Regular Meeting Agenda  
PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION  
Thursday, September 5, 2013 at 7:00 p.m.  
North Berkeley Senior Center

7:00 pm CALL TO ORDER: Chair will call the meeting to order; Secretary will call roll.

7:05 pm PUBLIC COMMENT: Each speaker is limited to three (3) minutes.

7:30 pm APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Regular Meeting of July 2, 2013

7:35 pm CHAIR REPORT:

7:40 pm STAFF REPORT: Status of Permeable Paving Pilot Project

7:45 pm ANNOUNCEMENTS:

7:50 pm ACTION ITEMS: (Matters for discussion and possible action)
1. Measure M Public Process:  
   a. Draft Measure M report*  
   b. Notes from the May 2nd community meeting*  
   c. Notes from the June 8th community meeting*  
   d. Notes from the July 18th community meeting*  
   e. Summary of public comments*  
   f. Council Work Session October 1, 2013

2. New 5-Year Paving Plan: Preliminary Staff Draft**

3. Renaming Twain Path to Betty Olds Path*

9:00 pm INFORMATION ITEMS: (Action may be taken on any information item at this meeting if a majority of Commissioners votes to move it to an action item. This vote may take place at or before the time the item is scheduled to come up).

9:05 pm FUTURE AGENDAS

9:15 pm ADJOURNMENT

* Indicates written material included in packet.  
** Indicates material to be delivered at meeting.

This meeting is being held in a wheelchair accessible location.  
To request a disability-related accommodation(s) to participate in the meeting, including auxiliary aids or services, please contact the Disability Services specialist at 971-6346(V) or 971-7075 (TDD) at least three business days before the meeting date.  
Please refrain from wearing scented products to this meeting.
1947 Center Street, 4th Floor, Berkeley, CA 94704-1155 Tel: 510.971-6400 TDD: 510.971.6903 Fax: 510.971.6390 E-mail: publicworks@ci.berkeley.ca.us
Regular Meeting
PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION
Minutes
Thursday, July 2, 2013
Willow Room, Ratcliff Building
1326 Allston Way

CALL TO ORDER:
Present: Yep, Schueler, Henry, Haramati, Neal, Swift
Absent: Kelley

PUBLIC COMMENT: Each speaker is limited to three (3) minutes.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the regular meeting of June 6, 2013 were approved as submitted (MSC Henry/Schueler with a vote of 6-0-0)

CHAIR REPORT: The Chair reported on discussions of similar topics at the American Water Works Association (AWWA) conference recently.

STAFF REPORT: None.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: None.

ACTION ITEMS:
1. Measure M Public Process: Subcommittee Report
   A. Recap of June 8th community meeting: The meeting went very well, and good feedback was received. This will be summarized in written meeting notes. A total of 56 people attended the first two meetings.
   B. Planning for July 18th community meeting: The content of the meeting announcement flyer was discussed and amended accordingly. The final flyer was approved. The agenda was also discussed and approved (MSC Neal/Henry with a vote of 6-0-0).

The scorecard was discussed. Reconstruction should be paid for by Measure M, and maintenance by existing fund sources. Cost-effectiveness and leveraging are important considerations. The public and all stakeholders should evaluate the applicability consistency of “RAD 5 & 6.” Is there a trade-off between durability and permeability?

This meeting is being held in a wheelchair accessible location.
To request a disability-related accommodation(s) to participate in the meeting, including auxiliary aids or services, please contact the Disability Services specialist at 971-6346(V) or 971-7075 (TDD) at least three business days before the meeting date.
Please refrain from wearing scented products to this meeting.
1947 Center Street, 4th Floor, Berkeley, CA 94704-1155 Tel: 510.971-6400 TDD: 510.971.6903 Fax: 510.971.6390
E-mail: publicworks@ci.berkeley.ca.us
A script is needed for the residents who come out to the meetings whose only interest is “when will my street get paved?” The recommended criteria for prioritizing streets by the PWC could be adjusted to accommodate those. This will be tabled to at least November 2013 when the Commission will have time available.

Organizing future recommendations to Council: The public is invited to attend the September and October regular meetings. Further discussion is needed on where to go after that.

2. **5-Year Paving Plan Subcommittee Assignments:** Commissioners Schueler, Neal, and Kelley are appointed to the subcommittee (MSC Neal/Swift with a vote of 6-0-0).

**INFORMATION ITEMS:** None.

**FUTURE AGENDAS:** As planned in the Measure M process already set up.

**ADJOURNMENT:** 9:22 p.m.
July 18, 2013 Community Meeting Notes

A community meeting was held July 18, 2013 as part of the planning process to implement Measure M. The meetings are organized by the Berkeley Public Works Commission, in partnership with the Community Environmental Advisory Commission, the Transportation Commission, Parks and Waterfront Commission and the League of Women Voters. The July 18th meeting was the last of three public meetings and was to get input on the proposed scorecard for selecting Measure M projects. This document summarizes the following:

- Public input received in three breakout discussion groups
- Summary of public comments at the meeting and responses

Breakout Group Discussions

At this meeting, participants were asked to split into three breakout groups to help evaluate proposed criteria for the scorecard and to provide input on the broad ranking of the three major groups of those criteria, i.e. Resource Allocation and Durability (RAD – “Streets”), Overall Community Improvement (OCI) and Environment and Climate (EC). The following summarizes the public input.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Priority Criteria and Ranking</th>
<th>Additional Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Breakout Group 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leveraging funds should be highest priority based on the June 8th input</td>
<td>- We should continue to get public input during evolution of the process (e.g. in 2014).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Community enhancements are high priority</td>
<td>- Should consider adding visibility to work being done under Measure M (signage, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Ranking</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD  33.3  30</td>
<td>- Concern that after paving, roads are torn up and life of pavement PCI is shortened. There is an advantage to using permeable or “brick” type pavement to mitigate this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCI  33.3  40</td>
<td>- Community enhancements are high priority, including reconfiguring streets (e.g. narrow streets, trees on shopping streets, shared streets).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC  33.3  30</td>
<td>- We need to see benefit in long term, something that lasts 30 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Breakout Group 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Process should reflect urgency of environmental and climate concerns, e.g. stormwater runoff, flooding</td>
<td>- Desire to have less process, more results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project coordination – potential future undergrounding of utilities; bike and pedestrian safety.</td>
<td>- Recycling rubber tires into pavement is something to consider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- RAD are all engineering questions.</td>
<td>- Community and Environment are complicated questions with new ideas and different opinions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Scarcity of funds highlights need to advance multiple goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Breakout Group 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Ranking</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD  45</td>
<td>- Very important that pavement and project lasts a long time, high quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCI  30-35</td>
<td>- Get it done quickly – want results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC  20-25</td>
<td>- Important criteria:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note:</strong> Ranking depends on where you live in Berkeley</td>
<td>- Traffic volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Durable material (at least 20 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Get it done quickly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Traffic calming/safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Comments and Responses

The following summarizes public comments at the meeting. Responses were from Phil Harrington, Public Works Assistant Director, and Ken Emeziem, Public Works Engineer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Comments/Questions</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nancy Mueller:</strong> I live on Alvarado Road. Looking at PCI on the map, we may have questions. Is there an opportunity to work with City engineers? I think we can help you identify problem areas.</td>
<td><strong>Phil Harrington:</strong> Yes, in a number of ways. Right now, we are working with the Public Works Commission to incorporate street prioritization processes, along with the Watershed Plan. The first phase is accelerating street paving; we are looking at other elements as we go through process, e.g. coordination with utilities is important. Ken’s group has the role to communicate our plan effectively with utilities so work is done up front and won’t be torn up later. A lot of coordination goes into this. <strong>Kenneth Emeziem:</strong> I’ve met with someone on Alvarado, but I’m happy to meet with anyone from the group for input. When do you want to meet?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aunt Bea:</strong> I like meetings where I can take information back to my seniors. We’re getting older in South Berkeley and are concerned about our streets, especially flooding. Also in our area we need sewers cleaned; it hasn’t been done since the fire (1991). We’re concerned that using tires in pavement is contamination.</td>
<td><strong>Kenneth Emeziem:</strong> The City of Berkeley has not used any tire rubber in any paving yet. It is only a consideration. If we do it, it won’t necessarily be only in South Berkeley. The City of Berkeley has one of best sewer programs in California. We clean our sewers. If you know of an area that needs work, we’ll meet with you and we’ll clean it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sherry Smith:</strong> In Oregon, roads were very smooth. We learned it was because they are using recycled tires in the pavement. However, we also learned they are not permeable.</td>
<td><strong>Phil Harrington:</strong> Rubber has its value and benefits. It provides a quieter and smoother ride. No pavement used conventionally is permeable. Streets are now designed to keep water out and prevent erosion of the sub-layer. Cracks in the pavement can lead to potholes. On the PCI map, the streets identified with reds and oranges are not the priority streets for maintenance [but rather for reconstruction]. If we don’t maintain good streets, they will deteriorate and need more expensive treatments later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anonymous:</strong> Do we have the 5-year [paving] plan online now or is it somehow available?</td>
<td><strong>Phil Harrington:</strong> We are developing the 5-year plan now with the Public Works Commission and the Public Works Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anonymous:</strong> Is there any effort being made to look beyond the 5-yr plan to undergrounding utilities?</td>
<td><strong>Phil Harrington:</strong> Most undergrounding funding is provided by PG&amp;E. It’s very expensive. We are now looking at a lot of cost to improve the City’s infrastructure. Watershed improvement costs are $208 million. To get the PCI to 75, will cost $68-70 million. We are working on getting grants for some of these projects. It’s a lot of money needed, but Measure M is a great start.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anonymous:</strong> Is there a [long-range] master plan concept for infrastructure work? e.g. undergrounding, water, community amenities, etc.? We need a long-range master plan.</td>
<td><strong>Phil Harrington:</strong> $30 million for streets is a giant step forward for accelerating street improvements. We’re looking at developing a balanced approach for prioritizing. We’re looking at making a ‘giant dent’ in pavement needs. <strong>Phil Harrington:</strong> Yes, and we will incorporate work from Complete Streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alex M.:</strong> I’ve lived on Alvarado since 1971. It didn’t get repaved after fire (1991). Measure M is just a small portion of what needs to be done. Will the “giant dent” be green oriented?</td>
<td><strong>Phil Harrington:</strong> Yes, and we will incorporate work from Complete Streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ben Gerhard-Stein:</strong> I’m a member of the East Bay Bicycle Coalition. I want to put a plug in to make Berkeley a world-class bicycling destination by taking care of bikeways. Also re safety issues, reconsider how things are striped.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A community information session was held on May 2, 2013 to inform the public about Measure M. The meeting included a public comment period and a survey of public preferences. This document is prepared to respond to the questions asked and to provide a summary of the survey results.

**Public Questions and Planning Team Responses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Public Comments/Questions</th>
<th>Planning Team Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The planning team should use a website and there needs to be a better process for taking comments. If we want to encourage people to send comments, it’s not efficient to send them to staff. A Google doc would even be better.</td>
<td>The planning team developed a website for Measure M, with an online survey, to make it easier to interact with the community. It was not approved by the City due to the precedence it would set and the short duration of this process. The planning team is making the best use of traditional media and is open to ideas on better ways to communicate with the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Have we considered paving only the center of the street, and not the parking strips, as they've done in Oakland?</td>
<td>The planning team has discussed this with the Public Works Department and they are aware of this concept and the use in Oakland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The scenario planning process should allow for voting; maybe through dot voting or clickers.</td>
<td>The planning team values this input and will be using a more inter-active approach with the public at the June 8th community meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Greater weight should be given to projects that align with multiple issues, like bicycling, walking and climate change. We should consider what projects will lead to multiple benefits, and we can develop a formula based on these multiple benefits to score and rank projects. Look to green infrastructure projects in Emeryville.</td>
<td>The planning team values this input and will be moving to a multiple criteria “scorecard” approach to prioritize future projects. This new approach will be discussed at the June 8th community meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have we considered cool pavements?</td>
<td>The planning team is aware of cool pavements and has informed the Public Works Department. We will try to learn more on this as the process moves forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Are we considering the use of the funding to leverage outside money, like through matching funds?</td>
<td>The Public Works Department regularly reviews the availability of grant funding to leverage City funds on a variety of projects. This will be part of the scorecard criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>We can look at MRP (stormwater permits for litter collection) funds and leverage those funds since Measure M projects can assist with litter collection (example: sidewalk planting strip can catch litter and then be picked up, rather than litter going into sewers).</td>
<td>The planning team has informed the Public Works Department and they will look into how stormwater permit funding can be leveraged in conjunction with Measure M funds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**If you have questions, contact:**
Ray Yep, Public Works Commission, rayyep1@gmail.com
Sherry Smith, League of Women Voters, president@lwvbae.org
Summary of Survey Results
We received 15 survey responses at the May 2nd community meeting. The results are summarized as follows.

Survey Question 1—Funding needs and priorities:
“Utilizing sustainable and durable paving” received the highest number of votes for “highly important” priorities for Measure M funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding needs and priorities:</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Highly Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve pavement condition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve water quality of creeks and bays</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize sustainable and durable paving</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce flooding</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the priorities were ranked, there was no consensus. Each funding need and priority received equal numbers as a top priority. Although respondents ranked the “utilize sustainable and durable paving” priority slightly higher overall.

Survey Question 2—Secondary benefits:
‘Improving pedestrian and bike mobility’ had 8 high priority votes, with ‘reducing greenhouse gas emissions’ at 5 high priority votes. ‘Providing traffic calming’ came in last with only one high priority vote.

Survey Question 3—Types of streets that should include green infrastructure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of streets:</th>
<th>Number of Votes (out of 15 surveys)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streets identified in the Watershed Management Plan</td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets slated for full reconstruction (versus just an overlay)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets with documented flooding</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets that drain directly to a creek or water body</td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets that are seen by many residents</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (streets with trash; bike boulevards; streets that are pollutant source hot spots; bike and pedestrian friendly streets)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Streets identified in the Watershed Management Plan’ and ‘Streets that drain directly to a creek or water body’ received the highest number of votes.
A community meeting was held on June 8, 2013 as part of the planning process to implement Measure M. The meetings are organized by the Berkeley Public Works Commission, in partnership with the Community Environmental Advisory Commission, the Transportation Commission, Parks and Recreation Commission and the League of Women Voters. The June 8th meeting was the second of three public meetings and was to get input on criteria to be used in selecting Measure M projects. This document summarizes the following:

- Public input received in three breakout discussion groups
- Dot voting of the high priority criteria from the breakout groups
- Written survey results
- Summary of public comments at the meeting and responses

**Breakout Group Discussions**

At this meeting, participants were asked to split into three breakout groups to help determine criteria for a proposed scorecard and to rank those criteria. The following summarizes the public input.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Top Priority Criteria</strong></th>
<th><strong>Additional Criteria</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Breakout Group 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Integrate with other plans, especially watershed plan, but also the pedestrian, bike, climate, downtown, and area plans</td>
<td>- Undergrounding utilities – projects are hard to come by, hard to implement, take the opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Best bang for the buck” and longevity</td>
<td>- Collaborate with neighboring cities (funding, projects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leverage funds, e.g. public/private partnerships</td>
<td>- City municipal permit re stormwater, regulatory compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Geologic considerations, e.g. landslides, earthquakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Focus on getting things done, projects in the ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Helps to grow parks and greenspace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consider parking – loss could be good or bad depending on circumstance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of people impacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Visibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Breakout Group 2**      |                         |
| - Flood prevention | - Determination should be data driven, e.g. it’s more cost effective to repair streets before they fail. Replacement is the most expensive street repair. |
| - Durability (should be a pre-requisite, not just a criteria) | - Longevity |
| - Stormwater quality | - Materials, e.g. consider toxicity and greenhouse gas emissions |
| - Cost effectiveness – long term cost | - Slope and direction of the street as a factor influencing water storage and infiltration |
| **Note:** Group 2 emphasized that durable pavement and permeable pavement are not equivalent. | - High visibility of a project should not be a determinant but rather what works over the long-term |
|                           | - High use |

| **Breakout Group 3**      |                         |
| - Spend money on things that will actually solve problems | - Durability – city is recycling streets one every 60 years. We want to keep up rather than falling behind. |
| - Quick action – want to see this happen soon, not committee meetings and Council meetings. May want to avoid projects that require lots of engineering. | - Multiple criteria, e.g. small streets keep falling behind, so need more or different criteria so that they eventually “rise to the top”. |
| - Safety for school children and bikes, e.g. potholes. Safe routes for those not driving. | - Leveraging funds |
|                           | - Life-cycle costs – should evaluate materials for example |
|                           | - Flooding prevention for ‘below grade’ garages – is there something we can do that will actually work. |
**Dot Voting of High Priority Criteria**

The breakout group input can be consolidated into the several categories. In order of rank based on dot voting results, the criteria and their breakout group source(s) are:

**Long Term “Bang for Buck” (18 votes)**
The highest combined priority, mentioned by all three breakout groups as a top priority, was described as “long term ‘bang for the buck’”.
- Best bang for the buck and longevity (Group 1)
- Spend money on things that will actually solve problems (Group 2)
- Cost effectiveness (Group 3)

**Integrate with Other Plans (14 votes)**
For this category, three related categories were combined including: integrated benefit (5 votes), bike plan (8 votes), and pedestrian plan (1 vote).
- Integrate with other plans, especially watershed plan, but also the pedestrian, bike, climate, downtown, and area plans (Group 1)

**Improves Stormwater Quality (12 votes)**
- Improve stormwater quality (Group 3)

**Durable Pavement (11 votes)**
- Durability – city is recycling streets once every 60 years. We want to keep up rather than falling behind. (Group 3)
  *Note: this was not a top priority for breakout group 3 but was mentioned by several in the general discussion.*

**Leverage Funds (10 votes)**
- Leverage funds, e.g. public/private partnerships (Group 1)

**Mitigates Flooding (8 votes)**
- Flood prevention (Group 3)

**Quick Action (6 votes)**
- Quick action – want to see this happen soon, not committee meetings and Council meetings. May want to avoid projects that require lots of engineering. (Group 2)

**Surface Street Safety (4 votes)**
- Safety for school children and bikes, e.g. potholes. Safe routes for those not driving. (Group 2)

![Number of Votes Graph](image)

*Note: “Integrates with other plans” includes “bike plan” and “ped plan” which were initially broken out separately.*
Written Survey Results

A survey form was distributed to gather input from the attendees. 11 responses were received at the June 8th community meeting in addition to the 15 received at the May 2nd meeting. The 11 responses received at the June 8th meeting are summarized as follows.

Survey Question 1—Funding needs and priorities:
“Improve pavement condition” and “Utilizing sustainable and durable paving” received the highest number of votes for “highly important” priorities for Measure M funding. At the May 2nd meeting, results were consistent with “Utilizing sustainable and durable paving” receiving the highest number of votes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding needs and priorities:</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Highly Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve pavement condition</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve water quality of creeks and bays</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize sustainable and durable paving</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce flooding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the priorities were ranked, improving pavement condition was ranked highest the most. Reducing flooding received the lowest rankings.

Survey Question 2—Secondary benefits:
“Improving pedestrian and bike mobility” and “reducing greenhouse gasses” had the most high priority votes. “Providing traffic calming” came in last with only one high priority vote. These results are consistent with the first meeting survey results.

Survey Question 3—Types of streets that should include green infrastructure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of streets:</th>
<th>Number of Votes (out of 11 responses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streets identified in the Watershed Management Plan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets slated for full reconstruction (versus just an overlay)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets with documented flooding</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets that drain directly to a creek or water body</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets that are seen by many residents</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (streets with trash; bike boulevards; streets that are pollutant source hot spots; bike and pedestrian friendly streets)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Streets with documented flooding” and “Streets that drain directly to a creek or water body” received the highest number of votes at the June 8th meeting. At the May 2nd meeting, “Streets that drain directly to a creek or water body” also received a high number of votes.

Additional comments received on the survey:

- Is public works considering open pavement friction course as an alternative to traditional overlay? There are multiple benefits.
- Should maximize opportunities for grants and other leveraging.
- Need to provide through routes for bicyclists.
- Alvarado road needs repaving ASAP.
- Think about how to get citizen to vote for future taxes/bonds.
- Small residential streets in poor condition will have a hard time meeting sufficient criteria.
- Streets with high visibility so future bond measures will be more successful.
- Condition of paving makes biking unsafe.
Public Comments and Responses

The following summarizes public comments at the meeting. Responses were from Andrew Clough, Public Works Director, and Ken Emeziem, Public Works Engineer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Comments</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nancy Bickle:</strong> If criterion for picking streets to repair is cost effectiveness, we know that it is more cost effective to fix less damaged streets. Will you ever tear up streets [that require rebuild] to put in permeable pavers?</td>
<td>Andrew Clough: We want to avoid tearing up streets, but can do so when appropriate. It depends on the criteria chosen, location, and consideration of constructability. We need to learn on the use of permeable pavers as we go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wayne Huber:</strong> Permeable pavement is difficult over clay soils. Mr. Huber recommends we limit permeable pavement and focus on paving, safety, bike lanes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Toni Mester:</strong> Liability is not addressed. How much is the City responsible for private property flooding? How long can we continue draining with gravity? How effective are valley drains (water remains on surface) vs. large storage pipes?</td>
<td>Andrew Clough: Subsurface drains are designed to collect water and release it slowly – it will slow water down. Yes, the City may have some liability for flooding if the stormwater system itself has caused the damage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alisa Rose Seidlitz:</strong> Can we use green infrastructure to slow water down?</td>
<td>Andrew Clough: That is our intent. That is the type of improvement that will give a street more priority for action/funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Branka Krsul:</strong> What do we need to do to get our street paved?</td>
<td>Andrew Clough: We pave about 8% of the streets a year. We are here to work on developing criteria and to look for opportunities to install green infrastructure. Kenneth Emeziem: We use the “StreetSaver” program to determine the first cut for paving. We are now developing additional criteria based on Measure M. You can contact the Public Works department if you have further questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michael O’Day:</strong> What is the input from residents on the street to be paved? Does Public Works come by and ask residents on the street what is planned? How can residents get control or have influence?</td>
<td>Kenneth Emeziem: Initially, we don’t contact the neighbors and use StreetSaver to determine which streets will be paved. We use a 5-year paving plan to determine which streets will be paved; this is available to the public. Also, three months before each paving project, the Public Works Department sends a notice to residents and they can provide comments. One month before paving, another notice is sent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Susan Wengraf:</strong> We have problems with landslides in the hills. Do we have data on how pavers behave in active geologic areas?</td>
<td>Kenneth Emeziem: Public Works is using a world-class consultant on our pilot project. We see no problem in the hills (however, not on a very steep grade like Marin).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Susan Wengraf:</strong> Could we use pavers in sidewalk repair?</td>
<td>Andrew Clough: We need to consider the substructure needed. Sidewalks are thin and may not be appropriate, but improvements might be coordinate with street repair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have questions, contact:
Ray Yep, Public Works Commission, rayyep1@gmail.com
Sherry Smith, League of Women Voters, president@lwvbae.org
Note: Public comments are listed in the order of the most recent at the top of the list.

<table>
<thead>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>8/22/2013 Terri Bimes</td>
<td>Wildcat Canyon and Grizzly Peak need to be safe for bicyclists and improved.</td>
<td>Hi, I wanted to put my two cents in about repaving Wildcat Canyon and Grizzly Peak Drive. These roads are two of the gems of Berkeley. There are so many bikers who travel these roads. The potholes, however, make it treacherous. It would be great to have safe roads to bike on. Thank you for your consideration, Terri Bimes Member of the YMCA Tri Club</td>
<td>8/23/2013: Terri, We are tabulating and incorporating input from Berkeley citizens and thank you for your input. Ray Yep Chair, Public Works Commission</td>
<td>8/23/2013: Thank you Ray. I appreciate your efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>8/20/2013 Maria Garcia</td>
<td>Wildcat Canyon Road is dangerous to bicyclists and need improving. Suggesting posting caution signs.</td>
<td>Ray Yep met with Maria Garcia and Esta Brand on 8/20/2013 to discuss their concerns on the condition of Wildcat Canyon Road. Ms. Garcia responded with the following message on 8/21/2013: Hello Ray, Thanks so much for taking the time to meet with us yesterday, and for all the detailed information you provide us with at the meeting. I would like to verify with you the e-mail address where we need to send our comments, is: <a href="mailto:PWEngineering@cityofberkeley.info">PWEngineering@cityofberkeley.info</a> Regards Maria Garcia</td>
<td>8/21/2013: Maria, Yes, that is the correct email address. You should say &quot;Measure M community input&quot; in the subject line. Thanks for the opportunity to meet and discuss the concerns in your area. Ray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>8/18/2013 Bud Travers</td>
<td>Alvarado Road is in abysmal condition and needs to be improved.</td>
<td>I understand that the City has under review Streets and Watershed Improvements under Measure M. I am a 46 year resident of Berkeley who lives on Gravatt Drive, off of Alvarado Road. The road conditions leading to my home are abysmal and require correction. I want to stress in the strongest terms that Alvarado Rd. must be addressed and improved. the pot holes and uneven pavement is both dangerous and damaging to my vehicle. Please allocate funds to correcting Alvarado Road. Bud Travers 72 Gravatt Drive Berkeley, California</td>
<td>8/23/2013: Bud, We are tabulating and incorporating input from Berkeley citizens and thank you for your input. Ray Yep Chair, Public Works Commission</td>
<td>8/23/2013: Ray: Thanks for responding to my communication. The roads leading up to Gravatt are really in bad shape and need to be addressed. Many Thanks Bud Travers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>8/17/2013 Steve Robey</td>
<td>Wildcat Canyon Road and Grizzly Peak Blvd. are in dismal condition.</td>
<td>Hello Susan, This is just a follow up to our meeting last month regarding the dismal condition of Wildcat Canyon Road and Grizzly Peak Boulevard. Thank you once again for taking time to meet with us. I hope you have heard from our neighbors as well that this is a priority. We plan on following up by attending any relevant City Council meetings this fall. It is really important that the City of Berkeley adequately perform its basic services like road maintenance and repair, something which it no longer seems to think is part of its mandate.</td>
<td>8/23/2013: Steve, We are tabulating and incorporating input from Berkeley citizens and thank you for your input.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Thank you,
Steve Robey
548 Wildcat Canyon Road
Berkeley, CA 94708

From: Isabelle Gaston [mailto:isabelle.gaston@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 3:44 PM
To: abregul@gmail.com; agserp@sbcglobal.net; 'Albert'; 'Alice Gruber'; 'Alice Kahn'; andresacediel@gmail.com; 'Andy Fuchs'; 'Anthony Broese'; beckendo@berkeley.edu; cfineman@gmail.com; ckremen@gmail.com; claytonmschuster@gmail.com; 'Cohen, Frances'; cswarshaw@aol.com; dgartenb@yahoo.com; 'Don Kasamoto'; drubin@socrates.berkeley.edu; 'Eve Contente'; francineostrem@gmail.com; 'Gay Rose'; 'Georjana Barnes'; ghidora@sbcglobal.net; gould137@mac.com; hellboundslayer5150@gmail.com; cswarshaw@aol.com; hilarycynthia@comcast.net; 'James Williams'; 'Jim Guerette'; 'Jim Lunt'; 'Joe Ungerer'; 'Jonathon DeFoe'; 'Judith Maguire'; 'karen gold'; 'Karen Lottman'; lass@pixar.com; 'Kate Deyoe'; 'Kate Frankel'; kass@pixar.com; kudszus@berkeley.edu; 'Linda Banta'; 'Linda Fong'; 'Lisa Shen'; 'Mark Springer'; 'Mary Burmester'; moladen@sfsu.edu; 'Neil Burmester'; neilgewyn54@hotmail.com; 'Nigel Warshaw'; pilins@pacbell.net; P.sood@brainbang.com; pardeevt@comcast.net; pist_trips@yahoo.com; 'Patricia@batnet.com'; Paul Werner; ordering@comcast.net; richard@bloomberg.com; rsambb@sbcglobal.net; raymend.lin2001@yahoo.com; s.hatch@conveyinc.com; sambamboai2@aol.com; 'Shlomo Rosenfeld'; sk577@pacbell.net; steve.robey@gmail.com; swlewis53@yahoo.com; tami@nightinandayimages.com; tanynung@bcbglobal.net; tanabrahamson@yahoo.com; urthlove@yahoo.com; veronicacarg@yahoo.com; wildewoods@yahoo.com; wy21229@gmail.com; 'Adam Duhan'; lgbilertca@att.com; 'Sharon Eige'; wilam@pacific.net; 'Realtor'; 'Cole Smith'
Cc: swengraf@cityofberkeley.info
Subject: Pave Wildcat Canyon: Contact Susan Wengraf

Dear All,

Please find below the August newsletter from Susan Wengraf, our City Councilwoman. In it she requests YOUR input on the need for paving Wildcat Canyon. This is important. Please read it. She is also copied on this email.

Last week, Sybil, Steve, and I met with Susan as well as the Public Works Commissioner in charge of Measure M, Ray Yep. We toured Wildcat Canyon and Grizzly Peak by car and discussed the urgent need in having these roads paved. As most of you know, parts of these streets have not been paved in decades and they are extremely hazardous. We greatly appreciate Susan and Ray taking the time to meet with us and they shared with us some vital information – that is, if we want to have our streets paved we have to be VOCAL as residents and contact our local representatives. If there aren’t 15 votes on the City Council to support our request for the streets to be paved, it simply will not happen.

WE CANNOT ASSUME that because we voted for Measure M last fall (30 million dollar bond) and that our property taxes will be raised that any of the streets in our neighborhood will be paved. In fact, there is a good chance that very few streets in our neighborhood will see any improvement unless we take action. Why? Although 3 million is allocated for repairing roads every year and an additional 6 million will be available from Measure M per year for the next 5 years, the City Auditor stated that it would cost 65 million dollars to simply upgrade all the streets in Berkeley to an “average” rating from their present “failed” state (I can send you more info or the

Ray Yep
Chair, Public Works Commission
Again, please read Susan’s newsletter below and contact her. Let her know you care. She will share this with her fellow Council members. If the City doesn’t hear from us, they will think we’re OK with how the roads are up here. We are out of sight, out of mind. There is a lot of competition for how the annual 9 million dollars for road repair over the next several years will be spent. Let our voices be heard whether you are a bicyclist or just a concerned citizen.

Finally this is a **SMALL WINDOW OF OPPORTUNITY**. By early fall, the City will have drawn up their list of streets that will be repaved and either our streets including Wildcat are on it or they are not. Please pass this email along to anyone else in District 6.

Thank you!

Best,
Isabelle
<table>
<thead>
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<th>No.</th>
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</thead>
</table>
| 38  | 8/9/2013 David Nasatir  | Summit Road neighbors - 100% of Measure M funds should go to repave streets. | From: David Nasatir [mailto:nasatir@gmail.com]  
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 11:20 AM  
To: PWWorks  
Cc: Wengraf, Susan  
Subject: Measure M--  
  
After talking with my neighbors on the 1500 block of Summit Road, we have come to a consensus that 100% of the funds from the $30 M bond issue to repave streets should go for the "RAD" proposal; a technical emphasis on pavement and quantity. In general neighbor’s comments reflected the idea that the pavement on our street and the streets we use on a regular basis is so bad that it would be a mistake to focus on anything else until the general state of the roads in Berkeley were to be markedly improved.  
  
Thank you. | 2017 will most likely be paved much earlier as we will not have to wait for tax dollars to be collected and spent by calendar year but will be able to go to the bond market and raise Measure M capital now to fund those streets that are already identified for full "Reconstruction". There are a few more public meetings that are scheduled to be held by both the PWC and Council; if all goes well the new 5 year Paving Plan will be finalized by November. |
| 37  | 8/8/2013 Barbara Sargent | McGee Ave. resident - safe sidewalks are as important as street condition. | From: Barbara Sargent [mailto:barbarasargent@sbcglobal.net]  
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 7:59 PM  
To: PWEngineering  
Subject: Measure M Community Input  
  
It seems that "street repaving" refers to the roads where vehicles are driven. To me, safe sidewalks for pedestrians are at least as important. I have tripped and fallen several times because of the abominable condition of the sidewalks. This has happened mostly in my neighborhood. I live on McGee Ave. between Bancroft and Channing way. I walk almost everywhere. At my age, 74, I am particularly vulnerable to | |
<table>
<thead>
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| 36  | 8/2/2013 Isabelle Gaston, Sybil Hatch | Wildcat Canyon and Grizzly Peak Road – roads are unsafe for bicyclists and need to be repaved. | At the request of Isabelle Gaston and Sybil Hatch, Ray Yep met with them to review the pavement conditions on Wildcat Canyon Road and Grizzly Peak Road. We toured Wildcat Canyon Road from the intersection of Spruce Street to the Brazilian Room area. The pavement has extensive cracking, pot holes, and patching in several areas. The road has also had sewer work done. Isabelle and Sybil pointed out that many bicyclists use the road and that the pavement condition is dangerous. We also toured Grizzly Peak Road in the same area. Isabelle and Sybil pointed out that the road has bus traffic and it contributes to the heavy use and cracking of the pavement. Ray provided an update of the Measure M community meetings and the next steps in implementing street improvements. Isabelle and Sybil appreciated the visit and the information. They have also been communicating with Susan Wengraf on their concerns. | Hi Ray,  
I wanted to thank you very much for coming over last Friday to tour Wildcat Canyon and Grizzly Peak.  
We greatly appreciate your taking the time to meet with us and see how much these streets are in need of paving.  
I know there is a limited window of opportunity to ensure that these streets do indeed get on the list so I will probably reach out again to you in the near future and see if there is anything more that we can do before the October 1st City Council meeting.  
Sincerely,  
Isabelle | |
| 35  | 7/24/2013 Janice Thomas | Panoramic Hill – streets need improvements along with utility, sidewalk, and storm drainage needs. | JANICE THOMAS  
37 Mosswood Road  
Berkeley, CA 94704  
July 24, 2013  
Director Andrew Clough  
Public Works Department  
City of Berkeley  
Via electronic mail: PWEngineering@cityofberkeley.info  
Re: Measure M – Replacement of streets on Panoramic Hill  
Dear Mr. Clough,  
breaking a bone from a fall and I am not alone in this. Having level sidewalks is a necessity if people are to walk more. Isn't that a priority for Berkeley....fewer cars on the road?  
Please give strong consider to this issue in discussions about Measure M.  
Thank you.  
Sincerely,  
Barbara Sargent  
2316 McGee Ave.  
Berkeley, 94703 | | |
Thank you for rationalizing the priorities for street replacement and repair. Unfortunately, however, these priorities fall short of the comprehensiveness needed to correct years of neglect that some streets have suffered yet not others. As is so common in this town, priorities tend toward new development rather than investment in existing properties and structures. This is nowhere more evident than on Panoramic Hill where for years the City has deferred maintenance with hopes, perhaps, that we would give in and tax ourselves through an Assessment District so as to get emergency access, sewers, and roadwork. Instead, we have not taxed ourselves, except for Measure M, and as a result, have not gotten road improvements (other than patching) despite years of paying taxes for basic city services.

In the past, the City has prioritized residential streets other than Panoramic Hill streets despite those streets being less heavily trafficked and less degraded and not serving as corridor or feeder compared to Panoramic Way’s rating on all these variables. To illustrate, please compare Panoramic Way to Oak Ridge Road. These streets are similar in that both culminate in dead-ends, both are one-lane, both have parking on one-side only. But they are different in that Panoramic Way has more traffic than Oak Ridge among other features which would seem to favor Panoramic Way as a city priority. The logic of this contrast and comparison would lead one to infer that if Oak Ridge Road had its roadway reconstructed then Panoramic Way would likewise have its roadway reconstructed. To the contrary, only Oak Ridge was improved.

There are other examples too. For example, numerous streets throughout the Claremont area carry less traffic than Panoramic Way yet have had street reconstruction work. A drive through the area demonstrates this fact, but for the record, a few of the improved streets include El Camino Real and The Plaza Drive.

Panoramic Hill has numerous hazardous roadway conditions. For example, the section of Panoramic Way just south of the second hairpin turn and near Orchard Lane appears to be quite weak. The roadway, the railing, and the retaining wall tilt toward the house on the downhill side of the road. This is by no means the only hazardous roadway condition on Panoramic Way or on the other Panoramic Hill roadways including Mosswood Road, Canyon Road, Arden Road. But this is one of the more visible hazards.

Infrastructure improvements which should have been done as a matter of course have been dangerously postponed to an indefinite future date. For example, the utility pole and overhead power lines at the first hairpin of Panoramic Way lie on top of the Hayward Fault, which courses through the earth at exactly this point of the roadway. If the utility pole were to topple during a quake, it would fall in the direction it is leaning, which is toward the roadway. If it falls into the roadway, traffic would be blocked on the only roadway available for cars to exit the neighborhood. This pole should be undergrounded, and the City should take the lead in initiating this fundamental public safety improvement by working with PG&E.

In consideration of the criteria used for the 5-Year Street Rehabilitation Plan, Panoramic Way meets the "coordination with City programs criterion." The City is currently in the process of partially rehabilitating sewers on Panoramic Hill. There should be no further delay in moving forward with street reconstruction on Panoramic Way. As you have not scheduled the work previously, it needs to be moved forward as an emergency.

Reconstruction of the street would also satisfy the environmental sustainability criterion by improving storm water quality that runs off of these steep hillside streets. Few streets in Berkeley are as steep as these.

Another reason to improve the street is because this very old neighborhood has very few sidewalks. Instead on many sections of the street, people must walk on the roadway. Panoramic Way was carved out in 1888 when it was developed as part of University Terrace by Charles A. Bailey.[1] Given the hazards of walking on a very narrow, substandard street with two way traffic, it would behoove the City to make the roadways as safe as possible, i.e. free of bumps, dips, severe slants, and potholes. Reconstruction, and not
just street maintenance, is long overdue and desperately needed. Unfortunately, maintenance – which is better than potholes – has also tended to make the streets even bumpier and more uneven and hence more hazardous for pedestrians.

In short, there is no excuse for this neglect. Panoramic Hill property owners have paid several times over to have our streets in good condition. Please prioritize these roadways as a matter of common sense and common decency. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Janice Thomas

[1] Panoramic Hill Historic District is listed on the National Register of Historic Places as of 10/28/05.

http://www.cr.nps.gov/nr/listings/20051028.HTM
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>7/24/2013 Suzanne Baker</td>
<td>Requests using Measure M funds to correct flooding at Schoolhouse Creek.</td>
<td>I would like Schoolhouse Creek to be considered for Measure M funds. Please see attached letter for more information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Received and Name</td>
<td>Key Words</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|       |                        |           | July 23, 2013 |                   |                      |

**Sent via Certified Mail**
City of Berkeley
Office of the City Attorney
2180 Milvia Street, 4th Floor
Berkeley, CA 94704

City of Berkeley
Department of Public Works
2180 Milvia Street
Berkeley, CA 94704

Re: 1634 Cornell Ave., Berkeley, CA 94703

Dear Gentlemen:

I am the owner of the above referenced real property located in Berkeley, California, having purchased it in September 2011. I write to advise you of my serious concerns that this property is at risk of flooding, and sustaining substantial damage, as a result of the City of Berkeley’s on-going negligence.

The property is situated at the last location where Schoolhouse Creek remains above ground, before draining into the San Francisco Bay. It is my understanding that in 2005, the property sustained significant damage as a result of flooding, caused by the City of Berkeley’s negligence. Accordingly, the prior owner of the property filed suit against the City of Berkeley in 2007, and in 2009, ultimately recovered in excess of $255,000.00 from the City. For reference, please see the lawsuit filed in Alameda County Superior Court entitled Gambino v. City of Berkeley, ACSC No. RG0730471. I have enclosed a copy of the First Amended Complaint from that matter for your review/assistance. Per the meeting minutes of the City of Berkeley dated September 22, 2009, I believe the matter was resolved as discussed above. I have enclosed a copy of the minutes for your convenience as well.

In December of 2012, Schoolhouse Creek flooded the exterior of property, coming within inches of entering the interior of the house, raising serious concerns that my home would be damaged in a similar manner.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>7/20/2013 Nigel Guest</td>
<td>Panoramic Hill and Dwight Way – poor pavement conditions and need improvements.</td>
<td>In light of the above, I made multiple inquiries/requests for assistance from the City of Berkeley in 2012 and 2013 to address this issue and to assist me in ensuring I would not experience flooding similar to that which essentially destroyed the property in 2005. An employee of the city, Danny Akagi examined my property and essentially informed me that there was nothing that I could personally do to address my concerns of flooding. Mr. Akagi informed me that the problem and actual cause of the flooding must have occurred as a result of a blockage west of my property, due to the speed at which the water receded, and this was beyond the control/extent of my property. While it is clear that the City of Berkeley was liable for prior flooding in the past, it is not clear to me that any steps have been taken to remedy the problem and absolve the City of any future responsibility for this problem. As my experience last year has shown, there definitely remains an issue with potential/actual flooding of the property, which I was informed is beyond my control to prevent/repair. Having provided the City of Berkeley with ample notice of this problem, I would prefer that the City take active steps to avoid another flooding (thereby preventing future potential litigation) and would make all reasonable efforts to assist the City in doing so. I am therefore writing to request that the City please address this issue and take steps to rectify the problem referred to by Mr. Akagi. I am aware of the recent Measure M legislation and believe addressing this obvious flood issue would be an appropriate use of Measure M funds. If you have any questions, or require additional information concerning the above, please do not hesitate to contact me at 510-435-9526 or <a href="mailto:Suzanne.l.blaker@gmail.com">Suzanne.l.blaker@gmail.com</a>. Thank you for your anticipated cooperation in this matter. Sincerely, Suzanne L. Blaker Encl. (1) First Amended Complaint (2) September 22, 2009 City Council Minutes cc: Danny Akagi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: Nigel Guest [mailto:info@avalon-enviro.com] Sent: Saturday, July 20, 2013 10:22 PM To: PWEngineering Subject: Measure M suggestions I have a couple of specific suggestions. - The whole of Panoramic Hill, particularly Panoramic Way. This has obviously been known for a long time, and sewer improvements appear to be underway, but the road surface is atrocious. I realize there are logistical difficulties, because some sections are one lane only. - Dwight Way between Shattuck and Piedmont. Heavily trafficked, and sections of the road surface are
<table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>7/19/2013 Helen Dickson</td>
<td>Scorecard criteria weighting – most important is protection of San Francisco Bay. Also overlap in “overall community improvement” and “environment and climate” helps draw attention to these criteria.</td>
<td>From: Helen Dickson [<a href="mailto:helenmardickson@gmail.com">mailto:helenmardickson@gmail.com</a>] Sent: Friday, July 19, 2013 12:37 PM To: PWEngineering Subject: Measure M Scorecard feedback To whom it may concern, After attending the Measure M meeting last night, I wanted to give some feedback regarding the weighting of the scorecard. I feel that the most important part of the scorecard is the &quot;Environment and Climate&quot; section. As guardians of one of the great natural resources, San Francisco Bay, it is our job to think about the health of the bay. I also think that there is considerable overlap between the &quot;Overall Community Improvement&quot; section and the &quot;Environment and Climate&quot; section. For example, bicycle and pedestrian paths (OCI 2.1) and Advancing CAP (OCI 3.1) will directly result in reducing greenhouse gas emissions (EC 4). With limited resources, an overlap in goals helps concise spending. Sincerely, Helen Dickson <a href="mailto:helenmardickson@gmail.com">helenmardickson@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>7/19/2013 Janice Thomas</td>
<td>Time period to comment on scorecard criteria.</td>
<td>Greetings. When does the Measure M comment period close? Thank you!</td>
<td>Janice, There is no official closing date, but getting your comments in the next 2 weeks would be good. We are currently working on a Measure M report and are targeting to have a draft by mid-August. Also, the Berkeley Public Works Department is preparing the next version of the city’s 5-year paving plan. They will be using the scorecard criteria that we discussed yesterday. Their target to have that draft plan completed is late August. Thanks very much. Ray Chair, Public Works Commission</td>
<td>Hi Ray, I reviewed the criteria, and none of them deal with neglect. I live on Mosswood Road, and I’ll be interested in finding out when it was last paved. There is patching on top of patching. No one in our neighborhood was notified about the public comment period. It’s quite problematic that homeowners who have been paying taxes for decades would not have the benefit of street re-paving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 29  | 7/18/2013     | John Rea        | Scorecard criteria – attendee wants to circulate criteria to bike constituency for comments. | From: John M. Rea [mailto:johnmrea@gmail.com]  
Sent: Thursday, July 18, 2013 8:07 PM  
To: PWEngineering  
Subject: May I have a copy of the single page handout with the (tentative) DRAFT-Scorecard Evaluation criteria (July 18, 2013)  
I took away the understanding that it was on the web site. Either I was mistaken, or finding it is beyond me. I wanted to attach it (and, if possible, point others to it) in an E-mail to the bike constituency that asked me to go.  
Good meeting tonight. Please pass on my compliments.  
Bye | 7/22/2013  
From Ray Yep:  
Hi John,  
Attached is the document that you referenced. We are going to put it on the Berkeley Public Works website but haven’t done it yet. If you have any other questions, please let me know. Thanks for attending. | 8/2/2013  
From John Rea:  
Thanks again for so promptly sending the DRAFT-Scorecard.  
I’ve fielded questions from my little interest group (cyclists) over the past weeks. I’ve held off circulating this scorecard, on the theory that the posting on the Public Works web site was not just going to be making it available, but as a part of asking folks to fill it out and send it in electronically.  
But, that may be an incorrect assumption.  
If that is the case, I can just circulate it now, with an explanation of what I learned at the meeting. I don’t think you want to get a flood of E-mailed Scorecards, however. Should people interested enough to fill out the scorecard send it:  
-----Hard copy to the Public works dept? or  
-----Electronically to a public works E-mail address?  
Because the process is holding to a tight time schedule—---a good thing—---I would like to get this out within a week or so.  
However, if I should hold on until something is on the public works web site, just give me an ETA.  
Thanks again for running an able, and well informed process.  
Bye | |
| 28  | 7/18/2013     | Martha Jones    | Derby Street – street needs repaving and street corners need rounding. | Derby Street borders the Clark Kerr Campus between Warring and Belrose streets it drastically needs paving with two corners squared.  
While paving the street, both Councilmember Gordon Wozniak of this district and Elizabeth Deakin, Chair, of U. C. Berkeley Institute of Transportation suggest that the rounded corner at Derby and Warring and the rounded corner of Derby and Belrose both be squared. They were rounded in 1959 to allow the cars to go faster. These dangerous corners have caused many accidents over the years including the recent one | | |
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| 26  | 7/17/2013 Don Brown | Warring Way gets a lot of traffic and needs to be repaved. | From: Don Brown [mailto:berkeleydon@gmail.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2013 9:58 AM  
To: PWEngineering  
Subject: Measure M Funds  
I'm unable to attend the Thursday night meeting on Measure M Funds and how they are to be spent. However, I'd like to urge that Warring from the Kerr Campus, east on Derby, south on Belrose and then Claremont Blvd be repaved to Russell. These streets must get more than 30,000 cars a day and they are pitted and worn out. | |
| 27  | 7/18/2013 Hans Giesecke | Panoramic Hill and Mosswood Road – streets are in terrible shape and need repaving. | From: Hans Giesecke [mailto:hansgieze@gmail.com]  
Sent: Thursday, July 18, 2013 1:52 PM  
To: PWEngineering  
Subject: Measure M Community Input  
TO: City of Berkeley  
FROM: Hans Giesecke  
SUBJECT: Spending Measure M Funds  
I am writing to underscore the compelling need for re-paving the asphalt on Panoramic Hill Road and Mosswood Road in Berkeley. Both of these streets are in terrible shape. They have been patched dozens of times by utility crews with the result being that there are numerous potholes, cracks, fissures, and uneven spots. Given the narrowness of the road, it is essential that at the very least these roads receive a new coating of asphalt so that there is a more smooth driving surface on roads which serve as the only points of access to one of Berkeley’s most historic neighborhoods.  
Many thanks for taking this compelling need into consideration.  
Sincerely,  
Hans and Susan Giesecke  
8 Mosswood Road  
Berkeley, CA  
94704  
510-642-9469  
hanscg@berkeley.edu | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date Received and Name</th>
<th>Key Words</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response and Date</th>
<th>Response to Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 25  | 7/17/2013, Carol Anne Brown | Derby and Belrose Streets get a lot of traffic and need to be repaved. | From: Carol Anne Brown [mailto:carolanne.brown@gmail.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2013 9:27 AM  
To: PWEngineering  
Subject: Measure M Funds  
Derby Street and Belrose Street are in serious need of being paved. This would be true even if they did not get a lot of traffic. However, it's desperately true because they get an enormous amount of traffic as the parade of cars to Cal goes north in the morning and south in the evening.  
Thank you.  
Carol Anne Brown  
2821 Claremont Blvd | | |
| 24  | 7/17/2013, Gene Rochlin | Derby Street – need priority to resurface Derby Street. | From: Gene [mailto:groke2@gmail.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2013 8:21 PM  
To: PWEngineering  
Subject: Measure  
Dear folks,  
The 2900 block of Derby street is desperately in need of a real repaving (not just patches). A few weeks ago I called about a big hole in front of our hose (2918) from which small blocks of pavement were being thrown up. A week or so later, a City crew patched it. But today when I went out to get the mail, there were three new fist-sized pavement blocks that had been thrown up from a new hole right behind the old one. So far, my car has not been dinged .... so far.  
Please give Derby street priority for a real resurfacing. We are a major road out from the City and Campus to Tunnel Road, and we really need it.  
Gene Rochlin  
2918 Derby | | |
| 23  | 7/17/2013, Anne Middleton | Dwight/Derby corridor – this is heavily travelled and needs to be repaved for safety. | From: Anne Middleton [mailto:middletona@berkeley.edu]  
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2013 11:50 PM  
To: PWEngineering  
Subject: Measure M funding for street repair  
Dear Berkeley Public Works,  
I write to urge that you use Measure M funds for repaving of the busy and broken streets that form the Dwight-Derby corridor -- and NOT cosmetic patching, but real repaving. The need is now urgent, and matter of public safety.  
I have resided on the heavily-travelled block (from Warring to Belrose) of Derby Street since 1977 -- before, that is, the present Clark Kerr Campus was redeveloped by the University, before Redwood Gardens was developed from a corner of this site, formerly the California School for the Deaf. Since shortly after that "repurposing" of the Dwight-Derby site -- and the increase in campus enrollment by about 10,000 students, and a comparable expansion of staffing -- there has been no further substantive street maintenance of this corridor (Dwight above Telegraph, Piedmont to Warring to Derby to Belrose to Claremont Blvd to the Ashby-Claremont traffic light).  
The cause of the damage isn't hard to discern; about 30,000 vehicles pass my house every day: during morning and evening rush hours traffic is at a virtual crawl, and when it isn't bumper to bumper out there | | |
(as well as in rush hour), it is the regular route of many kinds of heavy truck (despite posted signs prohibiting such vehicles -- see the sign just east of Warring on Derby).

The canonical traffic plan supposedly dictates that the southbound and eastbound traffic on this corridor "should" go south on Telegraph from Dwight. But as anyone who lives in SE Berkeley can tell you it doesn't and won't: it continues up Dwight and along the corridor toward the Rte 24 tunnel and the Warren freeway. Those who drive this corridor are mostly commuters to the campus from Lamorinda and the Oakland hills. And these thousands endure not only appalling delays, but axle-breaking holes in the roadway from Dwight to Tunnel Road.

Patching of the many holes in the roadway isn't working: the entire corridor I've described is now dangerously fractured, rough and hazardous to vehicles, to say nothing of bicycles and foot traffic. Large chunks of the road surface -- about 3 inches deep, and at least that wide -- are jarred loose daily, leaving holes fit to crack axles, as well as sprain ankles. We have a large collection of this seemingly volcanic detritus to show anyone in Public Works!

To my certain knowledge, the last time Derby was surface-scraped and resurfaced (i.e. the kind of treatment that Dwight has had this summer from Shattuck to Telegraph) was more than 25 years ago, probably closer to 30 years; i.e. shortly after the University finished its major retrofit of the Dwight-Derby site. It is WAY overdue for the complete repaving, from the subpavement surface on up, that Dwight has had this summer as far as Telegraph.

And a little enforcement of the prohibition of heavy (and polluting) vehicles on this route would be in order too -- but that's a matter for policing, not Public Works. Meanwhile, pavements that aren't a hazard to everyone's health are a necessity -- and soon!!!

Anne Middleton
2918 Derby Street
Berkeley 94705

22 7/18/2013 Eti Valdez-Kaminsky
Ward Street – 2300 block of Ward needs to be repaved.
From: Eti Valdez-Kaminsky [mailto:etimft@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 18, 2013 2:10 PM
To: PWEngineering
Subject: 2300 block of Ward

Please, please consider repaving our block 2300 Ward (2200 block - of which Mayor Bates lives) is also in need. We have many families with small children and the street has made ground meat of many kids body parts.

Thank you,
Eti Valdez-Kaminsky
2310 Ward St

21 7/17/2013 Monica Thyberg
Notes from community meetings – would like to access notes from the meetings.
Hi, Sherry,
I'm wondering whether tomorrow's public meeting about Measure M is the final one? I am interested in this topic but was unable to attend the first one (didn't know about it until after it was over), and am unable to attend tomorrow due to a long standing commitment. Are there any public notes about the results of the prior meeting or staff recommendations and/or reports that I could review to "catch up."

Thanks for whatever info you can find the time to share with me.

Monica Thyberg
1729 Berkeley Way
Berkeley, CA 94703
(510) 848-7636

From: LWVBÆ President <president@lwvbae.org>
To: Monica Thyberg <monica_thyberg@globalnet.net>
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2013 12:10 AM
Subject: Re: Meeting re: Measure M

Dear monica,

From: Monica Thyberg <monica_thyberg@globalnet.net>
To: LWVBÆ President <president@lwvbae.org>; "program@lwvbae.org" <program@lwvbae.org>; Sherry Smith <s1589@berkeley.edu>; Diz Swift <dsmoreswift@att.net>; votereditor@lwvbae.org
Sent: Sunday, July 21, 2013 4:21 PM
Subject: Re: Meeting re: Measure M

Dear Monica,

FYI, the public meeting on Thursday about Measure M will be the final meeting. The City announced that the final meeting will be held this Thursday, 7/25 at 6:30pm. The meeting is being held at the Berkeley City Council Chambers.

Sherry Smith
2300 block of Ward

23 7/17/2013 Monica Thyberg
Notes from community meetings – would like to access notes from the meetings.
Hi, Sherry,
I'm wondering whether tomorrow's public meeting about Measure M is the final one? I am interested in this topic but was unable to attend the first one (didn't know about it until after it was over), and am unable to attend tomorrow due to a long standing commitment. Are there any public notes about the results of the prior meeting or staff recommendations and/or reports that I could review to "catch up."

Thanks for whatever info you can find the time to share with me.

Monica Thyberg
1729 Berkeley Way
Berkeley, CA 94703
(510) 848-7636

From: LWVBÆ President <president@lwvbae.org>
To: Monica Thyberg <monica_thyberg@globalnet.net>
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2013 12:10 AM
Subject: Re: Meeting re: Measure M
20 7/8/2013 Marcia Edelen

EBMUD work – wants to know about EBMUD’s work on Eight Street.

Hello Mr. Yep,

Would you please give me some information (or direct me to an article) regarding the EBMUD work being done that involves the story-high black, Baker tanks that are being placed in the streets West of Strawberry Park (Allston, Browning, etc.)? What is their purpose and the extent of the changes?

Thank you,
Marcia Edelen
2221 Eighth St.

Marcia,

I don’t work for the City and do not know the answer to your question. I am copying Margo Schueler (Public Works Commissioner and works for EBMUD) and Jeff Egeberg (City Engineer) in hopes that one of them can answer your question. I am Chair of the Berkeley Public Works Commission, which is a volunteer citizen organization that provides advice to City Council on public works subjects. One of the subjects we are working on is the implementation of Measure M - streets and watershed improvements. Thanks.

Ray Yep
Chair, Public Works Commission
Cell: 510-318-4894

20 6/19/2013 Tracey Goldberg

Mendocino Ave. – want to see streets get paved. Realize that more funding is needed for infrastructure improvements and want to see Berkeley move quickly and strategically.

Hello,

My name is Tracey Goldberg. I live in Berkeley on Mendocino Ave. I attended the recent public meeting concerning the allocation of Measure M funds at the South Berkeley Senior Center. Though I am a licensed landscape architect, and have studied many of the issues being sifted through at the meeting, I attended as “just” a Berkeley resident. My own street is in pretty awful condition and, before pushing hard for repaving, I wanted to get a sense of the breadth of the issues before the city during the decision making process.

Aside from coming to appreciate how very complex the process is, one of the key things that stood out at the meeting was how few, if any, “regular” citizens attended the meeting. Almost everyone seemed to be

Hi Tracey,

I am Chair of Berkeley’s Public Works Commission, which is a volunteer citizen group that is advisory to the City Council. Detailed responses should come from Public Works staff and I am copying Andrew Clough (Public Works Director) and Jeff Egeberg (City Engineer). I am a
826 Mendocino Ave.

year resident of Berkeley and as a
civil engineer, I am keenly aware of
the nationwide challenges of aging
infrastructure and the trillions of
dollars of funding needs. In
Berkeley, the approximate $250
million of funding needs is only for
streets and watersheds. Other
infrastructure funding needs include
sewers, buildings, sidewalks,
pedestrian ways, bicycle paths,
etc. The good news is that the $30
million of Measure M funds is a step
in the right direction. The funding
for street improvements
will increase from the current $3.4
million/year to about $9.4
million/year. More streets will be
improved and at a faster rate. In
addition, Green Infrastructure (such
as bio-swales) will be incorporated
where it is connected with street
improvements.

As for the community meetings, we
have planned for three meetings and
are holding them in different
locations in the city and on different
days of the week. This is in hopes of
allowing more people to attend. The
public input has been very valuable.
We have one more meeting on July
18th and will then be preparing our
recommendations to the City
Council. We are very appreciative of
those who take the time to attend.

BTW, my son attended BHS and is
now in college. He played alto sax in
the Jazz Ensemble and the highlight
was performing on stage at the
Montreux jazz festival. If you would
like any advice on BHS, please let me
know. Thanks for writing to us.

Ray Yep
Chair, Berkeley Public Works
Commission
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date Received and Name</th>
<th>Key Words</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6/6/2013 Brenda Krsul</td>
<td>Alvarado Road – road is in bad condition and needs to be repaved.</td>
<td>Hi Jeff, I have a question for you: Do you like Berkeley? I personally find Berkeley a very charming small town. And in my view it could be even more charming if we took better care of it. Unfortunately Berkeley has been...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6/7/2013 Alec Flett</td>
<td>Wildcat Canyon Road – road is in terrible condition and is dangerous to bicyclists.</td>
<td>From: <a href="mailto:alecflett@gmail.com">alecflett@gmail.com</a> [<a href="mailto:alecflett@gmail.com">mailto:alecflett@gmail.com</a>] On Behalf Of Alec Flett Sent: Friday, June 07, 2013 4:03 PM To: PWEngineering Subject: Use Measure M funds for repaving wildcat canyon! Hi there - I'm an Berkeley citizen and an avid cyclist and runner. I spend a lot of time on Wildcat up in the hills. I take my kids out for hikes in inspiration point. The pavement up there has gotten downright dangerous - mainly to cyclists but also to runners, and the drive alone out to Inspiration Point is really terrible too - your car jostles all over the place! There are numerous patches and holes that have compounded over the years to make As a cyclist, I've many times almost lost control of my bike if I haven't very carefully avoided some of these obstacles! I hope that part of Measure M can include repaving that road - I don't want to encourage people to drive fast on those wind-y back roads, but it's so much more dangerous in the condition it's in. Thanks for your consideration, Alec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6/12/2013 Jim McGrath</td>
<td>Wildcat Canyon Road – road is dangerous to bicyclists and needs improvements.</td>
<td>Subject: Alvarado Road Please pave this road. The ruts are crazy! Nancy Mennel 116 Vicente Rd., Berkeley 94705 From: <a href="mailto:mcmgrath@comcast.net">mcmgrath@comcast.net</a> [<a href="mailto:mcmgrath@comcast.net">mailto:mcmgrath@comcast.net</a>] Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 1:54 PM To: PWEngineering Subject: Measure M Priorities I would like to recommend that you include a segment of Wildcat Canyon for repair and/or improvement. The segment of Wildcat Canyon in Tilden Park, from about 0.5 miles west of the Inspiration Point parking lot, and continuing west for approximately 2 miles, is in such bad shape that it is dangerous to bicyclists. Berkeley has a bicycle plan, and this route is on nearly all of the recreational rides for cyclists in the hills south of the Carquinez Straits, including the Grizzly Peak century. Repairs made after sewer repairs were not adequate, and heavy trucks doing that work, and logging, have damaged the roadbed to the point where there are potholes and crevices that are almost impossible to see in the dappled sunlight. The deterioration since January in particular is severe, and now represents both a hazard of injury, and a potential liability for the City. Jim McGrath 2301 Russell Street Berkeley, CA 94705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6/13/2013 Jim McGrath</td>
<td>Wildcat Canyon Road – road is dangerous to bicyclists and needs improvements.</td>
<td>From: <a href="mailto:mcmgrath@comcast.net">mcmgrath@comcast.net</a> [<a href="mailto:mcmgrath@comcast.net">mailto:mcmgrath@comcast.net</a>] Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 1:54 PM To: PWEngineering Subject: Measure M Priorities I would like to recommend that you include a segment of Wildcat Canyon for repair and/or improvement. The segment of Wildcat Canyon in Tilden Park, from about 0.5 miles west of the Inspiration Point parking lot, and continuing west for approximately 2 miles, is in such bad shape that it is dangerous to bicyclists. Berkeley has a bicycle plan, and this route is on nearly all of the recreational rides for cyclists in the hills south of the Carquinez Straits, including the Grizzly Peak century. Repairs made after sewer repairs were not adequate, and heavy trucks doing that work, and logging, have damaged the roadbed to the point where there are potholes and crevices that are almost impossible to see in the dappled sunlight. The deterioration since January in particular is severe, and now represents both a hazard of injury, and a potential liability for the City. Jim McGrath 2301 Russell Street Berkeley, CA 94705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response and Date**

**Response to Response**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date Received and Name</th>
<th>Key Words</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response and Date</th>
<th>Response to Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6/6/2013 Aaron Welch</td>
<td>Rose Street – Need beautification, traffic calming, and pedestrian safety improvements at Rose, Hopkins, and Curtis intersection.</td>
<td>neglected in some big ways. Roads!! The condition of roads seems to be diminishing rapidly. I have another question for you: When a wooden floor or a carpet in a hallway of your home gets badly cracked and damaged to the extent that you can actually twist your ankle by stepping on it, do you wait 10 to 20 years to repair it? Our streets are our hallways to our work places, grocery shops, friends, theaters, hospitals, etc. I think it is our responsibility to take care of them and keep them safe. As you know, taking care of our infrastructure also creates jobs. Just another positive element in the process of doing it. My drive from home and back is nothing but unpleasant. Certain parts of, namely: Alvarado Road are so rough that I feel (every day!) my internal organs in my body shaking. Personally I feel very disrespected as a citizen of Berkeley. Can we do better than that? City of Berkeley has done some great work recently by re-paving Ashby Ave., Tunnel Road, etc. Thank you for that! It feels great driving on a smooth road. I am forced to drive now on both sides of the road in order to avoid unpleasant drive and damages to my car. I shall be glad to pick you up and take you for a ride so you can see what I mean. I should not be put in situation to write this kind of a letter and bag the city to pave the streets. I am doing my share: I am paying taxes and voting for the officials who promise a lot and then betray us.</td>
<td>about the condition of streets in Berkeley, particularly Alvarado Road. Unfortunately, there is a backlog of over $60 million in street repair, and we are given an annual budget of $3.4 million. So as you can see, it will take quite a long time to get around to all of it. Some good news is that last November voters passed Measure M, a $30 million bond measure, that will go in large part to street repair. The Public Works Commission is hosting a series of community meetings to prioritize how that money will be spent. The next one is this Saturday from 10:00-12:00 at the South Berkeley Community Center. You could consider attending to hear how the process is working and provide your input.</td>
<td>for “some good” news. $30 million? Great!!! Let’s do it! Thank you for letting me know about this Saturday community meeting. I shall be there. With best regards, Brenda Krusil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From: aaron welch [<a href="mailto:aaronjwelch@yahoo.com">mailto:aaronjwelch@yahoo.com</a>]</td>
<td>Sent: Thursday, June 06, 2013 11:29 PM</td>
<td>To: PWEngineering</td>
<td>Subject: Measure M Comments, Aaron Welch, 1226 Rose Street</td>
<td>Please consider beautification, traffic calming, pedestrian safety improvements, and/or streetscape/street trees at the intersection of Rose Street, Hopkins, and Curtis. The crossing is unsafe for pedestrians and motorists, and the low-radius shallow right turn from Hopkins east onto Rose encourage high vehicle speeds while limiting drivers’ ability to see the busy pedestrian crosswalk across Rose. There is also no way to walk up Hopkins across this intersection. Full re-design of this irregular intersection and introducing a traffic circle or triangle would be ideal, and offer traffic calming and a neighborhood gateway for the neighborhoods to the east up Rose and Hopkins, including as these streets cross the Ohlone Greenway. Adding street trees or stormwater treatment to the existing paced traffic island would be a secondary strategy, as would curb bulbouts for the crosswalk. Thanks, Aaron Welch and Stephanie Mackley (We own the houses at 1226 and 1228 Rose Street, between Belevedere and Curtis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Key Words</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response and Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 13  | 6/6/2013   | Doug Wiedwald  | Wildcat Canyon Road – road is in terrible condition and needs to be repaved. | From: Doug Wiedwald [mailto:dwiedwald@gmail.com]  
Sent: Thursday, June 06, 2013 5:50 PM  
To: PWEngineering  
Subject: Please Repave Wildcat  
I ride along Wildcat often. Please repave it. It is in terrible shape and would make the riding and driving safer. |                    |                                     |
| 12  | 6/6/2013   | Joe DiStefano  | Wildcat Canyon Road – road is dangerous for bicyclists and needs to be repaved. | From: joedistefano4@gmail.com [mailto:joedistefano4@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Joe DiStefano  
Sent: Thursday, June 06, 2013 5:45 PM  
To: PWEngineering  
Subject: Use of Measure M Funds to Repave Wildcat  
Hello – I wanted to voice my concern and that of many other cyclists and residents over the abysmal condition of Wildcat Road in the City of Berkeley. The condition of the road is extremely dangerous for cyclists, and I know many who have broken wheels, gotten flat tires, lost water bottles, and even been thrown into oncoming traffic by potholes, cracks, and decaying street surfaces. It is only a matter of time before a death or serious injury occurs. This road, as a major thoroughfare for commuting and recreational cyclists, should be prioritized for repaving with Measure M funds. Thank you for your consideration,  
Joe DiStefano  
1972 Los Angeles Ave  
Berkeley, 94707 |                    |                                     |
| 11  | 6/6/2013   | Jackson Pritt  | #1 priority is repairing existing infrastructure.                         | From: Jackson Pritt [mailto:jacksonpritt@gmail.com]  
Sent: Thursday, June 06, 2013 11:01 AM  
To: PWEngineering  
Subject: Just Fix The Roads  
Hello,  
I read about the Measure M workshops at www.berkeleyside.com and just wanted to voice my opinion that the #1 priority for the funds should be repairing currently existing infrastructure and not adding new things.  
A lot of the new proposals sound really interesting, but if we don’t even have enough money to take care of what we already have how will we get enough money to take care of the ongoing repair costs for the new projects that are being proposed?  
Every time I go to El Cerrito I am shocked at how much nicer their roads are and how terrible so many of the roads in Berkeley are in comparison. I live on Delaware Street and the roads are worn to the point where we have to wash our car and hose down our house every month or two to get rid of the asphalt dust. We get a lot of traffic from people driving from Sacramento to San Pablo and could really use a fresh coat of asphalt and maybe even a speed hump to get people to slow down and stop rolling through stop signs.  
Thanks for taking the time to read this.  
Sincerely,  
Jackson Pritt  
1255 Delaware Street  
Berkeley, CA 94702  
P.S. When it comes to traffic calming the large speed humps used in El Cerrito near the Harding Elementary School seem to work better at slowing traffic than bollards or traffic circles. |                    |                                     |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date Received and Name</th>
<th>Key Words</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response and Date</th>
<th>Response to Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10  | 6/5/2013 Carol Dippel   | Concerned about condition of streets with slopes and whether permeable paving is viable in those areas. | Hi Ray, thanks for explanation & for providing the slide deck. Can you please also send me the questionnaire & how it should be returned? I don’t think I’ll be able to make it to this session but do have thoughts about street issues in my NE Berkeley neighborhood.
One of the issues I see on streets on slopes is sometimes the existing pavement actually moves when cars go over it during storms. For example, Marin Ave. immediately E. (uphill) from the fountain has wobbling, moving chunks of pavement during heavy storms. There are several others with similar conditions (North Hampton, Oxford) in this area where sometimes I wonder whether cars might be in danger of being swallowed by a sink hole. My primary concern is that these streets get fixed. I’m concerned about the viability of permeable paving solutions in areas subject to potential slides. It seems the water should be collected & transported in storm drains vs being allowed to permeate in such areas. Has this been factored into your analysis?
Thanks for consideration.
--Carol | Carol, Attached is the questionnaire we used at the May 2nd meeting and the scorecard document we plan to handout this Saturday. Please review, fill in your comments, and send it back to me. I will share it with our planning team.
Regarding your comment about Marin Avenue and related streets, I have forwarded your comment to Jeff Egeberg, Berkeley's City Engineer.
Thanks, Ray |
| 9   | 5/24/2013 Vincent Casalaina | Parker Street – fix the street between Benvenue and Hillgas. | From: Vincent Casalaina [mailto:proberk@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, May 24, 2013 11:04 AM
To: PWEngineering
Subject: Measure M Community Input.
Fix Parker St. between Benvenue and Hillegas.
Vincent Casalaina | Hi Ruth,
I’m sorry to hear about the condition of your street. I am copying Jeff Egeberg, Berkeley's City Engineer, and would like to ask him to respond to your specific question. They are in charge of infrastructure improvements and street repairs. My role is Chair of Berkeley's Public Works Commission, which is a citizen volunteer organization that is advisory to the City Council. We are leading an effort to get public input for the implementation of Measure M. We will include your comment in our review and recommendations. Thanks for contacting us. |
| 8   | 5/19/2013 Ruth Rosen     | La Vereda – street is crumbling and dangerous and needs urgent patches. | Dear Ray Yep:
I am writing to underscore what other neighbors have told you, namely that parts of La Vereda are virtually crumbling and need urgent patches. It is even dangerous to walk on the street because it’s not just pot holes, but the street is literally falling apart in section. We live on the corner of Hilgard and La Vereda and when we walk out of our house toward La Loma, we pass many part of the street that simply crumbling. We understand that the city wants to improve the infrastructure before it repaves the entire road, but leaving a city street is such ruins is simply unbelievable. Would you kindly tell us when patches will be made?
Sincerely,
Ruth Rosen | Hi Ruth,
I am forwarding this comment to Jeff Egeberg, Berkeley's City Engineer, and would like to ask him to respond to your specific question. They are in charge of infrastructure improvements and street repairs. My role is Chair of Berkeley’s Public Works Commission, which is a citizen volunteer organization that is advisory to the City Council. We are leading an effort to get public input for the implementation of Measure M. We will include your comment in our review and recommendations. Thanks for contacting us. |
| 7   | 5/3/2013 Aimee Baldwin  | Would like notes of the community meeting. | Hello Ray Yep,
I was unable to come to the Measure M meeting last night. I was wondering if there is a transcript or recording or some kind of summary available for me to review. | Aimee,
Unfortunately, we did not record the meeting and are not preparing full |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date Received and Name</th>
<th>Key Words</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response and Date</th>
<th>Response to Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5/2/2013 Nikki Gage</td>
<td>Asked for confirmation of the community meeting location.</td>
<td>Hi there, I went to NBSC today for a dance class and asked if the Community info on Measure M Planning meeting was still happening today at 5:30p. Nobody in the office or at the desk knew about it. I have been planning to attend. Is it still on? Which room will you be in? Thanks, Nikki Gage</td>
<td>Nikki, Yes, it is on today at 5:30 pm at the NBSC. Attached is our agenda for your info. See you there!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/26/2013 Sybil E. Hatch, P.E. Principal Convey</td>
<td>Expressed interest in Measure M and plans to attend community meeting.</td>
<td>Hello Ray – Hope this email finds you well. Thought I’d send you a copy of the email I sent to the Public Works staff about my thoughts on Measure M. It’s an issue I care about – and I’d like the city to get the best value for the available funds. I see on my calendar that I’ll be out of town for both the June and July public meetings. Are there other ways I can help guide or input to the process? Please keep me in mind if you need assistance with evaluating alternatives, etc. Best, Sybil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Sybil Hatch [mailto:s.hatch@conveyinc.com]  
Sent: Friday, April 26, 2013 3:33 PM  
To: ‘PWEngineering@cityofberkeley.info’  
Cc: Susan Wengraf (swengraf@ci.berkeley.ca.us)  
Subject: Measure M Community Input  
Hello Berkeley Public Works –  
I have reviewed the current City of Berkeley Street Repair Plan, as posted on http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/Public_Works/Sidewalks-Util/Street_Repair_Plan.aspx.  
I’d like some additional information on how, from an engineering perspective, the City prioritizes the street segments that need repair or reconstruction. For example, has the City performed a formal pavement survey? Does the City use a formalized pavement management approach – or are the segments listed in the plan ones that are already significantly damaged? Are the projects prioritized based on the amount of traffic each street receives? The Street Repair Plan does not include estimated costs for each of the targeted projects. Do you have that information available? I also would like some clarification about how the City is defining “watershed improvements.” As outlined in Measure M text, it appears to me that watershed improvements are specifically defined as things like rain gardens, swales, bio-retention cells, permeable paving, etc. within the public right-of-way and | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date Received and Name</th>
<th>Key Words</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response and Date</th>
<th>Response to Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/25/2013 Barbara Bryant</td>
<td>Contra Costa Avenue – wants information on the sewer work in her area.</td>
<td>Hi, Ray, I live at 881 Contra Costa Avenue in Berkeley. Within the last month, some surveyor-types came out and marked the main sewer line in the middle of the street with a brightly-colored spray paint circle. They also made a similar mark on the sidewalk in front of my house and my neighbor’s house. Do you know what this is about? No one said anything to us, and we haven’t received any information about whether some work is being planned here. Is this part of Measure M street/watershed improvements? I am concerned that the City will tear up our street/sidewalk with no notice. I would appreciate any information you can give me. Thanks.</td>
<td>Hi Barbara, I am Chair of Berkeley’s Public Works Commission, which is a volunteer organization advising our City Council. I am copying Jeff Egeberg (Berkeley’s City Engineer) who can answer your specific question. I can say for sure that it is not related to Measure M (streets/watershed improvements). This bond measure was approved by voters last November and our commission is organizing a process to get public input on how to prioritize the investments. We plan to make our recommendations to Council this Fall and to have the improvement projects starting at the beginning of 2014. We hope that you will attend our series of public meetings. I live in the Thousand Oaks area and our block has had water, sewer, and gas line construction in the past few years. In all cases, a flyer was left at our front door prior to the work and there was a contact person provided. If you have not had a flyer, then the work is probably not eminent. Again, Jeff should be able to let you know the details on your street. Thanks very much.</td>
<td>August 12, 2013 Hi, Ray, Still waiting for a response on this from you. It’s been 4 months! Thanks. Barbara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4/25/2013 Barbara Bryant

streets. This, to me, implies that they are potential extension projects to existing targeted street/pavement projects. Is this true? Or are larger watershed issues being considered? What is the timeframe over which the $30 million from Measure M is to be spent? Has the City applied for – or is it considering applying for – any outside funding sources such as grants that will supplement the Measure M moneys? I’d like to point out that El Cerrito managed to repave every single road in their city using ARRA funds.

In general, although I support measures that will help manage stormwater runoff – both quality and quantity – I am much more supportive of straight pavement improvements. I would prefer that a significant portion of the Measure M money be spent on the pavement itself, as I believe Berkeley’s streets are in a deplorable state of disrepair.

I plan to be at the May 2 public meeting – and at the subsequent community involvement meetings. I would also welcome the opportunity to serve on an advisory panel for the Measure M, if the need arises.

Hi, Ray,

I live at 881 Contra Costa Avenue in Berkeley. Within the last month, some surveyor-types came out and marked the main sewer line in the middle of the street with a brightly – colored spray paint circle. They also made a similar mark on the sidewalk in front of my house and my neighbor’s house. Do you know what this is about? No one said anything to us, and we haven’t received any information about whether some work is being planned here. Is this part of Measure M street/watershed improvements? I am concerned that the City will tear up our street/sidewalk with no notice.

I would appreciate any information you can give me.

Thanks.

Emeziem, Kenneth

Several years ago, the City started implementing a long-term, mandated Sanitary Sewer Capital Improvement Program in order to stay in compliance with the Environmental...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date Received and Name</th>
<th>Key Words</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ray Yep Chair, Berkeley Public Works Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2   |                        |           | Protection Agency (EPA) and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Cease and Desist Order to eliminate sewage overflows and reduce storm water infiltration and inflow into the sanitary sewer system. This year, the sewer main on Contra Costa is planned for rehab. The main is quite old and will be replaced to prevent future pipe failures and leakage problems. The intended result is to replace the existing clay sewer main with an HDPE sewer main. The City will also replace the lower laterals. We encourage you to retain the services of a contractor to inspect the upper or private sewer lateral. Will we note any improved water service afterwards, e.g., stronger toilet flush? [Emeziem, Kenneth] No. the work is not connected to the water service. 
How intrusive will the "sewer lateral work" be? [Emeziem, Kenneth] There will be excavation in the street and sidewalk to enable the contractor perform the required work. We will do our best to keep the inconvenience to a minimum. Will it mean breaking up sidewalk concrete/curbs, etc? [Emeziem, Kenneth] Yes. If breaking up concrete is needed to do the project, is that considered "damage caused by the Contractor" (and so not billed to the resident)? [Emeziem, Kenneth] the contractor will be required to replace any concrete that they damaged as a result of the work. |
<p>| 3   | 4/23/2013 Anne Lackey  | Wildcat Canyon Road – road is in bad shape and is dangerous to bicyclists. | Hi - I am an avid cyclist and often (along with thousands of other avid cyclists) take Wildcat Canyon Road from the top of Spruce to Inspiration Point and beyond. The section of road that is in Alameda County -- and I assume Berkeley? -- is in really awful shape and can be dangerous to cyclists. Is fixing this section of road something contemplated in Measure M? Many thanks, Anne Lackey |
|     |                        |           | Hi Anne, I don’t have an answer to your question at this time, but am copying Jeff Egeberg (City Engineer) and will include your comment into our planning process. Measure M will double the amount of funds to rehabilitate Berkeley’s streets. The public process we are starting is to gather public input on how and where to accelerate the improvements. Please come to our |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Key Words</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response and Date</th>
<th>Response to Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4/22/2013</td>
<td>Dan Smuts</td>
<td>Hopkins and Rose – would like to see median at Hopkins and Rose be converted to a permeable surface.</td>
<td>Hi Ray, I would like to give input on Measure M implementation but can’t make the June 8 public meeting. How can I offer my thoughts? In particular, I’d like to see the median at Hopkins and Rose (see image below) converted from asphalt to a natural, water permeable surface (ie: planted similar to the median at Hopkins and San Pablo right down the street). Thank you, Dan Smuts</td>
<td>Hi Dan, Thanks for your message. As for receiving your input, this message will suffice and I’ve copied others to make them aware of your comment. As you mentioned the June 8th public meeting, I would like to inform you that our first public meeting will be on May 2nd (Thursday) at 5:30 pm, at the North Berkeley Senior Center. We hope that you will be able to attend. Also, we will be informing the public that they can submit written comments to the Berkeley Public Works email box at <a href="mailto:PWEngineering@cityofberkeley.info">PWEngineering@cityofberkeley.info</a>. Thanks again. Ray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/22/2013</td>
<td>Ann-Marie Hogan</td>
<td>Interests to attend public meetings.</td>
<td>Good morning! For the upcoming workshops on Measure M, I see in the informational flyer that the June 8 meeting starts at 10 am and the one in July at 5:30, but do we have a sense of how long either will last? The flyer had an agenda and start and end time for the May meeting, which, unfortunately, I can’t attend. Thanks for everything you do and good luck with the public process. Ann-Marie Hogan</td>
<td>May 2nd community meeting and continue to voice your comments. Regards, Ray Yep Chair, Public Works Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Green infrastructure (GI) and low impact development (LID) projects mimic the natural environment by allowing rainwater to collect and infiltrate through porous media. This can serve numerous purposes including: (1) removing pollutants, (2) decreasing stormwater flow and flooding, and (3) replenishing groundwater supplies. GI and LID can be a cost effective solution for improving water quality and reducing flooding. Examples of such projects include rain gardens, permeable pavement, green roofs, and infiltration basins.

Where are Green Infrastructure Projects Underway or Complete?

The San Pablo Stormwater Spine Project is a grant-funded multi-City demonstration project installing LID retrofits on San Pablo Avenue sites from Oakland to Richmond. (Source: Watershed Management Plan, p. 27)

Examples of City projects that have LID measures include the new Animal Shelter (green roof, permeable pavement, etc.) and the Fire Station Warehouse on Folger (rainwater harvesting cistern). (Source: Watershed Management Plan, p. 28)

Benefits of Green Infrastructure

1. Pollution Abatement
2. Protection of Natural Waterways
3. Groundwater Recharge
4. Water Quality Improvements
5. Reduced Sanitary Sewer Overflows
6. Habitat Improvements
7. Reduced Flooding and Property Damage
8. Aesthetic Value
9. Public Spaces and Public Participation

Berkeley Animal Shelter  (Source: Ray Yep)
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Introduction

In November 2012, the Berkeley voters passed Measure M, authorizing the City of Berkeley to invest $30 million in bond funds in street repaving/rehabilitation and related green infrastructure. With this additional funding source, the City of Berkeley (City) has an opportunity to develop an integrated street investment plan that ensures streets are in safe condition for all users, neighborhoods are protected from flooding and our environment is sustainable.

In March 2013, the Public Works Commission (PWC) as the lead commission, invited the Community Environmental Advisory Commission (CEAC), the Transportation Commission (TC) and the Parks & Waterfront Commission (P&WC) to collaborate in a community process to gather input on goals and priorities for investing Measure M funds. Representatives from each of the four commissions met over a series of intensive working sessions to review current City plans, structure the community process and outline preliminary ideas for how current policies could be coordinated in a more integrated approach to street improvements. Plans and policies considered include:

- The Street Rehabilitation and Repair Policy and the annual Five Year Street Rehabilitation Plan (see pages 2-3);
- The Watershed Management Plan and green infrastructure technologies (see pages 4-5); and
- Active Transportation initiatives (see pages 6-7).

Over the course of a few months, the commissions hosted three community meetings to share ideas and gather public input on goals and priorities for Measure M funding. The League of Women Voters – Berkeley, Albany, Emeryville provided support to ensure a transparent and inclusive process.

Recommendations

The community engagement process has resulted in a series of recommendations for investing in Berkeley’s most heavily used civic space – our street network. The outcome of this community dialogue is a set of criteria and a process for supporting a more integrated and sustainable street network. The specific recommendations are described on pages 9-11 and include:

- Goals and Outcome Targets
- Evaluation Criteria and Scorecard
- Planning Process
- Monitoring and Oversight

Next Steps

Public Works staff will be working with the PWC to finalize the recommendations from this process for the proposed Five-Year Street Rehabilitation Plan for Council review. Program implementation is expected to begin in January 2014. This report summarizes the outcomes of the process including current initiatives related to implementing Measure M (pages 2-7), the community engagement process (page 8), recommendations (pages 9-11) and next steps (page 12).
Current Street Paving Planning Process

The City of Berkeley (City) currently maintains a rolling 5-Year Street Rehabilitation Plan for paving and reconstructing City streets. City staff updates the plan on an annual basis. The plan is presented to the Public Works Commission, which reviews and recommends action to City Council to ensure that the 5-year Street Plan is consistent with Berkeley's Street Rehabilitation and Repair Policy, Resolutions No. 55,384-N.S. and 64,733-N.S. The 5-Year Plan is generated with the aid of a computerized StreetSaver® program (developed by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission). StreetSaver® uses the following criteria: a) street pavement condition, b) type of repair required, c) road classification, e.g., arterial, collector, or residential, d) cost effectiveness, and e) budget constraints.

Berkeley Street Paving Policy

Berkeley's Street Rehabilitation and Repair Policy provides criteria for developing the plan, including the following:

- Implement integrated solutions that address the multiple demands on the street infrastructure that are designed for safety, and are environmentally sustainable and economically efficient over the long run.
- Coordinate with other City programs, such as sanitary sewers, storm drains, sidewalks, utility undergrounding districts, city building upgrades, traffic signals and other traffic calming measures, bicycle improvements, park projects, and Street Maintenance Division activities.
- Coordinate with utility company work.
- Budget distributed to: arterials – 10%, collectors – 50%, residential – 25%, discretionary and demonstration – 15%
- Prioritize collector and residential streets with AC Transit bus routes or bicycle routes.
- Improve contiguous blocks rather than one block at a time as much as possible.
Berkeley Street Pavement Condition

In November 2011, the City Auditor released a report concluding that Berkeley's streets are in poor “at risk” condition. The report estimated an additional $54 million would be needed to over five years to achieve an average pavement condition of good.

How is Pavement Condition Rated?

The City of Berkeley has approximately 217 miles of streets. The Public Works Department currently estimates that 155 miles of Berkeley streets need rehabilitation or repairs. The condition of the streets is characterized by a Pavement Condition Index (PCI). New streets have a PCI of 100 and a target PCI of 75 is generally accepted as streets in good condition.

What Paving Projects may be Eligible for Measure M Funding?

Measure M funding may be used for street paving and rehabilitation consistent with the 5-Year Street Rehabilitation Plan as it is updated annually and to sufficiently accelerate the implementation of that plan.

Measure M funded: A bond is a long-term loan and is traditionally used to fund capital improvements that are intended to last longer than the repayment period. The PWC recommends allocating Measure M funds for capital street construction projects with the potential to last at least the life of the bond repayment (minimum 30 years).

Maintenance funded: Direct tax monies are typically paid annually and are used to pay for ongoing operations and maintenance. The PWC recommends allocating the current direct tax monies to maintenance treatment to prolong the life of the pavement. This would allow for 2 to 3 times more street overlays over the next five years to comply with the Measure M language of “significant acceleration of street rehabilitation.”
Overview of the Watershed Management Plan

The Watershed Management Plan (WMP) was developed to identify opportunities to reduce flooding, improve water quality and enhance waterways and habitat. The WMP outlines general goals for managing stormwater across the city and identifies specific capital projects in two watersheds, Potters and Codornices, to address specific flooding and water quality issues. In addition, the WMP outlines a role for green infrastructure in supplementing the existing engineered storm drain infrastructure with greener developments that mimic natural hydrologic processes including filtration and infiltration by soils and plants.

Examples of flooding locations identified in the WMP:

- San Pablo Avenue, between Ward and Murray
- California Street, between Woolsey and Harmon
- Woolsey Street, between California and Adeline; at Dana
- Ashby Avenue, between California and King
- Martin Luther King, Jr. Way, between Russell and Woolsey
- Parker Street, between Seventh and Fourth
- Fulton Street at Derby
- Ellsworth Street between Blake and Parker
- Telegraph Avenue between Ashby and Woolsey; at Stuart
- College Avenue at Dwight

What WMP Projects may be Eligible for Measure M Funding?

WMP projects (identified in the plan or consistent with the goals) that are constructed as part of a street improvement may be eligible for Measure M funding. Creek restoration activities identified in the Watershed Management Plan may only be funded under Measure M if they are directly related to street improvements, such as a creek culvert upgrade. Criteria for prioritizing WMP projects and green infrastructure in Measure M funding street improvements are included in the recommended scorecard on page 11.
Green Infrastructure

Green infrastructure (GI) and low impact development (LID) projects mimic the natural environment by allowing rainwater to collect and infiltrate through permeable media. This can serve numerous purposes including: (1) removing pollutants, (2) decreasing stormwater flow and flooding, and (3) replenishing groundwater supplies. GI and LID can be a cost effective solution for improving water quality and reducing flooding. Examples of such projects include rain gardens, permeable pavement, and infiltration basins.

Benefits of Green Infrastructure

1. Pollution Abatement
2. Protection of Natural Waterways
3. Groundwater Recharge
4. Water Quality Improvements
5. Reduced Sanitary Sewer Overflows
6. Habitat Improvements
7. Reduced Flooding and Property Damage
8. Aesthetic Value
9. Public Spaces and Public Participation

Green Infrastructure Examples

Permeable paving refers to paving materials that allow stormwater to filter through to the soil below.

Vegetated swales (bioswales) are broad, shallow channels designed to convey and filter stormwater runoff.

Raingardens, or Bioretention Cells are vegetated depressions that can resemble miniature ponds or long strips.

Berkeley has implemented green infrastructure at the Berkeley Animal Shelter. Green infrastructure components include a rain garden, permeable paving and bicycle friendly elements.

Photo credit: Ray Yep

Berkeley Animal Shelter  (Source: Ray Yep)

Green infrastructure components include a rain garden, permeable paving and bicycle friendly elements.

Photo credit: Ray Yep
Berkeley’s Active Transportation Plans

Street reconstruction to improve paving offers an opportunity to incorporate other features to promote biking and walking in Berkeley. The City of Berkeley currently has a number of initiatives, totalling more than $47 million, to promote active transportation. Current plans and policies include:

1) **Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plans.**
Guides the development of new bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and the improvement of existing facilities by developing a plan with a list of priority projects for the City.
http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/transportation/

2) **Complete Streets Policy.**
Ensures that each time the City does construction on a street, it builds a “complete street,” or a street that accommodates all users and all modes of transportation, regardless of age or ability.
http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/transportation/

3) **Downtown Streets and Open Space Improvement Plan (SOSIP).**
Includes plans to make downtown Berkeley more “livable,” by creating features such as pedestrian plazas, improved bicycle connections, and more parks and greenery.
http://www.cityofberkeley.info/sosip/

4) **Climate Action Plan.**
Calls for an increase in walking and bicycling in order to achieve a significant reduction in vehicle trips in Berkeley, which account for about half of all greenhouse gas emissions.
http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/climate/
Promoting Active Transportation

Active transportation, such as walking, biking, and taking transit, is a healthy, sustainable, and affordable way to travel throughout Berkeley and the Bay Area. Berkeley has some of the highest rates of bicycling and walking in the country, and was awarded the “Most Accessible City in the Nation” by disability experts in 2007. The walking and bicycling experience in Berkeley can be improved by:

- **Building Complete Streets.**
  The Complete Streets Policy, passed in December 2012, will ensure that all future street repairs are built for all modes of transportation, including biking and walking.

- **Prioritizing the Bicycle Network.**
  Many of Berkeley’s bikeways need resurfacing as soon as possible. Pavement condition is a key concern of cyclists. Paving a street improves one’s ability to travel more safely and easily by bike. The current method of repaving streets (“the 5-year paving plan”) uses a formula that prioritizes streets with heavy auto traffic. Some bikeways are captured through this method, but many are missed because they are on residential streets. Approximately 22% of the City’s roadways are existing or planned bikeways.

- **Traffic Calming.**
  Safety for all roadway users can be improved by integrating priority traffic calming measures (e.g., neighborhood traffic circles, speed tables, etc.) as streets are repaved. Permeable pavers are another alternative for slowing traffic.

What Projects may be Eligible for Measure M Funding?

Measure M provides funding for street repaving and rehabilitation and the installation of green infrastructure as part of street work. However, Berkeley’s complete streets policy requires that when a street is repaved all “related” improvements to the street must be made. This could include funding for bicycle, pedestrian, traffic safety (calming), and drainage improvements for that street. Measure M does not provide for “related” improvements to be funded on a standalone or individual basis; they must be integrated into a street repaving and rehabilitation project. Criteria for prioritizing active transportation improvements in Measure M funding street projects are included in the recommended scorecard on page 11.
During the course of the community engagement process, three public meetings were held to share information and gather input. The meetings included an open house portion to share information on related city initiatives, as well as break out discussions to facilitate meaningful dialogue and gather community suggestions. Participants offered valuable input for both the process and the recommendations. A summary of the meetings is included below for reference. Meeting agendas, materials, and comment summaries are available on the Public Works Department website: http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/Public_Works/Sidewalks-Streets-Utility/Measure_M__The_Public_Works_Commission_and_the_Public_Process.aspx

**Meeting #1: Overview of the Process and Background**
**Thursday, May 2, 2013**
- Background on Berkeley's infrastructure needs
- Overview of City Paving, Watershed and Active Transportation policies
- Overview of the process and how to get involved
- Gather input on goals and priorities

**Meeting #2: Develop Preliminary Criteria**
**Saturday, June 8, 2013**
- Share draft goals and priorities
- Gather input on criteria

**Meeting #3: Share Draft Recommendations**
**Thursday, July 18, 2013**
- Share draft scorecard and gather input
- Share recommendations on planning process
- Gather input on ranking

In addition to the three public meetings, community members submitted comments by letter and email. Input from the second public meeting resulted in the development of a scorecard. Input from the third community meeting informed the final recommended ranking in the scorecard.
Recommendations

The community engagement process resulted in several specific recommendations for Measure M investment which are summarized below. The Berkeley Public Works Department is integrating these recommendations into the annual Five-Year Street Rehabilitation Plan. These recommendations along with the Five Year Street Rehabilitation Plan will be presented to the City Council for consideration.

Goals and Target Outcomes
Measure M funds should make strides toward the following goals:
- Streets are in good safe condition for all users
- Reduced neighborhood flooding
- Our environment becomes more sustainable

Evaluation Criteria
The community engagement process resulted in a recommended scorecard to prioritize and select streets for improvement. The recommended scorecard is included on page 11. The criteria and weighting for the scorecard were developed based on the following:
- Public input from the community meetings
- Elements from the Envision framework (see textbox for more detail)
- Criteria suggested by the Public Works Department

Planning Process
The planning process included on page 10 outlines recommendations for how to incorporate the scorecard into the street improvement planning process. The process recommends the Measure M funds should be focused on street capital improvement projects and green infrastructure, and not be used for maintenance functions. The planning process diagram also indicates when to consider green infrastructure and permeable paving design elements, as well as how to track progress through a series of performance metrics and reporting.

Monitoring and Oversight
Each year, the Public Works Commission reviews the annual Five Year Street Rehabilitation Plan and submits recommendations for approval by City Council. The current Five Year Street Rehabilitation Plan report includes metrics for proposed miles of street improvement, as well as the type of paving. In order to track performance, an annual report summarizing the following additional metrics is recommended:
- Track miles of street reconstruction
- Track street Pavement Condition Index
- Track green infrastructure installations and flooding mitigation
- Track life cycle cost effectiveness of Measure M investments

The Commissions recommend that the PWC in coordination with the TC, CEAC and P&WC, monitor the progress of Measure M implementation to evaluate alignment with the goals, evaluation criteria and performance metrics. In addition, the Commissions recommend continuing to engage the public annually to report on progress and gather additional input.

Envision Assessment Tools
The scorecard uses applicable elements of the Envision™ framework. Similar to the LEED system for evaluating sustainable building, Envision™ provides a holistic framework for evaluating the community, environmental and economic benefits of infrastructure projects. Envision™ can be used to track sustainability goals, recognize achievement in sustainability, prioritize investment of scarce resources and integrate community priorities.

Envision™ is the product of a joint collaboration between the Zofnass Program for Sustainable Infrastructure at the Harvard University Graduate School of Design and the Institute for Sustainable Infrastructure. www.sustainableinfrastructure.org

During the community meetings, participants shared goals and priorities for street improvements and learned about ideas to develop a more integrated, sustainable street network.

Photo credit: Nancy Bickel
Proposed Planning Process

The planning process below outlines how to incorporate the scorecard into the street improvement planning process. The planning process diagram also indicates when to consider green infrastructure and permeable paving design elements, as well as how to track progress through a series of performance metrics and reporting.

Planning Phase Activities

Current Process:
- Run StreetSaver
- Coordinate with City programs
- Coordinate with utilities
- Comply with City policies
- Prepare preliminary 5-yr paving plan

Use Scorecard:
- Rate each street
- Summarize street priorities
- Recommend streets for reconstruction

Public Works Dept. recommends 5-yr paving plan:
- Consider discretionary need
- Reviewed by Public Works Commission
- Approval by City Council

Design and Monitoring Phase Activities

Prepare reconstruction designs:
- Field verify street priorities
- **Incorporate green infrastructure**
- Select durable pavement types
- Check for grant funding
- Prepare designs and bid documents

Prepare maintenance bid documents:
- Field verify street priorities
- **Incorporate green infrastructure**
- Select slurry seal or overlay
- Check for grant funding
- Prepare bid documents

Monitor performance:
- Track miles of street reconstruction
- Track street Pavement Condition Index
- Track green infrastructure installations and flooding mitigation
- Track life cycle cost effectiveness of Measure M investments

Public Works Dept.

---

Measure M Integrated Streets Investment Plan
**Scorecard Evaluation Criteria**

The primary outcome of the community engagement process is the recommendation to use the following scorecard in the annual street prioritization process. Each street proposed for reconstruction will be rated according to the criteria and points outlined. Points will be given for sub categories and rolled up where applicable. The total assigned points will be tabulated to develop an overall prioritization of streets and watershed improvements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Project Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Resource Allocation and Durability</strong></td>
<td>Max. Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD 1</td>
<td>Rates high on StreetSaver® output for complete “reconstruction”</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD 2</td>
<td>Leverages funds</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD 2.1</td>
<td>Secures grant funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD 2.2</td>
<td>Cost effective in the long run</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD 2.3</td>
<td>Spend money on things that will solve multiple problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD 3</td>
<td>Candidate for durable or permeable paving -- long lasting</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD 3.1</td>
<td>Use durable pavement systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD 3.2</td>
<td>Use durable permeable pavement where advantageous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD 4</td>
<td>Ready to implement</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD 4.1</td>
<td>Involves few utility interferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD 4.2</td>
<td>Engineering and evaluations can be done quickly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Community Improvement</strong></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCI 1</td>
<td>Enhances public health and safety</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCI 1.1</td>
<td>Improves traffic safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCI 1.2</td>
<td>Advances traffic calming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCI 1.3</td>
<td>Enhances equitable community benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCI 2</td>
<td>Advances Berkeley Complete Streets Policy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCI 3</td>
<td>Advances bicycle and pedestrian plans</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCI 4</td>
<td>Integrates with other City Plans</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCI 4.1</td>
<td>Advances SOSIP, DAP, CAP, and/or Area plans*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment and Climate</strong></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 1</td>
<td>Consistent with Watershed Management Plan</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 1.1</td>
<td>Improves stormwater quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 1.2</td>
<td>Mitigates flooding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 2</td>
<td>Includes Green Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 3</td>
<td>Consistent with Climate Action Plan Goals</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 3.1</td>
<td>Reduces greenhouse gas emissions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 3.2</td>
<td>Prepares for long term adaptability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Street and Open Space Improvement Plan (SOSIP), Downtown Area Plan (DAP), Climate Action Plan (CAP).*
Next Steps

The Measure M community engagement process has provided an opportunity for Berkeley residents to re-envision a more sustainable, integrated street network. The process has facilitated collaboration across Commissions, integrated Public Works staff expertise, and engaged the community in meaningful dialogue about the future of Berkeley’s most heavily used civic space – our street network. This process has resulted in a set of recommendations for Measure M investment that can be incorporated directly by Public Works Department into the 2014 Five Year Street Paving Plan, as well as each year going forward. These recommendations, along with the 2014 Five Year Street Paving Plan will be presented to Council for consideration and implementation which may begin as soon as January 2014.

Measuring Success

The purpose of Measure M funding is to significantly accelerate the implementation of the 5 year street repaving plan as it is updated annually and to install green infrastructure as part of this street improvements when appropriate. The table below shows anticipated increased funding levels over the next five years.

Example Street Improvement Funding Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program (figures are rounded)</th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Pavement Management Funding</td>
<td>$3.4M</td>
<td>$3.4M</td>
<td>$3.4M</td>
<td>$3.4M</td>
<td>$3.4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Measure M Funding</td>
<td>$2.5M</td>
<td>$6.0M</td>
<td>$6.0M</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Berkeley is constructing a permeable paver project on Allston Way next to Martin Luther King Jr. Civic Center Park.

For more information on case studies and benefits of pavers, see the “Permeable Interlocking Concrete Paver” report by the PWC on the Public Works Department Measure M website.
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Contact
Please provide written comments to PWEngineering@cityofberkeley.info

For more information, please contact Ray Yep, Chair, Public Works Commission at rayyep1@gmail.com
Subject: FW: June 4th Council actions: 17. City Manager Referral: Naming of Twain Path No. 68 in Honor of Councilmember Betty Olds

17. City Manager Referral: Naming of Twain Path No. 68 in Honor of Councilmember Betty Olds

From: Councilmember Wengraf

Recommendation: In accordance with the City of Berkeley's naming policy, refer to the City Manager the naming of the new Twain Path No. 68 and request that this be sent to the appropriate commission for consideration and return to Council with a recommendation. The Berkeley Path Wanderers and the adjacent neighbors of Path No. 68 are in full support of naming this new path in honor of former Councilmember Betty Olds.

Financial Implications: See report

Contact: Susan Wengraf, Councilmember, District 6, 981-7160

Action: Approved recommendation.