TFM Bedsworth says that there is also “commute to work” data in the U.S. census which could be beneficial. Chair Shah noted activity around the Key system/eBART, as well as the LEED standards for neighborhood design: <http://www.usgbc.org/DisplayPage.aspx?CategoryID=19>.

iv. Friday, August 10, 10:30 a.m., was chosen for the Charrette, with coordination by TFMs Shah, Petouhoff, and Room. TFM Graham can provide input after the draft plan is complete.

v. There was one speaker on this item: Sanjiv Handa.

c. Food and Materials Working Group.

- i. TFM Heinberg presented a draft on behalf of the working group.

- d. Port of Oakland Working Group.
 - i. The working group has discovered that there is a dearth of baseline data regarding relevant Port issues.
 - ii. Emissions data is currently being collected; fuel consumption data, however, is not available.
 - iii. TFM Graham suggests collecting “best practices” information from ports worldwide.
 - iv. TFM Bedsworth suggests looking at data for the Goods Movement Plan for Los Angeles and Long Beach (shipping industry), and the BAAQMD Bay Area Green Ports Initiative.
 - v. TFM Kim announced a meeting at the Port of Oakland on August 1, to discuss activities on Port property and air quality.
 - vi. There was one speaker on this item: Sanjiv Handa

- 7. Discussion of the Process and Metrics to be utilized by the OIO Task Force to Prioritize Recommendations to Council.
 - i. This item was held over to the next meeting.
 - ii. It was unclear how the “4 E’s” (Environmental Enhancement, Economic Prosperity, Social Equity, and Engagement) are going to fit into this discussion.
 - iii. TFM Graham called attention to a preliminary outline on metrics provided in the June agenda package.

- 8. Future Agenda Items.
 - i. Discussion of Process and Metrics, held over to the August meeting from this meeting (put early on the agenda, before presentations).
 - ii. TFM Register’s presentation.
 - iii. Post-Carbon Institute presentation (TFM Heinberg will make contact).
 - iv. TFM Kim will contact Rebecca Kaplan of the AC Transit Board to see if there might be AC information to report.

- 9. Announcements.
 - i. The Task Force voted unanimously to move the next full meeting from August 16 to August 30. Motion proposed by TFM Kim and seconded by TFM Room.
 - ii. Grand opening of the third Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) fueling station (accessible to public) on July 26, at 10 a.m.— Brush Street at 2nd.
 - iii. Friday July 27, San Jose Electronic Transportation Development Association will sponsor a workshop on clean fleet vehicles.
 - iv. TFM Kim endorses Victor Uno and Margaret Gordon for Port Commission, and suggests support because of their work on labor, environmental and environmental justice issues.

- 10. Adjournment at 9:30 pm.