

Transportation Focus Group

August 19, 2025, 3 – 4:30 pm



Action Items/Takeaways

- Follow up with SR2S regarding use of school travel data in GPU process
- Strengthen framework by including/connecting ideas with other city/county initiatives
- All Options are great and it would be great to implement them all
- Options have no conflict, it's not clear what the constraints are
- SLR, Link21, Vision 980 missing from maps
- Rethink role of cars in city; use freeway to advantage
- RR is severe challenge to development in estuary
- Transportation connectivity is big issue in E Oakland, and between Estuary and flatlands
- Uncertainty of OUSD, children are travelling across neighborhoods
- Lack of micromobility stations in area east of High St
- Several corridors are in the HIN; we need to make them safe places where people want to be (ACTC San Pablo Study is a good planning example)
- Foothill and Bancroft are not parallel corridors
- How can we plan for transit even if we are not a transit provider?

Attendees

Staff Presenters: Lakshmi Rajagopalan, Michelle Matranga

Staff Attendees: SP: Timothy Green, Daniel Findley, and Ed Manasse. DOT: Colin Piethe and Jason Patton

Focus Group Participants: Robert Prinz, Advocacy Director, Bike East Bay; George Spies, Co-Organizer, Traffic Violence Rapid Response; Chris Hwang, Board President Walk Oakland Bike Oakland; Courtney Wood, SSA and Technical Assistance Lead, Alameda County SR2S; Bryan Culbertson, Volunteer, Traffic Violence Rapid Response; Justin Hu-Nguyen, Co-Executive Director of Mobility Justice, Bike East Bay; Kenny Jeong, Traffic Engineer, Alameda County Safe Routes to Schools Program; Tom Holub, Board Chair, Original Scraper Bike Team; Denise Turner, Lead Program Manager, Alameda CTC / SR2S; Valerie Haines, Associate Engineer, Alameda County Safe Routes to Schools Program; Jennifer Cohen, Pacific Merchant Shipping Association; Carter Lavin, Transbay Coalition & East Bay Transit Riders Union; Mark Spencer, Alameda CTC / SR2S; Erin Blankinship, East Oakland Resident; Alice Chen, Oakland Resident and Board Member, Transform

Meeting Purpose and Goals

Solicit feedback on the Options for Stabilization and Growth. Participants grouped and invited to attend specific meetings based upon their role. This meeting gathers perspective on the Options from transportation professionals and advocates.



Summary of Engagement

Plan Options Presentation + Discussion

Summary of Feedback

The Options, Planning Process and General Comments

Denise T: has safe routes data informed the GPU process?

SP staff believe SRTS data was used and offered follow up to confirm.

Mark S: “Neighborhoods” emphasis on providing better access to underserved communities is appreciated. SR2S recommends tying the Options in with city and county programs and initiatives. From a federal and state level safety is an area of transportation that is not being attacked, with higher success to keep these programs going. If GPU ties in pedestrian and bicycle, safe routes to school, trail, and parks programs, and shows how these all support each other - the City will better be able to leverage grant funding.

SP Staff: policy/program details and interdepartmental coordination will emerge during element development and implementation

Bryan C: Options aren’t in conflict. It would be great to implement them all; how are they compared? What are the trade-offs/constraints that would keep you from implementing all?

SP staff: high level presentation, report comparisons in Chapter 4. Rationale for 3 concepts structure provided, including short, mid, or long term implementation goals. The Options are framing is an exercise, upzoning to accommodate growth occurred through the HE. This process is about how we can address our strengths/weaknesses as a city. It is a false dichotomy to create these as options-- actually all could happen, but they help frame a discussion: Where can growth be accommodated and where can it help meet community needs? What transportation infrastructure is needed to support new growth centers? DOT staff: a helpful way of thinking about the Options is their dimension for growth, how and where would it be accommodated, and what proportion would go where.

George S: Like “themes” or “emphases” rather than options.

Carter L: Maps should include SLR and adaptation plans, Link 21 and I-980 removal.

SP staff: climate change addressed during GPU1/Safety Element, SLR will continue to be addressed in the LUTE/GPU 2, carrying over SLR combing zone from DOSP, and RSAP work to address gaps in BCDC requirements. Coordination with Link 21 and Vision 980 teams and community feedback laid groundwork for San Antonio Station Hub in the Options Report.

Carter L: Regarding fire risk in the hills, I'm assuming over the next 100-years, there's a managed retreat. Transit investment should go in where people will be living in 20 years and growth directed away from the hills.

SP staff: Safety Element addressed, OFD is updating their Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, and not planning for growth in the hills.

George S: Various elements of the different options are good ideas. Rethink the role of cars. Many freeways cut through Oakland; ameliorate their presence and take advantage of them to



reduce thru traffic on surface streets. A comprehensive transportation plan should look at lowering speed and volume on our streets.

Tom H: Hegenberger Improvement Study didn't get funded; our kids use that road. There are projects/ideas for improving connections in E Oakland, but not a lot of movement on them.

George S: Port is substantial to economy; traffic generated by the Port needs to be thought through so it doesn't conflict with people/community centered growth.

George S: 980 should become our "Central Park;" we are desperately short of recreational space and this would be our last foreseeable opportunity.

Option A

Courtney Wood: SR2S works with OUSD, parents and OakDOT on developing recommendations for infrastructure around schools. Pros/cons to all approaches. Oakland as "city of neighborhoods" is a great way to help localize infrastructure recommendations that we include around schools, but we need to learn more about District enrollment, which is declining. We don't know what that will look like overtime or if there will be school closures. Many families already travel between neighborhoods to get to schools, what does that look like for how we get those growth areas to their schools, both potentially within and outside of their neighborhood? It is a changing system with uncertainties that we must consider.

Option B

George S: ACTC's San Pablo Ave Plan is great and when implemented, we'll see organic growth emerge because of infrastructure work done on the street. Likewise, with Option B, the way to get there is to make the corridor pleasant place to walk and be in. For many places, the street is unpleasant outside of a car. How do we fix that? If people are going to drive less, use transit more, we have to think that through.

Justin H: Every aspect of the plan is interesting; we are a city of smaller neighborhoods. We have a legacy of needing to ship people from east to west; I want more crosstown corridor planning: how do we create a facility that suits all ages and abilities and addresses safety-- whether it is creating more urban greenways, or it's on San Pablo, Foothill, MacArthur or Bancroft. Could a kid bike to their school? A parallel route is insufficient because you're weaving in/out of major corridors and traffic. I want to ride a full journey knowing the route will be safe. We have a lottery-based system for schools and kids are scattered all over the city.

Robert P: Foothill, Bancroft, and International are not parallel corridors; each has important destinations that serve people of all modes. The Complete Streets concept means that each corridor is important for people to use via all modes; each should provide reasonable and safe access, not either/or. All 3 are hotspots on the high injury network and will not get better without dedicated corridor investments to slow car traffic. That's impossible while prioritizing thru car traffic. Those corridors need to be approached from a traffic safety perspective – a high-level development and planning process of those corridors needs its own process, not necessarily as part of the general plan. As we saw with the International BRT, there were concerns with the project outcome; businesses did not feel included during planning or construction.

Bryan C: HIN = 8% of streets responsible for 60% of severe and fatal collisions in the Oakland.



Chris H: I would encourage a policy to support park and open space maintenance, perhaps local hiring or support for improvement districts to maintain and to program these enhanced spaces, transforming spaces into multi-functional "third spaces".

Bryan C: Is there a public transit plan part of this project? Can we come up solutions to make a public transit be a predominant way to get around the city, like what exists in San Francisco?

SP staff: working with AC Transit to get feedback and more information on their plans. LUTE will focus on transit and making Oakland streets safer. DOT staff: while the city is transit rich. it is a challenge as it not a transit provider and the transit providers cross jurisdictions. The city has street grid bones for a transit first city and it's about getting more density to support it - the corridor option offers high potential to align infrastructure and density.

Option C

Justin H: Moving some of the employment center Mid-East would shorten commutes. I always hear people have to drive because they have to go far. Far is relative, but how can we create more alternatives to driving?

Robert P: There's been many missed opportunities in this midtown area. Measure DD (2002) was supposed to complete the Shoreline Bay Trail and failed to between Jingtown and Tidewater, mostly due to difficulty in negotiating with shoreline property owners. With targeted development, build in opportunity to complete long-neglected Bay Trail segments, and critical connectivity for biking and walking in an area. Similarly, the East Bay Greenway project is moving along, but was watered down due to failed negotiations with UPRR, extreme cost, and required environmental mitigations. Even with the trail moved from RR ROW, the pollution is there. This project should acknowledge and develop a plan for environmental remediation.

Robert P: One huge improvement would be for UPRR to relinquish that ROW along San Leandro St; it would increase connectivity between waterfront and neighborhoods on the other side of San Leandro St. Union Pacific shut down the completion of the San Leandro Creek Trail over to 105th Ave. If they're out of the picture, the city or county could finish that project, improve permeability for BART and build out the rest of the East Bay Greenway as originally planned. Connectivity between flats and shoreline is critical-- bike/walk bridges and I-80 interchanges. There have been plenty of studies and plans, but nothing's happened. There are no large parks in E Oakland. There's a giant waterfront area that's too difficult to access.

Bryan C: San Antonio plan includes a shuttle; make it AC Transit-funded to integrate with the transit network instead of a separate program that wouldn't be as useful.

Tom H: If you attempt to create a new waterfront zone, it could fall into the same situation we've had trying to revitalize JLS for 30 years. The town projects included hundreds of millions of dollars for access to JLS, which is well connected relative to E. Oakland. You'll have similar problems in the mid-waterfront, with multiple rail lines and I-880 in between where people live.

Maintenance and Stabilization

Robert P: New street trees/greenery installations are great, but Oakland also needs better maintenance of existing trees and of new plantings to make sure they grow healthy. Also, car impacts harm street trees and greenery, with regards to crashes and pollution.



Robert P: Regarding stabilization, it would be helpful to understand the estimated cost to Oakland related to car traffic and crashes, and provide a dedicated analysis of the impacts to infrastructure, local businesses, health and safety impacts, lawsuits/settlements, crime, and environmental impacts. Car traffic impacts city finances and forces tough decisions on other stuff that people say that they want. Without a dollar amount on impacts, it's hard for the city to make a case for proactive investments.

Tom H: The biggest issue for active transportation in E. Oakland is access and safety on HIN corridors. There are barriers to get around and through neighborhoods off Foothill, San Leandro, 73rd and 98th. We're doing a project on 98th to build a new clubhouse; what's going happen to the kids there? Another piece is access to the waterfront.

Erin B: E. Oakland needs massive infrastructure investment. Before we work on waterfront developments, we need to fix the streets and make this place more livable, walkable and beautiful. It feels like nobody cares about this part of the city. I drive because it's horrible biking. How is E. Oakland so overlooked and not thought about in a more intentional, focused way? Why are you putting a giant storage facility on the corner of High St and International Blvd?

Micromobility

Justin H: With more e-bikes coming; how will patterns change and how do we create safe spaces and interactions? Current greenways may be insufficient to accommodate e-mobility or cargo bikes. How do we create facilities to accommodate all people and mobility options?

Tom H: The micromobility landscape is embarrassing. There's nothing east of High St for Bay Wheels and for all other options, there's nothing as far as High St. None are accessible and all violate ADA; no one is proposing anything to address that. We need real contracts with these companies that require them to do the things that we plan for in our city.

DOT Staff: currently expanding bike share into East Oakland

<https://oaklandbpac.org/2025/06/11/baywheels-update/>