

Meeting Summary
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
October 27, 2015, 12 p.m.

Attendees (in person and on phone):

Alex Fong, Caltrans District 3	Jim Kirstein, Friends of Folsom Parkways
Brit Snipes, Town of Loomis	José Luis Cáceres, SACOG
Bruce Griesenbeck, SACOG	Judy Matsui-Drury, City of Sacramento
Chris Dougherty, City of West Sacramento	Kirin Kumar, WALKSacramento
Daniel Peterson, Yuba County	Lynne Goldsmith, Advocate
Dave Cassel, Kaiser Pedal Power	Mark Fernandez, City of Lincoln
Denise Lewis, Department of General Services	Mike Dour, Roseville
Doug Fredericks, Psomas	Renée DeVere-Oki, SACOG
Elise Chadwick, Elk Grove Unified School District	Tim Young, Yuba County
Jeff Damon, Sacramento Regional Transit District	Tina Glover, SACOG
Jerry Barton, EDCTC	Traci Canfield, RT
Jesse Gothan, City of Sacramento	Walt Seifert, Sacramento City-County Bicycle Committee
Jim Antone, Yolo-Solano AQMD	William Appleby, Yuba Area Bicycle Advocates

1. Introduction and Information Sharing

- Mr. Cáceres introduced himself and asked everyone to speak clearly and loud, due to recorder that was in the room for sake of taking action notes for the meeting.
- Mike Dour, City of Roseville, shared some topics in his introduction: Working on design of the 1st buffered bike lane in Roseville, and also couple class 1 bike trail projects near completion, adding another mile to their system, and have another mile worth of class 1 bike trails under construction next year.
- **Draft policy guidelines for the Caltrans Class IV Bikeways**
Alex Fong, Cal Trans, District 3, Fiscal Coordinator, shared: a couple of months ago Caltrans held a bike ways summit, from that summit they felt that an advisory committee would help to draft guidelines based on California State Laws and, and that they are close to releasing a formal draft, sometime in November, with the anticipation of a Jan 1st, 2016 adoption date. Alex will send this draft to Mr. Cáceres in addition to Mrs. Cacciatore.
- Chris Doherty, City of West Sacramento: Gave a brief description of the work that is being done near the deep water channel and Village parkway to help protect the bike trail through that particular part of the area thru to downtown.

- Kirin Kumar, WALKSacramento: South Sacramento Vision Zero pilot project to grow into a City-wide Vision Zero program. We have a couple of grants to help with getting technical assistance in the local jurisdictions on incorporating health into their environment. We're happy to meet with any jurisdiction to talk about it.
- Jim Antone, Yolo & Solano Air District, shared the Board approved funding for \$10,000 thru clean air fund for a couple of Bikeshare programs, 1 being the bicycle loan program to include a bicycle lending library which would be for cargo & family friendly bikes & also provide training for how to use those type of bikes. And the UC Davis Airport Bike Share Pilot Program, for \$2200. (Program is an alternative for transportation by using bikes from the airport into downtown Davis)
- **Regional Bike Share Pilot Update** Mr. Caceres stated that Mr. Shelton will not be in he is out sick but wanted to share that the PDF version of the Bicycle & Pedestrian Committee Newsletter is now available. Jeff Damon pointed out that SACOG hired Toole Design Group for BikeShare.

2. Summary of April 28th, 2015, Meeting

The summary was approved by consensus. Kirin Kumar motioned, Alex Fong seconded.

3. SACOG Household Travel Survey

Mr. Griesenbeck: SACOG is updating its travel model. The last update that was done on this model was in 2005, and that was using a household travel survey from the year 2000. Surveys are done to gather travel information. These surveys are expensive just because of the whole recruitment, data collection and retrieval process is quite expensive. These surveys haven't been done for decades around the country at different times and there is a pretty well developed history of cost to doing these surveys. The current cost of doing these surveys is anywhere from \$150-\$200 per completed survey.

The approach that we are using for this survey is a little bit different than the last one. One of the differences is that we are working with our sister agencies in other parts of the state Metropolitan Transportation Commission in the San Francisco Area, the Southern California Associations of Governments in Los Angeles area, and the San Diego Association of Governments in San Diego area. We are working with them to design the surveys so that it's a common survey that is being administered to 80-90% of the state's population, in terms of area. The other thing that will be unique about the survey is the primary mode in which will be a mobile device. The other reason to collaborate process with MTC is that we hope to reduce the cost of actually doing the survey design and achieve economies of scale. We'll actually see if it proves to be correct.

Some of the things that are driving the survey design--A lot of new modes of travel, Uber, Lyft, car sharing, bike sharing is actually prevalent to some jurisdictions, Zip car, and then there's a lot of changing values about car ownership and changing values about the need to travel for and participate in activities that don't require travel at all. Those are some of the things that we want to focus on in the survey design, so that we collect

information about how people are making those choices and to get enough information so we can observe people trading off car ownership with other ways. So those are the main billboard issues that we want to capture in this survey.

Questions:

Q: When is this going to happen and how is this different from other travel surveys? I'm hoping in 2017, and if we can do it any sooner than that, great. We're going thru this design process with these other ideas, so our timeline is somewhat strapped to that process.

Q: How is it different from other surveys--The American community survey is a great annual, ongoing survey that they US Census Bureau does. They do ask some questions about travel, but they tend to only ask questions about work travel, commute travel, so the only thing we can really get out of the American Community Survey is you can get tracking data on prevalence of other commute and the times that people say that they spend travelling, and I say "the time people *say* they spend travelling" because you don't really know when you look at the survey results, there's a lot of people that report 5 minutes, 10 minutes, 20 minutes, there's not too many people reporting 13 minutes, the travel doesn't actually happen on the 5's, so you get information like that, and you can get a certain amount of information about where people are commuting, but you get no information about trips to school, trips to shopping, trips for recreational purposes, so they actually ask nothing about that. The household travel surveys we will do is our way of kind of getting into that. The only difference between the surveys that this money will fund and the surveys that the US Department of Transportation periodically takes and the state Department of Transportation periodically takes is that there will be a much bigger sample and the survey itself will be slightly different although they are asking the same types of questions. I think the main difference between those ones and then this one is we hope that this will be a mobile device-enabled survey primarily, and for folks that don't have mobile devices we will have some other alternate way of collecting information but primarily it will be a mobile device based survey.

Is there a way to get raw data for Sacramento?

Yes, but there will be some shielding to protect personal and private information.

Q: Is there a way to access survey information for CycleSac?

I don't know. (This request from Kirin Kumar was flagged for follow-up.)

Q: Have you looked at Strava and their heat maps?

There's a lot of big data out there and people who are mining movements, processing it, and selling it. He will look into it.

Q: Question/Statement- The modes of shopping has also changed throughout the years, people are now using Amazon, and shopping online, how is this going to impact the survey?

Absolutely. This survey will ask questions that get at those decisions and the degree to which they're changing their travel behavior.

Q: What is the proposed geographical area? Will it include Placer & El Dorado County as well?

Yes this will include SACOG area, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba County along with Placer and El Dorado Counties (non-Tahoe Basin).

Q Will you be coming back to the meetings?

Yes, we will be checking in periodically. One time in particular, we will be bringing a draft of the survey at that time.

4. Vision Zero Planning

This is actually a presentation that I made to the Sacramento City/County Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting and was not taken as an action item, so no action was taken, we will present it again in November. The goal of Vision Zero is to eliminate all fatal & serious traffic injuries (serious injuries are defined as long term disabling injuries). The preface is that preserving a human life should be the highest priority for the transportation system. Not moving as many cars as fast as possible.

I recommended to the City/County Advisory Committee to adopt the Vision Zero Program. I will draft a letter to ask the City/County Advisory Committee to adopt this program and provide copies to all the agencies.

- Began in Sweden. Fatalities reduced by 1/3.
- Norway, Netherlands, UK, have adopted it. And now cities across the US, including 8 or 9 cities in California have adopted or are considering adoption.
- All departments are involved in developing strategic plan for a City.
- The idea is not to eliminate all crashed, but to eliminate serious ones. So a Vision Zero program might tolerate property damage from rear view mirrors getting damaged on narrow roads, vs wider roads with higher speeds and injuries/fatalities.
- In US it's like a 747 crashing every week.
- Traffic crashes aren't examined in the same way as other large causes of deaths.
- Councilmember Hansen asked staff to examine a Vision Zero program for City of Sacramento.
- Vision Zero is about a change in attitude in how people think about crashes.

Questions?

Q: Chris Doherty, West Sacramento: In your research, are there are policies and are there specific measures that are easy to implement for cities to deploy the Vision Zero program? And what are those?

It usually gets back to the 4Es. The big thing is to reduce the speed of cars and reducing the kinetic energy. There are examples of reducing the drunk driving by limiting the alcohol levels. Sweden has installed median barriers in areas where there are high speeds to eliminate the amount of head on collisions. San Francisco has taking a geographical

approach in looking at where the most crashes are and what they can do to try and prevent those crashes in those areas.

Q: Is there a community amongst those that you listed that is a model program?

The Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition and LA California have come up with a guidelines on doing Vision Zero. In the US the programs are very new, a year or two old, so I don't think there are any results or best practices yet, but there certainly the plans exist. I'm sure there's consultants in Sweden that can advise others of what they have done.

Q: Is there a website we could go to see model programs?

There is something called the Vision Zero Network which has recently been established, supported by Kaiser Permanente. They have a map of cities that have the Vision Zero Programs and has been run by Leah Shahum, who was the former Executive Director of the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition.

Kirin interjected that New York is the most successful program. He talked about top-down vs. bottom-up programs.

Special Presentation: City of Sacramento's North 12th Complete Street, State ATP Recipient

Mr. Caceres introduced Mrs. Matsui & Mr. Gothan to present on the N 12th Street project, one of the 3 projects selected for funding by the State for Active Transportation Program funds. The website is www.N12street.com.

Jesse went over the project and where the project originated from and where the project is going. Also, shared what partners they were working with on the project to include SHRA, RT, River District, SMUD, SACOG, and Caltrans. The corridor he is speaking of is the old Highway 160, which is a relinquishment to the City. Part of the transformation of this project is the River District Plan which was adopted in 2011. The River Districts goal was to not just make this a pass through but to make this a safer gateway into central city & a more productive gateway. The River District has set some policy goals to get this to a place making project. Also this year the City received a grant fund through the Choice Neighborhood Program (30 Million from HUD) and the City has been designated as a "Promise Zone."

The River District has some major disadvantages such as homelessness, unemployment and social services are also involved and trying to get this area cleaned up. The Choice Neighborhood fund will help with renovating the public housing that is along this stretch of highway and ties in with the other projects to get this gateway improved. Some of the changes to expect are to make sidewalks big enough for pedestrians and pets, adding in bicycle lanes, streetscapes, just an overall better gateway. Another addition would be to add street parking to the businesses that are located down the street.

Now that this project has been funding the next phase is the Project approval and Environment Documentation, it would be about 18 -24 month schedule for the

Environment Documentation Approval and then following close behind will be the final PS&E Package then looking at construction in 2020.

They also received some community design fund and are looking to improve the 16th street corridor area as well.

Ms. Matsui will be project manager on this. She will be working on getting feedback and getting this back to the group. Please feel free to contact her for any questions on the project. Total budget for this project is 4.5 million.

5. Special Presentation: Yuba County's Seventh Avenue Bicycle Path and Pedestrian Route Improvements, State ATP Recipient

Mr. Peterson: The project is in the town of Olivehurst and connects the residential side of town to the more commercial side of town thru a loop. The application may have been successful because the project speaks for itself. The scope of the project is to add improvements to make it a safer and more appealing ride for bicyclists and pedestrians as well. Some of the improvements would be to add bicycle lanes and gutters along the sidewalks, new striping, traffic control devices, a crosswalk at the elementary school, curbing stations, pedestrian refuge islands, and improved pedestrian lighting. None of these items exist at the moment. There is an existing storm drain system so this project will be able to tie into that. A survey was done in this area that asked if improvements were made here to make it a safer for bicyclists, would more people use their bicycles and they answered with yes, they would and let their children ride their bikes to school. This area is extremely disadvantaged and this funded project would greatly improve the community. There is a higher rate of obesity, asthma, heart problems in this area then the statewide average. With the improvements to make the routes safer and more manageable, it would lower the rate by encouraging the community to get out and walk and or cycle. The community has expressed the need for improvement for the past few years now. There has been 12 collisions involving pedestrians and 15 collisions involving bicyclists in this area in past 5 years. With these improvements it would protect both the pedestrians and the bicyclists.

The project will remove on-street parking.

6. Regional Funding Program Recommendations for Public Review

Ms. DeVere-Oki announced that the projects are out for review starting at the Board meeting. There is a fiscal crisis going on at the state, with less funding for STIP projects than we expected.

7. Regional ATP Funding Program Recommendations

Ms. DeVere-Oki announced that the Board would approve these this Thursday. Our process is streamlined. Everything is up on the website. This was a highly competitive round.

ATP Cycle Three will begin with workshops in March. We'll be putting that calendar together.

8. Roundtable Discussion of State ATP, Regional ATP, and Bike & Pedestrian Funding Programs

- What power does SACOG have to shape the process?
 - ❖ There's a statewide ATP working group organized by CTC and Caltrans that makes decisions, and we can give our feedback to that working group. Jerry Barton is on the working group.
- Are we envisioning large or small changes? Is there any way to level the playing field?
 - ❖ There's been some discussion about checking on whether Disadvantaged Communities were indeed so. Also, there could be a push to put less emphasis on that criterion. In this round 88% of projects awarded were within DC areas.
 - ❖ SRTS advocates want more projects to be SRTS oriented
- Some projects that applied appeared more recreational than utilitarian.
- A lot of the money went to big projects. I think it should be distributed by population. There were a bunch of projects that were "bundled," combining multiple projects into one giant project to maximize points.
- Regarding scoring, Caltrans was to deduct 10 point based on delivery history, but Caltrans didn't actually consider that in the scoring. So that was extra work for applicants that was unnecessary. That was a bad business practice.
- Southern California did really well this cycle.
- LA County submitted 90 applications, Others submitted 55, 31, 31, 27 vs Sacramento County 17. Essentially, Southern CA is stacking the deck.
- Victoria Cacciatore sent out a follow-up survey and will be reporting back at a future meeting.
- Can we push for more than 2 reviewers? We submitted the same application between the two rounds and got much differing scores.

9. Proposed MUTCD Change Recommendations for Bicycle Wayfinding

Mr. Seifert is scheduled for December to present on this. This is not about directional signs, but about simply labeling streets at intersections of bike paths and streets, intersections of bike paths with other bike paths, and at bridge and overcrossings at bike paths.

Mr. Seifert's proposal is to make bike path intersection signs mandatory, to use the same

signs as at street intersections, which means bike paths will need to be named, and that the colors on the signs be the same as other street signs.

Comments & Questions: Highway signs shouldn't be exempted. It's a safety issue. If something happens on the trail, you would want to be able to point to a nearby freeway and know what that freeway number was. Naming trails is important. This is all really helpful for emergency response. The overhead clearance sign is a good one. We shouldn't feel it necessary to mandate the same background color as roads in the jurisdiction. Some creativity and flexibility here should be allowed. One comment that could come up is that some of these signs could get stolen. "American River Parkway" might be a popular one to steal. Some of these signs might need extra consideration to prevent or address theft.

10. Other Matters

Let José Luis Cáceres know if you have any feedback on today's meeting or want to give more feedback/comments on any of these items.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:15 p.m.