

Brad Beck, Senior Transportation Planner (bbeck@ccta.net)

From: Tony Sustak, Richmond Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee member

Re: Update of Countywide Bicycle Pedestrian Plan

Subject: Comments and thoughts on the Fehrs & Peers document and suggestions for changing the county's priorities.

Red type: Additional notes and comments added by Tony Sustak, RBPAC

Policy 1.3:

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
- **Art, historical and cultural centers**
- **Civic centers/local government facilities**

Policy 2.2 p 32

Explicitly mention "Timing of traffic lights" in the context of traffic calming. This is especially critical along San Pablo Ave. as well as 23rd St where drivers travel at the effective speed limit determined by the actual timing of the lights.

Seattle timed lights to 11 miles per hour to allow uninterrupted travel bicycle travel speeds.

Table 11 and map

Add the following locally approved routes

Remove MacDonald Ave. from the list of Unbuilt Segments, Table 11, as the City has rejected bike facilities on this corridor.

Cutting Blvd. should be substituted for a major east-west route: Connects to Del Norte BART Station, Kennedy High School, MLK Park & Recreation Center & Nystrom Elementary School, Ohlone Greenway, Pt. Richmond, Miller-Knox Park, north-south connections with Harbour Way, Marina Way, 37th St.

Repaving of a narrow strip of east bound Cutting (for some reason the asphalt strip immediately adjacent the concrete gutter is in very bad shape) would make Cutting an excellent candidate for Class II or Class 3 bike lanes.

3. Indicate a direct connector between the east and west portions of the Richmond Greenway across 23rd St., the railroad line, and Carlson

Near term priority should be given to connectors of important segments through out the county (as examples: Greenway east & west @ 23rd St., (Richmond), Pleasant Hill BART/Contra Costa Center Bike Shortcut Path, State Hiway 4 Bypass trail blockage (no promised overpass).

Policy 5.5 These gaps are not merely an ease of use issue, but also a safety issue as users will be forced to interact with traffic at the gaps, insuring that there will be collisions, injuries and deaths.

Richmond specific:

1. Connecting the East and West segments of the Greenway with a bridge will actually make this a user friendly corridor for easy bike commuting and will result, over time, in a large increase in use. Some more viable connection to the Ohlone is needed as well, to allow easy access to the Del Norte BART Station.
2. Connecting the segments of the Greenway would serve a west county wide interest by providing a car-free connection to the Bay Trail's western segments, Pt. Richmond and the San Pablo Peninsula, which will also have linkages to 3 BART Stations, as well as the Richmond AMTRACK.
3. Completing the Greenway achieves another interest that **should be a goal** in the plan. The draft's writers recognize that youth and low income workers are going to be disproportionate users of bicycles by virtue of their youth or their lack of resources. The Greenway runs through a heavily "Minority" and lower income area of Richmond and connects the eastern and western reaches of this community.

Bicycle/Pedestrian Advocate: The County should create and fund a position of bicycle advocate. Duties should be obvious.

Signage:

Recommend that the county adopt the protocols for bike way-finding that has been developed by the City of Oakland and encourage/mandate that locales to do the same. Local or county logo insignia's can be placed on these signs, with the way-finding info either below or superimposed.

1. Rationale: Oakland signage is well thought out and adoption would be a consistent format as now exists for auto centric signage.

Signage for auto users: Especially on Class 3, put “Share the Road Signs” and “Sharrows”.

1. That the County adopt a policy and seek to fund Share The Road signs and Sharrows.

Rationale: From SF experience, car drivers may still resent sharing the road with bicyclists, but at least they expect them to be there. **Sharrows** have the same effect.

Bicycle infrastructure:

1. That the County adopts a policy of encouraging locales to provide secure locking facilities. The policy should encourage safe bike parking, even though there may not as yet be investments in Class 2 or 3 lanes: Speed up placement and increase numbers E-locker installations and other secure bicycle locking facilities.

Rationale:

Large numbers of destinations are not going to be served any time soon by bike lanes. Safe locking at destinations will encourage bike use and cut down on car trips.

Placement of secure locking facilities is not likely to necessitate EIR's or protracted and expensive engineering studies.

a. BART offers bike racks, but the cameras around the bike racks do not work and are, thus, useless. BART needs to be pushed to stop squandering huge amounts of money on corporate welfare projects such as the Oakland Airport non-attended, driverless light rail and invest in serving its customer base. County Supes should express their outrage at this waste resources. There are plenty of other BART projects, like getting on with the long-delayed seismic retrofit of the overhead rights-of-way and the Bay Tunnel, and station access issues to keep the Building Trades Council happy.

A potential role for a County Bike/Ped Advocate will be to hector entities like BART, to “run a tighter ship”.

Another goal for a County Bike/Ped Advocate will be to work with BART and other transit properties to establish, especially at BART, Bicycle Stations in the East County stops. Bike Stations provide secure parking, service, and put to use BART real estate that currently serves as pigeon habitat and would be a great investment to spur future bike commuting to the stations and cut down on garage expenses.

2. The county should work with the school districts to provide high and middle schools with secure locking facilities, which can include E-Locker type installations and/or limited access monitored area storage. This should be part of any SR2S plans.

Bicycle Master Plans in locales with out BMP's:

1. The **2015** goal is too unambitious. Bicycle infrastructure is far less expensive than auto infrastructure and the 2015 goal appears to reflect too much comfort with the status quo.

Bicycle Safety Classes: Ch. 4 Goals and Policies

1. Contra Costa provides no resources for League of American Bicyclist classes. The East Bay Bicycle Coalition got a foundation grant to sponsor some classes in CCC.

2. Money should be earmarked for safety class sponsorship. The county should assign someone, working with the Bike/Ped advocate to pursue alternative funds should they become available.