



# Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans Working Group Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, July 11, 2012, 1:30 to 3:30 p.m.  
1333 Broadway, Suite 300, Oakland, CA 94612

## Meeting Outcomes:

- Provide comments on Draft Countywide Pedestrian and Bicycle Plans, in particular the Implementation Chapters

1:30 – 1:35 p.m. Staff	<b>1. Welcome and Introductions</b>	
1:35– 1:40 p.m. Staff	<b>2. Review of July 27, 2011 Meeting Notes</b> <i><u>02 BPPWG Meeting Notes 072711.pdf –Page 1</u></i> <i><u>02A BPPWG Meeting Attendance 072711.pdf – Page 9</u></i>	I
1:40 – 2:20 p.m. Victoria Eisen Rochelle Wheeler	<b>3. Overview of Draft Countywide Pedestrian and Bicycle Plans and Approach to Implementation Chapters</b> <i><u>03 Memo Draft Countywide Pedestrian and Bicycle Plans.pdf – Page 11</u></i> <i><u>03A Draft Countywide Pedestrian and Bicycle Plans and Joint Appendices</u></i> – Mailed previously to members, upon request; Plans posted at: <a href="http://www.alamedactc.org/app_pages/view/5275">http://www.alamedactc.org/app_pages/view/5275</a> <i><u>03B Comment Form.doc – Page 17</u></i>	I
2:20 – 3:25 p.m. All	<b>4. Feedback on Draft Plans</b>	I
3:25 – 3:30 p.m. Staff	<b>5. Announcements</b> <i><u>05 BPPWG Meeting Schedule &amp; Purpose.pdf – Page 19</u></i>	I
3:30 p.m.	<b>6. Adjournment</b>	

Key: A – Action Item; I – Information/Discussion Item; full packet available at [www.alamedactc.org](http://www.alamedactc.org)

**Next Meeting:**

Date: None, this is the final meeting of the PWG

**Staff Liaisons:**

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

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

**Location Information:** Alameda CTC is located in Downtown Oakland at the intersection of 14<sup>th</sup> Street and Broadway. The office is just a few steps away from the City Center/12<sup>th</sup> Street BART station. Bicycle parking is available inside the building, and in electronic lockers at 14<sup>th</sup> and Broadway near FrankOgawaPlaza (requires purchase of key card from [bikelink.org](http://bikelink.org)). There is garage parking for autos and bicycles in the City Center Garage (enter on 14<sup>th</sup> 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 (Alameda CTC)  
**From** | Victoria Eisen  
**Date** | August 31, 2011  
**Project** | Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Updates  
**Subject** | **July 27, 2011 Plans Working Group Meeting Notes**

---

These notes reflect discussions at the July 27, 2011 Plans Working Group (PWG) meeting. The meeting focused on two components of the plans update process: revised approaches to the bicycle and pedestrian vision and priority capital networks, and to the process of estimating the cost of the bicycle and pedestrian vision capital networks. Although the committee discussion followed the presentations, PWG member comments relevant to each category are interspersed in the record of the presentation content, below, and are indicated with a “→” symbol.

**Discussion of Revised Vision and Priority Capital Projects Networks Recommendations**

Victoria presented the revised capital project prioritization approach, by category:

**Bicycle Vision Network**

1. *Inter-jurisdictional network*: Based on 2006 network, but updated to reflect segments that have been constructed, superior routes identified in local plans and other suggested network improvements.
  - San Leandro Creek connects the Bay Trail to the East Bay hills and travels through downtown San Leandro and two Communities of Concern (East Oakland and Ashland/Cherryland). It is, therefore, inter-jurisdictional and should be included in the Bicycle Vision Network.
2. *Access to transit* (formerly “Transit Priority Zones”)
  - Meant to improve bicycle access to public transit.
  - Links radiate 1-2 miles from transit hubs, depending on the planning area.
  - Provides links to major employment, where feasible.
  - Updated bus transfer locations per 2009 AC Transit Bicycle Parking Study.
  - Adds links to Communities of Concern from the nearest transit node and can exceed the 1-2 mile threshold.
  - Will transit passengers bike farther if there is a bikestation at the transit station?
3. *Access to Downtowns*
  - Nine downtowns plus one self-designated major commercial district (MCD) in the other five cities and one MCD per unincorporated community, TBD.
  - Links from each downtown/“downtown equivalent” radiate out three miles.
  - Plus links to the Communities of Concern, even if they exceed three miles.
  - The MCD proposal is inequitable. Shouldn’t Montclair, for instance, be included?

- One downtown or downtown equivalent per jurisdiction is unfair from a population standpoint. (ACTC response: those jurisdictions with larger populations have proportionately more transit hubs and, therefore, more bicycle network links.)
- What about colleges and universities? (ACTC response: the inter-jurisdictional network connects to all of them. In addition, many bus transfer points are at colleges.)

4. *Inter-jurisdictional trails*

- Same list as in the 2006 plan (Bay Trail, Iron Horse Trail, “others”)
- Plus the East Bay Greenway, including connections to the Bay Trail that are inter-jurisdictional
- Plus Bay Trail spurs (which link the trail to the Bay, where the trail is not along the shoreline)

5. *Communities of Concern*

- Add access to major transit, downtowns/downtown equivalents, even if the mileage exceeds maximum amounts described above.
- Plan will either include conceptual routes or Alameda CTC will work with the applicable jurisdictions to map specific routes before the draft Countywide Bicycle Plan is released.
- The Plan will include the most recent Community of Concern boundaries and projects, in case any are updated before the draft plan is completed.

Bicycle Priority Network

The goal is to identify the highest priority projects to focus on implementing over the next 4-5 years, until the next bicycle plan update. Rather than selecting and mapping a specified set of priority network links, instead it is proposed to define categories of priority projects in the plan. Any project in the vision network that is not in a priority category will be eligible for funding, but will not rank as highly as projects in the priority categories.

1. *Inter-jurisdictional network*

- Not originally prioritized, but many commented how important inter-city links are, so revised recommendation prioritizes those links that are inter-jurisdictional (i.e., at city boundaries), and are the result of a multi-jurisdictional planning effort.

2. *Access to Transit*

- Radiates out from transit hubs up to the vision network distances and provides continuous access from the hub outward.
- Therefore, links closer to transit nodes are prioritized over those farther out and not connected directly to the node with bicycle facilities.
- Also includes links from Communities of Concern to the closest regional transit node.
  - Should not prioritize continuous access, particularly since the timeline is only five years. Implementation of bicycle facilities is extremely opportunistic and opportunities don't always nicely line up with continuous access. Concern that this approach will be difficult to implement. Consider letting local jurisdictions argue for projects that provide discontinuous access, but that are included in the Vision Network.

- Continuous access is more important for the pedestrian network than for bikes, where trip distances are longer.
  - Replace geographic prioritization with a data-based approach using criteria such as safety, number of users, traffic volumes and gap closures. Should map recommended routes against SWITRS data (ACTC response: data did inform identification of priority categories. Measure B criteria can and will rely on these sorts of criteria.)
3. *Access to Downtowns*
    - Analogous arrangement as Access to Transit: Bicycle access radiating out from downtowns and downtown equivalents (per the Vision network definitions) and provides continuous access from these destinations outward.
    - Links closer to the downtowns/equivalents are prioritized over those farther out and not connected directly to the downtowns/equivalents with bicycle facilities.
    - Also includes links from Communities of Concern to the closest downtowns/equivalents.
  4. *Inter-jurisdictional Trails*
    - Bay Trail spine and connectors (not spurs)
    - Iron Horse Trail east to Greenville Road
    - East Bay Greenway
  5. *Communities of Concern*
    - Access to/from the closest regional transit hubs and downtowns/equivalents
    - Irrespective of vision distances

### Pedestrian Vision Network

This network also has five categories; four are the same as in the Bicycle Vision Network, but with slightly different definitions. Most are the same as in the 2006 Pedestrian Plan.

1. *Access to Transit*
  - Connections to rail, ferry and bus transit trunklines of countywide significance.
  - Same as 2006, but with updates (e.g., West Pleasanton/Dublin BART) and the addition of major bus lines that cross county borders.
2. *Access within Downtowns*
  - Access within downtowns and downtown equivalents (see Bicycle Vision network definition).
3. *Access to Activity Centers*
  - In the 2006 plan, walk access to activity centers was assumed with one 1/8-mile link between each activity center and the nearest transit stop.
  - There was some PWG feedback that this should be expanded to a 1/4-mile walkshed around each activity center.
  - Eliminating major commercial districts from the downtown category had the unintended effect of providing pedestrian access to shopping malls (with primarily auto access), but not to major commercial districts. Furthermore, it's thought that the 1/4-mile walkshed in/around activity centers would dissipate investment away from the plan-designated priority areas/categories of transit and downtowns.

- Therefore, it is recommended that:
  - Major commercial districts (as defined in the 2006 Pedestrian Plan: in a General Plan, mainly retail and services, multi-block areas) will be mapped and be included as activity centers.
  - Priority pedestrian access to all activity centers to be provided with up to two links up to 1/8-mile long each between the activity center and the nearest transit stop.

→ Activity Centers are not well-enough defined.

4. *Inter-jurisdictional Trails*

- Same ten trails as in the 2006 plan.
- Plus the East Bay Greenway and inter-jurisdictional connectors to the Bay Trail (same as in the Bicycle Vision Network).
- Plus Bay Trail spurs
- Plus other inter-jurisdictional trails that link populated areas.

5. *Communities of Concern*

- Walk access to the closest local transit stop with service to downtowns/downtown equivalents and major transit nodes.
- Maximum distance ¼-mile.
- Includes facilities fitting this description, whether they're included on vision map or not.

Pedestrian Priority Network

As for the Bicycle Priority Network, the definitions of the priority categories will be included in the plan text, but not will not be mapped.

1. *Access to Transit*

- Continuous access radiating out from transit nodes up to the vision distance (one half-mile). Closer to the node prioritized over those farther away.

2. *Access within Downtowns*

- Pedestrian access within downtowns/downtown equivalents

3. *Inter-jurisdictional trails*

- Bay Trail (spine and connectors)
- Iron Horse Trail (east to Greenville Road)
- East Bay Greenway

4. *Communities of Concern*

- Radiate out from Communities of Concern up to ¼-mile to the closest transit stop.

**Discussion of Proposed Approach for Capital Projects Cost Estimating for Vision Networks**

Victoria began the discussion by stating that there are two purposes for estimating the cost of the capital bicycle and pedestrian vision networks:

1. To compare the total bicycle and pedestrian vision network construction and maintenance cost to the revenue expected to be available for these uses, in order to identify the funding gap for each plan.
2. To advocate for funding to fill these gaps.

This definition of cost estimates will not be used to limit or otherwise determine grant funding for particular projects. The cost estimating process is intended to develop countywide costs by project category, not to estimate the cost of any particular project. The methodology to estimate the cost to deliver the programs included in the updated bicycle and pedestrian plans will be included in the draft plan. All costs will be in 2012 dollars.

One final note on the relationship between the methodology recommended for the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian plans and the Countywide Transportation Plan (CWTP), which is also currently being updated. Although, every effort is being made to achieve consistency between the three plans, the purpose of estimating costs in the CWTP is very different than that for the bicycle and pedestrian plans. Rather than trying to estimate countywide totals, in the case of the bike and pedestrian plans, the CWTP is estimating the cost of individual projects, which will be used in cost effectiveness calculations. Therefore, the cost estimation methodology employed in the plans will be different.

### Bicycle Vision Network

Victoria began by explaining the rationale for proposing a new methodology for cost estimating in the bicycle plan. Except for Class I trails, costs in the 2006 bicycle plan were escalated from 2001, unless specific costs were available for a particular project. Because these numbers are ten years old, and so many new links are being added to the network (transit access, downtowns and communities of concern), a new cost estimation methodology is recommended, as follows. Construction and maintenance costs are presented separately.

### Construction Costs

#### 1. *Construction/Class I Trails*

- In 2010, Alameda CTC estimated the cost of the three major countywide trails (Bay Trail, Iron Horse Trail and East Bay Greenway) based on recent feasibility studies, so this cost will be used for these three trails.
- The cost of the “other” trails is recommended to be estimated by escalating the per mile costs in the 2006 plan unless local or other agency staff provide more current numbers.
  - Suggest comparing these costs to the cost of the recent Berkeley Class I project.
  - Suggest talking with the City of Oakland’s Measure DD implementation folks for another per mile estimate.

#### 2. *Construction/Class II*

- Given that the purpose of this exercise is to develop countywide numbers, and given that all local bicycle plans estimate costs using per-mile numbers, it is recommended to develop per-mile costs for the Countywide Bicycle Plan, then multiply by the number of Class II mileage.
- The consultant team surveyed all local plans in Alameda County and found different per mile costs for different types of Class II facilities (see Table 1 in packet):
  - Lower cost: Only signing/stripping, average \$30,000/mile
  - Higher cost: Where lane reductions are needed, average \$100,000/mile

- Because it is unknown what proportion of each bicycle lane type is needed for the unconstructed portions of the countywide bicycle network, assumptions are proposed for comment, such as:
  - 100% higher cost since many facilities at the lower cost have already been built OR
  - 80% at the higher cost and 20% at the lower cost OR
  - Some other set of assumptions

3. *Construction/Class III*

- For the same reasons discussed for Class II, it is recommended to estimate new per mile costs for Class III facilities. Unfortunately, there are at least five distinct types of facilities that fall under the “Class III” category, which originate from the 2006 Countywide Bicycle Plan and local plans:
  - Signage only: (\$10,000/mile)
  - Shared lane markings (aka “sharrows”) and bike routes on arterials (\$55,000/mile)
  - Wide curb lanes (\$139,000/mile, on average)
  - Wide shoulders, less than standard bike lane width, generally on rural roads (\$150,000/mile, but \$216,000/mile in 2006 plan)
  - Bicycle Boulevards, including sharrows, bulbouts, high visibility crosswalks. Most local plans do not include this cost. The cost in those that do (except the City of Oakland’s) is as high as \$400,000/mile (in Berkeley). The 2006 Countywide Plan listed \$184,500 in 2010 dollars.
- A blend is recommended because, as for Class II facilities, the actual distribution is unknown. Given that the cost of the most expensive categories is similar (the last two bullets are \$200,000 or more), it is recommended to assume 25 percent of the network will cost \$10,000, \$55,000, \$139,000 and \$214,000, for an average cost of \$104,000 per mile.

4. *Construction/Major Infrastructure Projects*

- This category includes freeway overcrossings, bridges, intersection reconfigurations and other projects that will require major capital outlay, but are not included in the per-mile costs above.
- The cost of 16 such projects (all on the inter-city network) was included in the 2006 Countywide Bicycle Plan.
- It is recommended that PWG members review these projects and costs and that the plan update/escalate the 2006 costs to 2012.
- Similar major projects in the added areas (access to transit, downtowns and communities of concern) should also be accounted for. Although they may not be included in the cost estimates, the updated plan should note this category of projects.

5. *Construction/Communities of Concern*

- Since specific routes will most likely not be identified in these communities, it is recommended to estimate the cost of these links using GIS-calculated distance between the centroid of each community and the nearest major transit stop or station (and another calculation to the nearest downtown/downtown equivalent) times the number



of such unique links (i.e., avoiding double counting), and then multiplying by the higher Class II amount of \$100,000/mile.

In addition to breaking down the cost to build the countywide bicycle network by facility class, these costs will also be presented by the following prioritization categories: inter-jurisdictional network, access to transit, access to downtowns, trails and communities of concern.

- Suggest comparing these cost estimates to actual projects Alameda CTC has funded, as a check.

### Maintenance Costs

Previous versions of the Countywide Bicycle Plan established annual maintenance costs, but were not based on per-mile costs. To help implement the 2012 plan goal of identifying funding streams for maintenance, it is recommended to develop class-specific maintenance costs, as follows:

1. *Maintenance/Class I Trails*
  - Use EBRPD per mile costs.
2. *Maintenance/Class II*
  - Assume \$1,500/mile/year (the average of the locally reported costs – see memo Table 2).
3. *Maintenance/Class III*
  - Assume \$700/mile/year (also the locally reported average).

In a future update to the Alameda CTC Walkability Toolkit, it is recommended to provide maintenance costs by component, such as signal detectors, traffic signs, restriping, trimming shrubbery, etc.

- Would re-paving be eligible for maintenance funding, or is this a capital cost?
- Suggest distinguishing between major maintenance (resurfacing, restriping, etc.) and routine maintenance (sweeping, emptying trash, etc.), as Marin County does.

### Pedestrian Vision Network

Unlike the 2006 Countywide Bicycle Plan, the 2006 Pedestrian Plan estimated projects by component. It is generally recommended to escalate the numbers in that plan, with some modifications, as described below. Note that, unlike the bicycle network, the percentage of the pedestrian network that has already been constructed is unknown.

- Not only don't we know how much is built, we don't know how much of what is built is substandard. (Consultant response: in future, what's unconstructed, substandard and constructed should ideally all be tracked, as feasible.)

#### 1. *Construction/Access to Transit*

- Bus: The 2006 methodology considered the mileage and number of stops on each trunkline route and multiplied this by an average investment that included bulbouts, crosswalk striping and other costs listed in Appendix G of the 2006 plan. A lower per-mile cost was assumed for the ½-mile walkshed surrounding each trunkline to account for the lower investment envisioned on these less-traveled streets. It is recommended to

develop a simpler methodology in the plan update, along the lines of the Bicycle Plan's proposed per mile method:

- Trunkline mileage x average per mile cost
  - Half-mile walkshed x a lower average per mile cost
  - Rail: The 2006 plan cost estimation relied on the cost of a single "ideal" project (improvements to 40<sup>th</sup> Street adjacent to the MacArthur BART station, which was upgraded just as the plan was being developed). It is recommended to select a more recent project on which to base updated improvements in the vicinity of rail stations.
  - Ferry: Improvements near ferry terminals were based on a project at the South San Francisco ferry terminal, which was being developed in 2005. It is recommended to verify that this is the most recent ferry project or to base improvement costs on those used for rail stations, as described above.
2. *Construction/Access within Downtowns*
    - The 2006 plan categorized Alameda County's downtowns as small, medium or large and applied a different level of investment accordingly, based on the MacArthur BART project described in the rail section above. It is recommended to base new per mile costs on the new "ideal" project for downtown and downtown equivalent calculations.
  3. *Construction/Activity Centers*
    - The 2006 plan assumed walk access between a single bus stop, on average 1/8-mile from each activity center, and each activity center. This is recommended to be doubled to two per activity center, and to add major commercial centers to the list of activity centers, since for the most part they are being taken out of the downtown category, then multiply these distances by the same per mile cost as the off-trunkline bus access figure.
  4. *Construction/Trails*
    - Same process as bicycle plan, but using pedestrian plan's list of "other" trails.
  5. *Communities of Concern*
    - Assume one quarter-mile to the nearest local bus stop using the off-trunkline per mile costs.

Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans Working Group - Attendees & Invitees

Meeting Date: 7/27/2011	First Name	Last Name	Agency/Group Represented	Title
x	Wendy	Alfson	Bay Area Walkable Communities Collaborative / Walk & Roll Berkeley / California Walks	Executive Director California Walks
x	Eric	Anderson	City of Berkeley	Bike/Ped Coordinator
x	Aleida	Andrino-Chavez	City of Albany	
x	Carmela	Campbell	City of Union City	
x	Reh-Lin	Chen	City of San Leandro	Senior Transportation Engineer
x	Rene	Dalton	City of Fremont	Assoc. Transp. Engr.
x	Sean	Dougan	East Bay Regional Park District	
x	Brooke	DuBose	Fehr & Peers	Transportation Planner
x	Victoria	Eisen	Eisen Letunic	Principal
x	Robin	Freeman	Merritt College - Brower Dellums Institute for Sustainable Policy Studies	
x	Kendahsi	Haley	Cycles of Change/Bike Go Round	Instructor/Outreach Coordinator
x	Lee	Huo	Bay Trail/ABAG	Bay Trail Planner
x	Nathan	Landau	AC Transit	
x	Anh	Phan Nguyen	Caltrans/Ped Program	
x	David	Ralston	City of Oakland CEDA/ORA	PM Infrastructure and Streetscapes
x	Zach	Rehm	City of Piedmont	Planning Technician
x	Billy	Riggs	UC Berkeley	Principal Planner
x	Renee	Rivera	East Bay Bicycle Coalition	Executive Director
x	Jennifer	Stanley	City of Oakland	Bicycle & Pedestrian Program Manager
x	Diane	Stark	Alameda CTC	
x	Rochelle	Wheeler	Alameda CTC	
x	Morgan	Wilson	City of San Leandro	
x	Karl	Zabel	Hayward Area Recreation and Park District	Operations & Dev. Sup.

***This page intentionally left blank***



## MEMORANDUM

**To:** Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans Working Group (PWG)

**From:** Rochelle Wheeler, Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Coordinator  
Beth Walukas, Deputy Director of Planning

**Date:** July 6, 2012

**Subject:** Review of Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans

### Recommendation

This item is for information only. No action is requested.

### Summary

The Draft Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans were released for public review and comment on June 25, 2012, and are posted on the Alameda CTC website ([www.AlamedaCTC.org](http://www.AlamedaCTC.org)). Hard copies of the full draft plans and the joint Appendices (Attachment A) were offered, and mailed, to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans Working Group (PWG) members previously, upon request. Together, the Draft Countywide Pedestrian and Bicycle Plans lay out the vision and steps for making Alameda County a safe and convenient place for walking and bicycling over the next 28 years. The plans describe the existing walking and bicycling conditions in the county, the priorities for countywide bike and pedestrian funding for both capital projects and programs, the total costs to implement the priorities, total expected revenue and next steps for implementing the plans.

Staff are taking the draft plans to Alameda CTC committees and the Board, including the PWG, in July for comment, and also requesting written comments through July 27<sup>th</sup>. Staff will consider and incorporate comments, as appropriate, in August, and then release final draft plans in September, to be considered by the Alameda CTC Board for adoption. In addition to comments made at the meeting, PWG members are encouraged to submit written comments on the draft plans to Rochelle Wheeler using the attached comment sheet (Attachment B; also posted on the Alameda CTC web address listed above), by **Friday, July 27, 2012**, at 5:00 p.m.

### 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, 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 improved bike 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 draft Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans, which have been updated to meet the above objectives, each consist of six chapters and an executive summary. Because of the close coordination of these plans, one joint Appendices was developed. The full plans are posted on the Alameda CTC website ([www.alamedaCTC.org](http://www.alamedaCTC.org)).

### *Countywide Priorities*

Both plans establish countywide capital projects, programs and plans that are intended to implement the plan's vision and goals. These priorities, which have been made consistent between the plans as appropriate, will guide countywide discretionary funding decisions. For the Pedestrian Plan, they include a "vision system" of pedestrian facilities throughout the county, while the Bicycle Plan includes a "vision network" of countywide bicycle facilities.

The countywide pedestrian vision system totals 3,183 miles of pedestrian facilities. 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 775 miles of bikeways, of which, approximately 374 miles (48%) have been built while 401 miles (52%) are still to be constructed. The network, like the pedestrian vision system, 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 describe a set of priorities within the vision system or network, on which to focus limited countywide funding. They include a largely overlapping and robust set of priority programs to promote and support walking and bicycling, and the creation and updating of local pedestrian and bicycle master plans.

### *Implementation Chapters*

The Implementation Chapters are the only draft chapters not previously reviewed by PWG, although an approach to the construction and maintenance cost estimating was brought to the last PWG meeting in July 2011 for comment, as summarized in the meeting minutes. These chapters have taken a considerable amount of time to develop given their complexity and comprehensiveness. They include estimates of the costs to implement the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans over the next 28 years, and the expected revenue during the same time period, plus the next steps needed to begin implementing the goals of the plans before the plans are again updated.

### *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 \$2.8 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 \$3.1 billion, and the expected revenue is \$820 million, as shown in the table below. These costs are higher than those in the previous (2006) Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans for reasons described in the plans.

At the same time that costs have increased for both plans, so has anticipated revenue. This is mainly due to assuming that the Transportation Expenditure Plan will be passed in November 2012, and will continue throughout the life of the plan (a similar assumption was made in the Countywide Transportation Plan).

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	\$ 617.2	\$2,463.4	\$3,080.6
Construction of capital projects			
• Shared costs for multi-use trails	\$ 265.9	\$ 265.9	\$ 531.8
• Remaining Plan construction costs	\$ 158.1	\$1,470.8	\$1,628.9
Maintenance of capital projects			
• Shared costs for multi-use trails	\$ 59.9	\$ 59.9	\$ 119.8
• Remaining Plan maintenance costs	\$ 56.3	\$ 585.5	\$ 641.8
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*

Each of the two plans includes fourteen priority activities, or “next steps” that the Alameda CTC should take to begin to implement the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans. These activities are grouped into funding, technical assistance and countywide initiatives.

*Input to date*

During the two year plan development process, the Bicycle Pedestrian Plans Working Group (PWG) and the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), were the primary two groups to review and give input on the plans. The PWG has reviewed every chapter, or key chapter elements, of the plan in their initial draft form. The PWG has provided input on the plans, including the original scope of work for the two documents, at nine meetings to date, as summarized in Attachment 05 in the July meeting packet.

The majority of the PWG meetings during the planning process focused on developing the countywide priorities for capital projects. The PWG discussed the countywide priorities at five of its meetings. In addition to these meetings, during this critical stage, 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.

In addition, during the entire planning process, staff have maintained and updated a mailing list of interested people, and kept this group informed of opportunities for public input and posted information on the agency’s website. The list of interested members of the public has been notified of the draft plans availability.

*Draft and Final Plans review process*

The Draft Plans were released on Monday, June 25<sup>th</sup>, and are available for public review and comment through Friday, July 27<sup>th</sup>. During this five week period, a number of Alameda CTC Committees, and the Board, will have the opportunity to provide input on the plans at their meetings, as follows:

- June 25, 2012 Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee (PAPCO)
- July 3, 2012 Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee (ACTAC)
- July 9, 2012 Planning, Policy, and Legislation Committee (PPLC)
- July 11, 2012 Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans Working Group (PWG)
- July 12, 2012 Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
- July 26, 2012 Alameda CTC Board

In August, all comments will be considered and incorporated, as appropriate, into the final draft plans. Both plans will then be presented to ACTAC and BPAC, for their recommendation to the PPLC and full Board for its consideration for adoption and incorporation, by reference, into the Countywide Transportation Plan. The July meeting will be the final meeting of the PWG, which is a technical working group, not a formal advisory body.



### *Requested Feedback from PWG*

The PWG is requested to review the two draft plans and joint appendices in detail and provide comments. At the PWG meeting, it is recommended that members provide high level input on the overall Draft Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans, in particular on the *Implementation* chapters which it is reviewing for the first time. Specific comments and corrections are also encouraged, and can be submitted via the comment form (Attachment B) by the July 27<sup>th</sup> comment deadline.

Some of the areas the PWG may wish to focus its feedback on during the meeting include:

- *Implementation* chapters overall, but in particular the methodologies used in the cost estimating section, and the activities included in the next steps section.
- *Countywide Priorities* chapters, which the PWG reviewed portions of in memo format, but not as complete draft chapters. This includes how understandable the priority bicycle network and priority pedestrian system are, since these will be used as the basis for future countywide discretionary calls for projects.

Detailed review and comments requested via the comment forms on the following:

- Listing of major non-bikeway capital projects (in Appendix X), for (1) accuracy of status and cost of the projects and (2) if unbuilt, for need for the projects. These projects are also included on the vision network maps.
- Updated countywide bicycle vision network maps of your jurisdiction or agency, especially:
  - Review all existing and proposed bikeways to make sure they match local plans. This is especially important for jurisdictions with bicycle plans that have been updated or created since June 2011.
  - Review all “unclassified” bikeways, and let Alameda CTC know if these are an existing or proposed bikeway, or if the jurisdiction opposes including these in the countywide network. For the most part, these bikeways were added to meet the objectives of providing access to transit and access to central business districts, as described in the *Countywide Priorities* chapter.
  - Review networks for meeting the objectives of the bicycle vision network, as written in the plan.
  - Review overall accuracy and readability of the maps.
- Updated countywide pedestrian vision system maps, including a review of accuracy and readability of the maps, and how well the maps meet the objectives of the pedestrian vision system, as written in the plan.
- Review both plans, in particular the *Existing Conditions* and *Evaluation of Plans, Policies and Practices* chapters, for accuracy regarding your jurisdiction, agency, or organization.

### **Attachments**

- A: Draft Countywide Bicycle Plan, Draft Countywide Pedestrian Plan and Joint Appendices (on web at [www.alamedaCTC.org](http://www.alamedaCTC.org))
- B: Comment Sheet

***This page intentionally left blank***

<b>Comments on:</b> Draft Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans	<b>Prepared By:</b>
<b>Comments due by:</b> Friday, July 27, 2012, 5:00pm to Rochelle Wheeler, <a href="mailto:rwheeler@alamedactc.org">rwheeler@alamedactc.org</a>	<b>Agency/Organization:</b>

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

***This page intentionally left blank***

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

*Created: July 27, 2010*

*Revised: July 3, 2012*

***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"> <li>• Input on Plan Updates Request for Proposals Scope of Work</li> </ul>
2	June 3, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduce consultant team</li> <li>• Review approach and timeline</li> <li>• Input on Tables of Contents</li> <li>• Input on Local Agency Questionnaire</li> <li>• Input on Outreach</li> </ul>
3	September 22, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Input on Existing Conditions Draft Chapters</li> <li>• Outreach Strategy</li> </ul>
4	October 20, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion of proposed approaches to Bike and Ped Networks (Vision/Goals)</li> </ul>
5	December 8, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Input on Evaluation of Current Practices Draft Chapter</li> <li>• Input on Vision/Goals Draft Chapters</li> </ul>
6	February 9, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priority Projects/Programs (Vision Networks)</li> </ul>
7	March 23, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priority Projects/Programs (Prioritization Approach)</li> </ul>
8	June 8, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft Programs Approach</li> </ul>
9	July 27, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revised Draft Vision and Priority Capital Projects Networks: Review of Input and Direction</li> <li>• Input on Capital Project Cost Estimating Approach</li> </ul>
10	July 11, 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Full Draft Plans, including Implementation Chapters</b></li> </ul>

***This page intentionally left blank***