



Downtown Streets & Open Space Improvement Plan Subcommittee

Matthew Taecker, Secretary, 2120 Milvia Street, Berkeley, CA 94704
Telephone: 510.981.7487 Email: mtaecker@ci.berkeley.ca.us Web: www.cityofberkeley.info/sosip

1 MINUTES¹

2 Downtown Streets & Open Space Improvement Plan Subcommittee – Meeting #8 3 Thursday, September 30, 2010, from 7 to 9:30 pm

4 North Berkeley Senior Center, 1901 Hearst Avenue, Berkeley, California

5
6 **Subcommittee Member Attendance.** Seven (7) COB members were present: Keith Alward,
7 Patricia Dacey, Meghan Lang, Jim Novosel, Carole Schemmerling, Margo Schueler, and Ann
8 Smulka. Teresa Clarke and Kate Harrison were absent (without Leave). UC members
9 present: Emily Marthinsen.

10
11 **Staff Attendance.** Matt Taecker (Principal Planner & Secretary to Subcommittee).

12
13 **Public Attendance.** About ten (10) community members attended some part of the meeting.

14
15 **Order of the Agenda.** No changes were made.

16
17 **Public Comments.** Six (6) members of the public commented.

18
19 Dave Campbell, East Bay Bicycle Coalition, said that proposed bike facilities on Milvia
20 need more development. He supported removing one lane of parking to create full bicycle
21 lanes. Bike parking might be increased through the conversion of on-street parking
22 spaces. He asked that traffic diverters be considered at University and around Bancroft.

23
24 Charles Siegel, Bicycle Friendly Berkeley Coalition, asked the Subcommittee to only
25 recommend one alternative for Milvia: to remove one lane of parking to create full bicycle
26 lanes. He also asked the Subcommittee to be more aggressive about introducing traffic
27 calming features along Milvia.

28
29 Jamie Rusin, Downtown Berkeley Association, stressed the importance of improvements
30 along Shattuck and University because they are Berkeley's commercial corridors. In
31 addition, Shattuck Square and the end of University should have more foot traffic because
32 of UC's Helios project and a new pedestrian passage on Walnut. He asked that Shattuck
33 and University improvements be the highest priority, and that Center Street Plaza not take
34 funding away from these projects.

35
36 Committee members affirmed their recommendation to make Center Street Plaza and
37 Shattuck Square with University Avenue highest priorities. Some members said that
38 phase 1 of Center Street Plaza would avoid the expensive water feature, and that closing
39 the top of Center Street for events would be relatively easy to do.

40
41 John Caner, Downtown Berkeley Association, said that future development along the end
42 of University Avenue could pay abutting street improvements. Regarding Center Street
43 Plaza, he said that some abutting merchants are against the Plaza concept, and that the
44 Plaza concept makes all of the abutting merchants "nervous."

¹ The SOSIP Subcommittee was unable to adopt these Minutes because it was dissolved on September 30, 2010 by Council Resolution. (Former) Subcommittee members were given an opportunity to review and comment on these Minutes, and no objections or corrections were received.

45 Committee members noted that the end of University Avenue is among the highest
46 funding priorities.

47
48 Steve Finacom, Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association, proposed specific revisions
49 to the draft SOSIP: the parking lot next to the Civic Center Building should be eliminated
50 and the space should be made part of Civic Center Park; reconstruction of the Center
51 Street Garage should include rooftop open space; the whole Plan should stress the need
52 to provide more space for active recreation; and an analysis should be performed to
53 estimate the number of trees lost versus trees gained -- because of SOSIP improvements.

54
55 Merrillie Mitchell, Council candidate, said that UC's "DHS" site should have open space.
56 She objected to creating a water feature on Center Street. She emphasized the
57 importance of keeping sidewalks clean and trees well kept.

58
59 Chuck McColluch, Design Review Committee, said that small incremental improvements
60 should be the principle focus of the SOSIP, rather than big projects.

61
62 John Roberts, Downtown Berkeley Association, said that funding should go to projects
63 where merchants and other stakeholders are in support.

64
65 **Final Recommendations for SOSIP.** The Subcommittee developed amendments to be
66 considered through collaboration and without disagreement -- including those draft
67 amendments prepared by Staff.

68
69 A motion was heard to adopt the SOSIP "Public Review Draft" (dated August 31, 2010) the
70 following revisions:

- 71 • the addition of the Financial Strategies chapter (dated September 23, 2010);
- 72 • the amendments developed at the Subcommittee's September 30 meeting (below);
73 and
- 74 • the amendments developed by the Subcommittee on September 13 and
75 summarized by staff in memo of September 23 (attached) -- with refinements made
76 on September 30 (also below).

77 The motion was seconded.

78
79 **Amendments Developed on September 30**

80
81 Milvia Bike Lanes. Remove reference to Class 2.5 option that would keep parking on
82 both sides of the street. Note proximity of Golden Bear parking lot to meet parking
83 demand.

84
85 University Avenue. Revise new option to show diagonal parking with bulb-outs to on
86 both sides of the street. Show one truck loading space on each side.

87
88 Recreation. Stress need for recreational elements in Goals, in Major Project
89 descriptions, in Programming policy (with reference to roof opportunity on top of new
90 Center Street Garage).

91
92 Civic Center Park. Remove parking lot in diagram.

93
94 Parklets. Review and, if needed, amend standards and procedures to encourage
95 temporary installations, such as parklets.

96

97 Green Infrastructure. Note that green roofs can be used in conjunction with SOSIP
98 improvements.
99

100 Harold Way. Indicate as shared or slow street (not closed).
101

102 Financing Strategy. Consider how developers could assume fair-share maintenance
103 costs, if they chose to exercise the in-lieu fee option. Only a portion of the in lieu fee
104 could be used instead of required open space.
105

106 Credits for SOSIP. Subcommittee asked that the Principal Planner & Designer for
107 SOSIP take greater credit for developing the Plan.
108

109 Members of the SOSIP Subcommittee adopted the motion unanimously.
110

111 **Next Steps.** Staff explained that the Subcommittee's recommendations would go to other
112 Commissions for comment, and that those comments would be summarized and forwarded to
113 City Council with the Subcommittee's Plan. Subcommittee members stressed the importance
114 committing funds to implement the Plan and provide on-going maintenance. Staff expected
115 that Council would begin consideration of the recommended SOSIP in early 2011.
116

117 **Appreciation.** Chairperson Novosel and other Subcommittee members expressed
118 appreciation for the collaborative and constructive attitudes that characterized the SOSIP
119 process. Staff and Subcommittee expressed their appreciation for their respective efforts.
120

121 **Adjournment.** The final meeting of the SOSIP Subcommittee was adjourned at 9:30 pm.