Wayfinding Plan Advisory Committee

Thursday, August 13th, 2015
2:00p.m. – 3:00p.m.
Call in: (760)569-0800 (641)569-0800 Participant Code: 580128#

Transportation Agency for Monterey County — Conference Room
55-B Plaza Circle, Salinas

MINUTES

1. Welcome & Introductions

Committee Members Present

Bernard Green California State University, Monterey Bay
Victoria Beach (by phone) City of Carmel-by-the-Sea
Andrea Renny City of Monterey
Ted Lopez Fort Ord Reuse Authority
Lisa Rheinheimer Monterey-Salinas Transit
Eric Petersen Pedal Alpini/Fort Ord Recreation Trails Friends

Staff Present

Todd Muck, Deputy Executive Director Ariana Green, Associate Transportation Planner
Virginia Murillo, Assistant Transportation Planner

2. Review Draft June 18, 2015 Minutes

There were no comments on the June 18th meeting minutes.
3. **Discuss Draft Wayfinding Sign Designs & Bike Map**

**Presentations**

**Layouts**

Virginia Murillo, Assistant Transportation Planner, presented the three draft wayfinding sign design concepts and the draft bike map layouts to the Committee for input. Ms. Murillo noted that the elements from the three different sign design concepts can be combined into a preferred design.

Committee Member Eric Petersen asked about the size of the directional signs. Ms. Murillo noted that the size of the signs will comply with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). Committee Member Petersen also asked about the possibility of placing distance information in kilometers and miles. Ted Lopez, Fort Ord Reuse Authority alternate asked about translation for the wayfinding sign designs. Committee members offered the following input:

- **Preference for Option #1 (pictured below) — Modern, Contemporary directional sign.** Committee Members Bernard Green and Andrea Renny and Todd Muck, Deputy Executive Director, liked the “Explore by bicycling and walking” logo. Committee Member Renny mentioned that the logo can easily be created with vinyl stickers. Committee members liked the “Explore Salinas” text order, over the “Salinas Explore” text order. In general, Committee members liked the destination, mileage and minutes distance information for the directional signs. Ms. Murillo mentioned that the [www.TAMC.mySidewalk.com](http://www.TAMC.mySidewalk.com) voting results also show a preference for **Option #1**.
• Preference for the **Option #2 (pictured below)** – **Grounded, Contemporary compass rose add-on sign.** Committee Member Victoria Beach noted that this is a cost-effective option for add-on signs. Mr. Muck asked about the possibility of having the compass rose be a bicycle wheel.

![Option #2 Diagram](image1.png)

• Preference for the **layout of Option #3 in the Option #2 structure of the gateway kiosk (pictured below).**
Committee Member Renny noted that the continual structure of gateway kiosk option #2 was important for Americans with Disabilities (ADA) compliance, since someone that is visually impaired can detect the continual structure. Committee Member Beach also expressed her preference for the more natural aesthetic of gateway kiosk option #2, and noted that the other options would not have a high durability. Both she and Committee Member Renny liked the materials of the gateway kiosk option #2, noting that these materials have a high durability. Committee Member Renny also mentioned that baked enamel maps are a durable option for the gateway treatments.

Ms. Murillo also presented the planning level cost estimates for the sign designs, and noted that these estimates include the cost of installation and fabrication. Ms. Murillo mentioned that the cost of fabrication for the directional signs ranges from $100 (directional sign option #3) to $250-$300 (directional sign option #1). Ms. Murillo mentioned that the planning level cost estimates pictured below are based on current bids. Committee Member Renny noted that it would be more cost-effective to go out to bid for the production of customized signs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Level Sign Cost Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: Modern Contemporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Grounded Contemporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Regional Icons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Planning level costs capture shop drawings, fabrication, footings, posts and installation.
Costs based on the suggested materials and design shown on the concept drawings.
Costs could vary depending on final design and fabrication technique.

Committee Member Renny suggested that T AMC set up a contract with a sign shop that can produce the customized signs, as local sign shops have limited capacity for fabrication of directional sign option #1. That way the jurisdictions can have better access to the signage when replacements are needed. Ms. Murillo mentioned that Emily Duchon, from Alta Planning + Design, suggested that T AMC order extra blank signs to keep as replacements.

Committee Members expressed a preference for Vertical Bicycle Map Layout #3. Committee Member Eric Petersen mentioned that this layout would work well with handle bar map holders. Committee Members Green and Beach also liked the vertical map layout, noting that it would be useful for cyclists looking at individual city panels. Committee Member Lisa Rheinheimer noted that the bike map colors should match the sign design color palette.