



**BERKELEY CITY COUNCIL FACILITIES, INFRASTRUCTURE,
TRANSPORTATION, ENVIRONMENT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE
SPECIAL MEETING**

**Wednesday, June 7, 2023
2:00 PM**

2180 Milvia Street, 6th Floor - Redwood Room

Committee Members:

Councilmembers Terry Taplin, Kate Harrison, and Rigel Robinson
Alternate: Councilmember Mark Humbert

This meeting will be conducted in a hybrid model with both in-person attendance and virtual participation. For in-person attendees, face coverings or masks that cover both the nose and the mouth are encouraged. If you are feeling sick, please do not attend the meeting in person.

Remote participation by the public is available through Zoom. To access the meeting remotely using the internet: Join from a PC, Mac, iPad, iPhone, or Android device: Use URL <https://cityofberkeley-info.zoomgov.com/j/1615164582>. If you do not wish for your name to appear on the screen, then use the drop down menu and click on "rename" to rename yourself to be anonymous. To request to speak, use the "raise hand" icon on the screen. To join by phone: Dial **1-669-254-5252** or **1-833-568-8864 (Toll Free)** and Enter **Meeting ID: 161 516 4582**. If you wish to comment during the public comment portion of the agenda, press *9 and wait to be recognized by the Chair.

To submit a written communication for the Committee's consideration and inclusion in the public record, email policycommittee@cityofberkeley.info.

Written communications submitted by mail or e-mail to the Facilities, Infrastructure, Transportation, Environment & Sustainability Committee by 5:00 p.m. the Friday before the Committee meeting will be distributed to the members of the Committee in advance of the meeting and retained as part of the official record.

AGENDA

Roll Call

Public Comment on Non-Agenda Matters

Minutes for Approval

Draft minutes for the Committee's consideration and approval.

1. Minutes - May 4, 2023

Committee Action Items

The public may comment on each item listed on the agenda for action as the item is taken up. The Chair will determine the number of persons interested in speaking on each item. Up to ten (10) speakers may speak for two minutes. If there are more than ten persons interested in speaking, the Chair may limit the public comment for all speakers to one minute per speaker. Speakers are permitted to yield their time to one other speaker, however no one speaker shall have more than four minutes.

Following review and discussion of the items listed below, the Committee may continue an item to a future committee meeting, or refer the item to the City Council.

2. Discussion and possible action on new proposed regular meeting time: First and third Wednesday of the month, 2:00 p.m.

3. Audit Status Report: Underfunded Mandate: Resources, Strategic Plan, and Communication Needed to Continue Progress towards the Year 2020 Zero Waste Goal

From: City Manager

Referred: November 3, 2022

Due: July 25, 2023

Contact: Liam Garland, Public Works, (510) 981-6300

4. Audit Status Report: Unified Vision of Zero Waste Activities Will Help Align Service Levels with Billing and Ensure Customer Equity

From: City Manager

Referred: November 3, 2022

Due: July 25, 2023

Contact: Liam Garland, Public Works, (510) 981-6300

Committee Action Items

5. **Adopt an Ordinance Adding a New Chapter 12.01 to the Berkeley Municipal Code Establishing Emergency Greenhouse Gas Limits, Process for Updated Climate Action Plan, Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Regional Collaboration**

From: Councilmember Harrison (Author), Councilmember Bartlett (Co-Sponsor) and Councilmember Hahn (Co-Sponsor)

Referred: November 15, 2021

Due: July 31, 2023

Recommendation: 1. Adopt an ordinance adding a new Chapter 12.01 to the Berkeley Municipal Code (BMC) establishing Emergency Greenhouse Gas Limits with an effective date of [], 2022.

2. Refer to the FY23-24 Budget Process \$[] consistent with implementing the requirements of Sections 12.01.040, 12.01.050, 12.01.060.

Financial Implications: See report

Contact: Kate Harrison, Councilmember, District 4, (510) 981-7140

Unscheduled Items

These items are not scheduled for discussion or action at this meeting. The Committee may schedule these items to the Action Calendar of a future Committee meeting.

6. 51 Bus Rapid Transit

From: Councilmember Taplin (Author)

Referred: November 28, 2022

Due: June 21, 2023

Recommendation: 1) Refer to the City Manager the development of an implementation and community engagement plan to install Bus Rapid Transit, including dedicated bus lanes, transit signal priority, elevated platforms, and enhanced sections, on the AC Transit 51B route along University Avenue from Sixth Street to Shattuck Avenue and along Shattuck Avenue from University Avenue to Durant Avenue, with engagement centering pedestrian, cyclist, transit and mobility justice advocates, the disability rights community, local faith communities, merchants, neighboring residential communities inclusive of tenants, seniors, and students, and historically marginalized communities.

2) Refer \$300,000 to the Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Budget Process to conduct a Complete Street Corridor Study antecedent to the installation of a cycle track along University Avenue from 6th Street to Oxford Street, consistent with the City of Berkeley's 2017 Bicycle Plan and integrating pedestrian amenities consistent with the City of Berkeley's 2020 Pedestrian Plan. As per the Bicycle Plan, the study will be evaluated in the context of the modal priorities established by the City of Berkeley General Plan's 2001 Transportation Element and the Alameda County Transportation Commission's (ACTC) 2016 Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan.

3) Refer \$300,000 to the Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Budget Process to conduct a Complete Street Corridor Study antecedent to the installation of a cycle track along Oxford Street from Virginia Street to Durant Avenue consistent with the Bicycle Plan and integrating pedestrian amenities consistent with the Pedestrian Plan. As per the Bicycle Plan, the study will be evaluated in the context of the modal priorities established by the Transportation Element and ACTC's Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan. It will be coordinated with proposed improvements to transit performance on this Primary Transit Route, such as bus boarding islands, transit-only lanes, transit signal priority/queue jump lanes, far-side bus stop relocations, and other improvements as described in AC Transit's 2016 Major Corridor Study.

4) Refer \$X to the Fiscal Year XX-XX Budget Process to install quick-build bus station improvements along the AC Transit 51B route.

5) Initiate consultation with AC Transit and UC Berkeley Bear Transit as soon as possible on the planning, scoping, and implementation of these items.

Financial Implications: See report

Contact: Terry Taplin, Councilmember, District 2, (510) 981-7120

Items for Future Agendas

- **Requests by Committee Members to add items to future agendas**

Adjournment

Written communications addressed to the Facilities, Infrastructure, Transportation, Environment & Sustainability Committee and submitted to the City Clerk Department will be distributed to the Committee prior to the meeting.

This meeting will be conducted in accordance with the Brown Act, Government Code Section 54953 and applicable Executive Orders as issued by the Governor that are currently in effect. Members of the City Council who are not members of the standing committee may attend a standing committee meeting even if it results in a quorum being present, provided that the non-members only act as observers and do not participate in the meeting. If only one member of the Council who is not a member of the committee is present for the meeting, the member may participate in the meeting because less than a quorum of the full Council is present. Any member of the public may attend this meeting. Questions regarding this matter may be addressed to Mark Numainville, City Clerk, (510) 981-6900.



COMMUNICATION ACCESS INFORMATION:

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 (510) 981-6418 (V) or (510) 981-6347 (TDD) at least three business days before the meeting date. Attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various scents, whether natural or manufactured, in products and materials. Please help the City respect these needs.

I hereby certify that the agenda for this meeting of the Standing Committee of the Berkeley City Council was posted at the display case located near the walkway in front of the Maudelle Shirek Building, 2134 Martin Luther King Jr. Way, as well as on the City's website, on June 1, 2023.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mark Numainville".

Mark Numainville, City Clerk

Communications

Communications submitted to City Council Policy Committees are on file in the City Clerk Department at 2180 Milvia Street, 1st Floor, Berkeley, CA, and are available upon request by contacting the City Clerk Department at (510) 981-6908 or policycommittee@cityofberkeley.info.

**BERKELEY CITY COUNCIL FACILITIES, INFRASTRUCTURE,
TRANSPORTATION, ENVIRONMENT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MINUTES**

**Thursday, May 4, 2023
1:00 PM**

2180 Milvia Street, 6th Floor - Redwood Room

Committee Members:

Councilmembers Terry Taplin, Kate Harrison, and Rigel Robinson
Alternate: Councilmember Mark Humbert

This meeting will be conducted in a hybrid model with both in-person attendance and virtual participation. For in-person attendees, face coverings or masks that cover both the nose and the mouth are encouraged. If you are feeling sick, please do not attend the meeting in person.

Remote participation by the public is available through Zoom. To access the meeting remotely using the internet: Join from a PC, Mac, iPad, iPhone, or Android device: Use URL <https://cityofberkeley-info.zoomgov.com/j/1609443290>. If you do not wish for your name to appear on the screen, then use the drop down menu and click on "rename" to rename yourself to be anonymous. To request to speak, use the "raise hand" icon on the screen. To join by phone: Dial **1-669-254-5252 or 1-833-568-8864 (Toll Free)** and Enter Meeting ID: **160 944 3290**. If you wish to comment during the public comment portion of the agenda, press *9 and wait to be recognized by the Chair.

To submit a written communication for the Committee's consideration and inclusion in the public record, email policycommittee@cityofberkeley.info.

Written communications submitted by mail or e-mail to the Facilities, Infrastructure, Transportation, Environment & Sustainability Committee by 5:00 p.m. the Friday before the Committee meeting will be distributed to the members of the Committee in advance of the meeting and retained as part of the official record.

MINUTES

Roll Call: 1:04 p.m. Councilmembers Robinson and Harrison present.

Councilmember Taplin present at 1:13 p.m.

Public Comment on Non-Agenda Matters: No speakers.

Minutes for Approval

Draft minutes for the Committee's consideration and approval.

1. Minutes - April 13, 2023

Action: M/S/C (Robinson/Harrison) to approve the April 13, 2023 minutes.

Vote: Ayes – Robinson, Harrison; Noes – None; Abstain – None; Absent – Taplin.

Committee Action Items

The public may comment on each item listed on the agenda for action as the item is taken up. The Chair will determine the number of persons interested in speaking on each item. Up to ten (10) speakers may speak for two minutes. If there are more than ten persons interested in speaking, the Chair may limit the public comment for all speakers to one minute per speaker. Speakers are permitted to yield their time to one other speaker, however no one speaker shall have more than four minutes.

Following review and discussion of the items listed below, the Committee may continue an item to a future committee meeting, or refer the item to the City Council.

2. Audit Status Report: Underfunded Mandate: Resources, Strategic Plan, and Communication Needed to Continue Progress towards the Year 2020 Zero Waste Goal

From: City Manager

Referred: November 3, 2022

Due: July 25, 2023

Contact: Liam Garland, Public Works, (510) 981-6300

Action: No speakers. Presentation made and discussion held. No action taken.

3. Audit Status Report: Unified Vision of Zero Waste Activities Will Help Align Service Levels with Billing and Ensure Customer Equity

From: City Manager

Referred: November 3, 2022

Due: July 25, 2023

Contact: Liam Garland, Public Works, (510) 981-6300

Action: No speakers. Presentation made and discussion held. No action taken.

Committee Action Items

4. **Budget Referral: Additional Street Maintenance Funding to Improve Pavement Condition, Saving Tax Dollars and Our Streets**

From: Councilmember Kesarwani (Author), Councilmember Humbert (Co-Sponsor), Councilmember Taplin (Co-Sponsor), Councilmember Wengraf (Co-Sponsor)

Referred: February 27, 2023

Due: July 18, 2023

Recommendation: Refer to the FY 2023-25 biennial budget process to further increase the street paving budget by \$4.7 million General Fund in FY 2024-25 for a total street paving budget of approximately \$20 million in FY 2024-25.

On July 26, 2022, the City Council unanimously passed a policy ensuring an adequate annual General Fund contribution for street maintenance that amounts to a total of \$15.3 million annually plus inflation—the amount needed to maintain (although not improve) the pavement condition. This budget request for an additional \$4.7 million builds on the streets fiscal policy by seeking to increase the street paving budget further in FY 2024-25 to begin to improve the pavement condition.

We note that the City Council already approved a \$9 million increase to the street paving budget for FY 2023-24 for a total of \$16.3 million in FY 2023-24.

A dollar of maintenance early in a street's life-cycle saves \$8 later in the street's life-cycle due to avoided rehabilitation and/or reconstruction costs associated with failing streets, making this budget request an urgent matter of fiscal oversight. Further, the defeat of the Measure L general obligation bond on the November 8, 2022 ballot means that the City currently lacks significant resources to fully address deferred street maintenance, requiring the City Council to add additional resources from the General Fund in order to make steady progress towards improving the average pavement condition.

Financial Implications: See report

Contact: Rashi Kesarwani, Councilmember, District 1, (510) 981-7110

Action: 1 speaker. M/S/C (Robinson/Taplin) to send the item to Council with a positive recommendation.

Vote: All Ayes.

Unscheduled Items

These items are not scheduled for discussion or action at this meeting. The Committee may schedule these items to the Action Calendar of a future Committee meeting.

5. 51 Bus Rapid Transit

From: Councilmember Taplin (Author)

Referred: November 28, 2022

Due: June 5, 2023

Recommendation: 1) Refer to the City Manager the development of an implementation and community engagement plan to install Bus Rapid Transit, including dedicated bus lanes, transit signal priority, elevated platforms, and enhanced sections, on the AC Transit 51B route along University Avenue from Sixth Street to Shattuck Avenue and along Shattuck Avenue from University Avenue to Durant Avenue, with engagement centering pedestrian, cyclist, transit and mobility justice advocates, the disability rights community, local faith communities, merchants, neighboring residential communities inclusive of tenants, seniors, and students, and historically marginalized communities.

2) Refer \$300,000 to the Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Budget Process to conduct a Complete Street Corridor Study antecedent to the installation of a cycle track along University Avenue from 6th Street to Oxford Street, consistent with the City of Berkeley's 2017 Bicycle Plan and integrating pedestrian amenities consistent with the City of Berkeley's 2020 Pedestrian Plan. As per the Bicycle Plan, the study will be evaluated in the context of the modal priorities established by the City of Berkeley General Plan's 2001 Transportation Element and the Alameda County Transportation Commission's (ACTC) 2016 Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan.

3) Refer \$300,000 to the Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Budget Process to conduct a Complete Street Corridor Study antecedent to the installation of a cycle track along Oxford Street from Virginia Street to Durant Avenue consistent with the Bicycle Plan and integrating pedestrian amenities consistent with the Pedestrian Plan. As per the Bicycle Plan, the study will be evaluated in the context of the modal priorities established by the Transportation Element and ACTC's Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan. It will be coordinated with proposed improvements to transit performance on this Primary Transit Route, such as bus boarding islands, transit-only lanes, transit signal priority/queue jump lanes, far-side bus stop relocations, and other improvements as described in AC Transit's 2016 Major Corridor Study.

4) Refer \$X to the Fiscal Year XX-XX Budget Process to install quick-build bus station improvements along the AC Transit 51B route.

5) Initiate consultation with AC Transit and UC Berkeley Bear Transit as soon as possible on the planning, scoping, and implementation of these items.

Financial Implications: See report

Contact: Terry Taplin, Councilmember, District 2, (510) 981-7120

Unscheduled Items

6. **Adopt an Ordinance Adding a New Chapter 12.01 to the Berkeley Municipal Code Establishing Emergency Greenhouse Gas Limits, Process for Updated Climate Action Plan, Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Regional Collaboration**

From: Councilmember Harrison (Author), Councilmember Bartlett (Co-Sponsor) and Councilmember Hahn (Co-Sponsor)

Referred: November 15, 2021

Due: May 31, 2023

Recommendation: 1. Adopt an ordinance adding a new Chapter 12.01 to the Berkeley Municipal Code (BMC) establishing Emergency Greenhouse Gas Limits with an effective date of [], 2022.

2. Refer to the FY23-24 Budget Process \$[] consistent with implementing the requirements of Sections 12.01.040, 12.01.050, 12.01.060.

Financial Implications: See report

Contact: Kate Harrison, Councilmember, District 4, (510) 981-7140

Items for Future Agendas

None

Adjournment

Action: M/S/C (Harrison/Taplin) to adjourn the meeting.

Vote: All Ayes.


Adjourned at 2:12 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct record of the Facilities, Infrastructure, Transportation, Environment & Sustainability Committee meeting held on May 4, 2023.

Neetu Salwan, Assistant City Clerk

Communications

Communications submitted to City Council Policy Committees are on file in the City Clerk Department at 2180 Milvia Street, 1st Floor, Berkeley, CA, and are available upon request by contacting the City Clerk Department at (510) 981-6908 or policycommittee@cityofberkeley.info.



No Material
Available for
this Item

There is no material for this item.

City Clerk Department
2180 Milvia Street
Berkeley, CA 94704
(510) 981-6900

The City of Berkeley Land Use, Housing & Economic Development Policy Committee Webpage:
<https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/city-council/council-committees/policy-committee-land-use-housing-economic-development>



Office of the City Manager

INFORMATION CALENDAR
November 3, 2022

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: Dee Williams-Ridley, City Manager

Submitted by: Liam Garland, Director, Department of Public Works

Subject: Audit Status Report: Underfunded Mandate: Resources, Strategic Plan, and Communication Needed to Continue Progress towards the Year 2020 Zero Waste Goal

INTRODUCTION

The Office of the City Auditor presented a July 1, 2014 Report to the City Council: Underfunded Mandate: Resources, Strategic Plan, and Communication Needed to Continue Progress towards the Year 2020 Zero Waste Goal¹ (Audit Report). The City Auditor conducted the Audit Report at the Public Works Director's request to assess Zero Waste Division's progress towards the Year 2020 Zero Waste Goal. This is the fifth and final status report on the efforts made to implement the Audit Report's recommendations, which are slated for no further follow-up action as recommended by the City Auditor for all audits more than five years old.

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

The Audit Report noted fifteen (15) recommendations for the Public Works Department (PWD) and its Zero Waste Division (ZWD) to review, implement and report to Council. The first set of seven (7) recommendations was related to zero waste goals and ZWD's operational components, and the second set of eight (8) recommendations focused on collaborating with the Department of Information Technology (IT) to utilize technology to interface with Zero Waste routes, staff, and the customers.

Since the January 15, 2020 update on this Audit Report, Public Works has made additional progress on the implementation of recommendations. At the time of this report, the Auditor's Office verified three (3) of the recommendations as implemented and dropped the remaining twelve (12) recommendations.

BACKGROUND

Public Works' Zero Waste Division is responsible for the collection of residential material, including refuse, recycling, and composting; collection and processing of commercial material, including refuse, recycling, and composting; off-site hauling and

¹ https://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Auditor/Level_3_-_General/A%20RPT_Zero%20Waste_Final.pdf

composting of green/food waste for all customers; off-site hauling, sorting, and marketing of construction and demolition debris for all customers; and manages contracts related to the above work.

On March 22, 2015, the Berkeley City Council adopted Zero Waste Resolution No. 62,849-N.S. setting a goal of zero waste sent to landfills by the year 2020. The Resolution does not define a specific zero waste percentage expectation for Berkeley, but the language used therein suggests diversion of 100% of waste from landfills.

In its October 17, 2017 presentation to the City Council, the Zero Waste Commission recommended attaining the City's Zero Waste goal requires redefining the Zero Waste Goal and issuing a Request for Proposal (RFP) for a Zero Waste Management Strategic Plan. The City Council approved this recommendation.

On April 28, 2022, the City released the RFP, seeking qualified firms for the development and completion of an Integrated Zero Waste Management Strategic Plan (Plan) to provide methodologies and guidance for the City's Zero Waste Division's operation, personnel, program, and financial requirements to meet the City's Climate Action Plan and Zero Waste goals. The Plan's development will include robust public participation and outreach, along with City Council and staff input on both the draft and final Plan. City Council approved an item at the October 8, 2022 meeting to enter into a contract with the selected consultant for the Plan's development.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE IMPACTS

The increased diversion of compostable and recyclable materials is an essential part of the City's Zero Waste Goal as described in the City's 2009 Climate Action Plan.

POSSIBLE FUTURE ACTION

Public Works' Zero Waste Division and the Zero Waste Commission will continue to take timely and focused action(s) to address outstanding and partially implemented recommendations.

FISCAL IMPACTS OF POSSIBLE FUTURE ACTION

The Integrated Zero Waste Management Strategic Plan has an approved budget of \$500,000. The AMCS financial software platform and associated professional services are budgeted for \$1.3 million for the first five years. There may be additional financial impacts to complete the remaining Audit findings.

CONTACT PERSON

Greg Apa, Solid Waste & Recycling Manager (510) 981-6359

Attachment:

1. Audit Findings and Recommendations Response Form

ATTACHMENT No. 1

| Audit Title: Underfunded Mandate: Resources, Strategic Plan, and Communication Needed to Continue Progress Toward the Year 2020 Zero Waste Goal | | | | |
|---|--------------|--|---|--|
| Findings and Recommendations | Lead Dept. | Agree, Partially Agree, or Do Not Agree and Corrective Action Plan | Expected or Actual Implementation Date | Status of Outstanding Audit Recommendations and Implementation Progress Summary |
| Finding 1: Insufficient data and resources (for planning, strategy, or execution) dedicated to Berkeley's zero waste by 2020 resolution | | | | |
| 1.1 | Public Works | <p>Agree</p> <p>This is consistent with the strategic approach the Public Works Department has taken to correct operational deficiencies and create an organization more capable of continuing the work to reach the City's zero waste goal.</p> <p>The Department is poised to undertake an open search for a new ZWD Manager whose input, perspective, and anticipated professional expertise will be essential in analyzing the resources necessary to achieve the goal and drafting suitable recommendations to Council.</p> | <p>June 2015</p> <p>June 2019</p> <p>June 2019</p> <p>December 2019</p> <p>November 2020</p> <p>July 2023</p> | <p>5/09/2017 Status: not submitted</p> <p>January 23, 2018 Update: Not Implemented</p> <p>The Zero Waste Commission submitted to the City Council its recommendation for the City to develop an RFP to: 1) develop a Zero Waste Strategic Plan (Plan) to delineate terminology, 2) define and clarify what the City's Zero Waste Goal will be, and 3) develop plan for the Public Works - Zero Waste Division to implement to attain that goal. The City Council concurred with this recommendation which was an item on its October 17, 2017 Action Calendar for the Zero Waste Division to develop the RFP for the development of the Plan.</p> <p>6/04,2018 Update: Not Implemented</p> <p>The RFP is in development and should be released to solicit proposals to be submitted during the second quarter FY2019.</p> <p>March 12, 2019 Partially Implemented</p> <p>ZWD has developed an RFP to: 1) develop a Zero Waste Strategic Plan (Plan) to delineate terminology, 2) define and clarify what the City's Zero Waste Goal will be, and 3) develop plan for the Public Works - Zero Waste Division to implement to attain that goal. The RFP is in administrative review.</p> <p>March 24, 2020 Update Partially Implemented</p> <p>At the September 17, 2019 City Council Work Session, Public and its consultant presented the proposed 5-year Rate Review that includes additional staffing for implementation and compliance with State and StopWaste.org mandatory recycling and food waste. The Council provided input on the Rate Review is in review and adjusted Rates with be presented to the City Council mid-2020.</p> <p>November 13, 2022 Update Dropped</p> <p>Revised 5-year Rate Schedules presented at the December 7, 2021 City Council Work Session. Council consented to moving forward with Proposition 218 process to approve Rates as proposed. In January</p> |

ATTACHMENT No. 1

| Audit Title: Underfunded Mandate: Resources, Strategic Plan, and Communication Needed to Continue Progress Toward the Year 2020 Zero Waste Goal | | | | |
|---|--------------|---|---|--|
| Findings and Recommendations | Lead Dept. | Agree, Partially Agree, or Do Not Agree and Corrective Action Plan | Expected or Actual Implementation Date | Status of Outstanding Audit Recommendations and Implementation Progress Summary |
| | | | | 2022, The City Agenda Committee placed the revised 5-year rate schedules on pause. |
| 1.2 | Public Works | <p>Agree</p> <p>The Public Works Department has taken a strategic approach to solving the structural deficit and making progress toward our Zero Waste goal. The Department improved the efficiency of operations, followed the strategies in the Climate Action Plan, is currently completing a commercial franchise study, and in May 2014 completed a Prop 218-compliant rate increase. PW will continue to focus on maintaining efficient operations, high quality customer service, and improvements to waste diversion efforts.</p> <p>The Department will take the next step toward zero waste by reassessing the current situation, and developing a strategic plan intended to guide the Department through the increasingly difficult path to zero waste. Part of this process requires evaluating the existing Transfer Station infrastructure, along with what might be required to reach the Zero Waste goal as defined.</p> <p>The strategic plan will be flexible so that annual work plans can be designed to address changing conditions.</p> <p>Public Works will build upon relevant</p> | <p>June 2015</p> <p>June 2019</p> <p>June 2019</p> <p>December 2019</p> <p>May 2021</p> | <p>5/09/2017 Status: not submitted</p> <p>January 23, 2018 Update: Not Implemented The City's Solid Waste Management Plan (1998) and Source Reduction and Recycling Element (1992) are the City's most recent documents guiding the City's actions toward the goal of zero waste. Although the City's Solid Waste Management Plan Update (2005) wasn't formerly adopted by the City, it was designed to achieve the 2010 goal of reaching 75% diversion. The City is currently achieving 76% diversion based on FY2015 information. The Zero Waste Commission and the City Auditor each concluded independently that a comprehensive, written strategic plan that clearly defines roles and responsibilities and assigns sufficient resources is needed to guide the City towards the goal of achieving zero waste. The Zero Waste Commission recommended and the City Council concurred at its October 17, 2017 Action Calendar concurred with Zero Waste Commission's recommendation for Public Works' Zero Waste Division to develop an RFP to: develop a Zero Waste Strategic Plan to delineate terminology, define and clarify what the City's Zero Waste Goal will be, and develop plan to attain the defined Strategic Plan's Zero Waste Goal.</p> <p>6/04,2018 Update: Not Implemented These issues will be included in the development of RFP that will be advertised for proposals the second quarter FY2019.</p> <p>March 12, 2019 Partially Implemented ZWD has developed an RFP to: 1) develop a Zero Waste Strategic Plan (Plan) to delineate terminology, 2) define and clarify what the City's Zero Waste Goal will be, and 3) develop plan for the Public Works - Zero Waste Division to implement to attain that goal. The RFP is in administrative review.</p> <p>March 24, 2020 Update Partially Implemented With installation and implementation of the Zero Waste Division's management software (vendor is AMCS and projected to be</p> |

ATTACHMENT No. 1

| Audit Title: Underfunded Mandate: Resources, Strategic Plan, and Communication Needed to Continue Progress Toward the Year 2020 Zero Waste Goal | | | | |
|---|--------------|---|--|--|
| Findings and Recommendations | Lead Dept. | Agree, Partially Agree, or Do Not Agree and Corrective Action Plan | Expected or Actual Implementation Date | Status of Outstanding Audit Recommendations and Implementation Progress Summary |
| | | | <p>May 2022</p> <p>August 2024</p> | <p>City's policy and decision making and paths of implementation to the goal of Zero Waste. IT and ZWD are in the process of selecting a vendor to implement an entirely new ZW software solution that includes routing, billing and work orders. ZW meets weekly with key PW staff to ensure division objectives and action items are prioritized and budgeted for. With the first reading and passing of the Single Use Foodware and Litter Reduction Ordinance on January 22, 2019, ZWD is working closely with PW Fiscal and Admin division to budget for adequate staffing for this new responsibility. ZWD anticipates completion of a Feasibility Study to replace the existing Transfer Station by mid-2019. ZWD primary objectives are in accordance with the Citywide Strategic Plan. Once the new ZW software system is in place and the Strategic Plan has been completed, a more accurate work plan could be created that would include performance measures.</p> <p>March 24, 2020 Update Partially Implemented With installation and implementation of the Zero Waste Division's management software (vendor is AMCS and projected to be completed late 2020), the City can assure Strategic Plan proposes that customers information is accurate and verifiable (FUND\$ cannot). With completion of this step, the City can issue an RFP for a new user-friendly routing system. With a new Routing system, reliable, verifiable and accurate performance metrics can be developed. The cost of these systems and additional staffing required have been included in projected budgets.</p> <p>November 13, 2022 Update Dropped The AMCS software financial platform will not be fully implemented until July 2024. An RFP for an Integrated Zero Waste Management Strategic Plan (Plan) was released April 28, 2022. An October 8, 2022 City Council Consent Item was submitted for award of contract for development of the Plan to the selected consultant. The implementation of the AMCS platform and the Plan development will be conducted and coordinated in unison.</p> |
| 1.4 | Public Works | <p>Agree</p> <p>Prepare an annual report to Council, highlighting progress toward strategic plan and work plan goals to achieve zero waste in Berkeley.</p> | December 2019 | <p>5/09/2017 Status: not submitted</p> <p>January 23, 2018 Update: Partially Implemented With the newly re-staffed ZWC and new management at Zero Waste Division and once the Strategic Plan is completed and as part of the Strategic Plan, the Work Plan with goals, budget, timelines, FTEs and measurements will be developed. Then, Public Works will initiate</p> |

ATTACHMENT No. 1

| Audit Title: Underfunded Mandate: Resources, Strategic Plan, and Communication Needed to Continue Progress Toward the Year 2020 Zero Waste Goal | | | | |
|---|------------|--|--|--|
| Findings and Recommendations | Lead Dept. | Agree, Partially Agree, or Do Not Agree and Corrective Action Plan | Expected or Actual Implementation Date | Status of Outstanding Audit Recommendations and Implementation Progress Summary |
| Berkeley achieve zero waste. This includes sharing strategic and annual work plan goals and regular updates regarding progress and completion. | | | November 2021 | <p>annual reporting to Council. Nonetheless progress has been made, such as: the ZWD has undertaken a City Facilities Greening Project to ensure that all City-owned facilities have the appropriate containers with signage for trash, recyclables (bottles/cans and fiber), and organics; and that City staff receive training on the acceptable materials to place in each container type. The recent, May through September 2017, renovation of 1947 Center Street is being used as a pilot for this Project.</p> <p>In celebration of Earth Day 2017, the ZWD hosted a Zero Waste Earth Day Fair for City employees to get answers to all of their recycling-related questions, play games, enjoy zero waste snacks, and talk trash with ZWD staff. This event was attended by more than 100 City employees.</p> <p><u>March 12, 2019</u> Partially Implemented City staff have been encouraged to participate in the visioning sessions for the Transfer Station Redesign January 16, 17, and 18, 2019. Also, ZWD has developed an RFP to: 1) develop a Zero Waste Strategic Plan (Plan) to delineate terminology, 2) define and clarify what the City's Zero Waste Goal will be, and 3) develop plan for the Public Works - Zero Waste Division to implement to attain that goal. The RFP is in administrative review. Once the strategic plan is completed, it will be shared with City staff.</p> |
| | | | November 2021 | <p><u>March 24, 2020 Update</u> Partially Implemented At the Council's Work Sessions for Rate Review (September 17, 2019) and Solid Waste & Recycling Transfer Station Feasibility Study (November 5, 2019), PW informed Council of the need for additional RFPs, staffing, funding and facility requirements to meet the City's zero waste goal.</p> |
| | | | August 2024 | <p><u>November 13, 2022 Update</u> Dropped Revised 5-year Rate Schedules was presented at the December 7, 2021 City Council Work Session. Council consented to moving forward with Proposition 218 process for property owner consent of the revised Rates as proposed. These Revised Schedules included additional costs for: 1) Ecology and CCC contracts (\$85 mil over 10 years, sole sourced per Council direction); staffing for AB 341 & 1826 (commercial recycling), SB1383 (organic recycling) and Single Use</p> |

ATTACHMENT No. 1

| Audit Title: Underfunded Mandate: Resources, Strategic Plan, and Communication Needed to Continue Progress Toward the Year 2020 Zero Waste Goal | | | | |
|---|--------------|---|--|--|
| Findings and Recommendations | Lead Dept. | Agree, Partially Agree, or Do Not Agree and Corrective Action Plan | Expected or Actual Implementation Date | Status of Outstanding Audit Recommendations and Implementation Progress Summary |
| | | | | Disposal Foodware and Litter Reduction Ordinance compliance; and CEQA compliance work for Transfer Station Replacement Concepts A and B. In January 2022, The City Agenda Committee placed the revised 5-year rate schedules on pause. |
| 1.5 Determine if additional funds are needed for the education, outreach, compliance, and enforcement necessary to reach zero waste goals. If sufficient funds are not available, propose to Council a separate fee to cover those costs for the City's zero- waste program, such as a regulatory fee as allowed under Proposition 218. | Public Works | Agree The Public Works Strategic Plan process will evaluate and identify the necessary resources, and if funding is insufficient, a recommendation will be made to consider an Integrated Waste Management Fee or other appropriate mechanism to fund additional staffing and/or outreach needs. | December 2019 | <p>5/09/2017 Status: not submitted</p> <p>January 23, 2018 Update: Partially Implemented Since September 2016, Public Works has hired the Zero Waste Division's Solid Waste & Recycling Manager, Greg Apa, and Recycling Program Manager, Heidi Obermeit, who have 29 and 10 years, respectively, of solid waste industry experience. With their extensive background in the solid waste industry, they are in the process of reviewing, assessing and addressing Zero Waste's current efforts to educate and as needed the expansion of educational outreach to the community members and commercial businesses, both existing and new. Outreach educational materials are somewhat dated and these materials may be updated and customized as required with more current graphics and narratives. In addition, the ZWD has hired a Field Service Representative who assists ZWD's education and compliance efforts with all community members and businesses. In 2018, the current Council approved rate structure will require an updated rate study including the cost of increased educational outreach and training for handling of recyclable materials to ensure a sustainable rate structure to achieve the zero waste goals that the Council has set for Public Waste and Zero Waste Division.</p> <p>March 12, 2019 Partially Implemented Public Works has determined through internal budget process that Zero Waste needs two additional full-time staff members to oversee the education, outreach, compliance, and enforcement necessary to reach zero-waste goals. The Zero Waste Division will be determining additional funding beyond staffing needed to increase education, outreach, compliance, and enforcement during the strategic planning process. The RFP for the strategic plan process is currently under administrative review. This process will also identify if the current levels of fees can cover the costs of the City's Zero Waste program or if Public Works will need to assess additional fees.</p> |

ATTACHMENT No. 1

| Audit Title: Underfunded Mandate: Resources, Strategic Plan, and Communication Needed to Continue Progress Toward the Year 2020 Zero Waste Goal | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| Findings and Recommendations | Lead Dept. | Agree, Partially Agree, or Do Not Agree and Corrective Action Plan | Expected or Actual Implementation Date | Status of Outstanding Audit Recommendations and Implementation Progress Summary | |
| | | | November 2021 July 2023 | <p>March 24, 2020 Partially Implemented July 2019, City Council approved the hiring two additional full-time staff members to oversee the education, outreach, compliance, and enforcement necessary to reach zero waste goals. At a September 17, 2019 City Council Work Session on the current Rate Review Study, Council provided Public Works and its consultant direction to provide ongoing and additional services to be funded by the Zero Waste Fund. An update of the Rate Review Study will be scheduled with the City Council mid-2020.</p> <p>November 13, 2022 Update Dropped Revised 5-year Rate Schedules was presented at the December 7, 2021 City Council Work Session. Council consented to moving forward with Proposition 218 process for property owner consent of the revised Rates as proposed. These Revised Schedules included additional costs for: 1) Ecology and CCC contracts (\$85 mil over 10 years, sole sourced per Council direction); staffing for AB 341 & 1826, SB1383 and Single Use Disposal Plastic and Litter Reduction Ordinance compliance; and CEQA compliance work for Transfer Station Replacement Concepts A and B. In January 2022, The City Agenda Committee placed the revised 5-year rate schedules on pause.</p> | |
| 1.6 | Update the City's Zero Waste website to include easily accessible information regarding: | Public Works | Agree | October 2016 | <p>5/09/2017 Status: not submitted</p> <p>January 23, 2018 Update: Implemented With the hiring of the Recycle Program Manager, ZWD is continuously streamlining and updating the City's and ZWD's website to include: guidelines to recycle plant debris and food waste; information on the mandatory recycling requirements for businesses and multi-family properties in Alameda County; and links to other recycling resources in the area. Further, the ZWD has made available guidelines to help designers of multifamily, commercial, and mixed-use buildings plan for recycling collection when designing new buildings or renovations. In conjunction with the City's Public Information Officer, the ZWD has distributed press releases to educate the general public about the appropriate material to place in their refuse, recycling and green compost carts, extra pick-up bags, proper cart placement.</p> |

ATTACHMENT No. 1

| Audit Title: Underfunded Mandate: Resources, Strategic Plan, and Communication Needed to Continue Progress Toward the Year 2020 Zero Waste Goal | | | | |
|---|--------------|---|--|--|
| Findings and Recommendations | Lead Dept. | Agree, Partially Agree, or Do Not Agree and Corrective Action Plan | Expected or Actual Implementation Date | Status of Outstanding Audit Recommendations and Implementation Progress Summary |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zero waste goals and progress toward those goals. <p>StopWaste.org is a good example and has resources that Berkeley can direct customers to use.</p> <p>Updates should be made as changes are made to the list of materials accepted through each waste stream.</p> | | | | |
| <p>1.7 Engage in discussions with the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery to obtain permission to collect garbage biweekly instead of weekly while maintaining weekly collection of compostables. Perform additional education and outreach prior to implementing biweekly garbage service to educate the public on the change. Alternatively, seek permission to implement a pilot project for biweekly garbage service.</p> | Public Works | <p>Agree</p> <p>The ZWD will investigate the process of obtaining legal permission to pilot biweekly rubbish collection. We will identify the operational and outreach preparation necessary to evaluate the feasibility of this pilot.</p> | N/A | <p>5/09/2017 Status: not submitted</p> <p>January 23, 2018 Update:</p> <p>Dropped</p> <p>Although a Solid Waste & Recycling Manager and Recycling Program Manager is on staff, the Zero Waste Division, as an enterprise funded collection service division, is understaffed and inexperienced to engage in the process change of State Law, which requires weekly collection of refuse. In addition, this would require significant lobbying of CalRecycle to approve a pilot program to collect refuse other than on a weekly basis.</p> <p>The Audit Report states that there is the potential of \$496,000 annual cost savings by switching to biweekly garbage service. However, and as noted in the Audit Report, this is based on assumptions which:</p> <p>1) State law requires the refuse shall not remain on any premises more than seven (7) days. Berkeley would need to revise the State law, request a waiver or seek permission for a pilot program. This waiver or revision of State law will potentially require substantial lobbying members of City Council, State House of Representative(s) and Senator(s), as well as, of all the many County and State permitting and health agencies that would be involved to amend State law.</p> |

ATTACHMENT No. 1

| Audit Title: Underfunded Mandate: Resources, Strategic Plan, and Communication Needed to Continue Progress Toward the Year 2020 Zero Waste Goal | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Findings and Recommendations | Lead Dept. | Agree, Partially Agree, or Do Not Agree and Corrective Action Plan | Expected or Actual Implementation Date | Status of Outstanding Audit Recommendations and Implementation Progress Summary |
| | | | | 2) Require additional staff and funding to support a community educational outreach to ensure that refuse is not just reallocated by community members to the recycling and plant debris carts. 3) Public Works would need to enter into negotiations with the employee bargaining unit to an agreement whether positions can be eliminated through attrition or reassignment. |
| Finding 2: Limited use of available technologies affects operational efficiencies | | | | |
| 2.1 | Work with the Department of Information Technology to configure the CRM system with a required field that auto populates valid route information based on address and service delivery type so that route specific data can be collected on a going-forward basis. | Public Works | Agree | <p>5/09/2017 Status: not submitted</p> <p>December 2019 <u>January 23, 2018 Update:</u> Not implemented Currently the City is implementing an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) project to replace the FUND\$ system including the CRM application. ERP is a software with financial (accounting, billing, budget, contracts) and human resource (time entry, personnel, payroll, benefits) applications. As part of this project, ZWD has been working with IT and its consultant during the needs assessment phase to ensure that RouteSmart™ will interface with the selected software.</p> <p><u>June 4, 2018 Update:</u> Not implemented IT with ZWD is soliciting many companies to demonstrate their invoicing, customer service, and routing systems. With the conclusion of the demonstrations, IT will develop an RFP that will soloist proposals for systems that will integrate with Erma.</p> <p>December 2019 <u>March 12, 2019</u> Not Implemented IT released an RFP on behalf of Public Works for Zero Waste Management software on October 18, 2018. As the FUND\$ system is in the process of being replaced, a new system was deemed necessary and IT issued an RFP for a Zero Waste Management System and Professional Services consisting of a Waste Billing System, a Waste Computerized Maintenance Management System and a Route Optimization System. One proposal was received. If the proposal is accepted, software installation and implementation is anticipated to begin immediately upon contract execution in May 2019, with software operational by December 2019. The new system will require route optimization and will have an onboard system for drivers containing route information based on address and service delivery type so that route-specific data can be</p> |

ATTACHMENT No. 1

| Audit Title: Underfunded Mandate: Resources, Strategic Plan, and Communication Needed to Continue Progress Toward the Year 2020 Zero Waste Goal | | | | |
|---|--------------|---|--|--|
| Findings and Recommendations | Lead Dept. | Agree, Partially Agree, or Do Not Agree and Corrective Action Plan | Expected or Actual Implementation Date | Status of Outstanding Audit Recommendations and Implementation Progress Summary |
| | | | <p>November 2022</p> <p>July 2024</p> | <p>collected on a going-forward basis. The details of this system will be evaluated and developed as part of implementation. In addition to these new systems, Public Works and Parks are also implementing a new computerized maintenance management system. Once that vendor has been selected, then 311 will issue an RFP for a new Customer Relationship Management system that will integrate with the Zero Waste solutions.</p> <p>March 24, 2020 Update Not Implemented IT is finalizing the contract the new Zero Waste software management system and to be completed late 2020. After this in operation, RFPs will be issued for new Routing and CRM system. When these are operational, CRM will be able to integrate routing information.</p> <p>November 13, 2022 Update Dropped Contract awarded to AMCS to install new customer account & financial software platform to be up and running by mid-2024.</p> |
| 2.2 | Public Works | <p>Agree</p> <p>Zero Waste will work with IT to create the most efficient link between RouteSmart™ and the CRM system that can be created, given available resources. One solution, budget permitting, would be implementing the best of breed billing system that integrates with RouteSmart, rather than to trying to configure the CRM system to handle functions it was never designed to handle.</p> | <p>April 2015</p> <p>December 2019</p> | <p>5/09/2017 Status: not submitted</p> <p>January 23, 2018 Update: Not Implemented IT has been able to create a table that extracts customer information from the FUND\$ and RouteSmart™. However, and due to the limitations of FUND\$, this link takes hours to download information into RouteSmart™ versus that the company states should take minutes. Therefore, until the installation of the ERP process is completed, RouteSmart™ cannot be used to its full route optimization capabilities.</p> <p>March 12, 2019 Not Implemented Working with RouteSmart™ for further integration was deemed not worthwhile as that system does not integrate with ArcGIS which is the City's primary system for spatial data. IT released an RFP on behalf of Public Works for Zero Waste Management software on October 18, 2018. The RFP was for a Zero Waste Management System and Professional Services consisting of a Waste Billing System, a Waste Computerized Maintenance Management System and a Route Optimization System. One proposal was received. If the proposal is</p> |

ATTACHMENT No. 1

| Audit Title: Underfunded Mandate: Resources, Strategic Plan, and Communication Needed to Continue Progress Toward the Year 2020 Zero Waste Goal | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| Findings and Recommendations | Lead Dept. | Agree, Partially Agree, or Do Not Agree and Corrective Action Plan | Expected or Actual Implementation Date | Status of Outstanding Audit Recommendations and Implementation Progress Summary |
| | | | <p>November 2022</p> <p>August 2024</p> | <p>accepted, software installation and implementation is anticipated to begin immediately upon contract execution in May 2019, with software operational by December 2019. In addition to these new systems, Public Works and Parks are also implementing a new computerized maintenance management system. Once that vendor has been selected, then 311 will issue an RFP for a new Customer Relationship Management system that will integrate with the Zero Waste solutions.</p> <p>March 24, 2020 Update: Not Implemented After evaluating various applications and discussed by IT, IT-CS and PW, a link between RouteSmart and CRM cannot be installed. Therefore, the first step of soliciting a new Zero Waste software management system. Then, an RFP for new routing software will be issued. In IT-CS will be soliciting a new CRM system.</p> <p>November 13, 2022 Update Dropped Contract awarded to AMCS to install new customer account & financial software platform to be up and running by mid-2024.</p> |
| 2.3 | Appoint individuals at the management, supervisory, and line staff levels to meet and identify Zero Waste Division operational and analytical reporting needs based on the performance goals at each level of the organization. Work with IT staff to determine responsibility and establish timelines for developing the reports. | Public Works | Agree. | <p>September 2016</p> <p>5/09/2017 Status: not submitted</p> <p>January 23, 2018 Update: Implemented ZWD along with IT, 311 Call Center, and Revenue Collection have established a monthly meeting to address operational and reporting needs; and create action plans to address those identified needs. These monthly reports included reviewing and analyzing as a Group: 1) monthly 311 calls on various the community members zero waste issues, 2) develop resolutions on community members' zero waste issues (reviewed weekly by 311 and ZWD personnel), and 3) review and resolve community members' LAGAN cases created by 311 calls.</p> |
| 2.4 | Designate a business-line expert within the | Public Works | Agree | <p>December 2018</p> <p>5/09/2017 Status: not submitted</p> <p>January 23, 2018 Update:</p> |

ATTACHMENT No. 1

| Audit Title: Underfunded Mandate: Resources, Strategic Plan, and Communication Needed to Continue Progress Toward the Year 2020 Zero Waste Goal | | | | |
|---|-------------------|---|---|--|
| Findings and Recommendations | Lead Dept. | Agree, Partially Agree, or Do Not Agree and Corrective Action Plan | Expected or Actual Implementation Date | Status of Outstanding Audit Recommendations and Implementation Progress Summary |
| <p>Zero Waste Division and require that expert to develop internal capacity to configure optimal collection routes and produce standardized reports for route specific reporting using existing software (or the software implementation of Recommendation 2.5 below). The reports developed should allow measurement of the performance metrics developed in Recommendation 1.2 and 1.3 above.</p> | | | <p>December 2019</p> <p>May 2021</p> | <p>Not Implemented In late 2016 and with RouteSmart™ staff input, ZWD reviewed its current staff capability to implement complete routing needs. And it was determined, the ZWD staff is not currently capable of this effort. ZWD has only recently achieved sufficient fund balance to have the funding ability to budget and requisition this job classification with its annual budget. With the completion of the optimization of commercial routing, ZWD in collaboration with IT will propose to fund this position in FY2019.</p> <p><u>March 12, 2019 Update:</u> Not Implemented Additional staffing positions have been proposed as part of the budget process with both the Senior Solid Waste Supervisor and an Associate Management Analyst being tasked with route optimization once new software has been identified and implemented. As mentioned elsewhere in this table, an RFP process for this software is currently underway.</p> <p><u>March 24, 2020</u> Dropped Existing software (FUND\$ and RouteSmart™) are not capable or adaptable to allow configuration of optimal routing. IT received one proposal for an RFP for a Zero Waste Management System that includes a Waste Billing System, a Waste Computerized Maintenance Management System on October 18, 2018. Once the contract is finalized and the system installed, an RFP for Routing System may be released. With a user-friendly routing system, performance metrics; such as, cart set out and participation rates cubic yards/tons collected; can be compiled and reports developed.</p> |
| <p>2.5 Assess the benefits of using mobile technologies that would allow drivers to enter information directly into the CRM system while on their routes, take pictures of why pickups were skipped, and implement electronic</p> | Public Works | <p>Agree</p> <p>The Zero Waste Division will work with Information Technology and Human Resources Departments to assess the pros, cons, and feasibilities of mobile technologies (hardware and software).</p> | | <p>5/09/2017 Status: not submitted</p> <p><u>January 23, 2018 Update:</u> Not Implemented ZWD with IT input has been working with the RouteSmart™ to determine if ZWD can utilize its mobile technology to improve route management and provide real-time service data to the customer service representatives in the 311 Call Centers. Fixed unit GPS units are available in the marketplace to track truck movements, such as, missed pickups. However, and with any mobile technology, these systems are constantly involving and improving. Therefore, any investment in a mobile system will not be implemented until the</p> |

ATTACHMENT No. 1

| Audit Title: Underfunded Mandate: Resources, Strategic Plan, and Communication Needed to Continue Progress Toward the Year 2020 Zero Waste Goal | | | | |
|--|---------------------|--|---|---|
| Findings and Recommendations | Lead Dept. | Agree, Partially Agree, or Do Not Agree and Corrective Action Plan | Expected or Actual Implementation Date | Status of Outstanding Audit Recommendations and Implementation Progress Summary |
| <p>route books and other mobile field reporting. Include in the assessment changes to job responsibilities that might require a meet and confer with union representatives. Purchase the software and hardware if cost beneficial.</p> | | | <p>December 2019</p> <p>January 2021</p> <p>August 2024</p> | <p>City's ERP project vendor selected, contract awarded and then ZWD/IT needs assessment completed.</p> <p>March 12, 2019 Partially Implemented IT released an RFP on behalf of Public Works for Zero Waste Management software on October 18, 2018. The RFP was for a Zero Waste Management System and Professional Services consisting of a Waste Billing System, a Waste Computerized Maintenance Management System and a Route Optimization System. These systems will utilize onboard mobile hardware. In addition, this system will integrate with the new GPS solution which will integrate with the Zero Waste solution allowing for real time decision making and route information. Exact capabilities of both systems will be validated and coordinated as part of the contracting process once the vendors are selected.</p> <p>March 24, 2020 Update Partly Implemented IT released an RFP for a Zero Waste Management System and Professional Services consisting of a Waste Billing System, a Waste Computerized Maintenance Management System will allow a follow-up RFP for Route Optimization System on October 18, 2018. One proposal was received. IT and Legal are in the process of finalizing a contract with the vendor with software installation to follow. Once this system is installed and operating, an RFP for onboard truck/route/customer reporting system may be released.</p> <p>November 13, 2022 Update Dropped Contract awarded to AMCS to install new customer account & financial software platform to be up and running by mid-2024.</p> |
| <p>2.6 Work jointly with the Department of Information Technology and the Department of Finance to develop and automate script flows in the CRM system to ensure that all cases undergo the appropriate</p> | <p>Public Works</p> | <p>Agree</p> | <p>October 2016</p> | <p>5/09/2017 Status: not submitted</p> <p>January 23, 2018 Update: Implemented ZWD, IT, 311 Call Center, and Finance have developed script flows with use of the CRM tracking systems to ensure all cases receive appropriate review prior to closing. These cases are compiled and reviewed weekly and monthly by ZWD, IT, 311 Call Center, and Finance staff.</p> |

ATTACHMENT No. 1

| Audit Title: Underfunded Mandate: Resources, Strategic Plan, and Communication Needed to Continue Progress Toward the Year 2020 Zero Waste Goal | | | | |
|---|------------------------|--|--|--|
| Findings and Recommendations | Lead Dept. | Agree, Partially Agree, or Do Not Agree and Corrective Action Plan | Expected or Actual Implementation Date | Status of Outstanding Audit Recommendations and Implementation Progress Summary |
| agreement is reached. | | | | |
| 2.8 Create a method for community members to track the status of their cases online, which will reduce the call volume to the 311 Call Center. | Information Technology | Agree This functionality will be available after the upgrade of our CRM system is complete, currently scheduled to be no later than the end of FY 2015. | June 2016 June 2020 January 2022 | 5/09/2017 Status: not submitted January 23, 2018 Update: Not Implemented Currently 311 team members create cases and assigned them to the appropriate service queue for ZWD investigation and response. This system allows the City to internally track issues but the ability of community member to track independently or via the City website has not been linked. Currently the City is implementing an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) project to replace the FUNDS\$ system and to update the City website. With the installation of the selected ERP, then the CRM system can be integrated with the ERP system. This integration would allow community members' to track their issues, such as, missed pickups, cost of service, etc. only. March 12, 2019 Not Implemented IT released an RFP on behalf of Public Works for Zero Waste Management software on October 18, 2018 for a complete Zero Waste Solution. Software installation and implementation is anticipated to begin immediately upon contract execution in May 2019, with software operational by December 2019. Subsequently, IT will be issuing an RFP for a new 311 system to replace LAGAN that will integrate with the Zero Waste solution. One of the objectives of these new systems is to provide customers the ability to track their requests. March 24, 2020 Update Partially Implemented IT released an RFP for a Zero Waste Management System and Professional Services consisting of a Waste Billing System, a Waste Computerized Maintenance Management System will allow a follow-up RFP for Route Optimization System on October 18, 2018. One proposal was received. IT and Legal are in the process of finalizing a contract with the vendor with software installation to follow. Once this system is installed and operating, an RFP for onboard truck/route/customer reporting system may be released. With an onboard system linked to Customer Relationship Management (CRM) |

ATTACHMENT No. 1

| Audit Title: Underfunded Mandate: Resources, Strategic Plan, and Communication Needed to Continue Progress Toward the Year 2020 Zero Waste Goal | | | | |
|---|------------|--|--|---|
| Findings and Recommendations | Lead Dept. | Agree, Partially Agree, or Do Not Agree and Corrective Action Plan | Expected or Actual Implementation Date | Status of Outstanding Audit Recommendations and Implementation Progress Summary |
| | | | August 2024 | reporting system, customers could track status of their cases, such as, missed pickups, late routes, etc November 13, 2022 Update Dropped Contract awarded to AMCS to install new customer account & financial software platform to be up and running by mid-2024. |



Office of the City Manager

INFORMATION CALENDAR

November 3, 2022

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: Dee Williams-Ridley, City Manager

Submitted by: Liam Garland, Director, Public Works

Subject: Audit Status Report: Unified Vision of Zero Waste Activities Will Help Align Service Levels with Billing and Ensure Customer Equity

INTRODUCTION

The Office of the City Auditor presented to the City Council a September 20, 2016 Report: Unified Vision of Zero Waste Activities Will Help Align Service Levels with Billing and Ensure Customer Equity. The City Auditor conducted the audit to assess whether the City of Berkeley is correctly billing customers based on their actual refuse collection levels; whether all Berkeley residents are signed up to receive refuse, recycling, and plant debris collection service as required by the Berkeley Municipal Code; and whether there are opportunities for improving both refuse and service delivery operations. This is the final status report on the efforts made to implement the Audit Report's recommendations, which are slated for no further follow-up action as recommended by the City Auditor for all audits more than five years old.

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

The Audit Report included twelve (12) recommendations for the Office of the City Manager and Departments of Finance, Information Technology, and Public Works to review, implement, and report to Council regarding the status of recommendations. This is the fifth and final status report on the recommendations. Public Works has continued to make progress since the last status update. The Auditor's Office verified six recommendations as implemented and has dropped the remaining six recommendations. Please see Attachment 1 for a detailed table of audit report recommendations, corrective actions, and implementation progress.

BACKGROUND

Public Works' Zero Waste Division is responsible for the collection of residential material, including refuse, recycling, and composting; collection and processing of commercial material, including refuse, recycling, and composting; off-site hauling and composting of green/food waste for all customers; off-site hauling, sorting, and marketing of construction and demolition debris for all customers; and manages contracts related to the above work.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE IMPACTS

With the implementation of the Audit's recommendations, the Zero Waste Division will continue to help reduce the volume of waste landfilled and:

- Increase residential composting, recycling, and source reduction.
- Increase commercial composting, recycling, and source reduction.
- Increase recycling of construction and demolition (C&D) debris.
- Expand efforts to eliminate waste at its source.
- Increase waste diversion in public buildings.

All of these above-noted items promote the City's zero waste goal and are included in the approved Climate Action Plan Goals for Waste Reduction and Recycling.

POSSIBLE FUTURE ACTION

Public Works will continue to take timely and focused action(s) to address outstanding and partially implemented recommendations. The Zero Waste Division is working with the Information Technology and Finance Departments to select the software solution(s) needed to facilitate the implementation of the audit recommendations.

FISCAL IMPACTS OF POSSIBLE FUTURE ACTION

Public Works will update Council periodically on the progress, resources available, and any additional funding needed to address those recommendations that remain outstanding and partially implemented.

CONTACT PERSON

Greg Apa, Solid Waste and Recycling Manager, (510) 981-6359

Attachment:

1. Audit Findings and Recommendations Response Form

ATTACHMENT No. 1

| Audit Title: Unified Vision of Zero Waste Activities Will Help Align Service Levels with Billing and Ensure Customer Equity | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| Findings and Recommendations | Lead Dept. | Agree, Partially Agree, or Do Not Agree and Corrective Action Plan | Expected or Actual Implementation Date | Status of Outstanding Audit Recommendations and Implementation Progress Summary | |
| Finding: Integrated thinking about zero waste operations will help ensure accurate billings and customer equity | | | | | |
| 1.1 | Agree to a common and unified vision for zero waste operations. Discuss the long-term zero waste goals, objectives, and key initiatives and share that information with those responsible for day-to-day operations. Use meetings and informal communications to regularly encourage staff to embrace a unified view of zero waste operations. | City Manager's Office and Team Response: Public Works, Finance, and Information Technology | Agree | October 2016 | January 23, 2018 Update Implemented Since late 2015, Zero Waste, 311, and IT (called collectively the Customer Solutions Group or Group) have met on a monthly basis to discuss operational issues that affect the three divisions. Given that this Group was already in place and per the Auditor's recommendation, the Group opted to include Finance as a participant instead of creating of a separate team and meeting. The meetings' monthly agenda identifies that the Group's primary focus is the development and continuous implementation of a common approach by all members to ensure a unified vision for zero waste operations for all community members. In addition, the meetings' agenda details those customers' issues as they occur, so that, the Group's members resolve them. These resolutions are applied by the Group to continue its efforts to strive towards the City's zero waste goals and the initiatives needed to attain these goals. |
| 1.2 | Form a zero waste team comprised of managers and line staff involved with zero waste operations (i.e., waste collection, billings, customer calls, systems support). Include a diverse pool of people who can share ideas, resources, and knowledge. Have the team members' work collectively to evaluate their respective functions; the interrelationships among their departmental activities; and the practices, policies, and procedures they use to perform their zero waste account management and operations functions. Ensure that the team understands that their | Team Response: Public Works, Finance, and Information Technology | Agree | October 2016 | September 20, 2016 Update Implemented Zero Waste, 311, and IT meet on a monthly basis to discuss operational issues that affect the three divisions. This meeting schedule has been in existence for over one year. Since there was already a setup in place, we decided to include Finance as a participant versus create a separate team. We expanded the group and meeting scope to accommodate the Auditor's recommendations. At every meeting, it will be the first agenda item to make sure all participants are made aware of the team's concept. We will consider this completely implemented by October 2016, as at that time we will have met twice within the capacity required by this audit recommendation. This will be a regular meeting for the foreseeable future. The team members do understand that the Zero Waste operation is an enterprise with different parts and that the success of the operation depends on each of these distinctive units working together. |

ATTACHMENT No. 1

| Audit Title: Unified Vision of Zero Waste Activities Will Help Align Service Levels with Billing and Ensure Customer Equity | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| Findings and Recommendations | Lead Dept. | Agree, Partially Agree, or Do Not Agree and Corrective Action Plan | Expected or Actual Implementation Date | Status of Outstanding Audit Recommendations and Implementation Progress Summary |
| | | | December 2019 | <p>IT administration, IT-311 and Zero Waste have commenced efforts, such as, an As-Is (existing software) review to improve customer interface with the City and a To-Be (future software) for the development of an RFP to solicit new software for new customer interface, refuse billing and routing systems. These reviews were facilitated by the City’s software consultant, Third Wave. The RFP is tentatively scheduled for a late 2018 release.</p> <p>Rather than the purchase of another software system to integrate the existing inefficient (i.e., requires another software program to be bolted on to existing software), and inadequate software, a new routing and customer billing system would replace the CX and RouteSmart™ systems, integrate with ERMA and would be customer driven resolution and coordinated billing system.</p> <p>March 12, 2019 Update Partially Implemented</p> |
| | | | January 2021 | <p>IT released an RFP on behalf of Public Works for Zero Waste Management software on October 18, 2018. The RFP was for a Zero Waste Management System and Professional Services consisting of a Waste Billing System, a Waste Computerized Maintenance Management System and a Route Optimization System. One proposal was received. If the proposal is accepted, software installation and implementation is anticipated to begin immediately upon contract execution in May 2019, with software operational by December 2019</p> <p>March 24, 2020 Update Partially Implemented</p> |
| | | | July 2024 | <p>IT released an RFP for a Zero Waste Management System and Professional Services consisting of a Waste Billing System, a Waste Computerized Maintenance Management System will allow a follow-up RFP for Route Optimization System on October 18, 2018. One proposal was received. IT and Legal are in the process of finalizing a contract with the vendor with software installation to follow.</p> <p>November 13, 2022 Update Dropped</p> <p>Contract awarded to AMCS, July 2020, to install new customer account & financial software platform to be up and running by mid-2024.</p> |
| 1.4 | Require the zero waste team formed in response to | Team Response: | October 2016 | September 20, 2016 Update Implemented. |

ATTACHMENT No. 1

| Audit Title: Unified Vision of Zero Waste Activities Will Help Align Service Levels with Billing and Ensure Customer Equity | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| Findings and Recommendations | Lead Dept. | Agree, Partially Agree, or Do Not Agree and Corrective Action Plan | Expected or Actual Implementation Date | Status of Outstanding Audit Recommendations and Implementation Progress Summary |
| <p>recommendation 1.2 to have regular meetings, e.g., quarterly, to share information about their operations and the known or expected changes and events that may impact cross-functional efforts. These meetings may need to be more frequent at first and less frequent over time. The team should use their meeting time to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify continued barriers to change. ▪ Decide on solutions that will help overcome barriers. ▪ Share information about the challenges preventing staff from meeting operational objectives. ▪ Make cross-departmental decisions to improve processes and customer service. <p>Also see recommendation 1.2.</p> | <p>Public Works, Finance, and Information Technology</p> | | | <p>As mentioned in response to recommendation 1.2, we expanded our existing monthly meeting to include Finance. The purpose of those meetings has always been to share information about operational and staff challenges. We expanded the meeting to include specific suggestions for this recommendation.</p> <p>This initiative will be a continuous process that will be put in place for years to come as it becomes part of managing the operations of Zero Waste.</p> |
| <p>1.5 In collaboration with Information Technology and as part of Enterprise Resource Planning, budget for, select, and install an account management system designed for zero waste activities. Use information from the zero waste team evaluation (recommendation 1.2) and zero waste strategy analyses</p> | <p>Team Response: Public Works and Finance</p> | <p>Agree</p> | | <p>January 23, 2018 Update Not Implemented The current Customer Relationship Management (CRM) system will not integrate with RouteSmart™ due to both FUND\$ and CRM system limitations. The City is currently engaged in the Enterprise Resource Planning process to replace the FUND\$ and then integrate the CRM system, which according to the current schedule by June 2019. The long term solution will be to procure a new customer management, operations and billing software that will fully integrate the RouteSmart™ with the new ERP. Zero Waste Division and the Customer Solutions Group is actively engaging with IT to ensure that the new ERP system recognizes that Zero Waste Division is an enterprise funded operation. That is, it would be desirable to utilize RouteSmart system's</p> |

ATTACHMENT No. 1

| Audit Title: Unified Vision of Zero Waste Activities Will Help Align Service Levels with Billing and Ensure Customer Equity | | | | |
|--|-------------------|---|---|---|
| Findings and Recommendations | Lead Dept. | Agree, Partially Agree, or Do Not Agree and Corrective Action Plan | Expected or Actual Implementation Date | Status of Outstanding Audit Recommendations and Implementation Progress Summary |
| <p>(recommendation 1.8) to identify the critical business needs that should be included in the purchase of new zero waste account management system, or that should be considered when determining whether sufficient middleware options exist to fully integrate existing systems with the new account management software. Also see recommendations 1.2 and 1.8.</p> | | | July 2019 | <p>capabilities to generate customer driven service requests (work orders), whereas the current ERP system is a City staff internally generated system input. IT has recognized that to provide seamless CRM service that a Request for Proposals (RFP) for an application that delivers the most efficient financial and operational software system that specifically handles the Zero Waste collection services will be written in FY2018 as part of Phase 2 of the ERP project.</p> <p><u>September 25, 2018 Update</u> Partially Implemented IT administration, IT-311 and Zero Waste have commenced efforts, such as, an As-Is (existing software) review to improve customer interface with the City and a To-Be (future software) for the development of an RFP to solicit new software for new customer interface, refuse billing and routing systems. These reviews were facilitated by the City’s software consultant, Third Wave. The RFP is tentatively scheduled for a late 2018 release.</p> <p>Rather than the purchase of another software system to integrate the existing inefficient (i.e., requires another software program to be bolted on to existing software), and inadequate software, a new routing and customer billing system would replace the CX and RouteSmart™ systems, integrate with ERMA and would be customer driven resolution and coordinated billing system.</p> |
| | | | December 2019 | <p><u>March 12, 2019 Update</u> Partially Implemented IT released an RFP on behalf of Public Works for Zero Waste Management software on October 18, 2018. The RFP was for a Zero Waste Management System and Professional Services consisting of a Waste Billing System, a Waste Computerized Maintenance Management System and a Route Optimization System. One proposal was received. If the proposal is accepted, software installation and implementation is anticipated to begin immediately upon contract execution in May 2019, with software operational by December 2019.</p> |
| | | | January 2021 | <p><u>March 24, 2020 Update</u> Partially Implemented IT released an RFP for a Zero Waste Management System and Professional Services consisting of a Waste Billing System, a Waste Computerized Maintenance Management System will allow a follow-up RFP for Route Optimization System on October 18, 2018. One proposal was received. IT and Legal are in the process of finalizing a contract with the vendor with software installation to follow.</p> |
| | | | July 2024 | <p><u>November 13, 2022 Update.</u></p> |

ATTACHMENT No. 1

| Audit Title: Unified Vision of Zero Waste Activities Will Help Align Service Levels with Billing and Ensure Customer Equity | | | | |
|--|-------------------|---|---|---|
| Findings and Recommendations | Lead Dept. | Agree, Partially Agree, or Do Not Agree and Corrective Action Plan | Expected or Actual Implementation Date | Status of Outstanding Audit Recommendations and Implementation Progress Summary |
| <p>perform an independent review of the calculations and data entry for accuracy. Have the reviewer report back on any errors.</p> <p>Ensure that management is also notified of the errors, verifies that the corrections were made, and signs off on the review.</p> | | | July 2024 | <p>produced two other times to make sure all the error was fixed and the Manager of the unit signed off on the final report before finalizing system changes.</p> <p>January 23, 2018 Update: Implemented</p> <p>The initial base rates were approved by Resolution No. 66,600-N.S. effective July 1, 2014 for FY2015. The Department of Public Works administration calculates the next Fiscal Year's rates based on the previous Fiscal Year's rates. The rates are calculated utilizing the current CPI, the published April annual rate, or 3%, whichever is greater. These new FY rates and calculations are verified and signed off by Zero Waste Division Manager. The completed approved Rate Tables are then forwarded to the Finance Department Revenue Collections Manager for final verification and FUNDS\$ system input for billing.</p> <p>November 13, 2022 Update Implemented</p> <p>Contract awarded to AMCS, July 2020, to install new customer account & financial software platform to be up and running by mid-2024. New Rates were proposed at a 12/07/2022 Council Work Session that was to include the cost of AMCS. The Proposition 218 rate approval process was put on hold by City Agenda Committee in January 2022.</p> |
| <p>1.8 Request that Information Technology use the CX module data extracts, such as the one used for this audit, to provide Public Works staff with the data they need to analyze zero waste strategies. Use the data extracts to further identify the critical business needs for new zero waste account management software.</p> <p>Also see recommendation 1.5.</p> | Public Works | Agree | Originally Expected: December 2016 | <p>September 20, 2016 Update</p> <p>We will ask IT to provide our fiscal services and zero waste strategy staff with CX data using existing data extracts, and use that for data analytics using software such as Excel. We will use these extracts to help identify the reporting needs of a new zero waste account management system.</p> <p>If needed, IT staff can provide reports or training to Public Works staff so they are able to run the reports themselves or extract the information in the format needed, if feasible.</p> <p>January 23, 2018 Update Not Implemented</p> <p>The CX module data utilized for this Audit was specifically designed to support the data request and this is what is called a bolt-on module, which means, it retrieves specific data requested from the CRM. Any module development requires IT to code, test and implement these bolt-on modules for a specific request. To analyze all appropriate data to identify a critical Zero Waste Division business need(s) would require the utilization of data residing in RouteSmart™. The Current CRM system will not integrate or auto-populate with RouteSmart™ due to CRM system limitations. Per</p> |

ATTACHMENT No. 1

| Audit Title: Unified Vision of Zero Waste Activities Will Help Align Service Levels with Billing and Ensure Customer Equity | | | | |
|---|------------|--|--|---|
| Findings and Recommendations | Lead Dept. | Agree, Partially Agree, or Do Not Agree and Corrective Action Plan | Expected or Actual Implementation Date | Status of Outstanding Audit Recommendations and Implementation Progress Summary |
| | | | December 2019 | <p>the current IT ERP implementation schedule, the City is scheduled to upgrade and/or replace the CRM system in June 2019.</p> <p>The long term solution will be to procure a new customer management, operations and billing software that will integrate and fully utilize the RouteSmart™ data. An RFP for an application that delivers the most efficient financial and operational software system specific to the Zero Waste Division operational and the solid waste industry requirements is scheduled to be developed in FY2018 as part of Phase 2 of the ERP project.</p> <p>September 25, 2018 Update Partially Implemented</p> <p>IT provided extensive CX data in support of the Commercial Route expansion. During the expansion which involved adding over 400 accounts, critical limitations of the CZX software were identified. Additionally, IT facilitated the key departments to complete an As-Is analysis of existing software to identify areas of improvement. The departments have completed a To-Be analysis of future software which was the basis for a Request For Proposals (RFP) to solicit new software for new customer interface, refuse billing and routing systems. Both the CX (customer account management and billing software) and RouteSmart™ (collection routing software) systems are planned for replacement within the next year. These reviews were facilitated by the City's software consultant, Third Wave. The RFP is tentatively scheduled for late 2018 release. IT administration, IT-311 and Zero Waste are collaborating to ensure a unified approach.</p> <p>This new routing and customers billing software will the CX and RouteSmart™ Systems and integrate with Erma, the City's new financial software system. The new software will be customer driven and provide enhanced, coordinated billing system.</p> |
| | | | December 2019 | <p>March 12, 2019 Update Partially Implemented</p> <p>IT released an RFP on behalf of Public Works for Zero Waste Management software on October 18, 2018. The RFP was for a Zero Waste Management System and Professional Services consisting of a Waste Billing System, a Waste Computerized Maintenance Management System and a Route Optimization System. One proposal was received. If the proposal is accepted, software installation and implementation is anticipated to begin immediately upon contract execution in May 2019, with software operational by December 2019.</p> |
| | | | January 2021 | <p>March 24, 2020 Update Partially Implemented</p> |

ATTACHMENT No. 1

| Audit Title: Unified Vision of Zero Waste Activities Will Help Align Service Levels with Billing and Ensure Customer Equity | | | | |
|--|-------------------|---|---|--|
| Findings and Recommendations | Lead Dept. | Agree, Partially Agree, or Do Not Agree and Corrective Action Plan | Expected or Actual Implementation Date | Status of Outstanding Audit Recommendations and Implementation Progress Summary |
| | | | December 2019 | tentatively scheduled for late 2018 release. IT administration, IT-311 and Zero Waste are collaborating to ensure a unified approach. This new routing and customers billing software will the CX and RouteSmart™ Systems and integrate with Erma, the City’s new financial software system. The new software will be customer driven and provide enhanced, coordinated billing system. March 12, 2019 Update Partially Implemented |
| | | | January 2020 | IT released an RFP on behalf of Public Works for Zero Waste Management software on October 18, 2018. The RFP was for a Zero Waste Management System and Professional Services consisting of a Waste Billing System, a Waste Computerized Maintenance Management System and a Route Optimization System. One proposal was received. If the proposal is accepted, software installation and implementation is anticipated to begin immediately upon contract execution in May 2019, with software operational by December 2019. March 24, 2020 Update Partially Implemented |
| | | | July 2024 | IT released an RFP for a Zero Waste Management System and Professional Services consisting of a Waste Billing System, a Waste Computerized Maintenance Management System will allow a follow-up RFP for Route Optimization System on October 18, 2018. One proposal was received. IT and Legal are in the process of finalizing a contract with the vendor with software installation to follow. August 24, 2022 Update. Dropped Contract awarded to AMCS to install new customer account & financial software platform to be up and running by mid-2024. |
| 1.10 | Public Works | Agree. | December 2016 | September 20, 2016 Update We agree that the actual service levels should be compared against route books but believe that enforcing the policy to have drivers do onsite comparisons is no longer an efficient use of our drivers’ time. We are exploring other options, such as using student interns to do the comparisons. January 23, 2018 Update Implemented The Zero Waste drivers are reminded monthly to verify actual service levels with the route books for their collection routes by the Zero Waste Management Team. The Zero Waste dispatcher(s) are in constant communication with the drivers to ensure service levels are correct. If service levels are not corrected, Zero Waste Supervisor(s) |

ATTACHMENT No. 1

| Audit Title: Unified Vision of Zero Waste Activities Will Help Align Service Levels with Billing and Ensure Customer Equity | | | | |
|--|-------------------|---|---|--|
| Findings and Recommendations | Lead Dept. | Agree, Partially Agree, or Do Not Agree and Corrective Action Plan | Expected or Actual Implementation Date | Status of Outstanding Audit Recommendations and Implementation Progress Summary |
| | | | June 2020 | <p><u>March 12, 2019 Update</u> Partially Alternately Implemented Given the roll-out issues associated with the November 1st implementation of the City's new enterprise resource planning system, "Erma", staff time has been rerouted to resolve. This project is on hold.</p> |



Kate Harrison
Councilmember District 4

ACTION CALENDAR
November 30, 2021

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
From: Councilmember Harrison
Subject: Adopt an Ordinance Adding a New Chapter 12.01 to the Berkeley Municipal Code Establishing Emergency Greenhouse Gas Limits, Process for Updated Climate Action Plan, Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Regional Collaboration

RECOMMENDATION

1. Adopt an ordinance adding a new Chapter 12.01 to the Berkeley Municipal Code (BMC) establishing Emergency Greenhouse Gas Limits with an effective date of [redacted], 2022.
2. Refer to the FY23-24 Budget Process \$[redacted] consistent with implementing the requirements of Sections 12.01.040, 12.01.050, 12.01.060.

CURRENT SITUATION, EFFECTS, AND RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

Scientific evidence indicates that between the industrial period of 1850 and 2021, economic systems, namely state and free-market forms of capital accumulation and economic growth have increased global atmospheric carbon dioxide levels to a staggering 418 parts per million (ppm), beyond the established planetary boundary of 350 ppm, and warmed global average temperature by approximately 1.1 degrees Celsius. Available scientific evidence indicates there is no 'safe' level of warming beyond 350 ppm, only gradations of risk with respect to habitability.

Berkeley is already experiencing unprecedented negative effects of warming associated with 1 degree of warming, and current global growth trends and policies could push humanity past 1.5 degrees by mid-century, leading to a devastating 2-4 degrees by the end of the century. The 'Global North,' which includes Berkeley, has far exceeded its fair share of the emissions comprising and exceeding the boundary, and must reduce its emissions rapidly and justly.

The City of Berkeley has engaged with the issue of global warming for at least three decades and has unquestionably been a leader in certain climate actions. Yet, in light of the current gravity of the climate emergency, current strategies and targets are not adequate. Exceptionally risky “mitigation” strategies, namely midcentury ‘net-zero’ pledges have provided for unbridled economic and emissions growth and thus severely dwindled carbon budgets, effectively rendering Berkeley’s gradual reduction goals: 80% by 2050 (Measure G, 2005 and Resolution 64,480-N.S., 2009) and net-zero by 2045 (Resolution 69,852–N.S., 2021), untenable. The majority of risk associated with each additional ton of greenhouse gas emitted will be borne by generations who will have not consented to current reduction goals and strategies. Current policies could exacerbate or lead to exceedingly dangerous new tipping points.

This item is timely in light of ongoing reports that national “pledges” under Paris Agreement could lead to at least 3 degrees of catastrophic warming, the inability for Congress to pass meaningful domestic and international climate policies and legislation, and the failure of world leaders to reach an effective and substantive agreement at the 26th UN Climate Change Conference of the Parties (COP26) in Glasgow.

BACKGROUND

The ordinance establishes emergency greenhouse gas limits aimed at reducing sector-based greenhouse gas emissions 90% below 2000 levels and consumption-based emissions 90% below 2013 levels by 2030. These limits would bring Berkeley closer to its global ‘fair share’ and science-based reduction obligations, and could help achieve reductions at scale as part of a program of regional coordination and collaboration.

While such targets are ambitious, mitigating and minimizing global warming risk and maximizing adaptation, resilience and adherence to planetary boundaries earlier in the century rather than later will likely result in less disruption to society over the long term, and will generate opportunities for more inclusive and sound democratic decision making as compared to waiting until atmospheric carbon levels reach increasingly catastrophic levels.

These limits are consistent with the City’s 2006 “precautionary principle” established by BMC 12.29, and which states:

“The purpose of this chapter is to promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the community by minimizing health risks, improving air quality, protecting the quality of ground and surface water, minimizing consumption of resources, and minimizing the City’s contribution to global climate change by implementing in a phased manner, as provided in this chapter, the City’s use of a precautionary principle approach in its decisions.”

As enacted by Council, BMC 12.29 requires the City to apply the following precautionary principle tenets in the course of action and decision-making:

1. Anticipatory Action: Anticipatory action may prevent harm. Government, business, community groups, and the public share this responsibility.

2. Right to Know: The community has a right to know complete and accurate information on potential health and environmental impacts associated with the selection of products, services, operations or plans.
3. Alternatives Assessment: Examine a full range of alternatives and select the alternative with the least potential impact on health and the environment including the alternative of doing nothing.
4. Consideration of Significant Costs: Consider significant short-term and long-term costs in comparing product alternatives, when feasible. This includes evaluation of significant costs expected during the lifetime of a product, (e.g. raw materials, manufacturing and production, transportation, use, clean-up, acquisition, extended warranties, operation, supplies, maintenance, disposal costs, long and short-term environmental and health impacts); and that expected lifetime compared to other alternatives.
5. Participatory Decision Process: Decisions applying the Precautionary Principle should be transparent, participatory by including community input, and informed by the best available information.

The ordinance requires the City to develop a new Climate Action Plan and consistent with these GHG limits and precautionary principle tenets, and to establish relevant legislative and budgetary timelines to help the City reach its objectives.

In addition, the ordinance requires the City to consider post-growth climate mitigation strategies and policies as potential alternatives to the growth and market-based and other policies that created the crisis and remain a persistent obstacle to meaningful action. The City's policies and programs *must not* aim to merely increase economic growth for growth's sake, but rather to support the provision of basic human needs and happiness.

It also provides an institutional framework to build solidarity with neighboring Bay Area communities and jurisdictions to achieve collective limits that could change rate of global warming while simultaneously providing sister cities in other countries precious time to improve living standards and pursue decarbonization.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

This item is consistent with the latest climate science and the precautionary principle established by BMC 12.29.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Proposed Ordinance adding a new Chapter 12.01.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Staff time will be necessary to implement the new ordinance. This item refers \$[] to the FY23-24 Budget Process consistent with implementing the requirements of Sections 12.01.040, 12.01.050, 12.01.060.

CONTACT PERSON

Councilmember Kate Harrison, Council District 4, (510) 981-7140

ORDINANCE NO. –N.S.

ADDING CHAPTER 12.01 TO THE BERKELEY MUNICIPAL CODE TO ESTABLISH
EMERGENCY GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS LIMITS

BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Berkeley as follows:

Section 1. That Chapter 12.01 of the Berkeley Municipal Code is added to read as follows:

Chapter 12.01

EMERGENCY GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS LIMITS

Sections:

12.01.010 Findings and purpose.

12.01.020 Definitions.

12.01.030 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Limits.

12.01.040 Climate Action Plan.

12.01.050 Monitoring, Evaluation, And Reporting.

12.01.060 Regional Collaboration.

12.01.070 Severability.

12.01.080 Construction.

12.01.090 Effective date.

12.01.010 Findings and purpose.

The Council of the City of Berkeley finds and declares as follows:

- A. Available scientific evidence indicates that between the industrial period of 1850 and 2021 economic systems, namely state and free-market forms of capital accumulation and economic growth, have increased global atmospheric carbon dioxide levels to a staggering 418 parts per million (ppm) beyond the established planetary boundary of 350 ppm, and warmed global average temperature by approximately 1.1 degrees Celsius. The 'Global North,' which includes Berkeley, has far exceeded its fair share the emissions comprising and exceeding the boundary, and must reduce its emissions rapidly and equitably.
- B. Available scientific evidence indicates there is no 'safe' level of warming beyond 350 ppm, only gradations of risk with respect to habitability. Berkeley, California, the United States, and the world is already experiencing unprecedented negative effects of warming associated with 1 degree of warming, and current global growth trends and policies will push humanity past 1.5 degrees as early as the 2030s and 3 to 4 degrees by the end of the century. Global warming between 1.5 to 2 degrees Celsius is expected to further accelerate existential risks to health and safety including but not limited to, extreme weather, mass extinction, water and food shortages, violent conflict, fire, forced migration, economic collapse, disease, heat stress, and sea level rise. The majority of risk associated with each additional ton of greenhouse gas emitted will be borne by generations who will have not consented to current reduction strategies.
- C. In the twenty-first century, Berkeley, California, and the United States have largely and irresponsibly relied on ineffective market-based mechanisms, unrealistic expectations of absolutely decoupling GDP growth from energy use, speculative mass deployment of negative emission reduction technologies and 'net-zero' practices to offset continued fossil fuel production and consumption, and underappreciation of irreversible tipping points, aerosol masking, and non-carbon greenhouse gasses. In light of the current gravity of the climate emergency, these strategies have unequivocally failed; between Measure G and 2018, each jurisdiction only reduced greenhouse gasses by a respective 10%, 12%, and 26%, while at the same time globally, nearly a third of all anthropogenic carbon dioxide was emitted. Exceptionally risky strategies pursued by the Global North, namely midcentury 'net-zero' pledges have provided for unbridled economic and emissions growth and thus severely dwindled carbon budgets, effectively rendering Berkeley's gradual reduction goals: 80% by 2050 (Measure G, 2005 and Resolution 64,480-N.S., 2009) and net-zero by 2045 (Resolution 69,852-N.S., 2021), untenable.
- D. It is the intent of the Council to adopt stringent and equitable science-based greenhouse gas emissions limits and related action plans and reports, consistent with the precautionary principle approach established by Chapter 12.29, for the purpose of achieving the rapid, far-reaching, unprecedented and just changes in all aspects of society associated with mitigating and minimizing global warming risk and maximizing adaptation, resilience and adherence to planetary boundaries.
- E. The Council further intends to endeavor to build solidarity with neighboring communities and jurisdictions to achieve collective limits that could change rate of global warming while simultaneously providing sister cities in other countries precious time to improve living standards and pursue decarbonization.

12.01.020 Definitions.

A. "Climate Action Plan" means the document required under Section 12.01 outlining the specific actions the City will endeavor to take to reduce Greenhouse gas emissions and to mitigation, resilience and adaptation efforts with respect to climate impacts.

B. "Consumption-Based Greenhouse Gas Emissions" means all the Greenhouse Gas emissions associated with producing, transporting, using, and disposing of products and services consumed by a particular community or entity in a given time period, including emissions generated outside the boundaries of the community or the geographic area where the entity is located.

C. "Greenhouse Gas" means any and all of the following gases: carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons and sulfur hexafluoride.

D. "Sector-Based Greenhouse Gas Emissions" means all of the Greenhouse Gas emissions generated within the geographic boundaries of the City in a given time period.

E. "Responsible Production and Consumption" means improving how materials and products are extracted, manufactured, delivered, acquired, used, reused, recycled, and disposed of to ensure that the production and consumption of materials and products promote basic human needs, are distributed in a socially equitable manner, and carried out in a way that minimizes environmental impacts over the lifecycle of those materials and products while matching the carrying capacity of the earth's resources and adding value so as not to jeopardize present and future generations. "Lifecycle" means the complete material life of a product, good, or service, including resource extraction, manufacture, assembly, construction, maintenance, transportation, operations or use, and end of life (reuse, recycling/composting, and disposal). "Carrying capacity" means the number or amount of people, plants, and other living organisms that an ecosystem can support indefinitely without causing environmental degradation.

F. "Post-Growth Emissions Mitigation" means Greenhouse Gas mitigation strategies and policies that acknowledge and support the following:

- (1) rapid emissions reductions may not be compatible with economic policies that support limitless growth, especially growth in the production and consumption of commodities that do not support basic human needs,
- (2) in jurisdictions with high aggregate wealth there may be a disassociation between additional capital accumulation, economic growth, and GDP, and key social outcomes, to include but not limited to, health, social wellbeing, happiness and equity,
- (3) fairer distribution of income and wealth, and guaranteed access to universal public services.

12.01.030 Emergency Greenhouse Gas Emissions Limits.

A. The following Greenhouse Gas emissions limits are hereby established:

- (1) By 2030, reduce Sector-Based Greenhouse Gas Emissions [90%] below 2000 levels.
- (2) By 2030, reduce Consumption-Based Greenhouse Gas Emissions to [5] mtCO₂e per household or less, equivalent to a [90%] reduction compared to 2013 levels.
- (3) By 2026, the Council shall determine an appropriate deadline for achieving 100% zero emissions across both Sector and Consumption-Based inventories.

12.01.040 Climate Action Plan.

A. By [], 2022, the City Manager or designee shall prepare and submit for relevant Council policy committee and Council approval a Climate Action Plan (CAP) which shall

do all of the following:

- (1) Align with the emissions limits established in Section 12.01.030.
 - (2) Consider equitable Post-growth Climate Mitigation strategies and policies.
 - (3) Incorporate an equity framework that addresses historic racial, class-based, and social inequalities; prioritizes social, economic, and environmental benefits derived from implementing the CAP; and ensures an equitable distribution of those benefits. This framework shall consider:
 - (a) The engagement and prioritization of those who are most impacted by climate change and have historically had the least influence in decision-making processes, including low-income communities of color, communities with disabilities, and other impacted populations;
 - (b) Burdens and/or unintended consequences of related actions, especially for low-income communities of color, communities with disabilities, and other vulnerable populations; and
 - (c) Social interventions needed to secure workers' rights and livelihoods when economies are shifting to responsible production and consumption, collectively referred to as a "just transition" framework, and other impacts on workforce and job opportunities.
 - (4) Include, but not be limited to, the following elements: energy supply; transportation and land use; building operations; housing; Responsible Production and Consumption; carbon sequestration and water conservation.
 - (5) Identify strategies and/or make recommendations to achieve emissions limits for all elements. The CAP shall recommend approaches on goals and principles. Each strategy or recommendation shall:
 - (a) Identify parties responsible for implementation;
 - (b) Incorporate an estimated cost; and
 - (c) Incorporate estimated legislative and budgetary timelines based consistent with Section 12.01.030; and
 - (d) Contain key performance indicators and explicit equity metrics to measure progress.
- B. The City Manager or their designee shall update the Climate Action Plan at least every two years.

12.01.050 Monitoring, Evaluation, And Reporting.

- A. The City shall demonstrate its long-term commitment to reducing Greenhouse Gas emissions and advancing racial and social equity by measuring and reporting emissions, tracking key performance indicators and equity metrics, and monitoring the City's progress on meeting its climate action goals and commitments.
- B. The City Manager or their designee shall, with the assistance from relevant City agencies:
- (1) Measure and monitor Sector-Based Greenhouse Gas Emissions, including municipal emissions, using best available global protocols for preparing Citywide Greenhouse Gas emission inventories.
 - (2) Measure production and consumption emissions using best available global methodologies for preparing consumption-based emission inventories.
 - (3) Evaluate Sector-Based Greenhouse Gas Emissions against set limits, document production and consumption emissions, and produce an annual Greenhouse Gas emissions report.
 - (4) Establish a monitoring and reporting process for the implementation of the CAP that:
 - (a) Tracks key performance indicators and equity metrics for strategies to help

monitor their progress and implementation;

(5) Request and receive data from City departments to support:

(a) The annual Greenhouse Gas emissions inventory. City departments may be asked to provide data on, but not limited to, the following: their energy use; types of fuels used for their operations; fuel volume; vehicle-miles travelled (if applicable) within their jurisdictions; and private sector Greenhouse Gas emission sources regulated by the department. Departments may also be requested to verify emission estimates and assumptions and review resulting reports;

(b) Monitoring and reporting of Climate Action Plan implementation. City departments may be asked to provide data on key performance indicators and equity metrics related to adopted strategies and actions; and

(6) Coordinate with other City agencies to monitor, track, and report on climate action progress to local, state, national, and global partners.

(7) Report its findings in a progress report to the Council and public every year.

(8) Report on at least a biannual basis to relevant Council policy committees and commissions to support policy and budget development consistent with reduction limits established in Section 12.01.030.

12.01.060 Regional Collaboration.

The Council and City staff, working alongside the public, shall endeavor to build solidarity and coalitions with neighboring communities, jurisdictions, and agencies to achieve equitable collective Greenhouse Gas limits and observe planetary boundaries.

11.63.070 Severability.

If any word, phrase, sentence, part, section, subsection, or other portion of this Chapter, or any application thereof to any person or circumstance is declared void, unconstitutional, or invalid for any reason, then such word, phrase, sentence, part, section, subsection, or other portion, or the prescribed application thereof, shall be severable, and the remaining provisions of this Chapter, and all applications thereof, not having been declared void, unconstitutional or invalid, shall remain in full force and effect. The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed this title, and each section, subsection, sentence, clause and phrase thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, sentences, clauses or phrases had been declared invalid or unconstitutional.

12.01.080 Construction.

This Chapter is intended to be a proper exercise of the City's police power, to operate only upon its own officers, agents, employees and facilities and other persons acting within its boundaries, and not to regulate inter-city or interstate commerce. It shall be construed in accordance with that intent.

12.01.090 Effective date.

The provisions in this ordinance are effective [], 2022.

Section 2. Copies of this Ordinance shall be posted for two days prior to adoption in the display case located near the walkway in front of the Maudelle Shirek Building, 2134 Martin Luther King Jr. Way. Within 15 days of adoption, copies of this Ordinance shall be

filed at each branch of the Berkeley Public Library and the title shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation.

51 Bus Rapid Transit



Facilities, Infrastructure, Transportation, Environment, and Sustainability Policy Committee

March 2, 2023

RECOMMENDATION

- Refer to the City Manager the development of an implementation and community engagement plan to install Bus Rapid Transit, including dedicated bus lanes, transit signal priority, elevated platforms, and enhanced sections, on the AC Transit 51B route along University Avenue from Sixth Street to Shattuck Avenue and along Shattuck Avenue from University Avenue to Durant Avenue, with engagement centering pedestrian, cyclist, transit and mobility justice advocates, the disability rights community, local faith communities, merchants, neighboring residential communities inclusive of tenants, seniors, and students, and historically marginalized communities.

RECOMMENDATION

- Refer \$300,000 to the Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Budget Process to conduct a Complete Street Corridor Study antecedent to the installation of a cycle track along University Avenue from 6th Street to Oxford Street, consistent with the City of Berkeley's 2017 Bicycle Plan and integrating pedestrian amenities consistent with the City of Berkeley's 2020 Pedestrian Plan. As per the Bicycle Plan, the study will be evaluated in the context of the modal priorities established by the City of Berkeley General Plan's 2001 Transportation Element and the Alameda County Transportation Commission's (ACTC) 2016 Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

- Refer \$300,000 to the Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Budget Process to conduct a Complete Street Corridor Study antecedent to the installation of a cycle track along Oxford Street from Virginia Street to Durant Avenue consistent with the Bicycle Plan and integrating pedestrian amenities consistent with the Pedestrian Plan. As per the Bicycle Plan, the study will be evaluated in the context of the modal priorities established by the Transportation Element and ACTC's Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan. It will be coordinated with proposed improvements to transit performance on this Primary Transit Route, such as bus boarding islands, transit-only lanes, transit signal priority/queue jump lanes, far-side bus stop relocations, and other improvements as described in AC Transit's 2016 Major Corridor Study.

RECOMMENDATION

- Refer \$X to the Fiscal Year XX-XX Budget Process to install quick-build bus station improvements along the AC Transit 51B route.
- Initiate consultation with AC Transit and UC Berkeley Bear Transit as soon as possible on the planning, scoping, and implementation of these items.

WHAT IS BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT)?



- AC Transit describes BRT as “a high-quality, high-capacity bus transit system designed to emulate light rail operation”
- AC Transit’s 2016 Major Corridors Study
- AC Transit’s 2018 Multimodal Corridor Guidelines

PERCENT TRAVEL SPEED AND RIDERSHIP




Figure A: Percent Travel Speed Increase by Mode (2040 with Project vs. 2040 Baseline)




Figure B: Ridership Increase by Mode (2040 with Project vs. 2040 Baseline)

COST PER PASSENGER TRIP AND OPERATING COSTS




Figure D: Cost per Unlinked Passenger Trip by Mode




Figure E: Operating Cost per Mile by Mode

HIGH-AMENITY STATIONS AND OFF-BOARD FARES




Oakland



Oakland

PEDESTRIAN INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSIT SIGNALS



BUS-ONLY LANES



San Francisco



San Leandro

WHY BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT)?

- City of Berkeley's Climate Action Plan
- City of Berkeley's Strategic Transportation Plan
- City of Berkeley's Strategic Plan
- City of Berkeley's Vision Zero Action Plan
- Population Trends
- AC Transit Ridership
- Pedestrian Collisions
- ADA Compliance
- Local Business and Economy

CLIMATE ACTION PLAN (2009)

- Transportation Emissions Are Largest Source of Greenhouse Gases
- Envisions Public Transit, Walking, Cycling, and Other Sustainable Mobility Nodes as Primary Means of Transportation
- Goal: Increase Safety, Reliability, and Frequency of Public Transit
- Goal: Manage Parking Effectively to Minimize Driving Demand
- Goal: Encourage and Support Alternatives to Driving
- In 2018, City Declared Climate Emergency

STRATEGIC TRANSPORTATION PLAN (2016)

- Envisions Streets, Sidewalks, and Pathways as Multimodal
- Goal: Encouraging People to Walk, Bicycle, and Ride Transit
- Goal: Improve Transit Efficiency
- Goal: Design Street Networks That Ensure Comfortable, Safe Environments for Users of All Abilities
- Prioritizing Transit Services Along Transit Routes

STRATEGIC PLAN (2018)

- Goal: Provide State-of-the-Art, Well-Maintained Infrastructure, Amenities, and Facilities
- Goal: Create a Resilient, Safe, Connected, and Prepared City
- Goal: Foster a Dynamic, Sustainable, and Locally-Based Economy

VISION ZERO ACTION PLAN (2019)

- Strategy to Eliminate All Traffic Fatalities and Severe Injuries While Increasing Safe, Healthy, and Equitable Mobility for All
- Goal: Create Safer Transportation Options for People Who Walk, Bike, and Take Transit
 - Makes These Modes More Attractive
 - Reduces Number of Car Trips
 - Resulting in Fewer Severe and Fatal Collisions

POPULATION TRENDS

- City of Berkeley's 2023 Housing Element Update
- Since 2000, Population Has Increased 9% Each Decade
- 2020 Department of Finance Estimate: 122,580
- 2030 Association of Bay Area Government Estimate: 136,000
- 2040 Association of Bay Area Government Estimate: 141,000

AC TRANSIT RIDERSHIP

- 2019 Annual Report: Ridership Over 53 Million, 2.5% Increase from 2018
 - Key Factors: Proactive Efforts, Service Frequency, Robust Local Economy
 - Nationwide Major Transit Providers Reported 2.8% Decline
- 2020 COVID-19 Pandemic
 - Fewer People Commuting, Running Errands, or Doing Activities
 - Schools and Colleges Closed, Employees Working from Home
- Fiscal Year 2021-2022: Ridership Almost 29 Million, 36% Increase
 - Service at 85% of Pre-Pandemic Levels

PEDESTRIAN COLLISIONS

- City of Berkeley's 2020 Pedestrian Plan
 - Shattuck and University Avenues Rank 1st and 5th (2008 - 2017)
 - 1st and 3rd (Tied) for Fatal or Severe

ADA COMPLIANCE

- BRT Improvements Advance City's Goals
 - Increasing Mobility Access for Transit Riders and Cyclists with Disabilities
 - ADA Accessibility Standards Issued by US Department of Transportation
 - Guidance for Bus Boarding and Alighting Areas, Shelters, Signs, and More

LOCAL BUSINESSES AND ECONOMY

- National Institute for Transportation and Communities
 - 2015 National Study of BRT Development Outcomes
 - Areas Within a ½ Mile of BRT Corridors Increased Share of Office Space By ⅓
 - New Multifamily Apartment Construction Doubled Since 2008
- PolicyLink “Business Impact Mitigations for Transit Projects” (2013)
 - Best Practices: Financial and Technical Assistance, Proactive Outreach

INITIAL CITY AND COMMUNITY INPUT

- City of Berkeley's Office of Economic Development
- District 2 Transportation and Infrastructure Commissioner
- AC Transit
- Bike East Bay
- Telegraph for People
- Walk Bike Berkeley

BUILDING COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

- Berkeley Chamber of Commerce
- Center for Independent Living
- Downtown Arts District
- Downtown Berkeley Association
- Netivot Shalom
- Poet's Corner Merchants
- Telegraph for People
- University Avenue Association
- Walk Bike Berkeley
- Way Christian Center
- ...And More!

ONGOING CITY/AGENCY DISCUSSIONS

- AC Transit
- Alameda County Transportation Commission
- Berkeley Unified School District
- Fire Department
- Office of Economic Development
- Public Works Department
- Transportation Division
- Transportation and Infrastructure Commission
- UC Berkeley Bear Transit

QUESTIONS AND CONTACT INFORMATION

- Councilmember Terry Taplin
 - TTaplin@cityofberkeley.info
 - (510) 981-7120

- Rubén Hernández Story (*Chief of Staff*)
 - RHernandezStory@cityofberkeley.info
 - (510) 981-7120





CONSENT CALENDAR
March 2 December 13, 2023

To: —Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: —Councilmember Terry Taplin (Author)

Subject: 51 University Downtown Avenue Bus Rapid Transit

RECOMMENDATION

- (1) Refer to the City Manager and the Department of Public Works the installation initiation of a University Avenue Multimodal Corridor Project that centers the creation of a transit-only lane Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) corridor spanning along University Avenue, Shattuck Avenue, and Telegraph Avenue with dedicated lanes and elevated platforms.
- (2) Refer \$300,000 to the budget process to be allotted to the Department of Public Works engage a consultant for study, community engagement, and project design for the study, community feedback process, and design of the project. Refer \$30,000 to the budget process for the construction of elevated bus stop platforms for the purposes of bringing BRT elevated platforms to University Avenue on a pilot basis while the wider project is in development. initiate consultation with AC Transit and UC Berkeley Bear Transit as soon as possible on the planning, scoping and implementation of these items.

RECOMMENDATION

- 1) Refer to the City Manager the development of an implementation and community engagement plan to install Bus Rapid Transit, including dedicated bus lanes, transit signal priority, elevated platforms, and enhanced sections, on the AC Transit 51B route along University Avenue from Sixth Street to Shattuck Avenue and along Shattuck Avenue from University Avenue to Durant Avenue, with engagement centering pedestrian, cyclist, transit and mobility justice advocates, the disability rights community, local faith communities, merchants, neighboring residential communities inclusive of tenants, seniors, and students, and historically marginalized communities. Refer to the City Manager the development of an implementation and community engagement plan to install Bus Rapid Transit including dedicated bus lanes, transit signal priority, elevated platforms, and enhanced sections, along the AC Transit 51B route along University Ave from Sixth St to Shattuck Ave and along Shattuck Avenue from University Sixth to Durant, with engagement centering pedestrian, cyclist, transit and mobility justice advocates, the disability rights community, local faith communities, merchants,

neighboring residential communities inclusive of tenants, seniors, and students, and historically marginalized communities.

- 2) Refer \$300,000 to the Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Budget Process to conduct a Complete Street Corridor Study antecedent to the installation of a cycle track along University Avenue from 6th Street to Oxford Street, consistent with the City of Berkeley's 2017 Bicycle Plan and integrating pedestrian amenities consistent with the City of Berkeley's 2020 Pedestrian Plan. As per the Bicycle Plan, the study will be evaluated in the context of the modal priorities established by the City of Berkeley General Plan's 2001 Transportation Element and the Alameda County Transportation Commission's (ACTC) 2016 Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan. Refer \$300k to the FY 24-25 Budget Process to conduct a Complete Street Corridor Study antecedent to the installation of a two-cycle track along the University from 6th to Oxford consistent with the adopted 2017 Bicycle9 Bike Plan and integrating pedestrian amenities consistent with the Pedestrian Plan. As per the 2017 Bicycle Plan, the study will be evaluated in the context of the modal priorities established by the Berkeley General Plan Transportation Element and the Alameda County Transportation Commission Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan.

- 3) Refer \$300,000 to the Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Budget Process to conduct a Complete Street Corridor Study antecedent to the installation of a cycle track along Oxford Street from Virginia Street to Durant Avenue consistent with the Bicycle Plan and integrating pedestrian amenities consistent with the Pedestrian Plan. As per the Bicycle Plan, the study will be evaluated in the context of the modal priorities established by the Transportation Element and ACTC's Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan. It will be coordinated with proposed improvements to transit performance on this Primary Transit Route, such as bus boarding islands, transit-only lanes, transit signal priority/queue jump lanes, far-side bus stop relocations, and other improvements as described in AC Transit's 2016 Major Corridor Study. Refer \$300k Refer \$X to the FY 24-25 Budget Process to conduct a Complete Street Corridor Study antecedent to the installation of a two-cycle track along Shattuck from Virginia to Woolsey consistent with the adopted 2017 Bicycle9 Bike Plan. and integrating pedestrian amenities consistent with the Pedestrian Plan. As per the 2017 Bicycle Plan, the study will be evaluated in the context of the modal priorities established by the Berkeley General Plan Transportation Element and the Alameda County Transportation Commission Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan. It will be coordinated with proposed improvements to transit performance on this Primary Transit Route, such as bus boarding islands, transit-only lanes, transit signal priority/queue jump lanes, far-side bus stop relocations, and other improvements as described in the AC Transit Major Corridor Study.

- 4) Refer \$X to the Fiscal Year XX-XX Budget Process to install quick-build bus station improvements along the AC Transit 51B route. Refer to the FYx \$X to install quick-build bus station improvements along the 51b route.

- 5) Initiate consultation with AC Transit and UC Berkeley Bear Transit as soon as possible on the planning, scoping, and implementation of these items.
Initiate consultation with AC Transit and UC Berkeley Bear Transit as soon as possible on the planning, scoping, and implementation of these items.

FISCAL IMPACTS

Staff costs. An estimated \$300,000 for the staff costs of engaging a consultant for the Multimodal Corridor Project. An estimated \$30,000 for two elevated platforms, or “bus bulbs”, at an estimated cost of \$15,000 per platform.¹

BACKGROUND CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

Existing Transit Lanes**Existing Transit Lanes in Berkeley**

Currently, Berkeley has a transit lane on Bancroft Way between Telegraph and Downtown that is used by westbound buses, and a transit lane is planned for Durant Ave for eastbound buses. Bus lines using these lanes continue on to Shattuck, University, and Telegraph.

Shattuck, University, and Telegraph Avenues

Berkeley’s University Avenue runs West to East from the Berkeley Marina and I-80 Freeway to its termination at UC Berkeley’s Crescent Lawn. University Avenue is dubbed the “Gateway to Berkeley” due to the location of the city’s lone Amtrak Station at the intersection of Fourth Street, the avenue’s proximity to both the North Berkeley and Downtown Berkeley BART stations, the regularly congested I-80 exit onto the avenue, and the service of AC Transit’s 51B, 52, 79, 88, 802, and FS lines. University Avenue is a wide street with two travel lanes in each direction, parking lanes, turn pockets, and a center median.

Berkeley’s Shattuck Avenue runs North to South from Indian Rock Park in the Berkeley Hills to 45th Street in Oakland near the intersection of Telegraph Avenue. Shattuck Avenue serves as the main street of Berkeley, running through its Downtown, which is home to the Downtown Berkeley BART Station, AC Transit and Bear Transit stations, and various restaurants and office spaces.

Telegraph Avenue, from Woolsey Street on the Oakland border up through Dwight Way near UC Berkeley, is in the midst of its own Multimodal Corridor Project² that may result in BRT infrastructure in the coming years. Should this project be completed or significantly underway at the time of the development of BRT plans for Shattuck and University Avenues, close attention should be paid to its initial impacts, successes, and failures so that future applications of BRT infrastructure build on these lessons.

¹<https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2020%20Pedestrian%20Plan%20Appendix%20E%20%28adopted%29.pdf>

²<https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/our-work/capital-projects/telegraph-avenue-multimodal-corridor-project#:~:text=The%20Telegraph%20Avenue%20Multimodal%20Corridor,bike%20lanes%2C%20and%20transit%20improvements.>

University Avenue

Berkeley's University Avenue runs West to East from the Berkeley Marina and I-80 Freeway to its termination at the Crescent Lawn of the UC Berkeley campus. University Ave is dubbed the "Gateway to Berkeley" due to the location of the city's lone Amtrak Station at University & Fourth Street, the avenue's proximity to both the North Berkeley and Downtown Berkeley BART stations, the regularly congested I-80 exit onto the avenue, and the service of AC Transit's 51B, 52, 79, 88, 802, and FS lines on at least part of the corridor. University Avenue is a wide street with two travel lanes in each direction, parking lanes, turn pockets, and a center median.

The central location of University Avenue and the variety of communities it connects makes this corridor an incredibly important focus for the City's housing and transportation planning for the coming decades. University Avenue has had a number of housing developments completed recently, with additional developments under construction. With University Avenue likely seeing a growth in new housing development under the forthcoming Housing Element, it is important for Berkeley's transportation infrastructure to keep up with the changing needs of its old and new residents. On top of the expected growth in Berkeley's population and thus its transportation needs, climate change and the urgency of pedestrian and cyclist safety require that the transportation system of the City's future be one that prioritizes public transit and bicycle travel over the use personal automobiles. With this in mind, the 2017 Bicycle Plan recommends a Complete Streets Corridor Study for University Avenue.³

Shattuck & Telegraph Avenues

Any successful transportation project that seeks to increase the speed and reliability of AC Transit service in Berkeley will need to serve a longer route have to apply to more than the a single relatively short corridor segment just one major within Berkeley. There are several transit corridors within Berkeley, and connecting to other cities, that AC Transit has identified as needing upgraded types of service. We It would be important for the City would like to work with the City AC Transit to identify the routings which would roadway. be the most productive.

Telegraph Avenue, running from the Oakland border in South-East Berkeley up through downtown to UC Berkeley, is in the midst of its own multimodal corridor project at this time that may result in rapid transit infrastructure on the avenue in the coming years.⁴ Should the Telegraph Avenue Multimodal Project be completed or significantly underway at the time of the development of BRT plans for University Avenue and Shattuck Avenue, close attention should be paid to initial impacts, successes, and failures of the Telegraph project so that application of rapid transit infrastructure on University and Shattuck is done that builds on the lessons of Telegraph.

³https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-01/Berkeley-Bicycle-Plan-2017_AppendixH_Complete%20Streets%20Corridors.pdf

⁴<https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/our-work/capital-projects/telegraph-avenue-multimodal-corridor-project#:~:text=The%20Telegraph%20Avenue%20Multimodal%20Corridor,bike%20lanes%2C%20and%20transit%20improvements.>

~~Furthermore, these three avenues are each unique and each present their own problems when considering the addition of BRT. The application of BRT on the downtown stretch of Shattuck Avenue, which could improve the service of AC Transit's 18 and various other lines which briefly serve Shattuck at the start/end of their routes, will require careful consideration of the already congested conditions of the street. The construction of elevated platforms on University Avenue as a pilot for BRT while completion of Telegraph Avenue's project is underway and Shattuck Avenue rapid transit is being considered will allow for some near-term service improvements while giving staff the time necessary to study how to bring multimodal improvements to the rest of the corridors as fastidiously as possible.~~

Bus Rapid Transit

While diverse in their application around the world, Bus Rapid Transit is typically a transportation corridor that prioritizes fast and efficient bus service that may include dedicated bus lanes, traffic signal priority, elevated platforms, and off-board fare collection.⁵ There is no one-size-fits-all approach to BRT and a University Avenue BRT is sure to look different than it might on Telegraph Avenue or International Boulevard in Oakland. ~~However, ,but~~ pursuit of a quicker and more efficient bus corridor along University should result in dedicated bus lanes and elevated platforms at existing AC Transit stops. ~~Most transit planners consider center running bus lanes--such as provided on International Boulevard. aAnd Van Ness Avenue. iIn San Francisco--as more effective than curbside bus lanes. However, this would have to be determined in the course of planning the project.~~ Relative to other rapid transit improvements such as light rail, BRT's advantages include lower upfront capital requirements, a higher degree of flexibility in their application, and a much ~~er~~ quicker ~~be~~ implementation timeline.⁶

⁵ <https://www.transit.dot.gov/research-innovation/bus-rapid-transit>


⁶ <https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1023&context=jpt>



Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco

Do we want to include a photo? Van Ness Ave is probably the best example -- it is designed to work with multiple existing bus lines using regular buses

Figure 1: Characteristics of Bus Rapid Transit



Source: GAO analysis of bus rapid transit research.

7

Population Trends

According to the City of Berkeley's 2023 Housing Element Update,⁸ the city's population has grown steadily since 2000, increasing approximately 9% each decade. The Department of Finance estimates that the city's population was 122,580 in 2020. The Association of Bay Area Governments' Plan Bay Area 2040 projections anticipate Berkeley's population to reach about 136,000 by 2030 and 141,000 by 2040.

Pedestrian Collisions

The City of Berkeley's 2020 Pedestrian Plan⁹ determined that Shattuck and University Avenues represent two of the top five streets with pedestrian collisions between 2008 and 2017, ranked first and fifth, respectively, as well as two of the top four streets with fatal or severe pedestrian collisions in the same time period, ranked first and third (tied) respectively.

⁷ <https://www.gao.gov/blog/2016/04/13/rapid-buses-for-rapid-transit>

⁸ https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Combined_HousingElementFinal_redline.pdf

⁹ <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-01/2020-Pedestrian-Plan.pdf>

AC Transit

In AC Transit's 2019 Annual Report¹⁰, they reported a systemwide ridership of over 53 million customers, reflecting a 2.5% increase (1.28 million riders) over the previous year. This occurred at a time when major transit providers nationwide reported a ridership decline of 2.8%. Key factors attributed to this growth included proactive efforts to maintain high service levels, adding service frequency, and a robust local economy. That same year, AC Transit released their first Strategic Plan¹¹ in about 20 years. In April of 2022, an Addendum¹² was added to address the effects of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

The pandemic has had an enormous impact on transit operations and economic activity. In 2020, fewer people needed to ride the bus, whether to commute to work or get around the city for personal errands and activities. Schools and colleges closed their campuses and several office workers began working from home. Although there has been a recovery in ridership¹³ beginning in 2021, pre-pandemic levels have not been reached. Fiscal Year 2021-2022 saw an annual ridership of almost 29 million customers, which was a 36% increase (7.6 million riders) over the previous fiscal year. Service is at around 85% of pre-pandemic levels, which is the equivalent of deleting one out of every seven trips.

RATIONALE

City of Berkeley Plans

The City of Berkeley's Climate Action Plan,¹⁴ adopted in 2009, envisions public transit, walking, cycling, and other sustainable mobility modes as the primary means of transportation for residents and visitors. To do so, it lists various goals, such as increasing the safety, reliability, and frequency of public transit and managing parking effectively to minimize driving demand and encourage and support alternatives to driving. It also addresses the fact that transportation emissions are the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions, a trend that has continued as of the 2019 Greenhouse Gas Inventory.

The Berkeley Strategic Transportation Plan¹⁵, adopted in 2016, envisions the city's streets, sidewalks, and pathways as multimodal, serving people walking, bicycling, riding transit, driving, and moving goods. To do so, it lists various goals, such as encouraging people to walk, bicycle, and ride transit, improving transit efficiency, designing street networks that ensure comfortable, safe environments for users of all abilities, and prioritizing transit services along transit routes.

¹⁰https://www.actransit.org/sites/default/files/2021-03/0017-20%20Annual%20Report%202019_small_FNL.pdf

¹¹<https://www.actransit.org/sites/default/files/2021-03/AC%20Transit%20Strategic%20Plan.pdf>

¹²https://www.actransit.org/sites/default/files/2022-12/0230-22%20Strat%20Plan%20Adden_FNL.pdf

¹³<https://www.actransit.org/ridership>

¹⁴<https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-01/Berkeley-Climate-Action-Plan.pdf>

¹⁵<https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/our-work/adopted-plans/berkeley-strategic-transportation-best-plan>

The City of Berkeley's Strategic Plan¹⁶, adopted in 2018, includes long-term goals such as providing state-of-the-art, well-maintained infrastructure, amenities, and facilities, creating a resilient, safe, connected, and prepared city, and fostering a dynamic, sustainable, and locally-based economy. That same year, the city declared a climate emergency and committed to mobilize to end greenhouse gas emissions swiftly.

The Berkeley Vision Zero Action Plan¹⁷, adopted in 2019, is a strategy to eliminate all traffic fatalities and severe injuries while increasing safe, healthy, and equitable mobility for all. To do so, it lists various goals, such as creating safer transportation options for people who walk, bike, and take transit, which would make these modes more attractive and reduce the number of car trips in Berkeley, which can mean fewer severe and fatal collisions.

AC Transit's Recovery

Supporting AC Transit's recovery enhances the mobility and safety of Berkeley residents while simultaneously improving the walkability and bikeability of the city as well as breathing life into the local economy.

Any successful transportation project that seeks to increase the speed and reliability of AC Transit service in Berkeley will need to serve a longer route than the single relatively short corridor segment within Berkeley. There are several transit corridors within Berkeley connecting to other cities that AC Transit has identified as needing upgraded types of service. It would be important for the city to work with AC Transit to identify the routings which would be the most productive.

Shattuck, University, and Telegraph Avenues

The central location of University Avenue and the variety of communities it connects makes this corridor an incredibly important focus for the city's housing and transportation planning for the coming decades. University Avenue has had a number of housing developments completed recently, with additional developments under construction. With University Avenue likely seeing a growth in new housing development under the forthcoming Housing Element, it is important for Berkeley's transportation infrastructure to keep up with the changing needs of its old and new residents. On top of the expected growth in Berkeley's population and thus its transportation needs, climate change and the urgency of pedestrian and cyclist safety require that the transportation system of the City's future be one that prioritizes public transit and bicycle travel over the use personal automobiles. With this in mind, the 2017 Bicycle Plan recommends a Complete Streets Corridor Study for University Avenue.¹⁸

Furthermore, these three avenues are each unique and each present their own problems when considering the addition of BRT. The application of BRT on the downtown stretch of Shattuck Avenue, which could improve the service of AC Transit's

¹⁶<https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-01/Berkeley-Strategic-Plan.pdf>

¹⁷<https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-02/Berkeley-Vision-Zero-Action-Plan.pdf>

¹⁸https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-01/Berkeley-Bicycle-Plan-2017_AppendixH_Complete%20Streets%20Corridors.pdf

18 and various other lines which briefly serve Shattuck Avenue at the start and end of their routes, will require careful consideration of the already congested conditions of the street. The construction of elevated platforms on University Avenue as a pilot for BRT while completion of Telegraph Avenue’s project is underway and Shattuck Avenue rapid transit is being considered will allow for some near-term service improvements while giving staff the time necessary to study how to bring multimodal improvements to the rest of the corridors as fastidiously as possible.

Breakdown of Recommended Improvements

Dedicated bus lanes improve travel speeds and reliability by reducing delays caused by other traffic. Transit signal priority uses technology to reduce dwell time at traffic signals for transit vehicles, such as extending the duration of green lights or shortening that of red lights. Raised platforms make it easier and more accessible for passengers to board or alight from buses by decreasing the distance between the platform and the vehicle, therefore increasing route efficiency.

ADA Compliance

The recommended improvements also help advance the city’s goal of increasing mobility access for transit riders and cyclists with disabilities. ADA Accessibility Standards for transportation facilities are issued by the US Department of Transportation and include guidance for bus boarding and alighting areas, shelters, signs, and more.¹⁹

Impact to Local Businesses and Economy

In addition to advancing various climate and public safety goals of the city, investing in bus and bicycle infrastructure benefits local businesses and the economy. The League of American Bicyclists’s report entitled “Bicycling Benefits Business”²⁰ illustrates that the bicycle industry and its related transportation, tourism, and health benefits spur job creation, economic activity, and cost savings. The Outdoor Industry Association reported that outdoor recreation consumers spend \$887 billion annually and create 7.6 million jobs.²¹

The National Institute for Transportation and Communities published a peer-reviewed study examining BRT lines and found that the areas within a half-mile of BRT corridors increased their share of new office space by one third from 2000-2007, and new multifamily apartment construction doubled in those half-mile areas since 2008.²² PolicyLink released a report entitled “Business Impact Mitigations for Transit Projects”²³ that address BRT projects, concluding that best practices include providing the right

¹⁹<https://federalist-e3fba26d-2806-4f02-bf0e-89c97cfba93c.app.cloud.gov/preview/atbcb/usab-uswds/ada-alternative/ada/#ada-810>

²⁰<https://bikeleague.org/sites/default/files/Bicycling%20Benefits%20Business.pdf>

²¹<https://outdoorindustry.org/resource/2017-outdoor-recreation-economy-report/>

²²<https://t4america.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/NATIONAL-STUDY-OF-BRT-DEVELOPMENT-OUTCOMES-11-30-15.pdf>

²³https://www.policylink.org/sites/default/files/FINAL%20PolicyLink%20Business%20Impact%20Mitigation%20Strategies_0.pdf

type of financial and technical assistance and proactive outreach to businesses built on constant communication, flexibility, and trust.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

The City estimates that transportation-related emissions accounts for approximately 60% of our community's total annual greenhouse gas emissions.²⁴ By encouraging alternatives to car transportation by making public transportation options quicker and more appealing, policy stands to lower the emissions from our community's dominant source of carbon emissions.

The goal of any new public transportation initiative must be to increase the local mode share of residents choosing public transportation over personal automobiles for commuting and other trips. BRT offers many advantages for this pursuit. The U.S. Government Accountability Office reviewed implemented BRT projects in 2012 and found that "13 of the 15 project sponsors...reported increases in ridership after 1 year of service and reduced average travel times of 10 to 35 percent over previous bus services."²⁵ Paired with the multimodal project along Telegraph Avenue, Berkeley has the potential for a large increase in transit ridership and thus a decline in greenhouse gas emissions if the City follows through on BRT in the coming years.

FISCAL IMPACTS

Staff costs. An estimated \$300,000 for the staff costs of engaging a consultant for the Multimodal Corridor Project. An estimated \$30,000 for two elevated platforms, or "bus bulbs", at an estimated cost of \$15,000 per platform.²⁶

CONTACT

Councilmember Terry Taplin, ~~Councilmember~~, District 2, (510) 981-7120, TTaplin@cityofberkeley.info

ATTACHMENTS

1. AC Transit Multimodal Corridor Guidelines

²⁴https://www.cityofberkeley.info/Clerk/City_Council/2018/12_Dec/Documents/2018-12-06_WS_Item_01_Climate_Action_Plan_Update_pdf.aspx

²⁵<https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-12-811>

²⁶<https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2020%20Pedestrian%20Plan%20Appendix%20E%20%28adoped%29.pdf>



CONSENT CALENDAR
March 2, 2023

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: Councilmember Terry Taplin (Author)

Subject: 51 Bus Rapid Transit

RECOMMENDATION

- 1) Refer to the City Manager the development of an implementation and community engagement plan to install Bus Rapid Transit, including dedicated bus lanes, transit signal priority, elevated platforms, and enhanced sections, on the AC Transit 51B route along University Avenue from Sixth Street to Shattuck Avenue and along Shattuck Avenue from University Avenue to Durant Avenue, with engagement centering pedestrian, cyclist, transit and mobility justice advocates, the disability rights community, local faith communities, merchants, neighboring residential communities inclusive of tenants, seniors, and students, and historically marginalized communities.
- 2) Refer \$300,000 to the Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Budget Process to conduct a Complete Street Corridor Study antecedent to the installation of a cycle track along University Avenue from 6th Street to Oxford Street, consistent with the City of Berkeley's 2017 Bicycle Plan and integrating pedestrian amenities consistent with the City of Berkeley's 2020 Pedestrian Plan. As per the Bicycle Plan, the study will be evaluated in the context of the modal priorities established by the City of Berkeley General Plan's 2001 Transportation Element and the Alameda County Transportation Commission's (ACTC) 2016 Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan.
- 3) Refer \$300,000 to the Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Budget Process to conduct a Complete Street Corridor Study antecedent to the installation of a cycle track along Oxford Street from Virginia Street to Durant Avenue consistent with the Bicycle Plan and integrating pedestrian amenities consistent with the Pedestrian Plan. As per the Bicycle Plan, the study will be evaluated in the context of the modal priorities established by the Transportation Element and ACTC's Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan. It will be coordinated with proposed improvements to transit performance on this Primary Transit Route, such as bus boarding islands, transit-only lanes, transit signal priority/queue jump lanes, far-side bus stop relocations, and other improvements as described in AC Transit's

2016 Major Corridor Study.

- 4) Refer \$X to the Fiscal Year XX-XX Budget Process to install quick-build bus station improvements along the AC Transit 51B route.
- 5) Initiate consultation with AC Transit and UC Berkeley Bear Transit as soon as possible on the planning, scoping, and implementation of these items.

BACKGROUND

Existing Transit Lanes

Currently, Berkeley has a transit lane on Bancroft Way between Telegraph and Downtown that is used by westbound buses, and a transit lane is planned for Durant Ave for eastbound buses. Bus lines using these lanes continue on to Shattuck, University, and Telegraph.

Shattuck, University, and Telegraph Avenues

Berkeley's University Avenue runs West to East from the Berkeley Marina and I-80 Freeway to its termination at UC Berkeley's Crescent Lawn. University Avenue is dubbed the "Gateway to Berkeley" due to the location of the city's lone Amtrak Station at the intersection of Fourth Street, the avenue's proximity to both the North Berkeley and Downtown Berkeley BART stations, the regularly congested I-80 exit onto the avenue, and the service of AC Transit's 51B, 52, 79, 88, 802, and FS lines. University Avenue is a wide street with two travel lanes in each direction, parking lanes, turn pockets, and a center median.

Berkeley's Shattuck Avenue runs North to South from Indian Rock Park in the Berkeley Hills to 45th Street in Oakland near the intersection of Telegraph Avenue. Shattuck Avenue serves as the main street of Berkeley, running through its Downtown, which is home to the Downtown Berkeley BART Station, AC Transit and Bear Transit stations, and various restaurants and office spaces.

Telegraph Avenue, from Woolsey Street on the Oakland border up through Dwight Way near UC Berkeley, is in the midst of its own Multimodal Corridor Project¹ that may result in BRT infrastructure in the coming years. Should this project be completed or significantly underway at the time of the development of BRT plans for Shattuck and University Avenues, close attention should be paid to its initial impacts, successes, and failures so that future applications of BRT infrastructure build on these lessons.

Bus Rapid Transit

While diverse in their application around the world, Bus Rapid Transit is typically a transportation corridor that prioritizes fast and efficient bus service that may include dedicated bus lanes, traffic signal priority, elevated platforms, and off-board fare

¹<https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/our-work/capital-projects/telegraph-avenue-multimodal-corridor-project#:~:text=The%20Telegraph%20Avenue%20Multimodal%20Corridor,bike%20lanes%2C%20and%20transit%20improvements.>

collection.² There is no one-size-fits-all approach to BRT and a University Avenue BRT is sure to look different than it might on Telegraph Avenue or International Boulevard in Oakland. However, pursuit of a quicker and more efficient bus corridor along University Avenue should result in dedicated bus lanes and elevated platforms at existing AC Transit stops. Most transit planners consider center running bus lanes--such as provided on International Boulevard and Van Ness Avenue in San Francisco--as more effective than curbside bus lanes. However, this would have to be determined in the course of planning the project. Relative to other rapid transit improvements such as light rail, BRT's advantages include lower upfront capital requirements, a higher degree of flexibility in their application, and a much quicker implementation timeline.³




Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco

² <https://www.transit.dot.gov/research-innovation/bus-rapid-transit>

³ <https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1023&context=jpt>

Figure 1: Characteristics of Bus Rapid Transit



Source: GAO analysis of bus rapid transit research.

4

Population Trends

According to the City of Berkeley’s 2023 Housing Element Update,⁵ the city’s population has grown steadily since 2000, increasing approximately 9% each decade. The Department of Finance estimates that the city’s population was 122,580 in 2020. The Association of Bay Area Governments’ Plan Bay Area 2040 projections anticipate Berkeley’s population to reach about 136,000 by 2030 and 141,000 by 2040.

Pedestrian Collisions

The City of Berkeley’s 2020 Pedestrian Plan⁶ determined that Shattuck and University Avenues represent two of the top five streets with pedestrian collisions between 2008 and 2017, ranked first and fifth, respectively, as well as two of the top four streets with fatal or severe pedestrian collisions in the same time period, ranked first and third (tied) respectively.

⁴ <https://www.gao.gov/blog/2016/04/13/rapid-buses-for-rapid-transit>

⁵ https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Combined_HousingElementFinal_redline.pdf

⁶ <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-01/2020-Pedestrian-Plan.pdf>

AC Transit

In AC Transit's 2019 Annual Report⁷, they reported a systemwide ridership of over 53 million customers, reflecting a 2.5% increase (1.28 million riders) over the previous year. This occurred at a time when major transit providers nationwide reported a ridership decline of 2.8%. Key factors attributed to this growth included proactive efforts to maintain high service levels, adding service frequency, and a robust local economy. That same year, AC Transit released their first Strategic Plan⁸ in about 20 years. In April of 2022, an Addendum⁹ was added to address the effects of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

The pandemic has had an enormous impact on transit operations and economic activity. In 2020, fewer people needed to ride the bus, whether to commute to work or get around the city for personal errands and activities. Schools and colleges closed their campuses and several office workers began working from home. Although there has been a recovery in ridership¹⁰ beginning in 2021, pre-pandemic levels have not been reached. Fiscal Year 2021-2022 saw an annual ridership of almost 29 million customers, which was a 36% increase (7.6 million riders) over the previous fiscal year. Service is at around 85% of pre-pandemic levels, which is the equivalent of deleting one out of every seven trips.

RATIONALE

City of Berkeley Plans

The City of Berkeley's Climate Action Plan,¹¹ adopted in 2009, envisions public transit, walking, cycling, and other sustainable mobility modes as the primary means of transportation for residents and visitors. To do so, it lists various goals, such as increasing the safety, reliability, and frequency of public transit and managing parking effectively to minimize driving demand and encourage and support alternatives to driving. It also addresses the fact that transportation emissions are the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions, a trend that has continued as of the 2019 Greenhouse Gas Inventory.

The Berkeley Strategic Transportation Plan¹², adopted in 2016, envisions the city's streets, sidewalks, and pathways as multimodal, serving people walking, bicycling, riding transit, driving, and moving goods. To do so, it lists various goals, such as encouraging people to walk, bicycle, and ride transit, improving transit efficiency, designing street networks that ensure comfortable, safe environments for users of all abilities, and prioritizing transit services along transit routes.

⁷https://www.actransit.org/sites/default/files/2021-03/0017-20%20Annual%20Report%202019_small_FNL.pdf

⁸<https://www.actransit.org/sites/default/files/2021-03/AC%20Transit%20Strategic%20Plan.pdf>

⁹https://www.actransit.org/sites/default/files/2022-12/0230-22%20Strat%20Plan%20Adden_FNL.pdf

¹⁰<https://www.actransit.org/ridership>

¹¹<https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-01/Berkeley-Climate-Action-Plan.pdf>

¹²<https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/our-work/adopted-plans/berkeley-strategic-transportation-best-plan>

The City of Berkeley's Strategic Plan¹³, adopted in 2018, includes long-term goals such as providing state-of-the-art, well-maintained infrastructure, amenities, and facilities, creating a resilient, safe, connected, and prepared city, and fostering a dynamic, sustainable, and locally-based economy. That same year, the city declared a climate emergency and committed to mobilize to end greenhouse gas emissions swiftly.

The Berkeley Vision Zero Action Plan¹⁴, adopted in 2019, is a strategy to eliminate all traffic fatalities and severe injuries while increasing safe, healthy, and equitable mobility for all. To do so, it lists various goals, such as creating safer transportation options for people who walk, bike, and take transit, which would make these modes more attractive and reduce the number of car trips in Berkeley, which can mean fewer severe and fatal collisions.

AC Transit's Recovery

Supporting AC Transit's recovery enhances the mobility and safety of Berkeley residents while simultaneously improving the walkability and bikeability of the city as well as breathing life into the local economy.

Any successful transportation project that seeks to increase the speed and reliability of AC Transit service in Berkeley will need to serve a longer route than the single relatively short corridor segment within Berkeley. There are several transit corridors within Berkeley connecting to other cities that AC Transit has identified as needing upgraded types of service. It would be important for the city to work with AC Transit to identify the routings which would be the most productive.

Shattuck, University, and Telegraph Avenues

The central location of University Avenue and the variety of communities it connects makes this corridor an incredibly important focus for the city's housing and transportation planning for the coming decades. University Avenue has had a number of housing developments completed recently, with additional developments under construction. With University Avenue likely seeing a growth in new housing development under the forthcoming Housing Element, it is important for Berkeley's transportation infrastructure to keep up with the changing needs of its old and new residents. On top of the expected growth in Berkeley's population and thus its transportation needs, climate change and the urgency of pedestrian and cyclist safety require that the transportation system of the City's future be one that prioritizes public transit and bicycle travel over the use personal automobiles. With this in mind, the 2017 Bicycle Plan recommends a Complete Streets Corridor Study for University Avenue.¹⁵

Furthermore, these three avenues are each unique and each present their own problems when considering the addition of BRT. The application of BRT on the downtown stretch of Shattuck Avenue, which could improve the service of AC Transit's

¹³<https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-01/Berkeley-Strategic-Plan.pdf>

¹⁴<https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-02/Berkeley-Vision-Zero-Action-Plan.pdf>

¹⁵https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-01/Berkeley-Bicycle-Plan-2017_AppendixH_Complete%20Streets%20Corridors.pdf

18 and various other lines which briefly serve Shattuck Avenue at the start and end of their routes, will require careful consideration of the already congested conditions of the street. The construction of elevated platforms on University Avenue as a pilot for BRT while completion of Telegraph Avenue's project is underway and Shattuck Avenue rapid transit is being considered will allow for some near-term service improvements while giving staff the time necessary to study how to bring multimodal improvements to the rest of the corridors as fastidiously as possible.

Breakdown of Recommended Improvements

Dedicated bus lanes improve travel speeds and reliability by reducing delays caused by other traffic. Transit signal priority uses technology to reduce dwell time at traffic signals for transit vehicles, such as extending the duration of green lights or shortening that of red lights. Raised platforms make it easier and more accessible for passengers to board or alight from buses by decreasing the distance between the platform and the vehicle, therefore increasing route efficiency.

ADA Compliance

The recommended improvements also help advance the city's goal of increasing mobility access for transit riders and cyclists with disabilities. ADA Accessibility Standards for transportation facilities are issued by the US Department of Transportation and include guidance for bus boarding and alighting areas, shelters, signs, and more.¹⁶

Impact to Local Businesses and Economy

In addition to advancing various climate and public safety goals of the city, investing in bus and bicycle infrastructure benefits local businesses and the economy. The League of American Bicyclists's report entitled "Bicycling Benefits Business"¹⁷ illustrates that the bicycle industry and its related transportation, tourism, and health benefits spur job creation, economic activity, and cost savings. The Outdoor Industry Association reported that outdoor recreation consumers spend \$887 billion annually and create 7.6 million jobs.¹⁸

The National Institute for Transportation and Communities published a peer-reviewed study examining BRT lines and found that the areas within a half-mile of BRT corridors increased their share of new office space by one third from 2000-2007, and new multifamily apartment construction doubled in those half-mile areas since 2008.¹⁹ PolicyLink released a report entitled "Business Impact Mitigations for Transit Projects"²⁰ that address BRT projects, concluding that best practices include providing the right

¹⁶<https://federalist-e3fba26d-2806-4f02-bf0e-89c97cfba93c.app.cloud.gov/preview/atbcb/usab-uswds/ada-alternative/ada/#ada-810>

¹⁷<https://bikeleague.org/sites/default/files/Bicycling%20Benefits%20Business.pdf>

¹⁸<https://outdoorindustry.org/resource/2017-outdoor-recreation-economy-report/>

¹⁹<https://t4america.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/NATIONAL-STUDY-OF-BRT-DEVELOPMENT-OUTCOMES-11-30-15.pdf>

²⁰https://www.policylink.org/sites/default/files/FINAL%20PolicyLink%20Business%20Impact%20Mitigation%20Strategies_0.pdf

type of financial and technical assistance and proactive outreach to businesses built on constant communication, flexibility, and trust.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

The City estimates that transportation-related emissions accounts for approximately 60% of our community's total annual greenhouse gas emissions.²¹ By encouraging alternatives to car transportation by making public transportation options quicker and more appealing, policy stands to lower the emissions from our community's dominant source of carbon emissions.

The goal of any new public transportation initiative must be to increase the local mode share of residents choosing public transportation over personal automobiles for commuting and other trips.. BRT offers many advantages for this pursuit. The U.S. Government Accountability Office reviewed implemented BRT projects in 2012 and found that "13 of the 15 project sponsors...reported increases in ridership after 1 year of service and reduced average travel times of 10 to 35 percent over previous bus services."²² Paired with the multimodal project along Telegraph Avenue, Berkeley has the potential for a large increase in transit ridership and thus a decline in greenhouse gas emissions if the City follows through on BRT in the coming years.

FISCAL IMPACTS

Staff costs. An estimated \$300,000 for the staff costs of engaging a consultant for the Multimodal Corridor Project. An estimated \$30,000 for two elevated platforms, or "bus bulbs", at an estimated cost of \$15,000 per platform.²³

CONTACT

Councilmember Terry Taplin, District 2, (510) 981-7120, TTaplin@cityofberkeley.info

ATTACHMENTS

1. AC Transit Multimodal Corridor Guidelines

²¹https://www.cityofberkeley.info/Clerk/City_Council/2018/12_Dec/Documents/2018-12-06_WS_Item_01_Climate_Action_Plan_Update_pdf.aspx

²² <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-12-811>

²³<https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2020%20Pedestrian%20Plan%20Appendix%20E%20%28adoped%29.pdf>



CONSENT CALENDAR
March 2, 2023

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: Councilmember Terry Taplin (Author)

Subject: 51 Bus Rapid Transit

RECOMMENDATION

- 1) Refer to the City Manager the development of an implementation and community engagement plan to install Bus Rapid Transit, including dedicated bus lanes, transit signal priority, elevated platforms, and enhanced sections, on the AC Transit 51B route along University Avenue from Sixth Street to Shattuck Avenue and along Shattuck Avenue from University Avenue to Durant Avenue, with engagement centering pedestrian, cyclist, transit and mobility justice advocates, the disability rights community, local faith communities, merchants, neighboring residential communities inclusive of tenants, seniors, and students, and historically marginalized communities.
- 2) Refer \$300,000 to the Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Budget Process to conduct a Complete Street Corridor Study antecedent to the installation of a cycle track along University Avenue from 6th Street to Oxford Street, consistent with the City of Berkeley's 2017 Bicycle Plan and integrating pedestrian amenities consistent with the City of Berkeley's 2020 Pedestrian Plan. As per the Bicycle Plan, the study will be evaluated in the context of the modal priorities established by the City of Berkeley General Plan's 2001 Transportation Element and the Alameda County Transportation Commission's (ACTC) 2016 Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan.
- 3) Refer \$300,000 to the Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Budget Process to conduct a Complete Street Corridor Study antecedent to the installation of a cycle track along Oxford Street from Virginia Street to Durant Avenue consistent with the Bicycle Plan and integrating pedestrian amenities consistent with the Pedestrian Plan. As per the Bicycle Plan, the study will be evaluated in the context of the modal priorities established by the Transportation Element and ACTC's Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan. It will be coordinated with proposed improvements to transit performance on this Primary Transit Route, such as bus boarding islands, transit-only lanes, transit signal priority/queue jump lanes, far-side bus stop relocations, and other improvements as described in AC Transit's

2016 Major Corridor Study.

- 4) Refer \$X to the Fiscal Year XX-XX Budget Process to install quick-build bus station improvements along the AC Transit 51B route.
- 5) Initiate consultation with AC Transit and UC Berkeley Bear Transit as soon as possible on the planning, scoping, and implementation of these items.

BACKGROUND

Existing Transit Lanes

Currently, Berkeley has a transit lane on Bancroft Way between Telegraph and Downtown that is used by westbound buses, and a transit lane is planned for Durant Ave for eastbound buses. Bus lines using these lanes continue on to Shattuck, University, and Telegraph.

Shattuck, University, and Telegraph Avenues

Berkeley's University Avenue runs West to East from the Berkeley Marina and I-80 Freeway to its termination at UC Berkeley's Crescent Lawn. University Avenue is dubbed the "Gateway to Berkeley" due to the location of the city's lone Amtrak Station at the intersection of Fourth Street, the avenue's proximity to both the North Berkeley and Downtown Berkeley BART stations, the regularly congested I-80 exit onto the avenue, and the service of AC Transit's 51B, 52, 79, 88, 802, and FS lines. University Avenue is a wide street with two travel lanes in each direction, parking lanes, turn pockets, and a center median.

Berkeley's Shattuck Avenue runs North to South from Indian Rock Park in the Berkeley Hills to 45th Street in Oakland near the intersection of Telegraph Avenue. Shattuck Avenue serves as the main street of Berkeley, running through its Downtown, which is home to the Downtown Berkeley BART Station, AC Transit and Bear Transit stations, and various restaurants and office spaces.

Telegraph Avenue, from Woolsey Street on the Oakland border up through Dwight Way near UC Berkeley, is in the midst of its own Multimodal Corridor Project¹ that may result in BRT infrastructure in the coming years. Should this project be completed or significantly underway at the time of the development of BRT plans for Shattuck and University Avenues, close attention should be paid to its initial impacts, successes, and failures so that future applications of BRT infrastructure build on these lessons.

Bus Rapid Transit

While diverse in their application around the world, Bus Rapid Transit is typically a transportation corridor that prioritizes fast and efficient bus service that may include dedicated bus lanes, traffic signal priority, elevated platforms, and off-board fare

¹<https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/our-work/capital-projects/telegraph-avenue-multimodal-corridor-project#:~:text=The%20Telegraph%20Avenue%20Multimodal%20Corridor,bike%20lanes%2C%20and%20transit%20improvements.>

collection.² There is no one-size-fits-all approach to BRT and a University Avenue BRT is sure to look different than it might on Telegraph Avenue or International Boulevard in Oakland. However, pursuit of a quicker and more efficient bus corridor along University Avenue should result in dedicated bus lanes and elevated platforms at existing AC Transit stops. Most transit planners consider center running bus lanes--such as provided on International Boulevard and Van Ness Avenue in San Francisco--as more effective than curbside bus lanes. However, this would have to be determined in the course of planning the project. Relative to other rapid transit improvements such as light rail, BRT's advantages include lower upfront capital requirements, a higher degree of flexibility in their application, and a much quicker implementation timeline.³




Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco

² <https://www.transit.dot.gov/research-innovation/bus-rapid-transit>

³ <https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1023&context=jpt>

Figure 1: Characteristics of Bus Rapid Transit



Source: GAO analysis of bus rapid transit research.

4

Population Trends

According to the City of Berkeley’s 2023 Housing Element Update,⁵ the city’s population has grown steadily since 2000, increasing approximately 9% each decade. The Department of Finance estimates that the city’s population was 122,580 in 2020. The Association of Bay Area Governments’ Plan Bay Area 2040 projections anticipate Berkeley’s population to reach about 136,000 by 2030 and 141,000 by 2040.

Pedestrian Collisions

The City of Berkeley’s 2020 Pedestrian Plan⁶ determined that Shattuck and University Avenues represent two of the top five streets with pedestrian collisions between 2008 and 2017, ranked first and fifth, respectively, as well as two of the top four streets with fatal or severe pedestrian collisions in the same time period, ranked first and third (tied) respectively.

⁴ <https://www.gao.gov/blog/2016/04/13/rapid-buses-for-rapid-transit>

⁵ https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Combined_HousingElementFinal_redline.pdf

⁶ <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-01/2020-Pedestrian-Plan.pdf>

AC Transit

In AC Transit's 2019 Annual Report⁷, they reported a systemwide ridership of over 53 million customers, reflecting a 2.5% increase (1.28 million riders) over the previous year. This occurred at a time when major transit providers nationwide reported a ridership decline of 2.8%. Key factors attributed to this growth included proactive efforts to maintain high service levels, adding service frequency, and a robust local economy. That same year, AC Transit released their first Strategic Plan⁸ in about 20 years. In April of 2022, an Addendum⁹ was added to address the effects of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

The pandemic has had an enormous impact on transit operations and economic activity. In 2020, fewer people needed to ride the bus, whether to commute to work or get around the city for personal errands and activities. Schools and colleges closed their campuses and several office workers began working from home. Although there has been a recovery in ridership¹⁰ beginning in 2021, pre-pandemic levels have not been reached. Fiscal Year 2021-2022 saw an annual ridership of almost 29 million customers, which was a 36% increase (7.6 million riders) over the previous fiscal year. Service is at around 85% of pre-pandemic levels, which is the equivalent of deleting one out of every seven trips.

RATIONALE

City of Berkeley Plans

The City of Berkeley's Climate Action Plan,¹¹ adopted in 2009, envisions public transit, walking, cycling, and other sustainable mobility modes as the primary means of transportation for residents and visitors. To do so, it lists various goals, such as increasing the safety, reliability, and frequency of public transit and managing parking effectively to minimize driving demand and encourage and support alternatives to driving. It also addresses the fact that transportation emissions are the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions, a trend that has continued as of the 2019 Greenhouse Gas Inventory.

The Berkeley Strategic Transportation Plan¹², adopted in 2016, envisions the city's streets, sidewalks, and pathways as multimodal, serving people walking, bicycling, riding transit, driving, and moving goods. To do so, it lists various goals, such as encouraging people to walk, bicycle, and ride transit, improving transit efficiency, designing street networks that ensure comfortable, safe environments for users of all abilities, and prioritizing transit services along transit routes.

⁷https://www.actransit.org/sites/default/files/2021-03/0017-20%20Annual%20Report%202019_small_FNL.pdf

⁸<https://www.actransit.org/sites/default/files/2021-03/AC%20Transit%20Strategic%20Plan.pdf>

⁹https://www.actransit.org/sites/default/files/2022-12/0230-22%20Strat%20Plan%20Adden_FNL.pdf

¹⁰<https://www.actransit.org/ridership>

¹¹<https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-01/Berkeley-Climate-Action-Plan.pdf>

¹²<https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/our-work/adopted-plans/berkeley-strategic-transportation-best-plan>

The City of Berkeley's Strategic Plan¹³, adopted in 2018, includes long-term goals such as providing state-of-the-art, well-maintained infrastructure, amenities, and facilities, creating a resilient, safe, connected, and prepared city, and fostering a dynamic, sustainable, and locally-based economy. That same year, the city declared a climate emergency and committed to mobilize to end greenhouse gas emissions swiftly.

The Berkeley Vision Zero Action Plan¹⁴, adopted in 2019, is a strategy to eliminate all traffic fatalities and severe injuries while increasing safe, healthy, and equitable mobility for all. To do so, it lists various goals, such as creating safer transportation options for people who walk, bike, and take transit, which would make these modes more attractive and reduce the number of car trips in Berkeley, which can mean fewer severe and fatal collisions.

AC Transit's Recovery

Supporting AC Transit's recovery enhances the mobility and safety of Berkeley residents while simultaneously improving the walkability and bikeability of the city as well as breathing life into the local economy.

Any successful transportation project that seeks to increase the speed and reliability of AC Transit service in Berkeley will need to serve a longer route than the single relatively short corridor segment within Berkeley. There are several transit corridors within Berkeley connecting to other cities that AC Transit has identified as needing upgraded types of service. It would be important for the city to work with AC Transit to identify the routings which would be the most productive.

Shattuck, University, and Telegraph Avenues

The central location of University Avenue and the variety of communities it connects makes this corridor an incredibly important focus for the city's housing and transportation planning for the coming decades. University Avenue has had a number of housing developments completed recently, with additional developments under construction. With University Avenue likely seeing a growth in new housing development under the forthcoming Housing Element, it is important for Berkeley's transportation infrastructure to keep up with the changing needs of its old and new residents. On top of the expected growth in Berkeley's population and thus its transportation needs, climate change and the urgency of pedestrian and cyclist safety require that the transportation system of the City's future be one that prioritizes public transit and bicycle travel over the use personal automobiles. With this in mind, the 2017 Bicycle Plan recommends a Complete Streets Corridor Study for University Avenue.¹⁵

Furthermore, these three avenues are each unique and each present their own problems when considering the addition of BRT. The application of BRT on the downtown stretch of Shattuck Avenue, which could improve the service of AC Transit's

¹³<https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-01/Berkeley-Strategic-Plan.pdf>

¹⁴<https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-02/Berkeley-Vision-Zero-Action-Plan.pdf>

¹⁵https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-01/Berkeley-Bicycle-Plan-2017_AppendixH_Complete%20Streets%20Corridors.pdf

18 and various other lines which briefly serve Shattuck Avenue at the start and end of their routes, will require careful consideration of the already congested conditions of the street. The construction of elevated platforms on University Avenue as a pilot for BRT while completion of Telegraph Avenue's project is underway and Shattuck Avenue rapid transit is being considered will allow for some near-term service improvements while giving staff the time necessary to study how to bring multimodal improvements to the rest of the corridors as fastidiously as possible.

Breakdown of Recommended Improvements

Dedicated bus lanes improve travel speeds and reliability by reducing delays caused by other traffic. Transit signal priority uses technology to reduce dwell time at traffic signals for transit vehicles, such as extending the duration of green lights or shortening that of red lights. Raised platforms make it easier and more accessible for passengers to board or alight from buses by decreasing the distance between the platform and the vehicle, therefore increasing route efficiency.

ADA Compliance

The recommended improvements also help advance the city's goal of increasing mobility access for transit riders and cyclists with disabilities. ADA Accessibility Standards for transportation facilities are issued by the US Department of Transportation and include guidance for bus boarding and alighting areas, shelters, signs, and more.¹⁶

Impact to Local Businesses and Economy

In addition to advancing various climate and public safety goals of the city, investing in bus and bicycle infrastructure benefits local businesses and the economy. The League of American Bicyclists's report entitled "Bicycling Benefits Business"¹⁷ illustrates that the bicycle industry and its related transportation, tourism, and health benefits spur job creation, economic activity, and cost savings. The Outdoor Industry Association reported that outdoor recreation consumers spend \$887 billion annually and create 7.6 million jobs.¹⁸

The National Institute for Transportation and Communities published a peer-reviewed study examining BRT lines and found that the areas within a half-mile of BRT corridors increased their share of new office space by one third from 2000-2007, and new multifamily apartment construction doubled in those half-mile areas since 2008.¹⁹ PolicyLink released a report entitled "Business Impact Mitigations for Transit Projects"²⁰ that address BRT projects, concluding that best practices include providing the right

¹⁶<https://federalist-e3fba26d-2806-4f02-bf0e-89c97cfba93c.app.cloud.gov/preview/atbcb/usab-uswds/ada-alternative/ada/#ada-810>

¹⁷<https://bikeleague.org/sites/default/files/Bicycling%20Benefits%20Business.pdf>

¹⁸<https://outdoorindustry.org/resource/2017-outdoor-recreation-economy-report/>

¹⁹<https://t4america.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/NATIONAL-STUDY-OF-BRT-DEVELOPMENT-OUTCOMES-11-30-15.pdf>

²⁰https://www.policylink.org/sites/default/files/FINAL%20PolicyLink%20Business%20Impact%20Mitigation%20Strategies_0.pdf

type of financial and technical assistance and proactive outreach to businesses built on constant communication, flexibility, and trust.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

The City estimates that transportation-related emissions accounts for approximately 60% of our community's total annual greenhouse gas emissions.²¹ By encouraging alternatives to car transportation by making public transportation options quicker and more appealing, policy stands to lower the emissions from our community's dominant source of carbon emissions.

The goal of any new public transportation initiative must be to increase the local mode share of residents choosing public transportation over personal automobiles for commuting and other trips.. BRT offers many advantages for this pursuit. The U.S. Government Accountability Office reviewed implemented BRT projects in 2012 and found that "13 of the 15 project sponsors...reported increases in ridership after 1 year of service and reduced average travel times of 10 to 35 percent over previous bus services."²² Paired with the multimodal project along Telegraph Avenue, Berkeley has the potential for a large increase in transit ridership and thus a decline in greenhouse gas emissions if the City follows through on BRT in the coming years.

FISCAL IMPACTS

Staff costs. An estimated \$300,000 for the staff costs of engaging a consultant for the Multimodal Corridor Project. An estimated \$30,000 for two elevated platforms, or "bus bulbs", at an estimated cost of \$15,000 per platform.²³

CONTACT

Councilmember Terry Taplin, District 2, (510) 981-7120, TTaplin@cityofberkeley.info

ATTACHMENTS

1. AC Transit Multimodal Corridor Guidelines


²¹https://www.cityofberkeley.info/Clerk/City_Council/2018/12_Dec/Documents/2018-12-06_WS_Item_01_Climate_Action_Plan_Update_pdf.aspx

²² <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-12-811>

²³<https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2020%20Pedestrian%20Plan%20Appendix%20E%20%28adoped%29.pdf>



Multimodal Corridor Guidelines



Acknowledgments

Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District

John Urgo

Stephen Newhouse



Toole Design Group

Jesse Boudart, P.E.

Pete Robie

John Dempsey, PLA

Ashley Haire, Ph.D, P.E.



Stantec

Michael Ohnemus, AICP



Additional Experts

Sean Co

Table of Contents

| | | | |
|--|----------|---|-----------|
| 1.0 Guide Overview | 1 | E. Bus Stop Dimensions..... | 14 |
| 1.1 Goals of the Guide..... | 2 | F. Door Locations and ADA Access..... | 16 |
| A. Purpose..... | 2 | G. Bus Stop Pads..... | 18 |
| B. Project Background..... | 3 | H. Curbs..... | 18 |
| 1.2 Guide Outline..... | 4 | I. Service Type and Service Level..... | 18 |
| 2.0 General Design Elements | 6 | 3.0 Typology Design Considerations | 20 |
| 2.1 Existing Guidelines..... | 7 | 3.1 General Guidance for Context Zones..... | 21 |
| 2.2 Bus Stop Design..... | 9 | 3.2 Design Elements..... | 22 |
| A. Bus Stop Spacing..... | 9 | 4.0 Typology Design Considerations | 26 |
| B. Bus Stop Siting..... | 10 | 4.1 Typology 1..... | 27 |
| C. Spatial Location of Bus Stop..... | 12 | A. Typology 1: Section View..... | 27 |
| D. Bus Stop Design..... | 13 | B. Typology 1: Plan View..... | 29 |

Table of Contents

| | | | |
|--|----|--|-----------|
| C. Typology 1: Perspective View..... | 30 | B. Typology 4: Plan View..... | 41 |
| 4.2 Typology 2..... | 31 | C. Typology 4: Perspective View..... | 42 |
| A. Stop Placement and Bike Facility Alignment..... | 31 | 4.5 Typology 5..... | 44 |
| B. Typology 2: Section View..... | 31 | A. Typology 5: Section View..... | 44 |
| C. Typology 2: Plan View..... | 34 | B. Typology 5: Plan View..... | 46 |
| D. Typology 2: Perspective View..... | 35 | C. Typology 5: Perspective View..... | 47 |
| 4.3 Typology 3..... | 36 | 5.0 Typology Selection..... | 48 |
| A. Typology 3: Section View..... | 36 | 5.1 Typology Selection Guidance..... | 49 |
| B. Typology 3: Plan View..... | 38 | 6.0 Maintenance Considerations..... | 51 |
| C. Typology 3: Perspective View..... | 39 | 7.0 Reference Endnotes..... | 53 |
| 4.4 Typology 4..... | 40 | | |
| A. Typology 4: Section View..... | 40 | | |

1.0 Guide Overview



Minneapolis, MN

Introduction

The AC Transit Multimodal Corridor Guidelines was developed to provide clear design standards for a range of typical roadway conditions to help ensure efficient transit operations, accommodate the needs of bicyclists, and facilitate safe access to and from bus stops for AC Transit passengers. This document offers guidance on design elements of bus stops adjacent to bicycle infrastructure. It is organized around five different typologies that vary based on the type of bicycle facility being considered and its location with respect to the curb, parking lane, and moving traffic. Ultimately, this guide will help create a more predictable, safe, and uniform experience for bus patrons, drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians as they travel through the jurisdictions that comprise the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District.

1.1 Goals of the Guide

A. Purpose

This guide has been developed to support the planning and design of bicycle facilities that will complement AC Transit's bus operations. AC Transit has set a goal to improve travel times and reliability on routes throughout its service area, especially on high-ridership corridors. The agency also seeks to promote safe pedestrian environments around its bus stops. This guide will help to establish a basis for collaboration on multimodal corridor projects with local jurisdiction staff and other stakeholders within the AC Transit service area. The guide draws from local, state, and national best practices guidance for multimodal corridor facilities while allowing for design flexibility to provide context-sensitive solutions.

The guide will address the following:

- **Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements for bus stop access, bus boarding, and sidewalk clearance outlined in the Designing with Transit handbook**
- **Spacing needs at bus stops for buses entering/exiting and clearance from crosswalks outlined in the Designing with Transit handbook**
- **Complementary designs for transit and bicycle facilities to ensure projects are integrated from the outset**
- **AC Transit's preference for in-lane bus stops and far-side bus stops in most scenarios**
- **Corridor typologies that reflect the various types of places present in the AC Transit service area**
- **Best practices for transit operations and accommodations for transit customers and bicyclists in existing designs and for innovative facilities such as separated bike lanes**
- **Methods to reduce conflicts among bicyclists, buses, and pedestrians to ensure safety while maintaining efficient operations**



- **Guidance for designing bicycle facilities to increase bicyclist comfort and encourage more people of all ages and abilities to ride bicycles**

The guide serves as AC Transit's official resource for planning and designing bus stops when accommodating bicycle facilities in transit corridors. The guide is intended to provide additional design guidance that supports existing planning and policy guidance published by the District. Therefore, this document should be used in conjunction with the Designing with Transit handbook and other approved policies or guidelines.

AC Transit hopes that this guide will serve as both an internal and external resource for local jurisdiction staff and developers when planning multimodal facilities and Complete Streets projects in the AC Transit service area. Complete Streets are generally defined as roadways built to enable safe travel for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and motorists. AC Transit will prioritize project support for projects that incorporate these design elements. These guidelines are a mechanism for AC Transit to clarify its roadway and curbside needs to stakeholders with the goal of streamlining the process of designing streets that support all modes.

B. Project Background

Multimodal corridors are major transportation facilities which accommodate auto, bus, bicycle and pedestrian travel. These corridors provide for travel across town and connect with the regional transportation system. Many cities and agencies in AC Transit's service area are expanding the reach of their multimodal corridors by designing and building innovative bicycle facilities along roadways. Many of these new bicycle facilities are built as Complete Streets projects which seek to enhance alternative modes of transportation, including bicycling, transit, and walking.

For cyclists, these new facilities can reduce the stress of riding a bicycle by providing physical separation from moving vehicles. However, there is an opportunity for Complete Streets designs to better address traditional bus transit operations. In the highly-constrained rights-of-way in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, facilities such as separated bikeways, parking-protected bike lanes, or conventional bike lanes require reallocation of roadway space. This reallocation can be achieved by relocating or eliminating on-street parking and/or narrowing, realigning, or eliminating traffic lanes. In some cases, these changes have shifted the



Berkeley, CA

travel lanes used by buses further from the curbside where bus stops are commonly located, creating challenging and time-consuming maneuvers for bus operators to pull in and out of traffic. Furthermore, the roadway configuration can induce buses to move in and out of bicyclists' path of travel, which affects both bicyclist safety and bus operations (often referred to as a "leap-frogging" effect). With rates of bicycling increasing and jurisdictions rapidly constructing bicycle infrastructure, minimizing conflicts between bicycle and bus operations is critical to the success of these bikeway facilities. Efficiently managing and reallocating roadway space for these specific users will benefit all people using the streets.

Among many considerations, a multimodal corridor should include bicycle facilities that do not impinge on overall bus travel speeds, on-time performance, or safety. Bus stop designs can separate bicyclists from buses by routing bicyclists behind bus stops to avoid bus-bicyclist conflicts. Also, restricting motor vehicle turning movements, a component of some bicycle facility designs, can reduce delay to buses by minimizing motor vehicle conflicts and queues. Bicycle facility projects may also restrict on-street parking in select locations or along entire blocks, which could reduce the likelihood of cars encroaching into bus stops.

AC Transit recognizes that healthy communities require safe pedestrian and bicycle facilities and effective bus services, often in the same corridors. The Bay Area needs regionally-focused guidance that reflects current best practices in reducing conflicts at bus stops and along corridors, promoting pedestrian and bicyclist safety in coordination with bus operations, maintaining or improving transit operations, providing travel time predictability, and recognizing the local context where bicyclists and buses share roadway space. AC Transit's Multimodal Corridor Guidelines addresses this gap in guidance in multimodal corridor design by offering templates for bicycle facilities that are compatible with high-quality bus transit service.


1.2 Guide Outline

The Multimodal Corridor Guidelines document is not a regulatory document. While much of the design guidance presented here represents best practices as published and endorsed by State and national agencies, the practices do not necessarily represent the adopted standards of these agencies. Therefore, users of these Guidelines should also consult regulatory standards such as the Caltrans *Highway Design Manual*¹ (for State facilities), the California *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices*² (for State and local facilities), and any adopted local street design standards, to identify where design exceptions may apply.


The guide begins with a discussion of general bus stop design elements related to stop spacing, location, design, and dimensions. A list of existing guidelines that may be referenced in conjunction with the Multimodal Corridor Guidelines is also presented.

Next, the guide presents five different bus stop typologies. These typologies vary based on the type of existing or proposed bicycle facility being located at the bus stop with respect to the curb, parking lane, and moving traffic. These bus stop typologies represent common contexts in the AC Transit service area. The five bus stop typologies are:


Typology 1 Class II Bicycle Facility between the Curb and a General Traffic Lane




Typology 2 Class II Bicycle Facility between Curbside Parking Lane and General Traffic Lane




Typology 3
Class IV Bicycle Facility (Separated Bikeway) between the Curb and a General Traffic Lane



Typology 5
Class IV Bicycle Facility (Two-way Separated Bikeway) between the Curb and a Parking Lane



Typology 4
Class IV Bicycle Facility (Separated Bikeway) between the Curb and a Parking Lane



The guide concludes with a discussion on selecting the appropriate bus stop typology. Five guiding principles are presented to help jurisdictions understand the factors that should influence bus stop design and the relationships between these factors.

2.0 General Design Elements



Plainville, CT

The Guide supplements existing engineering practices and requirements to meet the goals of Complete Streets policies in the jurisdictions served by AC Transit. Design guidelines, standards, and other policies on Complete Streets, transit stops, and bikeways, have been published by local and national entities. In implementing the Guidelines, local agencies should consider any supporting documentation required to address existing local and State design standards. Ultimately, local agencies must evaluate, approve, and document design decisions.

Existing conditions in urban environments can be complex; design treatments must be tailored to the conditions present in individual contexts. Good engineering judgment based on comprehensive knowledge of multimodal transportation design, with special consideration to bicyclists, should be part of any multimodal design. Decisions should be thoroughly documented.

The following section (2.1) provides a summary of existing design guidelines that can be referenced when making planning and design decisions about local streets and roads. These resources provide a much wider breadth of information on designing Complete Streets, which fall outside the localized scope of this guidebook. Section 2.2 summarizes key elements of bus stop design, as they relate to the five bus stop typologies presented in this Guide.

2.1 Existing Guidelines

The following design guidelines, prepared by national and local bodies, are a selection of resources which closely relate to the Guide. These resources may be referenced in conjunction with the Guide when making planning and design decisions related to Complete Streets, bikeways, and transit.

AC Transit *Bus Stop Policy*


The AC Transit *Bus Stop Policy*³ outlines the District's standards for bus stop spacing, bus stop location, bus stop enforcement, and bus stop installation or removal. Some of these policies are reiterated in the Guide.

AC Transit *Designing with Transit*

The *Designing with Transit*⁴ handbook supports planning that is centered on transit access. The handbook is also intended to encourage multimodal transportation planning: planning and engineering which supports transit, walking, and bicycling, not just automobiles. The handbook is particularly focused on the often-overlooked needs and potential of bus transit, the most widely-used mode of transit. It outlines AC Transit's analysis of how the East Bay can be rebuilt in a more transit-friendly manner and aims to provide practical guidance about how these can be achieved through land use planning, development of pedestrian facilities, and traffic engineering.

DESIGNING WITH TRANSIT

Making Transit Integral to East Bay Communities



Alameda CTC *Central County Complete Streets Design Guidelines*

The Alameda *Central County Complete Streets Design Guidelines*⁵ document helps ensure that Central Alameda County street designs consider the full range of users on every street and accommodate all users wherever possible. While the goal of these design guidelines is to help staff from the three Central Alameda County jurisdictions (San Leandro, Hayward, and Alameda County) clearly understand how to implement Complete Streets for each street type, for different modal priorities, and for varying contexts, the design guidance provided can be applied by jurisdictions throughout Alameda and Contra Costa counties. The *Central County Complete Streets Design Guidelines* build on the street typology developed as part of the Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) Multimodal Arterial Plan (MAP).



Caltrans *Highway Design Manual*

Caltrans encourages local agencies to develop designs that help ensure the needs of non-motorized users in all products and project development activities, including programming, planning, construction, maintenance, and operations.

Design guidance for bikeway projects is provided in Chapters 100, 200, 300, and 1000 of the Caltrans *Highway Design Manual*. Alternatives to bikeway design guidance must meet the criteria outlined in Section 891 of the California Streets and Highways Code.

Projects within State right-of-way must refer to Caltrans standards and guidance, including but not limited to:

- **Caltrans *Highway Design Manual***
- **Design Information Bulletin, Separated Bikeways**
- **Design Information Bulletin, Caltrans ADA standards**

AASHTO *Guide for Development of Bicycle Facilities*

The AASHTO *Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities*⁶ is the primary national reference for the planning and design of on-street bikeways and shared use paths. This guide represents AASHTO policy on bikeway planning and design, and addresses network planning principles, dimensions and treatments for bikeway design, and transitions between on-street bikeways and shared use paths. State DOTs and local jurisdictions often refer to this document when planning and designing bicycle facilities.

NACTO *Urban Street Design Guide*

A blueprint for designing 21st century streets, the NACTO *Urban Street Design Guide*⁷ provides a toolbox and tactics for cities to use to make streets safer, more livable, and more economically vibrant. The guide outlines both a clear vision for Complete Streets and a basic road map for how to bring them to fruition. The guide focuses on the design of city streets and public spaces, emphasizing city street design as a unique practice with its own set of design goals, parameters, and tools.

NACTO *Transit Street Design Guide*

The NACTO *Transit Street Design Guide*⁸ provides design guidance for the development of transit facilities on city streets, and for the design and engineering of city streets to prioritize transit, improve transit service quality, and support other goals related to transit. The guide sets a new vision for how cities can harness the immense potential of transit to create active and efficient streets in neighborhoods and downtowns alike.



NACTO *Urban Bikeway Design Guide*

The purpose of the NACTO *Urban Bikeway Design Guide*⁹ is to provide cities with state-of-the-practice solutions that can help create Complete Streets that are safe and comfortable for bicyclists. The *Urban Bikeway Design Guide* addresses treatments not directly referenced in the AASHTO *Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities*, although they are virtually all (with two exceptions) permitted under the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD)*¹⁰. The Federal Highway Administration has posted information regarding MUTCD approval status of all the bicycle-related treatments in this guide.

2.2 Bus Stop Design

It is AC Transit’s policy to encourage counties, cities, and developers to coordinate with AC Transit when locating bus stops on roadways. However, AC Transit does not own or maintain the bus stop areas, and the local jurisdiction can make the ultimate decision to site the bus stop.

When properly located, adequately designed, and effectively enforced, bus stops can improve service without disrupting general traffic flow. Decisions regarding bus stop spacing and location call for a careful analysis of passenger service requirements (demand, convenience, and safety), the type of bus service provided (local, rapid, Transbay/express, or flexible service/community circulator), and the interaction of stopped buses with general traffic flow. The following sections summarize general bus stop design elements.

A. Bus Stop Spacing

Bus stops are designated locations for bus passengers to board and alight. Therefore, bus stops must be conveniently located to enable easy passenger access. Convenience and speed must be balanced in determining appropriate bus stop placement, as too many bus stops can slow down travel times. Outside of downtown areas, the ideal spacing of bus stops is 1,000 feet apart. This target has been established with the goal of increasing travel speed for AC Transit buses, and means that some existing stops may be eliminated. Passenger usage of bus stops is an important factor when considering bus stop placement or removal.

Bus stops should be close enough that passengers can walk to them easily, but far enough apart to help buses move quickly. Table 1 provides general guidelines for bus stop spacing. Some discretion may be applied when balancing AC Transit’s interest in improving service and preserving traffic flow with consideration of passenger needs.

| Service Type | Spacing (feet) | Explanation |
|----------------------------------|------------------|---|
| Local (trunk, feeder, etc.) | 800-1,300 feet | Stops may be located more closely than listed based on trip attractors, stop activity or demand, transfer points or other land uses that may warrant it. |
| Rapid | 1,700-5,000 feet | Stops may be located more closely than listed based on trip attractors, stop activity or demand, transfer points or other land uses that may warrant it provided that the increased stops do not cause operational delays |
| Transbay/ Express | 1,000-2,600 feet | Service may use local stops as necessary to provide geographic coverage and to minimize delay for longer-distance passengers. |
| Flexible or Community Circulator | TBD | Stops would be determined on a route by route basis and would consider trip attractors, transfer areas or other factors. |

Table 1: AC Transit Bus Stop Spacing Guidelines (AC Transit Policy No. 508)

Table 1 lists AC Transit’s intended bus stop spacing for the four different Service Types. It is AC Transit’s preference to use the maximum bus stop spacing unless superseded by other determining factors such as topography (hills), limited access areas (freeways, bridges, airports), surrounding attractors, and transfer points. As a result, existing AC Transit routes may have stops that do not conform to the spacing criteria in this policy.

B. Bus Stop Siting

The optimal stop location should improve or minimize impact to bus travel times, maximize reliability and route efficiency, and be safe and accessible, while maintaining or enhancing bus passenger access to destinations and amenities. The siting of a bus stop not only impacts transit passengers, but also motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists near the stop.

Multiple factors are used to determine the appropriate siting of a bus stop including:

Demographics and Land Use

Ridership – Assess both existing and projected boardings and alightings, as well as the ridership profile (for example, a large proportion of seniors or students) at the stop. Low-ridership stops, particularly those near higher-ridership stops, may be considered for consolidation or removal. The threshold for a low-ridership stop will be determined by comparing its ridership to that at other stops along the route, or by comparing with a similar bus route, while also considering the frequency of service provided at the stop.

Existing and Future Land Uses – Note sensitive land uses, including medical facilities, municipal buildings, senior housing, and major transit trip generators such as shopping malls, schools, and dense commercial or residential complexes. Stop locations may be adjusted or added to provide better access to passenger origins and destinations, although this determination will also be dependent on pedestrian connections and conditions.



Seattle, WA

Existing Service and Passenger Amenities

Bus Route Connections – Consideration should be given to maintaining and/or improving bus stops serving parallel or intersecting bus routes. Under certain circumstances, the relocation of an existing bus stop may be necessary, and doing so may increase the access distance for passengers transferring between intersecting routes. Priority should be given to relocating the stop in close proximity of its former location, thereby minimizing the additional distance a transferring passenger would have to walk between stops.

Passenger Amenities – Evaluate opportunities to add amenities to new or existing stops and maintain or upgrade amenities at existing stops. Many bus stop amenities are justified by high ridership and a desire to improve passenger comfort. Implementation of amenities such as lighting or real-time arrival displays may require a nearby power source or solar panels.

Pedestrian Environment

Connections and Condition – Sidewalks immediately at the stop and those providing access to the stop and surrounding area are an important consideration. When choosing a site to establish or relocate a stop, choose the widest, most level sidewalk near the desired location. Stops should also be located to maximize ridership. A designer will need to balance the demands of pedestrian connections and bus ridership.

Crossings – Where bus stops are located near pedestrian crossings, the crossing should be marked and preferably located behind the stop, so that passengers are encouraged to cross behind the bus. Ideally, crossings should be signalized, especially in high-traffic and high-speed environments. Intersections and at-grade driveway crossings should have ADA-compliant curb ramps.

Safety and Bus Stop Visibility

Lighting – Lighting should be provided at stops for the safety and security of bus patrons. Bus stop lighting simultaneously offers bus operators better visibility of waiting passengers. Lighting can be cast by pedestrian-scale light fixtures, lighted shelters, overhead street lights, or brightly-lit signs.

Sight Distance – Consider sight distance for transit passengers, bus operators, and other motorists. Avoid obstructions to sightlines between bus operators and passengers such as trees, signs, buildings, shelters, and topography.

For optimal sight distance between bus operators and other motorists, bus stops should not be located over the crest of a hill, immediately in or after a roadway curve to the right, or at locations that might reduce visibility between buses and other vehicles.

| Speed Limit (MPH) | Sight Distance (feet) |
|-------------------|-----------------------|
| 15 | 200 |
| 20 | 265 |
| 25 | 335 |
| 30 | 400 |
| 35 | 465 |
| 40 | 530 |
| 45 | 600 |
| 50 | 665 |

Table 2: Sight Distance for Siting Bus Stops

Adapted from AASHTO 2016 and AASHTO 2011.

Note: Assume a 9-second time gap is required for buses to re-enter traffic without undue interference to traffic flow.

Approaching vehicles need to have adequate visibility of stopped buses and buses entering or exiting a stop, particularly when stops are located in the travel lane. Similarly, bus drivers need to be able to see vehicles approaching from behind when exiting a stop. Table 2 provides the recommended sight distance for bus stops, given the posted speed limit. At a minimum, bus stops should be sited to meet the minimum stopping sight distance provided by AASHTO.

It is not recommended to place stops where there is inadequate sight distance, and existing stops with poor visibility should be considered for relocation or removal. In addition, stopped buses can impact sight distance for vehicles exiting side streets. Depending on the location of the stop relative to an intersection, different vehicular turn movements can be affected.

C. Spatial Location of Bus Stop


The specific location of a bus stop within the right-of-way is important for bus operations. A good bus stop location is one that is operationally safe and efficient for buses and is safe and convenient for passengers. The stop should be located where it causes minimal interference with pedestrian movements and other traffic, including bicycle traffic.

On-street bus stops are usually located along the street curb for direct safe passenger access to and from the sidewalk and waiting areas. Stops may be located on the far side of an intersection, the near side of the intersection, or at a point mid-block.

Far-side stops are stops located after an intersection in the direction of travel. They are generally preferred because they reduce conflicts between right-turning vehicles and stopped buses, eliminate sight-distance deficiencies on approaches to an intersection, and encourage

pedestrian crossing at the rear of the bus. Additionally, since Rapid and BRT routes use transit signal priority to expedite travel across an intersection, far-side stops are integral to Rapid and BRT route implementation. Also, far-side stops allow passengers to cross the street from multiple directions to access the bus boarding area, due to its location on the corner of the intersection.

Near-side stops are stops located before an intersection in the direction of travel. They are acceptable when a far-side stop is deemed unsafe or impractical. They may also be used when a stop serves multiple routes that go in different directions after the downstream intersection. Like far-side stops, the stop's location allows passengers multiple crossing locations to access the bus boarding area, due to the location on the intersection corner.



Mid-block stops are stops that are not located in the general vicinity of an intersection. They are typically considered in special cases and are to be used only when no alternative is available. AC Transit and the jurisdiction where the bus stop will be located must approve any mid-block bus stops. This stop location generally has poor access due to the lack of formal street crossings near the stop, sometimes inducing passengers to reach the bus boarding area by crossing at undesignated locations.

In the typologies presented in Section 3, the diagrams feature far-side stops, as this is the stop location preferred by AC Transit. These typologies can be adapted to near-side or mid-block stops, if necessary.

D. Bus Stop Design

Floating bus stops are bus stops where the boarding platform is separated from the sidewalk by a bike lane. The bike lane is brought behind the bus stop to eliminate any potential conflict points between buses pulling into the stop and cyclists in the bike lane.

The appropriate width of a floating bus stop depends on many factors, including the width of travel lanes, width of bike lanes, and need for sidewalk space. A minimum width of eight feet is required for floating bus stops to ensure ADA-compliant access. However, where space permits, particularly for stops with large passenger volumes, a wider floating bus stop based on preferred dimensions may be designed.

The floating bus stop functions similarly to a bus bulb in that it allows the bus to stop in the travel lane. This design saves travel time for the bus by eliminating the need for the bus driver to merge in and out of traffic. The floating bus stop also provides a waiting area for passengers, and can relieve sidewalk congestion. This design may also save linear space compared to a traditional pull out bus stop, because when buses stop in the travel lane, pull-in or pull-out taper space is no longer required for buses to exit or enter the travel lane.



Vancouver, Canada

It is often a concern that buses stopping in traffic to serve a bus stop will slow traffic, but Federal Highway Administration studies show that stopping in the lane may actually increase traffic speeds on roadways with two travel lanes per direction (Kay Fitzpatrick, Kevin M. Hall, Stephen Farnsworth, and Melisa D. Finley: TCRP Report 65: Evaluation of Bus Bulbs [Washington, D.C.: Transportation Research Board, 2001], 2.).¹² Stopping in the travel lane reduces the phenomenon of bus drivers stopping with the bus protruding into traffic, thereby regularizing traffic flow. Typically, floating bus stops should not be installed on high-speed roads where the average travel speed is 35 miles per hour or greater, as stopping in the travel lane in such conditions may be unsafe.

On roadways with a single travel lane in one or both directions, local conditions, including vehicle volume and bus stop activity, should inform the use of floating bus stops. Floating bus stops may still cause the bus to partially block the travel lane when the bus boards and alights passengers. Therefore, motorists will need to wait for the bus to finish loading before they can progress. At a far-side stop, this wait time could cause cars to queue into the intersection and potentially block the intersection when the signal phase changes. Motorists may also try to divert around a stopped bus by entering the opposite-direction travel lane, which could be a safety concern.

AC Transit prefers that bus pullouts (turnouts) are avoided. Bus pullouts are generally detrimental to bus operations under most circumstances found in the AC Transit district and should be avoided. At a pullout, the roadway is widened just at the bus stop to channel the bus into a special curb lane. The bus then stops and serves the stop outside the travel lanes. Pullouts are generally not desirable for bus operations because they require the bus exit the traffic stream. Leaving the travel lanes can slow bus operations, particularly when the bus seeks to reenter traffic. Pullouts are generally designed for the convenience of other vehicles, not buses. Further, on Complete Street roadways with bicycle lanes, a bus pullout creates conflict with cyclists by requiring buses to fully cross the bike lane to pull in and out of the bus stop, as illustrated in the photo below.

Special cases where pullouts may be appropriate are unusually narrow roadways, such as those consisting of one very narrow travel lane (without a parking lane) in each direction. High-speed roadways without parking lanes may also be appropriate for pullouts. Further, there might be cases where bus pullouts could be useful for schedule adherence or layovers. However, these situations should be analyzed on a case by case basis. Finally, Transit Cooperative Research Program (TCRP) report 65 suggests pullouts for roads where traffic speeds are 40 mph and above.



Portland, OR

E. Bus Stop Dimensions

The required length of a bus stop is made up of the following components. Depending on the configuration of the bus stop (i.e. in lane vs. pull-out stop, near-side stop vs. far-side stop), not all elements will be present. Therefore, the total space required for a bus stop will be informed by the design and placement of the stop.

Bus Stop – total distance/area required for a bus to safely and efficiently pull into a stop, stop and load/unload passengers, and pull away from the stop and return to the travel lane. (Pull-in Taper + Platform + Pull-out Taper)

Platform – the area where the bus comes to a complete stop against the curb and from/to which passengers board and alight.

Pull-in Taper – the distance/area required for a bus to decelerate and exit the travel lane to reach the bus platform.

Pull-out Taper – the distance/area required for a bus to leave the bus platform, accelerate, and reenter the traffic stream.

Clearance from Crosswalk – the distance/area required from the front or rear of the bus and the adjacent crosswalk to ensure pedestrians and drivers have adequate sightlines.

Bus Stop Length

In addition to the selection of an appropriate location, there are other important requirements for bus stops. The required length of a bus stop is determined by the type of stop, stop location, stop amenities, roadway speed limit, and the number and type of buses expected to use the stop. There must be enough curbside space to enable bus operators to pull the bus parallel to the curb, open the doors onto the sidewalk, and pull away from the stop into the travel lane. Providing bus stops with sufficient length also prevents buses from straddling crosswalks, which can block access for pedestrians.

Required bus stop lengths vary depending on several factors:

- **Location of the stop relative to the intersection (far-side, near-side, or mid-block)**
- **Stop configuration**
- **Approach of bus turning movement**
- **Roadway speed, and thereby deceleration and acceleration space**
- **Presence of crosswalks, on-street parking, and driveways**
- **Location of landscaping and street furniture along the sidewalk edge**
- **Number of buses serving and/or laying over at the stop**

Because bus stop length will vary depending on the type and design of a specific bus stop, each typology presented in Chapter 4 includes a table detailing the dimensions required for that bus stop design. General design principles are described in the next subsections.

For buses that stop in the travel lane, the only consideration for the overall bus stop length is the platform itself, since no separate entering and exiting distance is required. The platform length is primarily determined by the size of the bus used on the route and the number of buses servicing the stop at peak hours.

At stops where the bus must pull out of the travel lane, the length required for a bus stop consists of three elements – the pull-in taper, platform/boarding length, and the pull-out taper. The stop must be long enough so that buses can not only stop there, but also get into and out of the stop easily. Adequate-length bus stops make it more likely that the bus driver will pull completely into the stop, rather than leave the back of the bus protruding into the travel lane. Because stopping flush with the curb is key for passengers with mobility impairments, providing a sufficiently long stop is an ADA issue.

Pull-In/Pull-Out Taper

Pull-in/pull-out taper applies only to curbside stops where the buses pull out of the travel lane. The length required for pull-in or pull-out taper is determined from the posted speed limit or prevailing speed, whichever is greater. If prevailing speed data cannot be collected, the posted speed limit should be used.

The stop location also affects the pull-in or pull-out taper distance required. Far-side stops do not require any additional pull-in taper because the bus can use the intersection to decelerate and pull into the stop. Conversely, for near-side stops, no pull-out taper is required because the intersection provides space to accelerate and merge back into the travel lane.

Platform Length

The length required for the platform is primarily a function of the type of bus the stop is designed to serve and the number of buses the stop must serve simultaneously. At a minimum, all AC Transit stops should

be designed to serve a 40-ft bus. On routes where articulated buses are used, stops should be designed to serve 60-ft buses. The length of a platform should increase if it is determined that the stop must accommodate multiple buses simultaneously. The Transportation Research Board provides guidance for determining when stops should be designed to accommodate multiple buses, based on the number of buses per hour, average dwell time, and adjacent intersection signal cycle times.

Stop Amenities

Stop amenities include bus shelters, benches/seating, wayfinding, fare vending machines, bike parking, trees/landscaping, trash cans, lighting, and other amenities that are located within the bus platform area. Stop amenities can help attract customers and increase passenger comfort, improve operational efficiencies, and foster local civic pride and economic development.

The presence of stop amenities, particularly bus shelters or other large amenities, may impact the required platform length. Bus shelters and other large stop amenities restrict the space available for passenger circulation and movement and may require that the platform length be increased. The ADA requires bus stop boarding and alighting areas at the front door landing area, and an accessible route between the landing area, sidewalk, and bus shelters. A clear zone at the first rear door is also required by AC Transit.

Crosswalk Clearance

For all far-side and near-side stops, clearance from the crosswalk is required for pedestrian safety. NACTO's guidelines recommend a minimum of 10 feet of clearance between the rear of the bus and the crosswalk at a far-side stop. With a near-side stop, a minimum of 10 feet of clearance between the front of the bus and the crosswalk is recommended.


F. Door Locations and ADA Access

AC Transit utilizes a variety of fleet types, including 30-ft, 40-ft, and 60-ft buses, which have two, three, or four doors, depending on the vehicle model. Landing areas and clear zones should be laid out to accommodate the bus fleet in operation. Landing areas and clear zones should be free of driveways, curb ramps, and obstructions such as utility poles, hydrants, and other street furniture. AC Transit's design guidelines recommend designing all stops with two door landing areas to accommodate the first two doors of all vehicles, regardless of vehicle length or model.

For the first door landing area, ADA guidelines require that a minimum width of 5 feet along the curb, and a minimum depth of 8 feet perpendicular to the curb, be provided at the landing area, to the extent feasible and within the control of the transit agency. The location of the landing area is primarily dependent on the siting of the stop relative to the intersection, and secondarily, on the availability of sidewalk space to accommodate an ADA-compliant landing area. The first door landing area should begin one foot behind the bus stop pole.

To accommodate rear door passenger activity, bus stops should also have a second door landing area. On AC Transit vehicles manufactured by Van Hool, the second door serves as the ADA-accessible ramp entrance. Therefore, providing a second landing zone is important to ensure that the stop is ADA-compliant. The second door landing area should be 11.5 feet wide along the curb, with a minimum depth of 8 feet perpendicular to the curb. The second door landing area should begin 12.5 feet behind the bus stop pole.

The critical path of travel for passengers at a bus stop is the connection between the landing area and the sidewalk and bus shelters. The ADA requires that there be an accessible route between these points. Sidewalks and bus shelters shall be connected to the landing area by an accessible route. This requirement means that a clear, unobstructed, ADA-compliant path of travel must be provided. AC Transit prefers a 4-foot wide path, although the ADA requires a minimum 3-foot wide path, which can be used in extenuating circumstances.



Accessible Landing Zone and Rear Clear Zone align with the front and second door of all buses.

Exhibit 1: AC Transit Landing Area Dimensions of Common Bus Types

G. Bus Stop Pads

Bus pads are highly durable areas of the roadway surface at bus stops, usually constructed of concrete, that address the common issue of asphalt distortion at bus stops.

Conventional asphalt pavement is flexible, and can be moved by the force and heat generated by braking buses and trucks, leading to wave-shaped mounds along the length of a bus stop. This issue is pronounced at high-volume stops where dwelling buses further heat the roadway surface, as well as near-side stops in mixed-traffic lanes where trucks can add to wear.

Bus pads should be at least 8.5 feet wide to accommodate both wheels of a bus, but should be wider at locations without precision loading to provide consistent service when the bus does not pull fully to the curb. Bus pad length should be determined based on the length of the platform area.

At stops where the bus crosses a bike lane, the concrete bus pad should end at either the curbside edge of the bike lane or the outside edge of the bike lane (including its full width) to prevent the creation of a longitudinal joint within the bike lane. Bus pads should end before the crosswalk to prevent lateral or longitudinal pavement joints within the crosswalk. If a bus pad must be extended into the crosswalk, it should extend across the full width of the crosswalk to prevent joints between concrete and asphalt.

H. Curbs

The curb alongside the bus stop should be painted red to prevent cars from parking within the bus stop space or within the pull-in or pull-out zone that is required at traditional bus stops where buses must pull out of the travel lane. If cars are parked at a bus stop or within the pull-in or pull-out zone, then the bus will not be able to stop flush along the

boarding platform which is inconvenient and dangerous for passengers, and can prevent bus ramps from being deployed, resulting in ADA accessibility issues. Curb height and design should be informed by local conditions or design standards.

I. Service Type and Level of Service

Finally, the service type and level of service provided on a route and/or corridor should be considered when determining the design of bus stops and prioritizing capital improvements. AC Transit has identified eight primary service types operated by the District. These are outlined in AC Transit Board Policy No. 550.¹³

Trunk Routes and Major Corridors – These are the services operating on corridors where residential densities are at least 20,000 residents per square mile (or comparable commercial densities). Routes in these corridors provide the backbone of the transit system; operate along the arterial streets and provide a high level of local and limited stop service. These routes have the highest priority for capital improvements.

Rapid - Provides limited stop service along a Trunk Route or Major Corridor featuring wide stop spacing, headway based schedules, transit signal priority and passenger amenities. Underlying local service contributes to aggregate service frequency.

Urban Secondary, Crosstowns and Feeder Routes – These are the routes operating in medium density corridors (10,000 – 20,000 residents per square mile or comparable commercial densities). These routes complement the trunk route network, providing a high level of local stop service. These corridors also are candidates for capital improvements to assist in bus operations.

Suburban Crosstowns and Feeder Routes – These are the routes operating in low density corridors (5,000 – 10,000 residents per square mile). These routes feed BART, park and ride lots, or other AC

Transit routes, or serve neighborhood circulation functions with a high level of service.

Low Density Routes – These are primarily routes operating in areas of very low density (fewer than 5,000 residents per square mile).

Community Flex Services – These are primarily routes operating in areas of very low density, again, fewer than 5,000 residents per square mile, that provide a more flexible operation than traditional fixed route service.

All-Nighter (Owl) Routes – These are the routes providing service between 12 midnight and 6 am. All-Nighter routes operate as a lifeline service during the “owl gap” period.

Transbay Routes – These are the routes providing service to downtown San Francisco via the Bay Bridge Corridor.

These service types form a hierarchy of service both in terms of service investment (annual service hours) and ridership. Therefore, AC Transit’s policy directs staff to prioritize capital investments for service types with the highest levels of service and highest ridership. Additionally, because the service type classifications closely correspond with service frequency and ridership, they can be used to inform the bus stop design, dimensions, and amenities.

Table 3 outlines AC Transit’s service types, span of service standards, and weekday peak frequency standards.

| Service Type | Span of Service Standard | Weekday Peak Frequency Standard |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Trunk and Major Corridors | 19-24 hours daily | 15-20 minutes |
| Rapid | 14-16 hours daily | 10-14 minutes |
| Urban Crosstown/ Feeder | 14-16 hours daily | 15-20 minutes |
| Suburban Crosstown / Feeder | 14-16 hours daily | 21-30 minutes |
| Very Low Density | 14-16 hours daily | 31-60 minutes |
| All-Nighter (Owl) | Owl gap period | 31-60 minutes |
| Transbay | 17-18 hours daily | 21-30 minutes |

Table 3: Span of Service and Weekday Peak Frequency Standards

Adapted from AC Transit Board Policy No. 550

3.0 Typology Design Considerations



Properly-placed design elements are critical to a positive overall experience for transit users. When reviewing individual bus stops and their context, designers must consider a wide range of issues that are unique to each location. In many transit corridors, the adjacent streetscape design elements may also contribute to the bus stop design. Due to constrained right-of-way, it is not feasible or practical to include all design elements at each bus stop location. The placement and use of design elements at bus stops should maximize safety, visibility, and comfort for all users. Designers are encouraged to consult with AC Transit or local guidance for additional design considerations.

3.1 General Guidance for Context Zones

For the purposes of this guide, establishing context zones simplifies the process of defining the roadway cross section along a corridor. Zones establish a foundation for designers to appropriately locate design elements tailored to the different uses expected of a roadway user. Exhibit 2 illustrates each zone with subsequent text describing the relationship between the zones and the design elements that commonly contribute to multimodal bus stop design.

Pedestrian Zone - This zone is generally reserved for pedestrian mobility for users of all ages and abilities to access pedestrian oriented destinations.

Furnishing Zone - This zone is generally reserved for seating, bicycle racks, street lights, parking pay stations, stormwater infrastructure, street trees, transit shelters, trash receptacles, in addition various

utilities that support a multimodal environment. This zone can also be flexible and may vary between blocks and along a corridor.

Bus Stop Bypass Zone - This zone is generally reserved to route the bikeway around the rear of the bus stop between the furnishing zone and floating bus stop furnishing zone.

Bus Stop Furnishing Zone - This zone is generally reserved to function similar to the furnishing zone and may consist of seating, lean bar or railing, transit shelter, or vertical railings as space provides. The available width and length of the floating bus stop will determine the amount, type, and function of design elements placed in the floating bus stop furnishing zone.

Floating Bus Stop - This zone is generally reserved for users waiting in a dedicated space to access transit.




EXHIBIT 2: Context Zones

3.2 Design Elements

All bus stops should consider utilizing appropriate design elements to provide a safe, accessible, and high-quality transit experience. This section defines typical bus stop design elements either as standard, recommended, or optional. Standard design elements are typical of bus stops, bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities, etc. Including recommended design elements should result in a high quality bus stop for all users. Design elements have been noted as optional to be sensitive to design preferences of jurisdictions.

Accessible Landing Pad (Furnishing/pedestrian zone or bus stop furnishing zone) – Standard

ADA guidelines require a minimum of 5 feet along the curb and a minimum depth of 8 feet perpendicular to the curb to be provided at the landing area. It should be a firm, stable surface, with a maximum 2% cross slope. The landing area should match the roadway running slope to the extent practicable and be parallel to the roadway.

Benches (Furnishing/pedestrian zone or bus stop furnishing zone) – Optional

Providing seating at bus stops is a pleasant amenity for transit users waiting for the bus. Benches may be stand-alone or integrated into a shelter. ADA does not provide guidance for outdoor benches, however the Proposed Guidelines for Pedestrian Facilities in the Public Right-of-Way (PROWAG) suggests that benches providing full back support and armrests better assist pedestrians with mobility impairments to sit and stand.



Vancouver, Canada

Bicycle Facility Elevation (Bus stop bypass zone) – Standard

Bicycle facilities may be provided at the same elevation with the sidewalk, at street level, or at an intermediate height with a 2- to 3-inch curb reveal between the sidewalk and street level. The appropriate elevation of the bicycle facility will often be based on known physical constraints or design feasibility. The advantages or disadvantages of these designs are discussed thoroughly in separated bike lane guidance. A designer should consult these references prior to choosing the appropriate bikeway elevation treatment.

Bicycle Racks (Furnishing zone or bus stop furnishing zone) – Recommended

Installing bicycle parking at bus stops increases a transit passenger's flexibility to park their bicycle and take transit. These decisions may be based on many external factors including distance, weather, convenience, and effort. This amenity improves first- and last-mile connections and can increase the desirability of combined bicycle and transit trips.

Furthermore, if the bus bicycle rack is at capacity, bicycle parking allows bicyclists to lock their bike if they choose. Bicycle racks should be placed outside of the path of travel at the bus stop and positioned so that no matter how a bicycle is locked, a one foot buffer from the bikeway and the edge of the locked bike will be maintained. Refer to the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals (APBP) Bicycle Parking Guidelines for the appropriate type and placement of bike racks.

Essentials of Bike Parking: Selecting and Installing Bike Parking that Works. Association of Pedestrian & Bicycle Professionals. 2015.¹⁴

Bike Ramp (Bus stop bypass zone) – Standard

When the elevation of the bicycle facility changes at a floating bus stop, a smooth ramp transition should be provided to allow comfortable passage for bicyclists through the bus stop influence area.



Cambridge, MA

Bus Shelters (Furnishing zone or bus stop furnishing zone) – Optional

Shelters provide a safe, secure, and comfortable space for users waiting for their bus. Shelters offer protection from inclement weather, and, in some cases, include lighting, heating, and opportunities for additional seating. Transit information, including route numbers, timetables, and, in some cases, maps, may also be provided at shelters.

The design of shelters should be simple, functional, and easy to maintain. The size of shelters will largely depend upon the amount of available space at a bus stop location.

Bus Stop Pole (Furnishing zone or bus stop furnishing zone) – Standard

Bus passengers need information to understand which bus routes will stop at their location. This pole and sign can also include information such as the route direction, schedule, etc.

Channelization (Bus stop bypass zone) – Recommended

Channelizing infrastructure can be designed to manage pedestrian and bicyclist movements between the travel lane, bikeway, and pedestrian facility. Pedestrians and bicyclists can be separately and effectively channelized by locating a vertical object (e.g., planter) to physically deflect and direct users to desired areas. For example, pedestrians could be channelized to designated crossings of the bikeway between sidewalk and floating bus stop. Effectively channelizing bicyclists and pedestrians through a bus stop can improve safety, provide maximum convenience, and enhance functionality.



Green Colored Pavement (Bus stop bypass zone) – Optional

The consistent use of green colored pavement may be used to delineate the bicycle zone or to emphasize areas of potential conflict. An alternative option is to use contrast to mark the separate zones, such as different colored concrete, or using asphalt for the bikeway and concrete for the floating bus stop and sidewalk.

Green colored pavement may be considered for optional use in marked bicycle facilities and in extensions of bicycle facilities through intersections and other traffic conflict areas. The use of dashed green colored pavement indicates merging areas for the bicycle facility and vehicular traffic. Solid green colored pavement may be used to designate the bike lane zone

Lean Bar or Lean Rails (Pedestrian/Furnishing Zone or bus stop furnishing zone) – Optional

Lean rails may be used in place of traditional benches. These amenities establish a narrow barrier between the bus island and the bus stop bypass to deter transit passengers from crossing the bicycle facility in non-designated spots. They also invite passengers to use these amenities casually as they wait for their bus.

Lighting (Furnishing Zone or bus stop furnishing zone) – Recommended

Bus stop lighting provides safety and security for all users while also increasing visibility of waiting passengers for bus operators. Sufficient illumination can be achieved with pedestrian-scale fixtures, lighted shelters, and street lights. The Illuminating Engineering Society provides guidance on how much illuminance to provide. Refer to Illuminating Engineering Society (IES), Roadway Lighting RP-8-14. 2014.¹⁵

Crosswalks (Pedestrian zone) – Standard

Crosswalks provide designated routes for pedestrians to cross another facility. Maintaining a pedestrian access route between the sidewalk, floating bus stop, and additional bus stop design elements is required. All crosswalks should be located to maximize visibility for pedestrians and of pedestrians by drivers and bicyclists. Bus stops should connect to a marked pedestrian crossing, preferably a crosswalk behind the stop, so that passengers are encouraged to cross behind the bus. Intersections and at-grade driveway crossings should have ADA-compliant curb ramps.

Detectable Warning Surface (Pedestrian zone) – Standard

The ADA requires that bus stop boarding and alighting areas shall be connected to streets, sidewalks, or pedestrian paths by an accessible route. Detectable warning surfaces provide a tactile and noticeable message that a change of environment will occur between these areas.

Railings (Bus stop furnishing zone) – Optional

Vertical railings may be useful at channelizations (bus stop bypasses), as they establish a barrier between the bus island and the bicycle facility routing behind it, deterring transit users from crossing the bicycle facility in non-designated locations.

Rear Landing Area (pedestrian/furnishing zone, bus stop furnishing zone) – Standard

The clear zone is the area where the back doors of the bus open onto the sidewalk or floating island. AC Transit requires bus stops to have a clear zone for the first rear door. The clear zone should be free of driveways, curb ramps, and obstructions such as utility poles, hydrants, and other street furniture. Although there is no requirement for the clear zone to be ADA-compliant, it is desirable, and at a minimum should be a level surface area. The clear zone should be 11.5 feet wide by 8 feet deep.

Street Trees and Stormwater Infrastructure (furnishing zone or bus stop zone) – Optional

Properly selected and maintained landscaping helps enhance passenger comfort at a bus stop and may improve the overall aesthetic of transit service. Street trees at bus stops can help provide shade and protection from adverse weather. Placement of street trees or stormwater infrastructure should not disrupt safety, visibility, or service at the bus stop location. Street trees, landscaping, and stormwater infrastructure should be selected based on environmental performance, maintenance, and aesthetic goals of the jurisdiction.

Trash receptacles (furnishing zone) – Optional

Trash and recycling receptacles or solar compactors are desirable at higher-ridership stops, stops in commercial areas and retail centers, and stops with shelters. AC transit recommends locating trash and recycling receptacles on the sidewalk to clarify that maintenance is a City responsibility, which may assist with keeping the overall buildup of debris to a minimum.



Sydney, Australia

4.0 Bus Stop Design Typologies



Seattle, WA

Designing a safe, comfortable, and functional bus stop for all users with special consideration to bicycle users is a primary purpose of this guide. Local jurisdictions are implementing more separated bike lanes on transit corridors and need design guidance to safely and seamlessly maintain bikeways through the bus stop. Based on common roadway and bikeway configurations, transit operations, and other considerations, five bus stop design typologies have been identified:

- **Typology 1: Class II Bicycle Facility between the Curb and a General Traffic Lane**
- **Typology 2: Class II Bicycle Facility between Curbside Parking Lane and a General Traffic Lane**
- **Typology 3: Class IV Bicycle Facility (Separated Bikeway) between the Curb and a General Traffic Lane**
- **Typology 4: Class IV Bicycle Facility (Separated Bikeway) between the Curb and a Parking Lane**
- **Typology 5: Class IV Bicycle Facility (Two-way Separated Bikeway) between the Curb and a Parking Lane**

Each design typology contains design elements reflecting the context of the roadway environment. Required and optional design elements are specified within the typologies, but the designer should use engineering judgment when selecting and locating design elements for a bus stop design. These bus stop typologies are intended to illustrate how and why design elements are included to provide a safe, comfortable, and functional bus stop.


Bus stops should be provided curbside (against a curb) in most instances, as this is the most functional location for a bus stop. In the typologies, the bus stop curb is located either along the sidewalk (Typology 1) or along a floating bus stop (Typologies 2-5).

Four of the five typologies utilize floating bus stops, which are sidewalk-level platforms built between the bicycle lane and the roadway travel lane. When using floating bus stops, bicyclists are directed behind the bus stop, reducing or eliminating most conflicts between buses and bicyclists. By eliminating the need for buses and bicycles to interact, floating bus stops have large safety benefits for bicyclists. They can also benefit pedestrians, as the floating bus stop doubles as a pedestrian refuge, which if designed efficiently, can shorten crossing distances and enable shorter signal cycles.

4.1 Typology 1 Class II Bicycle Facility between Curb and a General Traffic Lane

The first Typology illustrates locations where the bike lane is located adjacent to the curb on a roadway. This typology more likely pertains to transit routes outside of a priority bicycle network. The section view illustrates that the bus will position itself on top of the bike lane to board and alight passengers. This means the bus may block motorists and bicyclists. These roadway users may have to wait or move around a bus during boarding/alighting operations.

A. Typology 1: Section View



If a transit corridor consistently implements Typology 1, normal bus operations may cause a “leap-frogging” effect for bicyclists. Leap-frogging is described as: A) a bus will pass a bicyclist between bus stops, B) the bus boards/alights passengers, C) the bicyclist passes the dwelling bus, and D) then the bus passes the bicyclist between the bus stops again. The leap-frogging process could repeat several times, especially if the average bus speed is similar to a bicyclist’s riding speed. This effect is uncomfortable for bicyclists and increases the likelihood they will exit the bike lane into mixed traffic to pass a dwelling bus, which increases their crash risk with automobiles.¹⁶ Leap-frogging is a known operational issue and is usually mitigated by implementing more separation between the vehicle lane and the bike lane, which may then necessitate the use of the subsequent design typologies described in this document.

Several design elements have been explicitly called out for Typology 1. A bus stop has minimum design constraints so that an accessible landing zone and a rear clear zone are provided. The location of these zones at the bus platform varies depending on the prevailing bus size. Also, this typology includes design elements typically employed at roadways and bus stops such as a furnishing zone, bus stop pole, and detectable warning surfaces on the sidewalk ramps. Lastly, note the optional design elements such as the bus shelter, green pavement markings, and red curb zone. The exact location and scale of these design elements may vary based on the constraints and context of the bus stop.


The bus stop and platform length will vary based on many factors including the pull-in/-out taper, sight distance, physical bus dimensions, and headways. Table 4 provides guidance for these dimensions on Typology 1, but the designer should use engineering judgment based on the roadway context and design constraints.

| | Arterial Speed Limit | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|-----------|---------|
| | < 20 MPH | 20-35 MPH | >35 MPH |
| Platform | | | |
| 40' Bus | 40' | 40' | 40' |
| 60' Bus | 60' | 60' | 60' |
| Two 40' Buses | 120' | 120' | 120' |
| One 40' Bus and One 60' Bus | 140' | 140' | 140' |
| Two 60' Buses | 180' | 180' | 180' |
| Pull-in Taper | | | |
| Far-side Bus Stop | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Near-side Bus Stop | 10' | 15' | 20' |
| Mid-block Bus Stop | 10' | 15' | 20' |
| Pull-out Taper | | | |
| Far-side Bus Stop | 10' | 15' | 20' |
| Near-side Bus Stop | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Mid-block Bus Stop | 10' | 15' | 20' |
| Clearance from Crosswalk | | | |
| Far-side Bus Stop | 10' | 10' | 10' |
| Near-side Bus Stop | 10' | 10' | 10' |
| Mid-block Bus Stop | N/A | N/A | N/A |


Table 4: Typology 1 Influence Area Minimum Dimensions

B. Typology 1: Plan View

- 1 Bus shelter (optional)
- 2 Accessible landing zone (min. 5' x 8')
- 3 Rear clear zone (11.5' x 8')
- 4 Green pavement (optional)
- 5 Furnishing zone
- 6 Bus stop pole



C. Typology 1: Perspective View



4.2 Typology 2 Class II Bicycle Facility between Curbside Parking Lane and a General Traffic Lane

A. Stop Placement and Bike Facility Alignment


Adding parking to the roadway influences the spatial relationship between the bus boarding/alighting operation and the bike lane. Parking operations may cause conflicts with bus operations, and the door zone of parked vehicles can be a hazard for bicyclists. However, implementing a floating bus stop is an improvement for bicycle and transit operations, because the bus boarding/alighting operations can be performed independently of through bicycle movements.

AC Transit prefers far-side bus stops for a variety of bus-related operational reasons (AC Transit Policy No. 508); however, the designer can consider using near-side or mid-block bus stops. Note that conventional mid-block bus islands are illustrated but are not a preferred design because they create a potential conflict with bicyclists by requiring buses to fully cross the bike lane to pull in and out of the bus stop.

The key design characteristic of Typology 2 is the routing of the bike lane behind the bus stop, which minimizes conflicts between the bicycle movement and the bus boarding/alighting operation. The design elements at the floating bus stop and the furnishing zone should be located at least one foot from the edge of the bike facility. If a bicycle rack is located in the furnishing zone, the edge of a parked bicycle should be at least one foot from the edge of the bike facility, which may necessitate moving the bike rack further toward the building frontage. This shy distance improves bike operations and minimizes safety hazards from handlebar or pedal strikes.

Bus passengers have two designated bike lane crossings from the sidewalk to the floating bus stop, which helps manage pedestrian/bicycle interactions. Importantly, bicyclists are required to yield to pedestrians

B. Typology 2: Section View



at these designated crossings with the use of yield markings and an optional “Bike Yield to Pedestrians” MUTCD R9-6 sign. The furnishing zone and/or detectable edge assists with managing bus passenger crossings at those two locations.

Furnishing elements could include bicycle racks, trash receptacles, etc. Alternatively, detectable longitudinal panels can be embedded along the bike lane to guide visually impaired pedestrians to the designated bike lane crossing, as shown in exhibit 3 and in the photo to the right. These directional indicators are in accordance with International Standard 23599 and their color should contrast with adjoining concrete or asphalt pavement.




Exhibit 3: Longitudinal detectable edge



There are several bike lane-specific design elements which should be included when designing a bus stop based on Typology 2.

- 6 The bicyclist yield area provides space for bicyclists to stop for crossing pedestrians while also being protected from traffic.
- 7 The maximum bicycle ramp slope should be 1:12 from street to sidewalk level.
- 9 The bike lane transition taper of 1:10 is preferred, with a maximum of 1:5.¹⁷

Providing more space for bicyclists to yield for pedestrians and/or constructing a gentler slope or taper for the bike lane will improve comfort for bicyclists.

Lastly, vertical railings or lean rails may be optionally employed in Typology 2.


Table 5 provides guidance for these dimensions on Typology 2.

| Arterial Speed Limit | |
|-----------------------------------|------|
| All Speeds | |
| Bus Stop Island | |
| 40' Bus | 40' |
| 60' Bus | 60' |
| Two 40' Buses | 120' |
| One 40' Bus and One 60' Bus | 140' |
| Two 60' Buses | 180' |
| Entering Bike Lane Taper Distance | |
| Far-side Bus Stop | N/A |
| Near-side Bus Stop | 24' |
| Mid-block Bus Stop | 24' |
| Exiting Bike Lane Taper Distance | |
| Far-side Bus Stop | 24' |
| Near-side Bus Stop | N/A |
| Mid-block Bus Stop | 24' |
| Clearance from Crosswalk | |
| Far-side Bus Stop | 10' |
| Near-side Bus Stop | 10' |
| Mid-block Bus Stop | N/A |


Table 5: Typology 2 Influence Area Minimum Dimensions

C. Typology 2: Plan View

- 1 Bus shelter (optional)
- 2 Accessible landing zone (min. 5' x 8')
- 3 Rear clear zone (11.5' x 8')
- 4 Green pavement (optional)
- 5 Bikes yield to peds sign (optional)
- 6 Bicyclist yield area
- 7 Bicycle ramp (max 1:12 slope)
- 8 Furnishing zone/Detectable edge
- 9 Bike lane taper (preferred 1:10 / max. 1:5)
- 10 Detectable warning surface
- 11 Vertical railing (optional)
- 12 Bus stop pole
- 13 Red curb zone (optional)



D. Typology 2: Perspective View



4.3 Typology 3 Class IV Bicycle Facility (Separated Bikeway) between the Curb and a General Traffic Lane


Typology 3 contains the same elements and dimensions in the cross-sectional view as Typology 2. Both designs route the bike lane behind the floating bus stop platform with a 1-foot shy distance between the bike lane and any furnishing or bus stop elements.

The difference between Typologies 2 and 3 is the presence of parking. In Typology 2, a parking lane is located to the inside of the bicycle lane; in Typology 3, there is no parking lane. Parked vehicles influence the bike lane taper lengths through intersections and exiting the bus platform area.

Typology 3 illustrates vertical separation with white plastic flexposts between the travel lane and the bikeway. There are many different forms of vertical separation that can be employed and there are several guidebooks discussing their benefits and drawbacks. In general, choosing any form of approved vertical separation will be appropriate in conjunction with a floating bus stop design.

Table 6 provides guidance for these dimensions on Typology 3.

A. Typology 3: Section View




| | Arterial Speed Limit |
|--|----------------------|
| | All Speeds |
| Bus Stop Island | |
| 40' Bus | 40' |
| 60' Bus | 60' |
| Two 40' Buses | 120' |
| One 40' Bus and One 60' Bus | 140' |
| Two 60' Buses | 180' |
| Entering Bike Lane Taper Distance | |
| Far-side Bus Stop | N/A |
| Near-side Bus Stop | 18' |
| Mid-block Bus Stop | 18' |
| Exiting Bike Lane Taper Distance | |
| Far-side Bus Stop | 18' |
| Near-side Bus Stop | N/A |
| Mid-block Bus Stop | 18' |
| Clearance from Crosswalk | |
| Far-side Bus Stop | 10' |
| Near-side Bus Stop | 10' |
| Mid-block Bus Stop | N/A |


Table 6: Typology 3 Influence Area Minimum Dimensions

B. Typology 3: Plan View

- 1 Bus shelter (optional)
- 2 Accessible landing zone (min. 5' x 8')
- 3 Rear clear zone (11.5 x 8')
- 4 Green pavement (optional)
- 5 Bikes yield to peds sign (optional)
- 6 Bicyclist yield area
- 7 Bicycle ramp (max 1:12 slope)
- 8 Furnishing zone/Detectable edge
- 9 Bike lane taper (preferred 1:10 / max. 1:5)
- 10 Detectable warning surface
- 11 Vertical railing (optional)
- 12 Bus stop pole
- 13 Red curb zone (optional)



C. Typology 3: Perspective View




4.4 Typology 4 Class IV Bicycle Facility (Separated Bikeway) between the Curb and a Parking Lane

Typology 4's section view is also the same as the section views shown in Typologies 2 and 3.

A separated bikeway adjacent to parking can create a geometric cross section eliminating bikeway tapers through the intersection and exiting the floating bus platform area. Like Typologies 2 and 3, required, preferred, and optional design elements are annotated. The designer should consider the context of the area when including or excluding these design elements.


Table 7 provides guidance for these dimensions on Typology 4.

A. Typology 4: Section View




B. Typology 4: Plan View

- 1 Bus shelter (optional)
- 2 Accessible landing zone (min. 5' x 8')
- 3 Rear clear zone (11.5' x 8')
- 4 Green pavement (optional)
- 5 Bikes yield to peds sign (optional)
- 6 Bicyclist yield area
- 7 Bicycle ramp (max 1:12 slope)
- 8 Furnishing zone/Detectable edge
- 9 Detectable warning surface
- 10 Vertical railing (optional)
- 11 Bus stop pole
- 12 Red curb zone (optional)



C. Typology 4: Perspective View



| Arterial Speed Limit | |
|-----------------------------|------|
| All Speeds | |
| Bus Stop Island | |
| 40' Bus | 40' |
| 60' Bus | 60' |
| Two 40' Buses | 120' |
| One 40' Bus and One 60' Bus | 140' |
| Two 60' Buses | 180' |
| Clearance from Crosswalk | |
| Far-side Bus Stop | 10' |
| Near-side Bus Stop | 10' |
| Mid-block Bus Stop | N/A |

Table 7: Typology 4 Influence Area Minimum Dimensions

The perspective view of Typology 4 on the previous page features a callout diagram of an intermediate level bikeway design. A 2- to 3-inch curb reveal can be used to create an intermediate-level bikeway in lieu of a sidewalk-level bikeway adjacent to the floating bus stop island. There are several benefits and drawbacks of this optional design:

Benefits of Intermediate-level Bikeway Design

- **Vertical separation helps define the pedestrian and bicycle operating space. Cities with mature bicycling infrastructure regularly construct vertical separation between bicycle and pedestrian facilities.**
- **Decreased bike ramp length is needed between the street and bus platform level.**
- **The curb reveal provides a detectable edge between the sidewalk and the bikeway, eliminating the need for other longitudinal detectable elements. However, ADA-compliant ramps including detectable elements are required at pedestrian crossings of the bikeway.**

Drawbacks of Intermediate-level Bikeway Design

- **This design increases construction complexity.**
- **Drainage and maintenance of the bikeway in the bus stop platform area will require extra attention due to water pooling, leaf and debris buildup, etc.**

Importantly, curbs 4 inches or greater increase the risk of bicycle pedal strikes, so a 2- to 3-inch curb reveal is critical. Lastly, the 2- to 3-inch curb can be used in Typologies 2 through 5.


4.5 Typology 5 Class IV Bicycle Facility (Two-way Separated Bikeway) between the Curb and a Parking Lane

The cross section of Typology 5 uses the basic form of Typologies 2 - 4 where the bikeway is routed behind the floating bus stop platform and adjacent the sidewalk. Unique to Typology 5, the bikeway is designed for two-way travel, which necessitates increased minimum and preferred bikeway widths.

The plan view in Typology 5 illustrates fully curbed separated bikeway designs adjacent to parking. Again, there are many different vertical buffer treatments available to the designer, who should consider the context and constraints. When implementing Typology 5, special consideration should be given to increasing awareness of two-way bikeway travel at the floating bus stop platform. Signs, pavement markings, and other visual cues should be employed near the bus stop consistent with design guidance for two-way separated bike lanes.

Table 8 provides guidance for these dimensions on Typology 5.

A. Typology 5: Section View




| | | Arterial Speed Limit |
|---------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| | | All Speeds |
| Bus Stop Island | | |
| 40' Bus | | 40' |
| 60' Bus | | 60' |
| Two 40' Buses | | 120' |
| One 40' Bus and One 60' Bus | | 140' |
| Two 60' Buses | | 180' |
| Clearance from Crosswalk | | |
| Far-side Bus Stop | | 10' |
| Near-side Bus Stop | | 10' |
| Mid-block Bus Stop | | N/A |


Table 8: Typology 5 Influence Area Minimum Dimensions

B. Typology 5: Plan View

- 1 Bus shelter (optional)
- 2 Accessible landing zone (min. 5' x 8')
- 3 Rear clear zone (11.5' x 8')
- 4 Green pavement (optional)
- 5 Bikes yield to peds sign (optional)
- 6 Bicyclist yield area
- 7 Bicycle ramp (max 1:12 slope)
- 8 Furnishing zone/Detectable edge
- 9 Detectable warning surface
- 10 Vertical railing (optional)
- 11 Bus stop pole
- 12 Buffer treatment varies
- 13 Red curb zone (optional)



C. Typology 5: Perspective View



5.0 Typology Selection



Designing an appropriate bus stop depends on many factors including but not limited to the roadway configuration, posted/actual vehicle speeds, and bus passenger activity. Due to this contextual variability, it is possible to select multiple typologies on a single transit corridor. Subsequently, tailoring design elements for each bus stop will depend on site constraints, context, and local jurisdictional preference. While designers should strive for consistency, being flexible with the final design could result in a safer, more comfortable, and better-functioning bus stop for all users

5.1 Typology Selection Guidance

Selecting a typology is influenced by several factors:

- **Roadway classification**
- **Roadway constraints**
- **Traffic posted/actual speeds**
- **Vehicle volumes**
- **Bike volumes**
- **Bus volumes**
- **Passenger activity**

Choosing a bus stop typology based on the relationship between these factors is challenging because a local jurisdiction may prioritize some roadway uses over others. AC Transit is sensitive to these local priorities and encourages designers to consider these alongside the guiding principles presented in this Guide when selecting a typology and eventual bus stop design.

Guiding Principle 1 – The proposed roadway configuration should be the primary determinant in the choice of a typology.

The presence of vehicle lanes, parking, buffers, bike lanes, and other roadway elements may be the more static elements of a roadway configuration as compared with dynamic roadway characteristics such as posted speeds, user volumes, and passenger activity. The presence of a bike lane, separated bike lane, or two-way separated bike lane provides one filter of typology choice. The presence of parking is another important consideration in choosing a typology.

Also, some static objects within the roadway configuration are less permanent than others. Vehicle lanes, parking and design elements of

the furnishing zone are commonly removed, rearranged, or re-sized to accommodate other uses. Removing or resizing vehicle lanes and/or parking spaces may be needed to provide appropriate entering/exiting tapers for the bikeway. If there are existing design elements such as bus shelters, they could be too large to fit into a new floating bus stop location based on the typology dimensions. The local jurisdiction should work with AC Transit to develop solutions to design issues considering the range of roadway users.

However, there are several unique roadway configurations which could make selecting a typology difficult:

- **Suburban/rural locations with no sidewalks**
- **Roadway configurations with mixed-traffic bicycle facilities**
- **Locations with exclusive bus lanes**
- **Roadways with angled parking**
- **Shared street**
- **Other roadway configurations**

In these cases, the stop location should be examined in detail and engineering judgment should be applied to develop a design solution that balances the needs of all roadway users.

Guiding Principle 2 – Floating bus islands are preferred for bus routes with headways of 15 minutes or less.

Floating bus islands have two types of bus operational benefits. When a bus approaches a floating bus stop, it does not need to exit and re-enter the vehicle lane to serve each request for boarding or alighting. Merging back into the travel lane can be challenging for bus operators due to motorists failing to yield to the merging movement. Eliminating this issue can lead to travel time savings, which translates into operational cost savings and improved travel experience for customers. The other operational benefit includes a designated area for passengers to wait for their bus. This additional space allows AC Transit, and potentially

the local jurisdiction, to add further bus stop amenities to improve the passenger transit experience. Given a bus route with 15-minute headways, the operational and passenger benefits of floating bus islands may accumulate over a typical day and beyond.

Guiding Principle 3 – Floating bus islands are not preferred for roadways with posted speeds of 35 mph or higher.

Implementing a floating bus island means that a bus will stop in traffic and subsequently block traffic. With posted speeds of 35 mph or higher, a boarding/alighting event may create a safety issue between vehicles and bus operations. In these situations, a bus pull-out may be a more appropriate bus stop design treatment.

Consideration should be given to how bicyclists travel through a bus pullout. Bus pullouts may remove the bus completely from the vehicle and bike lane, allowing an unobstructed bicycle through movement. Designers should consider routing the bikeway behind the bus stop pullout, especially on higher speed roads and where bicycle through movements may be blocked by a stopped bus.

Where roadways have posted speeds of 35 mph or higher, separated bike lanes are recommended due to the increased risk bicyclists face on these types of roads. If separated bike lanes are implemented, their separation should be continued through a bus stop and potential bus pullout. In this situation, Typologies 3 to 5 may be appropriate to reference when designing the bus stop.

Guiding Principle 4 – A typology choice should incorporate future curbside use and future roadway configurations.

Choosing a typology could involve planning for future transit and/or roadway projects. AC Transit may make route enhancements or modifications in a corridor, and there could be changes to land use or other transit demand-related contexts. When these transit-related changes are being planned, changes to bus frequency could justify a floating bus stop at certain locations along the new route. Integrating an appropriate typology corresponding to the planned change may be especially important given the presence of bikeways and parking.

Local jurisdictions should consider floating bus stops when redesigning a corridor that carries an existing transit route and has existing bicycle facilities. Even if the transit route is low-frequency, designing the corridor with floating bus stops will allow for higher-quality bikeways and result in a safer, more balanced, comfortable, and functional corridor.



Emeryville, CA

6.0 Maintenance Considerations



Bus stop locations are typically on the edge of the roadway corridor and located in densely populated environments which accumulate debris during all seasons. Providing and implementing an effective maintenance program ensures continuity throughout the system.

Bus stops require routine maintenance to ensure functionality and provide a pleasant environment for all users. Litter can accumulate at bus stops and trees or other vegetation may drop foliage regularly or seasonally. Vandalism can also occur and should be remedied. Regular, seasonal, and as-needed maintenance agreements should be established with local jurisdictions or property owners. Some of these maintenance costs can be offset with bus stop and bus-related advertising.

Floating bus stops have special maintenance considerations because of the channelization created for the bikeway route. Bikeways may catch debris, dirt, and leaves, which should be swept on a regular or seasonal basis. Leaves, especially when wet, are very slippery and can create hazards for bicyclists passing through the area. Bus stop maintenance workers can use a variety of techniques to keep these areas clean, including hand sweeping, pressure washing, small hand-operated machines, or narrow maintenance vehicles.

Lastly, bus stops should be regularly inspected and the quality of design elements should be noted over time as they slowly deteriorate and lose their colorful luster. Inspecting and inventorying design elements could yield valuable information on longevity, replacement, and cost expectations. The information could then be used to investigate more robust design elements to be installed for existing or future bus stops.



Salem, MA

7.0 Reference Endnotes



Berkeley, CA

Reference Endnotes

¹ Highway Design Manual, 6th Edition. Caltrans. 2017

² California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. State of California. Caltrans. California State Transportation Agency. 2014.

³ Bus Stop Policy. AC Transit. Policy No. 508 Board Policy. Adopted 1989, Amended 2005.

⁴ Designing with Transit: Making Transit Integral to East Bay Communities. AC Transit. 2004.

⁵ Central County Complete Streets Design Guidelines. Alameda County Transportation Commission. 2016.

⁶ Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, 4th edition. American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials. 2012.

⁷ Urban Street Design Guide. National Association of City Transportation Officials. 2013.

⁸ Transit Street Design Guide. National Association of City Transportation Officials. 2016.

⁹ Urban Bikeway Design Guide. National Association of City Transportation Officials. 2014.

¹⁰ Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. Federal Highway Administration. 2009 Edition.

¹¹ Rhode Island Bus Stop Design Guide. Rhode Island Public Transit Authority. 2017.

¹² Transit Cooperative Research Program Report 65: Evaluation of Bus Bulbs. Fitzpatrick, et al. Transportation Research Board, Washington DC. 2001.

¹³ Service Standards and Design Policy. AC Transit. Policy No. 550 Board Policy. Adopted 1994, Amended 2004, 2008.

¹⁴ Essentials of Bike Parking: Selecting and Installing Bike Parking that Works. Association of Pedestrian & Bicycle Professionals. 2015.

¹⁵ Roadway Lighting RP-8-14. Illuminating Engineering Society. 2014.

¹⁶ A Summary of Design, Policies, and Operational Characteristics for Shared Bicycle/Bus Lanes. Florida Department of Transportation Research Center. 2012.

¹⁷ Design Information Bulletin Number 89. Class IV Bikeway Guidance (Separated Bikeways/Cycle Tracks). California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2015.

