



Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans Working Group Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, June 8, 2011, 1:30 to 3:30 p.m.
1333 Broadway, Suite 300, Oakland, CA 94612

Meeting Outcomes:

- Provide feedback on approach for bicycle and pedestrian programs
- Provide feedback on specific programs recommended for inclusion in one or both Plans

1:30 – 1:35 p.m. Staff	1. Welcome and Introductions	
1:35– 1:40 p.m. Staff	2. Review of March 23, 2011 Meeting Notes <i><u>02 BPPWG Meeting Notes 032311.pdf – Page 1</u></i> <i><u>02A BPPWG Meeting Attendance 032311.pdf – Page 5</u></i>	
1:40 – 1:55 p.m. Victoria Eisen	3. Update on Collecting and Incorporating Local Comments into Capital Project Prioritization Process <i><u>03 Flyer Local BPAC Meetings.pdf – Page 7</u></i>	
1:55 – 3:15 p.m. Victoria Eisen	4. Discussion of Bicycle and Pedestrian Programs Approach and Specific Programs Recommended <i><u>04 Overview Memo for Programs.pdf – Page 9</u></i> <i><u>04A Memo on Programs.pdf – Page 11</u></i> <i><u>04B Comment Sheet.doc – Page 31</u></i>	
3:15 – 3:30 p.m.	5. Announcements <i><u>05 BPPWG Meeting Schedule & Purpose.pdf – Page 33</u></i>	
3:30 p.m.	6. Adjournment	

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

Next Meeting:

Date: July, date TBD
Time: 1:30 to 3:30 p.m.
Location: 1333 Broadway, Suite 300, Oakland, CA 94612

Staff Liaisons:

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

Diane Stark, Senior Transportation Planner
(510) 208-7470
dstark@alamedactc.org

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.



EISEN | LETUNIC

TRANSPORTATION, ENVIRONMENTAL AND URBAN PLANNING

MEMORANDUM

To | Rochelle Wheeler and Diane Stark, Alameda CTC
From | Victoria Eisen
Date | March 28, 2011
Project | Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Updates
Subject | **March 23, 2011 Plans Working Group Meeting Notes**

These notes reflect discussions of the March 23, 2011 Working Group meeting. The meeting began with presenting the ways in which Working Group and Countywide BPAC member comments were incorporated into revised recommended bicycle and pedestrian vision networks/systems. The focus of the meeting was the recommended approach to prioritizing bicycle and pedestrian capital projects in the respective plans. The approach was presented and there was much discussion. Bold headers below correspond to the recommended project type categories and/or geographic areas to be prioritized.

Trails (Priority Project Type)

- Suggest prioritizing access routes to trails, not just the trails themselves.
- Consider whether just the Bay Trail spine should be prioritized, or spur and/or connector trail segments, as well.
- If trails, and access to the trails, are prioritized, the funding criteria could distinguish between them.
- Question whether trails should be a pedestrian priority.
- Trails are complex and very expensive – they will take a lot of the funding. Should consider if this is where we want countywide funding to go, as opposed to less expensive on-street facilities, and that less mileage will be built.
- One could argue that expensive projects should be funded by a countywide agency.
- Be creative about finding funding sources for maintenance on trails – shouldn't just come from bike/ped funds.

Inter-jurisdictional Routes (Priority Project Type)

- Do not prioritize inter-jurisdictional routes for pedestrians (if defined solely as gaps at city borders).
- Questions about how important projects at the County line are, compared to other projects.
- Bikeway gaps that are only within one jurisdiction, but that connect to a (built) cross-county bikeway, should be prioritized.
- Remove maintenance as a priority for inter-jurisdictional routes. Focus maintenance on trails.
- Maintenance addresses common challenges to disabled access, such as heaved sidewalks, so it should remain under inter-jurisdictional routes.

- Replace “inter-jurisdictional” with “multi-agency” for both plans, where agencies are those with land use or right-of-way authority. Also ensure that this approach is consistent with the vision network/system.

TPZs, Downtowns and Major Commercial Centers (Priority Geographies)

- All eight types of activity centers described in the 2006 Countywide Pedestrian Plan should be prioritized, particularly post-secondary educational institutions, not just downtowns and major commercial centers.
- Other activity centers draw more cyclists than those that have been prioritized.
- Proposal to base prioritized radii around downtowns and major commercial centers on the relative distance between them is at odds with the goal of connecting destinations; therefore, this proposal does not make sense for the Bicycle Plan.
- Consider eliminating ¼-mile threshold for pedestrian projects because it may be too short to be useful to some destinations, such as rail stations. Consider making distances geographically-specific, modal-specific (i.e., farther for Transbay bus than local bus) or leaving some discretion to grant reviewers to determine if project is indeed serving a transit station/stop.
- Include transit station improvements and bus shelters in downtowns as examples of prioritized expenses. Likewise, include streetscape projects and widened sidewalks in major commercial centers and in communities of concern.
- A one-half mile radius (for priority access around TPZs) seems arbitrary.

General Comments

- Proposed approach does not prioritize “low hanging fruit;” rather, it favors big, expensive difficult projects, such as trails and overcoming barriers, which will result in fewer projects being funded; however, this approach may be appropriate for a countywide plan. If it is intentional, it should be complemented with a countywide Complete Streets policy that applies to all projects funded with countywide funds.
- Consider including all projects in local plans in vision networks/systems so they’ll be eligible for other funding sources, particularly if countywide priorities are going to focus on bigger projects.
- Projects in a priority category and at a priority location may be the highest countywide priority for bicycle projects, but this does not hold for pedestrian projects. Need to look at what this looks like on the ground to really judge. Want to see proposal mapped so we can make sure the “highest priority” projects (those that meet more than one priority) really are the county’s highest priorities (especially since these are the projects on which the agencies will focus their funding applications).
- Do the proposed priorities do enough to help create an interconnected countywide bicycle network? (Proposed priority approach may be more appropriate for Pedestrian Plan.)
Response: proposal is intentionally to shift emphasis from a countywide network to TPZs, downtowns and major commercial centers.
- How can rural roadways be prioritized, especially ones that connect to other counties?
- How do emerging technologies/treatments fit into this approach, e.g., CycleTracks?

- The pedestrian and bicycle networks do not need to have the same, or even a parallel, prioritization approach.

This page intentionally left blank.

BPPWG Meeting 06/08/11
Attachment 02A
Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans Working Group
March 23, 2011
Meeting Attendance

Meeting Date: 3/23/2011	First Name	Last Name	Agency/Group Represented	Title
X	Eric	Anderson	City of Berkeley	Bike/Ped Coordinator
X	Aleida	Andrino-Chavez	City of Albany	
X	Naomi	Armenta	Alameda CTC - Paratransit/Seniors	
X	Leigh	Bryant	Alameda County General Services Agency	Sustainable Transportation Associate
X	Reh-Lin	Chen	City of San Leandro	
X	Rene	Dalton	City of Fremont	Assoc. Transp. Engr.
X	Sean	Dougan	East Bay Regional Park District	
X	Victoria	Eisen	Eisen Letunic	Principal
X	Lee	Huo	Bay Trail/ABAG	Bay Trail Planner
X	Paul	Keener	Alameda County Public Works Agency	Sr. Transp. Planner
X	Nathan	Landau	AC Transit	
X	Dale	Murai	Alameda County Public Health Department	
X	Jason	Patton	City of Oakland	Bicycle & Pedestrian Program Manager
X	Gail	Payne	City of Alameda (formerly ACTIA)	
X	Anh	Phan Nguyen	Caltrans/Ped Program	
X	David	Ralston	City of Oakland CEDA/ORA	PM Infrastructure and Streetscapes
X	Renee	Rivera	East Bay Bicycle Coalition	Executive Director
X	Diane	Stark	Alameda CTC	
X	Janis	Stephen	City of Pleasanton	Assistant Engr. II
X	Beth	Walukas	Alameda CTC	
X	Rochelle	Wheeler	Alameda CTC	
X	Karl	Zabel	Hayward Area Recreation and Park District	Operations & Dev. Sup.

This page intentionally left blank.



Your input is requested on the Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans!

The Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) is updating the 2006 Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans. The plans are used to identify countywide capital project and program priorities and guide the allocation of countywide funds for bicycle and pedestrian improvements. The update process began in May 2010. Final draft plans will be released in December 2011, and adopted in early 2012.

Currently, the Alameda CTC is visiting local Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) meetings to request input from the public on the countywide priorities for capital pedestrian and bicycle projects. Alameda CTC staff will review maps showing both the entire countywide pedestrian and bicycle draft vision networks for the next 25 years, and the more limited prioritized draft networks of bicycle and pedestrian capital projects. Feedback will be requested on the overall priorities and the specific capital projects, such as bikeways, access routes to transit, and pedestrian access to major transit stops and stations.

Attend one of these upcoming meetings to provide input!

Fremont Bicycle Pedestrian Technical Advisory Committee

Wednesday, May 18, 6:00 pm to 7:15 pm
Niles Room
39550 Liberty Street, Fremont
Agenda to be posted here:
<http://www.fremont.gov/index.aspx?NID=704>

San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

Tuesday, June 14, 6:30 pm to 9:00 pm
San Leandro City Hall, Sister Cities Gallery
835 E. 14th Street, San Leandro
<http://www.sanleandro.org/depts/transit/bicycle.asp>

Oakland Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

Thursday, June 16, 5:30 pm to 7:30 pm
Oakland City Hall, Sgt Daniel Sakai Hearing Room (on the second floor, north side of the building)
Agenda to be posted here:
<http://www2.oaklandnet.com/Government/o/PWA/o/EC/s/BicycleandPedestrianProgram/OAK024602#/agenda>

Berkeley Bicycle Subcommittee

Monday, June 20, 7:00 pm to 9:00 pm
North Berkeley Senior Center,
1901 Hearst Ave
Agenda to be posted here:
<http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/ContentDisplay.aspx?id=13086>

Pleasanton Bicycle Pedestrian Trails Committee

Monday, June 27, 6:30 pm
Pleasanton City Council Chambers,
200 Old Bernal Avenue
Agenda to be posted here:
<http://www.ci.pleasanton.ca.us/government/representatives/city-commissions.html#bptc>

More Info on the Plan Updates:

Website: www.tinyurl.com/ACBikePedPlans

Contacts: Rochelle Wheeler
(510) 208-7471
rwheeler@alamedactc.org

Diane Stark
(510) 208-7410
dstark@alamedactc.org

This page intentionally left blank.



MEMORANDUM

Date: June 1, 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: Programs Approach**

Recommendations

It is recommended that the Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans Working Group (Plans Working Group) provide input on the proposed approach to programs in the Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans updates at the meeting, and, if desired, in writing by Friday, June 17, 2011. See Attachment 04A for more information.

Summary

A memo from the Plans Updates consultant, discussing a draft list of programs to include in the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans is included in Attachment 04A. The memo includes the process for selecting the proposed programs, how they meet the draft plans' goals, available effectiveness information for each program, and potential parties responsible for coordinating the programs. The memo also includes a list of 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 of the updated Plans.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans Working Group members are encouraged to use the attached comment sheet (Attachment 04B) to submit written comments on the programs, 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, June 17, 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, the Vision, Goals & Objectives chapter, and the approach to the vision and priority networks for the Plans.

The approach to programs, with input from PWG, BPAC and interested others will be incorporated into the Priority Projects and Programs chapters in the Plans. This information will return to PWG and BPAC before it is finalized in the Plans.

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, draft vision and priority 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 program approach for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans will be consolidated and incorporated into the draft versions of the Priority Projects and Programs chapters.

Attachments

- 04A. Memo on Proposed Bicycle and Pedestrian Programs Approach
- 04B. Comment Sheet



MEMORANDUM

To | Diane Stark and Rochelle Wheeler, Alameda CTC
From | Victoria Eisen
Date | June 1, 2011
Project | Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Updates
Subject | **Proposed approach to countywide programs**

Background

Over the past several months, discussions have focused on capital projects for inclusion in the Vision and Priorities networks of the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans. In addition to capital projects of countywide significance, creating a pedestrian and bicycle culture in Alameda County will require programs that promote, educate, and provide other programmatic support for walking and cycling. The 2006 Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans recommended 25 programs, many of which have been implemented or are underway (see Table 1).

This memo summarizes 18 programs that are being considered for the plan updates, as listed in Table 1. The 18 programs were derived from programs included in the 2006 Countywide Bicycle and/or Pedestrian Plans, programs that the Alameda CTC is, or is interested in, supporting, or successful programs from other areas.

The discussion of each program in this memo includes the corresponding draft plan goals, the reported effectiveness of each program, and the potential responsible parties for coordinating each program. Consistency with goals is based on a comparison with the Vision, Goals & Objectives chapters, which the Plans Working Group and Countywide BPAC reviewed in December 2010. Effectiveness is discussed for those programs where information is available for similar programs.

Program categories

The 18 specific programs being recommended fall under one of five categories: promotion, education, technical support, collaboration and research, and facilities programs. In some cases, a program could fall under two categories, such as promotion and education: the most relevant one has been selected. Of the 18, ten of the programs support bicycle and pedestrian use, five are bicycle-only, and three are pedestrian only.

Program selection

All of the programs being recommended are, at a minimum, countywide in nature, or provide a model transferrable throughout Alameda County. In addition, all recommended programs are

either proven to be effective based on similar programs in Alameda County or other areas, or do not have information available about effectiveness (see Table 2). Those with no effectiveness data available were included because they still meet goals of the plans.

Eleven of the 18 programs were recommended in either the 2006 Countywide Bicycle or Pedestrian Plan (or both – see Table 1). The remaining seven include three programs that are already supported by Alameda CTC: #5 Countywide walking promotion campaign and # 6, Safe Routes for Seniors, which is described in the agency’s Active Transportation Case Statement, and #12 Annual count program. Finally, four of the recommended programs are recommended by the Alameda CTC staff and/or the consultant team based on their success in other geographic areas: #2 Sunday Streets, #9 Coordination of multi-agency capital projects, #10 Facilitate collaborative bicycle and pedestrian research, and #15 Bicycle sharing.

Of the 25 programs included in the 2006 Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans, 21 are being recommended for the plans updates in some form. These recommended programs either appear in this memo as a stand-alone program or have been combined with other programs, or will be included in the Implementation Chapter, as a policy, next step, or funding priority. Four programs were not recommended to be included, since they are either less countywide in nature, were less strong candidates, or are being performed by others:

Pedestrian Plan

1. Walking maps

Bicycle Plan

2. Explore subregional sharing of bicycle safety training equipment
3. Equip Police Departments with improved handouts
4. Explore ways to offer bicycle driver education materials at DMV offices

Program prioritization

The 2006 Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans treated the priority of programs in slightly different ways. In the Pedestrian Plan, programs were included on equal footing with capital projects of countywide significance, and planning (i.e. local master plans). The Bicycle Plan, however, gave a higher priority to capital projects, which, in general, are often more costly than programs, over programs. Neither Plan developed a prioritized “short list” of programs, similar to the high-priority capital projects list. One of the goals of updating the Plan updates is to acknowledge and elevate the importance of programs in both plans.

The PWG and BPAC are asked to consider whether bicycle and pedestrian programs should be prioritized as a whole, or whether some programs should be prioritized over others. If there should be priorities among the programs, the PWG and BPAC are asked to review the recommended programs in light of which are most effective in increasing walking and biking throughout the county, and which will support local jurisdictions’ efforts to increase the use of these modes.

Alameda CTC Role

For each program, one or more potential Alameda CTC roles are listed. These roles are listed as “potential” since they still require further discussion within the agency. The five roles are:

- Encourage – Alameda CTC would encourage others to fund and implement the programs.
- Fund – Programs under this category would be eligible for funding from Alameda CTC, such as through a grant process. The agency would administer the grant, but not implement the program.
- Support - This may include providing some technical assistance or support.
- Coordinate – This category includes coordinating or seeking funding, perhaps issuing a Request for Proposal (RFP), and administering a grant or contract. It does not include direct implementation of the program.
- Implement – Alameda CTC would fund, or find funding for, the program and implement it directly.

Table 1: Programs Recommended for Inclusion in Plans Updates

	2006 Bike Plan	2006 Ped Plan	Implemented or Underway	Proposed for Bike, Ped, or Bike/Ped Plans
PROMOTION				
1. Individualized Travel Marketing		x	x	BP
2. Sunday Streets				BP
3. Annual Bicycling Promotions	x		x	B
4. Organized walks and walk to transit programs		x	x	P
5. Countywide walking promotion campaigns			x	P
6. Safe Routes for Seniors				P
EDUCATION				
7. Safe Routes to Schools	x	x	x	BP
8. Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Campaign	x	x		BP
9. Traffic School Focused on Bicycle and Pedestrian Vehicle Laws	x	x	x	BP
10. Bicycle Safety Education	x		x	B
TECHNICAL SUPPORT				
11. Develop Technical Tools		x	x	BP
12. Bicycle and Pedestrian Count Program			x	BP
13. Government Agency Staff Training and Information Sharing	x	x	x	BP
14. Bikeway Signage Program	x			B
COLLABORATION & RESEARCH				
15. Coordination of multi-agency capital projects			x	BP
16. Facilitate Collaborative Bicycle and Pedestrian Research			x	BP
FACILITIES				
17. Bicycle Parking Capital Program	x		x	B
18. Bicycle sharing				B

Table 2: Evaluation of Programs Considered for the Updated Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans

	Plan(s)*	Effectiveness**	Countywide
1. Individualized Travel Marketing	BP	Y	Y
2. Sunday Streets	BP	Y	Y
3. Annual Bicycling Promotions	B	Y	Y
4. Organized walks and walk to transit programs	P	N/A	Y
5. Countywide walking promotion campaigns	P	N/A	Y
6. Safe Routes for Seniors	P	Y	Y
7. Safe Routes to Schools	BP	Y	Y
8. Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Campaign	BP	N/A	Y
9. Traffic School Focused on Bicycle and Pedestrian Vehicle Laws	BP	N/A	Y
10. Bicycle Safety Education	B	N/A	Y
11. Develop Technical Tools	BP	N/A	Y
12. Bicycle and Pedestrian Count Program	BP	N/A	Y
13. Government Agency Staff Training and Info Sharing	BP	N/A	Y
14. Bikeway Signage Program	B	N/A	Y
15. Coordination of multi-agency capital projects	BP	N/A	Y
16. Facilitate Collaborative Bicycle and Pedestrian Research	BP	N/A	Y
17. Bicycle Parking Capital Program	B	Y	Y
18. Bicycle sharing	B	Y	Y

* B: Bicycle Plan; P: Pedestrian Plan; BP: Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans

**N/A: data not available to determine effectiveness

PROMOTION programs for bicycling and/or walking

1. Individualized Travel Marketing

Individualized marketing offers residents of targeted neighborhoods information about alternatives to the single-occupant vehicle, including walking, biking and public transit. The TravelChoice program, administered by TransForm for the past several years, and funded in part by the Alameda CTC, has tailored marketing campaigns to specific neighborhoods in the cities of Oakland, Alameda and Berkeley, providing localized maps, neighborhood-specific transit materials, and multilingual outreach in order to connect with each household. As the next phase of program development, based on lessons learned from the original TravelChoice programs, TransForm is launching a new program called TravelChoice New Residents. This program, which also has some Alameda CTC funding, focuses specifically on residents as they move into walkable communities near public transit, effectively helping them to start new habits before they fall back on previous auto-oriented behaviors.

- Goal Addressed: Encouragement (Policy 3.1) – Work with all levels of public agencies, nonprofits and advocacy groups to implement effective encouragement programs that promote walking as a safe and convenient form of transportation among a broad range of potential users, including seniors and people with disabilities.
- Effectiveness: Medium/High: A study of the original TravelChoice program launched in the City of Alameda in 2006 revealed drastic changes in participants’ travel choices, including a 14 percent decrease in drive alone trips and 34 percent and five percent increases in transit and carpool, respectively.¹ However, in the long term, it is thought that these changes may not be sustainable without an ongoing program in place. The new program (TravelChoice New Residents) is designed to address this issue, by helping to establish long-term mode shifts. Because the program is not yet launched, the effectiveness is unknown at this time.
- Responsible Parties
 - Potential Alameda CTC role: Fund
 - Other Lead Parties/Partners: Contractor/consultant to administer the program

2. Sunday Streets

Sunday Streets, also known by their Spanish name, “Cyclovia,” are festivals that temporarily close streets to automobile traffic so people can use the entire roadway for walking, bicycling, skating and playing games. By providing a central public location for recreational activities, Sunday Streets build community, encourage residents to be physically active and can boost local economies with additional foot traffic. These events also remind community residents that streets are made for everyone and build greater awareness of bicyclists and pedestrians.

¹ <http://transformca.org/files/travelchoice-alameda-presentation.pdf>

In June 2010, the City of Oakland hosted its first “Oaklavia,” which was also the first Sunday Streets event in Alameda County. It took place on Broadway in downtown. Over a thousand participants attended and downtown businesses reported good sales. Alameda CTC could consider encouraging these events in other Alameda County locations by providing seed money for Sunday Streets events and by facilitating the transfer of knowledge between cities and organizations that have already implemented a Sunday Streets event and those that wish to organize one. Alameda CTC’s role in knowledge transfer could include sponsoring talks, developing a how-to guide, and informing agencies about Sunday Streets through already existing channels such as the Pedestrian and Bicycle Working Group.

- Goal Addressed: Safety, Education and Enforcement (Policy 2.4) – Promote collaboration among local, county and other agencies to deliver effective bicycle and pedestrian safety education programs for a variety of audiences, including drivers, and provide support for such strategies.
- Effectiveness: Medium: 25% of participants in the 2009 Portland, Oregon Sunday Parkways were not regular bicycle riders before the event,² indicating that such programs can be an effective way to expose residents to bicycling in a positive and safe environment, perhaps contributing to the objective of increasing bicycle mode share and physical activity.
- Responsible Parties
 - Potential Alameda CTC roles: Fund, Support
 - Other Lead Parties/Partners: Advocacy organizations to organize, advertise, recruit and train volunteers, work with government agencies to secure needed permits and ensure adequate law enforcement; Local politicians to endorse and participate

3. Annual Bicycling Promotions

Countywide annual bicycling promotions, such as Bike Month, Bike to Work Day, and International Walk and Bike to School Day can help raise community awareness and further legitimize safe and legal street bicycling. The 2006 Countywide Bicycle Plan recommends “continu(ing) to capitalize on existing annual promotions.” Alameda CTC supports such promotions, including Bike to Work Day, the Get Rolling/Ride into Life advertising campaign, and, through the County Safe Routes to School Program, International Walk and Bike to School Day. These programs encourage new cyclists and support existing cyclists.

- Goals Addressed:
 - Encouragement (Policy 3.1) Work with all levels of public agencies, nonprofits and advocacy groups to implement effective encouragement programs that promote walking as a safe and convenient form of transportation among a broad range of potential users, including seniors and people with disabilities.

² Ginenthal, Linda; Sunday Parkways 2009 Evaluation Report; www.portlandonline.com/transportation/index.cfm?a=274633&c=51522.

- Encouragement (Policy 3.5) Promote integration of bicycling into broader countywide transportation demand management programs and serve as a resource to employers on promotional information and resources related to biking to work.
- Effectiveness: High: Fifteen percent of participants in Bike to Work events have been shown to be new riders³. A month-long bike to work challenge in Portland saw 22.7 percent new rider participation⁴. Recent Alameda County surveys of residents and bicyclists show that people who participate in Bike to Work Day, bicycle more often after the event.
- Responsible Parties
 - Potential Alameda CTC roles: Fund, Coordinate

4. Organized walks and walk to transit programs

Many organizations throughout Alameda County lead weekly or annual walks as a way to encourage physical activity, introduce residents to each other and to their communities, and to promote walking for transportation, public health and fun. Since most public transit trips begin and end with walking, increased access to public transit can provide more opportunities for people to be physically active. “Transit ambassador” or “travel training” programs offer personalized orientation for new users of public transit in a particular geographic area.

The 2006 Pedestrian Plan prioritizes organized walks and walk to transit programs. Alameda CTC funded a senior walk club program in 2009 for the Tri-City area (Fremont, Newark and Union City). By June 2011, the program had 14 walking clubs, which organize walks and provide general walking and walk-to-transit information to its members. A facilitator leads each club for the first 16 weeks, after which the clubs are intended to continue without a facilitator.

Given the documented success of the Senior Walk Clubs program, and the potential for the program to change long-term transportation habits and encourage walking as a transportation option, the Alameda CTC could consider expanding the program to other communities throughout Alameda County or identifying a new focus area, and, in general, continue to prioritize organized walks and walk to transit programs. Also, Alameda CTC could consider serving as a countywide resource to assist local agencies and organizations to start their own organized walks and walk to transit programs.

- Goal Addressed: Encouragement (Policy 3.1) – Work with all levels of public agencies, nonprofits and advocacy groups to implement effective encouragement programs that promote walking as a safe and convenient form of transportation among a broad range of potential users, including seniors and people with disabilities.

³ Bike to Work Week: A Case Study in Successful Behavior Change; Bicyclinginfo.org

⁴ BTA toasts winners and all 11,000 participants of Bike Commute Challenge;
<http://bikeportland.org/2010/10/08/bta-toasts-winners-of-bike-commute-challenge-40856>

- Effectiveness: Unknown: Although the change in the amount of walking resulting from the program is unknown, over 90 percent of participants rated the clubs excellent or good.
- Responsible Parties
 - Potential Alameda CTC roles: Encourage, Fund, Support
 - Other Lead Parties/Partners: local jurisdictions, non-profits.

5. Countywide walking promotion campaigns

Walking promotion campaigns provide information, challenges, and contests to motivate people to walk for physical activity and for transportation. The message can be distributed through a variety of media, including print, television, radio, and online. In 2010, Alameda CTC launched the “Step Into Life” walking campaign, which targets adults and complements Alameda CTC’s other walking programs (Safe Routes to School for youth and the Tri-City Walk Clubs for seniors).

The 2006 Pedestrian Plan recommends promotion of walking among all age groups. Given the potential for this program to change long-term driving habits and encourage walking as a transportation option, the Alameda CTC could continue the countywide walking promotion campaign and expand it to capitalize on social media technologies, and draw from existing behavioral and public health research to develop effective messages for promoting walking.

- Goal Addressed: Encouragement (Policy 3.1) – Work with all levels of public agencies, nonprofits and advocacy groups to implement effective encouragement programs that promote walking as a safe and convenient form of transportation among a broad range of potential users, including seniors and people with disabilities.
- Responsible Parties
 - Potential Alameda CTC roles: Encourage, Fund, Coordinate or Implement
 - Other Lead Parties/Partners: Representatives from the public health field to collaborate on implementation and/or messaging

6. Safe Routes for Seniors

There are two potential components of Safe Routes for Seniors programs:

- Education and encouragement activities, such as pedestrian safety classes, walking clubs, and group events to encourage seniors to walk more
- Physical improvements to the pedestrian environment, identified by senior citizens through walk audits and other conversations with seniors to identify problems and brainstorm infrastructure solutions.

Though a Safe Routes for Seniors program was not identified in the 2006 Bicycle or Pedestrian Plans, Alameda CTC’s Active Transportation Plan Case statement includes the goal to “develop

a new Safe Routes for Seniors program to inspire seniors to feel empowered to walk, and even bike, especially as they transition out of driving.”⁵

The Senior Walk Clubs program (described under #4 Organized walks and walk to transit programs) could be rolled into a larger Safe Routes for Seniors program that includes pedestrian safety courses, travel training, and outreach and walking audits in neighborhoods with high concentrations of seniors or disproportionate rates of senior-involved pedestrian crashes.

Given the expected dramatic increase in Alameda County’s 65 and older population,⁶ the increased risk of injury to senior pedestrians⁷, and the documented effectiveness of Safe Routes for Seniors programs⁸, we recommend including a Safe Routes to Seniors program in the updated Pedestrian Plan. The Alameda CTC could develop parameters for a countywide Safe Routes to Seniors program, modeled on similar programs throughout the U.S. and the successful countywide Safe Routes to School program

- Goal Addressed: Encouragement (Policy 3.1) – Work with all levels of public agencies, nonprofits and advocacy groups to implement effective encouragement programs that promote walking as a safe and convenient form of transportation among a broad range of potential users, including seniors and people with disabilities.
- Effectiveness: High: In New York City, the non-profit group Transportation Alternatives, led a six-year Safe Routes for Seniors Program that worked with senior citizens from selected neighborhoods to understand obstacles to walking and advocate for physical improvements and policy changes to improve conditions. The program engaged over 2,000 seniors, resulted in 65 improvements in two underserved neighborhoods, increased walkability for over 26,000 seniors, and led to the adoption of a Safe Routes for Seniors program by the New York City Department of Transportation and the New York State Department of Transportation.⁹
- Responsible Parties
 - Potential Alameda CTC role: Encourage, Fund, Coordinate

⁵ www.actia2022.com/pdfs/Alameda%20County_2010%20Campaign_Case%20Statement_ver06-30-08_RTC.pdf

⁶ “In Alameda County, the population 65 and older is expected to grow from approximately 145,000 in 2005 to 390,00 in 2030 – a 170% increase.” (Aging in Alameda County, Trends, Challenges, and Opportunities, ACTIA. Original source: MTC Coordinated Public Transit/Human Services Transportation Plan (2007), ABAG projections 2005.)

⁷ Seniors accounted for 27% of reported pedestrian fatalities between January 2004 and December 2008 but only 11% of Alameda County population. (SWITRS, American Community Survey 2005-2009 estimates)

⁸ www.transalt.org/files/newsroom/reports/2009/Safe_Routes_for_Seniors.pdf

⁹ www.transalt.org/files/newsroom/reports/2009/Safe_Routes_for_Seniors.pdf

EDUCATION programs for bicycling and/or walking

7. Safe Routes to Schools

Safe Routes to Schools (SR2S) refers to a variety of multi-disciplinary programs aimed at promoting walking and bicycling to school, and improving traffic safety around school areas through education, encouragement, law enforcement, and engineering measures. SR2S programs typically involve partnerships among municipalities, school districts, community and parent volunteers, and law enforcement agencies.

Both the 2006 Countywide Pedestrian and Bicycle Plans included a countywide Safe Routes to Schools program. Beginning in 2007, Alameda CTC allocated a grant to TransForm, a non-profit Bay Area organization that advocates for public transit and walkable communities, to launch the Alameda Safe Routes to School Partnership, which included education and encouragement programs at elementary and middle schools throughout Alameda County. The program works with any school with an interest and capacity to develop a Safe Routes to Schools program. In 2011, the program operator was selected via an RFP process, using a combination of local and federal funds. The expanded program will provide additional activities, including a mobile bike repair vehicle. Typically, SR2S programs do not extend through high school, the time when students are making decisions about which mode of transportation to use; however, the expanded program supports high school SR2S programs in an effort to encourage young adult transportation choices to be less reliant on automobiles.

- Goal Addressed: Encouragement (Policy 3.4) – Support the expansion of the countywide Safe Routes to Schools program to every elementary school in the county and to high schools, and encourage local school districts and jurisdictions to implement projects, activities and events that promote walking to school among both students and staff.
- Effectiveness: High: The Alameda County Safe Routes to School Partnership increased countywide walking rates to school by six percent and 11 percent in Oakland during the 2008-09 school year.¹⁰
- Responsible Parties:
 - Potential Alameda CTC role: Fund, Coordinate
 - Other Lead Parties/Partners: School administration to provide support necessary for integrating SR2S programs into school activities and curriculum; local transportation planners and engineers to participate in walk audits; law enforcement to help conduct bicycle rodeos, participate in walk audits and conduct targeted enforcement upon request; and parent volunteers are a necessity for a successful SR2S program

8. Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Campaign

Bicycle and pedestrian safety campaigns use a variety of advertising media to deliver messages that encourage safe and legal bicycling, walking and driving. Campaign

¹⁰ TransForm, Safe Routes to School Partnership Evaluation Report, School year 2008-09.

messages are typically tailored to address specific, documented safety issues. Alameda CTC has not implemented a countywide bicycle and pedestrian safety campaign.

Although neither the 2006 Bicycle nor Pedestrian plans explicitly include a countywide safety education program, the Pedestrian Plan recommends “driver education programs [to] alert drivers to their responsibility to ensure pedestrian safety...[including] public service announcements via radio, TV, billboard or bus shelter advertising...” and the Bicycle Plan recommends that Alameda CTC “explore ways to provide bicycle driver education messages aboard AC Transit and BART vehicles.”

Following the lead of the City of San Jose, which in 2002 developed the StreetSmarts Campaign to teach children how to become safer pedestrians and bicyclists and adults how to make smarter choices on the roads, twelve other agencies from throughout the greater San Francisco Bay region, including Danville, Benicia and Santa Rosa, have partnered with San Jose in implementing a Street Smarts Campaign. StreetSmarts is a multi-media campaign, which uses billboards, brochures, press releases and radio spots to deliver campaign messages that are tailored to behavior the individual community is trying to encourage, including observing red lights and encouraging residents to bicycle.

Given the fact that other similar agencies have successfully implemented Street Smarts, such as departments of health (Monterey), and transportation authorities (Marin) and the start-up work that has been addressed by the StreetSmarts program, Alameda CTC could consider implementation of a StreetSmarts-like countywide bicycle and pedestrian safety program for the update of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans.

- Goals Addressed: Safety (Policy 2.4) – Promote collaboration among local, county and other agencies to deliver effective bicycle and pedestrian safety education programs for a variety of audiences, including drivers, and provide support for such strategies.
- Responsible Parties
 - Potential Alameda CTC role: Encourage, Fund, Coordinate
 - Other Lead Parties/Partners: Local jurisdictions, non-profits

9. Traffic School Focused on Bicycle and Pedestrian Vehicle Laws

Traffic school classes for motorist violators are often coordinated at a countywide level. Courses may incorporate a short session on safe bicycling, walking, and driving; bicyclist, pedestrian, and motorist rights and responsibilities under the vehicle code; and common bicyclist, pedestrian and motorist errors to avoid.

Through bicyclist citation diversion programs, bicyclists ticketed for riding in an illegal manner are offered the opportunity to reduce their fine by attending a bicyclist safety education course. In some programs, lawbreakers are required to attend such a course to clear their ticket.

Both the 2006 Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans include a program for traffic school or driver education programs for motorists. The Bicycle Plan also recommends traffic school for bicyclists who have received citations. Through a grant provided by Alameda CTC, the East Bay Bicycle Coalition (EBBC) is working with Alameda County police departments to set up these citation diversion programs, whereby ticketed cyclists are given the option of taking bike safety classes as a substitute for paying a ticket.

Given the acute need for safety education for bicyclists, the Alameda CTC could support implementation of bicycle diversion programs and add a bicycle- and pedestrian-related curriculum into all drivers' education courses.

- Goals Addressed: Safety, education, and enforcement (Policy 2.4)– Promote collaboration among local, county and other agencies to deliver effective bicycle and pedestrian safety education programs for a variety of audiences, including drivers, and provide support for such strategies.
- Effectiveness: Medium/High: While there is no empirical evidence correlating bicycle safety education and collision reduction, the acute need for safety education is supported by the fact bicyclists were at fault for 53 percent of bicycle-related collisions in Alameda County between 2003 and 2008.¹¹
- Responsible Parties
 - Potential Alameda CTC role: Encourage, Fund, Support
 - Other Lead Parties/Partners: Alameda County judicial system and local police departments to approve the courses; bicycle and pedestrian advocacy groups to provide initial course outlines and instructors

10. Bicycle Safety Education

Bicycle safety education consists of safety classes for adults and children that include skill and practice objectives for each age range, on-bike instruction, and topics ranging from basic bicycle handling, to riding with traffic, to commute and transit tips.

The 2006 Countywide Bicycle Plan recommends “establish[ing] county-level bicycle safety education programs for adults and children.” Alameda CTC has provided grant funding for Safe Routes to Schools Programs (see description above), and for adult bicycle safety education courses, family cycling clinics, and other classes taught by the East Bay Bicycle Coalition (EBBC) since 2007.

Given its potential for changing long-term driving habits and promoting bicycling as a transportation option, this program could continue to be included in the Bicycle Plan update, and be implemented through the continued prioritization of the Safe Routes to Schools program and bicycle education courses.

¹¹ Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS).

- Goal Addressed: Safety, Education, Enforcement (Policy 2.4) – Promote collaboration among local, county and other agencies to deliver effective bicycle and pedestrian safety education programs for a variety of audiences, including drivers, and provide support for such strategies.
- Responsible Parties
 - Potential Alameda CTC role: Fund, Coordinate
 - Other Lead Parties/Partners: non-profits, or others, to develop and deliver bicycle education classes

TECHNICAL SUPPORT for bicycling and/or walking

11. Develop Technical Tools

Technical tools are guidelines, toolkits, analysis tools, and online resources that assist public agencies to plan, design, and construct high-quality bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, and to develop and implement effective education, encouragement, and enforcement programs. The 2006 Pedestrian Plan includes “development of technical tools” as a programmatic funding priority, and the first Toolkit for Improving Walkability in Alameda County was published at that time, and was updated in 2009.

If Alameda CTC elects to continue this program, the agency could consider updating the toolkit during the plan update period (i.e., by 2017), expanding the document to include bicycling-related tools, developing additional technical tools, such as Complete Street implementation assistance, and bringing existing technical tools to Alameda County, such as San Francisco’s smartphone-based bike route tracking application, CycleTracks. Technical tools developed under this program could be used to support collaborative research identified as another programmatic recommendation (#16).

- Goal addressed: Planning and Design (Policy 4.6) – Strongly encourage local jurisdictions to adopt policies, guidelines, standards and regulations that result in pedestrian-friendly communities, and, where applicable, transit-oriented land use development, and provide them with technical assistance and resources to do so.
- Responsible parties:
 - Potential Alameda CTC role: Coordinate or Implement
 - Other Lead Parties/Partners: local jurisdictions to advise on needs

12. Bicycle and Pedestrian Count Program

Bicycle and pedestrian count programs are used to record count data that can be used to measure the effect of infrastructure improvements on walking and bicycling, estimate overall bicyclist and pedestrian activity levels, calculate exposure to vehicles, and track temporal and spatial trends. Count locations, count times, and data collected vary by program.

Although supporting bicycle or pedestrian counts was not recommended in either the 2006 Pedestrian or Bicycle Plans, the Alameda CTC has, since 2008, coordinated an annual count program of bicyclists and pedestrians at 30 locations or more throughout Alameda County. The first two years of the count program were done in collaboration with UC Berkeley's SafeTREC (Safe Transportation & Research Center). The Alameda CTC has allocated funding for counts and data analysis in 2011.

In addition, Alameda CTC worked with two local jurisdictions (Oakland and Dublin) to install a permanent automated in-pavement bicycle counter, and owns three portable automated pedestrian counters. These counters provide continuous count data over many days and years, showing daily, seasonal and annual variations.

The overall count effort, which complements a regional program administered by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, provides valuable data for tracking trends in bicycle and pedestrian travel, which can be used to gauge the effectiveness of projects and programs, to evaluate collision rates, and for other research aimed at encouraging travel by bike and on foot in Alameda County. This program can be improved by reviewing the location of counts annually to determine if additional sites should be added.

Given the lack of countywide data correlating bicycle and pedestrian activity levels and collision rates, we recommend including an annual manual bicycle and pedestrian count program in the update of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans. Also, the Alameda CTC could consider supporting the expansion of automated bicycle and pedestrian counters, in particular along trails, where data is less robust.

- Goal Addressed: Planning (Policy 4.12) – Continue to collect and analyze data on bicycle and pedestrian trips and travel behavior, and encourage other public agencies, special districts and transit agencies to do so as well.
- Responsible Parties:
 - Potential Alameda CTC role: Encourage, Fund, and Coordinate or Implement
 - Other Lead Parties/Partners: Local partners to advise Alameda CTC regarding count locations; MTC to continue regional program

13. Government Agency Staff Training and Information Sharing

Bicycle and pedestrian planning training sessions for government agency staff help keep staff knowledgeable of current standards and recent innovations in bicycle and pedestrian planning. Such training sessions can take the form of webinars, mini-conferences, on-site classes, and speaker series.

The 2006 Bicycle Plan recommended prioritizing education and promotion strategies to “provide mechanisms for cities to share best practices,” while the 2006 Pedestrian Plan prioritized local staff training, and recommended the creation of the Pedestrian Bicycle

Working Group. Towards these ends, Alameda CTC sponsors and promotes webinars and events related to bicycle and pedestrian planning, including:

- Providing free access to a monthly webinar sponsored by the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals (APBP) for local transportation professionals and the general public
- Hosting a one half-day bicycle/pedestrian conference, which featured presentations from the 2008 Pro Walk/Pro Bike conference made by Bay Area bike/pedestrian practitioners
- Planning to host another half-day conference in FY 11/12

In 2007, the Alameda CTC started the Pedestrian Bicycle Working Group (PBWG), a group of agency, non-profit and advocacy staff working towards improving bicycling and walking in the county. The group, which is on hiatus while the Countywide Plans are being updated, meets to up to four times a year to share bicycle and pedestrian best practices and information, and to provide input to the Alameda CTC on programs.

Given the rapid pace of innovation in the bicycle and pedestrian fields, Alameda CTC could continue the current training and information sharing program and expanding it by providing a speaker series that brings in experts on innovative bicycle and pedestrian treatments, liability issues, mode shift, and other relevant topics.

- Goals Addressed:
 - Education (Policy 2.3) – Provide technical assistance and other tools to local jurisdictions for selecting priority areas for bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements, and planning and designing safer streets and facilities.
 - Planning & Design (Policy 4.10) – Continue to serve as a forum for local agencies and other stakeholders—including through the Pedestrian and Bicycle Working Group—to plan multi-jurisdictional projects and countywide programs and to share information about bicycle-related issues of mutual concern.
- Responsible Parties:
 - Potential Alameda CTC role: Fund, Implement
 - Other Lead Parties/Partners: Local jurisdictions, transit operators, park districts and advocacy groups to commit one staff person to attend PBWG meetings

14. Bikeway Signage Program

The 2006 Bicycle Plan recommends that Alameda CTC facilitate the process of developing a uniform countywide bicycle wayfinding signage program that includes a countywide route numbering/naming system and identification of major destinations to sign. This program has not been implemented, in part due to a lack of consensus about the usefulness and legibility of numbering systems. A destination-based signage system that provides destinations, directions and distances for cyclists would be more effective, particularly if implemented intensively at the local level, with close coordination between neighboring jurisdictions, rather than implemented less intensively at a countywide level. The City of

Oakland has developed a clear methodology for identifying destinations and locations where signs should be displayed and the frequency and placement of signs. Their sign design is based on the standard Caltrans green and white bikeway signage so that the new wayfinding signage is easily recognizable to bicyclists and motorists as bikeway signage. The Alameda CTC could work with local jurisdiction to discuss and create an approach for countywide signage. Alameda CTC could provide technical design guidance to local jurisdictions on wayfinding signage, and fund local wayfinding signage programs, using the City of Oakland's program as a model.

- Goal Addressed: Infrastructure (Policy 1.9) – Support and encourage the development of effective, coordinated bicycle wayfinding signage systems that are seamless across jurisdictional boundaries.
- Responsible Parties
 - Potential Alameda CTC roles: Encourage, Fund, Support

COLLABORATION AND RESEARCH to improve bicycling and walking

15. Coordination of multi-agency capital projects

Many local bicycle and pedestrian capital improvements require the cooperation and/or permission of other agencies to implement. These include projects that cross or are within Caltrans, park districts or water agency rights-of-way. This added step in the process of realizing planned facilities takes valuable local staff time, compared to projects on purely local right-of-way, and an ability to negotiate often unfamiliar bureaucracies. These barriers can keep such projects from moving to the top of local priority lists, regardless of their value or relative importance.

Alameda CTC does not have a policy to pursue collaborative projects, but has, on a case-by-case, brought in consultant services to collaborate with Caltrans or a local agency to manage the development of a project. The decision to manage a project is typically related to whether Alameda CTC has an allocated funding source for the project, a direct mandate to implement the project, or management that can improve project delivery. For example, Alameda CTC is leading the East Bay Greenway project which extends across multiple jurisdictions.

The Alameda CTC could establish a program that provides consulting or staff assistance to jurisdictions, aimed at coordinating local jurisdictions with other agencies and providing the procedural guidance and technical support needed to implement projects.

- Goal Addressed: Infrastructure (Bike Policy 1.4/Ped Policy 1.10) - Collaborate with and promote coordination among Caltrans and local agencies to implement facilities on the countywide bicycle network and pedestrian infrastructure of countywide significance.
- Responsible Parties:

- Potential Alameda CTC roles: Support, Coordinate
- Other Lead Parties/Partners: Consulting coordinators to work with local jurisdictions to implement projects that require the cooperation of other agencies; local jurisdictions to identify projects and prioritize them for this program

16. Facilitate Collaborative Bicycle and Pedestrian Research

Alameda County's colleges and universities present opportunities for collaborating on bicycle and pedestrian research relevant to the goals of Alameda County's Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans. Although neither 2006 plan identified collaborative research as a programmatic focus area, Alameda CTC's predecessor agency, ACTIA, has had success with such efforts. Similar to its work with the County Department of Public Health, ACTIA partnered with the UC Berkeley Traffic Safety Center (SafeTREC) on their development of a simple model to predict pedestrian volumes at intersections.

Given the need for additional knowledge in the bicycle and pedestrian fields, and the high-quality work being conducted by local educational institutions, the Alameda CTC could consider continuing to work with local colleges and universities to address gaps in bicycle and pedestrian research, in particular gaps that relate to understanding collision rates, collision risk, mode choice, and demand modeling.

- Goal Addressed: Planning (Policy 4.11) Support and fund research into bicycle planning and program implementation when it has a direct benefit for Alameda County.
- Responsible parties:
 - Potential Alameda CTC role: Fund, Coordinate
 - Other Lead Parties/Partners: Alameda County educational and/or public health institutions.

FACILITIES programs for bicycling

17. Bicycle Parking Capital Program

The 2006 Countywide Bicycle Master Plan recommends a countywide bicycle parking program for bicycle racks and lockers, in addition to providing assistance for:

- Model bicycle parking ordinances
- Selecting vendors
- Prioritizing locations for bike racks
- Matching bicycle parking types to land uses

To date, Alameda CTC has funded bicycle racks and electronic lockers as part of larger grant-funded projects. However, bicycle racks are inexpensive and can often be funded with local funds, so Alameda CTC may wish to prioritize funding high-capacity bicycle parking (e.g., bike stations, on-street bicycle corrals) and innovative technologies and solutions, which tend to be more expensive. In addition, Alameda CTC may consider

providing technical assistance and resources to local jurisdictions regarding bicycle parking best practices.

- Goals Addressed:
 - Infrastructure (Policy 1.6) – Encourage transit operators to improve bicycle routes to stations and stops in collaboration with local jurisdictions, to meet current and future demand for bicycle parking at stations and to maximize opportunities for on-board bicycle access, and provide funding for such projects.
 - Infrastructure (Policy 1.8) – Provide technical assistance to local jurisdictions on bicycle parking best practices; and encourage them to install parking to meet current and future demand, and to require it as part of new developments.
- Effectiveness: High: According to a 2006 report, secure bicycle parking is a significant concern, equal to a reduction of trip length by 26.5 minutes.¹² A 2002 study found that, for commute trips, end-trip bicycle parking facilities have a higher importance than length of the trip.¹³
- Responsible Parties
 - Potential Alameda CTC roles: Fund, Support
 - Other Lead Parties/Partners: Government agencies to select and install appropriate bicycle parking

18. Bicycle sharing

Bicycle sharing is an innovative approach to urban mobility, combining the convenience and flexibility of a private vehicle with the accessibility and reliability of mass transit. Bike share programs provide public bicycles on demand for fast and easy access for any trip around a city without the hassles presented by parking a private car or waiting on a transit timetable. Users may rent a bicycle using a smart card and deposit the bicycle at any bike share station. The bike share operator redistributes the bicycles based on demand.

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), in conjunction with San Francisco Metropolitan Transportation Agency (SFMTA), City of Redwood City, San Mateo County, Caltrain and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, plans to launch approximately 1,000 bicycles in San Francisco and at Caltrain stations along the Peninsula. VTA is planning a companion pilot program in San Jose, which will put an additional 100 shared bicycles on the street.

Bike sharing presents a new opportunity for encouraging people to bicycle and expanding the reach of transit. Alameda CTC could consider studying the feasibility of a bike share system, drawing from MTC's bike share experience. Because the MTC experience will inform many aspects on how a bike share system could perform in Alameda County, it may

¹² J.D. Hunt and J.E. Abraham, "Influences on Bicycle Use," *Transportation*, 463, 2006.

¹³ John E. Abraham, Susan McMillan, Alan T. Brownlee, and John Douglas Hunt, "Investigation of Cycling Sensitivities"; *Transportation Research Board*, 2002.

be advantageous for Alameda CTC to make bikeshare a long term goal, with a preliminary plan to initiate a feasibility study at least one year after the MTC bike share launch.

- Goal Addressed: Infrastructure (Policy 1.2) – Support the design and construction of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure that serves a broad range of travel purposes, abilities and ages, including school-aged children, seniors and people with disabilities.
- Effectiveness: High: Capital BikeShare in Washington D.C. currently has over 10,000 active annual subscribers, and each bike in their fleet gets on average five rides per day.¹⁴
- Responsible Parties
 - Potential Alameda CTC role: Fund, Support, Coordinate
 - Other Lead Parties/Partners: Advertisement revenue can be generated by selling space on bicycles and bikeshare; a private contractor to operate the system; local jurisdictions to provide input on program structure, bicycle locations and operations and some local funding.

Input Requested

At the June 8 Plans Working Group meeting and the June 9 BPAC meeting, it will be important for committee members to provide feedback on the following questions:

1. Which proposed programs would most support local jurisdictions' work to improve bicycling and walking?
2. What would the ideal Alameda CTC role be for each program, to support local agency work?
3. Which proposed programs are the most important to be implemented, in your opinion?
4. Which proposed programs are the least important to be implemented, in your opinion?
5. Would it be useful for the plan updates to prioritize this list of 18 programs?
6. If so, what criteria would you recommend using for selecting the most effective, useful and appropriate programs?
7. Would you recommend combining any of the programs?
8. Are there any other programs that we should consider including?
9. Should any programs be removed?

¹⁴ Email communication from Capital BikeShare Project Manager; May 18, 2011.

This page intentionally left blank.

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

Created: July 27, 2010

Revised: June 3, 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	June 8, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Programs Approach
9	July 2011, date TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Priority Capital Projects: Review of Input and Final Direction
10	September 2011, date TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation Draft Chapters
11	October 2011, date TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Summaries/Introductions
12	December 2011, date TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full Draft Plans