



Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans Working Group Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, March 23, 2011, 1:30 to 3:30 p.m.

1333 Broadway, Suite 300, Oakland, CA 94612

Meeting Outcomes:

- Provide feedback on prioritization approach for bicycle and pedestrian capital projects
- Discuss relationship of Countywide Transportation Plan Call for Projects with the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan updates

1:30 – 1:35 p.m. Staff	1. Welcome and Introductions	
1:35– 1:40 p.m. Staff	2. Review of February 9, 2011 Meeting Notes	I
	<u>02 BPPWG Meeting Notes 020911.pdf – Page 1</u>	
	<u>02A BPPWG Meeting Attendance 020911.pdf – Page 5</u>	
1:40 – 3:15 p.m. Victoria Eisen	3. Approach to Prioritization of Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects	I
	<u>03 Overview Memo for Prioritization Approach.pdf – Page 7</u>	
	<u>03A Memo on Proposed BikePed Plan Prioritization.pdf – Page 9</u>	
	<u>03B Comment Sheet.doc – Page 15</u>	
3:15 – 3:25 p.m. Staff	4. Discussion of Countywide Transportation Plan Call for Projects and Countywide Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan Updates	I
3:25 – 3:30 p.m.	5. Announcements	I
	<u>05 BPPWG Meeting Schedule & Purpose.pdf – Page 17</u>	
3:30 p.m.	6. Adjournment	

Key: A – Action Item; I – Information/Discussion Item; full packet available at www.alamedactc.org

Next Meeting:

Date: TBD

Time: 1:30 to 3:30 p.m.

Location: 1333 Broadway, Suite 300, Oakland, CA 94612

Location Information: Alameda CTC is located 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.com/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.

**MEMORANDUM**

To | Rochelle Wheeler (ACTIA) and Diane Stark (ACCMA)
From | Victoria Eisen
Date | February 14, 2011
Project | Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Updates
Subject | **February 9, 2010 Plans Working Group Meeting Notes**

These notes reflect discussions of the February 9, 2011 Working Group meeting. Bold section headings correspond to the agenda items in which each discussion occurred.

Approach to development of pedestrian “vision network”Access to six areas of countywide significance other than downtowns and major commercial districts

- Delete transit qualifier that applies to six activity centers (i.e., all but downtowns and major commercial districts).
- Analysis needed to determine if this qualifier has really ruled out any activity centers from funding eligibility because they weren't served by transit.
- Why is transit qualifier 1/8-mile? In the unincorporated areas, people often walk farther than that to their destinations.
- One-eighth-mile makes sense for prioritizing county funding.
- Argument to “broaden net” by increasing this distance is to include more projects in plan to allow eligibility for outside (yet-to-be-identified) funding sources.
- Countywide plans provide a framework for attracting funding to local projects. Don't limit potential projects to those served by transit because this limits locals' flexibility.
- This point is moot in North County; are there activity centers in the other planning areas that are not within 1/8-mile of transit (1/2-mile for downtowns and major commercial areas)?
- Could leave qualifier as is for now and ask jurisdictions to identify if there are any activity centers farther than 1/2-mile from transit. Could map 1/2-mile walk-sheds from transit to see if any activity centers fall outside.

Access to transit

- Make sure BRT would be eligible under current definitions. (It is.)

Summary of discussion

- Continue to organize pedestrian “system” as in 2006 plan, around the same three categories of areas of countywide significance, with minor modifications described in the memo for this item.
- Think about whether it is appropriate to continue to limit inclusion in the countywide system in the six non-downtown/non-major commercial area areas of countywide significance to the 1/8-mile-or-less pedestrian connection between the activity center and the closest transit stop (as is the case in the 2006 plan), or alternately, if the system should also include pedestrian facilities within these six categories of activity centers.
- Ask locals and transit operators to review the activity centers in each of the three categories listed in Appendix E of the 2006 plan. (AC Transit to review AC Transit corridors identified in 2006 plan; Lohnes + Wright to review LAVTA and Union City trunklines.)

Approach to development of bicycle vision network

2006 network as starting point

- Consider not starting from 2006 bicycle network; rather, start with a more skeletal system. Current network has too many links, yet does not connect some major destinations (e.g., UC Berkeley and downtown Oakland). However, a skeletal network may limit funding opportunities. (Alameda CTC staff response: 2001 plan was based on a corridor approach, rather than an attempt to intentionally connect specific destinations.)
- Articulating potential purposes of the countywide bicycle network beyond funding eligibility could help define the new network:
 1. CEQA reform
 2. Complete streets: inclusion in the countywide network, coupled with new Alameda CTC policy, could require improvements to streets on countywide network to trigger complete street construction.
 3. Linking local networks and adjoining jurisdictions
 4. Directing Alameda CTC to assist local agencies in solving challenges in areas of countywide significance (e.g., 40th/San Pablo Avenue, Emeryville).
 5. Communicates to Caltrans and other agencies that route is important at a countywide level
- Need to compare where bike trips are being made/routes cyclists would like to take to the 2006 network to see if a more skeletal network that connects activity centers could result. This would include improving routes people already take and constructing new routes. Resulting system could be organized in tiers:

1. Skeletal network of inter-jurisdictional routes
 2. Parallel routes to those in #1
 3. More detail around transit and activity centers, as proposed
- Support for access to destinations in adjacent counties (e.g., El Cerrito Plaza BART and Bay Bridge/San Francisco).
 - Consider needed programs at same time as projects to include in network to ensure that projects can be implemented. Barriers to overcome with programs include projects that are too small to warrant the time to apply for funding, projects that are too large for most funding programs and those with technical challenges unrelated to funding.
 - Consider mapping activities (e.g., school trips, shopping for food) to identify clusters that need bicycle access (e.g., West Oakland). Could MTC's Communities of Concern provide a surrogate for this analysis?
 - Connecting communities should be the highest priority of the plan, particularly in North County where cities are close to each other.

Access to Transit Priority Zones (TPZs)

- Add two planned Fremont BART stations and UPRR trail.
- Increase distance to TPZs in parts of county where BART station spacing is greater.
- Should maps reflect specific routes in vicinity of TPZs, downtowns and major commercial centers, or should they shade applicable radii?
- Access to transit is more crucial to include in the network than accommodating long distance trips.

Access to downtowns and major commercial districts

- Consider leaving distance to downtowns at 3 miles, but reducing distance to major commercial districts to 2 miles.

Process of obtaining local review of potential network

- Useful for Alameda CTC staff to meet with groupings of local staff, then with groupings of BPAC members.
- Ask locals to review the routes included in the 2006 network to see if there are some that no longer make sense (e.g., Mountain Blvd in Oakland, route to Berkeley Marina and Amtrak). Related, newly adopted local plans may identify new priorities, compared to local plans on which 2006 network was based.

Summary of discussion

- Useful to preserve concept of countywide bicycle network.

- Need to also include programs and policies that help local jurisdictions implement bicycle projects on countywide network.
- Helpful to arrange meetings with local staff and BPACs to ensure network identifies best countywide network links and that detail areas around TPZs, downtowns and major commercial centers identify best local routes.
- Based on recent BART access data, increase distance to TPZs to:
 - 1 mile in North County
 - Greater in Central County
 - Greatest in South and East County

**Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans Working Group
March 23, 2011
Meeting Attendance**

Meeting Date: 2/9/2011	First Name	Last Name	Title	Agency/Group Represented
X	Wendy	Alfsen	Executive Director California Walks	Bay Area Walkable Communities Collaborative / Walk & Roll Berkeley / California Walks
X	Eric	Anderson	Bike/Ped Coordinator	City of Berkeley
X	Aleida	Andrino-Chavez		City of Albany
X	Leigh	Bryant	Sustainable Transportation Associate	Alameda County General Services Agency
X	Dave	Campbell		Bicycle Friendly Berkeley Coalition
X	Reh-Lin	Chen		City of San Leandro
X	Rene	Dalton	Assoc. Transp. Engr.	City of Fremont
X	Sean	Dougan		East Bay Regional Park District
X	Lee	Huo	Bay Trail Planner	Bay Trail/ABAG
X	Paul	Keener	Sr. Transp. Planner	Alameda County Public Works Agency
X	Nathan	Landau		AC Transit
X	Dale	Murai		Alameda County Public Health Department
X	Shaun	O'Bryan	Volunteer Planner	East Bay Bicycle Coalition
X	Jason	Patton	Bicycle & Pedestrian Program Manager	City of Oakland
X	Renee	Rivera	Executive Director	East Bay Bicycle Coalition
X	Nicole	Schneider		Alameda CTC
X	Peter	Schultze-Allen	Env. Programs Analyst	City of Emeryville
X	Diane	Stark		ACCMA
X	Janis	Stephen	Assistant Engr. II	City of Pleasanton
X	Rochelle	Wheeler		ACTIA
X	Karl	Zabel	Operations & Dev. Sup.	Hayward Area Recreation and Park District

This page intentionally left blank.



MEMORANDUM

Date: March 17, 2011

To: Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans Working Group

From: Rochelle Wheeler, Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator
Diane Stark, Senior Transportation Planner

Subject: Updates to the Bicycle & Pedestrian Plans: Priority Projects Approach

Recommendations

It is recommended that the Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans Working Group (Plans Working Group) provide input on the proposed Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans priority projects approach in Attachment 03A for the Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans updates at their meeting, and, if desired, in writing by Friday, April 1, 2011.

Summary

A memo from the Plans Updates consultant, discussing background, recommendations and desired input for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans priority approach is attached. The memo summarizes input from the PWG and BPAC on the vision networks and provides a recommended priority approach for the updated Plans. It also includes questions for discussion at the PWG meeting. A comment sheet is also attached for submitting input on the recommended approach (see instructions below). Input from the PWG and BPAC will be incorporated into the Priority Projects and Programs chapters.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans Working Group members are encouraged to use the attached comment sheet (Attachment 03B) to submit written comments on the network proposals, but may also provide input via email. Written comments should be submitted to Rochelle Wheeler at rwheeler@alamedactc.org and Diane Stark at dstark@alamedactc.org by Friday, April 1, 2011, at 5:00 p.m.

Discussion

The Countywide Pedestrian and Bicycle Plans, last adopted in 2006, are in the process of being updated. The Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans Working Group will be requested to review and provide input on each chapter of the draft plans and then the full, compiled plans, which will be completed by late 2011. The final plans are expected to be adopted in early 2012.

To date, the PWG has reviewed the draft Existing Conditions chapters, Evaluation of Current Practices Chapter, and Vision, Goals & Objectives chapters.

At the meeting in February 2011, the PWG provided input on approaches to re-defining the vision networks for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans. Building on this input, the attached memo 03A defines an approach to the priority projects for the bicycle and pedestrian plan networks. This approach, with input from PWG, BPAC and interested others will be incorporated into the Priority Projects and Programs chapter in the Plans. This information will return to PWG and BPAC before it is finalized in the Plans.

Additional Input to the Plans

Alameda CTC is coordinating outreach to local BPACs. Staff intends to attend BPACs around the county to collect additional input on the Priority Projects and Programs chapters in spring 2011. Further information will be brought to the March PWG meeting.

A web page with information about the plan updates process is available at: <http://tinyurl.com/ACBikePedPlans>. It includes links to the draft plan chapters, the new draft maps, information about the review of the plans and how the public can participate in providing input. Please continue to share this web link with others who may be interested.

Next Steps

Comments on the priority projects approach for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans will be consolidated and incorporated into the draft versions of the Priority Projects and Programs chapters. An approach for prioritizing countywide programs will be brought to the next PWG meeting.

Attachments

- 3A. Memo on Proposed Bicycle and Pedestrian Priority Projects Approach
- 3B. Comment Sheet

**MEMORANDUM**

To | Diane Stark and Rochelle Wheeler, Alameda CTC
From | Victoria Eisen
Date | March 16, 2011
Project | Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Updates
Subject | **Proposed Approach to Prioritizing Capital Projects**

Background - Vision Network

At the February Pedestrian and Bicycle Plans Working Group (PWG) and BPAC meetings, we discussed what links the vision bicycle and pedestrian networks/systems should include in order to best achieve the visions and goals of the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans. A summary of the input from the PWG is included in the meeting notes.

The consensus of the PWG and BPAC for the Countywide Bicycle Plan was to maintain most of the 2006 vision bicycle network and to add more detail in Transit Priority Zones (TPZs, as defined in the 2006 Countywide Bicycle Plan), and Downtowns and Major Commercial Areas (as defined in the 2006 Countywide Pedestrian Plan). Specifically, in response to input from the PWG and BPAC, it is recommended to include bicycle network links in approximately the four cardinal directions radiating out 1 mile from North planning area TPZs, 1.5 miles from Central planning area TPZs and 2 miles from South and East planning area TPZs. These distances are based on the median distances BART passengers reported cycling to Alameda County stations in the 2008 BART Station Access Survey. It is further recommended to adjust the three-mile distance originally proposed to radiate out from downtowns and major commercial districts based on the actual distance between these areas in each planning area. While the exact distances will be calculated using mapping software, essentially this approach would reduce these distances where they are closer (such as in the North planning area) and could increase them or support them remaining at three miles elsewhere in the county.

There was also general agreement for the Countywide Pedestrian Plan to maintain the approach employed in the 2006 Pedestrian Plan, which prioritized "Pedestrian Areas of Countywide Significance," with some minor adjustments.

For both networks, a need was cited to review the links and locations that comprise each of the categories of countywide significance.

Priorities

The purpose of this memo is to recommend an approach to prioritizing these vision networks/systems, which will form the basis of the fifth chapters in the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Updates, "Priority Projects and Programs" and will guide future countywide bicycle and pedestrian investment priorities. The prioritization approach recommended for the Plan Updates in this memo addresses capital projects only. It is understood that programs that encourage safer and

more convenient and inviting cycling and walking are equally important; however, the method to identify and prioritize these programs will be addressed in a separate discussion.

The 2006 Countywide Bicycle Plan established priorities by identifying a financially constrained network based on a cost estimated to be equal to the revenue expected to be available for bicycle projects throughout the life of the Plan. A subset of these projects – one per jurisdiction – comprised the Plan’s “high priority projects.”

The 2006 Countywide Pedestrian Plan did not prioritize projects; rather the cost to deliver the complete pedestrian system was estimated and compared to expected revenue over the life of the Plan. Alameda CTC calculated the difference between these amounts and used the Plan as an advocacy document to argue for the need for increased pedestrian funding.

Commonality between Proposed Approach to Prioritizing Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects

Since the outset of the development of the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Updates, it has been a goal to coordinate and make parallel the two documents, and their respective approaches to planning, to the extent possible and appropriate. Prioritizing capital projects is an especially important area in which to strive to achieve this goal because prioritization directly influences future investments. The more similar the types of projects and areas where both bicycle and pedestrian investments are focused, the farther those investment dollars can go. Therefore, the recommended prioritization methodology calls for the following two priority categories to be used in both plans:

1. Priority project types: Trails and inter-jurisdictional routes
2. Priority geographies: Transit Priority Zones, Downtowns, Major Commercial Centers and Communities of Concern (using MTC’s criteria)

Priority Geographies

Transit Priority Zones (TPZs): Defined in the 2006 Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan, TPZs are meant to focus investment in bicycle access to BART, ACE and Amtrak stations, ferry terminals and major bus transfer stops. While this term was not used in the 2006 Alameda Countywide Pedestrian Plan, here it is meant to include all “major transit” stops/stations and bus trunkline routes, as defined in the 2006 plan, and updated in this process.

Downtowns: The 2006 Countywide Pedestrian Plan defined these as the central business district of any city in Alameda County, as defined by the local general, specific or downtown plan.

Major Commercial Centers: A collection of mainly retail and service establishments in a multi-block area, according to the 2006 Countywide Pedestrian Plan.

Communities of Concern: Economically disadvantaged communities, as defined by MTC.

Priority project types (category #1) define the highest priority types of capital projects, while priority geographies (#2) define the highest priority locations. In other words, projects that are in either

category are a priority, but those that appear in both categories, or in more than one sub-category, would compete for funding more favorably than those in one category alone (see attached table).

With the exception of the three countywide major trail systems, the consultant team is recommending prioritizing project categories, rather than specific projects to allow more flexibility for local governments to identify specific priority projects within the definitions above. This flexibility will allow the countywide plans to adapt to changing local priorities, shifting funding sources and newly adopted plans.

Inter-jurisdictional projects are recommended to be prioritized because, although they may be of countywide significance for bicycle and pedestrian travel, these projects may not be prioritized by local jurisdictions, which tend to focus on projects that are completely within their boundaries and do not require coordination among multiple agencies. Alameda CTC, as a multi-jurisdictional agency, is likely to have a greater impact in this area.

Transit hubs, downtowns and major commercial centers were identified in the 2006 Countywide Pedestrian Plan as areas of countywide significance, meaning they're places that serve pedestrians traveling to and from a variety of locations throughout Alameda County and beyond. In addition to recommending prioritizing pedestrian projects in these areas, it is recommended to also use the same locations to prioritize projects in the Countywide Bicycle Plan because it is thought that these areas are equally important destinations to the county's cyclists.

Finally, MTC's Communities of Concern capture areas of Alameda County with low auto ownership rates and, in many cases, limited employment, shopping and transit opportunities. MTC-funded and Alameda CTC-managed Community-Based Transportation Plans identify needed projects in these areas, where there is often higher-than-average reliance on walking and bicycling.

Priority Bicycle Project Types & Geographies

The prioritization method proposed for the Bicycle Plan update diverges from that used in 2006 in that it does not attempt to match project cost to expected revenue over the life of the plan, i.e., there is no "financially constrained" category proposed in the Plan update. This recommendation is being made to focus planning and implementation efforts on the four or five year period before the next Countywide Plan update to support successful implementation through a flexible and adaptable plan, rather than planning at the project or category level over the life of the plan, during which priorities and fund availability will likely change. Similarly, rather than each jurisdiction identifying a single high priority project, the approach recommended below allows local jurisdictions multiple opportunities to implement their highest priority projects that align with countywide priorities.

The recommended priority project types in the vision bicycle network are to construct and maintain Alameda County's three inter-jurisdictional trail systems: the San Francisco Bay Trail, the Iron Horse Trail and the East Bay Greenway, as well as interjurisdictional routes, which would include capital projects and maintenance needed to overcome barriers (like freeway ramps), fill gaps and overcome other similar challenges, particularly connections at inter-jurisdictional boundaries.

Recommended priority geographies include Transit Priority Zones, Downtowns, Major Commercial Centers and Communities of Concern. These are the same categories as in the vision network, but would be focused within more constrained boundaries than the vision network. Specifically, the recommended priority geographies would extend half as far as called for in the vision network, one-half to one mile from TPZs (depending on the Planning Area) and half of the final vision network mileage radiating out from downtowns and major commercial centers determined for each Planning Area. Projects in Communities of Concern that are identified in a Community-Based Transportation Plans (CBTPs) are also recommended to be prioritized.

Priority Pedestrian Investments & Geographies

Although the 2006 Countywide Pedestrian Plan did not prioritize projects, a prioritization methodology is recommended for the Plan Update, to make it more consistent with the Countywide Bicycle Plan, to help focus implementation and to reinforce synergies between the two plans. As in the Countywide Bicycle Plan, constructing and maintaining the Bay Trail, Iron Horse Trail and East Bay Greenway are recommended as priority project types in the Countywide Pedestrian Plan, along with inter-jurisdictional routes. It is further recommended that the same geographies as are recommended to be prioritized in the bicycle plan be prioritized in the pedestrian plan, although the recommended distances for the Pedestrian Plan are more appropriate for walking: within ¼-mile of TPZs, and within downtowns and major commercial centers. As for the bicycle plan, the prioritized area for these geographies is a tighter circle than the vision network. Pedestrian projects in Communities of Concern that are identified in CBTPs are recommended priorities, consistent with the bicycle plan.

Relationship between Plan Prioritization and Grant Program Design

Although the priorities adopted in the final Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans will influence which projects are funded in the future with Measure B and other sources, these priorities are not the same as the grant program guidelines. Rather, Alameda CTC will develop grant programs and funding criteria consistent with the adopted priorities, but which are more specific and detailed to allow easier identification of projects most consistent with the Plans' visions and goals. The grant program design, including funding criteria, is the appropriate venue to specify factors considered too detailed for a countywide plan. For example, the grant program design needs to address local jurisdictions' across-the-board difficulty delivering grant-funded projects. This need and corresponding recommendations will be discussed in the context of the Plans' Implementation chapters.

Committee feedback requested

Members of PWG and BPAC are requested to provide any comments on the proposed approach to prioritizing the vision networks in the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans they would like to have considered. In particular, members should be prepared to weigh in on:

Comments that pertain to the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Networks

1. Is it desirable for the prioritization methodologies of the two plans to be similar, all things being equal?
2. Should the three countywide trail systems be among the highest priority investments in the bicycle and pedestrian networks?

3. Should inter-jurisdictional routes be among the highest priority investments in the bicycle and pedestrian networks?
4. Should maintenance costs be prioritized, in addition to capital costs?
5. Should countywide investments be focused on TPZs, downtowns, major commercial centers and communities of concern?

Countywide Bicycle Network

1. Are there investment types missing from the attached table (i.e., beyond countywide trail systems and barriers/gaps)?
2. Are the priority geographic distances described above and specified in the attached table appropriate or should they be revised?

Countywide Pedestrian Network

1. Are there investment types missing from the attached table (i.e., beyond countywide trail systems)?
2. Are the priority geographic distances described above and specified in the attached table appropriate or should they be revised?

Alameda County Transportation Commission | Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans Capital Project Prioritization Recommendations

Plan	Priority Project Types		Priority Geographies			
	Trails	Inter-jurisdictional routes	TPZs	Downtowns	Major Commercial Centers	Communities of Concern
Bicycle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bay Trail • Iron Horse Trail • East Bay Greenway • May be maintenance or capital 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closing barriers & gaps • May be maintenance or capital <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caltrans facilities, RR tracks • Other challenges at/near boundaries (e.g., agency coordination) 	<p>Access 1/2-mile-to-one-mile out from TPZs (50% of vision network distances in each Planning Area)</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long-term parking at transit stations/nodes • Signage directing cyclists to best route/entry to transit stations • Bicycle-oriented spot improvements within TPZs 	<p>Access 1.5 miles out from Downtowns (DTs) (50% of vision network distances)</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bike parking within DTs • Bicycle-oriented spot improvements within DTs • New bike lanes to and within DTs 	<p>Access 1.5 miles out from Major Commercial Centers (MCCs) (50% of vision network distances)</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bike parking within MCCs • Bicycle-oriented spot improvements within MCCs 	<p>Areas defined as “Communities of Concern” by MTC</p> <p>Example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects in Community-based transportation plans
Pedestrian	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bay Trail • Iron Horse Trail • East Bay Greenway • May be maintenance or capital 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closing barriers & gaps • May be maintenance or capital <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highway off/on ramps, RR tracks • Other challenges at/near boundaries 	<p>Continuous access within 1/4-mile of TPZs</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intersection crossing improvements • Pedestrian lighting 	<p>Within Downtowns</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intersection crossing improvements • Pedestrian lighting 	<p>Within Major Commercial Centers</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intersection crossing improvements • Pedestrian lighting 	<p>Areas defined as “Communities of Concern” by MTC</p> <p>Example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects in Community-based transportation plans
Notes			<p>Compare TPZs to PDAs</p> <p>Note: Mapped TPZ boundaries and locations may change; definition supersedes map</p>			

Priority project types define priority investment types; priority geographies define priority locations.

The *highest* priority projects are those that are both a priority project type and are within a priority geography, OR are within more than one priority geography.

Comments on: Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan
 Updates - **Network Prioritization Approach**

Comments Due By: **Friday, April 1, 2011, 5:00pm** to
 Rochelle Wheeler, rwheeler@alamedaCTC.org
 AND Diane Stark, dstark@alamedaCTC.org

Prepared By: _____

Agency/Group: _____

PLAN (Bike, Ped, Bike/Ped)		Review Comments				Responses (staff use)

This page intentionally left blank.

Alameda County Transportation Commission
Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans Working Group
Meeting Schedule and Purpose

Created: July 27, 2010
Revised: March 18, 2011

Meetings typically held on Wednesdays from 1:30pm to 3:30pm

	Meeting Date	Meeting Purpose
1	October 21, 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Input on Plan Updates Request for Proposals Scope of Work
2	June 3, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce consultant team • Review approach and timeline • Input on Tables of Contents • Input on Local Agency Questionnaire • Input on Outreach
3	September 22, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Input on Existing Conditions Draft Chapters • Outreach Strategy
4	October 20, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of proposed approaches to Bike and Ped Networks (Vision/Goals)
5	December 8, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Input on Evaluation of Current Practices Draft Chapter • Input on Vision/Goals Draft Chapters
6	February 9, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority Projects/Programs (Vision Networks)
7	March 23, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority Projects/Programs (Prioritization Approach)
8	May 2011, date TBD <i>(new meeting added)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority Projects/Programs
9	June 2011, date TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Priority Projects/Programs Chapters • Implementation (mid-task direction)
10	July 2011, date TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation Draft Chapters
11	September 2011, date TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Summaries/Introductions (mid-task direction)
12	October 2011, date TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Summaries/Introductions Draft Chapters
13	December 2011, date TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full Draft Plans