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Introduction

The Contra Costa County Transportation Authority adopted the first Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (CBPP) in December 2003. Since that time, several key events have occurred that will affect the CBPP:

1. Contra Costa voters approved Measure J, the extension of the half-percent sales tax for transportation improvements and growth management,
2. MTC adopted a policy for the routine accommodation of non-motorized travel, and

The Authority has begun the process of revising the CBPP to address these changes and to update and expand the local data upon which the Plan is built. In the first step of this revision, the team of Fehr & Peers and Eisen|Letunić, the Authority’s consultants, worked with local and regional agencies to update and expand information on plans, policies, facilities, and requirements that could affect the shape of the updated CBPP.

The Options Paper serves several purposes. First, it summarizes the data collected so far from local agencies for their review. Individual jurisdictions and the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) should review the maps, summary tables, and text of this paper for accuracy and completeness. We expect that additional information will become available to incorporate into the updated Plan. Second, the Options Paper outlines possible changes to key sections of the Plan for review by the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC), the RTPCs, individual jurisdictions and the public. For example, the paper outlines a revised set of goals and policies, new prioritization methods, and model policies and checklists that the plan could include. Third, this paper provides a foundation for community input. We plan to hold a first round of community meetings to generate feedback and ideas on possible changes to the CBPP and updated maps.
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The Options Paper begins with a chapter-by-chapter outline of proposed changes to the plan as well as separate sections on changes to the CBPP’s goals and policies, methods for setting priorities, the updated maps, and options for improving the tools for carrying out the plan. Because the Authority hopes that jurisdictions can use the CBPP to meet State requirements for a bicycle plan, the appendices begin with a list of those requirements and include a summary of the data collected from local jurisdictions, organized by these 11 requirements.

The next phase of the plan will include the following steps:

- Outline guidelines for implementing the CBPP, including a list of available funding sources (eligibility requirements, application deadlines, and evaluation criteria)
- Further refine the CBPP to reflect current policy documents related to pedestrians and bicyclists
- Incorporate the most recent ADA guidelines and standards

The following sections outline options for updating the CBPP. We welcome comments and feedback on any of the material in the options paper.
Section 1. Chapter-by-Chapter Outline of Major Changes for the CBPP Update

This section lists the chapters and appendices of the original CBPP and summarizes all the significant changes that we propose to make to as part of the update to the document. Collectively, those changes will constitute the update of the CBPP. At the end of the section is a list of key options and questions to consider related to the changes proposed. We will rely upon feedback from the RTPC TACs, the CBPAC, and the RTPCs to finalize these options and update the document. Following this step, we will conduct a series of public meetings to gather input on the document update before finalizing the draft document for review. (Unless noted otherwise, chapters and appendices mentioned below refer to chapters and appendices of the original CBPP and not of this options paper.)

Executive Summary: This section will be entirely rewritten, reflecting the content and tone of the updated CBPP.

1. Introduction: This chapter will be rewritten to reflect changes to the objectives of the CBPP and to highlight the major changes made to the updated CBPP. The chapter will also be supplemented with a new section outlining the process used to develop the updated CBPP.

2. Goals and Policies: This chapter will be updated to clarify and refine the existing policies and recommendations, focusing primarily on addressing Measure J, routine accommodation policies and updating and expanding data. The goals and discussion of goals in Chapter 2 will remain largely intact but policies will be reviewed closely and revised to reflect larger local policy changes and changes in local thinking about bicycling and walking since the adoption of the original CBPP in 2003. This chapter will be significantly expanded to include sections on Measure J (with an emphasis on the provisions that affect bicycling and walking), on MTC’s new routine accommodation policies and on the updated Action Plans (provided these are updated in time). Lastly, the section on “Relationship to Other Plans and Poli-
cies” will be supplemented with summaries of significant new plans and policies adopted since 2003.

3. Background: This chapter will be revamped to present the local data collected from all jurisdictions in Contra Costa necessary to meet Caltrans’ requirements for a bicycle plan and for funding under the Bicycle Transportation Account. To the extent feasible, the chapter will be organized so that jurisdictions can rely on the CBPP “as is” to meet Caltrans’ requirements. In addition, we will add a section highlighting the major accomplishments in implementing the original CBPP, particularly bicycling and walking facilities completed since 2003. The existing information in this chapter will otherwise be revised only to update factual changes occurring since 2003, including more-recent commuting statistics and collision data.

4. Bikeway Network: Measure J’s Growth Management Program (GMP) requires that each jurisdiction in the Contra Costa “incorporate policies and standards into its development approval process that support transit, bicycle and pedestrian access in new developments.” To help jurisdictions comply with this requirement, the existing information in this chapter will be reviewed closely and strengthened to reflect best practices for encouraging bicycling and will be supplemented with guidelines covering not only bicycling facilities but also other aspects of new developments that impact people’s decision to bicycle. The description of existing bicycle facilities will be updated to reflect projects completed since the 2003 Plan as well as more detailed bicycle parking, shower and locker data. The “Proposed Bikeway Network” section will be updated, including the description of the proposed system and Table 8 (unbuilt segments), which will reflect changes to the proposed system and segments constructed since 2003. In addition, the section on priority corridors will be updated to reflect changes to the prioritization criteria and methods, and Table 9 (Top Bikeway Improvements) and the following project descriptions will be updated to reflect the new priority projects.

Because the two sections are closely related, we will consider folding parts of Appendix A (“Bicycle Planning and Design”) into this chapter, if it improves the flow and readability of this topic.
5. **Pedestrian Network**: To help jurisdictions comply with the above-mentioned requirement in the GMP, the existing information in this chapter will be reviewed closely and strengthened to reflect best practices for encouraging walking and will be supplemented with guidelines covering not only pedestrian facilities but also other aspects of new developments that impact people’s decision to walk. Additionally, the section on ADA will be updated to reflect changes in thinking regarding the law and also in implementation practices. We will consider folding parts of Appendix B (“Pedestrian Design and Planning”) into this chapter.

6. **Links to Transit**: This chapter will be revised to update factual changes occurring since 2003, including changes resulting from the passage of Measure J in 2004. We will also discuss the criteria for the new Safe Routes to Transit funding program and provide a qualitative analysis of current projects that could compete well for funding.

7. **Safety and Support**: This chapter will be revised to update factual changes occurring since 2003, including changes resulting from the passage of Measure J in 2004. The description of Safe Routes to School could be expanded to highlight recommended school safety projects in the plan. The “Preparing a School Commute Safety Study” checklist could be moved to an Appendix, and/or shortened to focus on the five “E’s”: engineering, encouragement, enforcement, education, and evaluation (see discussion in Section 6 of this Options Report).

8. **Implementation**: The first section of this chapter, “Implementation Tasks,” will be revised only to update factual changes occurring since 2003. The second section, “Plan Cost Estimates,” will be revised with more recent estimates of unit costs. The last section, “Funding,” will be entirely rewritten, including with a new sub-section on funding sources created since 2003 and another sub-section outlining a process—including evaluation criteria—for allocating Measure J funds for bicycling and walking projects. We will consider folding Appendix G (“Tools for Local Agencies”) into this chapter.

**Appendix A, Bicycle Planning and Design**: As with Chapter 4, this section will be reviewed closely and strengthened to reflect best practices for encouraging bicycling and will be supplemented with model design standards and guidelines covering not only bicycling facilities.
but also other factors that impact people’s decision to bicycle. The discussion of the “Bike Stencil Route” will be updated to reflect the California MUTCD-adopted “Sharrow” marking. As mentioned earlier, we will consider folding at least part of this appendix into Chapter 4.

Appendix B, Pedestrian Design and Planning: As with Chapter 5, this section will be reviewed closely and strengthened to reflect best practices for encouraging walking and will be supplemented with model design standards and guidelines covering not only pedestrian facilities but also other factors that impact people’s decision to walk. As mentioned earlier, we will consider folding at least parts of this appendix into Chapter 5. In particular, the section on crosswalks and Table B-1 (“Types of Pedestrian Crossing Improvements”) will be updated to incorporate the latest research and guidelines on crossing treatments.

Appendix C, Bicycle Demand Forecasting Model: This section will be updated to reflect changes in demographic information and priorities.

Appendix D, Funding Sources: Information on continuing funding sources will be updated and summaries of new funding sources—including Measure J; MTC’s Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program and Transportation for Livable Communities; Safe Routes to Transit; and the Federal Safe Routes to School program—will be added.

Appendix E, US DOT Policy, Caltrans Directive, and MTC’s Routine Accommodation Policy: The material under this appendix will be supplemented with MTC Resolution 3765, which establishes routine accommodation policies for the region, and also with the routine accommodation checklist.

Appendix F, Local Projects: The list of and the bikeway atlas in this chapter will both be revised and updated, based on information provided by local jurisdictions.

Appendix G, Tools for Local Agencies: This section will be revised to reflect the objective of the CBPP update to make it easier for local jurisdictions to use the CBPP to meet Caltrans requirements for bicycle plans. Additionally, the tools outlined in Section 6 of this paper could
be included in this Appendix. As mentioned earlier, we will consider folding this appendix into Chapter 8.

**Key Options and Questions for Discussion**

- Chapter 2 of the original CBPP, “Goals and Policies,” consists of two sections: “Goals and Policies” and “Relationship to Other Plans and Policies.” Rather than updating Chapter 2 within its present framework, would it be preferable to turn each of those two sections into its own chapter? The justifications for elevating those two sections into chapters are: (1) goals, policies and other “policy statements” (for example, actions to implement the policies) form the heart of any plan; and (2) one of the primary reasons for updating the CBPP is to incorporate new policies such as Measure J and MTC’s routine accommodation requirements, which merit more extensive discussion. Alternatively, we could move the discussion of the relationship of the CBPP to other plans to the introduction.

- The “Background” chapter will include local bicycling data collected from all jurisdictions in Contra Costa. What would be the best way to present this information: (a) organized by jurisdiction (so that all the information from a specific jurisdiction is in one place); (b) organized by topic area (bike parking, for example, so that information can be compared across jurisdictions); or (c) as a matrix, as shown in Appendix B of this options paper?

- We are considering folding Appendix G (re-titled “Tools for Local Agencies”) into Chapter 8 (“Implementation”). First, this information is important to cities wanting to use the CBPP to meet Caltrans requirements for bicycle plans; second, Appendix G in the original plan is only two pages long. Is this a good approach or should the information remain as an appendix?
Section 2.
Goals and Policies

Plans from local agencies were reviewed to determine existing policies related to walking and bicycling in Contra Costa. These plans include bicycle, pedestrian, and trail plans; general plans; and programming guides for transportation funding. Relevant policies in each jurisdiction are summarized in tables for each RTPC (see Appendix B).

In addition, the existing CBPP’s goals and policies were reviewed and possible changes identified. The existing plan includes some vague policies, lacks specific “action” statements to supplement the goals and policies, does not include benchmarks, and does not have an overarching vision statement. Refining the goals and policies will provide more clear direction and clarify roles and responsibilities regarding plan implementation.

The proposed changes include drafting a vision statement; adding actions under each goal and policy; suggesting benchmarks to guide evaluation of progress on the plan’s goals; and highlighting tools to help implement the plan. The suggested revisions to the goals and policies are included below for review and comment. The original plan’s goals and policies are included in Appendix D.

Proposed Vision Statement

More people who live, work, shop and go to school in Contra Costa will walk and bicycle, thereby improving health, reducing emissions of greenhouse gases, and making our transportation system more sustainable. To support walking and bicycling, Contra Costa will have an integrated system of safe, convenient and comfortable bicycle, pedestrian and other non-motorized facilities that provide access to schools, jobs, shopping, neighborhoods, community facilities, parks and regional trails. Jurisdictions within Contra Costa will collaborate on creating inter-jurisdictional facilities, consistent signage, joint funding applications, and compatible standards for new develop-
Project sponsors will consider the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians when designing, reviewing and approving all development and transportation projects and accommodate those needs, whenever possible.

The following goals, policies and actions are intended to outline the Authority’s program for encouraging walking and bicycling within Contra Costa. These policies work within the framework of Measure J — and to be consistent with Measure C — but provide greater detail and focus for the Authority’s support for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Each of the jurisdictions in Contra Costa has an essential role in achieving the preceding vision. Their efforts to work with their communities to plan, design and implement bicycle and pedestrians are needed to create the safe, comfortable and convenient system envisioned in this plan. Other agencies, including the East Bay Regional Park District, MTC, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and Contra Costa Water District, must also be enlisted in these efforts. The public and user groups, including the East Bay Bicycle Coalition, can provide critical help in identifying issues and suggesting approaches to solving them.

GOAL 1

Expand, Improve and Maintain Facilities for Bicycling and Walking

While a number of important bicycle and pedestrian facilities exist in Contra Costa, many that are currently in place have significant gaps and major barriers—such as waterways and highways—that inhibit travel. While bike lanes and sidewalks alone can provide a good basic bicycle and pedestrian network, other improvements — such as signs, maps, curb ramps, crosswalks and traffic signals that better accommodate pedestrian and bicycle movement — make for a more useful
and complete system. The following policies are recommendations for providing a truly comprehensive and functional network. These policies and actions will guide the development of a connected countywide bicycle network, provide missing links in the pedestrian system, and encourage bicycle and pedestrian provisions in development.

**Policy 1.1  Support the construction of a system** of bicycle and pedestrian facilities that connect and provide access to key destinations within Contra Costa. This system will include:

- **Existing and future bicycle facilities of countywide importance** (the Countywide Bicycle Network)
- **Local bicycle facilities that interconnect with and support the Countywide Bicycle Network**
- **Pedestrian and other bicycle facilities that improve access to and within transit stations and centers, schools, commercial and job centers, and other activity centers and facilities**

**Action 1.1.1**  Work with local agencies and RTPCs to identify gaps and barriers to bicycling and walking among and within pedestrian districts, key destinations, including to transit and schools, and define priorities for eliminating these gaps and barriers and making needed improvements.

**Action 1.1.2**  Determine funding needs for expanding and improving bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and support local efforts to find, apply for, and receive funding to meet those needs.

**Action 1.1.3**  Use the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan to guide how best to allocate funding under the control of the Authority for regional or countywide bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs, while allowing jurisdictions flexibility in funding local projects.

**Action 1.1.4**  Work with local agencies to develop a coordinated countywide approach to signage. This system could include:
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- Directional and destination signs along bikeways and shared use trails
- Location maps in downtown areas and other major pedestrian districts
- A route identification system and common set of signs for the Countywide Bicycle Network

Action 1.1.5 Support local jurisdiction efforts to consider the impacts that its land use and development policies have on the local, regional and countywide transportation system, and to incorporate policies and standards into its development approval process that promote transit, bicycle and pedestrian access in new developments. This support could include providing information useful to local agencies in planning, designing, and implementing improvements to the bicycle and pedestrian network, including, but not limited to:

- Model zoning and subdivision ordinance language
- Guidelines and standards for bicycle and pedestrian facilities
- Monitoring of bicycle- and pedestrian-related collision levels

Action 1.1.6 Ensure that the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists are considered in the planning design and development of projects the Authority is directly involved in and, where feasible and consistent with local plans and the CBPP, incorporate design elements that accommodate walking or bicycling.

Policy 1.2 Encourage routine maintenance of bikeway and walkway network facilities, as funding and priorities allow, including regular sweeping of bikeways and shared use pathways.

Action 1.2.1 Include the costs of major maintenance needs of bicycle and pedestrian facilities when calculating the maintenance needs of streets and roadways generally. Larger scale projects (such as crack sealing of pavement and pavement overlays) should be distinguished from routine maintenance and budgeted for accordingly.
GOAL 2

Improve Safety for Bicyclists and Pedestrians

Improving safety is a critical goal of this plan. Motorists, pedestrians and bicyclists need to understand and obey the rules; generally, greater consideration of and respect for other users of the street and trail system will contribute to safer conditions. In addition to improving and expanding facilities for bicycling and walking, implementation of the following policies will help gauge and improve safety.

Policy 2.1  Monitor and evaluate information on collisions involving bicyclists and pedestrians; provide this information to local agencies to assist in remedying existing problem locations.

Action 2.1.1  Work with agencies within Contra Costa on a countywide collision data analysis program that will generate data useful in identifying actions and improvements to pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

Policy 2.2  Support the development and implementation of effective programs to educate drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians of their rights and responsibilities, as well as pedestrian and bicycle education and safety programs for adults and youth.

Action 2.2.1  Work with 511 Contra Costa to get information out to the public and interested agencies and organizations about how to walk or bicycle safely. This action could include sponsoring safe bicycling classes and distributing pamphlets on the rights and responsibilities of both drivers and pedestrians and bicyclists in California.
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GOAL 3

Encourage More People to Bicycle and Walk

In addition to providing safer and more direct routes and parthways, agencies can help encourage more people to make walking and bicycling everyday activities through information, training, and encouragement. Maps can help people find user-appropriate, routes, for example, and training on how to ride safely can give people more confidence. These policies address techniques that could encourage more people to walk or bicycle beyond their current levels.

Policy 3.1  Work with local and regional agencies to develop useful and cost-effective programs to encourage more people to walk and bicycle.

Action 3.1.1  Support effective programs for providing maps, trip planning services, and other “wayfinding” methods for bicyclists and pedestrians, including updating data in the 511.org “bike mapper” program.

Action 3.1.2  Give priority to projects that provide or improve access to or within schools, transit centers/stations, job centers, downtowns, recreational areas, and other key destinations.

Action 3.1.3  Support the development of Safe Routes to School programs at schools throughout Contra Costa.

Action 3.1.4  Continue to encourage bicycling and walking as part of transportation demand management and commute alternatives programs. Support events such as Bike to Work Day, Walk to School Day and National Walk at Lunch Day.

Action 3.1.5  Support programs that help bicyclists learn how to ride safely and programs that provide to all users of the transportation system on their rights and responsibilities. This support could include sponsoring skills classes for bicyclists.
Policy 3.2  Encourage traffic calming, intersection improvements, or other similar actions that improve safety for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Action 3.2.1  Ensure that criteria for selecting projects support effective and efficient efforts to improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians.

Action 3.2.2  Include information on effective safety improvements as part of outreach and information sharing efforts.

GOAL 4

Coordinate Local Efforts to Encourage Walking and Bicycling

An ideal transportation system includes well-designed and clearly marked sidewalks, bike facilities and trails that connect neighborhoods, shopping, work and school. These facilities provide mobility for pedestrians and bicyclists both within each city and throughout Contra Costa. Building such a system will require the concerted efforts of local governments to work with neighborhoods and businesses within their jurisdiction and to work together with adjoining jurisdictions to coordinate the development of bicycling and walking in Contra Costa. The Authority will work to support and coordinate these local efforts.

Policy 4.1  Provide a forum for local jurisdictions, agencies, and stakeholders to discuss and help resolve bicycle and pedestrian issues of mutual concern and to develop countywide or subregional approaches that could help overcome obstacles standing in the way of achieving the goals of this plan.

Action 4.1.1  Sponsor or support efforts to identify, define and implement multi-jurisdictional projects and programs.

Action 4.1.2  Collaborate with the County, RTPCs, local jurisdictions and agencies, the East Bay Regional Park District, water districts, BART and Caltrans to implement the projects and programs in the plan.
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**Action 4.1.3** Encourage local agencies to consider a proposed project’s contribution towards the regional network (or access to the regional network) when evaluating and prioritizing local projects.

**Action 4.1.4** Support applications by local agencies for state and federal funds, including preparation of joint grant applications, where appropriate.

**Action 4.1.5** Work with a committee of local agency staff and bicyclists and pedestrians to develop, update and help implement the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. The CBPP will be updated as often as necessary to maintain eligibility for BTA funding. As part of the periodic update of the CBPP, the committee will:

- Review, assess, and recommend, where necessary, refinements to the goals, policies, and actions
- Review and reevaluate the Countywide Bicycle Network, identified pedestrian districts, and priorities for completing and improving the network and districts
- Update information on projects, routes, and other actions
- Identify new or remaining issues that could be resolved through countywide efforts
- Provide public outreach to encourage local participation in Plan updates

**Policy 4.2** Provide information on best practices.

**Action 4.2.1** Identify best practices throughout Contra Costa and post these on the Authority’s website as a resource for local agencies.

**Action 4.2.2** Provide consistent, updated design standards for bicycle and pedestrian facilities and encourage local agencies to adopt these standards.

**Action 4.2.3** Provide guidance for accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians as well as for vehicles during construction of transportation improvements and other development projects,
such as by developing a model construction monitoring/mitigation program.

**Action 4.2.4** Encourage local agencies to adopt model policies to encourage walking and bicycling, such as walkability guidelines and crosswalk installation policies.

**GOAL 5**

**Plan for the Needs of Bicyclists and Pedestrians**

As noted in the FHWA’s Policy Statement on Integrating Bicycling and Walking into Transportation Infrastructure, “ongoing investment in the Nation’s transportation infrastructure is still more likely to overlook rather than integrate bicyclists and pedestrians.” When the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians are overlooked, improvements designed to benefit automobiles, trucks or transit may worsen the mobility of bicyclists and pedestrians. Considering and accommodating bicycle and pedestrian mobility and safety in the planning and designing of new or improved transportation facilities can benefit all modes of travel.

The goal is that all new development and major redevelopment projects incorporate bicycle and pedestrian facilities, including temporary facilities where needed during construction. That, however, is not always possible. Roadways where bicyclists and pedestrians are prohibited, for example, need not include sidewalks or bike lanes. On the other hand, their design, construction or implementation should not cut off existing or planned bicycle or pedestrian facilities. Where demand for bicycling or walking is low, or where the cost to provide them is excessive, agencies may need to find alternative ways of accommodating those needs. Finally, most agencies in Contra Costa must deal with existing roadways with limited right-of-way and established land uses adjoining them. “Retrofitting” sidewalks, bike lanes and other such facilities while accommodating vehicular movement can be a major challenge, involving significant compromises.
Policy 5.1  Consider the needs for mobility, accessibility, and safety of bicyclists and pedestrians — including children and seniors — when planning, designing, and developing transportation improvements and programs and accommodate those needs wherever needed and feasible, and encourage other agencies to do the same.

Action 5.1.1  Review capital improvement projects to make sure that needs of non-motorized travelers (pedestrians and bicyclists, including children, seniors and persons with disabilities) are considered in programming, planning, maintenance, construction, operations, and project development activities and products.

Action 5.1.2  Incorporate sidewalks, bike ways, bike parking, showers and lockers, crosswalks, pedestrian cut-throughs, or other bicycle and pedestrian improvements to accommodate various user groups (experienced and inexperienced, commuters and recreational users) into new projects as appropriate and feasible.

Action 5.1.3  Provide comfortable and convenient alternatives when bicycle or pedestrian facilities are removed.

Implementation Tools

Implementation tools are those programs, new policies, policy modifications, changes to the CPBB, or other measures that would be used to implement actions described above. A sub-set of these are discussed below.

Programs to support enforcement and education could include:

- Enforcement of pedestrian- and bicycle-related laws by local police departments, through targeted “stings.”
- Teaching bicycle and pedestrian safety to school children and drivers.
- Safe Moves program
- Bicycle Rodeos at schools and community centers.
- Working to incorporate questions about pedestrian- and bicycle-related laws into the DMV driving test.
Checklists are often used to help institutionalize bicycle and pedestrian considerations into a new jurisdiction. Checklists to ensure the routine accommodation of bicyclists and pedestrians could include:

- Routine Accommodation checklist.
- Site Analysis checklist for proposed development.
- Transportation Impact Study checklist.

**Benchmarking**

Benchmarks are specific targets or objectives that can be tracked over time. They add accountability to a plan. A prime example is a benchmark related to safety. Creating a specific target for improving safety is often helpful. A common collision reduction goal is the following:

- Achieve a 10 percent reduction in bicycle and pedestrian collisions on a per capita basis over the next 20 years.

**Key Options and Questions for Discussion**

- Is a Vision Statement useful? Is the proposed statement appropriate for the Plan? How might it be reworded?

- Are the benchmarking and implementation tools useful and reasonable?

- Are there any goals or policies that are especially important? Are there any that require revision or reorganization?

- Given that the Authority has limited powers when it comes to actually building pedestrian and bicycle facilities — limited to information, support, and funding — can the policies and actions be refined to better balance the goals of the plan and those limited powers?

- Are policies about influencing MTC policies and programs, whether specific policies such as the Regional Bicycle Plan (e.g., adding routes designated in the CBPP to the RBP) or more general policies on walking or bicycling, needed?
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Section 3.
Methods for Setting Priorities

The last 2003 CBPP contained two sets of criteria: one for selecting bicycle routes to be designated as part of the regional system; and a second for designating priority countywide corridors. A possible third set of criteria would relate to criteria for consideration when awarding grants. This section discusses these three sets of criteria and how they could be used in setting priorities. In each section, the 2003 CBPP process is described followed by a potential set of changes for the current plan.

DESIGNATING THE COUNTYWIDE BIKEWAY NETWORK

One of the eleven requirements for a bicycle plan to conform to State law is to designate a network of existing and proposed bikeways. Generally, agencies have construed this requirement to mean the network of “main” facilities, whether currently in place or only planned.

Criteria for Designating the 2003 Countywide Bikeway Network

The 2003 CBPP, on page 29, outlined the criteria for designating the Countywide Bikeway Network. The 2003 CBPP used the following criteria to identify the network of bicycle corridors of countywide significance:

1. Existing bicycling patterns based on public input
2. Roadway conditions (speeds, volumes)
3. General connectivity and directness of route
4. Number of destinations served (schools, parks, employment centers)
5. Topography and gradients
6. Integration into the regional system
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7. Presence of reasonable alternatives for bicyclists of various skill levels  
8. Collision and safety data

The plan used these criteria to designate the over 600-mile Countywide Bikeway Network. Of these 600 miles, over 350 were unbuilt at the time the plan was adopted.

Proposed Criteria for Designating the 2008 Countywide Bikeway Network

While the criteria used in 2003 are still applicable, they could be refined to reflect the ability to use GIS to better apply them. As will be discussed in a subsequent section, measures of latent demand are significantly more sophisticated than in 2003 and can substitute for former proxy measures such as destinations served.

In addition, after discussion with the CBPAC, we have decided not to include criterion on safety because it cannot be evaluated without looking at the specifics of a project. Safety would instead be considered when reviewing project applications. A project that would improve a location with a high collision rate would receive a higher score than one in a location with a lower collision rate, even though both would support increased bicycle usage. This is discussed in more detail in the section below.

The resulting recommended criteria for designating regional the countywide bikeway network is:

1. Existing bicycling patterns based on public input  
2. Roadway conditions (speeds, volumes)  
3. General connectivity and directness of route  
4. Latent bicycle demand  
5. Topography and gradients  
6. Integration into the regional system  
7. Presence of reasonable alternatives for bicyclists of various skill levels

The 2003 Plan included collision and safety data as a criterion. The proposed new criteria for designating the Bikeway Network, howev-
er, do not, primarily because it is not clear how safety should be used at the corridor level. Should we designate the Bikeway Network where there is a high incidence of collisions or where there isn’t?

**DESIGNATING PRIORITY COUNTYWIDE CORRIDORS**

While the Regional Bikeway Network is a subset of the broader bike-way networks of each of the cities and the county, there is still need to prioritize within this network. One major reason for this is so that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Regional Bikeway Network reflects the recommendations of the CBPP. This was an effect outcome of the 2003 CBPP; while not every CBPP-designated Priority Countywide Bikeway Network was included in the MTC Regional Bikeway Network, MTC selected a subset of CBPP recommendations rather than using their own discretion to select route.

Priority Countywide Corridors may also receive higher consideration in selecting projects to receive grants award by CCTA, but this is discussed later in this section.

All proposed bikeways on the recommended countywide network went through a feasibility process locally. Based on this analysis, the ultimate alignment as well as local priorities may have been altered.

**Criteria for Designating 2003 Priority Corridors – Bicycles Only**

Found on page 45, the 2003 CBPP included a second set of criteria to identify which of the corridors with gaps (and almost all of them had significant gaps) should receive priority for funding. The 2003 Plan did not discuss criteria for designating pedestrian corridors or districts. The bicycle Priority Corridor criteria were:

**Destinations Served** The actual number of schools, employment centers, parks, commercial centers, and transit centers served within a reasonable distance of the project. Larger facilities, such as regional parks, were given two points.

**User Groups** Bikeways that would attract a broader array of user groups, including school children, families, less experienced bicyclists, and pedestrians, received higher scores.
Feasibility  Projects that have preliminary design completed or appear to have relatively few feasibility constraints received higher scores.

Safety  Projects that addressed safety concerns, especially on busy streets, received higher scores.

Connectivity  Projects that provide new connectivity or close major gaps and do not duplicate other nearby facilities, received higher scores. (Connectivity to the regional system will be a consideration for local bikeways on funding applications.)

Public Input  Projects that were identified as priorities by the public received higher scores. The Rural Road Improvement Project was also included to encourage those agencies with jurisdiction over rural-type roadways to consider bicycle-friendly concepts, including pullouts, shoulders, and signing, to improve bicycle safety along these routes. Finally, a project focusing on completing major regional trails was added to emphasize its importance to not only the county but the region, as well.

Proposed Criteria for Designating 2008 Priority Corridors

As noted earlier, Priority Corridors are a subset of the Countywide Bikeway Network, which have already undergone an exhaustive screening and prioritization process. The proposal for the 2008 Plan is that further prioritization within this rank of projects be made on the basis of the expected number of users that could benefit from the project. This is not a prediction of the actual number of users, but rather an assessment of potential demand, often called latent demand, based on demographic and socioeconomic factors.

There are two sets of proposed criteria presented below: one for bicycle projects and one for pedestrian projects. Both sets of criteria would first evaluate the likelihood that the proposed project would encourage bicycling and/or walking and second evaluate the project’s overall feasibility.
Since multi-use trail facilities are designed for the use of bicycle and pedestrian users, a combination of both latent demands would be appropriate.

**Bicycle Latent Demand**

The first step would be to identify locations with the most potential for cycling. As part of the development of its Smart Growth Index, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) identified factors which could influence the decision to bicycle or walk. These factors would be assigned a weight which, when taken together, measure an area’s “bikeability.” Bikeability analysis helps identify locations that have the greatest potential to serve a large number of cyclists.

The factors identified that have a measurable impact on the decision to bicycle include:

- **Presence of/proximity to Schools.** Estimated demand would vary by the size and type of schools. For example, areas within a two-mile radius of colleges or universities with enrollments of 5,000 or greater would get the highest demand score, while smaller colleges would be assumed to have a lesser demand. High schools and middle schools would have smaller “demand sheds” still.

- **Population Density** measured as people per acre.

- **Employment Density** measured as employees per acre. We could also include factor addressing proximity to neighborhood shopping districts.

- **Mix of Uses** measured as a ratio of employees to population.

- **Zero Vehicle Households** as identified in the 2000 Census.

- **Proximity to Transit.** Areas within two miles of BART, Capitol Corridor or other rail stations.

**Pedestrian Latent Demand**

For pedestrian projects, a similar approach is proposed, although the factors are slightly different. To measure pedestrian demand, a set of 15 indicators correlated with higher rates of walking would be used. Areas of strong walking demand (or high “potential”) are grouped into four categories: demographics, proximities, pedestrian environment, and important policy areas.
• **Demographics**  Indicators describing groups that have a greater likelihood of walking, including seniors, youth, low income persons, and those without cars. These indicators come from US Census 2000 data.

• **Proximities**  Indicators of nearness to key walking destinations (located within 1 mile of walking distance). These indicators are derived from Geographic Information System (GIS) data. These destinations could include schools; transit stations, transit centers or stops on rapid bus transit lines; significant job centers; and downtowns.

• **Pedestrian environment**  Indicators that have been empirically shown to correlate with the choice to walk, including population density, employment density, and mixed land uses. These indicators may be derived from several sources, including GIS and US Census data.

• **Policy areas**  Presence of special areas having greater importance for pedestrians due to City policies. These areas would be mapped using feedback from each of the RTPCs.

**CRITERIA FOR CONSIDERATION IN GRANT FUNDING**

The final set of criteria would be used to review and select projects awarded by CCTA, Measure J Sales Tax-funded projects being the most obvious. There are a host of factors that members of the CBPAC requested be included, but for which more project-specific information is required. These and other factors should be used in the selection of projects for award for funds awarded by CCTA. These include:

- Gap Closures – Is the project a gap closure? If so, what gap does the project close? All of the priority corridors in the 2003 Plan were “gap closures”, that is, they would fill a missing link on the Countywide Bicycle Network. Although the priorities focused on these gaps in the countywide system, local jurisdictions were encouraged to also consider other projects, whether on the countywide system or not, that would improve the environment for bicyclists. When allocating funding for bicycle projects, the CBPP recommended that the Authority or local jurisdictions consider improvements to existing fa-
cilities on that system and other safety improvements and local connections as well as gap closures on the countywide system. Using the preceding criteria, these other improvements could score as high as, or higher than, gap closures on the countywide system.

- Safety – How does the project improve safety? An open-ended question allows the applicant to demonstrate the safety benefits of a specific set of improvements.
- Cost/benefit – Is the project cost-effective? What is the average cost per mile of the facility? (CCTA could also use its latent demand scores to assess the cost per user per mile)
- Integration - How does this project integrate with other efforts being undertaken in your jurisdiction
- Barrier elimination – Does the project eliminate an existing barrier (bridge a freeway and creek; elevate a railroad line; permeate a large block)?
- Complexity – This is described in more detail in the following section.

In addition to these new criteria, consideration of a few of the factors from the prior sections is also appropriate here. These are:

- Inclusion in the Countywide Bikeway Network
- Inclusion in the Priority Corridors
- Latent Demand

The two following maps illustrate what the application of these criteria within the county might look like. These bicycle and pedestrian “latent demand maps” use information from the Authority’s land use database and GIS system to identify where improvements might be more likely to encourage walking or bicycling. They use the following criteria:

- **Bicycle**
  - Proximity to Major Transit Stations
  - Proximity to College Campuses & Middle to High Schools
  - Population per Acre (within ULL)
  - Jobs per Acre (within ULL)
  - Ratio of Employed Residents to Jobs
  - Percent Zero-Vehicle Households
Zonal Scoring Factors (possible total of 29):
- Proximity to Major Transit Station
- Proximity to College Campus (with 5,000+ Enrollment)
- Proximity to High School & Other College Campus
- Proximity to Middle School Campus
- Population per Acre (within ULL)
- Jobs per Acre (within ULL)
- Ratio of # of Employed Residents to # of Jobs
- Percentage of Zero-Vehicle Households

Sources: LUJS, Countywide Model
Zonal Scoring Factors (possible total of 32):
- Proximity to Major Transit Station
- Proximity to School Campus
- Population per Acre (within ULL)
- Jobs per Acre (within ULL)
- Ratio of # of Employed Residents to # of Jobs
- Percentage of Zero-Vehicle Households
- Percentage of Youth (5-17) and Senior (62+)
- Percentage of Low Income Households

Source: LUIS, Countywide Model

Sources: LUIS, Countywide Model

Pedestrian Facility Latent Demand
Based on Scoring of Select Demographic & Geographic Factors

Total Score (by Zone)
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Pedestrian

- Proximity to Major Transit Stations
- Proximity to School Campuses
- Population per Acre (within ULL)
- Jobs per Acre (within ULL)
- Ratio of Employed Residents to Jobs
- Percent Zero-Vehicle Households
- Percent Youth (5–17) and Seniors (above 62)
- Percent Low-Income Households

The pattern of “latent demand” shown in the maps is not unexpected. It includes potential demand where densities are higher, where jobs and housing are more mixed, and schools and transit. The maps also show that some “tweaking” of the criteria may be necessary. Some zones are shown have a relatively high potential for walking or bicycling even though the number of jobs and housing are low or there are no transit or schools nearby.

Bicycle Complexity

Each potential bicycle project or corridor would be assigned a complexity of low, medium or high.

- **Low:** Project would require minimal changes to the existing roadway and roadway capacity and no or minimal purchase of right-of-way. Examples could include restriping a wide outside lane to add a bicycle lane or the addition of wayfinding signage.

- **Medium:** Project would require moderate changes to the roadway, such as parking/lane removal or purchase of some additional right-of-way or construction of some retaining walls.

- **High:** Project would require significant modifications to the roadway such as lane removal, parking removal, utility modification, roadway widening along the entire length of the facility, the construction of a wholly new facility or construction of significant retaining walls.
Bikeways with higher potential ridership and low complexity would receive the highest ranking; high biking potential and medium complexity next; and so on. Locations with high complexity should be addressed through policy changes or development projects. These projects will likely be longer-term projects.

**Pedestrian Complexity**

As with bicycle projects, the second step would be to measure complexity to implement. Each potential pedestrian project or corridor would be assigned a complexity of low, medium or high.

- **Low:** Project would require no or minimal changes to the roadway or reductions in roadway capacity. Examples might include improved crosswalk lighting or signage.
- **Medium:** Project would require moderate changes to the roadway such as parking removal or purchase of some additional right-of-way.
- **High:** Project would require significant modifications such as lane removal, parking removal, utility modification, right of way acquisition, roadway widening or construction of significant retaining walls.

Pedestrian projects with higher potential use and low complexity would receive the highest ranking; high potential use and medium complexity next; and so on. Locations with high complexity should be addressed through policy changes or development projects. These projects will likely be long-term projects.

**Advantages of the New Criteria**

The primary advantages of the new criteria are that they take advantage of new research and information which has emerged since the 2003 plan. Specifically, information about the factors that influence people’s decision to walk has become more quantitative thanks to the Environmental Protection Agency’s Smart Growth INDEX and PedINDEX. Both of these indices are GIS-based tools that analyze land use and socioeconomic factors found to have a direct relationship to the number of pedestrians or bicyclists in a given area.
In addition, adding a set of criteria related to grant funding considerations clarifies how many of the less tangible benefits of projects would be considered and allows more probing questions about the specific benefits of a project.

Key Options and Questions for Discussion

- Which of the options would work best? Should the 2003 criteria be retained, and applied to projects instead of corridors? Should the new criteria be used? If so, should it be applied to corridors or projects?
- Can the criteria be applied easily? Would one set work best at the planning level and another for assessing specific projects for funding?
- Could we develop a criterion that measures how many motor vehicle trips a project would replace, whether bicycle or pedestrian projects? How would we estimate it?
- Does it make sense to have separate criteria for bicycle, pedestrian, and multi-use path projects?
- How/where should corridors be segmented?
- What constitutes a gap closure? Should gap closure projects receive the highest priority? Are they all equally important?
- Do the criteria have an urban bias? Is that bad? What changes could be made to ensure that needs of bicyclists and pedestrians in lower-density areas are fully considered while identifying the most effective projects for the limited funding available?
- Should we use the project-specific criteria to identify priorities in this Plan, or wait for applications to prioritize?
Section 4.
Maps

Based on input received from local agencies, the consultant team has created a new set of maps. The maps, which are organized by RTPC and are reproduced in Appendix C, include the following data:

- Jurisdictional and RTPC boundaries, and city limits
- Existing and planned bikeways
- BART Line, BART stations, Amtrak stations, transit centers, and park and ride locations
- Downtown areas
- Schools
- Large shopping centers
- City halls

These maps should be reviewed carefully by each RTPC for completeness and accuracy, with particular attention to the following:

- Review of confusing/conflicting data
- Conflicts and connections at jurisdictional limits
- Missing or incomplete data

The next round of maps, which will be included in the draft CBPP, will correct any errors or omissions and add the following:

- Bicycle parking
- Showers and lockers
- Office/job centers

Parks and open space may also be added, depending on availability of data.

Given the scale of the maps, specific locations of bicycle parking, showers and lockers will not be shown. General locations (e.g. downtowns) or facilities at key locations (e.g., community centers, city halls) may be shown, however. A description of bicycle parking,
showers and lockers will be included in the plan. Pedestrian-related data can be shown at a macro level, and the Plan will summarize pedestrian projects submitted by local agencies.

In addition to the bikeway maps, the Plan will include a land use map, based on Countywide General Plan land use. Major shopping and employment centers may be added for local jurisdictions.

**Key Options and Questions for Discussion**

- First, are the maps complete and accurate? In particular, are there any segments of the ideal countywide bikeway network that are missing, disconnected or misaligned?

- The countywide map was divided into the six sub-areas that correspond to the RTPCs — west, central, east (north), east (south), San Ramon Valley, and Lamorinda — while the 2003 Plan included an atlas that divided the county into a regular grid like the Thomas Brothers map guides used in the Bay Area. Both provide detail at the same scale for all maps. Is there a better way to divide the countywide map?

- Are there any data layers in addition to the ones outlined above that should be added to the maps? Specifically, should the map include a layer of local streets? (Such a layer might be useful for providing context; on the other hand, at the scale of the maps, the increased detail might be distracting.)

- Are there any pedestrian projects that should be shown on the maps? How should they be shown?

- Should the Plan designate pedestrian districts? Should districts reflect local policy or be reflective of latent pedestrian demand?

- Should the maps show shopping destinations as a bicycle criterion?
Section 5. Responding to New Plans and Policies

Several guidelines, standards, and plans have been approved since the original CBPP. These include Measure J, the 2004 Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan and MTC’s Routine Accommodation Policy.

MEASURE J

One of the most significant change regarding bicycling and walking in Contra Costa since the adoption of the original CBPP is the approval of Measure J in November 2004. Measure J extends Contra Costa’s half-percent transportation sales tax until 2034. It will provide $2 billion in funding to the County and to its cities and towns for the construction of several large-scale capital improvement projects for transportation and to maintain local streets and roads, improve access to BART stations, provide bus service, fund transportation services for the elderly and persons with disabilities and—of greatest relevance to the CBPP—provide funding for bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

The most specific source of funding under Measure J for bicycling and walking is the Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities program. Measure J sets aside $30 million, or 1.5 percent of the total anticipated sales-tax revenues during the measure’s life, for non-motorized transportation facilities in this program. While a relatively small portion of the total funding, it represents a tripling of explicit bicycle and pedestrian funding from Measure C. Two thirds of these funds, or $20 million, is dedicated to completing projects outlined in the CBPP. The remaining third, or $10 million, is allocated to the East Bay Regional Park District for the development and rehabilitation of paved regional trails, to be spent equally in each of Contra Costa’s four subregions, as defined by the Authority (West, Southwest, Central and East). Under a related but separate program in Measure J, an extra $800,000 is available for pedestrian, bicycle and trail facilities specific to West County.
In addition, Measure J explicitly encourages project sponsors to fund bicycle and pedestrian facilities from four other Measure J programs:

>[C]onsistent with the Bicycle Plan and the importance of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, other potential funding categories in this Plan for pedestrian/bicycle/trail facilities include: (a) Major Streets: Traffic Flow, Safety, and Capacity Improvements; (b) Safe Transportation for Children; (c) Local Streets and Road Maintenance; and (d) the Transportation for Livable Communities project grants. Moreover, where it is appropriate, routine accommodation for pedestrians and bicyclists should be incorporated in construction projects funded from these other categories.

The phrase “[C]onsistent with the Bicycle Plan and the importance of bicycle and pedestrian facilities” acknowledges that bicycling and walking are legitimate transportation modes, deserving of funds under broader transportation funding programs, provided that funds be used for projects outlined in the CBPP. Below is a summary of these four broader funding programs.

**Major Streets: Traffic Flow, Safety and Capacity Improvements**
Under this program, $80.4 million will be made available for improvements to major thoroughfares, including installation of traffic signals, road widening, traffic calming and other pedestrian-safety improvements, construction of shoulders, installation of sidewalks and bike lanes, construction of curbs and gutters and installation of bus facilities such as turnouts and passenger amenities. The funds are to be allocated as follows: $48 million for Central County, $14.4 million for Southwest County and $18 million for East County.

**Safe Transportation for Children**
This program will make available $90.9 million, of which the majority — $66.4 million — is allocated to Southwest County, as follows: $26.4 million for the Lamorinda school bus program and $40 million for a school bus program and other projects that reduce school-related congestion or improve the safety of children traveling to school in the San Ramon Valley. Of the remaining amount, $10 million is for projects that facilitate access to schools in Central County — including pedestrian and bicycle facilities and the “SchoolPool” and transit incentive programs — and $14.5 million
is for a transit-fare subsidy program for low-income students in West County.

**Local Streets Maintenance & Improvements** This program will provide $360 million to local jurisdictions for transportation projects to be determined locally, subject to compliance with Measure J’s Growth Management Program (GMP). Each year, 18 percent of total sales-tax revenues will be distributed among local jurisdictions on a formula basis: a base allocation of $100,000 for each jurisdiction, with the balance to be distributed based 50 percent on relative population and 50 percent on road miles in each jurisdiction. Under related but separate programs, an additional $20 million is allocated to jurisdictions in Central County, $11 million to those in West County and $10.8 million to those in Southwest County.

**Transportation for Livable Communities Project Grants** Under this program, $100 million will be made available for planning efforts and capital improvement projects that support more-compact, mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly or transit-oriented developments or that encourage alternatives to single-occupant vehicles. Examples of such projects include pedestrian, bicycle and streetscape facilities, traffic calming and transit-access improvements. Jurisdictions must be in compliance with the GMP to be eligible for funds under this program. Subregional programming targets will be based on the population share of each subregion. Under a related but separate program, an extra $8 million is available for projects specific to West County.

While not mentioned alongside the previous four programs, there are three other programs under Measure J that could be used to fund improvements for non-motorized transportation. First, the *Commute Alternatives* program, which continues the Authority’s existing TDM efforts, will make available $20 million to promote alternatives to commuting in single-occupant vehicles. Eligible project types include parking, carpooling, vanpooling and transit facilities, “guaranteed ride home” programs, congestion-mitigation projects, the SchoolPool program, clean-fuel-vehicle projects and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Second, the *BART Parking, Access and Other Improvements* program will provide $41 million to improve access to and within BART stations. While bicycling and pedestrian facilities are not mentioned explicitly as eligible project types, it is reasonable, given the purpose
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of the program, to expect that funds could be used to improve bicycling and walking access to BART stations and to provide bicycle parking at stations. Lastly, the Subregional Transportation Needs program will provide $30.6 million for projects and programs identified by each subregion “to address its current and future needs.” The funds are allocated as follows: $16.2 million for Central County, $6 million for West County, $4.7 million for Southwest County and $3.7 million for East County. Only the allocation for West County explicitly mentions improvements related to bicycling and walking (it lists “neighborhood traffic-calming improvements” as an eligible project type); however, given the broad objective of the program, the other subregions might also decide to use some of their funds under this program for bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

As mentioned earlier, Measure J requires that local jurisdictions be in compliance with the GMP to be eligible for funding under several of its programs. The objectives of the GMP are to assure that development pays for the facilities required to meet the demands created by such development; to require cooperative transportation and land-use planning among the County, cities, towns and transportation agencies; to support land-use patterns within Contra Costa that make more efficient use of the transportation system; and to support infill development and redevelopment in urban and brownfield areas. The GMP contains one requirement related to bicycling and walking, which is that each jurisdiction must “incorporate policies and standards into its development approval process that support transit, bicycle and pedestrian access in new developments.” One of the objectives of the CBPP is to help local jurisdictions comply with this requirement by outlining model policies, practices and design standards and guidelines related to bicycling and walking.

Measure J promises to have a major impact on non-motorized transportation in Contra Costa in two ways. First—and most importantly—it will make available millions of dollars in funding to construct bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Second, its requirements related to the GMP will promote and encourage bicycling and walking and help make them mainstream transportation options. The CBPP update will advance those promises in a number of ways: the plan will (a) refine strategies for filling in priority gaps in Contra Costa’s non-motorized transportation network; (b) identify priority projects; (c) establish cri-
teria that RTPCs will be able to use to select projects for funding under various Measure J programs; and (d) incorporate model policies, practices, standards and guidelines for facilitating bicycling and walking, particularly in new developments. These objectives of the CBPP update also happen to match up well with strategies in the 2004 countywide Transportation Plan related to bicycling and walking (see next section).

**COUNTYWIDE COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

In May 2004, the Authority adopted the 2004 update to the Contra Costa Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan. The 2004 update refines the Authority’s vision and goals for Contra Costa’s transportation future and outlines its strategies for improving mobility for all modes and for managing the impacts of growth. The update addresses, among other topics, how growth management and land use can help achieve desired transportation outcomes; the principles and performance measures adopted in Contra Costa’s five “Action Plans,” issues for consideration within the six primary travel corridors in Contra Costa; and a program of actions to achieve the Authority’s vision and goals.

A major focus area of the 2004 update is the extension of Measure C, the half-percent countywide transportation sales-tax measure passed by voters in 1988. The update outlines an expenditure plan for the extension—what would become the successful Measure J, approved by voters in November 2004. The expenditure plan allocates an anticipated $2 billion in sales-tax revenues over 25 years to a variety of transportation projects and programs, including bicycle and pedestrian facilities (see the section on Measure J for more information).

Chapter 4 of the 2004 Update discusses the issues and challenges facing the various components of Contra Costa’s transportation system and outlines the Authority’s strategies for addressing those issues. The section on bicycling and walking explains that the main deterrents to non-motorized transportation are widely separated and segregated land uses, conflicts with cars and the lack of safe, well-connected facilities. The section goes on to summarize the four general policy areas covered in the original CBPP: (i) defining and completing a countywide bikeway network; (ii) creating a safe, well-designed
system of pedestrian facilities; (iii) improving bicycle and pedestrian links to transit; and (iv) providing education and outreach programs to promote safe bicycling and walking. Last, that section of the CTP describes how the goals, policies and proposed actions of the original CBPP reinforce the strategies in the 2004 CTP update and vice versa. Below are the strategies from the 2004 CTP related to bicycling and walking along with a description of how the updated CBPP will build on the original CBPP to implement each of those strategies.

**Strategy 1.2: Define and close gaps in the existing highway and arterial system:** The updated CBPP will largely reaffirm the bicycle network proposed in the original plan. At the same time, it will update the network to reflect any newly built segments and will also review and revise the strategies for addressing priority gaps in the network.

**Strategy 3.3: Require local jurisdictions to incorporate policies and standards that support transit, bicycle and pedestrian access in new developments** and **Strategy 3.4: Support transit-oriented and pedestrian-friendly developments:** To help jurisdictions comply with Measure J’s Growth Management Program, the updated CBPP will incorporate (a) model design standards and guidelines for bicycle and pedestrian facilities and for other aspects of new developments that impact people’s decision to bicycle or walk; and (b) tools (such as evaluation checklists for site access and checklists for traffic-impact studies) that will help accommodate walking and bicycling more effectively in new developments.

**Strategy 3.5: Invest in trails, walkways, and pedestrian-oriented improvements:** To implement the projects outlined in the updated CBPP, the CBPP will identify priorities and guidelines for tapping into Measure J’s various funding programs.

**Strategy 3.6: Promote formation of more car pools and van pools and greater use of transit, bicycling, and walking:** The updated CBPP will incorporate best practices for encouraging bicycling and walking, in part to help jurisdictions comply with Measure J’s Growth Management Program.
Strategy 3.8: Encourage local jurisdictions to develop bicycle facilities and to connect those facilities into a coordinated network: The updated CBPP will continue to promote a coordinated network of bikeways within Contra Costa, identify projects for implementation, outline funding priorities and incorporate policies, practices, standards and guidelines for developing bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

The Authority has begun updating the Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan and expects to adopt the next update by the end of 2008. We don’t expect any significant changes to the goals and strategies as part of this update.

MTC’S ROUTINE ACCOMMODATION POLICIES

“Routine accommodation” refers to the practice of routinely considering the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians in the planning, design, funding and construction of transportation projects. At the federal and state levels, routine accommodation policies and guidelines have been included in a U.S. Department of Transportation policy statement titled “Accommodating Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel: A Recommended Approach” and in Caltrans Deputy Directive (DD) 64. At the regional level, MTC adopted Resolution 3765 in June 2006, consistent with Caltrans DD-64, which establishes routine accommodation policies for transportation funds distributed by MTC.

Resolution 3765

MTC Resolution 3765 requires agencies requesting transportation funds from MTC to “consider the accommodation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities” wherever bicycle and pedestrian travel is consistent with regional and local plans (such as the CBPP). It is not intended to replace locally adopted policies. This consideration must include the cost of providing bicycle and pedestrian facilities as part of the larger transportation project. The MTC resolution recommends that local jurisdictions establish a minimum percentage of overall project costs that should be set aside for bicycle and pedestrian facilities (the resolution mentions the Federal Highway Administration recommendation of up to 20 percent of the cost of broader transportation projects). In addition, Resolution 3765 prohibits the use of funds from the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program and the TDA Article 3 and Transportation for Livable Communities programs to pay for bicycle facilities.
and pedestrian facilities needed to mitigate new roadway or transit construction projects that remove or degrade bicycle and pedestrian access.

To carry out these policies, Resolution 3765 also requires that MTC develop and implement a “routine accommodation checklist,” to be used by project-sponsoring agencies seeking regional transportation funds to document how the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians were considered in the process of planning and designing their projects.

**Routine Accommodation Checklist**

MTC developed the routine accommodation checklist in the first half of 2007. MTC is planning to require its use starting in mid-2008, with an exact date yet to be determined. Project sponsors will be required to submit a completed checklist for each project submitted directly to MTC or indirectly, through the congestion management agencies (CMAs), for funding under any of MTC’s funding sources and programs. A checklist will be required for any transportation project with the potential to impact bicycle or pedestrian use, but not for projects that do not affect the public right-of-way (for example, emergency-communications or bus-washing equipment). The checklist must document how the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians were considered. For projects that do not accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians, the checklist must also document why not. The checklist is intended to be a vehicle for the disclosure, dissemination and discussion of information regarding routine accommodation; however, answers to questions on the checklist will not affect a project’s eligibility for MTC funding. MTC and Caltrans will monitor the effectiveness of their routine accommodation policies by conducting periodic detailed audits of selected projects and their checklists.

Under MTC’s adopted process for implementing the routine accommodation policies, the Authority and other CMAs have several key responsibilities with regard to the checklist. The responsibilities that the Authority will need to assume are:

- For projects sponsored by the Authority: Completing checklists and submitting them to MTC along with the recommended projects.
ISSUES AND OPTIONS

- For MTC funding programs in which projects are first recommended by local agencies to the Authority: Ensuring that project sponsors have submitted a completed checklist for each recommended project and forwarding the checklists to MTC at the time that the Authority recommends projects to MTC.
- For MTC funding programs in which local agencies recommend projects directly to MTC: None; MTC retains all responsibilities in this case.
- In all cases above, the Authority will also be responsible for posting completed project checklists on its website and providing a link to MTC’s list, by county, of all checklists.
- Again in all cases above, the Authority will also be responsible for providing completed checklists to its BPAC (which is responsible for reviewing the checklists) and notifying the BPAC when checklists are available on its website; checklists should be made available to the BPAC as early as practicable and no later than when a project is recommended to MTC.

MTC’s adopted process encourages CMAs to establish their own process for managing their checklist responsibilities, provided it is consistent with MTC’s. The CMAs’ process may specify when project sponsors submit completed checklists and when checklists are made available to the BPAC. (MTC encourages agencies to complete the checklist at the earliest stage of project development, so that pedestrian and bicycle considerations can be best addressed and incorporated into the project budget.) For their part, the BPACs are responsible for defining, in consultation with CMA staff, their procedures for reviewing project checklists. For any checklist, a BPAC may choose to discuss it at one of its regular meetings; to use an expedited process in which the checklist is discussed among BPAC members electronically (for occasions when there is little time between when a checklist is made available and when MTC makes its funding decision); or to not review it at all (checklists do not require BPAC approval).

Key Options and Questions for Discussion

- The updated CBPP will identify spending priorities for the $20 million dedicated to completing projects outlined in the CBPP under Measure J’s Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities program. Separate from that, however, can the CBPP be updated in such a
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way as to help bicycle and pedestrian projects compete better against other types of transportation projects for sources of funding under Measure J that are not specifically designated for non-motorized transportation (for example, Local Streets and Road Maintenance, Transportation for Livable Communities or Commute Alternatives)?

- Measure J’s Growth Management Program (GMP) requires that each jurisdiction in Contra Costa “incorporate policies and standards into its development approval process that support transit, bicycle and pedestrian access in new developments.” Is the material in Appendices A and B of the original CBPP coupled with the material in Section 6 of this options paper sufficient to help jurisdictions comply with this requirement? Are there other policies, practices, standards or guidelines that should be included in the CBPP toward that purpose?

- How well will the proposed changes to the CBPP outlined in this options paper implement the strategies in the 2004 CTP related to bicycling and walking?

- Can the CBPP be updated in such a way as to help the AUTHORITY comply with its responsibilities under MTC’s routine accommodation requirements (namely related to completing, reviewing and submitting project checklists)?
Section 6. Options for Accommodating Bicyclists and Pedestrians

As discussed in Section 5, Measure J’s Growth Management Program requires each jurisdiction to “incorporate policies and standards into its development approval process that support transit, bicycle and pedestrian access in new developments.” In addition to the plan’s goals and polices, the following tools can help accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians more effectively in planning and development practices. The updated plan could present these tools in Appendix G (“Tools for Local Agencies”) as examples that local agencies may choose to adopt. These tools include the following:

SITE ACCESS EVALUATION CHECKLIST

An analysis of a proposed project should also include an evaluation of how pedestrians and bicyclists get to and through the site. A Site Access Checklist can serve as a useful guide to ensure that pedestrians and bicyclists are able to safely access and navigate the site. The checklist questions would be adapted to reflect local standards and guidelines.

If a local jurisdiction chooses to use such a checklist, applicants would submit an internal pedestrian circulation plan to facilitate the safest, smoothest transition from sidewalk, transit stop or parking lot to building entrance. The circulation plan would include elements such as clearly marked walkways for pedestrians, delineated by textured or colored pavement or pavement stencils, and continuous sidewalks in parking lot medians from the parking lot to a marked crossing to the building entrance. To raise developer awareness about the benefits of pedestrian safety measures, both to pedestrians and to homeowners, local jurisdictions could develop a brief brochure detailing the guidelines contained in this Plan. Staff could distribute the brochures during the application process to educate builders about recommendations pertaining to walkability and pedestrian safety measures (see Appendix E for full checklist).
TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY CHECKLIST

Many traffic impact studies do not evaluate the effects of a project on pedestrians and bicyclists. A Traffic Impact Study checklist can serve as a useful guide to ensure that pedestrian and bicycle-related impacts are assessed, and improvements are incorporated into the project.

If a local jurisdiction chooses to use a Transportation Impact Study checklist, the following basic guidelines could be used. The checklist questions would be adapted to reflect local standards and guidelines (see Appendix F for full checklist):

**Impact on the existing pedestrian system**
- Describe pedestrian travel patterns and access
- Will the project change the width, routing, or conditions of an existing pedestrian facility?
- Will the project alter existing pedestrian travel patterns and/or otherwise affect a pedestrian’s ability to travel as directly as possible from origin to destination with no circuitous travel, due to any change to the sidewalk or pathway network?

**Pedestrian circulation and access**
- Will the project reduce or restrict a pedestrian’s access to any roadway or site, by decreasing safety, increasing the stress, or increasing the delay experienced by the pedestrian? This includes but is not limited to increasing the width of the road or reducing the width of the shoulder or bridge.
- Pedestrian’s stress levels can be quantitatively measured using Pedestrian Level of Service methodology.

**Safety of Operations**
- Does the project meet or exceed accepted design standards and guidelines, as promulgated by responsible agencies such as Caltrans or AASHTO?

**MODEL POLICIES AND CODES**

Local jurisdictions may consider adopting model policies or codes to support bicycle and pedestrian planning and strengthen the policies
ISSUES AND OPTIONS

in the CBPP. These include the following policies, which are summarized below:

- Safe Routes to School
- Safe Routes to Transit
- Transit First
- Complete Streets
- Walkability
- Alternative Level of Service Measures and Multi-Modal Policies

These model policies and codes could be included as a “clearing-house” of information in an appendix to the plan, or simply included on the Authority’s website with a description and links for more information. They are intended to provide local agency staff as well as members of the public with additional concepts for bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly policies.

**Safe Routes to School**

In California, there are two Safe Routes to School funding programs: one Federal (SRTS) and one through the State (SR2S). Both are administered by Caltrans, and support projects that aim to increase the number of children who walk or bicycle to school. These projects generally involve parents, schools, and community leaders working together with local city staff to examine conditions around schools and conduct projects and activities that improve safety.

Safe Routes to School can also take the form of a policy that directs local agencies to prioritize projects that enhance bicycle and pedestrian access to schools. Please see Appendix G for a full description of the funding sources and components of a Safe Routes to School program.

The existing plan’s chapter on Safety and Support includes a short description of Safe Routes to Schools projects and a checklist for preparing a school safety study. The description of Safe Routes to School could be expanded to highlight recommended school safety projects in the plan. In addition, the updated CBPP maps could highlight po-
COUNTYWIDE BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PLAN UPDATE

tential Safe Routes to School projects on the maps or in a sub-section of the Bikeway Network and Pedestrian Network chapters.

The checklist could be moved to an Appendix, and/or shortened to focus on the five “E’s”: engineering, encouragement, enforcement, education, and evaluation. An appendix could also include recommendations for writing successful Safe Routes to School grant applications. Appendix D would also be updated to provide information about the Federal funding program (which began in 2005) and to list recent Safe Routes to School projects in Contra Costa.

Safe Routes to Transit (SR2T)

Bicycling and walking are cost-effective and sustainable ways to reach regional transit stations, yet many commuters cite safety as the main reason they drive instead. In the Bay Area, SR2T is a grant program with funding from Regional Measure 2 that promotes bicycling and walking to transit stations through projects and plans that make trips to transit easier, faster, and safer. SR2T can also take the form of a policy that directs local agencies to prioritize projects that enhance bicycle and pedestrian access to transit. See Appendix G for a complete description of the funding program, along with scoring criteria; for more information see http://www.transcoalition.org/c/bikeped/bikeped_saferoutes.html.

The existing plan’s chapter on Links to Transit would be updated to reflect the SR2T funding program (which began in 2004) and to highlight recent SR2T projects in Contra Costa. It could also highlight recommended SR2T projects in Contra Costa. In addition, the updated CBPP maps could highlight potential SR2T projects on the maps or in a sub-section of the Bikeway Network and Pedestrian Network chapters. Appendix D would also be updated to describe the SR2T funding program and list recent projects in Contra Costa.

Transit First

A Transit-first policy helps a city evaluate and prioritize projects to ensure that transit, bicyclists, and pedestrians are prioritized. San Francisco’s Transit-First policy has been effective at encouraging development and transportation projects that benefit pedestrians and
bicyclists. A similar Transit-First policy could be adopted by jurisdictions in Contra Costa. Please see Appendix G for a full text of San Francisco’s policy.

**Complete Streets**

Complete streets are designed and operated to enable safe access for all users. Pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists and transit riders of all ages and abilities must be able to safely move along and across a complete street.

Instituting a complete streets policy ensures that transportation agencies routinely design and operate the entire right of way to enable safe access for all users. Several agencies have adopted Complete Streets policies. Similar Complete Streets policies could be adopted by jurisdictions in Contra Costa. Sample policies are included in Appendix G.

**Walkability**

Walkability is a qualitative measurement of the pedestrian environment. Walkability is essential in pedestrian districts, or areas with multiple pedestrian trip generators or destinations. Some examples of pedestrian trip generators include restaurants, parks, schools, transit centers, and employment centers. Factors affecting walkability include proximity of uses, the presence of buffers from traffic, and sidewalks that are wide enough to share comfortably with others. Walkable communities have:

- Short block lengths – no longer than 500 feet with few exceptions.
- Frequent crossing opportunities – at least every 300 feet near pedestrian trip generators such as schools, parks, libraries, shopping centers, and hospitals.
- Different uses located within walking distance of one another – neighborhoods within ¼-½ mile of shopping centers and employment centers; all neighborhoods within ¼-½ mile of a transit stop.
- Frequent pedestrian amenities – benches, water fountains, newspaper racks with consistent design and placement in pedestrian districts.
- Wide sidewalks with buffer zones – sidewalks at least six feet wide with a six-foot planting strip in pedestrian districts.
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- Compact intersections – with short crossing distances and cycle lengths for pedestrians.

Some jurisdictions have adopted walkability policies. Others have incorporated them into design guidelines. Similar policies could be adopted by jurisdictions in Contra Costa. Sample walkability policies are included in Appendix G.

The CBPP discusses walkability principles in the Pedestrian Network chapter, but does not call them out as such. The updated plan could incorporate a sub-section on walkability in the Pedestrian Network chapter, similar to the Traffic Calming sub-section, which outlines the key components listed above. Walkability principles could also be incorporated more explicitly into the pedestrian design guidelines in Appendix B of the plan.

Alternative Level of Service Measures and Multi-Modal Policies

There have been many attempts to measure the “level of service” (LOS) or quality of infrastructure from a bicyclist’s and pedestrian’s perspective, but there is currently no commonly-accepted method. Several jurisdictions, including Fort Collins, Colorado, Florida’s Department of Transportation, and Charlotte, North Carolina have developed pedestrian or bicycle level of service measures. Others, like Seattle, Washington, and Boulder, Colorado have developed street types that prioritize pedestrian or bicycle transportation. Similar policies could be adopted by jurisdictions in Contra Costa. Appendix G includes examples of innovative pedestrian and bicycle level of services measures.

The updated plan could include sample alternative level of service policies in an appendix.

Key Options and Questions for Discussion

- Are these model policies useful in Contra Costa County? If not, how could they be modified? Are there others that could be used instead?
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- Where should the model policies reside: in an Appendix to the CBPP or on the Authority’s website with links to more information?

- How much information is useful?

- Should the updated CBPP highlight Safe Routes to School and Safe Routes to Transit projects that are included in the recommended bikeway or pedestrian network? If so, should these projects be marked distinctively on the maps and/or project lists, included in sidebars or call-out boxes in the text, or highlighted in another way?

- How much information on Safe Routes to School and Safe Routes to Transit funding programs should be included? Would a set of recommendations for writing successful grant applications be helpful (as part of the Funding Sources appendix)? Would a simplified checklist for completing a SR2S or SR2T project be useful? Should a list of funding sources and web addresses be included?

- Should the updated plan incorporate a sub-section on the elements of walkability in the Pedestrian Network chapter?