BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN
FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BPC)

Wednesday, January 8, 2014, 6:00 p.m.

TRANSPORTATION AGENCY FOR MONTEREY COUNTY
(TAMC)
CONFERENCE ROOM
55-B PLAZA CIRCLE, SALINAS, CA 93901

AGENDA

Complete agenda packets are on display at the Transportation Agency for Monterey County office and at these public libraries: Carmel, Monterey, Salinas Steinbeck Branch, Seaside, Prunedale, and King City. Any person who has a question concerning an item on this agenda may call the Transportation Agency office to make an inquiry concerning the nature of the item described on the agenda. Please recycle this agenda.

1. **ROLL CALL:** Call to order and self-introductions. Committee bylaws specify that a quorum shall consist of a majority (7) of the number of voting memberships actually filled at that time (13); the existence of any vacancies shall not be counted for purposes of establishing a quorum. If you are unable to attend, please contact the Transportation Agency. Your courtesy to the other Committee members to assure a quorum is appreciated.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS:** Any member of the public may address the Committee on any item not on the agenda but within the jurisdiction of the Committee. Each member of the public is allotted with three minutes to address any concerns. Comments on items on today’s agenda may be given when that agenda item is discussed.

**BEGINNING OF CONSENT AGENDA:** Approve the staff recommendations for items 3.1 to 3.2 below by majority vote with one motion. Any member may pull an item off the Consent Agenda to be moved to the end of the **CONSENT AGENDA** for discussion and action.

| 3.1 | APPROVE minutes of Committee meeting of November 6, 2013. – Green Pages 5 - 8 |
3.2 RECEIVE report on proposed federal bicycle and pedestrian legislation.
– Watson Pages 9 - 14

This report contains information about a new federal proposal to set new measures and targets for bicycle and pedestrian safety, separate from motorized transportation safety measures and targets.

END OF CONSENT AGENDA

4. PROVIDE input on strategy for allocating Transportation Development Act 2% program funds for bicycle and pedestrian projects. – Cook Pages 15 - 16

The Transportation Agency manages the Transportation Development Act 2% program, which provides funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects of regional significance. For the next funding cycle, staff is recommending that the Agency issue a combined call for projects with its discretionary Regional Surface Transportation Program to maximize funding available for bicycle and pedestrian projects.

5. DISCUSS Bike Week activities in 2014. – Cook No Enclosure

The Transportation Agency funded and coordinated a Monterey County Bike Week public awareness campaign through 2012, which was timed to coordinate with National Bike Month. Staff is requesting input from the Committee on activities to promote as part of a county bike week campaign in May, 2014, which the Agency could allocate limited funding to this year.

6. DISCUSS possible candidates for the League of American Bicyclists 2014 Bicycle Friendly Community application. – Cook Pages 17 - 18

The League of American Bicyclists awards Bicycle Friendly Community designations to jurisdictions that apply and receive gold, silver or bronze ratings. The next deadline for applications to receive this designation is February 19, 2014.

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS and/or COMMENTS from Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee members on bicycle and pedestrian related items that are not on the agenda. No Enclosure

8. ADJOURN
ANNOUNCEMENTS

Next Committee meeting:
Wednesday, February 5, 2014
Transportation Agency for Monterey County Conference Room
55-B Plaza Circle, Salinas, California 93901
Light refreshments will be provided

If you have any items for the next agenda, please submit them to:
Andy Cook, Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator
By Thursday, January 20, 2014
andy@tamcmonterey.org

Documents relating to an item on the open session that are distributed to the Committee less than 72 hours prior to the meeting shall be available for public inspection at the office of the Transportation Agency for Monterey County, 55-B Plaza Circle, Salinas, CA. Documents distributed to the Committee at the meeting by staff will be available at the meeting; documents distributed to the Committee by members of the public shall be made available after the meeting.

Transportation Agency for Monterey County
55-B Plaza Circle, Salinas, CA 93901-2902
Monday thru Friday
8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
TEL: 831-775-0903
FAX: 831-775-0897

The Committee Agenda will be prepared by Agency staff and will close at noon January 20, 2014 nine (9) working days before the regular meeting. Any member may request in writing an item to appear on the agenda. The request shall be made by the agenda deadline and any supporting papers must be furnished by that time or be readily available.

If requested, the agenda shall be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 USC Sec. 12132), and the federal rules and regulations adopted in implementation thereof. Individuals requesting a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, may contact Transportation Agency at 831-775-0903. Auxiliary aids or services include wheelchair accessible facilities, sign language interpreters, Spanish Language interpreters and printed materials, and printed materials in large print, Braille or on disk. These requests may be made by a person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in the public meeting, and should be made at least 72 hours before the meeting. All reasonable efforts will be made to accommodate the request.
**CORRESPONDENCE, REPORTS, MEDIA CLIPPINGS**

This agenda with all attachments is available online at [http://tamcmonterey.org/committees/bpc/meetings.html](http://tamcmonterey.org/committees/bpc/meetings.html)

### Correspondence

| C1 | November 25, 2013 letter from Debra L. Hale, Executive Director, to Diana Jiminez, North Monterey County League of United Latin American Citizens re: Need for Safe and Accessible Bicycle Trails Connecting the Castroville Community. | Pages 19 – 21 |

### Reports, Meetings, Announcements and Publications

| R1 | Bicycling Monterey: Avoid Ticket – Bike Law Summary and Resources | Pages 22 – 23 |

### Media Clippings

| M1 | October 3, 2013 article in *KION 46 Central Coast News*, “East Alisal Businesses Upset Over Ciclovia Street Closures in Salinas.” |
| M2 | October 6, 2013 article in *Salinas Californian*, “Salinas Ciclovia Event Under Way.” |
| M4 | October 7, 2013 article in *Monterey County Herald*, “Salinas Cyclists Pedal for a Better Community.” |
| M6 | October 13, 2013 article in *Monterey County Weekly*, “Two Years After Caltrans Rejected a Grant Application, Carmel Looks to Improve Bicycle Safety.” |
| M7 | October 31, 2013 article in *Monterey County Herald*, “Police Briefs: Young Bicyclist Hurt in Bus Accident.” |
| M8 | December 7, 2013 article in Salinas Californian, “Fixie Fixation.” [https://www.thecalifornian.com/article/20131207/NEWS01/312050057/](https://www.thecalifornian.com/article/20131207/NEWS01/312050057/) |
# TRANSPORTATION AGENCY FOR MONTEREY COUNTY (TAMC)

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee**

**Draft Minutes of November 6, 2013**

Held at the Transportation Agency for Monterey County

55-B Plaza Circle, Salinas, CA

## Voting Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>MAR 13</th>
<th>APR 13</th>
<th>MAY 13</th>
<th>JUN 13</th>
<th>AUG 13</th>
<th>SEP 13</th>
<th>OCT 13</th>
<th>NOV 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eric Petersen, District 1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.L. Johnson, District 2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Wriedt, District 4 (Frank Henderson)</td>
<td>P(A)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P(A)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Lindenthal, District 5 (Geof Tibbits)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devin Meheen, Carmel-By-The Sea</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Ragsdale-Cronin, Del Rey Oaks</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzales - Vacant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield - Vacant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King City - Vacant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina - Vacant (Debra Daniels)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Meehan, Monterey</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Roehl, Pacific Grove (Tony Prock)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge Alan Hedegard, Salinas, Vice-Chair (Chris Flescher)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P(A)</td>
<td>P(A)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand City - Vacant (Mike Morris)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Yenovkian, Seaside (Jan Valencia)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soledad - Vacant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Craft, MBUAPCD</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Cappelli, Velo Club of Monterey (Robin Harness)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Garcia, FORA (Jim Arnold)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. County Recreation &amp; Park District - Vacant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Non Voting Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Serrano, Salinas Public Works</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Lopez, County Public Works (Oga Carranza)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Fukushima, Caltrans - District 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasha Tepedelenova, AMBAG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Cole, Pebble Beach Company</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Tolbert – CSUMB</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Chairman Eric Petersen called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. A quorum was established and self-introductions were made. Susan Ragsdale-Cronin was asked to introduce herself as the new representative for the City of Del Rey Oaks.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS
Megan Tolbert was acknowledged for her recognition in the October 31-November 6 Monterey County Weekly feature “25 for the next 25.”

3. BEGINNING OF CONSENT AGENDA
M/S/C Yenovkian/Capelli/Unanimous
Abstain: Ragsdale-Cronin, Prock, Meehan

3.1 Approved minutes of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee meeting of October 2, 2013.

END OF CONSENT AGENDA

4. REVIEWED and COMMENTED on Draft 2014 Legislative Program.

Sharon Gavin, Community Outreach Coordinator, reviewed the Transportation Agency’s draft legislative program, the purpose of which is to set general principles to guide staff and Board responses to proposed legislative or budgetary issues on an annual basis. The program also notifies state representatives of the Transportation Agency’s position on issues of key importance to the agency. The final program will be considered by the Transportation Agency Board of Directors for adoption at its January, 2014 meeting.

Chair Petersen asked if bicycle and pedestrian access would be addressed in the State Route 156 project. Ms. Gavin reported that the old highway alignment, which would become a County frontage road, would provide for improved access. DL Johnson also asked if improvements to the existing facility would be made for bicycling. Staff agreed to provide more information about these planned improvements to address bicycle and pedestrian access at a future meeting.

Phil Yenovkian asked if the draft program would address cuts to bicycle funding and efforts to restore funding. Ms. Gavin reported that the program supported such efforts and that staff...
could provide more detailed information about the agency’s efforts to enhance funding for bicycle and pedestrian transportation at a future meeting.

DL Johnson commented that high priority bicycle and pedestrian projects being planned around the county appeared to have funding shortfalls, and that funding to construct these projects needs to be secured.

5. **RECEIVED** a report on the Marina-Salinas Multimodal Corridor Plan.

Ariana Green, Transportation Planner, provided a report on the schedule and public outreach for the Marina-Salinas Multimodal Corridor Plan. The purpose of the Marina - Salinas Multimodal Corridor Plan is to determine a preferred alignment and conceptual roadway design that connects the Monterey Peninsula to Salinas through a collaborative and consensus-building process. Staff is convening a staff working group representing the jurisdictions along the corridor to oversee the study, and the Agency will be reaching out individually to stakeholder groups to provide information about the project and gather public feedback. Staff is proposing to convene a bicycle and pedestrian stakeholder group and requested assistance from committee members who had previously volunteered to identify individuals for that group.

Ms. Green reported that staff would present more information about advantages and disadvantages of the alternative corridor alignments under consideration for the corridor in January. David Craft requested an electronic copy of any existing studies about the corridor by email if possible.

6. **RECEIVED** report and provided preliminary input on the proposed 2014 Monterey County Bike Map.

Andy Cook, Associate Transportation Planner, reported that the Transportation Agency has periodically produced and distributed a map of bicycle facilities in Monterey County since 1997, and that staff is proposing to prepare a new map by the summer of 2014. The map will include facilities that have been added to the bicycle network since the Agency last released a map in 2008. Mr. Cook reported that staff would incorporate the committee’s comments into a scope of work for graphic design assistance to prepare the map, and would provide a copy of the draft map for review at a future meeting.

The committee provided the following input on content to consider for the bike map:

- Bike rack and locker locations
- Better scale/distance markers
- Off road trails
- Fire departments and public toilet locations
- Slope information
- Bike shops
- Fort Ord Dunes State Park and routes
- Fort Ord road network.
- Correct labeling of State Route 218 to correct an error in the 2008 map
- Consideration of labeling “unofficial” routes used by bicyclists locally
- Consider naming or numbering routes (ex://San Francisco Bike Map)

Chair Petersen recommended that staff pursue sponsorships to supplement funding for the map. The committee also discussed the San Francisco Bike Map as a model to consider for the Monterey County Bike Map, and suggested that the Agency develop an interactive web version that could be
accessed by smartphone. The committee suggested that staff focus more resources on developing a web version instead of printing paper maps.

7. COMMITTEE CALENDAR AND APPOINTMENTS FOR 2014

M/S/C Tolbert/Johnson/No - Hedegaard
The committee appointed Eric Petersen and David Craft to serve as Chair and Vice Chair for the 2014 calendar year.

M/S/C Craft/ Ragsdale-Cronin /No - Hedegaard
The committee adopted the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee meeting calendar for 2014.

8. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND/OR COMMENTS

Megan Tolbert announced a Meet & Greet Potluck with the California Bicycle Coalition was scheduled on Tuesday, November 12, 2013 at 5:30pm at the American Legion Hall in Monterey. The meeting is an opportunity for the local bicycle community to discuss local bicycle issues with Coalition members participating in the California by Bike Tour beginning in Oakland, CA on November 11, 2013 at the California Bike Summit and ending in Santa Barbara, CA on November 18, 2013.

DL Johnson commented that League of United Latin American Citizens has submitted a letter to the Transportation Agency, which was included on the agenda, regarding bicycle and pedestrian access in the Castroville community and the need for a new connection between Castroville and Moss Landing.

Phil Yenovkian expressed interest in the League of American Cyclist’s Bicycle Friendly Communities Application and requested that the committee have an opportunity to discuss local applications on the January committee agenda.

Andy Cook announced that Mari Lynch had posted a master calendar of bicycle-related activities on the Bicycling Monterey website and that a raffle with participating bike shops was open in celebration of the HER Helmet Tuesday program’s 4th Anniversary. DL Johnson suggested that Mari Lynch be invited to present to the committee on her Bicycling Monterey advocacy activities.

Chair Petersen announced that the next Salinas Criterium race was again being scheduled in May 2014. Mr. Petersen requested that staff keep the committee informed as to the status of a Bike Week campaign so that the scheduling of events can be coordinated with the campaign. Mr. Petersen also commented on statewide discussions to ban fixed-gear bikes without brakes. Megan Tolbert suggested that safety trainings be scheduled as part of a Bike Week campaign to address these safety issues and educated the public about bicycling laws, and announced that Bernard Green is now conducting safety trainings locally. DL Johnson commented that the County Health Department should be asked to support Bike Week.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Petersen adjourned the meeting at 7:20pm
Memorandum

To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee
From: Christina Watson, Principal Transportation Planner
Meeting Date: January 8, 2014
Subject: Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act

RECOMMENDED ACTION

RECEIVE report on proposed federal bicycle and pedestrian legislation.

SUMMARY

This report contains information about a new federal proposal to set new measures and targets for bicycle and pedestrian safety, separate from motorized transportation safety measures and targets.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

No financial impact.

DISCUSSION

On November 14, 2013, Congressmen Earl Blumenauer, the founder of the House Bicycle Caucus, introduced the Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act (see attached memo and article). The bill would require the US Department of Transportation to set separate measures for motorized and non-motorized safety. States would be able to set their own safety targets and have the flexibility to choose the best methods to meet them. The legislation encourages states to make their roadways safer without diverting funding from other safety needs. According to the Politico article,

"The bill is in response to concerns in the bike community that the Department of Transportation will ignore bikers and walkers when it sets the performance standards to measure how effective road projects are at meeting goals like reducing congestion and improving safety. Advocates point to what they call a stunning misalignment of the needs and the resources: While bikers and pedestrians account for 15 percent of all highway deaths, they get only 1 percent of the safety-related funding."

P:\Committees\Bike and Ped\BPC 2014\January\CW - fed bike law.docx

Transportation Agency for Monterey County
55-B Plaza Circle • Salinas, California 93901-2902
(831) 775-4406 FAX (831) 775-0897 • E-mail: christina@tamcmonterey.org
www.tamcmonterey.org
Staff will continue to watch this bill. It is likely that the bill will be included in the transportation authorization legislation that will be considered over the next few years.

Approved by: ___________________________ Date signed: 12/10/13
Debra L. Hale, Executive Director

Consent Agenda

Agency Counsel Review: N/A
Admin/Finance Approval: N/A

Attachments:
1. November 18, 2013 memo from Agency legislative consultants Alcalde & Fay
2. November 21, 2013 article in Politico, “Earl Blumenauer’s ‘bike-partisanship’”
On November 14, 2013, a bipartisan Congressional coalition introduced the Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act in both the House and Senate (H.R. 3494 and S. 1708, respectively). In the House, the bill was introduced by the founder of the Congressional Bike Caucus, Congressmen Earl Blumenauer (D-OR), along with fellow Caucus members Howard Coble (R-NC), Peter DeFazio (D-OR) and Mike McCaul (R-TX). The companion bill in the Senate was introduced by Senator Jeff Merkley (D-OR) and co-sponsored by Senators Kelly Ayotte (R-NH) and Brian Schatz (D-HI).

The bipartisan legislation would attempt to address the increasing number of traffic fatalities involving bicycling and walking by requiring that separate safety measures be set for motorized and non-motorized transportation. As required by MAP-21, the Department of Transportation must establish safety performance measures aimed at reducing the “number of serious injuries and fatalities,” which states and local MPOs are then required to meet or make significant progress toward meeting within two years. Under the Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act, DOT would establish distinct performance measures for motorized and non-motorized safety, which states would then have to meet based on the timelines established in MAP-21 for implementing motorized transportation safety measures. The bill maintains state control over the process by allowing them to set their own safety targets as well as the best ways to reach those goals. However, as with the MAP-21 requirements for motorized transportation safety, if a state or MPO was unable to meet the federal standards, DOT could require that it allocate additional funding from within its federal apportionment for projects that would move it closer to meeting performance targets.

In his press release announcing the legislation, Congressman Blumenauer stressed the need for safer roadways, noting that as modern transportation systems “adjust to handle different type of road users, the federal government must encourage appropriate standards to ensure road user safety.” Congressman Coble also called attention to the fact that while overall traffic fatalities had dropped, the number of bicycling and pedestrian deaths on roadways had risen in recent years. The Congressman suggested that this bipartisan legislation would “protect all users of our transportation system, while giving states flexibility to enact measures that make sense for them.”
The two bills were referred to the House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) and Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committees, respectively. At this time it is unclear as to whether this legislation has a real chance of moving forward as a stand-alone bill in either chamber. However, with MAP-21 expiring on September 30, 2014 and Congress beginning discussions on the next surface transportation bill, this bill could be included in any such reauthorization effort.

If we may answer any questions or provide additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us.
From: Paul Schlesinger <Schlesinger@alcalde-fay.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 21, 2013 7:03 AM
To: Paul Schlesinger
Subject: Earl Blumenauer's 'bike-partisanship'

Bit more related to bill on which I sent info the other day.

Paul

POLITICO

Earl Blumenauer’s ‘bike-partisanship’

By: Adam Snider

November 21, 2013 05:10 AM EST

Rep. Earl Blumenauer is always open to a legislative bike ride with Republicans. In his latest effort, the bow-tied Oregon Democrat is offering a short and simple bill to ensure that federal regulators keep bicyclists and pedestrians in mind when setting safety standards for road projects. Blumenauer’s bill has two Republican co-sponsors who aren’t exactly known for working on bike issues: Rep. Howard Coble of North Carolina, a senior member of the Transportation Committee who is retiring after next year, and House Homeland Security Committee Chairman Mike McCaul of Texas. The bipartisan support for the pro-biking, pro-walking measure stretches into the Senate, too. A version in the upper chamber attracted New Hampshire Republican Kelly Ayotte, who co-sponsored the bill along with Democrats Jeff Merkley of Oregon and Brian Schatz of Hawaii when it was introduced last week. As with other transportation bills this year both big and small, Blumenauer hopes that a good bipartisan showing will help his measure cut through Congress’s usual legislative gridlock and partisan warfare. (PHOTOS: Politicians riding bikes)

His hope isn’t unfounded — there’s been a lot of precedent lately. House Transportation Committee Chairman Bill Shuster (R-Pa.) worked with Democrats to secure strong support for an $8 billion water-projects bill that sailed through the House in a lopsided 417-3 vote in late October. That victory came despite the opposition of conservative groups as well as Congress’s ban on earmarks, which in past years could have helped secure votes from reluctant members. Also in October, President Barack Obama signed a bill involving sleep apnea testing for truck drivers just a month after a bipartisan pair of Transportation Committee lawmakers had introduced the legislation. Those successes came on the heels of a minor miracle last year: In an election year, Democrats and Republicans came together to pass both aviation and surface transportation bills that cost tens of billions of dollars and involved several sticky policy issues, such as how high the subsidies for small airports should be and how much money from gasoline taxes the government should spend on projects that aren’t for roads. “Most of all, the initiatives that I’m a part of are or should be bipartisan,” Blumenauer said in an interview in the speaker’s lobby. The bespectacled Democrat, known for wearing colorful bike pins and bringing fruitcake to reporters over the holiday season, joked that he’s a big fan of “bike-partisanship.” “Life’s too short, and I think infrastructure is a natural bipartisan platform,” he said. Blumenauer is one of the more active members during House votes, one of his aides said. Even though votes are pretty much the only time all House members gather in the same room, many lawmakers spend the time checking their phones or chatting casually with colleagues.
But not Blumenauer — he talks up issues and legislation with fellow members. In the case of his bike bill, his outreach paid off. Coble, who announced recently amid health problems that he won’t run for reelection next year, admitted he’s only “vaguely familiar” with Blumenauer’s bill. So why is he a co-sponsor? His reason points to just how much personal relationships matter on the Hill and the lasting power of transportation’s bipartisan tradition: “I’m really not that familiar with the bill. I just signed on because Earl asked me to, told me he was promoting it,” Coble said. The North Carolina lawmaker, at 82 years old, said he “wouldn’t think about riding a bike to work in a rural area like my district, much less up here” in Washington. The bill is in response to concerns in the bike community that the Department of Transportation will ignore bikers and walkers when it sets the performance standards to measure how effective road projects are at meeting goals like reducing congestion and improving safety. Advocates point to what they call a stunning misalignment of the needs and the resources: While bikers and pedestrians account for 15 percent of all highway deaths, they get only 1 percent of the safety-related funding. “DOT has taken a very narrow definition of what they can include in the performance measures,” said Andy Clarke, president of the League of American Bicyclists. Several bike advocacy sources who are working with DOT on the issue said bureaucrats at the Federal Highway Administration, used to working on road projects that focus almost entirely on cars and trucks, have been the biggest obstacle in getting the agency to address biker and pedestrian concerns. A DOT spokeswoman wouldn’t address the standards directly but said the agency has done a lot for biking and walking. DOT “is deeply committed to ensuring public safety by reducing traffic-related injuries and fatalities on our roadways, including bicycle and pedestrian safety,” the spokeswoman said, noting the $154 million from a discretionary grant program that has gone to bike and pedestrian projects over the years. “DOT will continue its commitment to improving safety across all modes of transportation, whether people choose to travel by car, plane, train, bike or foot,” the official said. Rep. Peter DeFazio (D-Ore.), also a co-sponsor of Blumenauer’s bill, said it’s hard for road engineers to change their mind-set to think of walkers and bikers when designing a highway even though doing so “makes an infinite amount of sense.” “Highway engineers, it wasn’t part of their education,” DeFazio said. “It’s not part of their daily experience. They’re just thinking about throughput and congestion and all those sorts of things.” Blumenauer’s bill would address the issue by forcing DOT to issue separate performance standards for motorized and nonmotorized transportation that would be used in the Highway Safety Improvement Program. The bill is likely to get lost in the year-end shuffle as Congress turns to some major legislative fights in early 2014. But with the deadline for a new surface transportation bill looming Sept. 30, 2014, Blumenauer can try to push for its inclusion in the broader highway and transit package — while still leaving time for a bike ride with a reluctant GOP lawmaker.
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Memorandum

To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee

From: Andy Cook, Associate Transportation Planner

Meeting Date: January 8, 2014

Subject: Transportation Development Act 2% Grant Program

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

PROVIDE input on strategy for allocating Transportation Development Act 2% program funds for bicycle and pedestrian projects.

SUMMARY:

The Transportation Agency manages the Transportation Development Act 2% program, which provides funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects of regional significance. For the next funding cycle, staff is recommending that the Agency issue a combined call for projects with its discretionary Regional Surface Transportation Program to maximize funding available for bicycle and pedestrian projects.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

Transportation Development Act funds are derived from a ¼ cent general sales tax collected by the State and returned to Monterey County to be allocated by the Transportation Agency. Two percent of Local Transportation Funds can be used for planning and constructing bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Approximately $250,000 is available on an annual basis.

The Agency allocates TDA 2% program funds in three year cycles. The program currently has outstanding commitments in the amount of $942,625 for the Moss Landing Sanctuary Scenic Trail and Castroville railroad crossing projects. Staff estimates that up to $940,000 in additional funds will be available through this program for bicycle and pedestrian projects in the next funding cycle.

DISCUSSION:

The Transportation Agency manages the Transportation Development Act 2% (TDA 2%) grant program in Monterey County, which provides local funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects of regional significance. Eligible projects under this program include construction of bicycle and pedestrian facilities that serve the needs of commuters and bicycle safety education.
In the last funding cycle, the Committee recommended that funds be allocated to two major projects sponsored by the County of Monterey: the Moss Landing segment of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail and the Castroville railroad crossing project, both of which face shortfalls for construction. The funds that staff expects to be available through the program will not be sufficient to fill the funding gap of either project.

In June of last year, the committee approved a strategy for the next funding cycle, recommending that funds be allocated to meet local match requirements ($57,057) for the design, environmental review and right of way phases of the Moss Landing trail project, and making the residual grant funds ($870,000) available for other projects. Based on that direction, staff is recommending that the County of Monterey apply for funding through the Active Transportation Program to construct the Moss Landing trail. The Agency has also included funding to construct the Castroville Railroad Crossing project in the Agency’s proposal for state transportation funding, which was approved by the Board of Directors in December.

Staff is now preparing to allocate discretionary funds available through the Agency, which includes the TDA 2% program and the Regional Surface Transportation Program. The latter program is a flexible fund source that the Agency allocates to member jurisdictions on a competitive basis. Staff estimates that $7.2 million will be available through the competitive allocation for the next funding cycle. Draft guidelines prepared by staff for Regional Surface Transportation Program applications (Web Attachment) incorporate scoring criteria intended to encourage submittal of “complete streets” projects. To maximize the amount of funding available through the Agency for bicycle and pedestrian improvements, staff is recommending that the relatively small amount of funding available through the TDA 2% program be combined with the Regional Surface Transportation Program and allocated through a single call for projects that can be issued as early as March.

A separate call for projects could alternatively be issued for the TDA 2% program and funds possibly allocated to jurisdictions applying for competitive Active Transportation Program grants through the state. Draft guidance for that new program does not include local match requirements, however. Staff therefore recommends that a combined TDA 2% and Regional Surface Transportation Program allocation is the most effective strategy that the Agency can pursue for allocating its discretionary funding to bicycle and pedestrian improvements.

Although the staff proposal does not involve a stand-alone process for allocating TDA 2% funds with approval by the Committee as done in the past, the draft guidelines for the Regional Surface Transportation Program establish a scoring committee that includes Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee representatives.

At this time, staff is requesting input on the process for allocating TDA 2% funds in the next funding cycle. Staff expects to finalize guidance for its discretionary funding programs for approval by the Board of Directors in February.

Approved by: Debra L. Hale, Executive Director
12-16-13

Date signed:

Regular Agenda
Counsel Approval: N/A
Admin/Finance Approval: N/A

Web Attachment: Draft Regional Surface Transportation Program Guidelines
TRANSPORTATION AGENCY FOR MONTEREY COUNTY
GUIDELINES & POLICIES FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF
REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM FUNDS

What is the Regional Surface Transportation Program?
The Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) was established by California State Statute utilizing Surface Transportation Program Funds that are identified in Section 133 of Title 23 of the United States Code. The State of California allows smaller Counties to exchange their apportionment of federal RSTP funds for State Highway Account funds, which are easier for local agencies to use for transportation with less stringent paperwork than with federal funds.

The Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) distributes these funds to local agencies as part of its responsibilities as a Regional Transportation Planning Agency.

The RSTP program generates approximately $4 million annually for transportation projects in Monterey County.

Project Eligibility
RSTP funding is eligible for a wide variety of transportation projects. In general projects must meet the criteria in Sections 133(b) and 133(c) of Title 23 of the United States Code (USC) and Article XIX of the State Constitution (Appendix A). Projects eligible for funding from the RSTP include:

- Construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration, and operational improvements on
  - Federal-aid highways (i.e., on any highways, including NHS and Interstate Highways that are not functionally classified as local or rural minor collectors).
  - Bridges (including bridges on public roads of all functional classifications), including any such construction or reconstruction necessary to accommodate other transportation modes, and including the seismic retrofit and painting of and application of calcium magnesium acetate on bridges and approaches and other elevated structures.
- Mitigation of damage to wildlife, habitat, and ecosystems caused by a transportation project funded under RSTP.
- Capital costs for transit projects eligible for assistance under the Federal Transit Act and publicly owned intracity or intercity bus terminals and facilities.
- Carpool projects, fringe and corridor parking facilities and programs, and bicycle transportation and pedestrian walkways on any public roads in accordance with Section 217 of Title 23, U.S.C.
- Highway and transit safety improvements and programs, hazard elimination, projects to mitigate hazards caused by wildlife, and railway-highway grade crossings. Safety improvements are eligible on public roads of all functional classifications.
- Highway and transit research and development and technology transfer programs.
- Capital and operating costs for traffic monitoring, management and control facilities and programs.
- Surface transportation planning programs
- Transportation enhancement activities.
- Transportation control measures listed in Section 108 (f)(1)(A) (other than clauses xii & xvi) of the Clean Air Act.
- Development and establishment of management systems under Section 303 of Title 23, U.S.C.
- Wetlands mitigation efforts related to RSTP projects.

**Funding Levels**

The following table shows the total amount of RSTP funding apportioned to TAMC since Fiscal Year 1991/92 (as of November 2013):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Apportionment</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Flood Repair Reimbursement</th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91-92, 92-93</td>
<td>$2,858,528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,858,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93/94</td>
<td>$2,423,472</td>
<td>$155,272</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,578,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94/95</td>
<td>$2,817,633</td>
<td>$174,030</td>
<td>$423,000</td>
<td>$3,414,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95/96</td>
<td>$1,987,659</td>
<td>$174,198</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,161,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96/97</td>
<td>$2,270,101</td>
<td>$232,429</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,502,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97/98</td>
<td>$2,449,175</td>
<td>$309,011</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,758,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98/99</td>
<td>$2,864,522</td>
<td>$319,221</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,183,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99/00</td>
<td>$2,670,544</td>
<td>$565,807</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,236,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00/01</td>
<td>$3,288,365</td>
<td>$521,364</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,809,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/02</td>
<td>$3,460,201</td>
<td>$331,485</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,791,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03</td>
<td>$2,911,306</td>
<td>$208,581</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,119,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/04</td>
<td>$3,484,606</td>
<td>$203,109</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,687,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05</td>
<td>$4,168,498</td>
<td>$245,186</td>
<td>$2,571</td>
<td>$4,416,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06</td>
<td>$3,857,207</td>
<td>$520,490</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,377,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/07</td>
<td>$4,044,157</td>
<td>$585,140</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,629,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08</td>
<td>$3,863,139</td>
<td>$332,462</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,195,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/09</td>
<td>$4,177,999</td>
<td>$93,881</td>
<td>-$253,001</td>
<td>$4,018,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10</td>
<td>$3,964,507</td>
<td>$60,151</td>
<td>$47,464</td>
<td>$4,072,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>$4,721,239</td>
<td>$29,115</td>
<td>$1,955,682</td>
<td>$6,706,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>$4,721,239</td>
<td>$53,317</td>
<td>$23,821</td>
<td>$4,798,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>$5,112,619</td>
<td>$52,503</td>
<td>-$3,000,000</td>
<td>$2,165,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash Received</strong></td>
<td>$72,116,716</td>
<td>$5,166,749</td>
<td>$2,199,720</td>
<td>$79,483,185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Apportionments Disbursed</strong></th>
<th><strong>Interest Disbursed</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cash on Hand</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$62,372,874</td>
<td>$3,990,588</td>
<td>$13,119,722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Programming of Regional Surface Transportation Program Funds
Since 1991, TAMC has funded transportation projects in two grant categories, Fair Share and Competitive. The Transportation Agency also sets aside RSTP in a reserve for use on eligible transportation projects by the Agency. These categories are described below.

RSTP Reserve: RSTP Reserve is an approved TAMC policy that reserves up to 10% of the annual RSTP funding amount off the top for use by TAMC for eligible transportation project and planning activities. The reserve amount has historically been $200,000 annually.

RSTP Fair-Share Allocation Process: RSTP Fair Share is an approved TAMC policy that apportions part of the RSTP funding by formula to the Cities and County of Monterey. The Fair Share amount has historically been $1,200,000 annually. TAMC has distributed this Fair Share funding every two to three years. The distribution of Fair Share funds is based on population and approved by the Board of Directors.

The programming is based on each jurisdiction’s share of the total urbanized population, as estimated by the California Department of Finance. Historically, TAMC has programmed three years’ worth of Fair Share funding for a total of $3.6 million. The following table shows the Fair Share funding amounts for each of the cities and County for Fiscal Years 2013/14-15/16:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% Total Population</th>
<th>Annual Allocation</th>
<th>3-Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carmel-by-the Sea</td>
<td>3,775</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>$10,747</td>
<td>$32,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Rey Oaks</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>$4,692</td>
<td>$14,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzales</td>
<td>8,296</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
<td>$23,619</td>
<td>$70,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>16,729</td>
<td>3.97%</td>
<td>$47,628</td>
<td>$142,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King City</td>
<td>13,073</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>$37,219</td>
<td>$111,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>20,073</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
<td>$57,148</td>
<td>$171,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>28,252</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>$80,434</td>
<td>$241,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Grove</td>
<td>15,268</td>
<td>3.62%</td>
<td>$43,468</td>
<td>$130,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>153,215</td>
<td>36.35%</td>
<td>$436,205</td>
<td>$1,308,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand City</td>
<td>33,121</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
<td>$94,840</td>
<td>$284,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soledad</td>
<td>25,430</td>
<td>6.03%</td>
<td>$72,400</td>
<td>$217,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Monterey</td>
<td>102,085</td>
<td>24.22%</td>
<td>$290,638</td>
<td>$871,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>421,494</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,200,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,600,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Population: January 1, 2013 Department of Finance

RSTP Competitive Grants: RSTP Competitive Grants are an approved TAMC policy that apportions part of the RSTP funding on a competitive basis. The competitive amount varies from year to year based on the annual apportionment of RSTP funds. TAMC has distributed this competitive funding every two to three years. The distribution of competitive funds is based on a project scoring criteria, peer review and approved by the Board of Directors.
Projects rank higher when the project can be completed within three years and the project is consistent with a local transportation plan or general plan. Application materials and scoring criteria are included in Appendix B.

Once funds are programmed to projects by the TAMC Board of Directors, the grantee may submit a claim for payment according to the procedures outlined in Appendix C.

**Regional Surface Transportation Grant Procedures**
The Transportation Agency for Monterey County staff will advise prospective claimants (eligible entities: cities, County, and Monterey-Salinas Transit) of the funds anticipated to be available, and of the procedures for applying for Regional Surface Transportation Program grant-awarded funds. Transportation Agency staff will adhere to the following procedures when administering the RSTP Competitive Grant program; however the Transportation Agency Board may elect to opt-out of a Competitive Grant cycle and program the RSTP funds towards projects of regional significance, foregoing this process.

- To be considered for funding, a grant application must be received by TAMC by the deadline specified in the call for projects.
- TAMC’s Technical Advisory Committee will appoint a Subcommittee, generally comprised of Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members, Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee (BPC) members, partner agency staff, and Transportation Agency staff without a conflict of interest, to evaluate and rank all applications according to the “Criteria” listed in these policies. Subcommittee members will make their recommendations for projects to receive funding to the TAC.
- The TAC will consider approving the initial rankings recommended by the Subcommittee. The TAC will recommend approval for funding by the Transportation Agency Board. Alternative projects will also be listed in case recommended projects fail to be constructed.
- The TAC will forward their recommendations on to the BPC for comment. If the comments cannot be incorporated, differences in recommendations will be discussed with the TAMC Board.
- The Transportation Agency Board will consider the recommendations made by the TAC and the BPC. The Transportation Agency Board will vote to approve projects for funding by adopting a resolution.
- Transportation Agency staff will notify the agencies of those applications that have been funded.

**Project Programming and Delivery**
Projects using RSTP funds are not required to have a local match like federal transportation programs. Once funds are allocated to an approved project, the project sponsor has three years to expend the funds. Funds are paid to projects on a reimbursement basis and upon claim by the project sponsor to TAMC.
Programming Policies
The cities and County may program funds to eligible transportation projects within their Fair Share amounts apportioned by TAMC. With Transportation Agency Board approval, Fair Share funds can be deleted from one project and added to another project at the discretion of the project sponsor by submitting a written request to the Transportation Agency, provided that the change does not cause an over programming of total Fair Share available to the city or County. Fair Share funds provide the most amount of flexibility for the cities and County when moving funds between projects.

Moving funds from the competitive or Transportation for Livable Communities categories is not allowed. If a project is not built or the project sponsor decides not to build the project, the funds revert back to the pool of funding for the next round of programming. If a city or County was awarded funding for two projects under the competitive category, the city or County may submit a written request for Transportation Agency Board approval to adjust funds between the two projects provided the total amount remains the same.

Local Jurisdictions Responsibility in RSTP Project Implementation
Once a project has been recommended and approved for RSTP funding then the local jurisdiction will need to implement the project in a timely manner.

Timely Use of Funds: California State Assembly Bill 1012 (AB102) requires that RSTP funds are subject to a “timely use of funds” provision. AB102 requires that once funds are obligated towards a project then the jurisdiction has up to three years to use the funds or lose them. The TAMC Board also has implemented a timely “Use of Funds Provision” that is similar to AB1012. The TAMC Timely Use of Funds provision gives the agency staff authority to de-obligate funds from a local agency if project implementation is not moving forward in a satisfactory manner and reapply these funds towards a project that is ready for implementation. This process of fund redistribution would first require the approval by the TAMC Board of Directors.

Annual Reporting: Recipients of RSTP funding will be required to submit an annual report to TAMC describing the use of funds. This report will provide interagency coordination to better assist in timely project implementation.

Project Completion Report: Recipients of RSTP funding will be required to submit a Project Completion Report, which includes before and after photos of the project, within sixty (60) days of the project being accepted as complete by the sponsor.

Media: Any press releases or media events held by the project sponsor to promote a RSTP funded project will include mention of the Transportation Agency for Monterey County’s role in funding the project.
APPENDIX A

PROJECT ELIGIBILITY

23 USC § 133 - Surface transportation program
(b) Eligible Projects.— A State may obligate funds apportioned to it under section 104 (b)(2) for the surface transportation program only for the following:

(1) Construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration, preservation, or operational improvements for highways, including construction of designated routes of the Appalachian development highway system and local access roads under section 14501 of title 40.
(2) Replacement (including replacement with fill material), rehabilitation, preservation, protection (including painting, scour countermeasures, seismic retrofits, impact protection measures, security countermeasures, and protection against extreme events) and application of calcium magnesium acetate, sodium acetate/formate, or other environmentally acceptable, minimally corrosive anti-icing and deicing compositions for bridges (and approaches to bridges and other elevated structures) and tunnels on public roads of all functional classifications, including any such construction or reconstruction necessary to accommodate other transportation modes.
(3) Construction of a new bridge or tunnel at a new location on a Federal-aid highway.
(4) Inspection and evaluation of bridges and tunnels and training of bridge and tunnel inspectors (as defined in section 144), and inspection and evaluation of other highway assets (including signs, retaining walls, and drainage structures).
(5) Capital costs for transit projects eligible for assistance under chapter 53 of title 49, including vehicles and facilities, whether publicly or privately owned, that are used to provide intercity passenger service by bus.
(6) Carpool projects, fringe and corridor parking facilities and programs, including electric vehicle and natural gas vehicle infrastructure in accordance with section 137, bicycle transportation and pedestrian walkways in accordance with section 217, and the modifications of public sidewalks to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.).
(7) Highway and transit safety infrastructure improvements and programs, installation of safety barriers and nets on bridges, hazard eliminations, projects to mitigate hazards caused by wildlife, and railway-highway grade crossings.
(8) Highway and transit research and development and technology transfer programs.
(9) Capital and operating costs for traffic monitoring, management, and control facilities and programs, including advanced truck stop electrification systems.
(10) Surface transportation planning programs.
(11) Transportation alternatives.
(12) Transportation control measures listed in section 108 (f)(1)(A) (other than clause (xvi)) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7408 (f)(1)(A)).
(13) Development and establishment of management systems [1]
(14) Environmental mitigation efforts relating to projects funded under this title in the same manner and to the same extent as such activities are eligible under section 119 (g).
(15) Projects relating to intersections that—
   (A) have disproportionately high accident rates;
   (B) have high levels of congestion, as evidenced by—
       (i) interrupted traffic flow at the intersection; and
       (ii) a level of service rating that is not better than “F” during peak travel hours, calculated in accordance with the Highway Capacity Manual issued by the Transportation Research Board; and
   (C) are located on a Federal-aid highway.
(16) Infrastructure-based intelligent transportation systems capital improvements.
(17) Environmental restoration and pollution abatement in accordance with section 328.
(18) Control of noxious weeds and aquatic noxious weeds and establishment of native species in accordance with section 329.
(19) Projects and strategies designed to support congestion pricing, including electric toll collection and travel demand management strategies and programs.
(20) Recreational trails projects eligible for funding under section 206.
(21) Construction of ferry boats and ferry terminal facilities eligible for funding under section 129 (c).
(22) Border infrastructure projects eligible for funding under section 1303 of the SAFETEA–LU (23 U.S.C. 101 note; Public Law 109–59).
(23) Truck parking facilities eligible for funding under section 1401 of the MAP–21.
(24) Development and implementation of a State asset management plan for the National Highway System in accordance with section 119, including data collection, maintenance, and integration and the costs associated with obtaining, updating, and licensing software and equipment required for risk based asset management and performance based management, and for similar activities related to the development and implementation of a performance based management program for other public roads.
(25) A project that, if located within the boundaries of a port terminal, includes only such surface transportation infrastructure modifications as are necessary to facilitate direct intermodal interchange, transfer, and access into and out of the port.
(26) Construction and operational improvements for any minor collector if—
   (A) the minor collector, and the project to be carried out with respect to the minor collector, are in the same corridor as, and in proximity to, a Federal-aid highway designated as part of the National Highway System;
   (B) the construction or improvements will enhance the level of service on the Federal-aid highway described in subparagraph (A) and improve regional traffic flow; and
(C) the construction or improvements are more cost-effective, as determined by a benefit-cost analysis, than an improvement to the Federal-aid highway described in subparagraph (A).

(c) Location of Projects.— Surface transportation program projects may not be undertaken on roads functionally classified as local or rural minor collectors unless the roads were on a Federal-aid highway system on January 1, 1991, except—

(1) as provided in subsection (g);
(2) for projects described in paragraphs (2), (4), (6), (7), (11), (20), (25), and (26) of subsection (b); and
(3) as approved by the Secretary.

California Constitution - Article 19 Motor Vehicle Revenues
SEC. 2. Revenues from taxes imposed by the State on motor vehicle fuels for use in motor vehicles upon public streets and highways, over and above the costs of collection and any refunds authorized by law, shall be deposited into the Highway Users Tax Account (Section 2100 of the Streets and Highways Code) or its successor, which is hereby declared to be a trust fund, and shall be allocated monthly in accordance with Section 4, and shall be used solely for the following purposes:

(a) The research, planning, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of public streets and highways (and their related public facilities for non-motorized traffic), including the mitigation of their environmental effects, the payment for property taken or damaged for such purposes, and the administrative costs necessarily incurred in the foregoing purposes.

(b) The research, planning, construction, and improvement of exclusive public mass transit guideways (and their related fixed facilities), including the mitigation of their environmental effects, the payment for property taken or damaged for such purposes, the administrative costs necessarily incurred in the foregoing purposes, and the maintenance of the structures and the immediate right-of-way for the public mass transit guideways, but excluding the maintenance and operating costs for mass transit power systems and mass transit passenger facilities, vehicles, equipment, and services.
APPENDIX B

REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM COMPETITIVE FUNDING
APPLICATION FORM
Grant Application Materials

Regional Surface Transportation Program Competitive Grants &
Transportation Development Act 2%

Applications due: May 1, 2014 - 12:00 PM

Transportation Agency for Monterey County
55B Plaza Circle
Salinas, California 93901
Purpose & Principles

The Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) was established by California State Statute utilizing Surface Transportation Program Funds that are identified in Section 133 of Title 23 of the United States Code. The Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) distributes these funds to local agencies as part of its responsibilities as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for Monterey County.

The purpose of the program is to provide funding to local jurisdictions for a wide variety of transportation planning and improvement projects, such as the research, planning, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of public streets and highways (and their related public facilities for non-motorized traffic), including the mitigation of their environmental effects. A full listing of eligible projects can be found in the Transportation Agency for Monterey County’s Guidelines & Policies for the Administration of Regional Surface Transportation Program Funds.

In establishing the Regional Surface Transportation Program Competitive Grants program, the Transportation Agency is seeking to fund projects that advance the goals of the Transportation Agency Board. These include funding and delivering projects of regional significance that improve safety, provide maintenance for existing facilities, or support the development of a multimodal transportation network utilizing the principles of Complete Streets. Fair geographic balance in distributing the funds and the cost effectiveness of the proposed projects in meeting the program’s goals are also taken into consideration when awarding grant funds.

Instructions

1. You must complete an application form for each project. All projects must submit an application, even if it has previously applied and received RSTP funding.
2. If your agency submits more than one project application, you must identify your highest priority project.
3. You are responsible for completing all sections of the application form and attaching any relevant information. Your project application will only be scored based on the information that is provided in your application. Additional information will not be accepted after the deadline; however, it may be presented to the TAMC Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for review.
4. Your project must pass the “Screening Criteria” section of this application form in order to qualify for funding.
5. You should refer to the attached RSTP Scoring Criteria when preparing the “Project Information” section of your application. You are responsible for providing complete and accurate information in order to receive the highest points possible.
6. The deadline for applications is the **first Thursday in May by 12:00 PM**. All applications must be received by TAMC on this date. No postmarks or faxes will be accepted. No application forms or additional information will be accepted after this date.
Screening Criteria
In order to qualify for RSTP funding, your project must meet the following criteria:

A. Your project must be implemented within a 3-year timeframe. Please specify if your project will meet this deadline. Please note that after three years, your project will lose the funding if it has not yet been completed.

B. Your project must be consistent with a minimum of one of the local or regional plans listed below. Please check off the applicable plans:

- Local General Plan
- Capital Improvement Program (CIP)
- Pavement Management System (PMS)
- Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP)
- MST Service Improvement Plan
- Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
- Approved Transportation Impact Study
- Other (please specify)
## Section A: Project Information & Regional Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Sponsor / Lead Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Contact Information (address, phone, email)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Amount of RSTP Funds Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Identify the funding sources for the project. You must specify if these funding sources are secured or proposed. Also indicate fiscal years in which these funds are programmed. Attached additional information if needed.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Description (include Average Daily Traffic data – vehicle, bike & ped, or transit passengers)**

**Is there a history of collisions in the project area (pedestrian, bicycle, motorist)?**

**Project Benefits (attach additional information if needed)**

**Describe how your project links regional origin / destinations or serves regional travel**

---

**Scoring Categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1) Traffic volume</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 point = 1 - 5,000 ADT</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 points = 5,001 - 10,000 ADT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 points = 10,001 - 20,000 ADT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 points = 20,001+ ADT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A2) Regional Significance</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The application will receive 1-15 points based on how well the project serves travelers from other areas or more than one jurisdiction.

**Subtotal (max.)**

25
Complete the attached Complete Streets Checklist and include with your application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Categories</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1) Project increases non-motorized demand</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2) Stakeholder outreach was conducted on the project scope and design</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3) Pedestrian facilities are improved with the project</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4) Bicycle facilities are improved with the project</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5) Transit facilities are improved with the project</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (max.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CHECKLIST - Existing Conditions

### 4. Existing Land Uses (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional/School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic/Public Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park/Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor-Serving/Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/Agricultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Safety *(See Complete Streets Needs Assessment Matrix & http://tims.berkeley.edu/)*

- Are there perceived safety/speeding issues in the project area? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- Is there a history of collisions in the project area?
  - Pedestrian [ ] Yes [ ] No
  - Bicyclist [ ] Yes [ ] No
  - Motorist [ ] Yes [ ] No

### 6. Congestion

- Does the roadway experience congestion? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- If so, at what time(s) is it congested?
  - AM Peak [ ] Yes [ ] No
  - PM Peak [ ] Yes [ ] No

### 7. Existing Roadway Conditions/Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>NB/EB:</th>
<th>SB/WB:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW Width</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Pavement Width</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Way Center Turn lane</td>
<td>[ ] Yes [ ] No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Width</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lane Width (&lt;5')</td>
<td>[ ] Yes [ ] No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping/Parking</td>
<td>[ ] Yes [ ] No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection(s)</td>
<td>[ ] Signalized [ ] Unsignalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Condition</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posted Speed Limit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Volumes (AADT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Route/ Stops</td>
<td>[ ] Yes [ ] No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Route</td>
<td>[ ] Yes [ ] No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CHECKLIST - Future Conditions

8. **Future Roadway Conditions**

Are there planned transportation & land use projects that could affect circulation in the project area?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

*If so, please list the project(s)*

Are planned projects anticipated to increase travel demand in the area? (mark yes or no for each mode)

- [ ] Yes  
- [x] No

9. **Stakeholder Outreach (check all that apply)**

Please indicate which stakeholder groups provided input on project scope and design:

- [ ] Neighborhood Group
- [ ] Business Association
- [ ] School
- [ ] Property Owners
- [ ] Environmental Group
- [ ] Bicycle Committees
- [ ] Pedestrian Committee
- [ ] Senior Group
- [ ] Transit Agency
- [ ] Transportation
- [ ] Disadvantaged

Specific changes requested by stakeholders?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

10. **Circle** the Complete Street Design Type - *(See Table 2 of Guidebook)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Design Type</th>
<th>Functional Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenue</td>
<td>Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulevard</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/Subdivision Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Auto/Truck-Oriented**

**Pedestrian/Bicycle-Oriented**
11. Transportation Network Deficiencies (Refer to Existing Conditions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lacking/Insufficient Bicycle Facilities</th>
<th>Lacking/Insufficient Transit Facilities</th>
<th>Lacking/Insufficient Transit Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lacking/Insufficient Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td>Insufficient accommodations for seniors</td>
<td>Insufficient accommodations for disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Connectivity</td>
<td>Insufficient accommodations for students/youth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the Existing and Future Conditions the project area is a candidate for:

- **Road Diet** (3 or more lanes; AADT<20,000; bicycle collisions)
- **Traffic Calming**
- **Roundabout**
- **Transit-Oriented Development/Transit Corridor** (15 min headway)
- **Neighborhood Shared Street**
- **Pedestrian Place**
- **Transit/Bicycle/Pedestrian Prioritization at Intersections**
The purpose of this section is to ensure all users have been considered in the design of the project. Complete street design is context-sensitive and a complete street in a rural area may look different than one in an urban area. Refer to safety and special user needs identified in the existing and future conditions sections. The Monterey Bay Area Complete Streets Guidebook Chapter 5 contains design best-practices and sample accommodations for these users.

### 12. Pedestrian Design

Which, if any, of the following is provided or improved through the project design?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Existing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimize Driveways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk/Path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping/Parking Buffer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Treatments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Calming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayfinding Signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audible Countdown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Describe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 13. Bicycle Design

Which, if any, of the following is provided or improved through the project design?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Existing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared-Lane Markings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiuse Path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route/Wayfinding Signs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Detection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Box</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color-Treated Bike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floating Bike Lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Describe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 14. Transit Design

Which, if any, of the following is provided or improved through the project design?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>Improved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority Bus Lane</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☐ Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Bulbs/Pull-Outs</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☐ Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☐ Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Time Bus Arrival Info</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☐ Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS/Signal Priority</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☐ Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Service (15 min headways)</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☐ Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wi-Fi</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☐ Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop/Station Amenities*</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☐ Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Describe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Transit Amenities include: Bench, lighting, trash can, route information/maps, concessions, music, and public art.
### CHECKLIST - Trade-Offs & Exemptions

#### 15. Project Trade-Offs

Is the recommended complete street cross section/design supportable?  
- Yes  
- No  

If not, explain why:

- Lack of ROW width
- Existing Structures
- Trees/Environmental Features
- Insufficient Funding
- Other: ____________________________

Have alternative designs been considered?  
- Yes  
- No  

What refinements to the cross section/needed were needed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Removed/partial zones (Ch. 5) for:</th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Bicyclists</th>
<th>Landscaping</th>
<th>Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Considered alternative routes/locations for</th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Bicyclists</th>
<th>Landscaping</th>
<th>Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 16. Exemptions (Refer to Ch. 6 of the Guidebook)

Is the project exempt from accommodating certain users?  
- Yes  
- No  

Cost of accommodation is excessively disproportionate to the need or probably use?  
- Yes  
- No  

Documented absence of current and future need?  
- Yes  
- No  

Other: ____________________________
Section C: Project Readiness & Cost Effectiveness

What is the status of your project? Provide a schedule of when the project components (e.g. design, construction) will be started and completed. Attach supporting documentation and additional information as needed.

List all costs associated with the project. This money will be granted for a three-year time frame. Indicate whether matching funds are secured or unsecured.

Total RSTP funding request: $__________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>RSTP Funds</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>Fund Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY14/15</td>
<td>FY15/16</td>
<td>FY16/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Document:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Outreach and Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROJECT COST:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring Categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1) Project is ready to bid within one year</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2) Request for funding will fully fund the project</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3) Project has already started and has completed the following phase(s):</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 points = Environmental Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 points = Plans, Specifications, and Estimates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% complete = 1 point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% complete = 2 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% complete = 4 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% complete = 5 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal (max.) 25
Section D: Safety Improvements & Sustainability Features
Consistency with the goals and policies of the Regional Transportation Plan is a requirement for all projects applying for Regional Surface Transportation Program competitive grant funding. Please indicate below how your proposed project will help to achieve the program goals of safety and sustainability on a qualitative scale of low, medium, or high projected impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access &amp; Mobility</th>
<th>Projected Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve ability of Monterey County residents to meet most daily needs without having to drive. Improve the convenience and quality of trips, especially for walk, bike, transit, car/vanpool and freight.</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces passenger hours of delay</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces average peak period travel time</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety &amp; Health</th>
<th>Projected Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design, operate, and manage the transportation system to reduce serious injuries and fatalities, promote active living, and lessen exposure to pollution.</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces the number of fatalities and injuries due to collisions</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves bicycle, pedestrian, and transit mode share</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Stewardship</th>
<th>Projected Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protect and enhance the County's built and natural environment. Act to reduce the transportation system's emission of Greenhouse Gasses.</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces greenhouse gas emissions</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserves sensitive habitat or prime agriculture land</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Equity</th>
<th>Projected Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce disparities in healthy, safe access to key destinations for transportation-disadvantaged populations.</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides funding for project serving Environmental Justice populations</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases the percent of population within ½ mile of high quality transit stop</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Benefit</th>
<th>Projected Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invest in transportation improvements – including operational improvements – that reinvest in Monterey County economy, improve economic access and improve travel time reliability and speed consistency for high-value trips.</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces vehicle hours of delay</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces the number of distressed lane miles</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Categories</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1) Project demonstrates an improvement in the safety and mobility of the facility</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 points = Safety Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 points = Access &amp; Mobility Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2) Project includes features that promote social, environmental, and economic goals</td>
<td>1-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 points = Social Equity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 points = Economic Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 points = Environmental Stewardship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (max.)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

REIMBURSEMENT FORM
**TRANSPORTATION AGENCY FOR**
**MONTEREY COUNTY (TAMC)**

**CLAIM FOR PAYMENT**

55-B Plaza Circle
Salinas, CA 93901-2902
831-775-0903 Tel
831-775-0897 FAX

**Claim For _____ Funds**

**From Fund:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Project or Purposes of Expenditures:</th>
<th>Check one to indicate use of funds:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Street and Road Purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Public Transit - Operating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Public Transit - Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ 2% Bicycle and Pedestrian Account Purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Other :</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expended to date on this project:</th>
<th>FUND</th>
<th>ACCOUNT</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less amount claimed to date on this project:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of this claim:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Handling Instructions:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL CLAIM $**

**SIGNATURE OF CLAIMANT**

I certify that this claim is in accordance with provisions Of the Transportation Development Act:

Signature, title of claimant Date

**APPROVAL OF DEPARTMENT**

This claim is based on TAMC approved application and there are adequate funds available in claimant’s account:

TAMC Executive Director Date
Approved as stated hereon:

TAMC Administrative Services Manager Date

**APPROVAL OF AUDITOR**

I certify that I have received all required documents for this claim and that the computations on the documentation and Claim are correct. This claim is approved for payment.

Mike Miller, AUDITOR – CONTROLLER, By Deputy Auditor Date
Memorandum

To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee
From: Andy Cook, Associate Transportation Planner
Meeting Date: January 8, 2014
Subject: Bicycle Friendly Community Application

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
DISCUSS possible candidates for the League of American Bicyclists 2014 Bicycle Friendly Community application.

SUMMARY:
The League of American Bicyclists awards Bicycle Friendly Community designations to jurisdictions that apply and receive gold, silver or bronze ratings. The next deadline for applications to receive this designation is February 19, 2014.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
There is no financial impact associated with this action.

DISCUSSION:
Based on a request at the November, 2013 Committee meeting, staff is requesting that the Committee gauge interest in, and discuss possible candidates for, the League of American Bicyclists as Bicycle Friendly Community designation program.

According to the League of American Bicyclists, the designation recognizes local communities nationwide that are making the implementation of safe bicycling policies and programs a priority. Since the program’s inception in 2004, the League has received more than 600 applications and awarded more than 280 communities with Bronze, Silver, Gold or Platinum designation. Applicants are provided customized feedback on their specific programs/plans, and if selected a League representative will present an award and two highway-quality road signs at a local ceremony or celebration. The designation lasts for four years, after which communities must reapply to renew their designation level or seek an enhanced designation. Cities, counties, Census designated places, regional or metropolitan planning organizations, Native American
Indian nations and military installations are eligible to be considered for this award.

The next deadline for submitting an application to receive Bicycle Friendly Community status is February 19, 2014 (for May 2014 designation). Communities must create an account and fill out the online application: <http://apply.bikeleague.org/member.php?act=register&categoryId=34>. Application materials and a brochure are included as a Web Attachment.

Approved by: Debra L. Hale, Executive Director

Date signed: 12-16-13

Regular Agenda

Counsel Approval: N/A
Admin/Finance Approval: N/A

Web Attachment: Bicycle Friendly Community Application
APPLICATION TIPS

The application will be referring to your type of jurisdiction as “community” throughout the application due to the great variety of types of jurisdictions applying, which does not include bicycle amenities, services and other resources outside your boundaries.

The word limits for open ended questions are just guidelines as the system is actually using a character limit. Ensure that your entered text does not get cut off, even if you stay within the word limit.

Ensure to log out using the Log Out button. Closing the browser will not log you out completely and will trigger a warning that another user is logged in next time you sign in. If this occurs, and you are certain that no other user is logged in at the same time, you can just disregard the warning and it will disappear within 24 hours.

At the end of the application, you can upload any documents that you would like to provide in support of your application, including at least five high resolution photos (1-2MB). You can submit up to 5 files at the time and there is no limit on how many files can be submitted. Please note that the files will upload immediately to a separate server and will not appear as an attachment.

NAME OF COMMUNITY

Name of Community
County
State
Has the community applied to the Bicycle Friendly Community program before?
If yes, what was the result of the last application?
If designated, what year was your community first awarded a Bronze or higher award?
Mayor or top elected official (include title)
Phone
Email
Address
Website

BFC CONTACT PROFILE

Note: This person will receive any future BFC related communication and will be listed as the contact person for the community on the award web profile, if designated.

Name of BFC contact
Title
Department
Employer
Address
City
State
Zip
Phone
Email

Is the BFC contact also the Bicycle Program Manager?
Yes
No

If no, does your community have a Bicycle Program Manager?
Yes
No

If different from above, what is the Bicycle Program Manager’s contact information (email and phone)?

COMMUNITY PROFILE

1. Type of Jurisdiction (Note: The application will be referring to your type of jurisdiction as “community” throughout the application, which does not include bicycle amenities, services and other resources outside your boundaries.)

☐ Town/City/Municipality
☐ County
☐ Metropolitan Planning Organization/Council of Governments
☐ Regional Planning Organization
☐ Rural Planning Organization
☐ Census Designated Place
☐ Indian Country
☐ Military Base
☐ Other
If other, describe (50 word limit)

2. For purposes of comparison, would you describe your community as largely
☐ urban
☐ suburban
☐ rural

3. Climate
Average daytime temperature (in °F)
January
April
July
October
Average precipitation (in inches)
January
April
July
October

4. Size of community (in sq. mi.)
Total area
Water area
Land area

5. Total Population

5a. College/University student population (during semester)
☐ 10% or less
☐ 10-25%
☐ 25-50%
☐ 50-75%
☐ more than 75%
☐ N/A

6. Population Density (Person per sq. mi. of land area)

7. Median Household Income

8. Age distribution (in percent)
Under 5
Age 5-17
Age 18-64
Age 65+
Totals (should equal 100)

9. Race (in percent)
White
Black or African American
American Indian and Alaska Native
Asian
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander
Some other race
Two or more races
Totals (should equal 100)
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)

10. How many government employees (including the Bicycle Program Manager), expressed in full-time equivalents, work on bicycle issues in your community?
11. What percentage of the community’s Bicycle Program Manager’s time is spent on bicycling issues?
- 10% or less
- 11-25%
- 26-50%
- 51-75%
- 76-100%
- N/A

12. Do you have an officially recognized Bicycle Advisory Committee?
- Yes
- No

12a. How often does it meet?
- Monthly or more frequently
- Every two months
- Quarterly
- Annually

12b. How many members serve on the committee?

12c. Which of the following groups are represented or regularly attend the Bicycle Advisory Committee?
  Check all that apply
- User Group
- Law Enforcement
- Chamber of Commerce
- Public Health
- Planning Department
- Transportation Department
- School Board
- Parks Department
- Recreation Department
- Transit Agency
- Other
  If other, describe (50 word limit)

12d. Name and email of Bicycle Advisory Committee Chair

13. List all bicycle advocacy groups in your community

13a. List the name and email of the primary contact for each bicycle advocacy group

13b. Do you contract with any advocacy groups for services or programs?
  Check all that apply
- Paid
- Volunteer
- No
13c. List all advocacy groups that are working with you on this application

14. What are the primary reasons your community has invested in bicycling?
   Check all that apply
   □ Improved quality of life
   □ Improving public health
   □ Community connectivity
   □ Transportation options
   □ Reduce car-parking demands
   □ Climate change/environmental stewardship concerns
   □ Decrease traffic congestion
   □ Increase tourism
   □ Increase property values
   □ Cooperation with adjacent communities
   □ Public demand
   □ Economic development
   □ Support Smart Growth or other growth management goals
   □ Traffic and bicycle/pedestrian safety
   □ Meet local or state requirements
   □ Other
   If other, describe (50 word limit)

15. What was your community's most significant achievement for bicycling in the past 12 months? (500 word limit)

16. If you have applied to the BFC program before, describe any improvements that have occurred for cycling in your community since your last application. (500 word limit)

17. What specific improvements do you have planned for bicycling in the next 12 months? (250 word limit)

ENGINEERING

18. Does your community currently have any of the following policies in place?
   Check all that apply
   □ Local complete streets policy
   □ Local bicycle accommodation policy
   □ Neither

18a. When was it adopted?

18b. Provide a link or attach a copy of this legislation or policy

18c. What tools are in place to ensure implementation?
   Check all that apply
   □ Implementation Guidance
   □ Design Manual
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□ Training
□ Oversight by Bicycle Program Manager
□ Implementation checklist
□ None of the above

19. Does your community currently have any of the following additional policies in place? Check all that apply
□ Design manual that ensures the safe and appropriate accommodation of bicyclists in every new road project
□ Streetscape design guidelines
□ Mixed-use zoning
□ Form-based/design-based codes
□ Connectivity policy or standards
□ Policy to preserve abandoned rail corridors for multi-use trails
□ Other
□ None of the above
If other, describe (50 word limit)

20. How do you ensure your engineers and planners accommodate cyclists according to AASHTO, MUTCD or NACTO standards? Check all that apply
□ Offer FHWA/NHI Training Course
□ Hire outside consultants to train staff
□ Send staff to bicycle-specific conferences/training
□ APBP webinars
□ Require project consultants to have bike/ped qualifications
□ Adopted a local design manual
□ Other
□ None of the above
If other, describe (50 word limit)

21. Which of the following significant physical barriers to cycling exist in your community? Check all that apply
□ Major highways
□ Bridges that are inaccessible or unsafe for cyclists
□ Tunnels that are inaccessible or unsafe for cyclists
□ Large body of water (e.g. river)
□ Roads with bicycle bans
□ Railroad corridors
□ Other
□ No significant physical barriers
If other, please describe (100 word limit)

22. How do you ensure that there are end-of-trip facilities for bicyclists? Check all that apply
□ Bike parking ordinance for existing buildings specifying amount and location
□ Bike parking ordinance for all new developments specifying amount and location
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- Ordinance requiring showers and lockers in existing non-residential buildings
- Ordinance requiring showers and lockers in new non-residential buildings
- Building accessibility ordinance (Bicycles are allowed to be parked inside non-residential buildings)
- On-street bike parking/bicycle corrals
- Ordinance that allows bike parking to substitute for car parking
- Requirement for new developments to meet LEED-Neighborhood Development silver standards or higher
- Developers are eligible for density bonuses for providing end-of-trip facilities
- Other
- None
If other, describe (250 word limit)

23. Do your standards for bicycle parking conform with APBP guidelines?
   Yes
   No
   No standards

24. What is the total number of public and private bike parking spaces in your community?

24a. What percentage of bike racks conform with APBP guidelines?
   □ 10% or less
   □ 11-25%
   □ 26-50%
   □ 51-75%
   □ more than 75%

24b. Of the total bike parking available, please specify the percentage of bike parking spaces that are:
   Bike lockers
   In bike depots (i.e. Bikestation)
   In bike corrals (on-street bike parking)

25. Approximately what percentage of the following locations has bike racks or storage units?
   Answer all that apply (in percent)
   Public & private schools
   Higher Education Institutions
   Libraries
   Transit stations and major bus stops
   Parks & recreation centers
   Other government owned buildings and facilities
   Event venues (e.g. convention center, movie complex)
   Hotels & restaurants
   Office buildings
   Retail stores
   Multi-family housing
   Public housing
26. Does your community have transit service (bus, light rail, heavy rail)?
   Yes
   No

26a. What percentage of buses are equipped with bike racks?
   □ 10% or less
   □ 11-25%
   □ 26-50%
   □ 51-75%
   □ 75-99%
   □ All

26b. Are bikes allowed inside transit vehicles?
   Yes
   Sometimes
   No
   If yes or sometimes, describe (50 word limit)

27. What is the centerline mileage of the existing off-road bicycle network within your community?

27a. How many miles of the following off-road bicycle accommodations do you have?
   Answer all that apply (in miles)
   Paved shared use paths (≥10 feet)
   Natural surface shared use paths (≥10 feet)
   Singletrack
   Other
   If other, describe (250 word limit)

27b. What percentage of all natural surface trails and singletrack are open to bicyclists?
   □ None
   □ 1-25%
   □ 26-50%
   □ 51-75%
   □ 76-99%
   □ All
   □ Not applicable

27c. What are the exceptions? (100 word limit)

28. What is the centerline mileage of your road network (including state owned and private roads)?

28a. What is the street network density? (centerline miles of road per sq. mi. of land area)

28b. What percentage of roads has posted or design speeds of 25mph and lower?
28c. What percentage of roads has posted or design speeds of 35mph and higher?

28d. What percentage of the existing on-street bicycle network meets or exceeds current AASHTO, MUTCD or NACTO standards?

28e. List your existing on-road bicycle accommodations that meet or exceed AASHTO, MUTCD or NACTO standards. Answer all that apply (in centerline miles)

- Conventional bike lanes (ridable surface ≥4 feet)
- Shared lane markings
- Contra-flow bike lanes
- Protected or buffered bike lanes (one-way)
- Protected or buffered bike lanes (two-way)
- Raised cycle tracks
- Left-side bike lanes
- Bike boulevards or Neighborhood Greenways
- Signed bike routes

29. What other ways have you improved conditions for bicyclists? Check all that apply

- Road diets
- Area wide traffic calming
- Speed limits 20 mph or less on residential streets
- Bike cut-throughs
- Signed bike routes
- Off-street way-finding signage with distance and/or time information
- On-street way-finding signage with distance and/or time information
- Shared Space/Home Zone/Living Street/Woonerf
- Roundabouts that accommodate bicycles
- Colored bike lanes outside of conflict zones
- Bike/pedestrian overpasses/underpasses
- Removal of on-street car parking
- Speed tables to calm traffic
- Car-free/Car-restricted zones
- Advisory bike lanes
- Other
- None

If other, describe (250 word limit)

30. What percentage of arterial streets provides designated space for cyclists (e.g. bike lanes or paved shoulders ≥4 feet, cycle tracks, etc)?

- None
- 1-25%
- 26-50%
- 51-75%
- 76-99%
- All
31. Which of the following broader transportation policies and programs are in place in your community?  
Check all that apply  
□ Maximum car parking standards  
□ No minimum car parking standards  
□ Paid public parking  
□ Shared-parking allowances  
□ Congestion charges  
□ Prioritization of active mobility in planning and design processes  
□ Other  
□ None  
If other, describe (250 words)

32. What maintenance policies or programs ensure the on-street bicycle network (including shoulders) remains usable and safe?  
Select all that apply

32a. Street sweeping  
□ Before other travel lanes  
□ Same time as other travel lanes  
□ Weekly  
□ Monthly  
□ Quarterly  
□ Annually  
□ Never

32b. Snow clearance  
□ No snow  
□ Before other travel lanes  
□ Same time as other travel lanes  
□ Within 48 hours of storm  
□ Never

32c. Pothole maintenance  
□ Within 24 hours of complaint  
□ Within one week of complaint  
□ Within one month of complaint  
□ Never

32d. Describe any other maintenance policies or programs for the on-street bicycle network (including shoulders). (100 word limit)

33. What maintenance policies or programs ensure the off-street bicycle network remains usable and safe?  
Check all that apply
33a. Path sweeping
- Not applicable
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Quarterly
- Annually
- Never

33b. Vegetation maintenance
- Not applicable
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Quarterly
- Annually
- Never

33c. Snow clearance
- Not applicable
- No snow
- Before roadways
- Same time as roadways
- Within 48 hours of storm
- Never

33d. Surface repair
- Not applicable
- Within 24 hours of complaint
- Within one week of complaint
- Within one month of complaint
- Never

33e. Describe any other maintenance policies or programs for the off-street bicycle network, if applicable. (100 word limit)

34. Is there a mechanism in place for cyclists to identify problem intersections or areas to traffic engineers and planners?
- Check all that apply
- Online reporting
- Hotline
- Monthly meeting
- Other
- None
If other, describe (100 word limit)

35. How do you accommodate cyclists at intersections in your community?
- Check all that apply
- Most signals are timed
- Most signals are timed for bicycle speeds
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☐ Green wave for cyclists in some locations
☐ Demand activated signals with loop detector (and marking) or bike accessible push-button
☐ Video or microwave detection
☐ Bicycle Signal Heads
☐ Advanced Stop Line or Bike Box
☐ Path crossing with high visibility markings or signs
☐ Raised path crossings
☐ Colored bike lanes in conflict areas
☐ Other
☐ None of the above
☐ No signals
If other, describe (100 word limit)

36. Describe any other amenities or infrastructure improvements that your community provides or requires that create a comfortable and attractive bicycling environment (e.g. human-scale building design guidelines, mixed-use zoning, public restrooms, etc). *(500 word limit)*

EDUCATION

37. What percentage of your public and private schools offer bicycle education, e.g. through a Safe Routes to School or similar program?

37a. Elementary
☐ None
☐ 1-25%
☐ 26-50%
☐ 51-75%
☐ 76-99%
☐ All
☐ Not applicable

37b. Middle School
☐ None
☐ 1-25%
☐ 26-50%
☐ 51-75%
☐ 76-99%
☐ All
☐ Not applicable

37c. High School
☐ None
☐ 1-25%
☐ 26-50%
☐ 51-75%
☐ 76-99%
☐ All
SPRING 2014 APPLICATION
For review only. Only applications submitted online will be considered for designation.

- Not applicable

38. Outside of schools, how are children taught safe cycling skills?

*Check all that apply*
- Youth bike clubs
- Bike clinics or rodeos
- Youth recreation programs
- Helmet fit seminars
- Safety town
- Trail riding classes
- Other
- None of the above

If other, describe *(250 word limit)*

39. Do you have a ticket diversion program?

*Check all that apply*
- For motorists
- For cyclists
- No

40. What have you done in the last 18 months to educate motorists and bicyclists on sharing the road safely?

*Check all that apply*
- Public service announcements
- Share the Road educational videos on community website/TV channel
- Community newsletter/magazine article
- Information in new resident packet
- Utility bill insert
- Flyer/handout
- Info sessions/lunch seminars
- Bicycle ambassador program
- Newspaper column/blog on bicycling
- Dedicated bike page on community website
- Billboards
- Share the Road Signs
- Share the Road information in driver's education
- Other
- None of the above

If other, describe *(250 word limit)*

41. How many times per year are the following adult bicycling education classes held within your community?

*Answer all that apply (in numbers)*
- Traffic Skills 101 classes or equivalent (full-day training course, including classroom and on-bike instruction)
- Cycling Skills classes (three to four hour classroom training courses)
- Commuter classes (one to two hour classes)
- Bicycle maintenance classes or workshops
42. Do you offer regular Smart Cycling courses for your city engineers and planners that include on-bike instruction and in-traffic cycling?
Yes
No

43. Has your community hosted a League Cycling Instructor seminar in the past two years?
Yes
No

43a. How many League Cycling Instructors are there in your community?

43b. List League Cycling Instructors that have taught *at least one class during the past 12 months*.

44. Which of the following groups of professional drivers have training that includes information on sharing the road with cyclists?
*Check all that apply*
- City staff
- Taxi drivers
- Transit operators
- School bus operators
- Delivery drivers
- Other
- None of the above
If other, describe *(100 word limit)*

45. Describe any efforts your community has made to ensure your education programs reach traditionally underserved populations, particularly seniors, women, youth and adult minorities and non-English speakers, and persons with disabilities of all ages. *(250 word limit)*

46. Describe any other education efforts in your community that promote safe cycling. *(500 word limit)*

**ENCOURAGEMENT**

47. How do you promote National Bike Month/your own dedicated Bike Month?
*Check all that apply*
- Official Proclamation
- Community Rides
- Mayor-led/Council-led Ride
- Public Service Announcements
- Videos promoting bicycling on community website/TV channel
- Publish a guide to Bike Month Events
- Bike Month Website
- Commuter Challenge
- Bike Commuter energizer stations/breakfasts
- Car-free days
Open Streets/Ciclovia/Sunday Parkways
Mentoring program for new riders
Bike valet parking at events
Bike to School Day
Bicycle-themed festival/parade/show
Public education campaign relating to cycling (e.g. with a focus on public health or environmental benefits)
Trail construction or maintenance day
Other
No promotion
If other, describe (250 word limit)

47a. What percentage of the population participate in Bike Month events?

47b. Do you actively promote Bike to Work Day or other bicycle commuting incentive programs?
Yes
No
If yes, describe (500 word limit)

47c. Approximately what percentage of the community workforce do you reach on Bike to Work Day?
None
1-25%
26-50%
51-75%
76% or more

48. How do you promote bicycling outside of your official Bike Month?
Check all that apply
Community and charity rides
Mayor-led/Council-led Rides
Videos on bicycling on community website/TV channel
Public Service Announcements
Trail construction or maintenance day
Open Streets/Ciclovia/Sunday Parkways
Commuter Challenge
Business program that provides discounts for customers arriving by bicycle
Triathlons and bicycle races
Bike commuter events
Car-free days
Publish a guide to community bicycle events
Mentoring program for new riders
Bike valet parking at events
Bike to School Day
Bicycle-themed festivals/parades/shows
Public education campaign relating to cycling (e.g. with a focus on public health or environmental benefits)
Community celebration/ride each time a bicycle project is completed
☐ Other
☐ No promotion
If other, describe (250 word limit)

49. List the signature cycling events that occur in your community. (250 word limit)

49a. How does the municipality sponsor or actively support these events?
Check all that apply
☐ Organize the event
☐ Fund event
☐ Contribute in-kind funding (i.e. police presence, closing roads, etc)
☐ Assist in promoting the event
☐ Other
☐ No support/ Not applicable
If other, please describe (100 word limit)

50. Does your local tourism board or chamber of commerce promote bicycling in your area?
Yes
No
If yes, describe (250 word limit)

51. Are there cycling clubs in your community?
Check all that apply
☐ Recreational bike clubs
☐ Mountain bike clubs
☐ Friends of the Trail groups
☐ National Mountain Bike Patrol
☐ Racing clubs or teams
☐ Other
☐ No
If other, describe (100 word limit)

51a. List the names of the clubs.
(500 word limit)

52. How many specialty bicycle retailers (shops dedicated primarily to selling bikes and bike-related equipment) are there in your community?

52a. List their names.
(250 word limit)

53. Which of these bicycling amenities do you have in your community?
Check all that apply
☐ BMX track
☐ Velodrome
☐ Cyclocross course
☐ Mountain bike park
☐ Pump tracks
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☐ Themed Loop route(s) around the community
☐ Other
☐ None
If other, describe *(100 word limit)*

53a. Is there a skate park in your community?
   Yes
   No

If yes, do bikes have access to the skate park?
☐ Always
☐ Sometimes
☐ Never

54. Are there opportunities to rent bicycles in your community?
   Yes
   No

55. Does your community currently have a bike sharing program that is open to the general public?
   Yes
   No
   Launching this year

55a. If yes, please provide details about the system below.
   How many bikes are in the system?
   How many stations are in the system?
   How many trips are being made annually?

56. Do you have any current League of American Bicyclists designated Bicycle Friendly Businesses in your community?
   Yes
   No
   If yes, list the names of the businesses and their award level. *(250 word limit)*

57. Do you have any current League of American Bicyclists designated Bicycle Friendly Universities in your community?
   Yes
   No
   No institutions of higher education
   If yes, list the names of the institutions and their award level. *(250 word limit)*

58. Does your community have a bike co-op or non-profit community bike shop?
   Yes
   No
   If yes, describe its services *(250 word limit)*
58a. If yes, does the co-op/non-profit community bike shop receive support from the local government?
☐ Grants
☐ Free or subsidized property/space
☐ Contracts for services, e.g. bicycle skills or maintenance education, event support, etc
☐ Other
If other, describe (250 word limit)

59. Does your community have youth recreation and/or intervention programs centered on bicycling?
Check all that apply
☐ Recycle a Bicycle
☐ Trips for Kids chapter
☐ Earn a Bike program
☐ Bike co-op or Community Cycling Center
☐ Other
☐ None
If other, describe (100 word limit)

60. What mapping and route finding information is available for your community, which has been updated in the last 18 months?
Check all that apply
☐ Online route finding service
☐ Online bike map outlining existing bike infrastructure (by type), public restrooms and other bicycle amenities
☐ Printed bike map outlining existing bike infrastructure (by type), public restrooms and other bicycle amenities
☐ Printed mountain bike trails map
☐ Printed greenways and trails map
☐ Smart phone app
☐ None of the above

61. Describe any other programs or policies your community has to encourage cycling. (500 word limit)

ENFORCEMENT

62. How does your police department interact with the local cycling community?
Check all that apply
☐ A police officer is an active member of bicycle advisory committee
☐ Identified law-enforcement point person to interact with cyclists
☐ No current formal interaction
☐ Other
If other, describe (100 word limit)
63. What kind of training is offered to police officers regarding traffic law as it applies to bicyclists?  
*Check all that apply*
- Basic academy training
- International Police Mountain Bike Association training
- Law Enforcement Bicycle Association training
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration Law Enforcement Training
- Completion of Smart Cycling course by one or more officers
- Presentation by League Cycling Instructor or local cyclist
- Institute for Police Training and Development bicycle training
- No training offered

64. What enforcement programs that target improving cyclist safety are in place?  
*Check all that apply*
- Helmet giveaways
- Light giveaways
- Bike lock giveaways
- Targeting motorist infractions
- Targeting cyclist infractions
- Positive enforcement ticketing
- Share the road campaigns
- Other
- None of the above

If other, describe *(100 word limit)*

65. What percentage of patrol officers are on bikes?
- None
- 1-10%
- 10-20%
- 30-40%
- 40-50%
- More than 50%

66. Are any other public safety (e.g. EMS) employees on bikes?
- Yes
- No

If yes, describe *(50 word limit)*

67. Do police officers report cyclist crash data or potential hazards to traffic engineers and planners to identify sites in need of safety improvements for cyclists?
- Yes
- No

68. Which of the following safety services and amenities are available in your community?
- Emergency call boxes/phones along trails
- Trail watch programs/ Trail patrols
- Street lighting on most arterials
- Street lighting on most non-arterials
69. Are there any local or state ordinances that protect cyclists? 
Check all that apply
☐ Specific penalties for failing to yield to a cyclist when turning
☐ It is illegal to park or drive in a bike lane (intersections excepted)
☐ Penalties for motor vehicle users that 'door' cyclists
☐ Ban on cell phone use while driving
☐ Ban on texting while driving
☐ Photo enforcement for red lights and/or speed
☐ Vulnerable road user law
☐ Safe passing distance law
☐ It is illegal to harass a cyclist
☐ Other
☐ None of the above
If other, describe (250 word limit)

70. Do your local ordinances place any restrictions on cyclists? 
Check all that apply
☐ Local law requires cyclists to use side paths regardless of their usability
☐ Local law requires cyclists to use bike lanes when provided
☐ Local law requires that cyclists are required to ride as far to the right of the road as practicable without exceptions
☐ Local or school policies restrict youths from riding to school
☐ Other
☐ None of the above
If other, describe (100 word limit)

71. Describe any other enforcement programs or policies relating to cycling. (500 word limit)

EVALUATION AND PLANNING

72. Does your community have a comprehensive bicycle master plan or similar section in another document? 
Yes
No
Currently under preparation

72a. If yes, please provide details about the plan below. 
Provide a link to the plan or describe. (250 word limit)
When was it passed or most recently updated?
Is there a dedicated funding source for implementation?
☐ Yes
☐ No
If yes, describe the funding source and designated amount (250 word limit)
What percentage of the current plan has been implemented?
Are you meeting annual target goals for implementation?
Yes  
No

73. Do you have a trails master plan that addresses mountain bike access?
Yes  
No  
If yes, provide the link to the plan or describe. (250 word limit)

74. Is there formal cooperation between the mountain biking community and the community recreation and planning staff?
Yes  
No  
If yes, describe (100 word limit)

75. Does your community have an on-going bicycle counting and/or survey program that allows for long-term trend analysis of cycling trips (e.g. participation in the National Bicycle and Pedestrian Documentation Project)?
☐ Yes  
☐ No  
If yes, please describe the most recent results. (250 word limit)

75a. If yes, do the counts capture the gender of cyclists?
☐ Yes  
☐ No  
If yes, please describe the most recent results. (100 word limit)

76. Does your community routinely conduct pre/post evaluations of bicycle-related road projects?
☐ Yes  
☐ No  
If yes, please describe the results. (250 word limit)

77. Does your community establish target goals for bicycle use, e.g. a certain bicycle mode share level?
☐ Yes  
☐ No  
If yes, please describe (250 word limit)

78. What is the most current journey-to-work data for your community? Tip: Search for topic B08301 (Means of Transportation to Work) for your community on the American FactFinder website (Advanced Search). Choose the most recent data set available for your community. Divide the total number of bicycle/pedestrian/transit commuters by the total number of commuters and multiply the result by 100.  
Bicycling (in %)
Percentage of bicycle commuters who are women (See topic Bo8006. Choose the most recent data set available for your community. Divide the total number of women bicycle commuters by the total number of bicycle commuters and multiply the result by 100.)

Walking (in %)
Transit (in %)

79. What is the average commuting distance to work for residents of your community? Tip: This data is not available nationally and needs to be collected locally (or estimated).
- Less than 2 miles
- 2-5 miles
- 5-10 miles
- Above 10 miles

80. What percent of children commute to school by bicycle? Tip: This data is not available nationally and needs to be collected locally.
- Elementary (in %)
- Middle School (in %)
- High School (in %)

81. How many cyclists have been involved in a crash in your community in the past five years involving a motor vehicle?

81a. How many cyclist fatalities have occurred in your community in the past five years involving a motor vehicle?

81b. Do you have a specific plan or program to reduce these numbers?
- Yes
- No
If yes, describe (250 word limit)

82. Do you measure the Bicycle Level of Service of roads and/or intersections?
- Yes
- No
If yes, please describe your methodology and recent results. (250 word limit)

83. Do you have community-wide trip reduction policies or programs?
- Yes
- No
If yes, describe the policy/program and the results. (250 word limit)

83a. Does the program use individualized marketing to identify and support current and potential bike commuters in your community?
- Yes
- No
If yes, describe the program and the results. (250 word limit)
84. Have you done an economic impact study on bicycling in your community?
   Yes
   No
   If yes, describe the results. (250 word limit)

85. Do you have a mechanism to ensure bicycle facilities, programs and encouragement efforts are implemented in traditionally underserved neighborhoods?
   Yes
   No
   Not applicable
   If yes, describe (250 word limit)

86. Describe any other programs or policies that your community uses to evaluate and/or plan bicycling conditions, programs, and facilities. (500 word limit)

FINAL OVERVIEW

87. What are the three primary reasons your community deserves to be designated a Bicycle Friendly Community?
   Reason One (250 word limit)
   Reason Two (250 word limit)
   Reason Three (250 word limit)

88. What are the three aspects of your community most in need of improvement in order to accommodate bicyclists?
   Aspect One (100 word limit)
   Aspect Two (100 word limit)
   Aspect Three (100 word limit)

89. Has completing this application made you more aware of what your community needs to do to be bicycle friendly?
   Yes
   No
   If yes, describe (250 word limit)

90. Are you planning any new projects based on your completion of the Bicycle Friendly Community application?
   Yes
   No
   If yes, describe (250 word limit)

Submit any documents that you would like to provide in support of your application, including at least five high resolution photos (1-2MB) here. You can submit up to 5 files at the time and there is no limit on how many files can be submitted. By submitting photos, the League of American Bicyclists has the right to use your photos to promote bicycling. Please note that the files will submit immediately and will not appear as an attachment.
We often get requests for model BFC applications from aspiring communities. Would you be willing to share your application?

Yes
No

How have you heard about the BFC program?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Award Level</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Platinum</td>
<td>101,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Platinum</td>
<td>63,722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Collins</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Platinum</td>
<td>143,986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Platinum</td>
<td>593,820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>20,232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breckenridge</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>4,540</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>105,162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corvallis</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>53,165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crested Butte</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>1,497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>16,887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>142,681</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson and Teton County</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>18,251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>221,551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>379,499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missoula</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>66,788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>64,403</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>739,426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottsdale</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>217,385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>563,374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>13,315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steamboat Springs</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>12,088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson &amp; East Pima Region</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>512,023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>24,697</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salida</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>52,74</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ada County</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>392,365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>140,024</td>
<td>Moved up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>296,197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Arbor</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>114,028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcata</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>17,321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>210,280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspen</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>681,804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>73,460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bend</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>77,455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomington</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>69,107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>645,169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bozeman</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>37,280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Award Level</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>42,417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calistoga</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>Moved up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlottesville</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>43,475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrboro</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>18,162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>2,896,016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>36,612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Springs</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>360,890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>102,324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>598,707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evanston</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>74,486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagstaff</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>57,391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folsom</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>63,960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainesville</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>117,182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunnison</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>5,854</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>8,238</td>
<td>Moved up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilton Head Island</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>33,862</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa City</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>68,947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>223,729</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Crosse</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>51,818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>466,520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longmont</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>87,461</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>30,648</td>
<td>Moved up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moab City and Grand County</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>14,271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>70,708</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>8,143,197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>44,460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park City and Snyderville Basin</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>20,671</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>1,454,382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Townsend</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>8,334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidio of San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redmond</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>49,637</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>456,394</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>181,743</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>43,766</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>54,593</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>67,947</td>
<td>Moved up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>89,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Award Level</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisters</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>1,925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerville</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>77,478</td>
<td>Moved up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>172,589</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vail</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>4,806</td>
<td>Moved up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>22,146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>599,657</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood River Valley</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>12,506</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anacortes</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batavia</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>26,045</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward County</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>1,80,000</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>261,610</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>15,936</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Heights</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>46,121</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>41,751</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duluth</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>86,265</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmhurst</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>46,371</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eureka</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>27127</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>20936</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Marais</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>1,351</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>29134</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>2,160,821</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jekyll Island</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>51,724</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montclair</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>37,726</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montpelier</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>7,855</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>24,672</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogden</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>83,800</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onalaska</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>17,736</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>28,572</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reston</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>58,404</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richfield</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>35,228</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>136,650</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens Point</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>26,717</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>48744</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamsburg</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>14,067</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winona</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>27592</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winston-Salem</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>229,617</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>73,812</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Award Level</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>48,770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>448,607</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appleton</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>72,563</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>42,844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arvada</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>107,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asheville</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>83,393</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens-Clarke County</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>52,205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bainbridge Island</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>631,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>8,493</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton Rouge</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>440,171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaverton</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>79,350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bemidji</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>13,431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bentonville</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>35,301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethesda</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>57,319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billings</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>100,147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boca Raton</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>83,960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>40,007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>21,820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbondale</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>5,196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>119,745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Rock</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>50,028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Falls</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>39,387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Rapids</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>12,6498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champaign</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>81,055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>252,257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Hill</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>55,616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>124,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>648,387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>167,674</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>297,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>396,815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeur d'Alene</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>41,983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>129,272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>44,061</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>748,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Award Level</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>43,225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conway</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>59,511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottonwood</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>12,426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupertino</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>50,479</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>154,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decatur</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>19,335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>203,433</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>212,789</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Placer County</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>11,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eau Claire</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>101,353</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeryville</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>10,080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>67,158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernandina Beach</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>11,510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitchburg</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>25,260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Wayne</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>253,691</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>7,212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>65,239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>500,121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>211,951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>18,026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goshen</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>31,719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>688,937</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>10,869</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Mankato</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>52,703</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeley</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>92,889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensboro</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>258,671</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>57,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gresham</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>101,537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>48,814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoboken</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>50,005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Beach</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>202,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>820,445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juneau</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>30,711</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>482,228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keene</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>24,769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>177,646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeland</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>97,422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Award Level</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>146,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>111,304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Cruces</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>92,235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>88,664</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee's Summit</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>92,188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewes</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>2,747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington-Fayette County</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>246,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>258,379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Altos</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>27,483</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>3,792,621</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>700,030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>52,281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>437,454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>418,480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midland</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>41,863</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>554,965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgantown</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>29,660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naperville</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>128,358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville-Davidson County</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>601,222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>29,886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>343,829</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>85,945</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>112,551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Little Rock</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>60,433</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>28,978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>365,875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean City</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>11,701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>174,925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>408,958</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>3,010,232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>205,648</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>16,727</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paso Robles</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>30,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>316,718</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>46,143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provo</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>117,489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Award Level</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>405,612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redding</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>89,470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno-Sparks Washoe County</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>421,407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>205,533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgeland</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>22,809</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Falls</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>15,308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>311,575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanoke</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>94,911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanoke</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>102,437</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>210,565</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Hill</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>66,154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockville</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>61,209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseville</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>122,060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roswell</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>85,920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Paul</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>281,244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>152,239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>1,144,646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>971,372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanibel</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>6,064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>110,376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaumburg</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>73,346</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedona</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>10,192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>57,628</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheboygan County</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>115,507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorewood</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>13,267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simsbury</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>23,256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitka</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>8,883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>9,098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>9,128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bend</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>100,842</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>23,609</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sioux City</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>11,925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Windsor</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>24,409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartanburg</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>39,487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>204,428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>156,206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State College - Centre Region</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>92,096</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Award Level</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillwater</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>45,688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>350,759</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>249,090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon Bay</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>9,144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit County</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>29,626</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>131,760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>198,387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>176,336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temecula</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>103,092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Woodlands Township</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>97,023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thousand Oaks</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>127,644</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traverse City</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>14,532</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>384,037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Heights</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbana</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>40,550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>156,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw and Winona Lake</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>18,467</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerville</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>36,120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>65,333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Windsor</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>27,165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>101,353</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>26,801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BUILDING A BICYCLE FRIENDLY AMERICA™

A roadmap to transforming states, communities, businesses and universities

THE LEAGUE OF AMERICAN BICYCLISTS
since 1880
Building a BICYCLE FRIENDLY AMERICA

Across the U.S., the interest in bicycling is skyrocketing — and it’s easy to see why. A bike is a ticket to health, mobility, freedom and fun. Bicycling isn’t just a way to get from one place to another; it’s an avenue to a better life. And when communities, businesses and universities get on board, great things happen.

How do you capture and capitalize on the tremendous benefits of biking? The League’s Bicycle Friendly America (BFA) program has the answers.

Over the past 10 years, the League has worked with hundreds of engineers, government officials, and bicycle advocates to identify the DNA of bicycle friendliness. Using that expert knowledge, we’ve determined the specific projects, policies, programs and plans that really make a difference. The BFA program gives you the specific tools to turn that knowledge into action.

Providing a roadmap to improve conditions for cyclists at the state and local level, the BFA program has expanded and evolved to serve four distinct areas: Communities, States, Businesses and Universities. With comprehensive online applications, the program collects data on activities within five broad areas:

1. **ENGINEERING**: Physical infrastructure and hardware to support cycling
2. **EDUCATION**: Programs that ensure the safety, comfort and convenience of cyclists and fellow road users
3. **ENCOURAGEMENT**: Incentives, promotions and opportunities that inspire and enable people to ride
4. **ENFORCEMENT**: Equitable laws and programs that ensure motorists and cyclists are held accountable
5. **EVALUATION**: Processes that demonstrate a commitment to measuring results and planning for the future

The BFA program is more than an assessment. All applicants get customized feedback on their application and access to technical assistance. If you aren’t bicycle friendly yet, we’ll help you get there. And once you’ve made the ranks of a Bicycle Friendly Community, Business or University, the BFA program helps you get to the next level.

Learn how you can get involved in the pages that follow and at www.bikeleague.org/bfa.

Cover photo: Trek
Long Beach Council Member Robert Garcia and Vice Mayor Suja Lowenthal in Long Beach’s separated bike lanes. (Photo: Allan Crawford)

THE BENEFITS OF BICYCLING

“Our Gold Bicycle Friendly designation is a tremendous honor, and it recognizes what a great place Minneapolis is to be a bicyclist. We’ve made a deliberate effort to be one of the nation’s top bicycling cities and those investments mean we have more and more ways for people to commute and experience the city on two wheels.”

- Mayor R.T. Rybak, Minneapolis, Minn.

“The #1 Bicycle Friendly State designation recognizes the hard work and cooperation among local and state agencies, bicycle groups and health professionals. The designation is an incentive to continue to refine and develop projects, policies and priorities to retain our position.”

- Washington Governor Christine Gregoire
Bicycling is more than a practical, cost-effective solution to many municipal challenges. It’s an opportunity to make your community a vibrant destination for residents and visitors — a place where people don’t just live and work, but thrive. The Bicycle Friendly Community program provides a roadmap to improve conditions for bicycling and direct assistance to make your distinct vision for a better, bikeable community a reality.

**WHY SHOULD MY COMMUNITY BECOME A BFC?**

Simple steps to make bicycling safe and comfortable pay huge dividends in civic, community and economic development. Given the opportunity to ride, residents enjoy dramatic health benefits, reduced congestion, increased property values and more money in their pockets to spend in the local economy. When your community is bike-friendly, tourism booms, businesses attract the best and the brightest, and governments save big on parking costs while cutting their carbon emissions.

Innovative infrastructure isn’t just for big cities. Missoula, Mont., recently rose to Gold BFC status thanks in part to the addition of protected bike lanes. “The City of Missoula, together with citizen advocates, has worked hard to integrate and promote bicycle commuting, and we’re proud that our extensive off-street bike trail system, together with our miles of bike lanes, and bike education and encouragement programs, reflect that,” says Missoula Mayor John Engen.

The Tucson/East Pima region attained Gold BFC status with an array of exceptional education programs. “The Bicycle Ambassador program has taught more than 1,000 adults safe cycling skills each year and the Safe Routes to School program has now expanded into the middle schools and includes summer bicycle camps,” says Ann Chanecka, Senior Transportation Planner, Pima Association of Governments.
WHAT MAKES A BICYCLE FRIENDLY COMMUNITY?

A Bicycle Friendly Community welcomes cyclists with trails, bike lanes, share the road campaigns, organized rides, Bike to Work Day events and so much more. A rich matrix of options that recognizes your area’s unique resources, the BFC application evaluates how your community encourages people to bike for transportation and recreation through the 5 Es: engineering, education, encouragement, enforcement, and evaluation.

WHAT’S THE BENEFIT OF BEING A BFC?

The popularity of the program speaks for itself: As of 2013, more than 600 communities have applied, and 242 have been awarded Bronze, Silver, Gold or Platinum designation. But, even if your community doesn’t quite make the grade yet, applying is well worth the time. Each applicant receives customized feedback and technical assistance. Once your community becomes a BFC, a League representative will present an award and two highway-quality road signs at a local ceremony or celebration.

HOW DO I GET STARTED?

Turn to page 14 and fill out the BFC scorecard to see if your community is ready to apply. All applications must be submitted with the approval of the community’s administration. Access the applications and additional resources at bikeleague.org/community.
Four years ago, Long Beach put an audacious statement on the wall of our City Hall: “Long Beach: The most bike friendly city in the U.S.” It wasn’t true at the time, but it gave us something to strive for. And we knew that we needed milestones to measure our progress along the way.

In 2009, we were given Bronze BFC status and we immediately set our sights on becoming Silver, then Gold and eventually Platinum. We knew this recognition would be important to our civic and business leaders, and that the metrics set out in the League’s application would be important measures for us.

At the time, we had a few bike lanes along with beach and river paths that were mainly for recreation. But as a result of our efforts, more than 20 new bike-related businesses have opened in Long Beach since 2010. We’ve added more than 170 bike-friendly businesses to our Bike Saturday program and created four bike-friendly business districts. On some streets, where we have put in new bike infrastructure, we have tripled the number of kids riding bikes to school.

We’re now seeing people move to Long Beach because of our biking and our active living culture. We are seeing conventions select Long Beach because of what we are doing. Most importantly we are seeing more and more people on their bikes, riding for fun, to get to school, to get to work and to run errands.

- By Allan Crawford, Bike Long Beach
Imagine your employees arriving at their desks energized, alert and more productive than ever. Picture your healthcare costs plummeting and staff morale skyrocketing. Envision customers flocking to your door instead of the competition. How do you get there? Start pedaling and become a Bicycle Friendly Business (BFB).

**WHY SHOULD MY BUSINESS BECOME A BFB?**

The bicycle isn’t just a great transportation option; it’s an economic engine that can drive your business to higher profits, happier employees and more loyal patrons. Encouraging bicycling showcases your commitment to sustainability, healthy living and accessibility for all. And biking doesn’t just enhance your bottom line — it makes your business a fun, engaging and exciting place to work or shop.
**WHAT MAKES A BICYCLE FRIENDLY BUSINESS?**

BFBs make it easy to pedal to work by providing amenities like secure bike parking and shower facilities. They fire up employees and patrons with incentives to commute by bike, company bike rides, and Bike to Work Week promotions. At a BFB, cycling is part of the business culture and becomes an expression of corporate responsibility. Those attributes shine through in the four areas of the BFB application: encouragement, education, engineering and evaluation.

Any corporation, organization, association, public agency or non-profit that actively promotes bicycling, has a distinct workplace outside of the home, and has two or more employees is eligible to apply.

**WHAT’S THE BENEFIT OF BEING A BFB?**

The League recognizes deserving businesses at the Bronze, Silver, Gold or Platinum level, but all applicants receive valuable feedback and assistance in becoming more bicycle friendly. When your business joins the more than 400 BFBs across the nation, you’ll get recognition in a national press release, decals for your workplace, a profile on the League website, and in the League’s annual yearbook distributed to 10,000 homes across the nation. Silver and higher awards also receive a bicycle print award.

**HOW DO I GET STARTED?**

Turn to page 15 and fill out the BFB scorecard to see if your business is ready to apply. Access the applications and additional resources at bikeleague.org/business.

---

**BFB PROFILE: THE BURKE GROUP**

For employees of The Burke Group in Rosemont, Ill., there are plenty of ways to arrive on two wheels, including the on-street bike route system or the trail leading directly to the building. But the bike friendly atmosphere doesn’t end at the front door.

In 2010, the engineering firm was awarded a Silver BFB designation thanks to excellent facilities and innovative programs, like showers, CEO-led social rides and a new bike for the top rider each year. The conversion of car-commuters was slow at first, but more and more employees dusted off their old bicycles as they heard their co-workers raving about the many benefits of riding and saw how the company supported their efforts.

In addition to creating a positive place to work, The Burke Group sees cycling as a means to improving job performance. Engineers who understand the challenges of multi-modal transportation are able to support bicycling in new designs. And the cycling culture has certainly boosted workplace camaraderie.

By 2012, The Burke Group had witnessed 30,000 fewer miles driven on local roads as a result of their efforts – and moved up to a Gold level BFB.
provides affordable transportation options for students and staff. By promoting biking, universities make it easy for students to adopt active transportation habits that keep them healthy long after graduation. And, just like a great football team, amenities like biking are a big draw for prospective students.

WHY SHOULD MY UNIVERSITY BECOME A BFU?

It’s not rocket science: Increased bicycling optimizes limited space, saves the university money on parking and healthcare, and provides affordable transportation options for students and staff. By promoting biking, universities make it easy for students to adopt active transportation habits that keep them healthy long after graduation. And, just like a great football team, amenities like biking are a big draw for prospective students.

WHAT MAKES A BICYCLE FRIENDLY UNIVERSITY?

Bicycle Friendly Universities promote cycling in a variety of ways, from secure bike parking to campus bike rides to bicycle education classes. To determine whether a campus makes the grade, universities are evaluated in five primary areas: engineering, encouragement, education, enforcement and evaluation/planning. Using the five Es, successful universities create a safe and comfortable environment that encourages cyclists of all skill levels to get out and ride for transportation and recreation.

Any university college, college, community college or other institution of higher education with a physical campus is eligible to apply!
BFU PROFILE: DUKE UNIVERSITY

When Greg Hardy got to campus, he was interested in biking — but Duke University got him hooked. “Biking is now part of my daily routine,” he says. “I originally started commuting by bike one or two days a week, but the ease of biking at Duke quickly increased my commuting.”

The Bicycle Friendly University program played a big role in showing the elite university where to start — and how to progress — in effectively encouraging students like Hardy to ride. “Applying for the BFU award helped us see what we were already doing and get expert advice on how to make improvements and set priorities,” says Brian Williams, Duke’s Transportation Demand Management Coordinator.

Based on the League’s guidance, the university conducted an assessment of every road on campus and installed bike lanes or sharrows on every single street. Duke also added a bicycle coordinator to its staff, providing full-time support for new bike projects, public awareness campaigns, more bike parking and a fleet of loaner bikes.

“Being able to say to the university, ‘For less than the cost of one deck-parking space, we were able to make all of the roads on campus more bicycle friendly’ was huge,” Williams says.

In 2012, Duke attained Bronze status — and they’re not done yet.

WHAT’S THE BENEFIT OF BEING A BFU?

By applying to become a BFU, your university gains immediate access to the expertise and insight of League staff — every applicant receives detailed feedback and assistance in becoming more bicycle friendly. The League recognizes deserving institutions at the Bronze, Silver, Gold or Platinum level and newly designated BFUs get two iconic BFU road signs, an award certificate, an online profile and recognition in a League-distributed press release.

HOW DO I GET STARTED?

Turn to page 15 and fill out the BFU scorecard to see if your university is ready to apply. All applications must be submitted with the approval of the institution’s administration. Access the applications and additional resources at bikeleague.org/university.
New businesses and potential residents aren’t just looking at tax rates and school districts anymore; they want to settle in a state with rich outdoor opportunities and safe transportation options for their entire family or workforce. The Bicycle Friendly States program helps government officials and advocates improve bicycling conditions and enhance quality of life.

**WHY SHOULD MY STATE BECOME BICYCLE-FRIENDLY?**

Bicycling means business: Bicycle tourism can be a major driver of economic development, and corporations can capitalize on reduced healthcare costs. By making streets comfortable and accessible for cyclists, bicycle friendly states increase the safety of all road users and give residents transportation choices that save money and improve health.
WHAT MAKES A BICYCLE FRIENDLY STATE?

Bicycle friendly states help ensure cyclists’ safety and access with policies and provisions like safe passing laws, Complete Streets policies, and signed bike routes. They make it inviting to ride within their borders with amenities like bike route maps, and educate motorists and law enforcement about the rights and responsibilities of bicyclists. In a bicycle friendly state, policymakers invest federal dollars on bicycle projects and account for cyclist in planning the future of their transportation system, too.

WHAT IS THE BICYCLE FRIENDLY STATE PROGRAM?

The Bicycle Friendly State program is the annual ranking of all 50 states’ progress toward promoting and embracing biking for transportation and recreation. The program focuses on all aspects of a state’s bicycle programs, from advocacy groups to law enforcement to the Department of Transportation. States receive an overall ranking, as well as scores in five categories: legislation and enforcement; policies and programs; infrastructure and funding; education and encouragement; and evaluation and planning. But the BFS program is more than a Report Card; League staff provide specific feedback, next steps and ongoing technical assistance. Learn more at bikeleague.org/states.

BFS PROFILE: DELAWARE

Delaware is small in size, but it’s making big strides for bicyclists. In 2011, despite tough economic conditions, the state legislature passed a landmark “Walkable, Bikeable Delaware” measure that unlocked an unprecedented $5 million in new state funds for bicycle and pedestrian projects.

Just a few months later, Governor Jack Markell announced a statewide trails plan backed with $13 million for new construction and updated facilities. In 2012, the state directed another $480,000 in federal funds for a greenway connecting two major cities.

But more important than money, Delaware boasts a strong statewide advocacy organization, innovative secretaries in the departments of Transportation and Natural Resources and visionary leadership from the Governor.

“Trails and bike routes are a part of a vision for a state with interconnected communities,” says Governor Markell, an avid cyclist himself. “We will continue working to make Delaware an attractive place not only to bike, but to live and work.”
### COMMUNITY SCORECARD

#### ENGINEERING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your community have a comprehensive, connected and well-maintained bicycling network?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is bike parking readily available throughout the community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a Complete Streets ordinance or another policy that mandates the accommodation of cyclists on all road projects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there a community-wide Safe routes to School program that includes bicycling education?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there bicycling education courses available for adults in the community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your community educate motorists and cyclists on their rights and responsibilities as road users?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENFORCEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do law enforcement officers receive training on the rights and responsibilities of all road users?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your community have law enforcement or other public safety officers on bikes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do local ordinances treat bicyclists equitably?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there a specific plan or program to reduce cyclist/motor vehicle crashes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your community have a current comprehensive bicycle plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a Bicycle advisory Committee that meets regularly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your community have a bicycle program manager?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENCOURAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your community have an up-to-date bicycle map?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the community celebrate bicycling during national Bike month with community rides, Bike to Work Day or media outreach?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the community host any major community cycling events or rides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there an active bicycle advocacy group in the community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SCORING (GIVE YOURSELF ONE POINT FOR EVERY “YES.”)

Score 0-8: Your community probably has some improvements to make before becoming a Bicycle Friendly Community – apply now to receive a free feedback report that will guide your community in becoming more bicycle-friendly!

Score 9-17: You’ve already got a good start – apply now and we’ll tell you what you’ve done well and how you can improve.

Start working with local officials to fill out the Bicycle Friendly Community application and contact us to help you through the process at 202-822-1333 or bfa@bikeleague.org.
**ENGINEERING**

☐ Y ☐ N  The business provides secure and convenient bike parking.

☐ Y ☐ N  Showers are on-site and are free for employee use.

**ENCOURAGEMENT**

☐ Y ☐ N  There are incentives provided by the business for employees to commute to work by bike.

☐ Y ☐ N  The business works with local advocates to improve bicycling conditions for the community.

☐ Y ☐ N  The business supports a bicycle team/club.

**EDUCATION**

☐ Y ☐ N  The business offers bicycle education classes.

☐ Y ☐ N  Bicycling education materials are available to employees on a regular basis.

**EVALUATION**

☐ Y ☐ N  The business has a bike coordinator (full, part-time, or volunteer) to help promote cycling.

☐ Y ☐ N  The business sets and evaluates annual goals to help increase ridership.

---

**UNIVERSITY SCORECARD**

**ENGINEERING**

☐ Y ☐ N  Does your campus have a well-connected bicycling network?

☐ Y ☐ N  Is bike parking readily available throughout the campus?

☐ Y ☐ N  Is the college or university easily accessible by bike?

**EDUCATION**

☐ Y ☐ N  Does the school offer bicycle education classes for students and staff?

**ENCOURAGEMENT**

☐ Y ☐ N  Is there an active bicycle advocacy group at the college or university?

☐ Y ☐ N  Is there an on-campus bike center for rentals and repairs?

**ENFORCEMENT**

☐ Y ☐ N  Do campus safety/law enforcement officers receive training on the rights and responsibilities of all road users?

☐ Y ☐ N  Is there a program on campus to prevent bike theft?

**EVALUATION**

☐ Y ☐ N  Does your school have a current comprehensive bicycle plan?

☐ Y ☐ N  Does your college or university have a bicycle program manager?

---

**SCORING (BUSINESS & UNIVERSITY)** Score 0-4: Your community probably has some improvements to make before becoming a Bicycle Friendly Business or University – apply now to receive a free feedback report that will guide you in becoming more bicycle-friendly! Score 5 and up: You’ve already got a good start – apply now and we’ll tell you what you’ve done well and how you can improve.

Start working with local officials to fill out the BFB or BFU application and contact us to help you through the process at 202-822-1333 or bfa@bikeleague.org.
November 25, 2013

Diana Jiminez
President
North Monterey County League of United Latin American Citizens
P.O. Box 1359
Castroville, CA 95012

RE: Need for Safe and Accessible Bicycle and Pedestrian Trails Connecting the Castroville Community

Dear Ms. Jiminez:

Thank you for your letter regarding the need for safe and accessible bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and connections in the Castroville community. The Transportation Agency is dedicated to delivering projects to enhance the safety and accessibility of the county's transportation system.

Several of the highest priority projects being funded and planned by the Transportation Agency in coordination with the County of Monterey will directly serve the needs of the Castroville community, both to address daily transportation needs and to improve bicycle and pedestrian access to recreation. The specific needs and projects identified in your letter are discussed below:

1. **Moss Landing Connector Trail**: State Route 1 would most likely serve as the alignment for a direct path between Castroville and Moss Landing, but no project is currently planned along that route. The Monterey County Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Master Plan includes bicycle lane improvements along Dolan Road between Moss Landing and the existing Castroville Boulevard path and bike route, which would provide a future connection when the Castroville Railroad Crossing project is completed and the bicycle lanes are funded and constructed. As described in more detail below, the Agency intends to allocate funding to construct the Railroad Crossing project and prioritize safety needs, but the Dolan Road project, and other similar bicycle lane projects in North Monterey County remain in the planning stage due to a lack of funding. Similarly, planned but currently unfunded segments of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail pathway would provide bicycle and pedestrian pathway connections to destinations on the coastline via the existing pathway adjacent to State Route 156 south of Castroville.
To initiate development of a direct pathway between Castroville and Moss Landing, a project description and cost estimate must be developed with sufficient detail to allow the project to be added to the Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan and Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Master Plan. Those actions would serve as a first step toward seeking state or federal funding for environmental review and engineering phases of a project, and eventual applications for funding to construct a facility. Additional considerations that will likely be involved in this project include providing for a safe crossing of State Route 1 from Castroville, Coastal Commission approval, and possible negotiation with landowners to secure right of way for a path.

2. **Castroville Boulevard/Highway 156 Connector Trail**: The County of Monterey is currently developing this project, which will construct a bicycle and pedestrian overcrossing of the Union Pacific Railroad tracks between Castroville Boulevard and Castroville and provide for a safe connection between North Monterey County High School and Castroville. This project continues to be a top regional funding priority for the Transportation Agency.

At this time, work remains to complete engineering and right of way phases and to secure final approvals for the project, but the County of Monterey has a funding shortfall for construction. The Transportation Agency intends to fully fund construction of the project in its upcoming proposal to the state for transportation funding. Assuming that sufficient funding is secured, the Agency expects that the project will begin construction in the middle of 2015 at the earliest. The Transportation Agency is coordinating with the County of Monterey on a quarterly basis to support the project’s construction.

The primary challenge in delivering bicycle and pedestrian improvements is an overall lack of transportation funding, and dedicated funding for these types of projects in particular. The Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan documents a need for billions of dollars in funding to meet countywide needs, including maintaining existing infrastructure in a state of good repair. The Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Master Plan ranks over 400 planned projects to serve as a guide for allocating scarce funds when they are available.

The Transportation Agency is in the process of developing a new long range plan and evaluating future funding options, which will support regional goals adopted by the Agency for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and developing sustainable, healthy communities. Consistent with these goals, the Transportation Agency will be evaluating options for allocating more resources to bicycle and pedestrian transportation, both through discretionary funding available for local streets and roads projects that incorporate adequate bicycle, pedestrian and transit-oriented features (referred to as “complete streets” projects) that fill gaps, as well as through efforts to secure new local revenues that can be dedicated to these projects. We encourage you to stay informed of the Transportation Agency’s activities through the Transportation Agency website ([www.tamcmonterey.org](http://www.tamcmonterey.org)), and agendas for Board of Directors meetings, which are generally held on the fourth Wednesday of each month.

Again, thank you for your recommendations on improving bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure in the Castroville community, and for your support of these projects as they are developed. In response to the general concern expressed about expanding access by bicycle and foot to recreational opportunities, the Transportation Agency is interested in meeting with
you to further discuss your ideas. Please contact Andy Cook in our office at (831) 775-4411, or email andy@tamemonterey.org to schedule a meeting.

Sincerely,

Debra L. Hale
Executive Director

cc: Board of Directors via Board agenda correspondence
    Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee via agenda correspondence
    Robert Murdoch, County of Monterey
    Timothy Gubbins, Caltrans District 5
Avoid a ticket!

Know California bike laws.

Below are some of them.


1. **Earbuds.** Leave one out. *(Bicyclists may not wear earplugs in both ears, or a headset covering both ears. Hearing aids are allowed. California Vehicle Code/CVC 27400.)*

2. **Alcohol/drugs.** Don’t get a BUI! *(Bicyclists may not ride while under the influence of alcohol or drugs. CVC 21200.5.)*

3. **Brakes—BMX, fixies, all bikes.** On CA roads, bikes are illegal without brakes. *(Bicycles must be equipped with a brake that allows...a one-braked-wheel skid on dry, level, clean pavement. CVC 21201(a).)*

4. **Traffic lights.** "Same roads, same rules, same rights." *(Bicycle riders on public roads have the same rights and responsibilities as motorists, and are subject to the same rules and regulations. CVC 21200.)*

5. **Ride in the same direction as traffic.** Bikes travel like cars, not like pedestrians. *(Bicyclists on the shoulder of a roadway must ride in the same direction as the traffic. CVC 21650.1.)*

6. **Proper lane usage.** See tips and details online. *(CVC Section 21202 - Operation on Roadway.)*

7. **Permanent seat.** *(The bicycle must have a permanent seat. Passengers must have a separate seat. [Passengers] under four years old, or weighing 40 pounds or less, must be restrained and protected from moving parts of a bicycle. CVC 21204.)*

8. **Helmets for minors.** If you're under 18, not wearing one may result in a ticket. *(Bicyclists and bicycle passengers under age 18 must wear an approved helmet... CVC 21212.)*

9. **Lights, reflectors.** The following equipment is required on bicycles ridden at night *(CVC 21201).* Local bike shops have great selections. You can also rig up your own lights from inexpensive supplies. See tips online.

   - A white headlight, or white lamp attached to the rider, visible from 300 feet in front of and from the sides of the bicycle
   - A red reflector visible from 500 feet when illuminated by a motor vehicle’s headlights
   - A white or yellow reflector on each pedal visible from 200 feet to the front and to the rear of the bicycle
   - A white or yellow reflector on each side of the front of the bicycle, and a white or red reflector on each side of the back of the bicycle, or reflectorized tires

Avoid an accident! *Follow safe riding practices—and advocate for better infrastructure.* Learn more: [BicyclingMonterey.com](http://BicyclingMonterey.com) *(831)375-6278*

Find Monterey County bike shops, services, clubs, and resources, including group rides and other activities; how to advocate for bike lanes and other improvements; HER Helmet Thursdays discounts for male and female cyclists; more!

Leyes de ciclismo de California - bicicletas


21200 — Los ciclistas tienen los mismos derechos y responsabilidades que los automovilistas.

21200.5 — Es ilegal montar bicicleta mientras esté bajo la influencia de narcóticos o alcohol.

21201 — Cuando pasee en bicicleta de noche, se requiere el siguiente equipo:
- Un faro delantero blanco en su bicicleta o una luz blanca en su persona, que sea visible desde 300 pies, tanto de frente como de los lados de la bicicleta
- Un reflector rojo que sea visible desde 500 pies al ser iluminado por los faros de un vehículo motorizado;
- Un reflector blanco o amarillo en cada pedal, que sea visible desde 200 pies, tanto desde el frente como desde atrás;
- Un reflector blanco o amarillo de ambos lados de la parte delantera de la bicicleta, que sea visible de cada lado, y un reflector blanco o rojo en la parte trasera de la bicicleta, que sea visible de cada lado, o llantas reflectorizadas;

21204 — Las bicicletas deben tener un asiento permanente. Los pasajeros deben tener un asiento separado. Los pasajeros de 4 años o menores, o que pesen menos de 40 libras, deben viajar en asientos que puedan sostenerlos de manera segura y proteger al pasajero de todas las partes movibles de la bicicleta.

21212 — Los ciclistas y los pasajeros menores de 18 años deben llevar un casco que cumpla con los estándares de ANSI o Snell.

21650.1 — Biciclistas en el borde de alguna carretera deben viajar en el mismo sentido que el resto del tráfico.

27400 — Los ciclistas no pueden usar audífonos que les tapen ambos oídos. Esta sección no se aplica a dispositivos para personas con deficiencias auditivas.

Traducción al español cortesía de Orange County Transportation Authority http://www.octa.net
Gracias!
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East Alisal Businesses Upset Over Ciclovia Street Closures in Salinas

Posted: Oct 03, 2013 6:33 PM PDT
Updated: Oct 04, 2013 3:35 PM PDT
By Ricardo Navarro - email

SALINAS, Calif. -- It's going to be a mile and half of community interaction. Sunday, Alisal Street will be closed off to traffic from Salinas Street to Sanborn. The point of that closure?

"It connects the two sides of the city. There's a lot of divide among the South Side and the East Side and this really helps unite our community," said Natalie Oliver, two weeks ago when Ciclovia received the approval from the City of Salinas.

However, after a year of planning to close that divide, a new one was created. This time between East Alisal merchants and organizers.

"I'm not looking to start a fight with anybody," said Jose Martinez-Saldana, Salinas United Business Association Executive Director.

Martinez-Saldana said when organizers approached SUBA in April about, Ciclovia, a street fair idea, it wasn't made clear Alisal Street would be closed from 6am until 2pm.

"Everything we received before hand talked about 10am to 2pm," said Martinez-Saldana.

However, Salinas Public Works Director Gary Peterson said SUBA submitted a letter endorsing the event in August, stating merchants understood organizers needed time to set up.

"What we are looking for is a solution that my merchants won't be affected as adversely," said Martinez-Saldana.

That means either shortening the route to Maderia or changing it from 10am till 2pm. Peterson said organizers made it clear from the start what the plans are and now its too late into the planning process to make any drastic changes.
Salinas Ciclovia event under way

2:51 PM, Oct. 6, 2013

The Salinas version of Ciclovia, a popular non-vehicle event being held in communities worldwide, is kicking off today.

The first-time event being held in this city has taken its cue from a number of cities around the world that have decided that people, not cars, should have the right of way on occasion.

"Ciclovía" is a term that translates from Spanish into English as "bike path."

The local route is set to follow a linear 1.6-mile path along East Alisal Street from Salinas Street downtown to North Sanborn Road in the Alisal business district.

The road closure began before 10 a.m. and is expected to continue until 2 p.m.

Activities during Ciclovía may include running, skating, dancing, aerobics, roller skating, walking, biking, zumba and yoga - and just playing.

Organizers say Ciclovía will feature fun activities for participants of all ages, including live entertainment, fitness and dancing classes, a bike decoration contest, art galleries, raffles and more.

A bike valet service will also be available at the event and a children's area will be located at La Paz Park on Wood Street.

Ciclovía Salinas is being organized by interested youth in the community, the Community Foundation of Monterey County, the California Endowment, Building Healthy Communities East Salinas and Tri County Business Systems.

Check this website and Monday's print edition of The Salinas Californian for more coverage later today.
Salinas bicyclists pedal for a better community

By CLAUDIA MELÉNDEZ SALINAS Herald Staff Writer Monterey County Herald

Los Padres Elementary third-grader Virgilio Hernandez could hardly get any sleep, his mother Margarita Cruz said Sunday. He woke up at 6 a.m. and made the family come to Ciclovia Salinas at 9 — an hour before it officially started.

The family returned again about noon, when the event was in full swing, and the streets usually packed with cars alive with children and youth skating and bicycling.

"This is so pretty," Cruz, 31, said. "My boy is so happy. We go to the park, we go take walks, but he likes riding his bicycle with his sister."

The first Ciclovia Salinas got to a start at 6 a.m. Sunday, with a group of volunteers gathered to hear encouragement from Salinas Police Chief Kelly McMillin. The group blocked off Alisal Street from North Sanborn Road in East Salinas to Salinas Street in downtown, and was ready for the first attendants by the official start of 10 a.m.

Along the route, there were activities for children such as the Wheelie Mobiliee of MyMuseum and a tricycle racing area. There were also Zumba classes and watering stations.

And while the crowds could have been bigger — considering the size of the population in East Salinas — organizers were pleased.

"At the beginning we worried, but it did pick up a lot," said Andrea Manzo, project coordinator with Building Healthy Communities. "We had a really short time for promotion. But seeing people riding, parents with their children was awesome. A family went by and said 'we walked 3.2 miles.'"

Ciclovia was proposed and organized by young people who live in East Salinas as a way to create a sense of community and get people to exercise more. For some, it's also a way to deter violence as it fosters caring among neighbors.

Originated in Colombia, Ciclovias have spread throughout the world. In some cities, such as Guadalajara and Bogotá, Ciclovias take place every Sunday and attract millions of people.

Although it took months to plan, Salinas merchants from the Salinas United Business Association attempted this week to cancel it, saying it would hurt their bottom line.

"They asked me and I had said I didn't want it," said Ana Arellano, owner of El Caporal Family Western Wear near North Sanborn. "Why didn't they do it when there's no work? In February, March. Today's too hot and people don't want to go out. These are the last days for real sales, and the bad season begins. One needs to save money to pay the rent during bad days. This is the best day of the week for sales."
East Alisal caters to mostly Latino residents employed in agriculture. Sunday is the only day they have off, and families use it for everything from going to Mass to buying groceries to taking a break.

And as winter comes to a close, so will the harvesting season. Once December arrives, there's no work, no money, no purchases.

Arellano, who's owned El Caporal for 11 years, does not believe events like these will help deter crime.

"It's parents who need to step up," she said. "If you have children and they get in trouble, you have to take responsibility."

Arellano was also concerned with some young people who were riding around wearing masks. In years past, businesses have been robbed by mask-wearing bandits, and she's afraid it could happen to her.

"For other people, it's nothing. For us, this does not speak well of the event. (The riders) should be showing their faces," Arellano said.

The mask wearers were teenagers and young men ages 13 and up. They were members of Salinas Bike Party, a group that gets together every month to ride their bikes through Salinas. The group has not held a bike party since July, so they were happy to be back on the streets. When they ride they get a kick out of being wizards, zombies or clowns.

"It's just fun," said Gabe Durbin, 16.

"It's about the community. It's for everyone to have fun," said Rafa Garcia, 21.

Ana Barrera, 41, took the opportunity to make a political statement: it's been 10 years since a comprehensive immigration reform package was proposed, and so far, nothing has been approved. Now, with the government shutdown, the chances for immigration reform grow thin. She waved the flag she got at the political rally 10 years ago in Los Angeles throughout the streets of Salinas, a U.S. flag with Mexico's seal superimposed.

"This is from 'A Day Without an Immigrant,'" she said, waving the flag. "Today is awesome."

Andrea Torres, 36, a resident of Soledad Street, walked nearly the entire route of Ciclovia with her daughters Kurysma, 6, and Angel, 4, riding their bikes.

"It's a great idea. It's a good opportunity for kids to go out and not have to worry about shootings or violence. It's nice out, it's nice to see people out. The girls are enjoying their bikes."

Emiliano Peña, 30, was riding his brand-new bike on Ciclovia when the chain began getting stuck. Chief McMillin had been riding up and down the route all morning, and he stopped to help.
"It's pretty cool the police officer tried to help," Peña said. "I've seen them help if a car breaks down, but not a bike. That was pretty awesome. I'm loving it. I wish this happened more often. There's a lot of kids and families, people of different ages just having a good time in their bikes."

Claudia Meléndez Salinas can be reached at 753-6755 or cmelendez@montereyherald.com.
Two Years After Caltrans Rejected a Grant Application, Carmel Looks To Improve Bicycle Safety

Carmel Mayor Jason Burnett wants to use part of the city’s $140,000 budget for Rio Park to help construct a bicycle and pedestrian path, improving access for River School students.

Sara Rubin | Posted 2 months ago

Some streets of Carmel-by-the-Sea feel barely wide enough to accommodate two-way traffic and parked cars. That can make even the quiet city feel treacherous for bicyclists – something City Council hopes to change.

Mayor Jason Burnett is appointing ad hoc committee members who will develop a game plan for moving four bike path projects forward.

The number-one priority is improving the windy road behind the Carmel Mission, from Rio Road to Monte Verde Street, where Carmel River Elementary School is located.
Safer access to school is a priority for councilwoman Victoria Beach, who’s also a parent of a River School student and, according to Burnett, a shoo-in as chair of the ad hoc committee. She sees improved bike paths as essential in connectivity for the whole area. “Carmel happens to be a keystone geography,” she says. “We’re kind of the hubcap.”

The current projects came after the city applied in 2011 and 2012 for $150,000 in transportation planning grants from the California Department of Transportation, but was rejected.

“We’re not necessarily going back to Caltrans,” Burnett says.

The city has about $190,000 in its budget to contribute to bike path-related improvements. Granting agencies such the California Coastal Conservancy, which is at work on a 1,200-mile trail from Mexico to Oregon, are other potential funding sources.

After the Caltrans rejection, Burnett and Beach asked planners at the Transportation Agency for Monterey County to help map out projects. TAMC’s report, expected to be released within a month, will lay the foundation for the ad hoc committee to begin soliciting public input and applying for funding to develop more detailed plans.

One possibility near the mission: changing Dolores Street to one-way and putting in a landscaping strip to separate cyclists from cars.

“Kids leaving River School are riding past queued-up cars,” TAMC Planner Ariana Green says. “They could easily get doored or hit.”

Using the existing roadway is the low-cost option, Green says, but she’s also looking at a route off the street that would cut across Mission Ranch property. That would require an easement.

“What the city comes up with could be completely different than what we’ve laid out, but this is a starting point,” she says. She recommends the city conduct a traffic circulation study near Mission Ranch to help the ad hoc committee with the next steps.

Other projects in Green’s report: a safer path to Carmel Middle School on Carmel Valley Road, better access to Palo Corona Park, and improving the connection from Monterey to Carmel. That route requires cyclists use dangerous on – and off-ramps to get onto Highway 1 for about a half-mile.

“Getting on or off of Highway 1 is not very comforting to most cyclists,” Velo Club President Matthew Sundt says. “If you’re a 10-year-old going to school, it’s probably not a good idea to try and compete with a car.”

For Beach, the efforts are about getting tourists, kids and older adults out walking and biking safely. “[Some] folks are already comfortable being out on their bikes, with special gear and racing clothes,” she says. For everybody else, she adds, “We’re trying to get rid of the intimidation factor.”
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Bicyclist hurt in bus accident

A 17-year-old girl suffered possible head injuries on Thursday after her bicycle hit a Monterey-Salinas Transit bus in Salinas.

The collision happened about noon on Sherwood Drive between Bernal Drive and East Rossi Street.

The girl was riding north on the sidewalk or in the slow lane when she started to cross the five-lane street at an angle, police said.

The driver of a northbound bus honked his horn and tried to swerve to avoid hitting the bicyclist, police Sgt. Gerard Ross said.

The girl may have been listening on earbuds and didn't hear the honking, Ross said.

"He was honking for several seconds and she didn't seem to react," he said.

The girl was talking at the scene and said she felt pain in her head. She was taken to a San Francisco Bay Area trauma center as a precaution, Ross said.

Man in black robs convenience store

A man dressed in black robbed the 7-Eleven with a knife at 7:30 p.m. on Thursday, Salinas police said.

The man jumped over the counter at 1305 N. Main St., held a knife to a clerk's neck and demanded money from the register.

The robber fled on foot with an undisclosed amount of cash. Police said he was 5 feet 10 and weighed 160 pounds.
Copenhagen Wheel zooms toward e-bike future

MIT-based start up Superpedestrian introduced the Copenhagen Wheel, an electric wheel that turns any bike into a hybrid e-bike for an easy, hill-defying commute. Could the future of biking be between the spokes?

By Karis Hustad, Staff Writer / December 16, 2013 at 10:03 am EST

Cambridge, Mass.

A freezing mist gathered in small droplets on my fingers, tightly wrapped around the handlebars of a white bike. The first “snow” of December (which by that time had turned to rain) may not seem like the ideal time for a ride, but this wasn’t any ordinary bike – this was the Copenhagen Wheel.

I looked down at the iPhone attached to the handlebar between my shivering knuckles, where the Wheel’s app was open, displaying my metrics. Current speed was 0 miles per hour, battery level was nearly full, and mode was Turbo. I was ready to go.

"How fast could Turbo really be?" I thought as I pushed off for my first ride with the newest hybrid e-bike on the market.
Turns out, really fast. With one push, the Wheel turned me into the bicycling Hulk, the power of my legs magnifying with every pedal push. As I rounded a corner, my speed accelerated to 15 m.p.h. in what felt like seconds.

The Copenhagen Wheel started as a concept by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology’s (MIT) SENSEable City Lab in 2009 when the city of Copenhagen asked the lab to come up with a way to make biking more accessible to people in urban areas. MIT’s idea? Put a lightweight motor on a wheel that gleans energy from braking and coasting. After four years of development, the Copenhagen Wheel has been released by MIT start-up Superpedestrian, right as experts forecast the e-bike industry will grow faster than ever before.

“We realized people are rethinking bikes are a whole,” says Assaf Biderman, co-inventor of the Copenhagen Wheel. “We said 'Let’s let people keep their bike, but [change] where the value lies.'”

The value is now in the wheel – specifically, the 12-pound, cherry-red motor placed like a hubcap in the middle of the back wheel.

As opposed to an e-bike, the Copenhagen Wheel is an e-wheel – meaning you can add the technology to any bike you choose. The device is powered by regenerative braking, transforming the kinetic energy used to slow a rider's speed into stored power. In other words, when you brake or go downhill, the battery recharges, allowing you to rely on the bike’s power for up to 30 miles at up to 20 m.p.h. It operates on a 350-watt electric motor with a 48-volt lithium-ion battery, which can offer an energy output of more than four times the average bike rider.

The Wheel can be controlled by an app that lets you decide how much you want to work. Pedal options range from Turbo, which uses the most energy, to Flatten Cities, which kicks in on an incline, to Eco, which adds a small push when your natural pedaling seems to slow. The app measures distance traveled, calories burned, and elevation climbed, which are all shareable on social media.

“The motor really integrates to your body; if you want to sweat, you can sweat,” Mr. Biderman says. “You have a choice. You can choose to live in the suburbs and ride 10 to 15 miles and make it to work without a sweat.”

Sweating and distance are exactly what has driven many toward e-biking technology, according to Jennifer Dill, professor at the Nohad A. Toulan School of Urban Studies and Planning at Portland State University in Portland, Ore. Ms. Dill, along with fellow Portland State researcher John MacArthur, recently completed a survey monitoring the habits and motivations of e-bikers across the country.

The survey found that 34 percent of e-bike riders say they ride to places further away once they had an e-bike, with another third saying they also
use the e-bike to run errands or get to social events – both instances where
distance and perspiration could play a role.

“The e-bike takes a little less effort to ride,” she says. “Anyone who has
any physical impairments ... an e-bike can help with that.” Her survey
showed 45 percent of e-bike commuters are over the age of 55.

She also points out that 60 percent of respondents feel safer while riding
an e-bike than a standard bike. And with an e-wheel – like the
Copenhagen Wheel – riders can get the extra push of an e-bike, but still
pedal like a normal bike. There’s no twisting a throttle or revving an
engine. To unknowing eyes, a bike with the Copenhagen Wheel looks like
any other, save the funky red wheel. Subtlety was a key aspect of the
design, says Biderman.

“If you put a battery and controller on the bike, and you have to wire up
your bike, it looks awful ... and requires expert installation,” he says.
Biderman claims the wheel can be put on a bike in five minutes if you’ve
never seen a bike before – 30 seconds if you’re a bike pro.

Outside of the United States, e-bikes are already common. According to
Quartz, 200 million e-bikes have been sold in China. In Europe, e-bike
sales increased from 100,000 in 2006 to about 850,000 in 2012. Navigant
Research, a clean technology research group, predicts that e-bike sales will
increase 23 percent worldwide by 2020, becoming a $38 million industry.
The US, however, will only see an increase of about 9 percent over the
same period.

While e-bikes take off, e-wheels have recently become more visible: The
Copenhagen Wheel made headlines when it garnered $2.1 million in
investments in October. Bike company FlyKly raised more than $700,000
on Kickstarter to produce an e-wheel that will be released next spring.
And Italian company Zehus says it will release a hybrid e-bike with a
smart wheel in 2014.

Regardless, the road to an e-bike future is far from fruition. Convoluted
US bike laws have led many to wonder “is my e-bike legal?” Full e-bike
prices are steep, often more than $1,000. E-wheels address some of the
cost issues, but are pricey compared with an average bike: the Copenhagen
Wheel retails for $699, and will bump to $799 after the first batch sells
out. FlyKly is aiming for $500; ZeHus has yet to announce a price.

But for one soggy reporter out for a test drive, a smart wheel was starting
to feel like a smart choice. Toward the end of my ride, I got a bit lost in a
maze of one-way streets in the industrial corner of Cambridge where
Superpedestrian is located.

Once I got my bearings, however, I was relieved not only to know where I
was, but that I wouldn’t have to work too hard to get back. I switched the
Wheel to Turbo, and zoomed off in the right direction.
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