

Nancy Baer, MSW, Manager
Injury Prevention & Physical Activity Promotion Projects Contra Costa Health Services
597 Center Ave. Suite 115
Martinez, CA 94553

August 3, 2009

Dear Brad:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the 2009 Contra Costa Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. I am commenting for myself as a member of the Countywide Committee, and have included comments from the Richmond Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (RBPAC), which I staff. I have also reviewed some of the comments by other committee members and will weigh in on selected items.

First of all congratulations to you, Fehr & Peers, and Eisen/Letunic on a thorough analysis of the current conditions, opportunities to improve pedestrian and bicycle travel, and appropriate roles for the Authority and other jurisdictions. The plan is well written and will provide a very good roadmap for future pedestrian and bicycling improvement projects. Below are suggestions for changes in the order that they appear in the document, with section title, page number, paragraph, or sentence identifiers as appropriate.

p.15: pp 2 Pedestrian Collisions: Unlike my friend John Cunningham, I like having the collision data here. You might want to mention that in CA, ped injuries are 17% of traffic related injuries, though only about 7% of all trips are made on foot and that collisions are significantly higher in CA than the national average (SHSP). Collision data is now available for 2007, the numbers in this paragraph and the table on the following page should be updated.

p. 30: Policy 1.3: Enumerate user groups to more closely parallel funding opportunities

- mothers with baby carriages
- school children
- commuters
- seniors

List key activity centers to parallel the user groups

- farmers markets
- schools and libraries
- rec centers
- shopping areas
- parks
- local and regional public transit
- senior centers
- Bay Trail

Goal 2, p.31, Policy 2.3: It may make sense to put something here about new data collection methodologies (e.g. UCBTSC ped and bike counting method) or maybe this goes elsewhere

Goal 3, p. 31: The objective should be way more ambitious! I understand the strategy of shooting low and then exceeding expectations, but I think given current climate change issues this objective should communicate a sense of urgency and encourage concerted action.

p. 32, Policy 2.2

Explicitly mention "Timing of traffic lights" in the context of traffic calming. This is especially critical because drivers often travel at the effective speed limit determined by the actual timing of the lights.

p. 35, 2nd sentence: Insert "currently" after "is" and before "very small". After comma, omit "it should not diminish" and add "there are compelling health and environmental reasons that underscore the importance of ... ". Mention the obesity epidemic and climate change.

p.39, Access Routes, 2nd sentence: Insert "useful" after "Safe"

p. 40, 1st paragraph, 7th line: Insert something about shorter crossing distances.

p. 40 or 41: I think that something about MTC's Pedestrian Toolkit (available online), and their Pedestrian Districts Study should be included in the Pedestrian Planning Section

p. 43, 2nd column, 1st paragraph under PEDSAFE, 4th line: Replace the word "matrices" with something more straightforward; e.g. charts.

p. 51, 1st paragraph, 2nd sentence: The end of the sentence should read "... work, social purposes, and recreation."

p. 53, chart: It would be helpful to include a chart of the existing built segments of the countywide network. Even though most people know where they are and there is a map, there are those odd little segments that were for some reason not included in an earlier approved route, but aren't classified as unbuilt either.

I believe El Cerrito is taking the lead on re-doing the I-80 and 580 interchange at Central, even though much of it is in Richmond. Macdonald should be removed, a decision was made by the City to not do bike lanes on Macdonald, Barrett will be the bike route. Richmond greenway, Greenway should be capitalized. The Richmond Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee met recently with City staff and Fehr & Peers to review and update a map of Richmond's current or proposed approved bikeways. That information will be inserted into the CBPP by Fehr & Peers. The following locally approved routes in Richmond should also be included, but may not be on Fehr and Peers list.

Class II: Bay Trail-Greenway connector:

Class II from the terminus of the Greenway at 2nd St, south 30 feet to Ohio Ave, west on Ohio (an existing striped bike lane) across the Richmond Parkway, and down S. Garrard Boulevard to Washington Park in Pt. Richmond. This is a potential route to BART from Point Richmond as well as a Greenway/Bay Trail Connector as it flows directly through the Tunnel in Pt. Richmond to the Miller Knox Shoreline. This route between 2nd and Pt. Richmond is already striped as a bike lane, and was obviously approved by the City of Richmond in the past. It should appear on the county map so it can be funded and improved.

Class 1: West side of Carlson Ave. from the BART overpass to the freeway overpass

Indicate a direct connector between the east and west portions of the Richmond Greenway across 23rd St., the railroad line, and Carlson. This segment is implied because the Greenway is an approved route, but does not appear on existing maps

And add if appropriate, not certain if this has been approved along with other segments of Carlson in the past: Eleven feet of "frontage" (mostly oleander) on the west side of Carlson is already maintained by the city of Richmond as a Richmond "park." This affords ample scope for a separated bike/ped multi-use trail ultimately connecting the Richmond civic center with the El Cerrito plaza and offers a landing for a connection between the east Richmond Greenway with the west Richmond Greenway.

p. 58, last paragraph, under Data Collection: As you know, one of the data challenges with counting pedestrians and bicyclists is that the number of people who walk or bicycle is not known, therefore it is difficult to determine collision rates by location. My understanding is that the new methodology developed by the UC Berkeley Traffic Safety to count pedestrians and bicyclists helps with this problem. This can help guide planning and construction priorities. They have done some local training on it and participants seem to have found it worthwhile. I think it would be worthwhile to include some information about this methodology and discuss its usefulness. The contact person is Jill Cooper, she can be reached at 510- 643-4259 or cooperj@uclink.berkeley.edu.

p. 60, last section, Traffic calming: It should be more clear that some traffic calming methods are more appropriate for pedestrians and some for bicycles and they are not always compatible with each other – requiring detailed analysis to determine which should be applied in a specific circumstance.

p.76, Street Smarts insert: There is also a Street Smarts Campaign in West County, which preceded the one in San Ramon. The West Contra Costa Street Smarts Campaign is supported financially by WCCTAC, and administered by Contra Costa Health Services. The activities are similar, but the SR campaign is generally more well-funded because of corporate offices in that area. This description should be more generic to include both campaigns.

p.77, bottom of first column: The “El Cerrito Police Bicycle Patrol Program” banner should be inside the box at the top of column 2.

Appendix B-17, Richmond: The Richmond General Plan has been released for public review. Even though it has not been adopted, it is a much better representation of the City’s intentions regarding

pedestrian and bicycle travel than the 1994 plan. I suggest using the newer version and putting in some kind of disclaimer that it hasn't been adopted.

Appendix B-18, San Pablo: San Pablo is also updating its General Plan, but it may not be far enough along to make it worthwhile including the more recent language. They are very close, however, to adopting a new streetscape improvement plan for 23rd Street (which includes reducing a lane and a possible Class II Bike Lane. It might be worth checking with Adele Ho to find out if the timing is close enough to include new language in the CBPP. Her # is 510-215-3068.