ALAMEDA County Transportation Commission
1333 Broadway, Suites 220 & 300 ▪ Oakland, CA 94612 ▪ PH: (510) 208-7400
www.AlamedaCTC.org

Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans Working Group Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, July 27, 2011, 1:30 to 3:30 p.m.
1333 Broadway, Suite 300, Oakland, CA 94612

Meeting Outcomes:

- Provide feedback on revised recommendations for vision and priority capital projects networks
- Provide feedback on proposed approach for estimating vision networks capital projects costs

1:30 – 1:35 p.m. Staff	**1. Welcome and Introductions**	
1:35– 1:40 p.m. Staff	**2. Review of June 8, 2011 Meeting Notes** *02_BPPWG_Meeting_Notes_060811.pdf* – **Page 1** *02A_BPPWG_Meeting_Attendance_060811.pdf* – **Page 7**	I
1:40 – 2:40 p.m. Victoria Eisen	**3. Discussion of Vision and Priority Capital Projects Networks – Revised Recommendations** *03_Overview_Memo_Plans_Recommendations.pdf* – **Page 9** *03A_Memo_Revised_Plans_Recommendations.pdf* – **Page 13** *03A1_Summary of Major Issues from Local Meetings.pdf* – **Page 23** *03A2_Table_Revised_Plans_Recommendations.pdf* – **Page 27**	I
2:40 – 3:25 p.m. Victoria Eisen	**4. Discussion of Proposed Approach for Capital Projects Cost Estimating for Vision Networks** *04_Memo Capital Projects Cost Estimating.pdf* – **Page 29** *04A Major Projects List from 2006 Countywide Bike Plan.pdf* – **Page 41** *04B_Comments_Sheet.doc* – **Page 47**	I
3:25 – 3:30 p.m.	**5. Announcements** *05_BPPWG_Meeting_Schedule_&_Purpose.pdf* – **Page 49**	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: October 2011, 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 (ACTIA) and Diane Stark (ACCMA)
From	Victoria Eisen
Date	June 13, 2011
Project	Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Updates
Subject	**June 8, 2011 Plans Working Group Meeting Notes**

These notes reflect discussions of the June 8, 2011 Working Group meeting. The meeting began with a brief overview of the process of updating the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian plans in general, and the capital priorities in particular. The meeting focused, however, on a discussion of the approach to selecting promotion, education and other programs needed to enhance the bicycling and walking culture in Alameda County. It included an overview of the following 18 programs that Alameda CTC is considering including in one or both plans, followed by the comments below.

1. Individualized Travel Marketing

- Everyone present who is familiar with TransForm's TravelChoice program is supportive of it.

2. Sunday Streets/Cyclovia

- Interest from Berkeley, San Leandro and Oakland civic leaders has been communicated to East Bay Bicycle Coalition reps; however no funding is currently available to support their efforts to expand Sunday Streets.
- Funding for permit fees, publicity, police overtime and other expenses is critical to holding such events.
- Alameda CTC should consider supporting a multi-city, East Bay Cyclovia, by developing common branding and marketing. The event could be held either on one day, or over a few months in a variety of cities. A multi-city event could highlight selected commute routes, such as through Berkeley/Emeryville/Oakland.
- The Guadalajara region of Mexico had a 35-mile Cyclovia/street closure, which resulted in pressure to add pedestrian and bicycle facilities.
- One opinion was raised that these events don't convert people into regular cyclists or walkers so it should not be a funding priority, however this was not the consensus of the group.
- San Francisco has shown that these events allow families to try riding together in a safe environment, some of whom continue to do so afterwards.
- To share the workload of putting on such an event, consider involving people, agencies and organizations not traditionally involved in bicycle/pedestrian transportation events, such as parks and recreation departments, human services, police, etc.

- It may be difficult to find streets in southern Alameda County that could be closed, but once there are more Sunday Streets events in other parts of the county, perhaps there will be more political will to find a way to implement them in all parts of the county.

3. Annual Bicycling Promotions
- Don't water down the popularity/effectiveness of annual events such as Bike to Work (BTW) Day by making them a whole month.
- The East Bay Bicycle Coalition's analysis shows continued growth of BTW Day in Alameda County over past years, that these events do generate new, regular riders, and that it's a good Alameda CTC investment.

4. Organized walks and walk to transit programs and 5. Countywide walking promotion campaign
- Consider associating walks with events, such as farmers' markets and Cal game day to help people find a walking route and establish healthy travel habits to these activities.
- Could just focus this on seniors (joining it with #6).
- Need to make sure that Alameda CTC website listing of organized walks throughout Alameda County includes Friends of Five Creeks in Berkeley.
- Consider supporting a mini-grant program to help nonprofits (such as Berkeley Pathwanderers) or local agencies hold such walking events.
- Encourage businesses to provide walking and cycling directions to their sites and incentives for not driving.

6. Safe Routes for Seniors
- Capital improvements intended for senior residents can have a positive effect on the entire neighborhood, even non-participants.
- Provides a nice "bookend" to Safe Routes to Schools programs, which focus on the other most vulnerable pedestrian population, younger pedestrians.
- One member stated that Alameda CTC should make this a priority and take a lead role, on par with their role in the Alameda County Safe Routes to Schools program.
- Prefer this walking program to #4, because it teaches people to be advocates.
- Consider expanding this program to include all "mature" adults, i.e., age 35 and up.

7. Safe Routes to Schools (SR2S)
- The existing countywide program has been a success, and is needed in all schools.
- An unintended benefit of the program has been to get parents involved in other aspects of participating schools.
- An important part of the success of the program has been TransForm's help and expertise, which school districts cannot provide on their own.
- Add to the existing program: a planning function to help cities prioritize their SR2S capital projects. This would include an analysis of: school locations vs collision locations, concentrations of children; and other statistics to help cities get the most bang for their SR2S

buck. The staff who apply for these grants don't always do these sorts of analyses. This sort of analysis could be useful for a Safe Routes for Seniors program as well.
- Schools need bicycle racks. Some schools won't let students ride because they don't have them.

8. Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Campaign
- Consider Marin County's Share the Road program as an alternative model to StreetSmarts. This program included safety check points, where safety literature was distributed to drivers and bicyclists, a focus on bicycle violation of pedestrian right-of-way, and training of bus drivers.
- Public service announcements needed to communicate that roadway conditions have changed as a result of increased walking and biking rates, so auto drivers, bus drivers and others need to be educated on how to share the road.
- Consider a partnership with AC Transit to train drivers to share the road.
- Consider adding an "implement" role for Alameda CTC.

9. Traffic School Focused on Bicycle and Pedestrian Vehicle Laws
- Look at Contra Costa County model for citation diversion program.

10. Bicycle Safety Education
- This is critical as a resource for local agencies. The ability to refer residents to the East Bay Bicycle Coalition program is very valuable.
- These programs also support goals of local bicycle plans.

11. Develop Technical Tools and 13. Government Agency Staff Training and Information Sharing
- Consider implementing a County level 311 line for reporting roadway hazards, analogous to San Francisco's program. This would help standardize reporting needs in each jurisdiction, which vary widely.
- Design guidelines/best practices (based on local Alameda County examples), with engineering level detail, would be extremely helpful to local agencies.
- The current Walkability Toolkit is very useful.
- Consider developing such tools that are at an engineering level of detail, along with funding to print and distribute them since engineers like to have guidebooks to refer to. Include new ADA guidelines in such publications.
- Training for staff is critical, since there are very few local resources for this now.
- Collapse programs #11 and 13 into a focus on training local agency staff on design.
- Webinars that Alameda CTC currently hosts are very useful.

12. Bicycle and Pedestrian Count Program
- Program is important because it shows effectiveness of capital programs, by showing before/after usage.
- Such counts should be made over a 12-month period to show effect in all seasons.

- City of Oakland is starting its own count program. Alameda CTC should help to coordinate local pedestrian and bicycle count efforts, with countywide counts and regional counts to ensure that the same methodology is used, and that count locations are not overlapping.

14. Bikeway Signage Program
- A countywide program should prioritize regional routes, like trails, particularly at intersections with trails. It is not needed everywhere.
- Such a program might be helpful in unincorporated areas, where there are no such local programs and many jurisdictions.
- A countywide program would be useful even without a uniform sign design. In fact, a uniform look is not desirable.
- Accurate countywide bicycle route maps are more important than a signage program.
- Lay to rest the concept of a countywide numbered signage system.
- This program could be subsumed under a more general technical assistance program, to provide assistance to jurisdictions on sign messaging and destination decisions. Consistent messaging is more important than uniform look.

15. Coordination of multi-agency capital projects
- Would be very useful, particularly in East County where residents complain of difficulty traveling between Pleasanton and Dublin, and Pleasanton and Livermore.
- Would be good having a single point of contact at Alameda CTC to figure out and establish a relationship with appropriate staff at Caltrans, since it takes a great deal of time and energy for local agencies to build this capacity.

16. Facilitate Collaborative Bicycle and Pedestrian Research
- General support - no comments.

17. Bicycle Parking Capital Program
- It was suggested by the Consultant that this category could be expanded to include transit facilities – like stairway channels and on-board transit racks.
- Would moving bicycle parking from a capital project (as it's currently treated by Measure B) to a Bicycle Plan "program" reduce the potential funding available to these projects?
- It's difficult for any city (even Oakland) to develop a bike rack program big enough to justify the effort needed to apply for a grant. Therefore, rather than funding bike racks, perhaps providing technical assistance related to bike parking would be a more appropriate role for Alameda CTC. For instance, communicating best practices to jurisdictions that don't have a bike parking request program.
- Alameda CTC should consider funding a mini-grant program to provide bicycle parking on non-city property (e.g., school sites, regional parks), since City funds cannot do this.
- Another role for Alameda CTC could be to buy bicycle racks in bulk and hire a contractor. Local jurisdictions would provide the list of locations where they would be installed.

18. Bicycle-sharing

- Because participants in bike-sharing programs tend to be people who are not regular cyclists or are visitors to the area, Alameda County may not be ready for bicycle sharing since its success depends on a bicycle-friendly infrastructure.
- Alameda CTC should play a role in studying the feasibility of bike-sharing in Alameda County. Some type of coordination is needed.
- MTC should lead any study or implementation of bike-sharing in Alameda County since it's so tied to regional public transit.
- There is a lot of interest in bicycle-sharing in Pleasanton, particularly at Hacienda Business Park.

Other discussion

- Several people noted that walking maps should not be excluded from the list. Alameda CTC could provide a mini-grant program for advocacy groups to develop them.
- Suggest collapsing 18 categories into a smaller number.
- Suggest prioritizing recommended programs into high/medium/low categories, at least for those that require Alameda CTC staff to play an active role in implementation.
- Don't do a strict prioritization, since opportunities may develop, or there may be momentum for certain activities.
- Local governments sometimes need help implementing projects, more than funding.

This page intentionally left blank.

Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans Working Group
June 8, 2011
Meeting Attendance

Meeting Date: 6/8/2011	*First Name*	*Last Name*	*Agency/Group Represented*	*Title*
X	Eric	Anderson	City of Berkeley	Bike/Ped Coordinator
X	Chiye	Azuma	Livermore Area Recreation and Parks District	Landscape Architect/Project Manager
X	Leigh	Bryant	Alameda County General Services Agency	Sustainable Transportation Associate
X	Carmela	Campbell	City of Union City	
X	Victoria	Eisen	Eisen|Letunic	Principal
X	Kendahsi	Haley	Cycles of Change/Bike Go Round	Instructor/Outreach Coordinator
X	Lee	Huo	Bay Trail/ABAG	Bay Trail Planner
X	Dale	Murai	Alameda County Public Health Department	
X	Jason	Patton	City of Oakland	Bicycle & Pedestrian Program Manager
X	Anh	Phan Nguyen	Caltrans/Ped Program	
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	Diane	Stark	Alameda CTC	
X	Janis	Stephen	City of Pleasanton	Assistant Engr. II
X	Bill	Surges	East Bay Regional Park District	
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.

ALAMEDA County Transportation Commission
1333 Broadway, Suites 220 & 300 ▪ Oakland, CA 94612 ▪ PH: (510) 208-7400
www.AlamedaCTC.org

MEMORANDUM

Date: July 20, 2011

To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans Working Group

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

Subject: **Revised Recommendations for Vision and Priority Capital Project Networks and Proposed Approach for Estimating Vision Networks Capital Projects Costs**

Recommendations
It is recommended that the Plans Working Group (PWG) provide input on two items related to the Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans updates:

1. Revised recommended approaches for the vision and priority capital project networks (Agenda Item #3), and
2. Proposed methodologies for estimating the costs of capital projects in the vision networks (Agenda Item #4).

Summary
A memo from the Plans Updates consultant recommending a revised approach to the vision and priority capital project networks based on the input received over the past several months is included in Attachment 03A. The memo and attachments include a summary of the major input received in May and June on the draft networks and recommendations on revised approaches for the vision and priority networks. The memo also includes a list of questions for discussion at the PWG meeting.

A second memo from the Plans Updates consultant (Attachment 04) contains recommendations for the methodologies to use in estimating costs of the capital projects in the vision networks of both the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans. The approaches address both construction and maintenance costs, and will be modified to reflect the final draft vision and priority networks approaches.

Input from the PWG will be incorporated into the Priority Projects and Programs chapters and the Implementation chapters of the updated Plans.

A comment sheet is attached for submitting input on both the revised recommended network approaches and the proposed costs methodologies. PWG members are encouraged to use the attached comment sheet (Attachment 04B) to submit written comments, but may also provide input via email. Written comments should be submitted to Rochelle Wheeler at rwheeler@alamedactc.org **by Monday, August 1, 2011, at 5:00 p.m**.

Discussion
The Countywide Pedestrian and Bicycle Plans, last adopted in 2006, are in the process of being updated. The Plans Working Group (PWG) is being requested to review and provide input on each chapter (or key elements of 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 May 2012.

To date, the PWG has reviewed three draft chapters and provided input on the various elements, as listed below:

1. Draft Existing Conditions chapters
2. Draft Evaluation of Current Practices chapter
3. Draft Vision, Goals & Objectives chapters
4. Approach to the vision and priority networks for the Plans (in December 2010, February 2011, and March 2011)
5. List of proposed programs

In May and June, Alameda CTC staff and consultants attended nine local meetings (four local agency meetings and five local Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) meetings) to gather input on the proposed approaches to the vision and priority capital project networks, and specifically on the network maps. In total, almost 60 people attended the local BPAC meetings. The major comments heard are included as Attachment 03A1.

Based on this input, revised recommended approaches to the networks are being proposed. They are described in the attached memo. Attachment 03A2 includes a comparison table of the approaches that were brought to the May and June meetings for input, the high level feedback received, and the revised approaches now being proposed.

Along with the PWG, the Countywide BPAC will also review and provide input on these revised approaches at their next meeting on July 26, the day before the PWG meeting. This combined feedback will be considered and used to develop the draft recommended approaches that, along with the updated draft vision network maps, will be incorporated into the Priority Projects and Programs chapters. The PWG will see these chapters when it reviews the Draft Plans, to be released in December.

The network maps will be edited in August to reflect the direction on the vision and priority network approaches, and the many requested mapping edits submitted in May and June. The most current vision network maps, which **do not include** these edits, can be viewed on the plans updates web page, under “Maps for East County meeting” here: *http://tinyurl.com/ACBikePedPlans*.

The memo on capital project cost methodologies (Attachment 04) is being presented solely to the PWG for input, as the technical advisory group for the plans updates. The final methodologies will be used to determine the costs of the bicycle and pedestrian vision networks. Ultimately these costs, along with programs costs, anticipated revenues and next steps will be included in the Implementation chapters of the plans, which the PWG will see in draft form at its next meeting.

A web page with information about the plans updates process continues to be available at: *http://tinyurl.com/ACBikePedPlans.* It includes links to the draft plan chapters, draft network 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
PWG and BPAC comments on the vision and priority network approaches will be used to develop the draft networks to be included in the Priority Projects and Programs chapters of the Draft Plans. Both groups will review these draft chapters, and the updated maps, after they are incorporated into the full Draft Plans, to be released in December. (The input received at the last PWG meeting on the list of programs will also be included in these Draft Chapters.)

The Implementation Chapter will be developed next, including cost and revenue estimates for capital projects and programs. These draft chapters will be brought to an October PWG meeting for input (date to be determined).

Attachments

03A. Memo on Proposed Revised Vision and Priority Networks
03A1. Summary of Major Issues from May/June Local Meetings
03A2. Summary Table of Proposed Revised Vision and Priority Networks

04. Memo on Approach to Estimating Capital Vision Network Costs
04A. List of Major Projects from the 2006 Countywide Bicycle Plan
04B. Comment Sheet

This page intentionally left blank.

EISEN | LETUNIC
TRANSPORTATION, ENVIRONMENTAL AND URBAN PLANNING

MEMORANDUM

To	Diane Stark and Rochelle Wheeler, Alameda CTC
From	Victoria Eisen
Date	July 15, 2011
Project	Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Updates
Subject	**Proposed revised vision and priority capital bicycle and pedestrian networks**

Background

In December 2010 and March/April 2011, our team proposed recommended approaches to developing the vision and priority bicycle and pedestrian capital projects networks for the updated Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans. These networks will help guide future investments in bicycle and pedestrian capital improvements in Alameda County. The Plans Working Group and the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) provided feedback on these recommendations. Following these meetings, and taking committee input into consideration, we created maps that portrayed the recommended approaches to the vision and priority networks.

In May and June 2011, Alameda CTC staff and Eisen|Letunic met with bicycle and pedestrian coordinators and other local agency staff from all communities throughout Alameda County. We also attended five local BPAC meetings throughout the county to gather public input. We brought maps that depicted the revised bicycle and pedestrian vision and priority networks and requested input. Over the course of these meetings, we received a significant amount of feedback on the approaches to the vision and priority networks and on local needs.

This memo, and two attachments, summarize the major issues raised in these meetings, and the resulting recommended revised approaches to identifying and prioritizing the vision bicycle and pedestrian networks for the update of the plans. The memo concludes with questions for the Plans Working Group and Countywide BPAC to obtain input that will help guide the next step of developing a final draft of the vision and priority approaches.

The network maps will be revised after the July BPAC and PWG meetings. Revised maps will therefore not be brought to either meeting in July. In the process of attending and responding to the nine local agency and local BPAC meetings, we revised the maps many times. We therefore have limited remaining mapping resources, which will be focused on map revisions to be included as part of the Draft Plans. The intent of the July meetings is to present revised vision and priority approaches to the PWG and BPAC and hear input on them. We will then make map edits, based on the input received at the meetings, along with the many other map edits

that have been requested from meetings throughout the county. Revised maps will be included in the Draft Plans, to be released at the end of this year.

Major issues identified
Over the course of the nine meetings held in May and June throughout the county, and via comments received from individual staff and from the public, some issues and concerns were raised, and support was also expressed for the proposed approaches. The issues that were brought up repeatedly at this series of meetings are included in Attachment 03A1, with explanatory notes on how they have or have not been incorporated into these revised recommendations. The specific map edits are not summarized in the attachment, since they will be addressed through the mapping process. Revised maps will be included in the Draft Plans.

Revised recommended approaches to Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan networks
Based on input from the committees, local BPACs and bicycle and pedestrian agency staff throughout Alameda County, the approach to the bicycle and pedestrian networks has been revised. The remainder of this memo describes the new, revised approaches organized by categories of the Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans vision and priority networks. A summary table comparing the Plans vision and priorities approaches brought to the local meetings and the recommended revised approaches now being proposed is included as Attachment 03A2.

For both plans, feasibility studies and maintenance are not called out as separate categories since they are considered phases of capital projects, and are therefore considered to be a part of the capital projects networks.

As a reminder, the vision networks define all of the capital projects that are included in each countywide plan. They are intended to accomplish the plans' goals and objectives regardless of potentially available funding. The priority networks are a subset of the vision networks and are intended to focus the more than likely limited funding on those areas that are most important to the county.

Finally, we are in the process of comparing the Vision Networks (as currently mapped) for both plans to the county's Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and Growth Opportunity Areas (GOAs). A report on this comparison and possible further revised recommendations will be brought to the BPAC and PWG meeting.

<u>Bicycle Vision Network</u>
Five sometimes overlapping categories comprise the revised recommended Bicycle Vision Network:

1. *Inter-jurisdictional network*. This network is based on the 2006 Countywide Bicycle Network, but is being updated to reflect segments that have been constructed since that plan was created, and to better conform to local bicycle plans where those routes serve countywide destinations.

2. *Access to transit*. Formerly called "Transit Priority Zones" in the 2006 Bicycle Plan and earlier in this update process, the terminology is being changed to better describe the purpose of this new network component: to improve bicycle access to rail stations, ferry terminals and major bus transfer points throughout Alameda County.

   The Vision Network includes a new overlay of links radiating out in approximately the four cardinal directions from each of these transit nodes. The access distances are between one and two miles long, depending on which Planning Area the transit area is located in: one mile in the North County, 1.5 miles in Central County and two miles in South and East County. These distances are based on an analysis of data from the 2008 BART Station Profile Survey that shows that bicyclists travel farther to transit in the South and East County than they do to the central or northern areas of the county. This data also correlates with the varying distances between BART stations throughout the county.

   The alignments for the access to transit links were selected to be consistent with local plans and to connect to major employment centers, where possible.

   The 23 major bus transfer stops included in the 2006 Bicycle Plan are being re-evaluated given new data that is available. Of these 23, fourteen are AC Transit bus stops that are proposed to be substituted for a set of stops identified in the 2009 AC Transit Bicycle Parking Study as locations where latent demand for bicycle parking, and therefore access, is high. The exact number and location of the stops is still being determined, and a recommendation will be brought to the BPAC and PWG meetings.

   Finally, the exception to these one-to-two mile distances for access to transit are the proposed links from Communities of Concern to the nearest major transit nodes, which may exceed these distances (see number 5 below for more detail).

3. *Access to Downtowns*. It is recommended that access to Alameda County's nine downtowns continue to be included in the Bicycle Vision Network. (The cities of Berkeley, Oakland, Alameda, San Leandro, Hayward, Fremont, Dublin, Pleasanton and Livermore all have planned or existing downtowns.) Furthermore, the remaining jurisdictions without a Downtown (the cities of Albany, Emeryville, Piedmont, Newark and Union City) would be asked to define one major commercial district that is its downtown or city center equivalent, to be included in the countywide network. One exception is the unincorporated areas of the County, which contain several communities, and therefore have several city centers, and will therefore have multiple major commercial districts, to be determined in consultation with the County. Each of these downtown or downtown-equivalent destinations is recommended to have an overlay of bicycle network links radiating out three miles in approximately the four cardinal directions. Links connecting Communities of Concern to these downtowns and

major commercial centers would potentially extend beyond the three-mile distance, as needed (see number 5 below for more detail).

The May recommendation for the countywide Bicycle Vision Network included access to both downtowns and major commercial districts (MCDs) which had been first identified in the 2006 Pedestrian Plan. This new category of access routes to Downtowns and MCDs was added to address the fact that the southern and eastern parts of the county have less transit, and therefore, an emphasis on access to transit in these areas would result in less representation in the countywide bicycle and pedestrian vision network. While the inter-jurisdictional network from the 2006 Bicycle Plan included routes that served downtowns and commercial districts, this new concept of access from the four cardinal directions borrowed the list of eight downtowns and twelve MCDs from the 2006 Countywide Pedestrian Plan. MCDs, as opposed to just Downtowns, were initially proposed in the draft vision and priorities network to address the fact that many Alameda County jurisdictions do not have a downtown designated in their General Plans. After many questions were raised at the May and June local meetings throughout the county about how these commercial districts were defined throughout the diverse county, it was concluded that a consistent definition from a cyclist's perspective would be very difficult to develop without a detailed study, which is out of the scope, timeline and budget of the development of the update of the Plans. Therefore, the recommended approach of one downtown or downtown-equivalent per jurisdiction, as discussed above, was developed.

4. *Inter-jurisdictional Trails*. The same set of trails that were included in the 2006 Countywide Bicycle Plan, which included much of the Bay Trail and Iron Horse Trail among others, are included in the Bicycle Vision Network. The East Bay Greenway was also added. Furthermore, the Bay Trail spurs (which connect the Bay Trail to the waterfront) have been added to the trail network. These trails have been added to ensure that the major countywide trail system is completed in Alameda County.

   While the Bay Trail includes connectors that link the trail to transit and other significant destinations, connectors for the other major trails have not yet been comprehensively identified. However, some connectors have been proposed between the Bay Trail and the future East Bay Greenway. Where these connectors are developed through a local planning process and are inter-jurisdictional, they will be part of the Vision Network, but will not be mapped in the Plan, since they are still schematic.

5. *Communities of Concern*. "Communities of Concern" are areas in Alameda County with large concentrations of low income or minority residents with inadequate access to transportation. These areas were identified by MTC using 2000 US Census data and have been the focus of five Alameda CTC-managed "Community-Based Transportation Plans" (CBTPs), which identify transportation improvements needed to help residents access jobs, services, health care and other destinations. Although the need to improve

bicycle and pedestrian connections from and within these communities is documented in each of the plans, a majority do not identify specific routes in need of improvement. Therefore, to help accomplish the goals of these plans, and provide much needed transportation options to these communities, conceptual bicycle routes from Alameda County's Communities of Concern to the nearest major transit nodes and downtowns (or major commercial districts, as defined above) are recommended to be included in the Bicycle Vision Network, as one of the four cardinal direction access routes. These access routes may be longer than the Vision Network access route lengths described further above, in order to reach the Communities of Concern. This approach helps meet the intent of the CBTPs in providing transportation access in these communities. The specific alignments for these routes will be defined at a later date by grant applicants. Outlines of the Communities of Concern areas will be included on the vision maps, and a legend note will explain the inclusion of these routes in the Vision Network.

The CBTPs are scheduled to be updated pending the availability of funding and having access to 2010 Census data. Future Communities of Concern areas and boundaries will therefore be amended into the Plans' Vision networks, for both the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans, as they become available.

Bicycle network priorities

Until now, we have discussed defining a subset of the above-defined Bicycle Vision Network as the Bicycle Priority Network. Maps were created to reflect that approach. After spending several months discussing this network with committee members, local bicycle and pedestrian planning staff and BPAC members, Alameda CTC staff and the consultant team have compared the feedback with the goal of the priority network: to identify the highest priority projects to focus on implementing over the next four or five years until the Countywide Bicycle Plan is updated again. The conclusion that has been reached is, rather than selecting and mapping a specific set of priority network links, to instead define priority categories of projects in the plan. This definition of priority categories of projects would be written in the plan, instead of mapped, to establish the preferences for funding through Alameda CTC. Projects on the Vision Network that do not fall into one of the priority categories would not be excluded from receiving funding, but would not rank as highly as projects in the priority categories. (The same approach is also proposed for the Pedestrian Priority Network below.)

The priority categories are identical to the five that comprise the Bicycle Vision Network described earlier in this memo, but the Priority Bicycle Network hones in on the aspects of each of these categories that is most important to focus on, as described below.

1. *Inter-jurisdictional network*. As a result of the feedback received on the importance of Alameda CTC supporting the construction of inter-jurisdictional network links, projects that are identified through a multi-jurisdictional planning effort are recommended to be prioritized in the Countywide Bicycle Plan. The highest ranking would go to projects

that bridge a gap immediately at the jurisdictional border, with the goal of then creating continuous access in either direction from that point.

2. *Access to transit*. The goal of this category is to ensure that good bicycle facilities serve Alameda County's major transit nodes. Therefore, links that radiate out from each transit node in the four cardinal directions, up to the maximum distances defined in the Vision Network (by Planning Area), and provide continuous bicycle access from the nodes are recommended to be prioritized over links that do not provide continuous access to transit, although they may be within the Vision Network threshold distances. Those projects closer to the transit node are therefore prioritized over those that are further away and not connected directly to the transit node. This definition includes links that serve communities of concern.

3. *Access to Downtowns*. Consistent with the recommended priority access to transit definition, links that radiate out from each of the downtowns/major commercial districts, up to three miles long, and provide continuous bicycle access from these districts are recommended to be prioritized over links that do not provide continuous access to downtown/major commercial districts, although they may be included in the Bicycle Vision Network. This definition includes links that serve communities of concern.

4. *Inter-jurisdictional Trails*. The following three countywide trail systems are recommended for prioritization in the Countywide Bicycle Plan:
    1. Bay Trail (including spine and connectors)
    2. Iron Horse Trail (east to Greenville Road, which is within the populated areas)
    3. East Bay Greenway

5. *Communities of Concern*. Because the goal of this category is to connect disadvantaged communities to transit and downtowns/major commercial districts, links in the vision network that accomplish this are recommended for prioritization, regardless of length, consistent with the descriptions of these categories, above.

<u>Pedestrian Vision Network</u>

Plans Working Group and BPAC members, local bicycle and pedestrian coordinators, and local BPAC members requested far fewer changes to the Pedestrian Vision and Priority Networks than to the Bicycle Networks. Four of the five Bicycle Vision Network categories are the same as those for the Pedestrian Vision Network, although the criteria that define each are somewhat different than those in the Bicycle Vision Network, as follows.

1. *Access to transit*. The Pedestrian Vision Network is recommended to include pedestrian facilities within one-half-mile of all rail and ferry services, and bus transit trunklines of countywide significance. The one revision to this category is to add major bus lines that provide regional connections (i.e., across county borders), where they have not already

been provided. This includes transbay lines that operate seven days a week (AC Transit routes F, NL, and O), and the AC Transit route 217 in Fremont, which connects to Santa Clara County.

2. *Access within Downtowns*. It is recommended that the Pedestrian Vision Network include pedestrian access within downtowns in the nine cities with downtowns (Berkeley, Oakland, Alameda, San Leandro, Hayward, Fremont, Dublin, Pleasanton and Livermore) and one major commercial district, or "downtown-equivalent," in each of the county's other six jurisdictions. This is consistent with the definition and explanation of downtowns for the Bicycle Vision and Priority Networks. As with the Bicycle Networks, the unincorporated areas would have more than one major commercial district, to respond to the fact that they include multiple communities. All downtown-equivalent major commercial districts must be close to major transit. While the bicycle network links provide access *to* these areas, the Pedestrian Vision Network is recommended to include pedestrian access *within* them, as was done in the 2006 Pedestrian Plan.

   Many comments and questions were received about the definition of Major Commercial Districts over the past few months. The 2006 Plan stated that they must be identified in a local general plan, and that they were a "collection of mainly retail and service establishments in a multi-block area" and may include office and/or residential uses." Twelve districts within the 15 jurisdictions were listed in the 2006 plan, so many jurisdictions did not have any major commercial districts. At the local meetings in May and June, many requests were made for adding additional commercial districts, though most local general plans do not specifically use this terminology, so a framework for deciding which districts to add was needed. The increased focus on Major Commercial Districts, and the lack of a simple method for determining which should be included, prompted a review of the wisdom of continuing to include these districts at all as areas of countywide significance, that they serve pedestrians from more than just the local community. It is difficult to know and easily classify which Major Commercial Districts have countywide significance and which do not, without a detailed study, which is out of the scope of this plan. It was also noted that most of the twelve Commercial Districts in the 2006 plan, and others that were proposed to be added, were already near transit of countywide significance, and therefore were already included in the Vision Network. Therefore, the recommendation is to include one downtown or a Major Commercial District to serve as a downtown-equivalent for each jurisdiction in the county, as described in more detail above.

3. *Activity Centers*. The Pedestrian Vision Network is recommended to include pedestrian facilities within a one quarter mile walk shed of the six other Activity Center sub-categories: shopping malls, colleges and universities, hospitals and medical centers, major public venues, government buildings, and regional parks. Edits to the lists of these centers, to reflect current conditions, will be made and included in the Draft Plan.

4. *Inter-Jurisdictional Trails*. The same ten trails included in the 2006 Pedestrian Plan are recommended for the updated Pedestrian Vision Network, plus the East Bay Greenway. The entire Bay Trail, including the spurs, will be included. The definition that trails must be inter-jurisdictional and link populated areas would remain, so requests received to add local trails are not being included.

   As for the Bicycle Plan Vision Network, connectors between the Bay Trail and the future East Bay Greenway, where they are developed through a local planning process and are inter-jurisdictional, will be part of the Vision Network, but will not be mapped in the Plan, since they are still schematic.

5. *Communities of Concern*. In order to facilitate pedestrian travel to major transit nodes and within downtowns/Major Commercial Districts, it is recommended that the Pedestrian Vision Network include walk access to the closest local transit routes that serve these destinations within a maximum distance of one-quarter mile. As with the Bicycle Vision Network, these routes would not be mapped, since there are many possible routes and stops that could be included.

<u>Pedestrian network priorities</u>

Consistent with the recommended Bicycle Priority Network, it is recommended that pedestrian priorities be defined in the Plan text, rather than on the maps, by priority categories, as follows.

1. *Access to transit*. Priority pedestrian projects in this category will provide or allow continuous walk access from public transit of countywide significance radiating outward, within the maximum distance limits of the Pedestrian Vision Network (1/2 mile). As with the Bicycle Priority Network, those projects closer to the transit node are therefore prioritized over those that are further away and are not connected directly to the transit node.

2. *Access within Downtowns*. The recommended priority pedestrian projects would provide pedestrian access within downtowns and those major commercial districts defined in the Pedestrian Vision Network.

3. *Inter-jurisdictional Trails*. The following three countywide trail systems are recommended for prioritization in the Countywide Pedestrian Plan:
   1. Bay Trail (including spine and connectors)
   2. Iron Horse Trail (as far east as Greenville Road, which is within the populated areas)
   3. East Bay Greenway

4. *Communities of Concern*. The recommended priority pedestrian projects in Communities of Concern will radiate outward from, and provide continuous access to, local bus

routes that serve major transit and the closest downtowns/Major Commercial Districts, up to the one quarter mile threshold in the Vision Network.

Requested feedback from PWG and BPAC members

1. Do you support the recommended overall approach to the priority networks, namely, that they will not be mapped, but just described in the text, and that exact access mileage will not be identified?
2. Do you support omitting the major commercial districts, except for those that are "downtown-equivalents," as specific destinations on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Networks?
3. Does the proposed approach to bicycle and pedestrian access to Communities of Concern meet the objective of connecting these communities to jobs and transit?
4. Do you support prioritizing the inter-jurisdictional bicycle routes, and if so, does the proposed approach make sense?
5. Overall, have the major issues been identified and adequately addressed with this proposal? If not, what are we missing or what should be revised?

This page intentionally left blank.

Alameda Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Plans Updates
Summary of Major Input received on Bicycle and Pedestrian Capital Projects Vision and Priority Networks

From: May and June 2011 local agency and local Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) meetings, plus individual comments from agency staff and public.

Alameda CTC responses are written in italics and enclosed in brackets, and, where applicable, refer to the revised networks approach in Attachment 03A. This list does not include requests for edits to the network maps.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans (both)

1. Downtowns/Major Commercial Districts Network Category:
    a. What is definition of Major Commercial Districts? Why are some included, others not? Why aren't shopping centers/malls included? These are the commercial districts of suburban areas (like Stoneridge Mall). Improved access to them is needed.
    [Revised approach.]
2. Trails Network Category:
    a. Iron Horse Trail (IHT)
        i. Don't describe trail inclusion as only in "urbanized" areas. Change it to be "east to Greenville Road" or in "populated areas."
        [Change made.]
        ii. Need assistance with working with BART to allow bicyclists to ride through Dublin/Pleasanton BART, since part of IHT.
        [Alameda CTC can assist (separate from Plan update).]
    b. Bay Trail
        i. Alignments may change, especially in South County, as trails are further designed.
        [Will note in Plan that alignments on maps may change to serve as a replacement to proposed alignments.]
        ii. Include Spurs in Vision, if not also in Priority Networks.
        [*Spurs recommended in vision, but not priorities, since goal is to first construct the spine, and next the connections from transit/populated areas.]*
    c. Trail connectors needed for East Bay Greenway. Specifically, add the San Leandro Creek Trail and San Lorenzo Creek Trail which will connect East Bay Greenway with the Bay trail in Oakland/San Leandro/Unincorporated area.
    [Connectors that are developed through a local planning process and are inter-jurisdictional will be added to Vision. Overall, the priority is to build the spine of EB Greenway and Bay Trail before connectors are built.]
    d. Trails should be connected to transit and other bikeway routes, and to other major trails.
    [Comment noted. Some trails do, while others do not.]
    e. Add more Trails (or prioritize):
        i. Arroyo Mocho Trail (Livermore to Pleasanton) should be a priority in Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans

[*Not added as priority, since it parallels Iron Horse Trail. Already included in Vision of both plans.]*

ii. Add local trails in Livermore – more realistic alignments than East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) trails in that area.
[*Local trails not added, unless they are replacing another route/trail that is parallel to the EBRPD trail.]*

3. Network Categories Missing:
    a. Add UC Berkeley as a new destination/category. 50,000 students/staff/faculty.
    [*Pedestrian Plan: Included as an Activity Center in the Vision Network, so pedestrian access within a ¼ mile is included. Also, it is within ½ mile walkshed of BART and major trunklines, so pedestrian improvements would be prioritized in this area.*
    Bicycle Plan: Will modify Downtown Berkeley/Downtown BART access routes to run along Hearst and Bancroft streets, next to campus.]
    b. Consider adding additional Activity Center categories, like youth centers or the Ed Roberts Campus, that draw people from outside one city.
    [*No new Activity Centers added – focus is on those already included for these Plan updates. Also, Ed Roberts Campus is included as "access to transit" in vision and priority maps, since it is at Ashby BART station]*
4. Priority Networks:
    a. Do not eliminate priority networks - needed in general, due to limited funds.
    b. Don't use Financially Constrained List – funding future is too uncertain
    c. Consider ranking the priority areas, in priority order.
    d. Could use cost-effectiveness to prioritize projects
    [Comments addressed in recommendation, or noted for grant funding cycle.]
5. Maintenance:
    a. Call this out – very important, especially for trails.
    b. Prioritize maintenance of existing facilities over adding new facilities.
    c. [Maintenance is included in networks, and in cost estimating. Both maintenance and new facilities are included in the update of the Plans. It would be very difficult to draw the line on not funding any new infrastructure and just maintenance.]
6. Geographic Equity
    a. Some concerns that the proposal is not equitable geographically.
    [Will get feedback from BPAC and PWG on revised recommendation and hear if this is still a concern.]
7. Funding levels:
    a. More funding is needed for bicycle/pedestrian projects and programs.
    [Comment noted.]

<u>Bicycle Plan (only)</u>

1. Transit Network Category:
    a. ½ mile (priority) distance is too short for biking
    [Comment addressed in revised approach.]
    b. Transit priority distances should be same (3/4 mile) throughout county for equity reasons. This will benefit the most users – more density as get closer in.
    [Still recommend that distances vary by Planning Area, because BART data shows differing biking distances to transit (BART), and for geographic equity

reasons. Revised priorities approach does emphasize projects that are closer to transit over those further from transit.]

c. Distances should be longer in areas with less transit, since people are biking longer distances to get there.
[Still recommend using available BART data, which shows average distances traveled.]

d. Transit Access routes need to connect to employment sites, or other destinations.
[Comment addressed in revised approach.]

e. Transit access distances should vary by type of transit
[For simplicity, recommend the same access distance, no matter the type of transit. Also, no easily available local transit data besides BART.]

f. Emeryville, with no major transit, should be connected to Ashby and Macarthur BART with access routes.
[Vision transit access routes do connect Emeryville to transit. Inter-jurisdictional routes also connect.]

g. Allow a bicycle "access route" to be a shuttle (not just a bikeway), since in some cases this might be best available option (e.g. Alameda-Oakland estuary crossing).
[This is possible, depending on funding source eligibility for transit operations.]

2. Downtown/Commercial Districts Network Category:
    a. 3 miles distance is too short, especially if hills
    [Recommend keeping same distance, since it is already quite long.]
    b. Access routes should connect to destinations.
    [Comment noted. Will attempt to connect when making map edits.]
3. Network Categories Missing:
    a. Union City Blvd – bicycle lanes. Some places, like Union City, have not prioritized trails and don't have any to implement. Would prefer on-street bikeways instead.
    [*Could be considered under inter-jurisdictional routes in vision and priority networks. Also Union City Blvd and other routes on Vision Network are eligible for funding under revised approach, just would not receive higher ranking that priority network projects will.]*
    b. Interjurisdictional Routes:
        i. Add interjurisdictional routes as priority
        ii. Some heavily traveled bicycle corridors between jurisdictions need further study. Need consensus on where routes should be and/or facility types. Also, bicycle access should be included for some corridors that may be studied by Alameda CTC for all modes. Examples include:
            1. San Pablo (Albany, Berkeley, Oakland, Emeryville)
            2. South Berkeley/Oakland/Emeryville connections
            3. College Ave (Berkeley/Oakland)
            4. Hesperian (Central County)
            5. Adeline/Market (Berkeley/Oakland)

    [The new proposed inter-jurisdictional category should address this need.]
    c. Park & Ride lots – add them as a destination
    [Not added at this time, due to size of vision network. Could consider adding in future.]

4. Alignments
    a. Exact alignments for all network segments/links should be allowed to vary, depending on local planning. Mapped routes should be considered guidance
    [This is allowed - any variance should be determined by local plans or feasibility studies.]
    b. Local Bicycle Plan alignments/routes should always be used on the network – the Countywide Plan should not show routes different than (or in conflict with) local routes
    [The countywide vision network should only be showing routes from local plans, unless a local jurisdiction has specifically requested adding a route not in their current network.]
    c. Need a balance of routes for experienced and less experienced riders.
    [Current network generally achieves a balance.]
5. Overall
    a. Addition of new access routes to transit and downtowns/Major Commercial Districts (MCDs) is good, but adds a lot to the networks. Further emphasizes need for prioritization, and clarity for how projects are selected.
    [Addressed in the revised recommendation.]
6. Specific Routes/Locations:
    a. Hayward:
        i. No good routes from Hayward BART to the Bay
        ii. Lack of north-south routes. Need more direct bikeways here
        iii. Local routes (off major high speed arterials) are poorly signed and difficult to follow
        iv. Routes from Castro Valley to Chabot College are terrible. Need better east-west routes and connections.

    [The countywide network reflects Hayward's local bikeway network. All comments regarding Hayward network will be passed on to the city for its consideration. In addition, Alameda CTC, as feasible, will work with Hayward on addressing these concerns.]

<u>Pedestrian Plan (only)</u>

1. Transit:
    a. Add bus lines in South County (SC) to connect to Ohlone College and Santa Clara County.
    [*Addressed by adding new bus transit trunkline category of significant inter-county routes,.]*
    b. Consider expanding ½ mile walkshed to BART in areas with few other transit options, like Castro Valley.
    [For equity reasons and simplicity, recommend maintaining the same walkshed distance throughout the county.]
2. Overall:
    a. Pedestrian Plan categories are very broad – cover a lot of projects, maybe too many
    [Comment noted - priority network attempts to narrow this down.]

COUNTYWIDE BICYCLE PLAN: Summary of Vision and Priority Networks

Bicycle Vision Network			
Category	**May Recommendation**	**Major Feedback**	**Revised Recommendation**
Inter-jurisdictional network	Maintain inter-jurisdictional (corridor approach) from 2006 plan network	Update network links, as needed, to reflect local plans and built links	Inter-jurisdictional (corridor approach) from 2006 plan network, with updated network links.
Access to transit	Radiate 1-2 miles in four directions from Transit Priority Zones (TPZs), depending on Planning Area (PA).	Rename TPZs, provide links to employment, update major bus transfer stops. Vary distances also based on type of transit.	Access to transit routes radiating 1-2 miles in four directions from major transit, depending on Planning Area (PA). Link to employment, where feasible, and use updated bus transfer stops.
Access to Downtowns	Radiate 3 miles from downtowns and major commercial districts (MCDs)	MCDs are difficult to define, and may not have countywide significance for biking	Radiate 3 miles from downtowns and MCDs in cities without a downtown, as appropriate
Inter-Jurisdictional Trails	Keep trails from 2006 network, plus add the East Bay Greenway	Requests were made for local trails to be added.	Keep trails from 2006 network, plus add the East Bay Greenway and Bay Trail spurs
Communities of concern	Provide facilities called for in Community Based Transportation Plans (CBTPs)	Projects are not clearly identified in the CBTPs, but are general categories.	Add access to/from regional transit and downtowns (in above categories) and allow routes to exceed mileage limits if to/from communities of concern

Bicycle Priority Network			
Category	**May Recommendation**	**Major Feedback**	**Revised Recommendation**
Inter-jurisdictional network	Not included in the priority network	Important to include in a countywide plan	Prioritize routes developed through a multi-jurisdictional planning effort, and create continuous access from the jurisdictional border.
Access to transit	Access radiating out from transit that is half Vision distance (.5 to 1 mile)	Difficult to determine best priority distances for each transit type and location in the county. Concerns that shorter distances are not long enough.	Prioritize links that provide continuous access from the nodes up to Vision distance thresholds (1 - 2 miles)
Access to Downtowns	Access radiating out from Downtowns and MCDs that is half Vision distance (1.5 miles)	N/A	Prioritize links that provide continuous access from the nodes up to Vision distance thresholds (3 miles)
Inter-Jurisdictional Trails	3 major countywide trails: Iron Horse Trail, Bay Trail (spine and connectors), East Bay Greenway	Requests were made for local trails to be added.	3 major countywide trails: Iron Horse Trail (east to Greenville Road), Bay Trail (spine and connectors), East Bay Greenway
Communities of concern	Provide facilities called for in CBTPs	Projects are not clearly identified in the CBTPs, but are general categories.	Add access to/from regional transit and downtowns (in above categories) and allow routes to exceed mileage limits if to/from communities of concern

COUNTYWIDE PEDESTRIAN PLAN: Summary of Vision and Priority Networks

Pedestrian Vision Network			
Category	**May Recommendation**	**Major Feedback**	**Revised Recommendation**
Access to transit	Access within 1/2 mile of major transit	Add bus lines that connect across county lines.	Access within 1/2 mile of major transit, including inter-county major bus routes
Access within Downtowns (DTs)	Provide ped access within DTs and Major Commercial Districts	Many more Major Commercial Districts should be added and definition refined.	Include ped access within one DT or Major Commercial District per jurisdiction
Activity Centers (shopping malls, colleges/universities, hospitals/medical centers, major public venues, government buildings, regional parks)	Access within 1/4 mile of Activity Centers	None, but the access to these Activity Centers was inadvertently omitted from the maps and reports that went to the local agency and local BPAC meetings.	Access within 1/4 mile of Activity Centers
Inter-Jurisdictional Trails	Keep trails from 2006 network, plus add the East Bay Greenway	Some requests for local trails to be included, and for Bay Trail spurs to be included.	Keep trails from 2006 network, plus add the East Bay Greenway and Bay Trail spurs.
Communities of concern	Provide facilities called for in Community Based Transportation Plans (CBTPs)	Projects are not clearly identified in the CBTPs, but are general categories.	Include ped facilities within a 1/4 walk shed of closest transit routes that serve major transit and downtowns/Major Commercial Districts.

Pedestrian Priority Network			
Category	**May Recommendation**	**Major Feedback**	**Revised Recommendation**
Access to transit	Access within 1/4 mile of major transit	Some comments that this distance is too short. Others that it is good to focus in a smaller area	Prioritize ped links that provide continuous access from public transit of countywide significance radiating outward to maximum Vision distance (1/2 mile)
Downtowns	Provide ped access within DTs and Major Commercial Districts	Many more Major Commercial Districts should be added and definition refined.	Include ped access within one DT or Major Commercial District per jurisdiction
Inter-Jurisdictional Trails	3 major countywide trails: Iron Horse Trail, Bay Trail (spine and connectors), East Bay Greenway	Add additional local trails.	3 major countywide trails: Iron Horse Trail (east to Greenville Road), Bay Trail (spine and connectors), East Bay Greenway
Communities of concern	Provide facilities called for in CBTPs	Projects are not clearly identified in the CBTPs, but are general categories.	Prioritize ped links that provide continuous access from the closest transit routes that serve major transit and downtowns, radiating outward to a 1/4 mile.

EISEN | LETUNIC
TRANSPORTATION, ENVIRONMENTAL AND URBAN PLANNING

MEMORANDUM

To	Diane Stark and Rochelle Wheeler, Alameda CTC
From	Victoria Eisen
Date	July 21, 2011
Project	Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Updates
Subject	**Proposed approach to estimating cost of capital vision networks**

Background

The Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans will provide a blueprint for creating high-quality bicycle and pedestrian environments throughout Alameda County over the next 28 years. In each plan, this will be achieved through a series of capital projects and ongoing programs focusing on technical support, promotion, and safety. The cost of these projects and programs will be presented in the Implementation Chapter of the plans, along with the bicycle/pedestrian revenue expected to flow to Alameda County over the same time period. The purpose of these costs is twofold:

1. To compare the total countywide cost of the bicycle and pedestrian capital project networks at build-out, plus program implementation, to the amount of revenue expected to be available in order to identify the extent of the funding gap for each plan.
2. To advocate for additional funding to fill that gap.

The cost estimates generated for the plans will *not* be used to limit or otherwise determine available grant funding for particular projects. In other words, the purpose of cost estimating in the countywide plans is to develop countywide costs – comprised of totals by project category (see the July 27 Plans Working Group memo under Agenda Item #3 for a description of the categories) – not to estimate the cost of any particular project.

Introduction

This memo discusses a proposed methodology for estimating the cost of building and maintaining the capital projects that are ultimately included in the bicycle and pedestrian vision networks. Per the recommendations presented in Agenda Item #3 on the capital projects networks approaches, cost estimates will not be calculated for the priority networks. The Plans Working Group (PWG) will have an opportunity to review a corresponding, though less complex, cost estimation approach for the recommended programs in the draft plans when they are released in December.

This memo is organized according to plan (i.e., bicycle or pedestrian), and the vision network categories for each plan (access to transit, access to downtowns, etc). The capital cost estimation methodology that is recommended in this memo is based on the approaches to the bicycle and pedestrian vision and priority networks that will be presented and discussed at the July PWG

meeting under Agenda Item #3. Any changes to those approaches will need to be reflected in the final costing methodology.

Finally, it is recommended that all estimated costs be escalated to 2012, the year the updated plans are scheduled to be adopted. The relationship of this escalation approach to that being used in the Countywide Transportation Plan update is discussed later in this memo

Bicycle Vision Network

As described in the memo on the approaches to the capital project networks (Agenda Item #3), the Bicycle Vision Network is comprised of five categories: Inter-jurisdictional network, Access to Transit, Access to Downtowns, Inter-jurisdictional Trails, and Communities of Concern. Cost estimates will be developed for each of these categories, as well as for maintenance. In other words, the plan will provide the cost to construct the unbuilt part of the network, and the cost to maintain the entire network.

Each of the network categories is made up of many bikeways categorized as either a Class I, II, or III facility, and some major infrastructure projects, such as bridges and undercrossings. For this reason, the costing methodologies presented below are grouped by these bikeway and infrastructure types. One network category, Communities of Concern, is made up of conceptual bikeways that have not been mapped as part of the Vision network, and therefore an approach to estimating these costs was developed and is proposed at the end of the construction costs section below.

With the exception of Class I pathways, the costs used in the 2006 Bicycle Plan were simply escalated from those first developed in the 2001 plan, unless specific project cost information was available from a recent plan or study. Because this source data is now generally ten years old, and for other reasons described below, new methodologies for cost estimating are being recommended for the 2012 plan.

Construction Costs

Trails (Class I Multi-Use Pathways)

Also known as trails or grade-separated pathways, these bikeway facilities are used by bicyclists and pedestrians only. For costing purposes, there are two sets of trails in the Bicycle Vision Network, under the category of Inter-jurisdictional Trails:

1. Major countywide trails: These include the Bay Trail, Iron Horse Trail and East Bay Greenway. In 2010, Alameda CTC estimated the cost to complete these trails, based on the most recent feasibility studies and analysis. It is recommended that these figures be used and escalated to 2012, as needed.
2. Other trails in the Bicycle Vision Network: The cost to construct these trails was estimated in the 2006 Countywide Bicycle Plan. These costs should be used and escalated to 2012, unless local or regional agency staff provides more updated cost estimates.

Bicycle Lanes (Class II)

Due to the reliance of the 2006 Bicycle Plan cost data on escalating figures from the 2001 plan, and the addition of more bikeway facilities serving transit and downtowns in this 2012 plan, it is recommended that the cost of all Class II facilities be estimated using a new and consistent methodology. Given that the goal of the estimation process is to develop a single countywide cost, and is not intended to develop specific project costs for the grant-making process or for some other purpose, and given that all local bicycle plans throughout Alameda County employ an average per-mile cost to calculate the total cost of facilities throughout the applicable jurisdiction, it is recommended that (1) an updated per mile cost be developed for the Countywide Bicycle Plan and (2) that it be multiplied by the total Class II mileage of the network to come up with a total cost for these facilities.

In order to determine an appropriate linear mile cost, it is recommended to consider the corresponding costs developed for local bicycle plans in Alameda County. A survey of these plans conducted for this project reveals that two distinct bicycle lane costs are often included: (1) a lower cost for Class II facilities that only require signing and striping, and (2) a higher cost for those that require a lane reduction to accommodate the bike lanes[1] (see Table 1). Without a time-consuming and detailed inventory, it is impossible to say what proportion of the Vision Bicycle Network falls into each category of bicycle lane project; however, it can be assumed that many of the "easier" projects that just required signing and striping, but did not require lane reductions, have already been installed. Furthermore, there are often unanticipated costs in the construction of any new bicycle lanes, such as the need to move signal detector loops. Therefore, it is recommended that either:

1) the higher average per lane-mile cost ($100,000/lane-mile) be used in the development of a countywide number, or alternately,
2) some proportion, for example 20 percent, could be assumed to fall into the lower cost striping and signing category ($30,000/lane-mile), while the rest (80 percent) could be assumed to need more costly improvements ($100,000/lane-mile).

Bicycle Routes (Class III)

For the same reasons listed for bicycle lanes (Class II), it is recommended that the cost of all Class III facilities be estimated using a new and consistent methodology that is based on a cost per linear mile, developed by considering the costs from the local bicycle plans. The 2006 plan included three types of bicycle route facilities, each with a distinct cost or cost range. After reviewing local plans and the state of the practice for bicycle route design, it is assumed to be likely that the Countywide Bicycle Vision Network links that are designated as Class III include at least five distinct types of facilities (listed from lowest to highest per-mile cost):

[1] In 2011, the City of Oakland calculated the actual construction cost of over 60 recently constructed bicycle projects. This data was not considered in this analysis because the cost of a majority of their projects was so much lower than the numbers reflected in any of the local bicycle plans (including Oakland's 2007 Bicycle Master Plan), in many cases by a factor of two or more. It is out of the scope of this project to determine the causes of this discrepancy, although it may be due to the economic recession.

1. *Signage only* is the lowest cost type. Many local bicycle plans include this type of bicycle route, and the average cost from these plans is $9,865 per mile in 2010 dollars, as shown in Table 1. This stand-alone sub-type was not used in the 2006 plan.
2. *Shared lane markings* or "sharrows," are stencils in the travel lane that indicate where bicyclists should ride in a shared travel lane. The cost of these facilities, as well as bicycle routes on arterial streets, which require more improvements than just signs, are both estimated to cost an average of $55,000 per mile in 2010 dollars. This sub-type was also not specifically called out in the 2006 plan.
3. *Wide curb lanes* are bicycle routes on arterial roadways that, in addition to signage, include a high level of maintenance, good pavement quality, and possibly sharrows. This sub-type comes from the 2006 countywide plan and was estimated to cost $60,000-$120,000 per mile to construct. Escalated to 2010 dollars, and with 30 percent added for contingencies, the average cost would be $138,375 per mile.
4. *Wide shoulders* are another type of Class III facility described in the 2006 Countywide Bicycle Plan, and refer to projects that require shoulder widening that is less than the width of a standard bicycle lane, generally on rural roads. These facilities cost less than Class II bike lanes, on average, but can cost much more than the previous three types, as much as $150,000 per mile or more, according to the City of Livermore. The 2006 plan listed these facilities as $216,000 per mile to construct.
5. *Bicycle boulevards* – low-speed streets that have been optimized for bicycle traffic and that discourage cut-through motor vehicle traffic – are a fifth type of Class III bicycle route facility. Bicycle boulevards can include sharrows, bulbouts, traffic signals, high-visibility crosswalks and other specialized treatments. Although most local bicycle plans do not include per-mile costs for these facilities, with the exception of the City of Oakland, those that do (the 2006 Countywide Bicycle Plan, Albany and Berkeley) list much higher per-lane costs for bicycle boulevards than other Class III routes, in most cases higher even than the high end of bicycle lane costs, as high as $400,000 per mile in Berkeley. These facilities were estimated to cost $120,000 per mile in the 2006 plan (or $184,500 in 2010 dollars, with contingencies added), and were included under the same bicycle route type as residential streets and local streets.

Although the current bikeway data for the Bicycle Vision Network does not segregate the bicycle routes into the five types listed above, it is recommended that a blend of these categories be considered for the assumed average Class III lane cost in the updated plan. Given that the cost of the most expensive categories – wide shoulders and bicycle boulevards are similar – it is recommended that the Class III cost estimate acknowledge the range of types of Class III facilities by assuming 25 percent of the network will be made up of each of the following facilities: signage only ($9,865 per mile), sharrows ($55,000 per mile), wide curb lanes ($138,375 per mile) and bicycle boulevards/wide curb lanes ($213,625 per mile), for an average of $104,000 per mile.

Table 1: Recommended per mile Class II and III bicycle facility costs
based on local jurisdictional cost estimates escalated to current (2010) dollars

	Class II		Class III	
Jurisdiction	**Low**	**High**	**Low**	**High**
Alameda (City)	$37,107	$139,150	$12,369	N/A
Albany	$20,000	$80,000	$15,000	$250,000
Berkeley[1]	$17,600	N/A	$2,000	$400,000
Dublin	$16,713	$77,995	$4,457	N/A
Emeryville[2]	$34,800	N/A	$2,880	N/A
Fremont[3]	$48,660	N/A	$8,110	N/A
Hayward	N/A	$151,971	$23,485	N/A
Livermore[4]	$3,990	$149,606	$11,969	N/A
Newark	$20,000	$80,000	$8,000	N/A
Oakland	N/A	$100,000	$10,000	$20,000
Piedmont	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pleasanton	N/A	$72,152	$7,215	N/A
San Leandro[5]	$52,000	$104,000	$10,400	N/A
Union City	$35,481	N/A	$11,827	N/A
Unincorporated County[6]	$52,000	$104,000	$10,400	N/A
2006 Countywide Bicycle Plan[7]	$36,901	$138,375	Note[8]	$184,500
Average	$31,271	$108,841	$9,865	$213,625
Recommended for 2012 Plan	**$30,000**	**$100,000**	**$104,000**	

Source: Most recently adopted local bicycle plans

Notes

1. Berkeley costs recently updated using the Consumer Price Index for the Bay Area.
2. 20% added for contingencies
3. 30% added for feasibility, design, contingencies, etc.
4. 45% added for design, contingencies, inspection and administration.
5. 30% added for feasibility, contingencies or administrative costs.
6. Planning consultant is tentatively using same figures as City of San Leandro.
7. 30% added for design & administration costs, contingencies, ROW acquisition and inflation costs.
8. The lowest cost in the 2006 Countywide Bicycle Plan was $92,249, which is much higher than the average local plan figure used, so it was not included in the average.

Major infrastructure projects

Beyond the three classes of bikeways, other major infrastructure projects are needed to create a high-quality bicycling environment throughout Alameda County. These projects include freeway overcrossings, bridges, intersection reconfigurations and other projects that will require major capital outlay, but are not included in the per-mile costs recommended above. The cost of 16 such projects is included in the 2006 Countywide Bicycle Plan (see Attachment 04A,

"Appendix C-3" of the 2006 plan, project #s 3, 4, 9, 41-51, 55, and 56). It is recommended that the 2006 cost of these major infrastructure projects, which are a part of the Inter-jurisdictional category of the Bicycle Vision Network, be escalated to 2012 costs, unless local jurisdictions or other agencies can provide more current cost estimates. PWG members are requested to review these project listings in Attachment 04A, and provide updated costs, if they are available.

Since the major infrastructure needs, such as bicycle/pedestrian bridges and freeway inter-change improvements, along the newly added (to the 2012 plan) transit and downtown access routes have not yet been identified, it is recommended that the plan note that these unknown costs have not been included in the cost estimates, and that they be considered in the next plan update.

Calculating Communities of Concern Costs

As described in the memo on the recommended capital project networks (Agenda Item #3), bikeways between Communities of Concern and the closest major transit stop/station and downtowns are recommended to be included in the vision network. Since this category is recommended to be noted in the map legend, rather than coded GIS links as in most of the other bicycle network categories, it is recommended that the average distance and cost be calculated as follows. The distance between the centroid of each Community of Concern and the nearest major transit stop/station (and another calculation to the nearest downtown) would be multiplied by the number of such unique links (i.e., seven[2] Communities of Concern times two destinations, all minus any routes that overlap with other categories in the Bicycle Vision Network). To obtain a cost, this would be multiplied by the higher recommended Class II bicycle lane per mile cost ($100,000).

Maintenance Costs

While previous versions of the Countywide Bicycle Plan estimated an annual total cost for maintenance, it was not based on a comprehensive per mile cost to maintain the total bikeway mileage in the network. Because one of the stated goals of the 2012 plan is, "Collaborate with local agencies and others on identifying and securing sustainable funding streams for the construction and, in particular, maintenance, of bicycle infrastructure," it is recommended that the methodology for maintenance costs be revised in this plan update. The following methodology is recommended, by class of facility:

- Trails (Class I): Use annual per-mile costs provided by East Bay Regional Park District.
- Bicycle Lanes (Class II): Assume $1,500 per mile per year costs, which is the approximate average of the costs reported in the local bicycle plans throughout Alameda County (see Table 2).
- Bicycle Routes (Class III): Estimate $700 per mile per year, based on the approximate average of costs in local bicycle plans (Table 2).

[2] The Alameda CTC has completed five Community Based Transportation Plans and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has identified two additional Communities of Concern in Alameda County.

In order to help local jurisdictions estimate maintenance costs, it is further recommended that the cost of maintaining individual components of the bicycle network be included in a future best practices toolkit for bicycling. Examples of these costs are signal detectors, traffic signs, restriping and repainting lanes and legends, trimming shrubbery, and sweeping bicycle lanes.

Table 2: Recommended annual per mile bicycle maintenance costs
based on local jurisdictional cost estimates escalated to current (2010) dollars

Jurisdiction	Class I	Class II	Class III
Alameda (City)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Albany	$25,000	N/A	N/A
Berkeley	$26,000	$3,400	$350
Dublin	N/A	N/A	N/A
Emeryville	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fremont	$1,061	$250	$125
Hayward	N/A	N/A	N/A
Livermore	N/A	N/A	N/A
Newark	$25,000	$1,500	$150
Oakland	N/A	N/A	N/A
Piedmont	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pleasanton	$25,769	$1,546	$155
San Leandro	$8,500	$2,000	$1,000
Union City	$8,500	$2,000	$2,000
Unincorporated County	$8,500	N/A	N/A
2006 Countywide Bicycle Master Plan	$29,567	N/A	N/A
East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD)	TBD	N/A	N/A
Average	$17,544	$1,783	$630
Recommended for 2012 Plan	**$25,000***	**$1,500**	**$700**

Source: Most recently adopted local bicycle plans
* = East Bay Regional Park District figure (will be confirmed at PWG meeting)

Pedestrian Vision Network

The capital cost of the original Pedestrian Vision Network was estimated during the development of the first Countywide Pedestrian Plan in 2006 by estimating the cost of each category in each Area of Countywide Significance. Since few pedestrian projects are recommended to be added or deleted from that network, it is recommended to use the methodology from the 2006 plans, with some modifications noted below, and to escalate the costs reported in that plan to 2012. The methodologies are organized by the five categories included in the proposed Pedestrian Vision Network, as described in Agenda Item #3.

Construction Costs

Cost estimates will be developed for each of the five categories in the Pedestrian Vision Network, reflecting the total cost to build the vision network. Although Alameda CTC has received a great deal of useful information from local jurisdictions regarding which bicycle network links have been constructed, there is little analogous data for the pedestrian vision network. It is therefore unknown what amount of the current total Pedestrian Vision Network has already been built, and additionally, how much has been built since 2006. The PWG is requested to provide input on whether an estimate should be made for these two items, or if it would be too hypothetical at this time.

Access to Transit

Bus transit access: In the 2006 Plan, bus trunklines were identified for all transit operators in Alameda County. For each trunkline, the mileage and number of stops were used to determine stop spacing, which was multiplied by an average number of investments assumed at each pair of stops, such as bulbouts, audible pedestrian crossing signals and crosswalk striping. Given the simplified per-mile methodology recommended for the 2012 Bicycle Plan, it is recommended that this 2006 Pedestrian Plan methodology be replaced with a simpler one as well that multiplies the total mileage of all trunklines by an average per-mile cost for investments to calculate the corridor costs. Similarly, the total mileage of the pedestrian access routes in the half-mile walkshed around the trunkline would also be multiplied by an average (lower) per-mile cost for investments, to get the off-corridor costs. The same types of investments from the 2006 plan would be assumed, but the costs would be escalated to 2012. The corridor and off-corridor costs would be added, as they were in the 2006 plan, to develop the total bus transit access cost.

Rail station access: For BART, ACE and Capital Corridor stations in areas without high-quality pedestrian environments, the cost of improvements was calculated in 2006 using the cost of improvements to one-quarter-mile of 40th Street in Oakland, adjacent to the MacArthur BART station, which had been improved during the development of the 2006 plan. It is recommended to select a more recent project, if available, on which to base these per-mile costs. The Plans Working Group is requested to suggest any potential projects to use for this purpose. It is further recommended that access to ferry terminal costs, which were based on estimates from the Water Transit Authority, now Water Emergency Transportation Authority, be updated to reflect more recent WETA figures.

Access within Downtowns

The downtowns in Alameda County were categorized as small, medium or large in the 2006 Countywide Pedestrian Plan. Since the quality of improvement was envisioned to be similar to that around BART stations, the cost of pedestrian improvements to each downtown was estimated using the BART station area costs, but at different scales depending on downtown size. This approach is recommended to be updated to reflect the revised recommended pedestrian network approach (see Agenda Item #3) that each city designate one downtown or

major commercial district (MCD), and also the updated rail station access costs, as described above.

Activity Centers

The 2006 Countywide Pedestrian Plan assumed improved walk access between each activity center identified in the plan and the nearest bus stop (assumed at a 1/8-mile average distance). The proposed Pedestrian Vision Network would greatly expand this to a 1/4-mile walk-shed surrounding each activity center. The cost of this extended pedestrian network component is recommended to be estimated by choosing a representative activity center, for example one in San Leandro, a medium density city; using GIS to calculate the mileage of the surrounding sidewalk network within one-quarter mile of the activity center; and multiplying this by the off-corridor per-mile cost used for the bus transit access. These unit costs would then be multiplied by the total number of activity centers.

Inter-jurisdictional Trails

The same assumptions and costs estimated for the Bicycle Plan will be used for the overlapping Class II facilities in the Pedestrian Plan. There are no trails in the recommended pedestrian network that are not also in the bicycle network.

Communities of Concern

Consistent with the methodology described above for the Bicycle Vision Network, the cost of providing quality pedestrian access between Communities of Concern and the local transit routes that serve major transit station/stops and downtowns is recommended to be calculated as follows: For access to transit, by multiplying the seven[3] communities by the average distance between centroids of the Communities of Concern and the nearest major transit station/stops, times the per-mile cost assumed in the bus transit access category, with a ¼ mile walk shed included in the per-mile costs. For access to the downtowns, the same calculation would be made, but for the average distance between the centroid and the nearest downtown.

Maintenance Costs

A recommendation for a simple method to estimate the maintenance costs for the Pedestrian Vision Network will be brought to the meeting. However, most local plans do not calculate a per mile cost for all pedestrian facilities (sidewalks, lighting, curb ramps, landscaping, tree maintenance, etc), so it may be difficult to develop a comprehensive per mile cost to use in this plan update.

[3] The Alameda CTC has completed five Community Based Transportation Plans and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has identified two additional Communities of Concern in Alameda County.

Cost by Category (both plans)
Beyond using the methodologies recommended above to calculate the total bicycle and pedestrian capital project network costs by facility type, it is further recommended to present this information by vision network category. For the Bicycle Vision Network, that would mean reporting the total cost of all facilities that comprise five categories: 1) the inter-jurisdictional network, regardless of class, and doing the same for 2) projects that provide access to transit, 3) access to downtowns, 4) inter-jurisdictional trails and 5) communities of concern. Similarly, it is recommended that Pedestrian Vision Network costs be reported by the five categories described above. Venn diagrams would help explain why the sum of the category totals, in each plan, would greatly exceed the total network cost (because many links serve more than one purpose and are, therefore, included in more than one category). Additionally, the overlapping costs between the two plans (for inter-jurisdictional trails) would also be described in both plans.

Consistency with Countywide Transportation Plan (including escalation)
Since the Alameda CTC is updating the Countywide Transportation Plan (CWTP) simultaneously with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan updates, and the latter two plans will be included in the CWTP, it is important to consider developing a consistent cost estimation methodology between the plans and the ways to accomplish that.

As discussed above, the proposed purpose of the bicycle and pedestrian plan cost estimating is to determine the total cost of categories of projects (such as total access to transit costs), and not specific project costs. Similarly, the CWTP will also use collective cost estimates to develop realistic overall costs. Unlike the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans, however, the CWTP's cost estimation methodology will also be used to sort individual projects by starting time (short, medium and long term) and to measure cost effectiveness. So, while the CWTP development process includes a very detailed and complex methodology that estimates the cost of individual capital projects, this level of detail is not appropriate for the bicycle and pedestrian plans.

Therefore, it is recommended that we avoid overstating the importance of ensuring that the cost estimation methodologies employed by the Countywide Transportation, Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans be in lockstep. Instead, it is recommended that all costs (and revenue) be stated in year-of-adoption dollars (i.e., 2012, in this case), consistent with the methodology that has been employed by all bicycle and pedestrian planning efforts throughout Alameda County. It is further recommended that the San Francisco Bay Area Consumer Price Index (CPI) be used to escalate costs and revenue to 2010 dollars (the most recent year the CPI is available) and that a consistent rate of inflation is assumed for 2011 and 2012 in order to estimate 2012 costs and revenue.

Feedback requested

1. Do you concur with using the costs included in the 2006 Bicycle Plan (escalated to 2012 dollars) for the trail projects (except for the three countywide trails, and if more current costs are provided, as noted)?

2. Do you concur with the approach to estimating total Class II bicycle lane project costs using a total per-mile cost?
3. Do you concur with the recommended methodology to calculate what the bicycle lane per-mile cost should be? If so, do you think:
    a. 100 percent of Class II facilities should be assumed at the higher cost, or that
    b. some amount (20 percent was suggested) should be assumed to have a lower cost?
4. Do you agree that Class III per-mile costs should be based on an average of four different types of Class III facility, as described in this memo, rather than assuming that all Class III routes will be constructed as the same type of facility?
5. Do you concur with the approach for calculating the cost of each category of projects in the updated pedestrian vision network, as described in this memo?
6. Do you have a recent project that you would recommend using to calculate an average cost for improving access to rail stations?
7. Do you have any input on how to calculate the amount of the 2006 pedestrian network that is already completed and the amount that has been completed since the 2006 plan was adopted?
8. Do you feel that the revised approach for estimating maintenance costs in the bicycle and pedestrian plans will cover the cost of bringing older, perhaps sub-standard trail facilities in particular, which are technically built, but need further improvements (such as the Ohlone Trail in Albany and Berkeley) up to current standards, or do you feel that a separate cost category needs to be estimated for a "built, but needs improvements" category of facilities? If so, what methodology do you recommend?

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix C-3 DESCRIPTION OF CROSS-COUNTY CORRIDORS

Project: 3 Fruitvale - Broadway — Corridor: 10

Segment	City	Roadway	From	To	Length (miles)	Exist	Recommended Bikeway Type	Improve Interchange	Install Signal	Location	Improve Grates	Improve RR Tracks	Arterial Improvements	Total Cost	Financially Constrained	High Priority
K	Oakland	E 12th St	34th Ave	Fruitvale Ave	0.1	No	Class 2 - Bike Lane		Yes	34th Ave/E				$254,206.0	Yes	
L	Oakland	Fruitvale Ave	E 12th St	E 10th St	0.1	No	Class 2 - Bike Lane						Yes	$67,357.0	Yes	
M	Oakland	Fruitvale Ave	E 10th St	Elmwood Ave	0.2	Yes	Class 2 - Bike Lane					Yes	Yes	$114,838.0	Yes	
N	Oakland	Fruitvale Ave	Elmwood Ave	Fruitvale Bridge	0.0	Yes	Class 2 - Bike Lane						Yes	$69,479.0	Yes	
O	Oakland/Alameda	Miller-Sweeney Bridge	Oakland city limit	Alameda city limit	0.1	No	To Be Determined						Yes	$1,594,019.0	Yes	
All bicycle facilities within Alameda are to be consistent with Surface Transportation Board authorized rail operations and nothing herein is to be viewed as inconsistent with joint-rail trail use.																
P	Alameda	Tilden Way	Miller-Sweeney Bridge	Broadway	0.3	No	To Be Determined							$133,952.0	Yes	
All bicycle facilities within Alameda are to be consistent with Surface Transportation Board authorized rail operations and nothing herein is to be viewed as inconsistent with joint-rail trail use.																
Q	Alameda	Broadway	Tilden Way	Central Ave	0.4	Yes	Class 2 - Bike Lane							$1,404.0		
R	Alameda	Broadway	Central Ave	Otis Dr	0.6	Yes	Class 2 - Bike Lane							$1,796.0		
S	Alameda	Broadway	Otis Dr	La Jolla Dr	0.1	No	Class 2 - Bike Lane							$9,925.0		
T	Alameda	Broadway	La Jolla Dr	Bay View Dr	0.1	Yes	Class 2 - Bike Lane							$281.0		
U	Alameda	Broadway	Bay View Dr	Shoreline Dr	0.0	No	Class 2 - Bike Lane							$2,482.0		

Project: 4 Alameda - Doolittle - Lewelling — Corridor: 15

Segment	City	Roadway	From	To	Length (miles)	Exist	Recommended Bikeway Type	Improve Interchange	Install Signal	Location	Improve Grates	Improve RR Tracks	Arterial Improvements	Total Cost	Financially Constrained	High Priority
A	Alameda	Atlantic Ave/Appazzato Pkwy	Ferry Point	Constitution Way	1.3	No	To Be Determined							$2,023,000.0	Yes	Yes
All bicycle facilities within Alameda are to be consistent with Surface Transportation Board authorized rail operations and nothing herein is to be viewed as inconsistent with joint-rail trail use.																
B	Alameda	new path through rail yard	Constitution Way	Sherman St/Atlantic Ave	0.7	No	To Be Determined							$1,530,000.0	Yes	Yes
All bicycle facilities within Alameda are to be consistent with Surface Transportation Board authorized rail operations and nothing herein is to be viewed as inconsistent with joint-rail trail use.																
C	Alameda	Clement Ave ext (proposed)	Sherman St/Atlantic Ave	Clement Ave/Grand St	0.6	No	To Be Determined							$19,000.0	Yes	Yes
All bicycle facilities within Alameda are to be consistent with Surface Transportation Board authorized rail operations and nothing herein is to be viewed as inconsistent with joint-rail trail use.																
D	Alameda	Clement Ave	Grand St	Tilden Way	1.2	No	To Be Determined							$33,000.0	Yes	Yes
All bicycle facilities within Alameda are to be consistent with Surface Transportation Board authorized rail operations and nothing herein is to be viewed as inconsistent with joint-rail trail use.																
I	Alameda	Fernside Blvd	Blanding Ave	High St	0.5	Yes	Class 2 - Bike Lane							$1,684.0	Yes	
J	Alameda	Fernside Blvd	High St	Encinal Ave	0.8	Yes	Class 2 - Bike Lane							$2,526.0	Yes	

Appendix C-3 DESCRIPTION OF CROSS-COUNTY CORRIDORS

Project: 9 Southern Alameda County I-880 Corridor **Corridor:** 25

Segment	City	Roadway	From	To	Length (miles)	Exist	Recommended Bikeway Type	Improve Interchange	Install Signal	Location	Improve Grates	Improve RR Tracks	Arterial Improvements	Total Cost	Financially Constrained	High Priority
BO	San Leandro	Hesperian Blvd	Halcyon Dr	San Lorenzo Creek/City Limits	1.0	Yes	Class 2 - Bike Lane	Yes		SR 238 at			Yes	$783,120.0		
CA	San Lorenzo	Hesperian Blvd	San Lorenzo Creek/city limit	Via Mercado	0.5	Yes	Class 3 - Bike Route	Yes		I-880 at Hesperian			Yes	$638,093.0	Yes	
CB	San Lorenzo	Hesperian Blvd	Via Mercado	Hacienda Ave	0.3	Yes	Class 3 - Bike Route						Yes	$90,716.0	Yes	
CC	San Lorenzo	Hesperian Blvd	Hacienda Ave	Bockman Rd	0.2	Yes	Class 3 - Bike Route						Yes	$85,046.0	Yes	
CD	San Lorenzo	Hesperian Blvd	Bockman Rd	Penny Ln	0.1	Yes	Class 3 - Bike Route						Yes	$45,358.0	Yes	
CE	San Lorenzo	Hesperian Blvd	Penny Ln	A St/Hayward city limit	0.3	Yes	Class 3 - Bike Route						Yes	$102,056.0	Yes	
JA	Hayward	Hesperian Blvd	A St	La Playa Dr	1.4	Yes	Class 3 - Wide Curb Lane						Yes	$533,000.0	Yes	
JA1	Hayward	La Playa Dr	Hesperian Blvd	Calaroga Ave	0.3	No	Class 3 - Residential Street							$55,000.0	Yes	
JA2	Hayward	Calaroga Ave	La Playa Dr	Catalpa Way	2.3	Yes	Class 2 - Bike Lane							$4,600.0	Yes	
JA3	Hayward	Catalpa Way	Calaroga Ave	Hesperian Blvd	0.2	Yes	Class 2 - Bike Lane							$400.0	Yes	
JA4	Hayward	Hesperian Blvd	Catalpa Way	Industrial Blvd	0.3	Yes	Class 3 - Bike Route							$400.0	Yes	
JB	Hayward	Hesperian Blvd	Industrial Blvd	Tripaldi Way	0.2	Yes	Class 3 - Wide Curb Lane						Yes	$77,850.0	Yes	
JC	Hayward	Hesperian Blvd	Tripaldi Way	Alameda Creek/city limit	0.3	Yes	Class 3 - Bike Route						Yes	$94,536.0	Yes	
JD	Union City	Union City Blvd	Alameda Creek/city limit	Horner St	0.9	Yes	Class 2 - Bike Lane						Yes	$350,000.0	Yes	
JE	Union City	Union City Blvd	Horner St	Alvarado Blvd	0.3	No	To Be Determined						Yes	$200,000.0	Yes	Yes
JF	Union City	Union City Blvd	Alvarado Blvd	Delores Dr	1.5	No	To Be Determined						Yes	$275,000.0	Yes	Yes
JG	Union City	Union City Blvd	Delores Dr	Alameda Creek Bridge	0.7	No	To Be Determined						Yes	$275,000.0	Yes	Yes
JH	Fremont	Ardenwood Blvd	Alameda Creek Bridge -n	Alameda Creek Bridge -s	0.1	No	Class 1 - Improved Bike/Ped Br						Yes	$2,500,000.0	Yes	Yes
JI	Fremont	Ardenwood Blvd	Alameda Creek Bridge -s	Paseo Padre Pkwy	0.3	Yes	Class 2 - Bike Lane						Yes	$126,048.0	Yes	
JJ	Fremont	Ardenwood Blvd	Paseo Padre Pkwy	Tan Oak Dr	0.1	No	Class 2 - Bike Lane						Yes	$38,095.0	Yes	
JK	Fremont	Ardenwood Blvd	Tan Oak Dr	railroad bridge	0.7	Yes	Class 2 - Bike Lane						Yes	$236,340.0	Yes	
JL	Fremont	Ardenwood Blvd	railroad bridge	SR-84 interchange N ramps	0.2	No	Class 2 - Bike Lane						Yes	$76,190.0	Yes	

Appendix C-3 DESCRIPTION OF CROSS-COUNTY CORRIDORS

Project: 39 Tassajara Creek Trail — Corridor: 95

Segment	City	Roadway	From	To	Length (miles)	Exist	Recommended Bikeway Type	Improve Interchange	Install Signal	Location	Improve Grates	Improve RR Tracks	Arterial Improvements	Total Cost	Financially Constrained	High Priority
TB	Dublin	Tassajara Creek Trail	200' n/o Somerset	Dublin Blvd	1.2	Yes	Class 1 - Bike Trail							$783,120.0		

Project: 40 Vasco Road — Corridor: 95

Segment	City	Roadway	From	To	Length (miles)	Exist	Recommended Bikeway Type	Improve Interchange	Install Signal	Location	Improve Grates	Improve RR Tracks	Arterial Improvements	Total Cost	Financially Constrained	High Priority
AA	unincorporated	Vasco Rd	county line	Dalton Ave	4.5	No	Class 2 - Bike Lane							$191,318.0		
AB	Livermore	Vasco Rd	Dalton Ave	Garaventa Ranch Dr	0.3	Yes	Class 2 - Bike Lane							$1,092.0		
AC	Livermore	Vasco Rd	Garaventa Ranch Dr	Northfront Rd	0.7	Yes	Class 2 - Bike Lane							$2,496.0		
AD	Livermore	Vasco Rd	Northfront Rd	I-580 bridge-N	0.2	No	Class 2 - Bike Lane							$6,377.0		
AE	Livermore	Vasco Rd	I-580 Bridge - N	I-580 Bridge -S	0.1	No	Class 2 - Bike Lane	Yes		I-580 at Vasco Rd			Yes	$506,095.0		
AF	Livermore	Vasco Rd	I-580 bridge-S	Preston Ave	0.2	No	Class 2 - Bike Lane						Yes	$68,777.0		
AG	Livermore	Vasco Rd	Preston Ave	East Ave	1.9	Yes	Class 2 - Bike Lane						Yes	$535,704.0		
AH	Livermore	Vasco Rd	East Ave	Tesla Rd	1.0	Yes	Class 2 - Bike Lane							$31,886.0		
AI	unincorporated	Tesla Rd	Vasco Rd	Mines Rd	0.8	No	Class 2 - Bike Lane							$28,698.0		

Project: 41 Damon Slough Bridge — Corridor: 5

Segment	City	Roadway	From	To	Length (miles)	Exist	Recommended Bikeway Type	Improve Interchange	Install Signal	Location	Improve Grates	Improve RR Tracks	Arterial Improvements	Total Cost	Financially Constrained	High Priority
BA	Oakland	new bike/ped bridge	slough-n	slough-s	0.0	Yes	New Bike/Ped Bridge							$1,560,187.0	Yes	

Project: 42 San Leandro Slough Bridge — Corridor: 5

Segment	City	Roadway	From	To	Length (miles)	Exist	Recommended Bikeway Type	Improve Interchange	Install Signal	Location	Improve Grates	Improve RR Tracks	Arterial Improvements	Total Cost	Financially Constrained	High Priority
BF	San Leandro	bike/ped bridge	slough-n	slough-s	0.2	No	New Bike/Ped Bridge							$1,560,187.0	Yes	Yes

Project: 43 Cerrito Creek Bridge — Corridor: 25

Segment	City	Roadway	From	To	Length (miles)	Exist	Recommended Bikeway Type	Improve Interchange	Install Signal	Location	Improve Grates	Improve RR Tracks	Arterial Improvements	Total Cost	Financially Constrained	High Priority
AA	Albany	new bridge	El Cerrito	Albany	0.1	No	New Bike/Ped Bridge							$1,560,187.0		

Appendix C-3 DESCRIPTION OF CROSS-COUNTY CORRIDORS

Project: 44 42nd Avenue Bridge — Corridor: 25

Segment	City	Roadway	From	To	Length (miles)	Exist	Recommended Bikeway Type	Improve Interchange	Install Signal	Location	Improve Grates	Improve RR Tracks	Arterial Improvements	Total Cost	Financially Constrained	High Priority
BI	Oakland	existing bridge	n/o of 42nd Ave	s/o of 42nd Ave	0.0	No	Improved Overpass							$1,560,187.0		

Project: 45 Hegenberger Undercrossing — Corridor: 25

Segment	City	Roadway	From	To	Length (miles)	Exist	Recommended Bikeway Type	Improve Interchange	Install Signal	Location	Improve Grates	Improve RR Tracks	Arterial Improvements	Total Cost	Financially Constrained	High Priority
BK	Oakland	improve undercrossing	s/o Hegenberger	n/o Hegenberger	0.1	No	Improved Underpass							$1,560,187.0		

Project: 46 Emeryville Ped/Bike Overcrossing — Corridor: 45

Segment	City	Roadway	From	To	Length (miles)	Exist	Recommended Bikeway Type	Improve Interchange	Install Signal	Location	Improve Grates	Improve RR Tracks	Arterial Improvements	Total Cost	Financially Constrained	High Priority
AA	Emeryville	Emeryville overcrossing	Bay Trail	Shellmound St	0.3	No	New Overpass							$7,800,936.0	Yes	

Project: 47 Highway 24 Ped/Bike Overcrossing — Corridor: 45

Segment	City	Roadway	From	To	Length (miles)	Exist	Recommended Bikeway Type	Improve Interchange	Install Signal	Location	Improve Grates	Improve RR Tracks	Arterial Improvements	Total Cost	Financially Constrained	High Priority
AL	Oakland	bike/ped overcrossing	Tunnel Rd	Broadway	0.2	No	New Overpass							$7,800,936.0		

Project: 48 Bridge over Altamont Creek — Corridor: 40

Segment	City	Roadway	From	To	Length (miles)	Exist	Recommended Bikeway Type	Improve Interchange	Install Signal	Location	Improve Grates	Improve RR Tracks	Arterial Improvements	Total Cost	Financially Constrained	High Priority
TA08	Livermore	Bridge - Las Positas Creek Tra	west side of Altamont Creek	east side of Altamont Creek	0.0	No	New Bike/Ped Bridge							$1,560,312.0		

Project: 49 Fremont — Corridor: 5

Segment	City	Roadway	From	To	Length (miles)	Exist	Recommended Bikeway Type	Improve Interchange	Install Signal	Location	Improve Grates	Improve RR Tracks	Arterial Improvements	Total Cost	Financially Constrained	High Priority
AA	Fremont	Alameda Creek Crossing	Bay Trail	Bay View Trail	0.1	No	New Bike/Ped Bridge							$4,000,000.0		

Project: 50 Livermore Ave Undercrossing — Corridor: 40

Segment	City	Roadway	From	To	Length (miles)	Exist	Recommended Bikeway Type	Improve Interchange	Install Signal	Location	Improve Grates	Improve RR Tracks	Arterial Improvements	Total Cost	Financially Constrained	High Priority
TA04	Livermore	Las Positas Creek Trail	west side of Las Positas Creek	east side of Las Positas Creek	0.1	No	New Underpass							$3,120,624.0		

Project: 51 Oakland-Alameda Connection — Corridor: 15

Segment	City	Roadway	From	To	Length (miles)	Exist	Recommended Bikeway Type	Improve Interchange	Install Signal	Location	Improve Grates	Improve RR Tracks	Arterial Improvements	Total Cost	Financially Constrained	High Priority

Appendix C-3 DESCRIPTION OF CROSS-COUNTY CORRIDORS

Project: 51 Oakland-Alameda Connection — Corridor: 15

Segment	City	Roadway	From	To	Length (miles)	Exist	Recommended Bikeway Type	Improve Interchange	Install Signal	Location	Improve Grates	Improve RR Tracks	Arterial Improvements	Total Cost	Financially Constrained	High Priority
SPR1B	Alameda	connection	Constitution Way Trail	Oakland Bay Trail	0.5	No	To Be Determined							$7,800,780.0		

Project: 52 Arroyo Mocho Trail — Corridor: 50

Segment	City	Roadway	From	To	Length (miles)	Exist	Recommended Bikeway Type	Improve Interchange	Install Signal	Location	Improve Grates	Improve RR Tracks	Arterial Improvements	Total Cost	Financially Constrained	High Priority
TA1	Pleasanton	Arroyo Mocho Trail	Alamo Canal	Pleasanton city limit - east	3.5	Yes	Class 1 - Bike Trail							$2,740,920.0		
TA2	unincorporated	Arroyo Mocho Trail	Pleasanton city limit - east	Livermore city limit - west	0.3	No	Class 1 - Bike Trail							$2,740,920.0		

Project: 53 Brushy Peak to Del Valle Trail — Corridor: 95

Segment	City	Roadway	From	To	Length (miles)	Exist	Recommended Bikeway Type	Improve Interchange	Install Signal	Location	Improve Grates	Improve RR Tracks	Arterial Improvements	Total Cost	Financially Constrained	High Priority
TA	Livermore	Del Valle Trail to Brushy Peak	Del Valle Regional Park	Iron Horse Trail	12.8	No	Class 1 - Bike Trail							$5,481,840.0		

Project: 54 Central Alameda - Harbor Bay Ferry — Corridor: 105

Segment	City	Roadway	From	To	Length (miles)	Exist	Recommended Bikeway Type	Improve Interchange	Install Signal	Location	Improve Grates	Improve RR Tracks	Arterial Improvements	Total Cost	Financially Constrained	High Priority
A	Alameda	Main St/Central Ave	Ferry terminal	Lincoln Ave	1.3	Yes	Class 1 - Bike Trail							$2,200.0		
B	Alameda	Central Ave	Lincoln Ave	Grand St	1.9	No	Class 2 - Bike Lane							$117,000.0		
C	Alameda	Central Ave	Grand St	High St	1.6	Yes	Class 2 - Bike Lane							$3,200.0		
D	Alameda	Central Ave	High St	Fernside Blvd	0.2	Yes	Class 3 - Bike Route							$500.0		
E	Alameda	Island Dr	bike/ped bridge	Mecartney Rd	0.8	Yes	Class 1 - Bike Trail							$1,500.0		
F	Alameda	Mecartney Rd	Island Dr	Aughinbaugh Way	0.7	Yes	Class 1 - Bike Trail							$1,300.0		
G	Alameda	Mecartney Rd	Aughinbaugh Way	Adelphian Rd	0.3	Yes	Class 2 - Bike Lane							$500.0		

Project: 55 Alamo Canal-580/680 Connector — Corridor: 65

Segment	City	Roadway	From	To	Length (miles)	Exist	Recommended Bikeway Type	Improve Interchange	Install Signal	Location	Improve Grates	Improve RR Tracks	Arterial Improvements	Total Cost	Financially Constrained	High Priority
AA	Dublin	Alamo Canal Trail	San Ramon Creek Trail	Alamo Canal Trail	0.1	No	New Underpass							$3,100,000.0		Yes

Appendix C-3 DESCRIPTION OF CROSS-COUNTY CORRIDORS

Project: 56 Emeryville Bike/Ped Bridge — Corridor: 5

Segment	City	Roadway	From	To	Length (miles)	Exist	Recommended Bikeway Type	Improve Interchange	Install Signal	Location	Improve Grates	Improve RR Tracks	Arterial Improvements	Total Cost	Financially Constrained	High Priority
AA	Emeryville	new overcrossing	Shellmound St	Horton St	0.1	No	New Overpass							$7,800,000.0	Yes	Yes
BB	Emeryville	Ohlone Way	New Overcrossing	Shellmound	0.0	No	Class 3 - Bike Route							$1,000.0	Yes	

Segment is less than 0.1 miles in length

Project: 57 Fremont Central - Peralta — Corridor: 120

Segment	City	Roadway	From	To	Length (miles)	Exist	Recommended Bikeway Type	Improve Interchange	Install Signal	Location	Improve Grates	Improve RR Tracks	Arterial Improvements	Total Cost	Financially Constrained	High Priority
A	Newark	Central Ave	Morten Ave/RR ROW	I-880	1.4	No	Class 3 - Bike Route							$65,000.0	Yes	
B	Fremont	Central Ave	I-880	Fremont Blvd	1.3	No	Class 2 - Bike Lane							$55,000.0	Yes	
C	Fremont	Fremont Blvd	Central Ave	Peralta Blvd	0.2	No	Class 2 - Bike Lane							$10,000.0	Yes	
D	Fremont	Peralta Blvd	Fremont Blvd	Mowry Ave	1.6	No	Class 2 - Bike Lane							$80,000.0	Yes	
E	Fremont	Mowry Ave	Peralta Blvd	Mission Blvd	0.9	No	Class 2 - Bike Lane							$39,000.0	Yes	

Project: 58 Fremont - Santa Clara — Corridor: 25

Segment	City	Roadway	From	To	Length (miles)	Exist	Recommended Bikeway Type	Improve Interchange	Install Signal	Location	Improve Grates	Improve RR Tracks	Arterial Improvements	Total Cost	Financially Constrained	High Priority
A	Fremont	Fremont Blvd	S Grimmer Blvd	county line	3.7	No	Class 2 - Bike Lane							$850,000.0	Yes	Yes

Project: 59 Albany - Berkeley — Corridor: 100

Segment	City	Roadway	From	To	Length (miles)	Exist	Recommended Bikeway Type	Improve Interchange	Install Signal	Location	Improve Grates	Improve RR Tracks	Arterial Improvements	Total Cost	Financially Constrained	High Priority
A	Albany	Buchanan St	bike/ped overcrossing	San Pablo Ave	0.7	No	Class 1 - Bike Trail							$1,100,000.0	Yes	Yes
B	Albany	Marin Ave	San Pablo Ave	Tulare Ave	0.9	Yes	Class 2 - Bike Lane							$1,700.0	Yes	
C	Berkeley	Marin Ave	Tulare St	Marin Circle	0.6	Yes	Class 2 - Bike Lane							$1,200.0	Yes	
D	Berkeley	Los Angeles Ave	Marin Circle	Spruce St	0.3	No	Class 3 - Residential Street							$36,000.0	Yes	

Project: 60 Hesperian - Mission — Corridor: 110

Segment	City	Roadway	From	To	Length (miles)	Exist	Recommended Bikeway Type	Improve Interchange	Install Signal	Location	Improve Grates	Improve RR Tracks	Arterial Improvements	Total Cost	Financially Constrained	High Priority
A	Hayward	Industrial Blvd	Hesperian Blvd	Ruus Rd	1.4	Yes	Class 3 - Bike Route							$3,000.0		

Comments on:
Alameda Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Updates -
Revised Capital Projects Networks AND
Proposed Cost Estimating Approaches

Prepared By:

Comments Due By:
Monday, August 1, 2011, 5:00pm to
Rochelle Wheeler, rwheeler@alamedactc.org

Agency/Group:

MEMO (Networks or Costs) and PAGE # (if applicable)	Bike, Ped, or Bike & Ped	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 21, 2011

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

	Meeting Date	Meeting Purpose
1	October 21, 2009	• Input on Plan Updates Request for Proposals Scope of Work
2	June 3, 2010	• Introduce consultant team • Review approach and timeline • Input on Tables of Contents • Input on Local Agency Questionnaire • Input on Outreach
3	September 22, 2010	• Input on Existing Conditions Draft Chapters • Outreach Strategy
4	October 20, 2010	• Discussion of proposed approaches to Bike and Ped Networks (Vision/Goals)
5	December 8, 2010	• Input on Evaluation of Current Practices Draft Chapter • Input on Vision/Goals Draft Chapters
6	February 9, 2011	• Priority Projects/Programs (Vision Networks)
7	March 23, 2011	• Priority Projects/Programs (Prioritization Approach)
8	June 8, 2011	• Draft Programs Approach
9	**July 27, 2011**	• **Revised Draft Vision and Priority Capital Projects Networks: Review of Input and Direction** • **Input on Capital Project Cost Estimating Approach**
10	October 2011, date TBD	• Implementation Draft Chapters
11	January 2012, date TBD	• Full Draft Plans

This page intentionally left blank.