



Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda

Thursday, October 4, 2012, 5:30 to 8 p.m.

Meeting Outcomes:

- Make recommendation on the Final Countywide Pedestrian and Bicycle Plans
- Discuss and provide input on the final Alameda CTC Complete Streets Required Policy Elements
- Receive an update on the One Bay Area Grant Program
- Receive an update on the BPAC Renaming Subcommittee

5:30 – 5:35 p.m. Midori Tabata	1. Welcome and Introductions	
5:35 – 5:40 p.m. Public	2. Public Comment	
5:40 – 5:45 p.m. Midori Tabata	3. Approval of July 12, 2012 and September 6, 2012 Minutes <u>03 BPAC Meeting Minutes 071212.pdf – Page 1</u> <u>03A BPAC Meeting Minutes 090612.pdf – Page 9</u>	A
5:45 – 6:45 p.m. Staff, BPAC Members	4. Recommend Approval of the Final Countywide Pedestrian and Bicycle Plans <u>04 Memo Final Countywide Pedestrian and Bicycle Plans.pdf – Page 15</u> <u>04A Comment Form.doc – Page 21</u> <u>04B Final Countywide Pedestrian and Bicycle Plans.pdf – Previously sent under separate cover</u>	A
6:45 – 7:05 p.m. Rochelle Wheeler	5. Input on Final Alameda CTC Complete Streets Policy Elements <u>05 Memo and Attachments Complete Streets Policy.pdf – Page 23</u>	
7:05 – 7:45 p.m. Beth Walukas and Vivek Bhat	6. Update on One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Program <u>06 Memo and Attachments OBAG Funding Program.pdf – Handout at meeting</u> <u>06A Memo and Attachments PDA Strategic Plan – Handout at meeting</u>	I

-
- 7:45 – 7:50 p.m. **7. Board Actions/Staff Reports** |
Staff **A. General**
 [07A BPAC Roster.pdf](#) – Page 39
 [07A1 BPAC Meeting Schedule FY12-13.pdf](#) – Page 41
 [07A2 Outreach Calendar of Events.pdf](#) – Page 43
- 7:50 – 8:00 p.m. **8. BPAC Member Reports** |
BPAC Members **A. BPAC Renaming Subcommittee Update**
 [08A Renaming Subcommittee Mtg Notes 072512.pdf](#) –
 Page 47
- 8:00 p.m. **9. Meeting Adjournment**

Next Meeting:

Date: November 15, 2012
Time: 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.
Location: 1333 Broadway, Suite 300, Oakland, CA 94612

Staff Liaisons:

Beth Walukas, Deputy Director
of Planning
(510) 208-7405
bwalukas@alamedactc.org

Rochelle Wheeler, Countywide Bicycle and
Pedestrian Coordinator
(510) 208-7471
rwheeler@alamedactc.org

Location Information: Alameda CTC is located at 1333 Broadway in Downtown Oakland at the intersection of 14th Street and Broadway. The office is just a few steps away from the City Center/12th Street BART station. Bicycle parking is available inside the building, and in electronic lockers at 14th and Broadway near Frank Ogawa Plaza (requires purchase of key card from bikelink.org). There is garage parking for autos and bicycles in the City Center Garage (enter on 14th Street between Broadway and Clay). Visit the Alameda CTC website for more information on how to get to the Alameda CTC: <http://www.alamedactc.org/directions.html>.

Public Comment: Members of the public may address the committee regarding any item, including an item not on the agenda. All items on the agenda are subject to action and/or change by the committee. The chair may change the order of items.

Accommodations/Accessibility: Meetings are wheelchair accessible. Please do not wear scented products so that individuals with environmental sensitivities may attend. Call (510) 893-3347 (Voice) or (510) 834-6754 (TTD) five days in advance to request a sign-language interpreter.



**Alameda CTC Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
Thursday, July 12, 2012, 5:30 p.m., 1333 Broadway, Suite 300, Oakland**

Attendance Key (A = Absent, P = Present)

Members:

 P Midori Tabata, Chair
 P Ann Welsh, Vice Chair
 P Alex Chen
 P Lucy Gigli
 P Jeremy Johansen

 A Preston Jordan
 P Glenn Kirby
 P Diana Rohini LaVigne
 P Sara Zimmerman

Staff:

 P Beth Walukas, Deputy Director of Planning
 P Rochelle Wheeler, Bicycle and Pedestrian
Coordinator

 P Angie Ayers, Acumen Building Enterprise, Inc.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Midori Tabata, BPAC Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. The meeting began with introductions and a review of the meeting outcomes.

Guests Present: Mike Ansell, Las Positas College; Lynne Bosche; Victoria Eisen, Eisen|Letunic; Paul Hodges, Hayward Area Recreation & Parks District (H.A.R.D.); Alison Horton; Jim Rothstern

Midori mentioned that this is the first meeting for fiscal year 2012-2013, and many exciting activities are anticipated for the year. She stated that once the updates to the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans are complete and approved by the Commission, BPAC will participate in preparation for Cycle 5 of the Countywide Discretionary Fund Grant Program. Midori stated that many of the BPAC members are also interested in the Complete Streets policy that Alameda CTC is working on with the jurisdictions and agencies.

2. Public Comment

Lynne Bosche stated that she is representing a committee forming in Piedmont to advocate for a city bicycle plan, because Piedmont is the last city in Alameda County to have one. Lynne attended the BPAC meeting to say thank you, because the Countywide Bicycle Plan update is helping to engage the City of Piedmont.

Mike Ansell, an employee of Las Positas College and a Livermore resident, stated that in the 10 years he's lived in Livermore, a bike community has become more possible. He's been the chair of the Las Positas Sustainability Committee for the last 3 years and the college hosted its first Bike to Work Day in May 2012. Mike said that he advocates a connection

between Dublin and Las Positas College on the north side of Interstate 580. He said there are approximately one or two farms on county land blocking the link between the two. According to the city's master plan, this section is pending development, and Mike said it would be best if the city developed the section into a bike path instead of waiting for a developer. Approximately 2,000 people attend Las Positas College, and that section of land would be a great connection if a bike path existed.

3. Approval of May 31, 2012 Minutes

Midori Tabata requested a correction in the "Guests Present" section of the May 31, 2012 minutes to change guest John Spangler's agency/affiliation to BART Bicycle Advisory Task Force.

Ann Welsh moved to approve the May 31, 2012 minutes with the above correction. Diana Rohini LaVigne seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously (7-0). At the time of the vote, one member had not arrived.

4. Review of Draft Countywide Pedestrian and Bicycle Plans

Rochelle Wheeler and Victoria Eisen gave a presentation on the draft Countywide Pedestrian and Bicycle Plans, which were released on June 25th. Staff requested the committee members provide input on the implementation chapters, in particular on activities included in the next steps; and on the countywide priorities chapters, including the priority bicycle network and priority pedestrian system that Alameda CTC will use to guide discretionary funding decisions. Written comments are due by July 27, 2012.

Staff mentioned that during August, Alameda CTC will revise the plans to incorporate the comments received in July from the following Alameda CTC committees:

- Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee (ACTAC)
- Alameda CTC Commission
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans Working Group
- Countywide BPAC
- Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee
- Planning, Policy and Legislation Committee

BPAC will review final drafts of the plans at the September 6, 2012 meeting and make a recommendation to the Commission that they adopt the plans on September 27, 2012. Refer to Attachment A for questions/feedback from the BPAC members.

Public comment: Allison Horton stated that bus drivers need to be educated about bicycle safety. She stated that she does not see cycle tracks mentioned in the plans and believes that cycle tracks are the number one way to solve problems, and they're not mentioned in the description of facilities or in the long-term plans. She stated that one well-placed cycle track would inspire many people to take up cycling.

5. Review Annual Countywide Pedestrian and Bicycle Count Program, 2012 List of Count Sites and 2012 Draft Counts Report

Rochelle Wheeler led the discussion on the Countywide Pedestrian and Bicycle Count Program. She noted that staff reviewed and revised the list of count sites, which Alameda CTC will use for the fall 2012 bicycle and pedestrian counts, and ACTAC reviewed the Counts Report on July 3, 2012 and did not have comments. Rochelle asked the BPAC to provide any additional comments on the report to her by July 20, 2012.

Rochelle told the committee that the *Draft Pedestrian and Bicycle Manual Count Report for Alameda County 2002 to 2011* is virtually the same data from the preliminary draft report that BPAC reviewed in April 2012. She stated that Alameda CTC revised the report to incorporate many of the comments from the BPAC, including expanding the comparison of the count data trends to other data trends, such as population and gas price changes over the past 10 years.

Rochelle stated that the 63 sites that Alameda CTC is proposing to count this fall were included as an attachment to the staff report. Two minor modifications were made to sites in Hayward and Newark based on input received. Rochelle mentioned that Alameda CTC would like to increase the number of count locations to 100 in 2013 if funding permits. Staff recommended that this effort to analyze and consider the selection of additional count locations take place after adoption of the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans, which will establish new pedestrian and bikeway networks. Rochelle stated that Alameda CTC wants to work with local jurisdictions to make sure the sites selected make the most sense. Alameda CTC will also use geographic information to better select the additional sites.

Based on comments from BPAC in April, Alameda CTC is considering counting in the morning versus in the 2 to 4 p.m. time period at sites near schools.

Questions/feedback from the members:

- On pages 44 and 52 of the count report change “site with the greatest % increase” to “site with the greatest % decrease.”
- Will Alameda CTC incorporate recreational and weekend data into the counts? Staff stated that when the site list is expanded, Alameda CTC will look at incorporating weekend and recreational count locations. Staff stated 24-hour trail data is now coming in and will be incorporated into the Counts Report in the future.
- A member commented that the site list does not include areas in West Berkeley and South Berkeley, which have many schools and are communities of concern.
- The commute hour only covers a small percent of trips and may not have the highest percent of collisions.
- Can we also track race and ethnicity? Staff considered adding the telephone survey information from Bike to Work Day, which provided data on ethnicity. Staff stated that we have county level data, and we can consider adding this in the future.
- Members stated that the demographics of recreational riders are different than commute riders and this is missing from the report.

- At which schools will the AM counts be conducted? Would recommend asking TransForm about which schools to focus on. Staff explained that currently the count program has 17 sites within a half mile of schools. Staff could decide to count at the sites around schools for three time periods to gather information to use for evaluation.
- Recommend adding before and after count data that is captured from grant-funded projects, and also mapping the locations of grant-funded projects, to use in determining additional count location.
- Does Alameda CTC have data on the peak periods, in particular around schools? Staff said that Alameda CTC will look at this in the future when expanding the site locations.
- Consider adding new sites along the *proposed* bikeways in the Bicycle Plan, to see changes over time.

6. Board Actions/Staff Reports

A. Draft Performance Report

Rochelle mentioned that Alameda CTC released the *Draft Performance Report* this month. This report shows the annual performance of roadways and transit, bicycle and pedestrian networks. Beth Walukas mentioned that the BPAC has seen the information in this report in various forms. Rochelle informed the group that Alameda CTC provided the hyperlink to the *Draft Performance Report* on the agenda.

B. Update on Complete Streets

Rochelle informed the committee that Alameda CTC hosted a Complete Streets Workshop on June 19, 2012. She mentioned that the workshop was very well attended, and the attendees showed a lot of enthusiasm and interest in the Complete Streets topic. Alameda CTC is creating a Complete Streets policy, which will be in alignment with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission policy. Rochelle stated that the hyperlink to the Complete Streets Workshop presentation is provided on the agenda.

C. General Information

Midori informed members of the South County Transportation Forum in Union City on July 26, 2012, and encouraged all members to attend.

Staff will email the schedule of outreach events to BPAC members, so that those who are interested can attend and represent BPAC at outreach events. The Alameda CTC will have a table at the August 18, 2012 Pedalfest in Jack London Square.

Midori mentioned that the next Measure B grant call for projects is moving forward, and it may include funds from the new measure and OneBayAreaGrant funds.

Rochelle informed the group that the next BPAC meeting is scheduled for September 6, 2012, which is the first Thursday of the month.

7. BPAC Members Reports

Lucy Gigli stated that the City of Alameda received a grant to build bike lanes along Crown Beach but that after extensive public comments the City voted to build cycle tracks instead of the bike lanes.

Midori Tabata mentioned that she attended the Alameda CTC Complete Streets Workshop, which was very interesting and informative. It was noted that the City of Oakland was not able to attend the workshop; however, the City of Oakland has generated a Complete Streets policy.

Midori informed the committee that the BPAC Renaming Subcommittee will meet on July 25, and she will make a report at the September BPAC meeting.

Midori stated that the City of Oakland will be testing green bike lanes with arrows on 40th Street near MacArthur BART and will use video to analyze how well the new green lanes will work.

8. Meeting Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

This page intentionally left blank

Comments on Draft Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans

BPAC

July 12, 2012 Meeting

Public Comment

- Need to educate bus drivers regarding sharing the road with bicyclists
- Add cycle tracks to the plans, as the best way to get more people bicycling

BPAC Member Comment

- Alameda CTC, as a countywide agency should lead the way for local jurisdictions. It should promote cycle tracks, and encourage local agencies to include them in their plans.
- Make the “next steps” section more action-oriented, including who and by when activities will be done. Draw out discrete projects.
- Include more trails in south county.
- Would be good to limit the priorities further. They are good, but seem very broad.
- Appreciate focus on continuous, close-in access to transit, particularly for pedestrians.
- Add bus driver safety training to the plans.
- How will these new priorities change the next call for projects? Will the multiple priorities be layered on each other, to increase priority for a project?
- In the “Evaluation of plans, policies and practices” chapters, add more about what Alameda CTC can do to improve existing local policies and practices, such as bus driver training and local bicycle parking policies. Then, add these actions to the Next Steps section.
- Have the two plans (bicycle and pedestrian) been coordinated, for example to see if there are conflicts between the two?
- Further address safety data in the plans. Address dangerous areas.
- How will these plans relate to complete streets efforts?
- Plan is very readable and informative.
- Comprehensive and interesting documents.

This page intentionally left blank

**Alameda CTC Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
Thursday, September 6, 2012, 5:30 p.m., 1333 Broadway, Suite 300, Oakland**

Attendance Key (A = Absent, P = Present)

Members:

 P Midori Tabata, Chair
 P Ann Welsh, Vice Chair
 A Alex Chen
 A Lucy Gigli

 P Jeremy Johansen
 P Preston Jordan
 A Diana Rohini LaVigne
 A Sara Zimmerman

Staff:

 P Beth Walukas, Deputy Director of Planning
 P Rochelle Wheeler, Bicycle and Pedestrian
Coordinator

 P Vivek Bhat, Senior Transportation Engineer
 P Matt Todd, Manager Programming
 P Angie Ayers, Acumen Building Enterprise, Inc.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Midori Tabata, BPAC Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. The meeting began with introductions and a review of the meeting outcomes.

Guests Present: Aleida Andrino-Chavez, City of Albany; Mike Bucci; Wendy Cosin, City of Berkeley; Jeff Hobson, TransForm; Glenn Kirby; John Knox White, formerly of TransForm

Midori Tabata acknowledged the BPAC's longest-serving member, Glenn Kirby, whose term recently ended. Midori and Rochelle Wheeler thanked him for his service and dedication to BPAC. Rochelle said that the BPAC will miss his knowledge and varied experience. Glenn said that he is thankful for the opportunity of working with BPAC since 2004.

2. Public Comment

There were no public comments.

3. Approval of July 12, 2012 Minutes

Due to a lack of a quorum, BPAC postponed approval of the July 12, 2012 minutes until the next meeting.

4. CDF Funded Grant Projects Updates**A. Sponsor Presentations on Completed Projects**

Wendy Cosin, Deputy Planning Director at the City of Berkeley, gave a presentation on the results of the Cycle 3 grant for the Aquatic Park Connection Streetscape Improvement project. She stated that Alameda CTC funded \$65,000 out of a \$1.3 million project. This funding allowed improvements including signage, way-finding banners, maps, and electronic bike lockers. The project, which also included major rail-crossing

enhancements funded with redevelopment monies, has greatly improved safety and convenience for walkers and bicyclists.

John Knox White, a former TransForm employee, gave a final presentation on the results of the Cycle 4 grant for the TravelChoice New Residents program. He stated that the program focused on reducing driving trips, and was conducted in every planning area of Alameda County. The program promoted bicycling, walking, public transportation, and carpooling as alternate travel methods. The staff worked with specific developments instead of larger neighborhoods. He mentioned that TransForm contacted 11,000 households and worked with 52 different developments throughout the county. TransForm developed an online communications strategy and delivered materials electronically. John referred BPAC to page 45 of the agenda packet for the results of the project surveys.

BPAC members discussed how a successful program such as TravelChoice can be used to encourage other programs going forward. John suggested that the TravelChoice program should be part of a TDM toolkit. Staff mentioned that if Measure B1 passes, a TDM plan will be created, and Alameda CTC can consider including this program in the plan.

Aleida Andrino-Chavez, Transportation Planner with the City of Albany, gave a presentation on Albany's Active Transportation Plan, which is both the city's first pedestrian plan and an update to its existing bicycle plan. The City used its \$130,000 Measure B grant, combined with its own Measure B pass-through funds in the amount of \$47,317, towards for the development of the plan and the environmental work, which totaled \$226,691. Aleida stated that the plans contain a total of 27 bicycle and pedestrian projects prioritized by ease of implementation and closure of gaps in the pedestrian and bicycle networks.

B. Review of CDF Semi-annual Progress Reports

Rochelle stated that the CDF semi-annual progress reports for active grant projects are in the agenda packet. She informed the BPAC members that they can contact Vivek Bhat with any questions. Members requested an update on the Alamo Canal project.

5. Presentation and Input on the OneBayArea Grant Program and Draft Alameda CTC Complete Streets Policy Requirement

Beth Walukas, Matt Todd, and Rochelle Wheeler gave a presentation on implementation of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) and Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) program and the draft Alameda CTC Complete Streets policy. Rochelle stated that Alameda CTC has requested that BPAC review and comment on the proposed policy considerations. The presentation covered:

- Overview of federal cycle 2 and OBAG program
- Requirements for:
 - Complete Streets
 - Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment and Growth Strategy

- Programming and project selection considerations
- Outreach activities
- Implementation schedule
- Policy recommendation

Rochelle stated that page 179 of the agenda packet includes the draft Alameda CTC Complete Streets policy elements. She said that only Fremont has a general plan that is compliant with the state's complete streets requirements.

Questions/feedback from the members:

- Regarding the vision element of the proposed Alameda CTC Complete Streets policy, which mentions that the street would be designed for "function and context," how would Alameda CTC apply this to Albany's project on the San Pablo Avenue Whole Foods site? Staff stated that Alameda CTC would expect local agencies to be responsible for implementing complete streets for local projects.
- What is included in the PDA inventory? Staff said that Alameda CTC sent a survey to the jurisdictions to gather more information about their requirements. The survey contains a series of questions on housing and job requirements, and an inventory of housing policies, jobs, and transportation investments.
- A member noted that potentially a lot more funding could go to bicycle and pedestrian projects via OBAG than from Measure B bicycle and pedestrian funding cycles.

Public comments:

- Glenn Kirby expressed concern, with the demise of redevelopment agencies, that funding directed to PDAs will be used for projects that private developers should pay for. A public oversight body, like BPAC, could be helpful to distinguish public versus private projects. Staff mentioned that funds can be used to provide an incentive, and transportation improvements may sway development.
- Jeff Hobson with TransForm asked that since OBAG is replacing MTC's allotment of funds to a variety of programs (Transportation for Livable Communities, Local Streets and Roads, Regional Bicycle Program, etc.) will Alameda CTC make sure the OBAG funds go to a variety of modes? Staff said that discussions for this are occurring now and that there are many unknowns, such as project readiness.
- Jeff Hobson asked how much Alameda CTC is talking to other counties about the OBAG implementation approach. Staff said that Alameda CTC is talking and sharing with other counties; however, Alameda County is further along than other counties for the implementation approach and developing an inventory, with the exception of possibly San Francisco County.

Beth informed the BPAC that Alameda CTC will bring an update on the OBAG implementation to the October meeting. She stated that staff will take input on the items presented at the meeting to the Commission on September 27, 2012, which will include comments from the BPAC.

Rochelle said Alameda CTC will continue to keep BPAC informed as the OBAG and Complete Streets items evolve. Beth said that the BPAC role in reviewing OBAG projects would be defined at a later date. She stated that Alameda CTC will solicit BPAC's input on projects; however, the manner in which it is solicited may be different than with Measure B funding because of the requirements necessary for OBAG funds.

A member inquired if the \$63 million received from MTC will be committed over the next five years. Staff stated that the money from the federal government delivered to the state will come in fiscal years 13-14 through 15-16. Projects will be selected in fiscal year 12-13 and recipients are required to start or complete construction by January 2017, so the results of the projects will be realized over two to five years.

6. Board Actions/Staff Reports

A. End-of-year Compliance Report

Rochelle mentioned that the End-of-year Compliance Report is a report to the community on how the local jurisdictions spent Measure B pass through funds over the last fiscal year. She informed the committee that the Executive Summary is in the agenda packet, and the full report is on the website.

B. General

Rochelle informed the committee that the next BPAC meeting is on October 4, which is the first Thursday of the month, and the November meeting is scheduled for the November 15, 2012, which is the third Thursday of the month. Rochelle said that the final Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans will be presented at the October 4 BPAC meeting.

Rochelle told the committee that the Alameda CTC schedule of outreach events is in the packet, and members should contact Krystle Pasco (kpasco@alamedaCTC.org) if they are interested in helping to staff a table at an event.

Rochelle invited the BPAC members to attend the North County Transportation Forum on Thursday, October 25, 2012, at the Alameda CTC offices.

7. BPAC Members Reports

A. BPAC Renaming Subcommittee Update

Preston Jordan provided an update on the BPAC Renaming Subcommittee. He stated that the subcommittee met in July. He said that the meeting discussion focused on developing draft goals for renaming the committee, which are: (1) increase accuracy of what the committee does; (2) use a name that markets/has persuasive value; (3) is more inclusive (doesn't exclude natural allies); and (4) avoids confusion. He stated that the subcommittee will continue to meet and will bring a report to BPAC in October.

Preston Jordan reported that, in Albany, a developer is being required to fund a study of a cycle track on San Pablo Avenue.

Jeremy Johansen reported that San Leandro had a kick-off event for Safe Routes to Schools, and that San Leandro Boulevard and East 14th Street are slated for renovation in the city.

8. Meeting Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

This page intentionally left blank



Memorandum

DATE: September 27, 2012

TO: Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

FROM: Rochelle Wheeler, Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator
Beth Walukas, Deputy Director of Planning

SUBJECT: Approval of Final Draft Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Commission approve the Final Draft Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans and incorporate them, by reference, into the Countywide Transportation Plan.

Summary

The Final Draft Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans were released for public review and comment on September 24, 2012, and are posted on the Alameda CTC website (www.AlamedaCTC.org). These plans, which lay out the vision and action steps for making Alameda County a safe and convenient place for walking and bicycling, incorporate comments provided in June and July 2012 on the previously released Draft Plans. The Final Draft plans (sent in full to all BPAC members under separate cover) include recommended countywide priorities for capital projects, programs and plans; total costs to implement the plan; expected revenues for the 28-year plan life; and implementation actions to begin to make the plan a reality over the next five years.

The Final Draft Plans are the culmination of two and a half years of planning and 35 public and committee meetings to gather input. In late June 2012, staff released the Draft Plans for comment and presented them to ACTAC, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), the Planning Policy and Legislation Committee (PPLC), the Paratransit Advisory Committee (PAPCO), the Alameda CTC Board, and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans Working Group, a technical group providing input on the plan updates. The agency received comments from over 50 individuals by the July 27, 2012 deadline, and from over 15 additional commenters after the deadline. In total over 270 specific comments were received from individuals, agencies and committees. These comments were considered and incorporated into the Final Draft Plans, as appropriate. A summary of all of the comments, along with staff responses to them, are posted on the agency website (www.alamedactc.org/app_pages/view/5275) due to the size of the document. Staff request any feedback on the Final Draft Plans either during the BPAC meeting, or in writing using the attached comment sheet (Attachment A; also posted on the Alameda CTC web address listed above), to be submitted to Rochelle Wheeler via email (rwheeler@alamedaCTC.org), by **Monday, October 15, 2012**, at 12:00 Noon.

Background

The Alameda CTC's predecessor agencies approved the first Countywide Pedestrian Plan and the first update to the Countywide Bicycle Plan in 2006. Since then, the priorities identified in these plans have been used to guide bicycle and pedestrian grant fund programming and the Alameda CTC bicycle and pedestrian program.

In June 2010, the agency launched a planning process to update both the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plans, focused on updating the existing conditions; reviewing how Alameda CTC policies and practices can be enhanced to address walking and bicycling; re-evaluating the Bicycle Plan priority capital projects and bringing more focus to improving bicycle access to transit; and establishing capital project priorities for the Pedestrian Plan. One over-arching goal was to make the two plans consistent, as appropriate, and parallel in their layout.

The Final Draft Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans, which meet the above objectives, each consist of seven chapters and an executive summary. Because of the close coordination of these plans, one joint Appendices document was developed.

Input during Plan Development

During the two and a half year plan development process, 35 public and committee meetings were held to gather input on the draft chapters of the plans and the Draft Plans themselves. The Countywide BPAC and the Bicycle Pedestrian Plans Working Group (a group of agency, non-profit and advocacy group staff) were the primary two groups to review and give input on the plans. Both groups reviewed almost every chapter of the plans in their initial draft form. In addition, ACTAC, PAPCO, PPLC and the full Board, provided input on selected chapters and elements of the plans.

In addition to these meetings, Alameda CTC staff met, by planning area, with agency staff and also attended four local BPAC meetings around the county to gather input from them and the public. During the entire planning process, staff have maintained a mailing list of interested individuals and kept this group informed of opportunities for public input, and also posted information on the agency's website.

Public and Committee Input on Draft Plans

The Draft Plans were released in late June 2012, and in June and July they were brought to five Alameda CTC committees and working groups, and the Alameda CTC Board, for comment. In addition, staff posted the plans on the agency's website, and notified all interested members of the public and local BPACs about the availability of the plans.

The agency received comments on the Draft Plans from over 50 individuals by the July 27, 2012 comment deadline, plus over 15 additional commenters after the deadline. In total, over 270 specific comments were received from individuals, agencies and committees. Staff reviewed and evaluated all of these comments. Due to the number of comments, especially the requested edits and updates to the bicycle and pedestrian vision maps, staff decided that more time was needed to adequately address the comments, and therefore the release of the Final Draft Plans was moved from late August to late September.

The major changes made to the Final Draft Plans to address the input on the Draft Plans are listed below. A summary of all of the comments received along with staff responses to each one is posted on the agency website (www.alamedactc.org/app_pages/view/5275).

- **New “Next Steps” Chapters:** Many individuals and several committees commented on the “Next Steps” section of the plans, which is the road map of implementation actions that are needed in the next four to five years to begin or continue implementing the plans. The request was for the section to be more action-oriented, including naming a responsible party for each action and a timeline for implementing it. In response to this request, many enhancements were made to the Next Steps section, as follows:
 - New stand-alone “Next Steps” Chapters were created by splitting the “Implementation” Chapters in each plan into two chapters: “Costs and Revenue” and “Next Steps.”
 - Each implementation action was evaluated, and as feasible, was made more concrete and action-oriented. New implementation actions were added, for a new total of 16 actions. The actions were aligned more closely to the countywide priorities, especially the programs, and also to the plan goals.
 - For each of 16 actions, many new sub-actions were added, for a total of 63 actions and sub-actions. To better integrate the plan actions into the work of the agency, the new actions were developed in coordination with the agency’s Planning section work plan for the next five years.
 - For each action, a year or range of years was added. This is summarized in a new table showing the timeline for the implementation of each of the actions.
- **Performance Measures and Targets:** Many individuals and several committees also requested establishing performance targets for walking and bicycling, and more performance measures, to track progress on implementing the plans.
 - While performance targets were not added to the plans, a near-term next step was added to 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 Alameda County. Given that Alameda CTC has no direct control over local implementation of projects and programs, and mode shift is influenced by many factors, Alameda CTC must work with all local jurisdictions to establish performance targets that are achievable.
 - Three new performance measures were added, to better gauge how well the county is implementing the plans, in particular regarding educational/promotional programs. These are now listed in the new “Next Steps” chapters, rather than the “Vision and Goals” chapters.
- **Vision Map Edits:** A large number of edits and comments were received on the vision network maps for both plans, but especially on the bicycle vision network. In general, these edits were corrections needed to improve the accuracy of the maps, by reflecting the current status (i.e., existing or proposed) or class of the bikeways, to reflect local conditions and plans. All of these corrections were made. Several requests were made to show current or more realistic potential alignments for regional trails, including the East Bay Greenway and the Bay Trail. These edits were also made.
- **New mileage numbers:** Due to changes to the vision maps, the total miles of facilities were re-calculated for both plans, including by planning area and by jurisdiction. The total

network miles in the bicycle plan did not change greatly, but the numbers now show that more of the network is built (52%) than was stated in the draft plan (48%). In the pedestrian plan, the total miles decreased significantly (by 400 miles), mostly as a result of corrections made to the maps to remove duplicating miles.

- **New implementation costs:** Because most of the costs are based on the total miles of network, the total costs also changed.
 - For the Bicycle Plan, although the cost of construction went down due to more of the network being built than previously thought, the maintenance costs went up, since there are now more miles to be maintained for a longer period. The end result is that the bicycle plan implementation cost did not change.
 - For the Pedestrian Plan, the overall costs came down by almost \$400 million, mostly due to the decrease in the vision system mileage with the removal of duplicating miles.
- **Safety education and data:** The safety of bicyclists and pedestrians, and the need for more understanding of the issue and more education, was raised at Committee meetings. In response to these comments, the timeline for implementation of educational programs addressing safety and a detailed collision analysis was moved up.

Countywide Priorities

One of the primary purposes of both plans is to establish a set of countywide capital projects, programs and plans that are intended to implement the plan's vision and goals. These projects, programs and plans, which have been made consistent between the plans as appropriate, will be used, along with additional scoring criteria, to guide countywide discretionary funding decisions. Each plan describes a priority system or network, which is a subset of the pedestrian vision system or the bicycle vision network, and on which limited countywide funding will be focused.

The countywide pedestrian vision system totals 2,800 miles of pedestrian facilities spread throughout the entire county. The system has five components:

- access to transit,
- access within central business districts,
- access to activity centers,
- access to Communities of Concern, and
- a network of inter-jurisdictional trails.

The bicycle vision network consists of 762 miles of bikeways, of which, approximately 394 miles (52%) have been built while 367 miles (48%) are still to be constructed. The network, like the pedestrian vision system, includes all parts of the county and has five components, focused on:

- an inter-jurisdictional network that provides connections between jurisdictions (this is largely the vision network from the 2006 Bicycle Plan),
- access to transit,
- access to central business districts,
- an inter-jurisdictional trail network, and
- access to Communities of Concern.

Both plans also include a largely overlapping and robust set of programs to promote and support walking and bicycling, and the creation and updating of local pedestrian and bicycle master plans.

Costs and Revenue

As stand-alone plans, the cost to implement all components of the Bicycle Plan between 2012 and 2040 totals \$945 million, while the cost for the Pedestrian Plan is \$2.4 billion. The revenue anticipated over the next 28 years for the Bicycle Plan is \$324 million; for the Pedestrian Plan, it is approximately \$500 million. Together, the two plans include some duplicating costs for the multi-use trails. If these costs are split evenly between the two plans, the total, non-duplicating cost, to implement both the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plans is approximately \$2.7 billion and the expected revenue is \$820 million (see table below). These costs are higher than those in the previous Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans for several reasons, but mainly because they are more comprehensive and have been expanded as follows:

- **Bicycle Plan:**
 - For construction costs, expanded vision network from 549 miles to 762 miles with a significant part of this mileage increase due to adding more routes to connect to transit.
 - More comprehensive maintenance costs.
 - Expanded number of educational/promotional programs and included the full program costs.
 - Inclusion of local master plans, which were not included in the 2006 plan.
- **Pedestrian Plan:**
 - For construction costs, expanded pedestrian vision system to include one central business district (CBD) per jurisdiction and added the communities of concern category.
 - Inclusion of maintenance costs for the first time.
 - Expanded number of educational/promotional programs and included the full program costs.

Combined Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans non-duplicating costs and revenue, 2012–2040

(in millions; rounded to nearest \$100,000)

	<i>Bicycle Plan</i>	<i>Pedestrian Plan</i>	<i>Total (non-duplicating) costs</i>
Costs	\$ 626.7	\$ 2,081.3	\$ 2,708.0
-Construction of capital projects	\$ 424.9	\$ 1,459.3	\$ 1,884.2
<i>Shared costs for multi-use trails</i>	\$ 259.1	\$ 259.1	\$ 518.2
<i>Remaining Plan construction costs</i>	\$ 165.8	\$ 1,200.2	\$ 1,366.0
-Maintenance of capital projects	\$ 124.8	\$ 540.6	\$ 665.5
<i>Shared costs for multi-use trails</i>	\$ 57.4	\$ 57.4	\$ 114.9
<i>Remaining Plan maintenance costs</i>	\$ 67.4	\$ 483.2	\$ 550.6
-Programs implementation	\$ 71.6	\$ 75.9	\$ 147.5
-Local master plans	\$ 5.4	\$ 5.4	\$ 10.8
Revenue	\$ 324.3	\$ 495.7	\$ 820.0

Next Steps

The Final Draft Plans were released on Monday, September 24th and are available for public review and comment through Monday, October 15th at Noon. Comments received by this date will be consolidated and provided to the Alameda CTC Board for its consideration for incorporating into the final plans. Three Alameda CTC committees are being requested to review the Final Draft plans and recommend that the Board adopt the plans. The committees and meeting dates are as follows:

October 2, 2012	Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee (ACTAC)
October 4, 2012	Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
October 8, 2012	Planning, Policy, and Legislation Committee (PPLC)

The Alameda CTC Board will meet on October 25, 2012 to consider adopting the plans, and incorporating them by reference into the Countywide Transportation Plan.

Attachments

Attachment A: Comment Sheet

Attachment B: Final Draft Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans (previously sent under separate cover)

Comments on:

Final Draft Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans

Prepared By:

Comments due by:

Monday, October 15, 2012, 12:00 Noon to
Rochelle Wheeler, rwheeler@alamedactc.org

Agency/Organization:

PAGE # (if applicable)	PLAN: BIKE, PED, OR BOTH	Reviewer Comments

This page intentionally left blank



Memorandum

DATE: September 25, 2012

TO: Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee (ACTAC)

FROM: Tess Lengyel, Deputy Director of Policy, Legislation and Public Affairs
Rochelle Wheeler, Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator

SUBJECT: Approval of Final Alameda CTC Complete Streets Policy Elements

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Commission approve the final complete streets elements for jurisdictions to include in their local complete streets policies to be compliant with both Alameda CTC and Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) requirements.

Summary

The Alameda CTC Master Program Funding Agreements (MPFAs), adopted by Alameda CTC in December 2011, require that all local jurisdictions adopt a complete streets policy by June 30, 2013. Five months after Alameda CTC's adoption of the MPFAs, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, via OBAG, established a requirement for local jurisdictions to adopt a complete streets policy, by January 31, 2013, five months before the Alameda CTC requirement. Alameda CTC staff drafted ten policy elements to be required for local jurisdictions in Alameda County to be compliant with the MPFA requirement. Alameda CTC wrote its policy elements to incorporate the MTC required elements, so that local jurisdictions may adopt one resolution that meets both agency requirements. To assist local jurisdictions in adopting a policy resolution, staff developed a sample resolution which may be used by jurisdictions.

In September 2012, ACTAC, the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), the Planning Policy and Legislation Committee (PPLC) and the Alameda CTC Board all reviewed the draft policy elements and the sample resolution, and provided input on them, as described further below. Staff revised both documents to reflect this input, and now requests approval of the revised policy elements (Attachment A). The revised sample resolution (Attachment B) is attached, as well as a sample local agency staff report that could be used to accompany a resolution (Attachment C). These two resources are being provided to support local jurisdictions in meeting the complete streets requirements, and may be modified by local agencies, as long as all of the required complete streets elements are addressed.

Discussion

Complete streets are generally defined as streets that are safe, convenient and inviting for all users of the roadway, including pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, persons with disabilities,

movers of commercial goods, users and operators of public transit and emergency services, seniors, and children. A complete street is the result of comprehensive planning, programming, design, construction, operation, and maintenance, and should be appropriate to the function and context of the street.

Building streets for all users has many benefits, including improving safety for all users, especially children and seniors; encouraging walking, bicycling and using transit; improving air quality; reducing greenhouse gas emissions; improving the health of the community by increasing physical activity; and supporting economic development and public safety.

Overview of Alameda CTC and MTC Complete Streets Requirements

The current Master Program Funding Agreements (MPFAs) between Alameda CTC and all local jurisdictions in Alameda County, which allows the distribution of local sales tax pass-through and Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) funding, includes a two-part complete streets requirement, as follows:

To receive Measure B and VRF funds, local jurisdictions must do both of the following with respect to Complete Street policies:

- 1. Have an adopted complete streets policy, or demonstrate that a policy is being developed and will be adopted by June 30, 2013. This policy should include the "Elements of an Ideal Complete Streets Policy" developed by the National Complete Streets Coalition.*
- 2. Comply with the California Complete Streets Act of 2008. The California Complete Streets Act (AB1358) requires that local general plans do the following:*
 - a. Commencing January 1, 2011, upon any substantial revision of the circulation element, the legislative body shall modify the circulation element to plan for a balanced, multimodal transportation network that meets the needs of all users of the streets, roads, and highways for safe and convenient travel in a manner that is suitable to the rural, suburban, or urban context of the general plan.*
 - b. For the purposes of this paragraph, "users of streets, roads, and highways" means bicyclists, children, persons with disabilities, motorists, movers of commercial goods, pedestrians, users of public transportation, and seniors.*

Adopted five months after the Alameda CTC requirement, MTC instituted a Complete Streets policy resolution requirement for any jurisdiction that wishes to receive OBAG funding. The OBAG requirements, like the Alameda CTC requirements, address both the adoption of a policy and compliance with the state Complete Streets Act. Unlike the Alameda CTC requirement, OBAG has established a deadline for complying with the state Complete Streets Act by October 31, 2014, as part of Resolution 4035.

To be eligible for OBAG funds, a jurisdiction will need to address complete streets policies at the local level through the adoption of a complete streets policy resolution

no later than January 31, 2013. A jurisdiction can also meet this requirement through a general plan that complies with the Complete Streets Act of 2008. As discussed below, jurisdictions will be expected to have a general plan that complies within the Complete Streets Act of 2008 to be eligible for the next round of funding. (page 12 of Resolution 4035)

...For the OBAG cycle subsequent to FY 2015-16, jurisdictions must adopt housing elements by October 31, 2014...therefore, jurisdictions will be required to have General Plans with approved housing elements and that comply with the Complete Streets Act of 2008 by that time to be eligible for funding. (page 13 of Resolution 4035).

Alameda CTC Complete Streets Policy Requirement

In September, Alameda CTC brought the draft complete streets policy document to ACTAC, BPAC, the PPLC and the Board for input, along with a draft sample resolution for adopting a policy. The original draft policy elements were developed to meet the Alameda CTC requirement in the MPFAs, and also allow jurisdictions to simultaneously comply with the MTC requirement. The Alameda CTC required policy elements are modeled on the National Complete Streets Coalition (NCSC) elements of an ideal complete streets policy, which are referenced in the MPFAs. The NCSC elements are based on national best practices and a review of the elements that are most effective at resulting in complete streets implementation.

At its September meeting, ACTAC provided the below input on the draft complete streets policy elements and the sample resolution:

- ***Use local plans:*** Support use of local bicycle and pedestrian master plans to guide complete streets implementation
- ***Ensure transit is included in designing streets:*** Support including transit planning in local jurisdiction work on streets
- ***Context Sensitivity:*** Need clarity on what this means and how it will be implemented locally
- ***Cost Implications:*** Concerns raised over potential cost increases to projects
- ***Maintenance:*** Need clarity on how complete streets is applied to street maintenance
- ***Flexibility:*** Request for flexibility at how implemented at local level

The PPLC did not add any additional input. Because the ACTAC packet mailout is before the September 27th Board meeting, staff will report on any input from the Board at the October ACTAC meeting.

The required policy elements were revised to reflect this input and are attached as a final draft in Attachment A, including integration of local plans, such as bike, pedestrian and transit plans, as guidance for complete streets projects, as well as modifying the exceptions process to allow local jurisdictions to define their own process and modifying the stakeholder engagement process to allow for a locally defined process. For each policy element, the complimentary NCSC policy and also the relevant MTC policy are listed for comparison, and notes are provided explaining any differences. Jurisdictions are encouraged to develop policy language that fits within the context of their local area.

Sample Resolution and Staff Report

A revised sample resolution, which reflects ACTAC input from its September meeting, is attached (Attachment B). It can be used by a jurisdiction as a starting point towards developing and adopting a complete streets policy. While Alameda CTC does not require that the complete streets policy be adopted by resolution, MTC does have this requirement, and this sample resolution is based closely on the sample that MTC developed for use by jurisdictions in complying with their complete streets requirement.

The sample resolution is being provided to assist local jurisdictions. Neither Alameda CTC nor MTC requires that this exact language be used, and therefore local jurisdictions may modify the resolution language, as appropriate to their locality. However, the final policy language contained in the resolution must still meet the intent of the Alameda CTC complete streets policy elements requirement.

Alameda CTC staff has also drafted a sample staff report that local jurisdictions can use, modify and expand upon, to create a staff report to accompany its complete streets policy resolution (Attachment C). The staff report describes the complete streets concept, the benefits of complete streets, and the county and regional requirements for complete streets.

Update on Timing for Policy Adoption

The MTC requirement for a complete streets policy adoption is January 31, 2013, while the Alameda CTC requirement is for June 30, 2013, a five month difference. At the September ACTAC and PPLC meetings, staff heard that jurisdictions would like more time to develop and adopt their complete streets policies, if feasible. Since the Alameda CTC MPFAs, with the June 30th deadline, were executed prior to OBAG adoption, it may be possible for Alameda County jurisdictions to be granted more time to adopt local complete streets policies.

Alameda CTC staff has submitted a letter to MTC requesting an administrative exception to the January 31, 2013 deadline to allow local jurisdictions more time to develop their complete streets resolution and proceed through approval processes. If granted by MTC, all jurisdictions in Alameda County requesting funding from the Alameda CTC must have their complete streets policy completed and approved by their local jurisdiction in time for Alameda CTC to make programming recommendations on the OBAG program. This will require either submission of a signed resolution or a written statement indicating that the jurisdiction will have its approved complete streets resolution prior to Alameda CTC final action on OBAG programming which will take place in June 2013.

Resources

Alameda CTC wants to ensure that local jurisdictions have the resources they need to adopt and implement successful complete streets policies. As a step towards this goal, Alameda CTC recently added a complete streets page to its website, listing many key complete streets resources available for both developing local policies and for implementation. The website can be found here: http://www.alamedactc.org/app_pages/view/8563.

Jurisdictions are especially encouraged to review the following two NCSC documents which include links to hundreds of complete streets policies around the country providing specific language examples, and also provide a step-by-step guide to developing a local policy:

- “Complete Streets Policy Analysis 2011”
 - <http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/resources/cs-policyanalysis.pdf>
- “Complete Streets Local Policy Workbook”
 - <http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/resources/cs-policyworkbook.pdf>

At a regional level, MTC will be offering complete streets workshops throughout the region in October, including in Alameda County.

Attachments:

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| Attachment A: | Final Alameda CTC Complete Streets Policy Elements with comparison to Other Policy Elements |
| Attachment B: | Sample Complete Streets Policy Resolution |
| Attachment C: | Sample Complete Streets Policy Staff Report (Available in ACTAC packet) |

This page intentionally left blank

Attachment A: Final Alameda CTC Complete Streets Policy Requirement with Comparisons to Other Policy Elements

August 28, 2012

	Final Alameda CTC Complete Streets Policy Requirement	National Complete Streets Coalition (NCSC) Complete Streets Elements (referenced in Master Program Funding Agreements)	MTC Required Elements of a Complete Streets Resolution to Comply with OBAG	NOTES on differences between Alameda CTC, NCSC and MTC elements
1	Vision: A clear and strong vision that is based on local needs and goals. The vision must include that all transportation improvements will be planned, funded, designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to provide safe mobility for all users, appropriate to the function and context of the facility.	Vision: Includes a <u>vision</u> for how and why the community wants to complete its streets.	Included in “serve all users” element, below.	A vision statement is required, as it will clearly define the goals and intent of the community. The ACTC language is based on Caltrans’ complete streets policy (Deputy Directive 64, Revision 1).
2	All Users and Modes: All users (referenced above) will include pedestrians, bicyclists, persons with disabilities, seniors, children, motorists, movers of commercial goods, users and operators of public transportation, and emergency responders.	All Users and Modes: Specifies that ‘ <u>all users</u> ’ include pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit passengers of all ages and abilities, as well as trucks, buses, and automobiles.	Serve all Users: All transportation improvements will be planned, designed, constructed, operated and maintained to support safe and convenient access for all users, and increase mobility for walking, bicycling and transit use.	The ACTC policy element more closely aligns with the intent of the NCSC element, while meeting the goals of the MTC element when combined with the <i>Vision</i> element above.

Attachment A

	Final Alameda CTC Complete Streets Policy Requirement	National Complete Streets Coalition (NCSC) Complete Streets Elements (referenced in Master Program Funding Agreements)	MTC Required Elements of a Complete Streets Resolution to Comply with OBAG	NOTES on differences between Alameda CTC, NCSC and MTC elements
3	<p>All Projects/Phases: The policy applies to all roadway projects including those involving new construction, reconstruction, retrofits, repaving, rehabilitation, or expansion of existing roadways, as well as those that involve new privately built roads and easements intended for public use.</p>	<p>All Projects/Phases: Applies to <u>both new and retrofit</u> projects, including design, planning, maintenance, and operations, for the entire right of way.</p>	<p>All Projects/Phases: The policy will apply to all roadway projects including those involving new construction, reconstruction, retrofits, repaving, rehabilitation, or changes in the allocation of pavement space on an existing roadway, as well as those that involve new privately built roads and easements intended for public use.</p>	<p>No changes to MTC element.</p>
4	<p>Exceptions: Jurisdictions must prepare a process for approving exceptions, including who is allowed to sign off on exceptions. Written findings for exceptions must be included in a memorandum, signed off by a high level staff person, such as the Public Works director, or senior-level designee, and made publicly available. Exceptions must explain why accommodations for all users and modes were not included in the plan or project.</p>	<p>Exceptions: Makes <u>any</u> <u>exceptions</u> specific and sets a clear procedure that requires high-level approval of exceptions.</p>	<p>Process: Plans or projects that seek exemptions from the complete streets approach outlined in prior sections must provide written finding of why accommodations for all modes were not included in the project. The memorandum should be signed off by the Public Works Director or equivalent high level staff person. Plans or projects that are granted exceptions must be made publically available for review.</p>	<p>ACTC element strengthens and streamlines the MTC language.</p>

	Final Alameda CTC Complete Streets Policy Requirement	National Complete Streets Coalition (NCSC) Complete Streets Elements (referenced in Master Program Funding Agreements)	MTC Required Elements of a Complete Streets Resolution to Comply with OBAG	NOTES on differences between Alameda CTC, NCSC and MTC elements
5	<p>Network/Connectivity: The transportation system should provide a comprehensive, integrated and connected network of facilities for all modes of travel. A well-connected network should include non-motorized connectivity to schools, transit, parks, commercial areas, and civic destinations.</p>	<p>Connectivity: Encourages <u>street connectivity</u> and aims to create a comprehensive, integrated, connected network for all modes.</p>	<p>Street Network/Connectivity: The transportation system should provide a connected network of facilities accommodating all modes of travel. This includes looking for opportunities for repurposing rights-of-ways to enhance connectivity for cyclists, pedestrians and transit users. A well connected network should include nonmotorized connectivity to schools, parks, commercial areas, civic destinations and regional non-motorized networks on both publically owned roads/land and private developments (or redevelopment areas).</p>	<p>ACTC element strengthens and streamlines the MTC language.</p>
6	<p>Jurisdiction: All departments in the jurisdiction whose work affects the roadway must incorporate a complete streets approach into the review and implementation of their projects and activities. As well, the jurisdiction will work in coordination with other agencies, transit districts and jurisdictions to maximize opportunities for Complete Streets, connectivity, and cooperation in designing and building transportation projects.</p>	<p>Jurisdiction: Is adoptable by <u>all agencies to cover all roads</u>.</p>	<p>Complete Streets in all Departments: All departments in the jurisdiction and outside agencies whose work affects the roadway must incorporate a complete streets approach into the review and implementation of their projects and activities. Potential complete streets opportunities could apply to projects such as, transportation projects, road rehabilitation, new development, utilities, etc.</p>	<p>ACTC element streamlines the MTC language and adds the intent of the NCSC element to apply to coordination between multiple agencies.</p>

	Final Alameda CTC Complete Streets Policy Requirement	National Complete Streets Coalition (NCSC) Complete Streets Elements (referenced in Master Program Funding Agreements)	MTC Required Elements of a Complete Streets Resolution to Comply with OBAG	NOTES on differences between Alameda CTC, NCSC and MTC elements
7	<p>Design: The jurisdiction will define and generally follow its own accepted or adopted design standards, and will also evaluate using the latest design standards and innovative design options, with a goal of balancing user needs.</p>	<p>Design: Directs the use of the <u>latest</u> and best design criteria and guidelines while recognizing the need for flexibility in balancing user needs.</p>	None.	An ACTC element is included, to follow the NCSC element, even though no MTC element included.
8	<p>Context Sensitivity: The planning and implementation of transportation projects will reflect conditions within and surrounding the project area, whether the area is a residential or business district or urban, suburban or rural. Project planning, design and construction of complete streets projects should include working with residents, merchants and other stakeholders to ensure that a strong sense of place is maintained.</p>	<p>Context Sensitivity: Directs that Complete Streets solutions will <u>complement</u> the <u>context</u> of the community.</p>	<p>Context Sensitivity: The planning and implementation of transportation projects will reflect conditions within and surrounding the project area, whether the area is a residential or business district or urban, suburban or rural. Project planning, design and construction of complete streets projects should include working with residents and businesses to ensure that a strong sense of place is maintained.</p>	Essentially no changes to MTC element.
9	<p>Performance Measures: Jurisdiction will establish performance measures, and identify a means to collect data for the measures, to evaluate the implementation of the complete streets policy. Examples include tracking the number of miles of bicycle lanes and sidewalks, numbers of street crossings, transit ridership, etc. Specific measures should be listed.</p>	<p>Performance Measures: Establishes <u>performance measures</u> with measurable outcomes.</p>	<p>Evaluation: City and county will establish a means to collect data and indicate how the jurisdiction is evaluating their implementation of complete streets policies. For example tracking the number of miles of bike lanes and sidewalks, numbers of street crossings, signage etc.</p>	ACTC element strengthens and streamlines the MTC language.

	Final Alameda CTC Complete Streets Policy Requirement	National Complete Streets Coalition (NCSC) Complete Streets Elements (referenced in Master Program Funding Agreements)	MTC Required Elements of a Complete Streets Resolution to Comply with OBAG	NOTES on differences between Alameda CTC, NCSC and MTC elements
10	<p>Implementation Next Steps:</p> <p>Jurisdiction will include a list of specific next steps for implementation of the Complete Streets policy. Implementation actions will include that any proposed improvements will be evaluated for consistency with all local plans, including bicycle, pedestrian and/or transit plans, and any other plans that affect the right-of-way.</p> <p>Implementation actions will also include that public input on projects and plans will be solicited from stakeholders, including local bicycle and pedestrian advisory committees (BPACs) and other advisory groups, as appropriate, as early in the development process as possible.</p>	<p>Implementation Plan:</p> <p>Includes <u>specific next steps</u> for implementation of the policy.</p>	<p>Plan Consultation: Any proposed improvements should be evaluated for consistency with all local bicycle, pedestrian and transportation plans and any other plans that affect the right of way should be consulted for consistency with any proposed improvements.</p>	<p>ACTC element streamlines the MTC language, incorporating both <i>Plan Consultation</i> and <i>BPAC Consultation</i> elements into one element, and adds the intent of the NCSC element to create a plan for specific next steps.</p>

This page intentionally left blank

Sample
Alameda County Transportation Commission
Complete Streets Resolution
for Alameda County Jurisdictions

Resolution No. _____

A RESOLUTION OF THE [City Council/Board of Supervisors] OF THE [Jurisdiction]
ADOPTING
A COMPLETE STREETS POLICY

WHEREAS, the term “Complete Streets” describes a comprehensive, integrated transportation network with infrastructure and design that allows safe and convenient travel along and across streets for all users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, persons with disabilities, motorists, movers of commercial goods, users and operators of public transportation, seniors, children, youth, and families *[insert other significant local users if desired, e.g. drivers of agricultural vehicles, emergency vehicles, or freight]*;

WHEREAS, [Jurisdiction] recognizes that the planning and coordinated development of Complete Streets infrastructure provides benefits for local governments in the areas of infrastructure cost savings; public health; and environmental sustainability;

WHEREAS, [Jurisdiction] acknowledges the benefits and value for the public health and welfare of reducing vehicle miles traveled and increasing transportation by walking, bicycling, and public transportation;

WHEREAS, the State of California has emphasized the importance of Complete Streets by enacting the California Complete Streets Act of 2008 (also known as AB 1358), which requires that when cities or counties revise general plans, they identify how they will provide for the mobility needs of all users of the roadways, as well as through Deputy Directive 64, in which the California Department of Transportation explained that it “views all transportation improvements as opportunities to improve safety, access, and mobility for all travelers in California and recognizes bicycle, pedestrian, and transit modes as integral elements of the transportation system”;

WHEREAS, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (known as AB 32) sets a mandate for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in California, and the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 (known as SB 375) requires emissions reductions through coordinated regional planning that integrates transportation, housing, and land-use policy, and achieving the goals of these laws will require significant increases in travel by public transit, bicycling, and walking;

WHEREAS, numerous California counties, cities, and agencies have adopted Complete Streets policies and legislation in order to further the health, safety, welfare, economic vitality, and environmental wellbeing of their communities;

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, through its One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) program, described in Resolution 4035, requires that all jurisdictions, to be eligible for OBAG funds, need to address complete streets policies at the local level through the adoption of a complete streets policy resolution or through a general plan that complies with the California Complete Streets Act of 2008;

WHEREAS, the Alameda County Transportation Commission, through its Master Program Funding Agreements with local jurisdictions, requires that all jurisdictions must have an adopted complete streets policy, which should include the “Elements of an Ideal Complete Streets Policy” developed by the National Complete Streets Coalition, in order to receive Measure B pass-through and Vehicle Registration Fund funding;

WHEREAS, [Jurisdiction] therefore, in light of the foregoing benefits and considerations, wishes to improve its commitment to Complete Streets and desires that its streets form a comprehensive and integrated transportation network promoting safe and convenient travel for all users while preserving flexibility, recognizing community context, and using design guidelines and standards that support best practices;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the [City Council/Board of Supervisors] of [Jurisdiction], State of California, as follows:

1. That the [Jurisdiction] adopts the Complete Streets Policy attached hereto as Exhibit A, and made part of this Resolution, and that said exhibit is hereby approved and adopted.
2. That the next substantial revision of the [Jurisdiction] General Plan circulation will incorporate Complete Streets policies and principles consistent with the California Complete Streets Act of 2008 (AB 1358) and with the Complete Streets Policy adopted by this resolution.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the [City Council/Board of Supervisors] of the [Jurisdiction], State of California, on _____, 201_, by the following vote:

Attachment: Exhibit A

Exhibit A

This Complete Streets Policy was adopted by Resolution No. _____ by the [City Council/Board of Supervisors] of the [Jurisdiction] on _____, 201__.

COMPLETE STREETS POLICY OF [JURISDICTION]

[Insert VISION statement here.]

A. Complete Streets Principles

1. Complete Streets Serving All Users and Modes. [Jurisdiction] expresses its commitment to creating and maintaining Complete Streets that provide safe, comfortable, and convenient travel along and across streets (including streets, roads, highways, bridges, and other portions of the transportation system) through a comprehensive, integrated transportation network that serves all categories of users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, persons with disabilities, motorists, movers of commercial goods, users and operators of public transportation, emergency responders, seniors, children, youth, and families *[insert other significant local users if desired, e.g. drivers of agricultural vehicles, freight, etc.]*.

2. Context Sensitivity. In planning and implementing street projects, departments and agencies of [Jurisdiction] will maintain sensitivity to local conditions in both residential and business districts as well as urban, suburban, and rural areas, and will work with residents, merchants, and other stakeholders to ensure that a strong sense of place ensues. Improvements that will be considered include sidewalks, shared use paths, bicycle lanes, bicycle routes, paved shoulders, street trees and landscaping, planting strips, accessible curb ramps, crosswalks, refuge islands, pedestrian signals, signs, street furniture, bicycle parking facilities, public transportation stops and facilities, transit priority signalization, and other features assisting in the provision of safe travel for all users, such as *[insert other accommodations if desired]* [, and those features identified in *insert name of Pedestrian/Bicycle Master Plan if it exists*].

3. Complete Streets Routinely Addressed by All Departments. All relevant departments and agencies of [Jurisdiction] will work towards making Complete Streets practices a routine part of everyday operations, approach every relevant project, program, and practice as an opportunity to improve streets and the transportation network for all categories of users, and work in coordination with other departments, agencies, and jurisdictions to maximize opportunities for Complete Streets, connectivity, and cooperation.

4. All Projects and Phases. Complete Streets infrastructure sufficient to enable reasonably safe travel along and across the right of way for each category of users will be incorporated into all planning, funding, design, approval, and implementation processes for any construction, reconstruction, retrofit, maintenance, operations, alteration, or repair of streets (including streets, roads, highways, bridges, and other portions of the transportation system), except that specific infrastructure for a given category of users may be excluded if an exception is approved via the process set forth in section C.1 of this policy.

B. Implementation

1. Design. [Jurisdiction] will generally follow its own accepted or adopted design standards, including *[list names here]*, and will also evaluate using the latest design standards and innovative design options, with a goal of balancing user needs.

2. Network/Connectivity. [Jurisdiction] will incorporate Complete Streets infrastructure into existing streets to improve the safety and convenience of all users, with the particular goal of creating a connected

network of facilities accommodating each category of users, and increasing connectivity across jurisdictional boundaries and for anticipated future transportation investments.

3. Implementation Next Steps. [Jurisdiction] will take the following specific next steps to implement this Complete Streets Policy:

- A. Plan Consultation and Consistency: Maintenance, planning, and design of projects affecting the transportation system will be consistent with local bicycle, pedestrian, transit, multimodal, and other relevant plans.
- B. Stakeholder Consultation: Develop and/or clearly define a process to allow for stakeholder involvement on projects and plans including, but not limited to, local bicycle and pedestrian advisory committees (BPACs) and/or other advisory groups, as defined necessary to support implementation of this Complete Streets policy by [insert jurisdiction] .
- C. *[Add additional specific next steps here.]*

4. Performance Measures. All relevant agencies or departments will perform evaluations of how well the streets and transportation network of [Jurisdiction] are serving each category of users by collecting baseline data and collecting follow-up data on a regular basis.

C. Exceptions

1. Exception Approvals. A process will be developed for approving exceptions, including who is allowed to sign off on exceptions. Written findings for exceptions must be included in a memorandum, signed off by a high level staff person, such as the Public Works Director, or senior-level designee, and made publicly available. Exceptions must explain why accommodations for all users and modes were not included in the plan or project. *[Specific exceptions can be listed here. Federal guidance on exceptions can be found from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Accommodating Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel (http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/guidance/design_guidance/design.cfm). In addition, the National Complete Streets Coalition's "Policy Analysis 2011" (<http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/resources/cs-policyanalysis.pdf>) provides direction on appropriate categories of exceptions.]*

Alameda County Transportation Commission
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
Roster and Attendance Fiscal Year 2012/2013

	Suffix	Last Name	First Name	City	Appointed By	Term Began	Re-apptmt.	Term Expires	Mtgs Missed Since Jul '12*
1	Ms.	Tabata, Chair	Midori	Oakland	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-4	Jul-06	Oct-11	Oct-13	0
2	Ms.	Welsh, Vice-Chair	Ann	Pleasanton	Alameda County Supervisor Nate Miley, District 4	Oct-09	Oct-11	Oct-13	0
3	Mr.	Ansell	Mike	Livermore	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-1	Sep-12		Sep-14	0
4	Mr.	Bucci	Mike	Newark	Alameda County Supervisor Richard Valle, District 2	Sep-12		Sep-14	0
5	Mr.	Chen	Alexander	Fremont	Alameda County Supervisor Scott Haggerty, District 1	Oct-09	Jan-12	Jan-14	1
6	Ms.	Gigli	Lucy	Alameda	Alameda County Supervisor Wilma Chan, District 3	Jan-07	Jan-09	Jan-11	1
7	Mr.	Johansen	Jeremy	San Leandro	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-3	Sep-10	Oct-11	Oct-13	0
8	Mr.	Jordan	Preston	Albany	Alameda County Supervisor Keith Carson, District 5	Oct-08	Sep-10	Sep-12	1
9	Ms.	LaVigne	Diana Rohini	Fremont	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-2	Jan-12		Jan-14	1
10	Mr.	Maddox	Heath	Berkeley	Transit Agency (Alameda CTC)	Sep-12		Sep-14	0
11	Ms.	Zimmerman	Sara	Berkeley	Alameda County Mayors' Conference, D-5	Feb-12		Feb-14	1

This page intentionally left blank

Alameda County Transportation Commission
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

BPAC Meeting 10/04/12
Attachment 07A1

**Draft Meeting Schedule for
2012-2013 Fiscal Year**

Created: May 30, 2012
Updated: September 7, 2012

	Meeting Date	Meeting Purpose
1	July 12, 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review Draft Countywide Pedestrian and Bicycle Plans (Info) Review Draft Bike/Ped Counts Report and 2012 Counts List (Info) Draft Performance Report (Info) Update on Complete Streets & June Workshop (Info)
2	September 6, 2012 (Note – this is the 1 st Thursday of the month)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Input on OBAG Funding Program & Complete Street Policy requirement (Info) Summary of All Local Pass-Thru Expenditures (Board report) (Info) Update on Subcommittee on BPAC Renaming CDF Grants, Cycles #3&4: Semi-Annual Progress Reports (Info) CDF Grants: Sponsor presentations (Berkeley Aquatic Park, Travel Choice, and Albany AT Plan)
3	October 4, 2012 (Note – this is the 1 st Thursday of the month)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendation on Final Draft Countywide Pedestrian and Bicycle Plans (Action) Input on OBAG Funding Program (Info) Input on Alameda CTC Complete Street Policy requirement (Info) Grant Summary Report to Commission (Info) Update on Subcommittee on BPAC Renaming
4	November 15, 2012 (Note – this is the 3 rd Thursday of the month)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Input on OBAG Funding Program (Info) Approval of Revised BPAC Bylaws (Action) Approve recommendation on 2013 Bike to Work Day funding (Action) Status report on Alameda County SR2S program (Info) Status report on East Bay Greenway project (Info) Update on the Transportation Expenditure Plan ballot measure (Info) CDF Grants: Amendment requests and sponsor presentations, as needed (Irvington)
5	January 10, 2013 (tentative)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CDF Grants: Amendment requests and sponsor presentations, as needed
6	February 14, 2013 (tentative)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CDF Grants, Cycles #3&4: Semi-Annual Progress Reports (Info) CDF Grants: Amendment requests and sponsor presentations, as needed
7	March 14, 2013 (tentative)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review TDA Article 3 Projects (Info) Report on Countywide Annual Bicycle and Pedestrian Counts and Funding Recommendation for 2013 counts (Action) CDF Grants: Amendment requests and sponsor presentations, as

Alameda County Transportation Commission
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

		needed
8	June 13, 2013 (tentative)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• BART Bicycle Advisory Task Force Appointment(s) (Action)• CDF Grants: Amendment requests and sponsor presentations, as needed• Performance Report (Info)• Report on Bike to Work Day (Info)• Grant Summary Report from May Commission Meeting (Info)• Summary of All Local Pass-Thru Expenditures (Board report) (Info)• Organizational Meeting:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Distribute BPAC Action Log: FY 12/13 (Info)○ Presentation on Alameda CTC's Bike/Ped Work Program for 13/14 (Info)○ Schedule for 13/14 BPAC Meetings (Info)○ Election of Chair & Vice-Chair for FY 13/14 (Action)○ Review Bylaws (Action)

To be added, as schedule is determined:

- CDF grant cycle 5
- Complete streets checklists, and other complete streets work TBD

Meeting Date	Event Name	Sponsor Agency/ Organization	Meeting Location	Outreach Type	Meeting Time	# Attend
Friday, September 14, 2012	San Leandro Senior Resource Fair	City of San Leandro	San Leandro Senior Community Center 13909 E. 14th Street, San Leandro, CA 94578	S_PWD - Senior Center and People with Disabilities	10 - 1 pm	250
Friday, September 14, 2012	NAACP - Berkeley President, Carol MacGruder	NAACP	Alameda CTC Offices, 3rd Floor Conf. Rm. 2	B - Business	1 - 2pm	unknown
Saturday, September 15, 2012	9th Annual Ethiopian New Year Celebration	Ethiopian Community and Cultural Center (ECCC)	Mosswood Park, 3612 Webster Street, Oakland, CA 94609	G - General	12 - 7pm	2500
Saturday, September 15, 2012	5th Annual Health and Wellness Fair	Center for Elders' Independence	Eastmont Town Center, 7200 Bancroft Avenue, Oakland, CA 94605	S_PWD - Senior Center and People with Disabilities	11 - 3pm	300
Saturday, September 15, 2012	Aztec Run For Education	Merritt College	Merritt College 12500 College Dr Oakland, CA	ED - Education	8am - 2pm	unknown
Sunday, September 16, 2012	Caravana de la Bahia		777 B Street, Hayward, CA	G - General	10am - 9pm	
Tuesday, September 18, 2012	AFSCME Presentation on Measure B	AC Transit	Wendell Rosen Law Office, 1111 Broadway, 19th Floor	B - Business	12 - 1pm	50+? (check w/TL or HB to check w/Victoria Winn)
Wednesday, September 19, 2012	Mayors Commission on Persons with Disabilities (MCPD) - Joint Access Compliance Advisory Committee (ACAC)	City of Oakland ADA Programs Division	One City Hall, First Floor, Hearing Room 3 1 Frank Ogawa Plaza, Oakland, CA 94612	E_G - Elected Officials, Government Agencies	9:30 - 11:00am	30
Wednesday, September 19, 2012	Tri-Valley Mayors' Summit	Hosted by the Dublin, San Ramon, Danville, Livermore, and Pleasanton Chambers of Commerce	Shannon Community Center, 116000 Shannon Avenue, Dublin, CA	B - Business	11:30am - 1:30pm	unknown
Wednesday, September 19, 2012	APBP Webinar: Liability: Understanding and Managing Risk	Alameda CTC/ APBP	Alameda CTC, 3rd Floor	C - Civic & Community Groups	12:00pm - 1:00pm	25
Wednesday, September 19, 2012	City Center Fall Concert Series	City Center	Oakland, City Center	B - Business	12 - 1pm	unknown
Wednesday, September 19, 2012	California AGC Bay Area Region Public Works Night - Panel Discussion	AGC California	Palm Event Center in the Vineyard, 1184 Vineyard Ave, Pleasanton, CA	B - Business	5 - 8:30pm	150+
Wednesday, September 19, 2012	BART to Livermore Ext. Project EIR Notice of Preparation (BART Public Scoping Meeting)	BART	Robert Livermore Community Center 4444 East Avenue Livermore, CA 94550	B - Business	6 - 8:30pm	100+
Thursday, September 20, 2012	Green Scene Fair	City of Pleasanton	Hacienda West 3825-3875 Hopyard Road Pleasanton, CA	E_G - Elected Officials, Government Agencies	10:30am - 1:30pm	unknown
Thursday, September 20, 2012	Fruitvale-San Antonio Senior Center, Lions Center for the Blind and Registrar of Voters and League of Women Voters	Lions Center for the Blind	Fruitvale-San Antonio Senior Center (right off of the Fruitvale BART just above Citi Bank)	B - Business	10am - 12pm	50-60
Thursday, September 20, 2012	Port of Oakland Commission Presentation on TEP	Port of Oakland	530 Water Street, 2nd Floor, Oakland, CA	B - Business	4:30 - 6pm	unknown
Sunday, September 23, 2012	Newark Days Community Information Faire	Newark Community Center	Newark Blvd and Cedar	G - General	12 - 4pm	10,000+
Monday, September 24, 2012	Ms. Julia Liou, Director of Planning and Development of Asian Health Services	Asian Health Services	TBD	H - Health Organizations	11:30am - 1pm	3
Tuesday, September 25, 2012	COMTO Panel Discussion	COMTO	2 Broadway, Oakland, CA	B - Business	5:30 - 7:30pm	40+
Wednesday, September 26, 2012	City Center Fall Concert Series	City Center	Oakland, City Center	B - Business	12 - 1pm	unknown
Wednesday, September 26, 2012	Measure B Presentation to the ACEC	ACEC Bay Bridge Chapter	Oakland Marriott, 1001 Broadway, 2nd Floor, Oakland, CA	B - Business	12 - 2pm	unknown

Meeting Date	Event Name	Sponsor Agency/ Organization	Meeting Location	Outreach Type	Meeting Time	# Attend
Thursday, September 27, 2012	Presenting at Goods Movement & Trade Industries Breakfast Meeting	Port of Oakland	TBD - Waterfront Hotel or JLS location	B - Business	7:30 - 10am	100 - 200
Thursday, September 27, 2012	San Leandro Transportation Forum: State of Local Streets	City of San Leandro	San Leandro Senior Community Center, 13909 East 14th Street, San Leandro, CA 94578	E_G - Elected Officials, Government Agencies	7 - 9pm	unknown
Tuesday, October 02, 2012	Montclair Lions Club - TEP Presentation	Montclair Lions Club	Montclair Bistro (in the Garden Room), 6118 Medau Street, Oakland, CA	C - Civic & Community Groups	12:15 - 1:30pm	20
Wednesday, October 03, 2012	International Walk to School Day					80 schools
Wednesday, October 03, 2012	City Center Fall Concert Series	City Center	Oakland, City Center	B - Business	12 - 1pm	unknown
Thursday, October 04, 2012	TEP Presentation to Hayward Chamber of Commerce's Government Relations Committee	Hayward Chamber of Commerce	1099 "E" Street, Hayward, CA	B - Business	8 - 10am	16
Thursday, October 04, 2012	TEP Presentation to the Sons In Retirement (SIR) Monthly Luncheon	Sons In Retirement (SIR)	San Ramon Country Club, (San Ramon Golf Course at 9430 Firecrest Lane, San Ramon, Ca. (Firecrest & Alcosta Blvd)	C - Civic & Community Groups	11:45am - 1:45pm	150
Saturday, October 06, 2012	Oaktoberfest	Dimond District Association	Dimond District	G - General	All Day	10000
Saturday, October 06, 2012	Science in the Park	City of Hayward	Alden E. Oliver Sports Park, Hayward, CA	ED - Education	9am - 4pm	5,000+
Saturday, October 06, 2012	Dublin Senior Info Fair	Dublin Senior Center	Dublin Senior Center, 7600 Amador Valley Boulevard, Dublin, CA 94568		10 - 2pm	200
Tuesday, October 09, 2012	Update on the TEP to AIA East Bay	AIA East Bay	1405 Clay Street, Oakland, CA	B - Business	12 - 2pm	30 + 2, including 10 copies of the full TEP
Wednesday, October 10, 2012	Pleasanton 2015 Forum	Pleasanton Chamber of Commerce	777 Peters Avenue, Pleasanton, CA 94566	B - Business	7:30 - 9am	20 - 30
Wednesday, October 10, 2012	City Center Fall Concert Series	City Center	Oakland, City Center	B - Business	12 - 1pm	unknown
Sunday, October 14, 2012	Sunday Streets Berkeley	Livable Berkeley	Downtown Berkeley	G - General	11 - 4 pm	10000
Wednesday, October 17, 2012	APBP Webinar: FHWA Experimentation for Advancing Best Practices	Alameda CTC/ APBP	Alameda CTC, 3rd Floor	C - Civic & Community Groups	12:00pm - 1:00pm	25
Wednesday, October 17, 2012	City Center Fall Concert Series	City Center	Oakland, City Center	B - Business	12 - 1pm	unknown
Thursday, October 18, 2012	Fall General Assembly	ABAG	Hyatt Regency, Embarcadero, San Francisco, CA	E_G - Elected Officials, Government Agencies	8:30am - 3pm	n/a
Thursday, October 18, 2012	TEP Presentation to the Rotary Club of Pleasanton	Rotary Club of Pleasanton	Hap's Original, 122 West Neal Street, Pleasanton, CA 94566	C - Civic & Community Groups	12 - 1:30pm	unknown
Tuesday, October 23, 2012	Older Adult Transportation Resource Fair	Pool of Consumer Champions of Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services	333 Hegenberger Road, 6th Floor, Monterrey Room, Oakland, CA 94621	S_PWD - Senior Center and People with Disabilities	10 - 1pm	200
Wednesday, October 24, 2012	Transportation Awards Ceremony - Excellence in Motion	MTC	Preservation Park Nile Hall 668 13th Street Oakland, CA	B - Business	8:30 - 10:15am	unknown
Wednesday, October 24, 2012	City Center Fall Concert Series	City Center	Oakland, City Center	B - Business	12 - 1pm	unknown
Thursday, October 25, 2012	North County Transportation Forum	Alameda CTC	1333 Broadway, Suite 300, Oakland	G - General	6:45 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.	50+
Friday, October 26, 2012	BART to Warm Springs Tunnel Completion					

Meeting Date	Event Name	Sponsor Agency/ Organization	Meeting Location	Outreach Type	Meeting Time	# Attend
Friday, October 26, 2012	BART Warm Springs Extension Project (WSX - ACTIA 2) Ribbon Cutting	BART		G - General		
Sunday, October 28, 2012	Dia De Los Muertos	Unity Council	Fruitvale Oakland	G - General	10:00 am to 6:00 pm	40,000+
Wednesday, October 31, 2012	Lewelling Avenue Widening Project – ACTIA #13 Ribbon Cutting	ACPWA	Corner of Lewelling and Via Granada, San Lorenzo, CA	G - General	2 - 4pm	unknown
Wednesday, October 31, 2012	City Center Fall Concert Series	City Center	Oakland, City Center	B - Business	12 - 1pm	unknown
Wednesday, November 14, 2012	APBP Webinar: Maps that Guide, Encourage and Inform	Alameda CTC/ APBP	Alameda CTC, 3rd Floor	C - Civic & Community Groups	12:00pm - 1:00pm	25

This page intentionally left blank

Alameda Countywide BPAC: Subcommittee on Renaming

July 25, 2012 Meeting Notes

Goals

1. Increase accuracy (explain functionally better what the committee does)
2. Name that markets/has persuasive value the idea of active transportation: Rhetorical or convincing effect
 - a. Educate to the benefits
3. Be more inclusive (don't exclude natural allies)
4. Avoid confusion

Target Audience

- Transportation issues policy makers

Possible names

- Biking & walking advisory committee: clearer, avoids confusion, but does market and isn't more inclusive
- Active transportation advisory committee: inclusive, educates, probably clear, but doesn't market/persuade
 - Check with disability rights community
- Healthy transportation advisory committee
- Sustainable advisory committee

Next steps

- Tell committee what we did and get their support to put more effort into it. Get their feedback on the goals.
- Then, if they are supportive, we can take next steps such as:
 - Informal survey
 - Brainstorm re names

This page intentionally left blank