



Jun 3, 2019

Dear honorable mayor and councillors

With respect to the draft proposal for a Fremont Mobility Commission (Agenda Item 7.B. on June 4, 2019), Bike Fremont offers the following comments/suggestions:

1. The scope of the Commission appears to be narrowly defined as the implementation of the current Mobility Action Plan (MAP), specifically delivering the program elements, 1-5. Since the MAP is a 5-year plan, the expectation is that the Commissioners terms would thus be 5 years. However, we feel it is likely that the plan will be updated and renewed past 5 years since the Mobility Task Force identified needs beyond the current action plant. Hence the statutory language establishing the Commission should be more broadly reflective of the goals the Mobility Task Force set out to achieve (which are likely to be persistent), rather than the currently listed actions to achieve those goals (which are likely mutable). As a reminder, these goals are:
 - *relieve traffic congestion*
 - *improve multimodal local circulation*
 - *reduce major traffic crashes*
 - *adapt to new transportation technologies*
2. With an eye to the long term, we would also like to see the 3rd goal specified as
 - *eliminate severe and fatal transportation incidents*This language provides better specificity and enshrines the Vision Zero Policy as a foundational aspect of mobility in Fremont. In fact, we would like to see this listed as the first and primary goal. Mobility is only ensured when one can have a reasonable expectation of personal safety.

We prefer “transportation incidents” over more vehicle-centric language to make sure that violence aboard public transit is included in the scope of personal safety. However, other language may be equally suitable.
3. For simplicity it is also possible to consider traffic congestion as a subset of multimodal circulation. “Traffic congestion” is usually applied to vehicle traffic, which is but one of the travel modes. In a system with good multimodal circulation, vehicle traffic should automatically be at minimal congestion. So a more concise listing of the goals would be:
 - *eliminate severe and fatal transportation incidents*
 - *improve multimodal local circulation*
 - *adapt to new transportation technologies*
4. Even with the streamlined goals above, the proposed breakdown along Traffic/School/ Bicycling/Transit demographics still makes sense. However, we would suggest that the desired number of representatives for each group is 3, with a minimum of 2. This can be accomplished without increasing the size of the Commission as there is likely to be overlap.

(Many cyclists rely on transit for medium/long-range travel for instance.) However, it is critical to ensure a minimum representation of 2 in each group, so that working groups can have continuity (and a quorum), even if one Commissioner becomes unavailable.

5. Regarding the selection of commissioners, as mentioned previously, we strongly feel that expertise comes from lived experience. Hence the selection process for Commissioners should emphasize significant involvement in the targeted focus areas, not just casual exposure. We particularly point out that occasional recreational cycling in off-street settings does not provide the necessary expertise to critically evaluate matters pertaining to cycling for transportation on city streets shared with motor vehicles.
6. We support the desire for geographic, gender, age and ethnic diversity on the Commission. We would suggest that any statutory language to that effect be made general for all Commissions in Fremont, effective with future appointments, not just the Mobility Commission. Indeed, the creation of this new Commission may be an opportunity to proliferate other best practices amongst Commissions, e.g.
 - adopt gender-neutral language (“chairperson” instead of “chairman”) in FMC 2.20.010 (b)
 - change the number of applicants required for citizen advisory committees by FMC 2.20.040 (c) to make it less onerous to fill such positions.
7. Circling back to the purpose of the Commission, we feel it is important for the establishing ordinance to explicitly define the scope to encompass:
 - Advise Council and Staff on any issue that relates to the goals listed in paragraph 3.
 - Assist with implementation actions pertaining to the goals listed in paragraph 3.
 - Act as a forum for the public’s participation on any issue that relates to the goals listed in paragraph 3.
 - Mutually exchange advice with other Commissions where the scope intersects, e.g. the Planning Commission should be able to request input on the impact of land use on mobility and vice versa.
8. Assuming that the Commission will persist, it makes sense to have 4-year terms for Commissioners, as per FMC 2.20.030 (f).
9. Finally, we strongly disagree with the statement that creation of the Mobility Commission should have no fiscal impact, since it replaces the existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Technical Advisory Committee (BPTAC). While the increased membership is not likely to incur additional costs, the Mobility Commission has vastly bigger scope. Even if the full Commission does not meet more often than suggested, the working groups will probably require quarterly or at least semi-annual meetings each. (For instance, the current BPTAC meets 4-5 times a year and still cannot cover all necessary topics.) The working groups likely constitute standing committees under Brown Act rules. Indeed, for them to effectively “optimize community participation opportunities” it will be required to treat them as such and thus will need staff support for any meetings. This will create additional costs that should



be analyzed and considered. Bike Fremont fully supports the above proposed structure of the Mobility Commission, and we want to make sure that it receives adequate fiscal support throughout its life. Hence, the costs should be properly planned, even if they are minor in the context of the full budget.

Sincerely yours,

Andreas V. Kadavanich
Bike Fremont Co-organizer