



**METROPOLITAN  
TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION**

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter  
101 Eighth Street  
Oakland, CA 94607-4700  
TEL 510.817.5700  
TTY/TDD 510.817.5769  
FAX 510.817.5848  
EMAIL info@mtc.ca.gov  
WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

**ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKING GROUP: AGENDA**

**MEETING NOTICE**

Thursday, January 21, 2016  
9:30 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.  
101 Eighth Street  
Oakland, California 94607  
Fishbowl Conference Room, 3rd Floor

Chair: Sean Co  
Co-Chair: Brad Beck  
Staff Contact: Kevin Mulder  
Call-in #: 888-273-3658  
Access code: 9427202

1. **Introductions - All** 9:30 a.m.
2. **MTC Bicycle and Pedestrian Counts** – Kevin Mulder, MTC, will report out on the Data Subcommittee’s recommendation for the bicycle & pedestrian count program FY 15-16. 9:35 a.m.
3. **ATP Guidelines Discussion** – Darryl Yip & Kevin Mulder, MTC, will review MTC’s draft proposed changes to the Active Transportation Program Cycle 3 Guidelines. 9:50 a.m.
4. **Complete Streets Checklist** – For group discussion: Group members’ suggested revisions to the Complete Streets checklist will be discussed for inclusion prior to the OBAG 2 call for projects. 10:10 a.m.
5. **Bike Share Update** – Kevin Mulder, MTC will provide a brief update on the bike share expansion following execution of all required agreements in December. 11:30 a.m.
6. **Announcements/Next Meeting** – Please direct suggestions for future meeting topics to MTC Staff. 11:40 a.m.

**Next Meeting:**

**Thursday, March 17, 2016\***

**\*Note: The ATWG meeting is the 3<sup>rd</sup> Thursday every other month starting in January**

*Members will alternate taking meeting notes and typing them up for distribution.*

J:\COMMITTEE\Active Transportation Working Group\2015 ATWG\July 2015\Agenda ATWG 7\_16.docx

*Dave Cortese, Chair*  
Santa Clara County

*Jake Mackenzie, Vice Chair*  
Sonoma County and Cities

*Alicia C. Aguirre*  
Cities of San Mateo County

*Tom Azumbrado*  
U.S. Department of Housing  
and Urban Development

*Jason Baker*  
Cities of Santa Clara County

*Tom Bates*  
Cities of Alameda County

*David Campos*  
City and County of San Francisco

*Dorene M. Giacomini*  
U.S. Department of Transportation

*Federal D. Glover*  
Contra Costa County

*Scott Haggerty*  
Alameda County

*Anne W. Halsted*  
San Francisco Bay Conservation  
and Development Commission

*Steve Kinsey*  
Marin County and Cities

*Sam Liccardo*  
San Jose Mayor’s Appointee

*Mark Luce*  
Napa County and Cities

*Julie Pierce*  
Association of Bay Area Governments

*Bijan Sartipi*  
California State  
Transportation Agency

*Libby Schaaf*  
Oakland Mayor’s Appointee

*James P. Spering*  
Solano County and Cities

*Adrienne J. Tissier*  
San Mateo County

*Scott Wiener*  
San Francisco Mayor’s Appointee

*Amy Rein Worth*  
Cities of Contra Costa County

*Steve Heminger*  
Executive Director

*Alix Bockelman*  
Deputy Executive Director, Policy

*Andrew B. Fremier*  
Deputy Executive Director, Operations

## Active Transportation Program Cycle 3 Guidelines

Highlight of Proposed Changes: January 14, 2016

---

### Program Years and Estimated Funding for Cycle 3 ATP

- FY 2019-20: \$10 million (Regional); \$60 million (Statewide)
- FY 2020-21: \$10 million (Regional); \$60 million (Statewide)
- Funding may increase due to increased FAST Act funding

### Proposed Guideline Updates

Due to the short timeframe to adopt the rATP3 Guidelines, staff recommends keeping the statewide application process, with minor changes as described below:

1. Revise the Disadvantaged Communities portion of the Statewide Application as follows:
  - a. Reduce scoring for Disadvantaged Communities from 10 points to 6 points in statewide application, and add 4 points for projects identified in an approved Community-Based Transportation Plan (CBTP). Proof of CBTP consistency will be provided in the supplemental regional application.
  - b. MTC will continue to use the Communities of Concern definition to meet the 25% statutory minimum for Disadvantaged Communities.
2. Create a set aside for smaller funding requests to encourage smaller project applications
  - a. 20% of rATP funds (\$4M) for project requests \$1 million and under, and may receive state-only funds. If this target is not met, projects requesting \$1 million and under scoring five or fewer points under the lowest-scoring funded project may be added to the Program to meet the 20% target.
  - b. Remaining rATP funds (\$16M) may be used for project requests of any size.
  - c. Existing minimum project size requirements from CTC still apply (\$250,000 minimum, except for non-infrastructure, SRTS, and plans).
3. Maintain existing supplemental regional criteria (plus CBTP addition from bullet 1)
  - a. Regional priority (5 points)
  - b. Completion of environmental document (3 points)
  - c. Consistency with OBAG Complete Streets Policy (2 points)
  - d. Consistency with Countywide Plan/Goals (0 or -2 points)
  - e. Deliverability (0 or -5 points)
  - f. CBTP consistency (see bullet 1a, above)
4. Maintain match requirement from Cycle 2
  - a. 11.47% match required, waivers for COC, non-infrastructure, SRTS, and construction projects where pre-construction was funded using non-federal non-ATP funds
5. Maintain adoption of Contingency Project List

### Schedule

- January 2016 – Discussion at Working Groups
- February 10/24, 2016 – PAC and Commission consideration of rATP3 Guidelines (Res. 4218)
- March 16-17, 2016 – CTC approves both statewide and MTC's regional ATP3 Guidelines
- April 2016 – Applicant workshops around the region
- June 1, 2016 – Application due date
- December 14/21 – Est. PAC and Commission consideration of rATP3 Program (Res. 4218, Rev.)
- Early 2017 – Est. CTC adoption statewide and regional ATP3 projects (April 1, 2017 is deadline)



# COMPLETE STREETS CHECKLIST

Project title:  
 County:  
 Jurisdiction/agency:  
 Project location:  
 Contact name:  
 Contact phone:  
 Contact e-mail:

## Preamble

Recent federal, state and regional policies call for the routine consideration of bicyclists and pedestrians in the planning, design and construction of all transportation projects. These policies—known as “Routine Accommodation” guidelines—are included in the federal surface transportation act (SAFETEA-LU), Caltrans Deputy Directive 64, and MTC Resolution 3765, which calls for the creation of this checklist.

In accordance with MTC Resolution 3765, agencies applying for regional transportation funds must complete this checklist to document how the needs of bicyclists *and* pedestrians were considered in the process of planning and/or designing the project for which funds are being requested. For projects that do not accommodate bicyclists *and* pedestrians, project sponsors must document why not. According to the resolution, the checklist is intended for use on projects at their earliest conception or design phase.

This guidance pertains to transportation projects that could in any way impact bicycle and/or pedestrian use, whether or not the proposed project is designed to accommodate either or both modes. Projects that do not affect the public right-of-way, such as bus-washers and emergency communications equipment, are exempt from completing the checklist.

## I. Existing Conditions

### 1 PROJECT AREA

- a. What accommodations for bicycles and pedestrians are included on the current facility and on facilities that it intersects or crosses?

- b. If there are no existing pedestrian or bicycle facilities, how far from the proposed project are the closest parallel bikeways and walkways?

- c. Please describe any particular pedestrian or bicycle uses or needs along the project corridor which you have observed or of which you have been informed.

- d. What existing challenges could the proposed project address for bicycle and pedestrian travel in the vicinity of the proposed project?

### 2 DEMAND

What trip generators (existing and future) are in the vicinity of the proposed project that might attract walking or bicycling customers, employees, students, visitors or others?

### 3 COLLISIONS

In the project design, have you considered collisions involving bicyclists and pedestrians along the route of the facility? If so, what resources have you consulted?

## II. Plans, Policies and Process

### 4 PLANS

- a. Do any adopted plans call for the development of bicycle or pedestrian facilities on, crossing or adjacent to the proposed facility/project? If yes, list the applicable plan(s).

- b. Is the proposed project consistent with these plans?

### 5 POLICIES, DESIGN STANDARDS & GUIDELINES

- a. Are there any local, statewide or federal *policies* that call for incorporating bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities into this project? If so, have these policies been followed?

- b. If this project includes a bicycle and/or pedestrian facility, have all applicable *design standards* or *guidelines* been followed?

### 6 REVIEW

If there have been BPAC, stakeholder and/or public meetings at which the proposed project has been discussed, what comments have been made regarding bicycle and pedestrian accommodations?

## III. The Project

### 7 PROJECT SCOPE

What accommodations, if any, are included for bicyclists and pedestrians in the proposed project design?

### 8 HINDERING BICYCLISTS/PEDESTRIANS

- a. Will the proposed project remove an existing bicycle or pedestrian facility or block or hinder bicycle or pedestrian movement? If yes, please describe situation in detail.

- b. If the proposed project does not incorporate both bicycle and pedestrian facilities, or if the proposed project would hinder bicycle or pedestrian travel, list reasons why the project is being proposed as designed.

- Cost (What would be the cost of the bicycle and/or pedestrian facility and the proportion of the total project cost?)

- Right-of-way (Did an analysis lead to this conclusion?)

- Other (Please explain.)

### 9 CONSTRUCTION PERIOD

How will access for bicyclists and pedestrians be maintained during project construction?

### 10 ONGOING MAINTENANCE

What agency will be responsible for ongoing maintenance of the facility and how will this be budgeted?

Project:

[All checklists](#)

Checklist:

**Online Checklist (blank)**


Name
Description
Status
Project
City
Contact Name
Contact Email
Contact Phone
Contact Address

1a	<b>What accommodations for bicycles and pedestrians are now included on the current facility and on facilities that it intersects or crosses?</b>	Class I bicycle paths Class II bicycle lanes Class III bicycle routes Bicycle Boulevards Bicycle parking <b>Sidewalks on one side or both sides of street</b> <b>Frequent crosswalks</b> Narrow unpaved path Pedestrian-actuated traffic signals or routine pedestrian cycle Bicycle actuated traffic signals or routine bicyclist cycle High visibility crosswalks Pedestrian-level lighting <b>ADA-compliant ramps</b> <b>Traffic signal push buttons</b> <b>Refuge islands on roadways</b> Transit shelter Wide curb lanes Right turn only lanes Transit vehicle stops Pedestrian count down signals None
----	---	--

Other

Please provide specifics of any items checked above.

1b	<b>If there are no existing pedestrian or bicycle facilities, how far from the proposed project are the closest parallel bikeways and walkways?</b>	0-1/4 mile 1/4 mile to 1/2 mile 1/2 mile to 1 mile 1+ mile
----	---	---

Other

1c	<b>Please indicate any particular pedestrian uses or needs along the project corridor that you have observed or have been informed of.</b>	Improved lighting Lack of sidewalk <b>Intersection improvements</b> Mid-block crossings Elderly or disabled School age children Transit shelter
----	--	---

		<p><b>Lack of ADA facilities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Narrow curb lanes</li> <li>Lack of bicycle parking</li> <li>Unresponsive signals to bicycles</li> <li>Long signal cycles which require pedestrians to wait long periods of time</li> <li>Choke points</li> <li>RR crossings</li> <li>No bike racks on busses</li> <li>Short signal crossing times</li> <li>Narrow undercrossings</li> <li>Right turn only lanes</li> <li>None</li> </ul>
		<b>Other</b>
1d	<p><b>What existing challenges could the proposed project improve for bicycle, pedestrian, or transit travel in the vicinity of the proposed project?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unresponsive signals to bicycles</li> <li>Lack of bicycle parking</li> <li>Freeway on-off ramps</li> <li>Narrow curb lanes</li> <li>Choke points</li> <li>RR crossings</li> <li>No bike racks on buses</li> <li>Wide roadway crossings</li> <li>Long signal cycles which require pedestrians to wait long periods of time</li> <li>Short signal crossing times</li> <li>Narrow undercrossings, overcrossings</li> <li><b>Sidewalk obstruction or missing sidewalk</b></li> <li>Pedestrian-level lighting</li> <li><b>ADA compliant facilities</b></li> <li>Transit vehicle stops</li> </ul>
		<b>Other</b>
2a	<p><b>What trip generators (existing and future) are in the vicinity of the proposed project that might attract walking or bicycling customers, employees, students, visitors or others?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Educational institutions</li> <li>Transit stations</li> <li>Senior centers</li> <li>High-density land uses</li> <li><b>Downtowns</b></li> <li>Shopping areas</li> <li>Medical centers</li> <li>Major public venues</li> <li>Government buildings</li> <li>Parks</li> </ul>
		<b>Other</b>
3a	<p><b>Have you considered collisions involving bicyclists and pedestrians along the route of the facility?</b></p> <p><b>If so, what resources have you consulted?</b></p>	
4a	<p><b>Do any adopted plans call for the development of bicycle or pedestrian facilities on, crossing or adjacent to the proposed facility/project?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City or town bicycle plan</li> <li>Countywide bicycle plan</li> <li>City or town pedestrian plan</li> <li>Countywide pedestrian plan</li> <li>Combined bicycle and pedestrian plan</li> <li>ADA transition plan</li> <li>General plan</li> <li>Specific plan</li> <li>Regional transportation Plan</li> <li>Sales tax expenditure plan</li> <li>Station area access plan</li> <li><b>No plans</b></li> </ul>
		<b>Other</b>

	<b>Is the proposed project consistent with these plans?</b>	No
5a	<b>Do any local, statewide or federal policies call for incorporating bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities into this project?</b>	Caltrans Deputy Directive 64 Caltrans Highway Design Manual (Chapter 1000) ACR 211 MUTCD 2003 MUTCD California supplement Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG) MTC Pedestrian Districts Study
		<b>Other</b>
	<b>If so, have the policies been followed?</b>	
5b	<b>If this project includes a bicycle and/or pedestrian facility, have all applicable design standards or guidelines been followed?</b>	
6a	<b>If there have been BPAC, stakeholder and/or public meetings at which the proposed project has been discussed, what comments have been made regarding bicycle and pedestrian accommodations?</b>	
7a	<b>What accommodations, if any, are included for bicyclists and pedestrians in the proposed project design?</b>	Class I bicycle paths Class II bicycle lanes Class III bicycle routes Bicycle Boulevards Bicycle parking <b>Sidewalks on both sides of street</b> Widened sidewalks <b>Frequent crosswalks</b> Narrow unpaved path Bicycle actuated traffic signals High visibility crosswalks Pedestrian-level lighting <b>ADA-compliant ramps</b> Traffic signal push buttons Refuge islands on roadways
		<b>Other</b>
8a	<b>Will the proposed project remove an existing bicycle or pedestrian facility or block or hinder bicycle or pedestrian movement?</b>	
	<b>If yes, please describe situation in detail.</b>	
8b	<b>If the proposed project does not incorporate either bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or if the proposed project would hinder bicycle or pedestrian travel, list reasons why the project cannot be re-designed to accommodate these facilities.</b>	
	<b>What would be the cost of the bicycle and/or pedestrian facility?</b>	
	<b>What is the bicycle and/or pedestrian facility's proportion of the total project cost?</b>	
	<b>Right-of-way. (Did an analysis lead to this conclusion?)</b>	
9a	<b>How will access for bicyclists and pedestrians be maintained during project construction?</b>	Alternative signed bicycle route Alternative signed pedestrian route Separated pedestrian pathway
		<b>Other</b>
10a	<b>What agency will be responsible for ongoing maintenance of the facility?</b>	
10b	<b>How will ongoing maintenance be budgeted?</b>	