

Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans - 2015 Progress Report  
**Implementation Actions (Tables 7.1) – 2013 to 2017**

		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Status	Notes
<b>FUNDING</b>								
<b>1. Implement the Countywide Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan by continuing to dedicate funding and staff time to the plan priorities, and integrating the priorities into the agency's activities</b>								
1.1	Use this plan to guide the agency's bicycle/pedestrian program and funding priorities.	√	√	√	√	√	Ongoing	
1.2	In each funding cycle for all of the funding sources administered by the agency, consider funding the plan priorities (as applicable), using this plan as a guide.	√	√	√	√	√	Ongoing	
1.3	Continue to have a countywide bicycle and pedestrian coordinator and/or team.	√	√	√	√	√	Ongoing	
1.4	Advocate for additional and/or new funding to support the plan priorities at the county, regional, state and federal levels.	√	√	√	√	√	Ongoing	
1.5	Annually review the plan's implementation actions to ensure that they are incorporated into the agency's work plan and to monitor progress made.	√	√	√	√		Ongoing	Annual reports brought to BPAC in October
1.6	Implement grant funding cycles for bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs every two years, or as discretionary funding is available.	\$		\$		\$	Ongoing	Bicycle/ pedestrian countywide discretionary funds and other funding sources with bicycle/pedestrian eligibility were programmed as part of 2013 Coordinated Funding Program. These funds now to be programmed biannually as part of Comprehensive Investment Program (first CIP was adopted in June 2015).
<b>2. Fund and provide technical assistance for the development and updating of local bicycle/pedestrian master plans</b>								
2.1	Continue to fund local master plans so that jurisdictions without an adopted plan can develop one, and the 14 local jurisdictions [ <i>bike</i> ] and 11 local jurisdictions [ <i>ped</i> ] and also other public agencies (such as BART [ <i>bike</i> ], AC Transit [ <i>ped</i> ], and UC Berkeley [ <i>bike/ped</i> ]) with plans can keep them up to date.	\$		\$		\$	Ongoing	Piedmont Active Transportation Plan funded in 2013 Coordinated Call. Local master plans remain eligible for bicycle/pedestrian countywide discretionary funds programmed through CIP.

Subitem numbering: B= Bike Plan; P = Ped Plan; Number only = Both Plans  
 √ = timing of ongoing implementation  
 ■ = timing of feasibility studies or strategic planning  
 \$ = coordinated with a funding cycle

Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans - 2015 Progress Report  
**Implementation Actions (Tables 7.1) – 2013 to 2017**

		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Status	Notes
2.2	Develop a toolkit of technical resources to assist agencies in developing and updating their plans, such as best practices, to ensure that plans are effective, and, to the extent feasible, comparable to each other.	■	■				Completed	Bicycle Plan Guidelines adopted in January 2015. Supporting tools including cost-estimating guide to be finalized in 2015.
<b>3. Coordinate transportation funding with land use decisions that support and enhance bicycling/walking</b>								
3.1	Develop and implement a Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment and Growth Strategy and PDA Strategic Plan that identifies “ready” PDAs and transportation projects within them, including developing cost estimates, incorporating complete communities and streets concepts and policies, and developing Transit-Oriented Design Guidelines.	■	■	√	√	√	Completed	PDA Investment and Growth Strategy adopted in March 2013; Updates adopted in September 2014 and May 2015.
3.2	Develop a countywide Community-Based Transportation Program, including updating the existing Community-Based Transportation Plans (CBTPs), incorporating new Communities of Concern areas as defined by MTC, identifying high priority projects (including bicycle and pedestrian projects) and costs estimates, and an implementation strategy.	■	■	√	√	√	Planned	Comprehensive update to Community-Based Transportation Plans to be conducted as part of an Equity Analysis Task of the Countywide Transportation Plan update (ongoing, to be adopted in 2016).
3.3	Conduct a feasibility study to design a program that integrates land use and transportation supported by financial incentives, similar to Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority’s “Community Design & Transportation” program, and identify a tracking method.		■				No progress	
3.4	Investigate other ways to maximize the coordination of transportation funding with land use decisions to support and enhance bicycling.			√	√		Ongoing	

Subitem numbering: B= Bike Plan; P = Ped Plan; Number only = Both Plans  
√ = timing of ongoing implementation  
■ = timing of feasibility studies or strategic planning  
\$ = coordinated with a funding cycle

Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans - 2015 Progress Report  
**Implementation Actions (Tables 7.1) – 2013 to 2017**

			2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Status	Notes
<b>4. (B) Pursue additional dedicated funding for bikeway maintenance</b>									
4.1	B	Consider setting aside a portion of discretionary funding for maintenance of facilities on the countywide network.	\$		\$			Ongoing	Trail maintenance is an eligible Measure BB bicycle/pedestrian discretionary fund expenditure; no progress towards dedicated set-aside.
4.2	B	Advocate for dedicated funding for bikeway maintenance, particularly for trails, at the regional, state and federal levels.	√	√	√	√	√	Ongoing	Alameda CTC staff advocated for trail maintenance to be eligible expenditure of state Active Transportation Program funds
<b>4. (P) Conduct research on, and develop resources for, best practices for funding sidewalk maintenance</b>									
4.1	P	Conduct research on sidewalk maintenance in Alameda County by surveying local jurisdictions on how sidewalk maintenance is currently funded and comparing these funding mechanisms to those used for roadway maintenance.			■			Potential work program item for 2015-16	
4.2	P	Develop best practices and recommendations for funding the maintenance of sidewalks, including suggesting possible new funding sources.				■		Potential work program item for 2015-16	
<b>TECHNICAL TOOLS AND ASSISTANCE</b>									
<b>5. Develop resources to support local jurisdictions in adopting and implementing Complete Streets policies</b>									
5.1		Develop a package of recommended technical assistance and resources that support complete streets in the county. [starting in 2012]	■					Ongoing	Alameda CTC hosted a half-day conference on complete streets implementation in 2013. Alameda CTC has covered topics such as planning for emergency response and green streets in PBWG meetings. Alameda CTC is leading a Central County Complete Streets Implementation Project which will develop a number of technical resources with countywide applicability.
5.2		Implement the recommended complete streets resources. [starting in 2012]	√	√	√	√	√	Ongoing	See 5.1.

Subitem numbering: B= Bike Plan; P = Ped Plan; Number only = Both Plans  
 √ = timing of ongoing implementation  
 ■ = timing of feasibility studies or strategic planning  
 \$ = coordinated with a funding cycle

Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans - 2015 Progress Report  
**Implementation Actions (Tables 7.1) – 2013 to 2017**

		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Status	Notes
5.3	Assist local jurisdictions with updating the circulation element of their general plans in compliance with Assembly Bill 1358, the “California Complete Streets Act of 2008,” by 2014, to be in compliance with the MTC policy requirement.	√	√				Completed	Alameda CTC created a Best Practice Resource on Incorporating Complete Streets in a Circulation Element. Alameda CTC is developing a multimodal street typology as part of Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan that could inform local circulation element updates.
<b>6. Offer regular trainings and information-sharing forums for local-agency staff on best practices in bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure and programs</b>								
6.1	Continue to provide free access to a monthly webinar presented by the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals, and consider expanding the reach of this program to those not located near the Alameda CTC offices.	√	√	√	√	√	Ongoing	
6.2	Host additional webinars on topics of interest, as they are made available.	√	√	√	√	√	Ongoing	
6.3	Host half-day educational forums on best practices in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and programs, at least every other year.	√		√		√	Ongoing	Half-day conference on Complete Streets Implementation hosted in Summer 2013. No progress in 2015.
6.4	Re-convene the Pedestrian Bicycle Working Group (PBWG), a group of local agency and advocacy staff that meets up to four times a year to share information, learn about best practices, and give input to Alameda CTC on its programs and projects.	√	√	√	√	√	Ongoing	
6.5	Establish a quarterly speaker series featuring bicycle and pedestrian experts to address timely topics such as the implementation of Complete Streets, liability concerns, innovative infrastructure treatments, and CEQA-related obstacles.	√	√	√	√	√	No progress	

Subitem numbering: B= Bike Plan; P = Ped Plan; Number only = Both Plans  
√ = timing of ongoing implementation  
■ = timing of feasibility studies or strategic planning  
\$ = coordinated with a funding cycle

Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans - 2015 Progress Report  
**Implementation Actions (Tables 7.1) – 2013 to 2017**

			2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Status	Notes
<b>7. Develop a local best practices resource and other tools that encourage jurisdictions to use bicycle/pedestrian-friendly design standards</b>									
7.1		Develop a local best practices resource that includes engineering-level detail for both basic and innovative infrastructure in use in Alameda County, as a way to share and spread best practices throughout the county, and to reduce the need for local agencies to re-invent the wheel. Information about programs, such as signage or enforcement, could also be included. The resource will be developed with input from local agencies, and could be print or web-based.	■	■				No progress	
7.2		Disseminate information about best practices and innovative design guidelines, [ <i>bike</i> : such as the NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide], as they become available, and work with local jurisdictions to determine which are the most useful and should be highlighted.	√	√	√	√	√	Ongoing	
7.3	B	Determine if a Bicycle Design Guidelines and Best Practices document would be useful to local jurisdictions as a resource for designing bicycle projects in Alameda County, including those funded by Alameda CTC, and if so, develop the document.		■				Completed	Countywide Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator determined that this is of lower value as many jurisdictions have developed local design guidelines as part of master plans and many examples of innovative, exemplary design guidelines already exist.
7.3	P	Update the "Toolkit for Improving Walkability in Alameda County," last published in 2009. At the same time (or earlier), consider developing Pedestrian Design Guidelines and Best Practices to be used by local jurisdictions as a resource for designing all pedestrian projects in Alameda County, including those funded by Alameda CTC.		■				No progress	

Subitem numbering: B= Bike Plan; P = Ped Plan; Number only = Both Plans  
√ = timing of ongoing implementation  
■ = timing of feasibility studies or strategic planning  
\$ = coordinated with a funding cycle

Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans - 2015 Progress Report  
**Implementation Actions (Tables 7.1) – 2013 to 2017**

		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Status	Notes
7.4	Once the above tools have been established, select a new tool to develop each year, via input from local jurisdictions (see list of possible tools in the “Countywide Priorities” chapter under “Technical Tools and Assistance” program).			■	■	■	Ongoing	
7.5	Support local jurisdictions in testing and implementing innovative infrastructure, as feasible.	√	√	√	√	√	Ongoing	Innovation is considered as part of project selection criteria for bicycle/pedestrian countywide discretionary funding, to help offset typically higher costs associated with innovative infrastructure.
7.6	Via information-sharing forums, such as the PBWG, develop a better countywide understanding of the limitations of the Highway Design Manual being used for the design of local streets, and the alternative design standards available for facilities.	√	√	√	√	√	Ongoing	
<b>8. Offer technical assistance to local jurisdictions on complex bicycle/pedestrian design projects</b>								
8.1	Research and develop the best method of offering technical assistance that is simple for local jurisdictions to use and feasible for Alameda CTC to operate. This could be done by expanding Alameda CTC’s current Transit-Oriented Development Technical Assistance program (TOD TAP) to include bicycle and pedestrian projects.	■	■	√	√	√	Completed	Alameda CTC funded several bicycle/pedestrian technical assistance projects as part of Sustainable Communities Technical Assistance Project (SCTAP) in 2013.

Subitem numbering: B= Bike Plan; P = Ped Plan; Number only = Both Plans  
√ = timing of ongoing implementation  
■ = timing of feasibility studies or strategic planning  
\$ = coordinated with a funding cycle

Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans - 2015 Progress Report  
**Implementation Actions (Tables 7.1) – 2013 to 2017**

		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Status	Notes
<b>9. Develop tools and provide technical assistance to help local jurisdictions overcome CEQA-related obstacles</b>								
9.1	Provide technical assistance to local jurisdictions to develop alternative CEQA policies, guidelines and standards to overcome, or at least lessen, some of the obstacles noted above. This may be done by developing a CEQA mitigation toolkit based on the best practices and resources developed in previous implementation actions.	√	√	√	√		Ongoing	Senate Bill 743 passed in 2014 will eliminate vehicle Level of Service as the CEQA metric used to assess transportation impacts. This shift should reduce frequency of mitigation measures which degrade the walking/biking environment and remove an impediment to bicycle/pedestrian projects that remove vehicle travel lanes. Alameda CTC is monitoring development of new CEQA guidelines pursuant to this bill and will support local jurisdictions in implementation.
9.2	Provide trainings and speaker sessions (via implementation action #6 above) for local jurisdictions that address relevant topics, such as expanding LOS standards to include multi-modal measures; the appropriate level of environmental review for different types of bicycle and pedestrian plans and projects; trip-generation methodologies appropriate for smart growth developments; and significance thresholds for transportation impacts.	√	√	√	√	√	Ongoing	Alameda CTC reviewed and adopted a series of trip-generation methodologies appropriate for smart growth as part of 2013 CMP. Alameda CTC is monitoring implementation of SB 743 to address auto LOS issues (see 9.1). Alameda CTC is funding a technical assistance project in Oakland that will develop a streamlined method for environmental review of road diet projects.
<b>COUNTYWIDE INITIATIVES</b>								
<b>10. Develop and implement a strategy to address how to improve and grow (as feasible) four near-term priority countywide programs (10.1 to 10.4 below)</b>								
10.1	<b>Safe routes to schools (SR2S) program.</b> Approximately 100 schools had established SR2S programs in 2012. This plan's long-term goal is to have a program in every school in the county (see Strategy 2.6 in the "Vision and Goals" chapter).	■	√	√	√	√	Ongoing	Program has increased number of schools and events year-over-year; many schools exhibit increases in student active and shared mode split

Subitem numbering: B= Bike Plan; P = Ped Plan; Number only = Both Plans  
 √ = timing of ongoing implementation  
 ■ = timing of feasibility studies or strategic planning  
 \$ = coordinated with a funding cycle

Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans - 2015 Progress Report  
**Implementation Actions (Tables 7.1) – 2013 to 2017**

			2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Status	Notes
10.2	B	<b>Countywide bicycle safety education program.</b> Safety classes are offered around the county in a variety of languages. The goal is to further expand the program to broaden its reach (see Strategy 2.5 in the "Vision and Goals" chapter).	■	√	√	√	√	Ongoing	Program has increased classes provided and attendance year-over-year
10.2	P	<b>Countywide pedestrian safety advertising campaign.</b> This is a new program that will create a countywide safety campaign aimed at promoting road safety among motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists and bus drivers.		■	√	√	√	Potential work program item for 2015-16	
10.3	B	<b>Countywide bicycle safety advertising campaign.</b> This is a new program that will create a countywide safety campaign aimed at promoting road safety among motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists and bus drivers.		■	√	√	√	Potential work program item for 2015-16	
10.3	P	<b>Countywide Safe Routes for Seniors program.</b> Many walking clubs and programs for seniors already exist around the county. The goal is to create a comprehensive countywide program that encourages seniors to walk, bike, and access transit safely (see Strategy 2.7 in the "Vision and Goals" chapter).			■	√	√	No progress	
10.4	B	<b>Countywide bicycling promotion program.</b> The current "Ride into Life!" advertising campaign, which is coordinated with Bike to Work Day each year, was evaluated in 2010/2011. The agency will re-examine this program, and other possible new efforts, to determine possible improvements.	√	√	■	√	√	Completed	"Ride into Life!" campaign revamped as "I Bike" campaign in 2013.
10.4	P	<b>Countywide walking promotion program.</b> The agency will develop new strategies to promote walking for health, recreation and transportation.				■	√	Not yet initiated	

Subitem numbering: B= Bike Plan; P = Ped Plan; Number only = Both Plans  
 √ = timing of ongoing implementation  
 ■ = timing of feasibility studies or strategic planning  
 \$ = coordinated with a funding cycle



Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans - 2015 Progress Report  
**Implementation Actions (Tables 7.1) – 2013 to 2017**

		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Status	Notes
10.5	Work with local jurisdictions to grow the above programs even further by developing and offering an easy-to-administer option for jurisdictions to contribute local funding toward countywide programs to expand the programs in their jurisdiction.	v	v				Potential work program item for 2015-16	
<b>11. Develop and adopt an internal Complete Streets policy</b>								
11.1	Alameda CTC will develop an internal Complete Streets policy that addresses the wide variety of activities that the agency performs, including capital projects development, fund programming, and countywide planning, tools and resources. This will ensure that capital projects implemented and/or funded by the agency provide safe and convenient access to all users, including bicyclists/pedestrians, as appropriate and feasible for each project.	■					Potential work program item for 2015-16	
<b>12. Determine options for modifying the countywide travel demand model to make it more sensitive to bicycling/walking and implement the best feasible option</b>								
12.1	As part of the model update—which will among other things, align the model with the 2010 Census, update the model years to 2010 and 2040, and incorporate the Sustainable Communities Strategy—evaluate options for modifying the model to make it more sensitive to bicycling/walking trips, and select the best feasible option. [starting in 2012]	■	v	v			Completed	Model update completed in 2015. Model improvements include adjusting bicycle mode share to reflect extent of bicycle network and assigning bicycle trips to network.
12.2	Consider leading a study, in collaboration with a local jurisdiction, of a road diet (possibly along a CMP network segment) to better understand the impacts to non-motorized transportation of using the model. Based on such a study, further recommendations could be developed to improve the model and the application of LOS standards.	■	v	v			No progress	

Subitem numbering: B= Bike Plan; P = Ped Plan; Number only = Both Plans  
v = timing of ongoing implementation  
■ = timing of feasibility studies or strategic planning  
\$ = coordinated with a funding cycle

Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans - 2015 Progress Report  
**Implementation Actions (Tables 7.1) – 2013 to 2017**

		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Status	Notes
<b>13. Determine options for revising the Congestion Management Program to enhance bicycle/pedestrian safety and access, and implement the best feasible option</b>								
13.1	During the update to the CMP, explore the options for revising the CMP to improve bicycle/pedestrian safety and access, and implement the best feasible option. As one option, consider using minimum safety and access standards for bicyclists and pedestrians, rather than multi-modal LOS, which may not provide direct guidance on future improvements.	■					Completed	2013 CMP update explored use of MMLOS, ultimately determining HCM 2010 MMLOS metrics not suitable for CMP purposes. Multimodal Arterial Plan is using bicycle level of traffic stress and a pedestrian comfort index to assess existing conditions and potential improvements on countywide arterial network.
13.2	Update the CMP guidelines to better define how to develop Areawide Deficiency Plans to address deficiencies on the CMP network, which will allow bicycling and walking improvements to more easily be incorporated into projects, or at a minimum, not pit the implementation of bicycle and pedestrian projects against auto projects to improve LOS.	■	√	√	√		Completed	
13.3	Conduct a feasibility study to explore implementing an impact analysis measure that supports alternative modes, such as San Francisco’s Automobile Trip Generated (ATG) measure, instead of using LOS methodologies that primarily address auto impacts. [starting in 2012]	■	√	√			No progress	No longer relevant due to SB 743.
13.4	Create maps of the areas of overlap between the CMP and the countywide bicycle/pedestrian vision network. This analysis will reveal the areas and routes on which to focus efforts to improve the CMP process from a bicycle and pedestrian safety and access perspective.	■					Completed	Overlap between CMP and bicycle/pedestrian networks being explored as part of Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan.

Subitem numbering: B= Bike Plan; P = Ped Plan; Number only = Both Plans  
√ = timing of ongoing implementation  
■ = timing of feasibility studies or strategic planning  
\$ = coordinated with a funding cycle

Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans - 2015 Progress Report  
**Implementation Actions (Tables 7.1) – 2013 to 2017**

		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Status	Notes
<b>14. Work with the County Public Health Department to consider bicycle/pedestrian data and needs in the development and implementation of health and transportation programs</b>								
14.1	Identify specific bicycle and pedestrian data and social marketing efforts on which to partner with the Alameda County Public Health Department (PHD) to further the goals of this plan.	■					No progress	
14.2	Continue to work collaboratively with the PHD on the intersection of public health and bicycling/walking.	√	√	√	√	√	Ongoing	
<b>15. Monitor, evaluate and report on progress annually on implementation of the Countywide Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan</b>								
15.1	Monitor the status of the plan's eight performance measures included in this chapter, and report on them in the Alameda CTC's annual Performance Report. In future years, the results of these and all other performance measures, as reflected in the Performance Report, will be used by Alameda CTC to set priorities in the agency's Capital Improvement Program.	■	■	■	■	■	Ongoing	Seven of eight performance measures are reported on annually as part of Alameda CTC Performance Report.
15.2	Annually review the plan's implementation actions to ensure that they are incorporated into the agency's work plan and to monitor progress made (this action is also reported under implementation action #1). Create a public report with this data, to be posted on the agency's website.	■	■	■	■		Ongoing	Annual reports brought to BPAC in October
15.3	Create and update a Geographic Information System (GIS) database to include all countywide, and also local, planned and built bicycle facilities [bike] and to track completion of the pedestrian facilities in the Ped Plan's vision system [ped]. Work with local jurisdictions to update this database annually.	■	√	√	√	√	Ongoing	GIS database of bikeways completed and updated annually based on information obtained from local jurisdictions

Subitem numbering: B= Bike Plan; P = Ped Plan; Number only = Both Plans  
 √ = timing of ongoing implementation  
 ■ = timing of feasibility studies or strategic planning  
 \$ = coordinated with a funding cycle

Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans - 2015 Progress Report  
**Implementation Actions (Tables 7.1) – 2013 to 2017**

		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Status	Notes
15.4	Continue the annual bicycle and pedestrian count program, as a way to gauge the effectiveness of new facilities and programs at encouraging bicycling/walking.	√	√	√	√	√	Ongoing	Manual counts collected in 2013 and 2014; 4 automated counters remain installed around county. Alameda CTC exploring changes to count program beginning in 2016.
15.5	Update the Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan every four to five years, coordinating with the updates of the Countywide Transportation Plan and of the Countywide Pedestrian/Bicycle Plan.				■	■	Not yet initiated	
<b>16. Conduct research to inform future plan updates and countywide bicycle/pedestrian planning</b>								
<b>Before next plan update [2013–2016]</b>								
16.1	<b>Performance targets:</b> Work with local jurisdictions and other stakeholders to research and, as feasible and appropriate to a countywide agency, develop comprehensive and meaningful quantitative targets for bicycling/walking in Alameda County. Also, consider establishing a future vehicle miles traveled target and using the countywide travel demand model to determine what actions are needed today to achieve the goal.	■	■				No progress	Deferred until next Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan update.
16.2	<b>Data collection:</b> Assess the benefits and disadvantages of Alameda CTC collecting its own bicycling/walking data, rather than relying on outside sources of data, in order to have more timely information for reporting on performance measures, and possibly targets, and in the next plan update.	■	■				Completed	Staff has identified deficiencies in many outside publically available data sources, but has also identified that best opportunities are to pursue enhanced data collection at regional level.
16.3	<b>Collision analysis:</b> Conduct a detailed countywide collision analysis, which can help guide future plan and funding priorities, and the direction and focus of the countywide bicycle/pedestrian safety advertising campaign.	■	■				Completed	Completed in 2014.

Subitem numbering: B= Bike Plan; P = Ped Plan; Number only = Both Plans  
 √ = timing of ongoing implementation  
 ■ = timing of feasibility studies or strategic planning  
 \$ = coordinated with a funding cycle

Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans - 2015 Progress Report  
**Implementation Actions (Tables 7.1) – 2013 to 2017**

		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Status	Notes
16.4	<b>Caltrans-owned facilities:</b> Work with local jurisdictions, Caltrans and other agencies, as appropriate, to develop a list of interchanges, overcrossings, undercrossings and at-grade crossings of Caltrans highways and roadways on which bicycle and pedestrian access could be improved, and consider prioritizing the list and working with Caltrans to identify funding for the highest priority projects. [ <i>bike</i> : This work would build upon the list of major non-bikeway capital projects already included in Appendix X.] This list would be shared with Caltrans, and other agencies, as appropriate, to help them identify opportunities to better accommodate non-motorized users.		■	■			No progress	
16.5	<b>Typical project costs:</b> Work with local agencies to refine typical construction and maintenance costs for bicycle/pedestrian capital projects. These cost assumptions could be used for estimating project costs not only in the Countywide Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan update but also in local master plans.			■	■		Ongoing	Bicycle/pedestrian cost estimating guide to be completed in 2015, which includes unit cost information based on actual project bid documents.
16.6	<b>Countywide and local BPACs:</b> Evaluate the staffing, funding, administration, composition and performance of the countywide and local BPACs for strengths, weaknesses and opportunities to improve their effectiveness.			■	■		Potential work program item for 2015-16	

Subitem numbering: B= Bike Plan; P = Ped Plan; Number only = Both Plans  
 √ = timing of ongoing implementation  
 ■ = timing of feasibility studies or strategic planning  
 \$ = coordinated with a funding cycle

Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans - 2015 Progress Report  
**Implementation Actions (Tables 7.1) – 2013 to 2017**

			2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Status	Notes
<b>During next plan update [2017]</b>									
16.7		<b>Bicycling/Walking rates:</b> Develop case studies of how other cities and counties around the nation have managed to increase bicycling/walking rates, and develop best practices and recommended policies both for internal use and for local jurisdictions.					■	Not yet initiated	
16.8		<b>Central business districts [ped : and major commercial districts]:</b> Review and standardize the definition of central business districts (CBDs) [ped : and major commercial districts (MCDs)], as used in the “Countywide Priorities” chapter, and determine their distribution throughout the county for planning purposes under the updated Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan.					■	Not yet initiated	
16.9	B	<b>Major bus transfer points:</b> Re-evaluate the purpose and definition of major bus transfer points, included in the “Countywide Priorities” chapter.					■	Not yet initiated	
16.9	P	<b>Rail transit access costs:</b> Develop separate costs for high ridership rail stations, such as many BART stations, and low ridership rail stations, such as some Amtrak stations, so that cost estimates are more accurate.					■	Not yet initiated	
16.10	B	<b>Types of Bikeways:</b> Differentiate bicycle boulevards from other Class III bicycle routes in the vision network, since the cost and usage of these facilities are very different.					■	Not yet initiated	

Subitem numbering: B= Bike Plan; P = Ped Plan; Number only = Both Plans  
 √ = timing of ongoing implementation  
 ■ = timing of feasibility studies or strategic planning  
 \$ = coordinated with a funding cycle

Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans - 2015 Progress Report  
**Implementation Actions (Tables 7.1) – 2013 to 2017**

			2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Status	Notes
16.10	P	<b>Major [non-bikeway] capital projects:</b> Identify the major [non-bikeway] capital projects (such as over- and under-crossings, and bicycle/pedestrian bridges) needed along the bicycle/pedestrian vision network [ <i>bike</i> : that are along access to transit and access to CBD routes]. This will assist in estimating the full costs of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan and prioritizing projects.						Not yet initiated	
16.11	B						■	Not yet initiated	
16.11	P	<b>Facilities needing major repair and/or upgrades:</b> Work with local jurisdictions to develop an inventory of countywide bicycle/pedestrian facilities in the vision network that are considered “built” but still are in need of repair or upgrades in order to be considered “completed,” and also the estimated costs to improve them.						Not yet initiated	
16.12	B						■	Not yet initiated	
16.13	B	<b>Re-paving needs:</b> Refine the cost to improve and maintain pavement along all bikeways in the bicycle vision network.					■	Not yet initiated	

Subitem numbering: B= Bike Plan; P = Ped Plan; Number only = Both Plans  
 √ = timing of ongoing implementation  
 ■ = timing of feasibility studies or strategic planning  
 \$ = coordinated with a funding cycle