BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BPC)

Wednesday, September 7, 2016
6:00 PM

TRANSPORTATION AGENCY FOR MONTEREY COUNTY (TAMC)
Sand City Council Chamber, 1 Sylvan Park, Sand City

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 Agency Secretary to make 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

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

Any member of the public may address the Committee on any item not on the agenda but within the jurisdiction of Transportation Agency and Executive Committee. Comments on items on today's agenda may be given when that agenda item is discussed.

3.1 Approved minutes of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee meeting of August 3, 2016.

- Montiel

_The Draft minutes of the August 3, 2016 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee meeting are attached for review._

END OF CONSENT AGENDA
4. RECEIVE report, and PROVIDE input on bike share in the City of Monterey.

   - Roveri

   Bike share is a transportation program that encourages bicycling as a mode of transportation for short distance trips without having to own a bicycle. On June 21, 2016 the Monterey City Council provided direction to staff to pursue a citywide bike share pilot program.

5. RECEIVE presentation on the final draft Pacific Grove Hwy 68 Study.

   - Letunic

   The Transportation Agency in partnership with the City of Pacific Grove and Caltrans is conducting a study of the State Route 68 Corridor in Pacific Grove to identify improvements that will provide safer access for all modes of travel.

6. RECEIVE update on Active Transportation Plan outreach efforts.

   - Murillo

   The 2016 Active Transportation Plan will be an update of the 2011 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. The focus of the 2016 Plan update is to match State Active Transportation Program guidelines, incorporate innovative bicycle facility designs, and promote high priority projects.

7. RECEIVE report on Ciclovía Salinas.

   - Murillo/Galarza

   Ciclovía Salinas is a youth-driven open streets event that attracts thousands to bike, walk, dance and skateboard along Alisal Street. This year's event will be held on October 9th. Event organizers are looking for volunteers to help.

8. ANNOUNCEMENTS and/or COMMENTS

9. ADJOURN

   ANNOUNCEMENTS

   Next Committee meeting:

   Wednesday, October 5, 2016

   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:
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 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.
MEMORANDUM

To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee
From: Maria Montiel
Meeting Date: September 7, 2016
Subject: Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee minutes of August 3, 2016

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Approved minutes of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee meeting of August 3, 2016.

SUMMARY:
The Draft minutes of the August 3, 2016 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee meeting are attached for review.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
This item has no financial impact.

DISCUSSION:
The draft minutes of the August 3, 2016 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee meeting are attached for review.

ATTACHMENTS:

- BPC August Draft Minutes
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E – Excused
P(A) – Alternate
VC – Video Conference
TC – Teleconference
1. 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**

   **M/S/C**
   Green/ Petersen/ unanimous

   MacGregor Eddy asked for an update on the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Moss Landing bridge and trail segment project and asked the Committee to agendize the item for a future meeting date. She expressed her concern that the Moss Landing bridge project is too expensive, and noted that she thinks the current Highway 1 bridge is spacious enough to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists.

3. **BEGINNING OF CONSENT AGENDA**

   **M/S/C**
   LeBarre/ Valencia/ unanimous

   Abstain: Henderson

   3.1 Approved minutes of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee meeting of June 1, 2016.

**END OF CONSENT AGENDA**

4. **MONTEREY COUNTY ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

   The Committee received an update on Active Transportation Plan, and provided input on bicycle and pedestrian projects received to date.

   Virginia Murillo, Assistant Transportation Planner, reported that the Active Transportation Plan will be an update of the 2011 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. In addition to creating an Active Transportation Plan that will meet the State’s guidelines, and identifying high priority bicycle and pedestrian projects, this effort will also focus on analyzing key gaps in the existing and proposed bicycle and pedestrian project networks, identifying opportunity sites for innovative bicycle facility design, and designating areas for enhanced regional and local connectivity. She noted that TAMC plans to hire a consultant to develop conceptual plans and cost estimates for the highest priority regional projects in order to make them competitive for State and Federal funding.

   Ms. Murillo noted that the Committees participated in a mapping activity to identify bikeway and pedestrian improvements throughout Monterey County. Ms. Murillo presented the improvements that had been identified so far.
The Committee had the following suggestions:

- Pacific Grove: Asilomar Ave to the Recreation Trail connection
- Highway 1 to Carmel to Monterey connection
- Bicycle connection from CSUMB to Seaside via General Jim Moore and 6th Avenue
- Salinas: W. Alisal St bike lanes from Blanco Rd to Pajaro St to Front St
- Pinnacles connection to King City via Bitterwater Rd
- Connection to San Antonio via Jolon Rd, possibly coordinate with Fort Hunter Liggett

5. **GOLDEN HELMET AWARD**

The Committee received a presentation on the Golden Helmet Award; and provided direction to staff on program awards process, application and ranking criteria.

Ariana Green, Associate Transportation Planner reported that the purpose of the Golden Helmet Award has been to recognize Monterey County residents who advocate for and encourage bicycling. She noted that the last Golden Helmet Award was presented in 2012 as part of Monterey County Bike Week. She noted that the aim of this award is to celebrate the annual countywide bike week events, highlight the benefits of bicycle commuting and inspire others to utilize alternative transportation modes.

Ms. Green went over the program, ranking criteria and nomination form and the Committee had the following suggestions on the Golden Helmet Award:

- Award the winner at the April TAMC Board meeting
- Add youth, groups, program and events to award category
- Consider asking for donation and prizes
- Ranking criteria: emphasis more on bicycling as a lifestyle choice, advocacy, including mountain biking advocacy
- Remove mileage criteria, and consider types of trips taken by bike instead of car (e.g. commute, shopping, entertainment, recreation/fitness)
- Reformat the application into a checklist survey style that is broken down into the ranking criteria categories, instead of asking for an open-ended “description”

6. **MONTEREY COUNTY BIKE MONTH 2016**

The Committee received a report on Monterey County Bike Month 2016 and provided direction to staff on future planning for Monterey County Bike Month and Bike Education.

Ariana Green, Associate Transportation Planner reported that Bike Month is a national campaign held annually in May to promote bicycling. She noted that the Agency has dedicated transportation Development Act funds for an annual campaign over a three year funding cycle, and requests direction from the committee on planning for future campaigns.

Ms. Green went over the following 2016 Bike Month campaign efforts:

- Provided a bike month poster
- Posted on TAMC website, Bicycling Monterey Calendar
- Posted on Monterey County weekly ads
- Sent press release
Ms. Green and Chair Petersen updated the Committee on the 2016 Bike Month events:

- TAMC and CSUMB offered free bike safety trainings and unfortunately had to cancel some because didn’t have enough people signed up
- Ecology Action Bike Rodeos at various Monterey County schools that trained 226 5th grade students with TAMC funds, and an additional 200 students through other local funding sources
- King City Road Race
- Salinas Criterium
- Salinas ride to Council
- Salinas panel discussion
- Seaside panel discussion
- Salinas Community ride

The Committee had the following suggestions on the Monterey County Bike Month:

- Consider more outreach using Facebook and Social media
- Consider starting a Bike & Pedestrian Committee Facebook page
- Assess whether it is worthwhile to pay for the Monterey County Weekly ads again for future

7. **ANNOUNCEMENTS AND/OR COMMENTS**

Committee member Michael LeBarre noted that he will be meeting with the King City Bike Club this Saturday and hopes to form relationships and report back needs to the Bike and Committee.

Chairman Petersen announced the San Ardo Road Race in two weeks.

Ariana Green noted that she will be in maternity leave for starting next week and will be returning at the end of February. She noted that Virginia Murillo will be covering on her behalf on the bike activities.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Petersen adjourned the meeting at 6:57 pm
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
RECEIVE report, and PROVIDE input on bike share in the City of Monterey.

SUMMARY:
Bike share is a transportation program that encourages bicycling as a mode of transportation for short distance trips without having to own a bicycle. On June 21, 2016 the Monterey City Council provided direction to staff to pursue a citywide bike share pilot program.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
There are no financial impacts to the Transportation Agency budget.

DISCUSSION:
Bike sharing is an innovative transportation program that increases the use of bicycles for relatively short-range travel, providing users the ability to pick up a bicycle at any self-serve bike station and return it to any other bike station located within the system's service area. Membership fees typically pay for the first half hour of use, at which point additional charges are assessed in half-hour intervals. The pricing structure of these systems therefore incentivizes short trips. Benefits of bike sharing systems identified in published research include traffic congestion and emissions reductions by providing an alternative to short automobile trips, increased public awareness and enthusiasm for bicycling, economic benefits around bike sharing stations, and possible public health benefits.

The Transportation Agency completed a Monterey County Bike Share Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan in 2012 that analyzed ridership and station placement, cost estimates for implementation and economic impacts to bike rental businesses. The Study identified Monterey and Pacific Grove as the highest-suitability areas for successful bike share.
The City of Monterey is currently exploring the potential of establishing a citywide bike sharing program. City of Monterey staff will present an update on the program. If the City moves forward, the next steps would include coordinating the program, applying for funding, station planning and permitting, selecting a vendor/operator, and public outreach.
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
RECEIVE presentation on the final draft Pacific Grove Hwy 68 Study.

SUMMARY:
The Transportation Agency in partnership with the City of Pacific Grove and Caltrans is conducting a study of the State Route 68 Corridor in Pacific Grove to identify improvements that will provide safer access for all modes of travel.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
The project budget is $150,000, utilizing a $120,000 Caltrans Partnership Planning for Sustainable Transportation grant matched with Transportation Agency funds. In June 2015 the TAMC Board approved a contract with consulting firm Eisen|Letunic to assist with the study.

DISCUSSION:
The study area includes State Route 68 between the Pacific Grove city limits and Asilomar Boulevard, and is divided into two distinct segments: 1) Forest Avenue between the City limits and Sunset Drive, 2) Sunset Drive from Forest Avenue to Asilomar Boulevard. Each segment has different land uses, features and user needs. The ultimate goal of the study is to create a more "complete" corridor that improves safety and serves the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, drivers and serves people of all ages and abilities.

The initial outreach phase of the study included presentations to the Transportation Agency Board, TAMC Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee, and Pacific Grove City Council, Traffic Safety Commission, and Planning Commission. A walking audit with project stakeholders was conducted in September and community workshops were held in
November to take inventory of existing conditions along the corridor. The input and data collected culminated in an existing conditions report and needs assessment that identified a variety of needs including:

- Lack of continuous sidewalks and bikeways
- Difficulty crossing Forest Ave and navigating two five-way intersections on Sunset Dr.
- Careless or aggressive driver behavior
- Lack of streetscaping and landscaping amenities, including wayfinding signage and lighting, particularly on Sunset Dr.

A series of conceptual design alternatives for the corridor were developed based on the needs assessment and with input from the community. A second series of community meetings were held to discuss the draft conceptual designs. With input from the three partner agencies, the conceptual designs were revised to address issues raised by the public.

The introduction of the public draft version of the study report is attached to this agenda item, and the full report is accessible online: [http://bit.ly/2bpdIqf](http://bit.ly/2bpdIqf)

The draft study report includes the existing conditions and needs assessment, along with chapters on recommendations and on implementation. The recommendations chapter includes the revised conceptual designs for addressing needs and concerns at seven key locations; an inventory of sidewalk gaps along the corridor; and a set of other, miscellaneous recommendations for improving conditions. These include:

- Continuous sidewalks, curb extensions, and enhanced pedestrian crossings
- Protected bike lanes and cycle tracks
- Streetscape improvements

The chapter on implementation includes cost estimates for recommended improvements; a list and discussion of the most promising ways to fund the improvements; and a list of recommended next steps to advance implementation of the study. In addition to the TAMC Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee, the study report will be presented to Pacific Grove's Traffic Safety Commission on September 13. Subsequently, the draft report is scheduled to be presented to the Transportation Agency Board on September 28 and to the Pacific Grove City Council on October 5.

ATTACHMENTS:

- PG Hwy 68 Study - Intro

WEB ATTACHMENTS:

- Draft study report
Draft study report appendices
The Pacific Grove Highway 68 Study was developed jointly by the Transportation Agency for Monterey County, the City of Pacific Grove and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). It was funded by Caltrans through the Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant Program.
# Table of contents

1 | **Introduction** ................................................................. 1  
   1 | Overview of the study .................................................... 2  
   2 | Planning process ............................................................. 2  
   3 | Contents of the plan ....................................................... 3  
   4 | Public outreach ............................................................. 3  

2 | **Existing Conditions** ...................................................... 5  
   1 | Overview ........................................................................ 6  
   2 | Field survey ................................................................... 6  
   3 | Observations from the field survey .................................. 7  
   4 | Setting .......................................................................... 8  
   5 | Land uses ....................................................................... 8  
   6 | Key destinations ............................................................ 11  
   7 | Street network ............................................................... 11  
   8 | Right-of-way characteristics ......................................... 12  
   9 | Traffic characteristics ................................................. 13  
  10 | Traffic collisions .......................................................... 14  
  11 | Transit service .............................................................. 15  
  12 | Related planning efforts .............................................. 16  

3 | **Needs Assessment** ........................................................... 25  
   1 | Overview ....................................................................... 26  
   2 | Opportunities for public input ....................................... 26  
   3 | Key themes from the comments ..................................... 27  
   4 | Survey ........................................................................... 32  
   5 | Interactive map ............................................................. 41  
   6 | Stakeholder luncheon .................................................... 45  
   7 | Public workshop ........................................................... 47  
   8 | Email and phone ............................................................ 50  

4 | **Recommendations** .......................................................... 53  
   1 | Chapter overview .......................................................... 54  
   2 | Conceptual designs ....................................................... 54  

5 | **Implementation** ............................................................. 79  
   1 | Chapter overview .......................................................... 80  
   2 | Cost estimates ............................................................... 80  
   3 | Funding ................................................................. 81  
   4 | Other considerations ................................................... 85  
   5 | Next steps ................................................................. 86  

3 | Sidewalk gaps ................................................................. 70  
4 | Other recommendations to improve conditions ............. 73  

Appendices

| A  | Observations from the walking field survey | 89 |
| B  | SWITRS collisions records | 95 |
| C  | Summary reports of April 6–8, 2016 traffic study | 98 |
| D  | Comments from the needs assessment survey | 104 |
| E  | Comments from the interactive map | 122 |
| F  | Responses to the survey on the conceptual designs | 129 |
| G  | Comments from the public meetings on the conceptual designs | 177 |
| H  | Additional public comments submitted during the task on conceptual designs | 179 |
| I  | Cost estimates for the conceptual designs | 181 |

Figures

| 1  | Project area and context map | 9 |
| 2  | City of Pacific Grove zoning map | 10 |
| 3  | Map of MST bus routes in the project area | 15 |
| 4  | Map of pedestrian ways in Pacific Grove from the City’s General Plan | 17 |
| 5  | Map of bikeways in Pacific Grove from the City’s General Plan | 18 |
| 6  | Recommended improvements along Forest Avenue from the Forest Hill Specific Plan | 20 |
| 7  | Cross sections along Forest Avenue from the Forest Hill Specific Plan | 21 |
| 8  | Key conditions and issues: Forest Avenue from the city limit to Stuart Avenue | 28 |
| 9  | Key conditions and issues: Forest Avenue from Stuart Avenue to Sunset Drive | 29 |
| 10 | Key conditions and issues: Sunset Drive from Forest Avenue to Walnut Street | 30 |
| 11 | Key conditions and issues: Sunset Drive from Walnut Street to Asilomar Avenue | 31 |
| 12 | Interactive map: Location of walking-related comments | 42 |
| 13 | Interactive map: Location of biking-related comments | 43 |
| 14 | Interactive map: Location of comments about both walking and biking or about another issue | 44 |
| 15 | Map of conceptual design locations | 57 |
| 16 | Map of sidewalk gaps | 72 |
| 17 | Caltrans fact sheet on the planned footpath on the south side of Sunset Drive | 74 |
| 18 | Sample crossing improvements | 76 |
Tables

1 | Annual average daily traffic along the corridor ................................................................. 13
2 | April 6‒8, 2016 traffic counts ......................................................................................... 13
3 | Intersection collision rates along the corridor ............................................................... 14
4 | Sidewalk gaps on Sunset Drive ....................................................................................... 71
5 | Sidewalk gaps on Forest Avenue .................................................................................... 71
6 | Estimated cost to complete sidewalk gaps ..................................................................... 80
7 | Estimated costs of conceptual designs ........................................................................... 81
8 | Most promising grant funding sources ........................................................................... 83
Acknowledgments

TAMC Board of Directors

County Representatives
- Supervisorial District 1: Fernando Armenta (Chair)
- Supervisorial District 2: John Phillips (County Representative)
- Supervisorial District 3: Simon Salinas
- Supervisorial District 4: Jane Parker
- Supervisorial District 5: Dave Potter (2nd Vice Chair)

City Representatives
- City of Carmel-By-The-Sea: Carolyn Hardy, Council Member
- City of Del Rey Oaks: Jerry Edelen, Mayor
- City of Gonzales: Maria Orozco, Mayor
- City of Greenfield: John Huerta Jr., Mayor
- City of King City: Michael LeBarre, Council Member
- City of Marina: Bruce Delgado, Mayor
- City of Monterey: Ed Smith, Council Member
- City of Pacific Grove: Robert Huitt, Council Member (City Representative)
- City of Salinas: Kimbley Craig, Council Member (Past Chair)
- City of Sand City: Todd Bodem, City Administrator
- City of Seaside: Ralph Rubio, Mayor
- City of Soledad: Alejandro Chavez, Representative (1st Vice Chair)

Non-Voting Ex-Officio Representatives
- Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments: Maura Twomey, Executive Director
- Caltrans District 5: Tim Gubbins, District Director
- City of Watsonville: Eduardo Montesino, Council Member
- Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District: Richard Stedman, Air Pollution Control Officer
- Monterey Regional Airport: William Sabo, Board Member
- Monterey–Salinas Transit: Carl Sedoryk, General Manager/CEO
Pacific Grove City Council
- Bill Kampe, Mayor
- Robert Huitt, Mayor Pro Tempore
- Ken Cuneo, Councilmember
- Rudy Fischer, Councilmember
- Casey Lucius, Councilmember
- Daniel Miller, Councilmember
- Bill Peake, Councilmember

Pacific Grove Traffic Safety Commission
- George Shayne, Chair
- Tony Prock, Vice Chair
- Linda Petersen, Secretary
- Andrew Kubica
- David Terry
- Charles Tope
- Vacant seat

Pacific Grove Planning Commission
- William (Bill) Fredrickson, Chair
- Bill Bluhm, Vice-Chair
- Robin Aeschliman
- Jeanne Byrne
- Donald Murphy
- Mark Chakwin, Secretary
- Nicholas Smith

Other agencies, organizations and individuals
- Blind & Visually Impaired Center of Monterey County: Rena Weaver
- City of Pacific Grove Community and Economic Development Department: Terri Schaeffer, Fred Williamson (intern)
- City of Pacific Grove Police Department: Jocelyn Francis
- City of Pacific Grove Public Works Department: Jessica Kahn
- Office of County Supervisor Dave Potter: Kathleen Lee, Jayne Mohammadi
- Monterey–Salinas Transit: Lisa Rheinheimer
- Pacific Grove Chamber of Commerce: Moe Ammar
- Pacific Grove Unified School District: Matt Bell, Matt Kelly, Buck Roggeaman

Project representatives and consultants
- Caltrans District 5: John Olejnik
- City of Pacific Grove: Daniel Gho (Public Works Department), Robert Huitt (City Council)
- Transportation Agency for Monterey County: Ariana Green, Debbie Hale (Executive Director), Todd Muck (Deputy Executive Director)
- Eisen | Letunic: Niko Letunic
- Fehr & Peers: Steve Davis, Anais Schenk
- Mark Thomas & Company: Marilou Ayupan
1 | Overview of the study

The Pacific Grove Highway 68 Study was launched in July 2015 to look at ways to improve two streets that are part of State Route 68 through Pacific Grove: Forest Avenue and Sunset Drive. The ultimate goal of the study is to create a more “complete” corridor—one that works better for different forms of transportation and for people of all ages and abilities. The study corridor encompassed Forest Avenue from the city limit to Sunset Drive; and Sunset Drive from Forest Avenue to Asilomar Avenue. In particular, the study explored ways to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists, who are among the most vulnerable users of the transportation system and are not served adequately by the corridor.

The study was led by the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC), with the help of transportation planning consultants, but is a joint effort of TAMC and two other agencies: the City of Pacific Grove and District 5 of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), which serves the Central Coast counties. While the day-to-day work on the study was conducted by TAMC staff and consultants, the process was overseen by a multi-agency project team. The team consisted of representatives of the three partner agencies and of the two main consulting firms on the project. The team met in person at several key points in the process and held bi-weekly conference calls to discuss the project status and plan upcoming activities.

This report documents the planning process for the project. More importantly, it proposes location-specific design concepts and includes other recommendations to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists and, more generally, to enhance the appearance of the corridor. The recommendations were formulated to respond closely to the key needs, concerns and suggestions expressed by the community through the planning process.

2 | Planning process

The planning process for the Pacific Grove Highway 68 Study was meant to provide a comprehensive framework for addressing several key objectives:

- Determine the needs and concerns—particularly with regard to walking and biking—of corridor users and other stakeholders: residents, students, workers, merchants, visitors, and staff and appointed and elected officials at the three partner agencies.
- Respond to these needs and concerns by recommending a set of improvements—again, with a focus on walking and biking—that are effective, are affordable and have public support.
- Engage the local community so as to strengthen the constituency for the recommended investments and improvements.
- Create a plan that serves as an advocacy document for securing funds from federal, state, regional, local and private sources to implement the desired improvements.

The planning process lasted just over a year, from July 2015 through August 2016. The process consisted of the following five main tasks:

1. Inventorying existing conditions and issues relevant to non-motorized transportation in the corridor to establish the physical...
and planning contexts for the project and to provide initial insights into the walking and bicycling experience in the corridor.

2. Conducting a needs assessment process to hear the concerns and needs of corridor stakeholders and the broader public, learn about the obstacles and challenges to walking and biking in the corridor, and solicit ideas and suggestions for improving conditions.

3. Developing draft conceptual designs to address the locations and issues of greatest community interest and need; obtaining public input on the draft designs; and revising the designs based on the input received.

4. Preparing a draft plan document that incorporates the work products from the previous tasks, lays out the recommendations for the corridor and describes considerations related to implementing the recommendations.

5. Finalizing the plan and guiding it through the formal approval process by the TAMC Board of Directors and the Pacific Grove City Council.

3 | Contents of the plan

The contents of this document generally follow the order of the tasks outlined above. In addition to this chapter (Chapter 1, Introduction), the document consists of four chapters and a number of appendices:

- **Chapter 2, Existing Conditions**, presents key findings and results from the existing conditions inventory. The inventory consisted of a walking field survey of the corridor, supplemented by a review of additional conditions and issues such as key destinations, the corridor’s right-of-way and traffic characteristics, and traffic collisions involving pedestrians or cyclists, among others.

- **Chapter 3, Needs Assessment**, describes the various opportunities that existed for the public to provide input on needs; summarizes the approximately 500 comments received through the various channels for public input; and condenses the comments into a list of the community’s key needs and concerns related to the corridor.

- **Chapter 4, Recommendations**, includes conceptual designs for addressing needs and concerns at key locations; an inventory of sidewalk gaps along the corridor; and a set of other, miscellaneous recommendations for improving conditions.

- **Chapter 5, Implementation**, presents cost estimates for the improvements shown as part of the conceptual designs; a list and discussion of the most promising ways to fund the proposed improvements; and a list of recommended next steps to advance implementation of the study.

- The appendices (A to I) contain mainly the comments received from the public on needs and on the draft conceptual designs, as well as participants’ observations from the walking field survey and detailed technical information related to some of the project tasks.

4 | Public outreach

Meaningful public participation is essential for a planning effort to enjoy community buy-in and acceptance. This is especially true in a community as involved and engaged as Pacific Grove. With this in mind, the planning process for the Pacific Grove Highway 68 Study included extensive outreach to corridor users and other stakeholders.

The public outreach strategy for the study included community workshops; presentations to stakeholder groups; online surveys; corridor-wide postcard mailers to residents and property owners; updates and announcements to the project’s email distribution list, on the project website (PGhwy68.org), on TAMC’s and the City of Pacific Grove’s websites, and through TAMC’s MySidewalk account; and outreach to local media, among other activities. Public outreach occurred throughout the planning process, but special efforts were made during two project phases: (i) to obtain input on needs and concerns; and later, (ii) to obtain feedback on the draft conceptual
designs. Below is a summarized timeline of key outreach efforts carried out as part of the Pacific Grove Highway 68 Study.

**July–August 2015:** Preliminary outreach to the community to introduce the project and to begin to build an email list for purposes of sending out updates and announcements. Postcards were mailed to residents and property owners in the corridor, and presentations were given to the Pacific Grove City Council, Planning Commission and Traffic Safety Commission, and to TAMC’s Board of Directors and Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee. Articles about the project appeared in the Carmel Pine Cone and Cedar Street Times.

**September 9, 2015:** A walking field survey of the corridor was conducted to assess physical conditions in person. The walk covered the stretch from Asilomar Avenue to Stuart Avenue; it was attended by 17 representatives of the partner agencies, consultants and key stakeholder groups and organizations. The survey is described in more detail in Chapter 2, Existing Conditions.

**October–November 2015:** Extensive outreach was conducted as part of the needs assessment process. The process is described in much greater detail in Chapter 3, Needs Assessment. Activities included:

- Online survey, which ran for a month, from October 21 through November 22, and received 221 responses.
- Interactive “pinnable” map on which people could post comments. It was open during the same period as the online survey, and received 58 comments.
- Lunch-time presentation on Thursday, November 19, at Pizza My Way (1157 Forest Avenue) aimed at corridor merchants and other key stakeholders but open to the broader public.
- Evening community workshop, also on November 19, at the First United Methodist Church (the Butterfly Church; 915 Sunset Drive).

**April–May 2016:** Extensive outreach was again conducted to obtain feedback from the public on the draft conceptual designs. Similar to outreach for the needs assessment, activities included an online survey (ran for just over three weeks and received 190 responses); a stakeholder breakfast presentation and an evening community workshop, both on April 19; and presentations to the Pacific Grove City Council, Traffic Safety Commission and Planning Commission, and to TAMC’s Board of Directors and Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee.

**August–October 2016:** Outreach was conducted to announce the draft study report and to solicit comments on it. Presentations were again given to the Pacific Grove City Council, Traffic Safety Commission and Planning Commission, and to TAMC’s Board of Directors and Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee.
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
RECEIVE update on Active Transportation Plan outreach efforts.

SUMMARY:
The 2016 Active Transportation Plan will be an update of the 2011 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. The focus of the 2016 Plan update is to match State Active Transportation Program guidelines, incorporate innovative bicycle facility designs, and promote high priority projects.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
The Transportation Agency budgeted $60,999, to be paid for out of TAMC reserve funding, to continue preparation of the Active Transportation Plan update in the 2016/2017 fiscal year budget. The Plan will position high priority projects to be more competitive for grant funding, such as the State’s Active Transportation Program that had $240 million available in Cycle 3 on a competitive basis.

DISCUSSION:
In addition to creating an Active Transportation Plan that will meet the State's guidelines, and identifying high priority bicycle and pedestrian projects, this effort will also focus on analyzing key gaps in the existing and proposed bicycle and pedestrian networks, identifying opportunity sites for innovative bicycle facility design, and designating areas for enhanced regional and local connectivity.

At the May Committee meeting, staff presented the criteria that will be used to rank proposed active transportation projects and the projects that have been received to date. Since the last update to the Committee, Committee members, and members of the public,
suggested more projects to be included in the Plan, such as:

- CSUMB connection to Seaside via General Jim Moore and 6th Ave
- Pacific Grove: Asilomar to the Recreation Trail connection
- Carmel to Monterey connection
- Salinas: W. Alisal bike facilities extended beyond Pajaro St to Front Street
- Gonzales: bike path connection between Gonzales and Chualar
- King City to Pinnacles connection
- King City to San Antonio connection via Jolon Rd
- San Ardo: cycletrack along Cattleman Rd, and sidewalks on Cattleman Rd, College St, Main St and Godchaux St

TAMC plans to hire a consultant to develop conceptual plans and cost estimates for the highest priority regional projects in order to make them competitive for State and Federal funding.

Staff will continue outreaching to bicycle and pedestrian stakeholders throughout the County to obtain more input on active transportation improvements that should be included as part of the Plan. Committee members and members of the public are invited to participate online, via an interactive Wikimap set up for the Plan: http://bit.ly/tamcatp

ATTACHMENTS:

- Active Transportation Plan Criteria
## Active Transportation Plan Project Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Addresses a location with a high bicycle and pedestrian collision history, or addresses a location that is associated with greater cyclist or pedestrian stress such as streets with higher motor vehicle volumes and/or posted speeds.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>Fills a gap or creates access in an existing route to major destinations. Will remove a barrier or close a system gap in the active transportation network.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>Creates a more comfortable walking or bicycling experience for the user by using innovative bicycle and/or pedestrian treatments such as cycle tracks, bike boxes or pedestrian countdowns.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation Trips</td>
<td>Expected to generate an increase in bicycling and/or walking trips by providing a connection between or access to major destinations, such as: employment centers, shopping centers, community centers, schools and transit stations.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Serves disadvantaged communities including households living in poverty, children and the elderly, and people of color. The State’s <a href="https://www.calenviroscreen.ca.gov/">CalEnviroScreen 2.0 Population Characteristics Indicators</a> tool will be used to measure equity.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Streets Opportunity Projects</td>
<td>Integrates active transportation facilities into pre-existing or planned roadway or maintenance projects</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Facilities</td>
<td>Improves the quality of an existing facility with high existing usage in a way that will increase usage.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


RECOMMENDED ACTION:
RECEIVE report on Ciclovía Salinas.

SUMMARY:
Ciclovía Salinas is a youth-driven open streets event that attracts thousands to bike, walk, dance and skateboard along Alisal Street. This year's event will be held on October 9th. Event organizers are looking for volunteers to help.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
The Transportation Agency contributed $3,000 out of its FY 2016/17 bike education and outreach budget to sponsor Ciclovía Salinas.

DISCUSSION:
Ciclovía Salinas is a youth-led, open-streets community event designed to promote active transportation options like walking and bicycling, among other goals. The event temporarily excludes motorized vehicles from Alisal Street between Main Street and Sanborn Rd, allowing residents to participate in a variety of physical activities and learn about available community resources. Last year's event drew over 3,000 participants people from the surrounding Alisal neighborhoods and from across Salinas and the greater Monterey County who participated in the event and were able to ride bikes, walk, jog, skateboard and roller skate along 1.6 miles of Alisal Street free of cars. Other event activities included live music, Zumba, Baile Folklorico dance class, Crossfit activities, hula hoop game, soccer clinic and football.

This year's October 9th Ciclovía event is being planned by youth in Salinas with the support and oversight of Building Healthy Communities. The event will open Alisal Street
from Main St to Sanborn Rd, for recreational activity from 10am-2pm. TAMC will be distributing bike education materials and will be giving away helmets at its informational booth. In addition, TAMC is partnering with the City of Salinas to do a demonstration cycletrack and protected bike lane that will allow Ciclovía participants to learn about these new bike facility types.

Representatives from the Salinas Ciclovia planning committee will provide a presentation on the proposed event. Event organizers are looking for volunteers to help with the event.

Transportation Agency for Monterey County
55-B Plaza Circle - Salinas, California 93901-2902
(831) 775-0903 - FAX (831) 775-0897 - www.tamcmonterey.org