

Alameda Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Plans Updates
**Summary of Major Input received on Bicycle and Pedestrian
Capital Projects Vision and Priority Networks**

From: May and June 2011 local agency and local Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) meetings, plus individual comments from agency staff and public.

Alameda CTC responses are written in italics and enclosed in brackets, and, where applicable, refer to the revised networks approach in Attachment 05A. This list does not include requests for edits to the network maps.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans (both)

1. Downtowns/Major Commercial Districts Network Category:
 - a. What is definition of Major Commercial Districts? Why are some included, others not? Why aren't shopping centers/malls included? These are the commercial districts of suburban areas (like Stoneridge Mall). Improved access to them is needed.
[Revised approach.]
2. Trails Network Category:
 - a. Iron Horse Trail (IHT)
 - i. Don't describe trail inclusion as only in "urbanized" areas. Change it to be "east to Greenville Road" or in "populated areas."
[Change made.]
 - ii. Need assistance with working with BART to allow bicyclists to ride through Dublin/Pleasanton BART, since part of IHT.
[Alameda CTC can assist (separate from Plan update).]
 - b. Bay Trail
 - i. Alignments may change, especially in South County, as trails are further designed.
[Will note in Plan that alignments on maps may change to serve as a replacement to proposed alignments.]
 - ii. Include Spurs in Vision, if not also in Priority Networks.
[Spurs recommended in vision, but not priorities, since goal is to first construct the spine, and next the connections from transit/populated areas.]
 - c. Trail connectors needed for East Bay Greenway. Specifically, add the San Leandro Creek Trail and San Lorenzo Creek Trail which will connect East Bay Greenway with the Bay trail in Oakland/San Leandro/Unincorporated area.
[Connectors that are developed through a local planning process and are inter-jurisdictional will be added to Vision. Overall, the priority is to build the spine of EB Greenway and Bay Trail before connectors are built.]
 - d. Trails should be connected to transit and other bikeway routes, and to other major trails.
[Comment noted. Some trails do, while others do not.]
 - e. Add more Trails (or prioritize):
 - i. Arroyo Mocho Trail (Livermore to Pleasanton) should be a priority in Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans

[Not added as priority, since it parallels Iron Horse Trail. Already included in Vision of both plans.]

- ii. Add local trails in Livermore – more realistic alignments than East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) trails in that area.

[Local trails not added, unless they are replacing another route/trail that is parallel to the EBRPD trail.]

3. Network Categories Missing:

- a. Add UC Berkeley as a new destination/category. 50,000 students/staff/faculty.
[Pedestrian Plan: Included as an Activity Center in the Vision Network, so pedestrian access within a ¼ mile is included. Also, it is within ½ mile walkshed of BART and major trunklines, so pedestrian improvements would be prioritized in this area.]

Bicycle Plan: Will modify Downtown Berkeley/Downtown BART access routes to run along Hearst and Bancroft streets, next to campus.]

- b. Consider adding additional Activity Center categories, like youth centers or the Ed Roberts Campus, that draw people from outside one city.

[No new Activity Centers added – focus is on those already included for these Plan updates. Also, Ed Roberts Campus is included as “access to transit” in vision and priority maps, since it is at Ashby BART station]

4. Priority Networks:

- a. Do not eliminate priority networks - needed in general, due to limited funds.
- b. Don't use Financially Constrained List – funding future is too uncertain
- c. Consider ranking the priority areas, in priority order.
- d. Could use cost-effectiveness to prioritize projects

[Comments addressed in recommendation, or noted for grant funding cycle.]

5. Maintenance:

- a. Call this out – very important, especially for trails.
- b. Prioritize maintenance of existing facilities over adding new facilities.
- c. *[Maintenance is included in networks, and in cost estimating. Both maintenance and new facilities are included in the update of the Plans. It would be very difficult to draw the line on not funding any new infrastructure and just maintenance.]*

6. Geographic Equity

- a. Some concerns that the proposal is not equitable geographically.
[Will get feedback from BPAC and PWG on revised recommendation and hear if this is still a concern.]

7. Funding levels:

- a. More funding is needed for bicycle/pedestrian projects and programs.
[Comment noted.]

Bicycle Plan (only)

1. Transit Network Category:

- a. ½ mile (priority) distance is too short for biking
[Comment addressed in revised approach.]
- b. Transit priority distances should be same (3/4 mile) throughout county for equity reasons. This will benefit the most users – more density as get closer in.
[Still recommend that distances vary by Planning Area, because BART data shows differing biking distances to transit (BART), and for geographic equity]

reasons. Revised priorities approach does emphasize projects that are closer to transit over those further from transit.]

- c. Distances should be longer in areas with less transit, since people are biking longer distances to get there.
[Still recommend using available BART data, which shows average distances traveled.]
 - d. Transit Access routes need to connect to employment sites, or other destinations.
[Comment addressed in revised approach.]
 - e. Transit access distances should vary by type of transit
[For simplicity, recommend the same access distance, no matter the type of transit. Also, no easily available local transit data besides BART.]
 - f. Emeryville, with no major transit, should be connected to Ashby and Macarthur BART with access routes.
[Vision transit access routes do connect Emeryville to transit. Inter-jurisdictional routes also connect.]
 - g. Allow a bicycle “access route” to be a shuttle (not just a bikeway), since in some cases this might be best available option (e.g. Alameda-Oakland estuary crossing).
[This is possible, depending on funding source eligibility for transit operations.]
2. Downtown/Commercial Districts Network Category:
- a. 3 miles distance is too short, especially if hills
[Recommend keeping same distance, since it is already quite long.]
 - b. Access routes should connect to destinations.
[Comment noted. Will attempt to connect when making map edits.]
3. Network Categories Missing:
- a. Union City Blvd – bicycle lanes. Some places, like Union City, have not prioritized trails and don’t have any to implement. Would prefer on-street bikeways instead.
[Could be considered under inter-jurisdictional routes in vision and priority networks. Also Union City Blvd and other routes on Vision Network are eligible for funding under revised approach, just would not receive higher ranking that priority network projects will.]
 - b. Interjurisdictional Routes:
 - i. Add interjurisdictional routes as priority
 - ii. Some heavily traveled bicycle corridors between jurisdictions need further study. Need consensus on where routes should be and/or facility types. Also, bicycle access should be included for some corridors that may be studied by Alameda CTC for all modes. Examples include:
 - 1. San Pablo (Albany, Berkeley, Oakland, Emeryville)
 - 2. South Berkeley/Oakland/Emeryville connections
 - 3. College Ave (Berkeley/Oakland)
 - 4. Hesperian (Central County)
 - 5. Adeline/Market (Berkeley/Oakland)*[The new proposed inter-jurisdictional category should address this need.]*
 - c. Park & Ride lots – add them as a destination
[Not added at this time, due to size of vision network. Could consider adding in future.]

4. Alignments
 - a. Exact alignments for all network segments/links should be allowed to vary, depending on local planning. Mapped routes should be considered guidance *[This is allowed - any variance should be determined by local plans or feasibility studies.]*
 - b. Local Bicycle Plan alignments/routes should always be used on the network – the Countywide Plan should not show routes different than (or in conflict with) local routes
[The countywide vision network should only be showing routes from local plans, unless a local jurisdiction has specifically requested adding a route not in their current network.]
 - c. Need a balance of routes for experienced and less experienced riders.
[Current network generally achieves a balance.]
5. Overall
 - a. Addition of new access routes to transit and downtowns/Major Commercial Districts (MCDs) is good, but adds a lot to the networks. Further emphasizes need for prioritization, and clarity for how projects are selected.
[Addressed in the revised recommendation.]
6. Specific Routes/Locations:
 - a. Hayward:
 - i. No good routes from Hayward BART to the Bay
 - ii. Lack of north-south routes. Need more direct bikeways here
 - iii. Local routes (off major high speed arterials) are poorly signed and difficult to follow
 - iv. Routes from Castro Valley to Chabot College are terrible. Need better east-west routes and connections.
[The countywide network reflects Hayward's local bikeway network. All comments regarding Hayward network will be passed on to the city for its consideration. In addition, Alameda CTC, as feasible, will work with Hayward on addressing these concerns.]

Pedestrian Plan (only)

1. Transit:
 - a. Add bus lines in South County (SC) to connect to Ohlone College and Santa Clara County.
[Addressed by adding new bus transit trunkline category of significant inter-county routes.]
 - b. Consider expanding ½ mile walkshed to BART in areas with few other transit options, like Castro Valley.
[For equity reasons and simplicity, recommend maintaining the same walkshed distance throughout the county.]
2. Overall:
 - a. Pedestrian Plan categories are very broad – cover a lot of projects, maybe too many
[Comment noted - priority network attempts to narrow this down.]