BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN
FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BPC)

Wednesday, September 02, 2015, 6:00 PM

SAND CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER
1 SYLVAN PARK, SAND CITY, CA 93955

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.

3. BEGINNING OF CONSENT AGENDA: Approve the staff recommendations for item 3.1 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 August 5, 2015. – Montiel

END OF CONSENT AGENDA
4. **Highway 183 Rumble Strips** - Caltrans
   
   1. **RECEIVE** report from Caltrans on Highway 183 Shoulder and Centerline Rumble Strips; and
   
   2. **PROVIDE** input on the project.

5. **RECEIVE** update on the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Wayfinding Plan, and **PROVIDE** input on the wayfinding sign theme and the bicycle map layout. - Murillo

6. **DISCUSS** Bike and Pedestrian Safety Subcommittee Goals and Objectives; and **APPOINT** members to the Subcommittee – Green

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.

8. **ADJOURN**

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Next Committee meeting:

**Wednesday October 7, 2015**

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:

Ariana Green, Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator

By Monday, September 28, 2015

ariana@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 Monday, September 28, 2015 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

CORRESPONDENCE

REPORTS

MEDIA CLIPPINGS

M.1  "First & Spring L.A. maps out sweeping transportation overhaul", LA Times (August 11, 2015).

M.2  "Turns onto Market Street by private cars barred starting Tuesday" SF Gate (August 10, 2015).
## Voting Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>NOV 14</th>
<th>JAN 15</th>
<th>FEB 15</th>
<th>MAR 15</th>
<th>APR 15</th>
<th>MAY 15</th>
<th>JUN 15</th>
<th>AUG 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eric Petersen, District 1, Chair</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>District 2 - Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 4 - Vacant</td>
<td>P(A)</td>
<td>P(A)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Wriedt, Carmel-By-The-Sea</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Ragsdale-Cronin, Del Rey Oaks</td>
<td>E</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>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>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King City - Vacant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Green, Marina</td>
<td>-</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>Tim Meehan, Monterey</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>Linda Petersen, 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Flescher, Salinas</td>
<td>P(A)</td>
<td>P(A)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand City - Vacant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Valencia, Seaside</td>
<td>P(A)</td>
<td>P(A)</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>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Boosman, Velo Club of Monterey (Vera Noghera)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P(A)</td>
<td>P(A)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Metz, FORA (Jonathan Garcia)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P(A)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P(A)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P</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>
<tr>
<td>James Serrano, Salinas Public Works</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Public Works – Ryan Chapman (Ogarita Carranza)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P(A)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</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>AMBAG – Cody Meyer (Sasha Tepedelenova)</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>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Cook, CSUMB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chair Eric Petersen called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. A quorum was established and self-introductions were made.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None this month.

3. **BEGINNING OF CONSENT AGENDA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M/S/C</th>
<th>Meehan /Green /unanimous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.1 Approved minutes of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee meeting of June 3, 2015.

**END OF CONSENT AGENDA**
4. **PACIFIC GROVE SR 68 CORRIDOR STUDY**

The Committee received a report on the Pacific Grove SR 68 Corridor Study.

Ariana Green noted that the purpose of the State Route 68 Corridor Study through Pacific Grove is to identify projects to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety in this corridor, to a level of detail sufficient for the City of Pacific Grove to pursue funding opportunities to further develop and construct improvements. She noted that this study also presents an opportunity to partner with Caltrans to implement “complete streets” projects and advance regional sustainable transportation initiatives. In conclusion Ms. Green expressed that a competitive bidding process was held and the Transportation Board approved a contract with consulting firm Eisen/Letunic to assist with the study.

5. **MONTEREY COUNTY BIKE MONTH**

The Committee received a report on Monterey County Bike Month 2015; and provided direction to staff on future planning for Monterey County Bike Month and Bike Education.

Ariana Green, Transportation Planner reported that bike month is a national campaign held annually in May to promote bicycling. She noted that the Transportation Agency has dedicated Transportation Development Act Funds for an annual campaign over a three year funding cycle. In 2015 TAMC helped promote local bicycling events during Bike Month, but did not have the staff time to develop and run the mini grant program.

She noted that TAMC also contracted with Ecology Action to do Bike Rodeos at two elementary schools. Ecology Action was able to leverage those funds to secure funding from the Monterey Peninsula Foundation and Community Foundation of Monterey County to do Bike Rodeos at an additional 15 schools in Monterey County. Ecology Action reached a total of 303 students through the Bike Rodeos.

Ms. Green requested input on Bike Education/Bike Month activities for 2016.

Chair Peterson stated Pedal Alpini would try to put on several events during Bike Month 2016 including:

- Bike Festival
- Salinas ride to council
- Salinas Community Ride
- Salinas Criterium
- Jr. Criterium Championships

Committee member Meehan made a motion to support staff’s recommendation for bike education/Bike Month 2016 excluding the commitment to contract with Ecology Action. He requested that at a future meeting the committee discuss alternatives to contracting with Ecology Action to do the bike rodeos. The motion passed unanimously.

Bernard Green, Marina Representative made a motion to form an additional sub-committee that would focus on bicycle and pedestrian safety, and to expand the existing Bike Month Planning subcommittee to include year-round bicycle education. The motion was seconded by Committee member Meehan, and the committee voted unanimously to support Mr. Green’s motion.
6. **CLASS IV BIKEWAYS**

The Committee received information on Class IV Bikeways.

Ariana Green, Associate Transportation Planner reported that there are now four different classes of bikeways recognized in California: Class I (path), Class II (bike lanes), Class III (shared facility), and now Class IV (cycle track or separated bikeway). A Class IV Bikeway is defined as “a right-of-way designated exclusively for bicycle travel adjacent to a roadway and which are protected from vehicular traffic”. The Class IV designation was made legal through Assembly Bill 1193, approved by Governor Brown last September. In addition to defining and recognizing Class IV as another type of bikeway, the bill requires Caltrans to develop safety design criteria to include in the Highway Design Manual by January 1, 2016.

Ms. Green provided examples of Class IV Bikeway design components: dedicated space, separation/buffer and physical barrier.

**Comments/Questions from Committee Members:**

- A con of Class IV bikeways is that they can “trap bicyclists”
- Class IV bikeways feel safer
- Maintenance is an issue for existing trails in Monterey County, can street sweepers fit in the bikeway?
- Smaller street sweepers that can fit in the Class IV bikeway do exist

7. **ANNOUNCEMENTS AND/OR COMMENTS**

Committee member Susan Ragsdale announced that she will be hosting a Sustainability Event at her house on Sunday September 13th. Please contact Ms. Ragsdale if you want more information.

Committee member D.L. Johnson noted that he spent most of his summer in China.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Petersen adjourned the meeting at 7:20 pm
Memorandum

To: Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee
From: Ariana Green, Associate Transportation Planner
Meeting Date: September 2, 2015
Subject: Highway 183 Rumble Strips

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
1. RECEIVE report from Caltrans on Highway 183 Shoulder and Centerline Rumble Strips; and
2. PROVIDE input on the project.

SUMMARY:
Caltrans is proposing edge line and centerline rumble strips on Highway 183 to reduce run-off-road and cross-centerline collisions on the State highway. Caltrans seeks input from the bicycling community on this candidate for future funding.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
The project is estimated to cost $1,200,000 and is eligible to receive federal-aid funding.

DISCUSSION:
The proposed project calls for pavement resurfacing and installation of centerline and shoulder rumble strips on Highway 183 from Blackie Road to Davis Road.

The need for rumble strips on Highway 183 was identified through the Caltrans Two – and Three-Lane Cross Centerline Collision Monitoring Program and the Roadway Departure Monitoring report.

Centerline rumble strips have been shown to reduce cross-centerline fatal collisions and edgeline (shoulder) rumble strips reduce run-off-road incidents, providing benefits to both motorists and bicyclists. The Caltrans standard is to install centerline and shoulder rumble strips where paved shoulders are five feet or greater.

Caltrans staff is recommending the project be included in the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP). If funded, the project is scheduled for construction by August 2019.

While rumble strips can provide cross-over and run-off-road benefits to bicyclists, they also create a barrier on the shoulder that can inhibit the cyclists’ ability to avoid debris or make left turns, and can take up valuable maneuvering space if they are not placed far enough to
the left or the shoulder is already narrow. Caltrans staff therefore seeks input on the design of this project from the TAMC Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee.

Approved by: __________________________ Date Signed: August 26, 2015
Debra L. Hale, Executive Director

Regular Agenda

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

Web Attachment: Request for Programming in the 2014 SHOCP document
Small Capital Value
Project Initiation Document
To
Request Programming in the 2014 SHOPP

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED:

DEB LARSON, DISTRICT PROGRAM MANAGER/PROGRAM ADVISER

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED:

AARON P. HENKEL, PROJECT MANAGER

APPROVED:

TIMOTHY M. GUBBINS, DISTRICT 5 DIRECTOR  2/5/15

This project initiation document has been prepared under the direction of the following Registered Civil Engineer. The registered civil engineer attests to the technical information contained herein and the engineering data upon which recommendations, conclusions, and decisions are based.

MOHAMMED MEGAG, REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER  1/13/2015

- Page 11 -
1. INITIATING OFFICE/INITIATOR:

The Program Manager for Two and Three-Lane Cross Centerline Collision Monitoring program has established that the project meets the qualification for the Safety Improvement Program (Program Code 201.010). The project is located in Monterey County on Route 183 from Davis Road PM 2.06 to Blackie Road PM R8.60.

This project initiation document provides conceptual approval of the proposal and a recommendation to program the project into the current State Highway Operation and Protection Program. A project report will serve as final approval of the proposal.

2. PURPOSE AND NEED:

Purpose:

The purpose of this project is to reduce the number and severity of cross centerline and run-off-road collisions on the State highway.

Need:

A need for this project was identified through the Two-and Three-Lane Cross Centerline Collision Monitoring Program List of locations to be investigated. The purpose of the Monitoring Program is to reduce cross-centerline fatal collisions on two-and three-lane highways.

3. DEFICIENCY SUMMARY:

As noted in the PIF, this segment was also identified in the Roadway Departure Monitoring report, recommending consideration of shoulder rumble strips. This office recommends edgeline rumble strip for conventional highways (where the paved shoulder is 5' or greater). Concurrence was received from HQ Office of Performance, Highway Safety and Operational Improvement program (July 16, 2014) to install Centerline and Shoulder Rumble Strips where paved shoulders are five feet or greater, as well as pavement resurfacing from PM 6.01 to PM 7.0. HQ supported this proposal. Refresh and provide thermo/retro-reflective raised markers from PM 1.831 (Davis Road Ramp) to PM 2.00 will be addressed.

4. PROJECT PROPOSAL:

This project proposes to construct centerline and shoulder rumble strips from Davis Road PM 2.0 to Blackie Road PM R8.60 as well as pavement resurfacing from PM 6.01 to 7.0, and centerline and line markings refreshed from PM 1.831 (Davis Road Ramp) to PM R8.6.

5. Design Exception:

This project will be built according to Caltrans Design standards and specifications.
6. Right of Way:

No new right of way needs are presently identified. The need for temporary construction easements is not anticipated.

7. Disposal Site:

A dedicated disposal site will not be needed for this project since only a small volume of excess material will potentially be generated.

8. Utilities:

Utility relocation is not required.

9. Environmental:

This project is expected to qualify for a Categorical Exemption under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Categorical Exclusion under National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

10. FUNDING/PROGRAMMING

It has been determined that this project is eligible for federal-aid funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Fiscal Year Estimate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>2015/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.xx.201.010</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED Support</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;E Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right-of-Way Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programming in the 2014 SHOPP 201.010. Support costs escalated 7% per year. Capital Escalated 5% per year.

The support/capital cost ratio is 78%.
11. SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Milestones</th>
<th>Scheduled Delivery Date (Month/Day/Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM PROJECT</td>
<td>M015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA &amp; ED</td>
<td>M200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT PS&amp;E</td>
<td>M377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIGHT OF WAY CERTIFICATION</td>
<td>M410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READY TO LIST</td>
<td>M460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVERTISE</td>
<td>M480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWARD</td>
<td>M495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVE CONTRACT</td>
<td>M500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACT ACCEPTANCE</td>
<td>M600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>END PROJECT</td>
<td>M800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Project Cost Estimate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Cost Per</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Items</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumble Strips and Pavement resurfacing</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Work</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Items</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key assumptions for the cost: Rumble strips constructed for full length of project. Cost breakdown is approximately: 10% for Minor Items, Mobilization and Supplemental Work each and 25% Contingency.

13. RISKS:

Additional pavement resurfacing may be required. Will monitor at design stage.

14. FHWA COORDINATION:

This project is considered to be an Assigned Project in accordance with the current Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Joint Stewardship and Oversight Agreement.

15. ATTACHMENTS:

- Vicinity Map
- Typical Cross Section
## DISTRIBUTION LIST

**Division / Program / Office**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HQ Division of Design</th>
<th>Design Report Routing</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HQ Division of Engineering Serv.</td>
<td>Division of Engineering Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ Environmental</td>
<td>Bob Pavlick</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ SHOPP Program Advisor</td>
<td>Kien T. Le</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Aaron Henkel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Manager</td>
<td>Jim Espinosa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Engineer</td>
<td>Xxxxx Xxxxx</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Maintenance</td>
<td>Lance Gorman</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kelly Mcclain</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Ballentine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Traffic Liaison</td>
<td>Paul McClintic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Traffic Operations</td>
<td>Deb Larson</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Safety</td>
<td>Mohammed Qatami</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Traffic Design</td>
<td>Jacques Van Zeventer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doug Lambert</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Materials</td>
<td>Susan Schilder</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Environmental</td>
<td>Marshall Garcia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Right of Way</td>
<td>Claudia Espino</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Planning</td>
<td>Dennis Reeves</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Landscape</td>
<td>Linda Araujo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPM</td>
<td>Jeremy Villegas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Fredricks</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>Victoria Pozuelo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee

From: Virginia Murillo, Assistant Transportation Planner

Meeting Date: September 2, 2015

Subject: Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Wayfinding Plan

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

RECEIVE update on the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Wayfinding Plan, and PROVIDE input on the wayfinding sign theme and the bicycle map layout.

SUMMARY:

The Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Wayfinding Plan will provide standard guidelines for bicycle and pedestrian wayfinding signs throughout Monterey County. The Plan will include wayfinding sign design guidelines, identification and branding of regional bicycle and pedestrian routes, and provide an implementation strategy.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

Staff expenses and funding for a $30,000 contract with Alta Planning + Design to design the wayfinding signs and update the Monterey County Bicycle Map is included in the Agency’s adopted FY 2015-16 budget. The Transportation Agency has budgeted $90,000 of Regional Surface Transportation Funds over three years to implement the Wayfinding Plan.

DISCUSSION:

A complete network of bicycle paths and lanes, secure bicycle storage, and ways to find comfortable routes to destinations are three key elements that encourage bicycling for transportation. These elements can attract an estimated 60% of potential bicyclists who indicate that they would cycle more often if it were safer and easier to do so.

The Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Wayfinding Plan will provide standard guidelines for bicycle and pedestrian wayfinding signs throughout Monterey County, including sign design, sign locations and implementation strategies. The goal of the Wayfinding Plan is to...
improve access to regional destinations, provide consistent wayfinding signs for regional connections, and promote key signage features that jurisdictions will be encouraged to incorporate into their own signs in order to improve wayfinding across city boundaries.

Staff is also working on updating the Monterey County Bicycle Map, which was last updated in 2008. The updated bicycle map will include the regional bike routes identified in the Wayfinding Plan.

To assist in these efforts, the Transportation Agency is working with the Wayfinding Plan Advisory Committee. The Committee is comprised of project stakeholders including representatives from the Transportation Agency’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee, the County of Monterey, other local cities, the Monterey County Health Department, Building Healthy Communities, Fort Ord Re-use Authority, the Velo Club, Green Pedal Couriers, Fort Ord Recreation Trails Friends, Pebble Beach Company, and Monterey-Salinas Transit. The Wayfinding Plan Advisory Committee has met to establish Plan goals, identify regional bicycle and pedestrian routes, and provide input on wayfinding sign design themes.

The Plan has proposed routes throughout Monterey County that enhance connections to neighboring cities and other destinations in the region. Uniform sign designs will include space for jurisdictions to promote their own local identity. Having uniform signs can support residents and visitors who want to bicycle and walk in the cities and in the county, and can enhance each jurisdiction’s brand as a regional destination.

In the upcoming months, the Wayfinding Plan Advisory Committee will continue to help shape the content of the Plan, provide input on the wayfinding sign design and will assist in developing implementation strategies for the Plan. The Wayfinding Plan Advisory Committee will also be refining the map of regional bicycle and pedestrian routes and destinations over the next few weeks. More information about the Wayfinding Plan may be found at: http://bit.ly/bpwayfinding

TAMC staff has been soliciting public input on the proposed routes and sign design using the mySidewalk page: https://tamc.mysidewalk.com/, and Committee members are invited to participate in the mySidewalk online discussion.

Approved by: [Signature]  Date signed: August 21, 2015

Debra L. Hale, Executive Director

Regular Agenda  Counsel Approval: N/A
Finance Approval: N/A
First & Spring L.A. maps out sweeping transportation overhaul

By DAVID ZAHNISER

AUGUST 9, 2015, 4:00 AM

First it was a ban on plastic bags. Then came the workplace prohibition on e-cigarettes.

Now the Los Angeles City Council is embarking on a new and controversial exercise in behavior modification: Getting more Angelenos to give up, or at least reduce their reliance on, the automobile.

Council members are on the verge of approving a sweeping new transportation policy, one that calls for hundreds of miles of new bus-only lanes, bicycle lanes and "traffic calming" measures over the next 20 years. The initiative, dubbed Mobility Plan 2035, has sparked a debate over the ramifications of redesigning major corridors such as Van Nuys Boulevard, Sherman Way and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard.

NEWSLETTER: Get essential California headlines delivered daily >>

Backers of the mobility plan call it an "aspirational" document, one that puts a new priority on road safety and expands the options for people who don't want to drive. Opponents say the city's own environmental analysis shows the plan will significantly increase traffic congestion by subtracting car lanes from an array of major boulevards.

"Cars are just going to sit there," said Don Parker, a board member with Fix the City, an advocacy group fighting the plan. "So labeling it a mobility plan is just not reflective of what the plan actually does."

The plan represents the city's most significant update of its transportation policy since 1999, a time when the city had considerably fewer rail and rapid bus lines.

The document, which goes to the council for a vote later this month, calls for an additional 300 miles of protected bike lanes, which are separated from traffic by curbs or other physical barriers. It also identifies 117 miles of new bus-only lanes and another 120 miles of streets where bus-only lanes would operate during rush hour.
Some corridors — including Sunset, Venice and Lankershim boulevards — would get both bus-only lanes and protected bike lanes under the plan.

Canoga Park resident Brent Butterworth, who frequently uses a bike to get to his appointments, welcomes those types of improvements. Newly installed bike lanes in Northridge have made Reseda Boulevard a much more appealing place to visit, he said.

If the mobility plan's projects are completed, "you'll have a little bit more congestion," the freelance writer said. "But people will look for alternative means of getting around."

In recent weeks, critics have zeroed in on the city's environmental impact report, which concluded the mobility plan's projects would increase not just congestion but also noise and cut-through traffic in residential neighborhoods.

The city's report also warned of "inadequate" access for emergency vehicles. And it found that during the evening rush hour, the number of major streets operating at an E or F level — the lowest so-called Level of Service ranking available — would double.

Level of Service, a long-used and often-criticized measure of traffic congestion, examines the number of vehicles that move through an intersection during a particular period.

Using that standard, officials concluded that the percentage of major street segments with E and F grades during the evening rush hour would grow from 18% to about 22% in 2035, without the proposed mobility plan. With the plan, the percentage of streets with the lowest grades would climb to nearly 36%, the analysis says.

That figure raises "very serious first-responder questions," said Richard Katz, a planning commissioner who spent eight years on the Metropolitan Transportation Authority board. If the number of congested intersections grows significantly, firefighters and ambulances will have a more difficult time reaching their destinations, he said.

"Taking away lanes, which creates congestion, to try and force people to choose a different method of transportation other than the car, is a horrible way to solve a congestion problem," he said.
"Why? It creates more congestion ... and people don't respond well to being forced to do things."

Planning officials say they relied on "conservative, vehicle-centric" projections in evaluating the mobility plan's potential effects. Put another way, they assumed that the percentage of drivers who choose to give up their cars and start bicycling, walking and taking public transit will remain in line with current traffic patterns.

Westside Councilman Mike Bonin, a key backer of the plan, says he does not believe the
scenarios used by the city will come true. Instead, he pointed to figures that indicate the mobility plan's projects will increase walking by 38%, transit use by 56% and bicycling by 170%.

"We've seen plenty of evidence that behavior is changing and will continue to change," Bonin added. "You have generations of people under the age of 35 ... who are choosing to live car free and car-lite."

Not every bus and bike project listed in the mobility plan will be built, said Senior City Planner Claire Bowin. And those that are considered will be subject to additional scrutiny, including more environmental reviews and input from public safety officials to make sure emergency vehicles have the proper access, she said.

L.A. officials say the mobility plan is an acknowledgment the city can't build its way out of congestion problems. Widening streets is no longer feasible or even desirable, they say. And new freeways are out of the question because of the cost and space involved.

"A paradigm shift of this kind often causes growing pains," said Connie Llanos, spokeswoman for Mayor Eric Garcetti, who supports the mobility plan. "But the long-term benefits outweigh the impacts."

City officials say an alternative method of evaluating traffic projections, Vehicle Miles Traveled, resulted in a more favorable analysis of the mobility plan. That approach estimates total vehicle miles traveled in a city or neighborhood during a specified period.

Under that analysis, completion of the mobility plan would result in about 35 million miles per day being traveled on L.A. surface streets in 2035. Without the plan, that number would grow to more than 38 million, the city found.

State officials are in the process of eliminating Level of Service as a tool for measuring traffic in the state's environmental review process, said Juan Matute, associate director of UCLA's Institute of Transportation Studies. The Vehicle Miles Traveled system is a more accurate way of assessing the environmental impacts of major construction projects, he said.

Regardless of the tool used to assess the city's plan, Matute expects some drivers will face added delays as the city shifts its emphasis to alternative modes of travel.

"There are going to be people who are going to be worse off as a result of implementation" of the plan, he said. "And those are going to be the people that continue driving the same or greater distances as they do now."

david.zahniser@latimes.com
Turns onto Market Street by private cars barred starting Tuesday

By Michael Cabanatuan  Updated 6:33 am, Monday, August 10, 2015

Anyone hoping to cruise San Francisco’s motley main drag of Market Street, whether driving through or simply gawking, will likely have to do it aboard Muni, in a taxi, on a bicycle or on foot.

Come Tuesday, in the latest evolution of the thoroughfare, private vehicles will be barred from turning onto Market between Third and Eighth streets — an effort to reduce the number of collisions injuring pedestrians and bicyclists. Commercial vehicles, including delivery trucks, taxis and private shuttles, will be exempt.

Combined with existing forced right turns for eastbound private cars at Sixth and 10th streets, the restrictions will drive most vehicles off Market.

So enjoy that drive down Mission Street, and know that you’re helping to make the city safer and the Muni buses faster.

Ed Reiskin, transportation director for the Municipal Transportation Agency, said the turn restrictions are designed to keep traffic flowing across Market Street, while making the intersections safer by eliminating turns and reducing through traffic.
"As important and central a street as Market Street is for the city, it is also a place where a lot of people are being injured and killed in collisions," he said. "It's home to four of the top 20 injury intersections in the city. It's a safety issue. We have a lot of conflicts, and people are getting hurt."

Here's what you need to know before Tuesday:

**Mind the signs**

They're covered now, or still being installed, but by Tuesday morning new signs will appear at intersections crossing Market. In addition to the familiar circle-and-slash signs banning left or right turns, others will appear: Stay in lane. No turns onto Market. You get the idea.

The quick version: Drivers can traverse Market on cross streets between Third to Eighth, but can't turn onto it. For now, a right turn from northbound Fifth Street onto eastbound Market will be permitted but only until Ellis Street reopens; it's closed for Central Subway construction.

**Changes on Market Street**

During the first week, parking control officers will be at every intersection directing motorists. Drivers who ignore them risk getting a ticket.

The red tide of transit lanes will continue to roll down Market Street.

The MTA plans to extend those red transit-and-taxi-only lanes, which now end at Fifth Street, all the way east to Third Street. Officials hope the confluence of the red lanes and reduced traffic will speed Muni buses, which, citywide, creep along at an average of 6 mph.

"An ancillary benefit for the people that ride Muni is that by removing traffic from Market Street, we will free up capacity and reduce delays on Muni," Reiskin said.

After the MTA started pushing eastbound cars off Market at Sixth and 10th streets, it saw travel times for Muni buses drop by 5 percent on Market, but increase 3 percent on Mission.

**Taxis yes, Uber no**

Taxis will still be able to turn onto Market, and can even use the so-called red carpet transit lanes. But the MTA will not extend the courtesy to ride services, including Uber, Lyft and Sidecar. Those services, which are neither licensed nor regulated by the city, must follow the restrictions.

While other ride service companies went along with the plan, Uber objected to its exclusion during an MTA board hearing, and suggested the agency was giving taxis preferential treatment.
Directors pointed out that Uber emphasizes that its drivers aren’t employees and drive their own cars, which makes them private vehicles subject to the restrictions.

Down the road

The MTA has no plans to extend the turn restrictions farther up or down Market, but that doesn’t mean it won’t happen.

Better Market Street, a multiagency city plan to redesign the boulevard, was supposed to have been completed in 2013 in conjunction with a repaving.

But, as is often the case in San Francisco, it’s taking longer than planned. So long, in fact, that Public Works couldn’t wait, and did some preliminary repaving. The MTA didn’t want to wait either, especially after embracing Vision Zero, a plan to eliminate traffic fatalities by 2024.

Better Market Street, still in the planning stages and undergoing required environmental studies, could eliminate cars, or widen sidewalks, or install protected bike lanes. Decisions are unlikely for at least a couple of years, and the final design is probably three to four years away — at least.

Michael Cabanatuan is a San Francisco Chronicle staff writer. E-mail: mcabanatuan@sfchronicle.com Twitter: @ctuan