

Pleasant Hill BART Shortcut Path and Wayfinding System Project

Community Workshop #2

Thursday, December 18, 2003

Wallgraphic Summary

Draft

INTRODUCTION

On December 18, 2003, about 34 people participated in the Pleasant Hill BART Shortcut Path and Wayfinding System 2nd Community Workshop. The purpose of this workshop was to introduce newcomers to the proposed project, continue the discussion of the community's concerns, and to provide answers to the first workshop's questions. People were invited to look at the exhibits arranged around the room.

Tim Gilbert opened the meeting and reviewed the agenda. John Cunningham, Transportation Planner for Contra Costa County, reviewed the project history and report, and answered several questions posed at the last workshop. The report is posted on the County's web site. John then turned the meeting over to Tim Gilbert.

Tim opened the floor to the public, asking that comments be limited to those not already expressed. Cheryl Sullivan reviewed trailing planning criteria and design issues. The group was then asked to discuss the positive and negative aspects of the four alternatives. Comments were recorded on a large wallgraphic, and summarized below. They are arranged by general topics. Additional wording is added [...] to clarify the comment. (Photoreductions of the wallgraphics produced at the workshop are provided at the end of this document.)

The workshop adjourned at 9 p.m. The 3rd workshop will be held in January, 2004. Date and place of the 3rd workshop will be announced when decided upon.

NEW COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

- [Staff/agency names here tonight: Joelle Fockler, Contra Costa Center; Michael Vecchio, City of Walnut Creek; Kevin Connolly, BART Planning; Jamie Perkins, East Bay Regional Parks District; Mark Covington, Walnut Creek Police Department; Mary Bustamante, Contra Costa Sheriff's Office; Steve Goetz, Contra Costa County Community Development Department]
- [East Bay Parks] trail experience: initially not wanted, later its an asset
- Crime is active where there's no visibility
- Is the concept (not the location) of the trail ok?
 - Pros and cons for the trail.
- Any count of users of the trail if it is built?
- Are there [immediate] neighbors in favor [of the path] here? – No
- Q#16 – count is anecdotal [see John Cunningham's Q&A sheet]
- 5,000 = household population
- If only 38 users, then access is poor?

- No pedestrian/bike traffic along David & Minert
- How to determine [pedestrian and bike] demand?
- Comment: Concord Trail Master Plan in BART R.O.W. (David and Minert) will complement/add to this area
- Will path here encourage walkers were there aren't any sidewalks?
- Bikes and pedestrians use David and Minert [now]
- Trails should connect parks and schools
 - This [shortcut path] does improve the connection
- Very unsafe for pedestrians – limited # of sidewalks
- Bancroft/Mayhew – no sidewalk, narrow, and very unsafe [now]
 - Pedestrians have to walk in the street
- Las Juntas – limited sidewalks
- Bently Street used [by pedestrians] instead of David/Minert
- [Minert/David]/Bancroft/Mayhew/Las Juntas have [safety] problems [now] – is this [shortcut] path going to make these safer?
 - Existing route is deficient [Minert/David – Bancroft/Mayhew – Las Juntas]
 - The [shortcut] path is not meant to take place of other needs [and improvements]
- [Shortcut] Path is affecting neighbors – while providing access to others
- Real estate values – [reports and opinions vary: values go up/values go down]
- If open trail, then need fence on both sides
- All options affect property owners
- Safety [Mark Covington from the Walnut Creek Police Department spoke to this]
 - Police experience very few incidents
 - No homeless living on trails
 - Very few incidents
 - More public – usually less crime
- East Bay trails [Jamie Perkins from the East Bay Regional Parks District spoke to this]
 - Have rangers to patrol [trails]
 - Little/few incidents
 - Maintenance and operations manual [addresses trail specifics]
- Past experience on Clemson when R.O.W. was open [but undeveloped]
 - Fires
 - Drugs
 - Trash

- Sense of security will be destroyed
- Lighting
 - At night?
 - Encourages use
 - Provides safety
 - Spill-over light [is a problem]
- Fencing
 - Who pays for it ? – not the homeowner

ALTERNATIVES MAP

- Option D [improve sidewalk conditions along Las Juntas, Mayhew, and Bancroft]
 - Positive improvements for all
 - Pictures [of existing conditions presented]
 - Graffiti, homeless are problems
 - Costs are less
 - Longer distance
- [Option] C
 - Costs lower [than B]
 - Neighbors keep edges clean [now]
 - Have to make sure landscape is kept up [A, B & C]
 - Fence needs to be high enough
 - Fencing is negative
 - Lighting needed
 - Dedicate [public owned] triangular parcels to landowners?
- [Option] B
 - Fencing – varies depending on situations
 - Visibility is good (length) + [+ = positive]
 - No traffic interaction +
 - Doesn't impact cul-de-sac – owner disagrees
 - Mature trees +
 - Don't travel through [private] property +
 - No auto exhaust +
 - Wayfinding is easy +

- Trees are a buffer +
- Residents prefer fence along road [Clemson]
- Lighting needed
- [Option] A
 - Driveways are problems for bikes and pedestrians
 - Wall at easement
 - Two [sharp] turns [in path]
 - Bridge needed
 - Least amount of construction (2nd least costly)
 - Is Cherry/Las Juntas [intersection] better than Bancroft/Mayhew?
 - Is traffic load enough for [new] sidewalk?
 - Lighting needed