

OVERVIEW OF BAY AREA PEDESTRIAN PLANNING

PEDESTRIAN DISTRICTS STUDY



Metropolitan Transportation Commission | June 30, 2005



DESIGN, COMMUNITY & ENVIRONMENT

OVERVIEW OF BAY AREA
PEDESTRIAN PLANNING

PEDESTRIAN DISTRICTS STUDY

Metropolitan Transportation Commission | June 30, 2005



DESIGN, COMMUNITY & ENVIRONMENT

1600 SHATTUCK AVENUE, SUITE 222
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94709

TEL: 510 848 3815
FAX: 510 848 4315

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
A.	BACKGROUND	1
B.	REPORT OVERVIEW	2
C.	SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS	4
2.	PEDESTRIAN PLANNING DOCUMENTS	7
A.	GENERAL PLANS	7
B.	PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE MASTER PLANS	15
C.	NEIGHBORHOOD PLANS	21
D.	TRANSIT AGENCY EFFORTS	24
E.	ADA TRANSITION PLANS	30
F.	CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	34
G.	COUNTYWIDE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING	35
H.	PEDESTRIAN SAFETY AND ENGINEERING STUDIES	37
I.	FINDINGS FROM PEDESTRIAN PLANNING DOCUMENTS	40
3.	PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEES	45
4.	CONCEPTS OF PEDESTRIAN DISTRICTS	53

Appendices

Appendix A: Funding Sources

Appendix B: Documents Reviewed

OVERVIEW OF BAY AREA PEDESTRIAN PLANNING
MTC'S BAY AREA PEDESTRIAN DISTRICTS STUDY
TABLE OF CONTENTS

I INTRODUCTION

A. Background

In his book *The Next American Metropolis*, Peter Calthorpe writes “pedestrians are the catalyst which makes the essential qualities of communities meaningful.” Indeed, pedestrians fill the Bay Area’s civic spaces, activating our parks and sidewalks, plazas and cafes, downtowns and shopping districts. Yet a recent study by the Surface Transportation Policy Project (STPP) reports that pedestrian safety continues to be compromised throughout the nation, with nearly 5,000 pedestrian deaths in 2003.¹ Another 70,000 pedestrians are injured in accidents each year. The news is better in the San Francisco Bay Area however, where STPP reports that pedestrian safety is improving. The Bay Area’s Pedestrian Danger Index (PDI) improved by 13 percent between 2002 and 2003, indicating a decrease in pedestrian fatalities and injuries.²

From pedestrian flag waving and illuminated crosswalks in Berkeley to scramble signals in Oakland, the Bay Area is rich with examples of innovative pedestrian planning efforts. A small number of cities, such as Oakland and San Francisco, have prepared or are working on pedestrian master plans for their communities, some of the only such plans in the State. A larger number of jurisdictions, including Union City, Fremont and Marin County, are preparing or have prepared combined bicycle and pedestrian master plans. Jurisdictions are also addressing pedestrian planning issues in their general plans and in planning documents for individual neighborhoods, such as downtowns or transit nodes. Bay Area transit providers are completing strategic plans and guidelines to improve pedestrian travel to transportation options. Federal, State and local agencies as well as non-profit organizations provide funding for pedestrian improvements and amenities.

In addition to the work of these local government, pedestrian planning has become a policy mandate for many federal, State and regional agencies. The

¹ Surface Transportation Policy Project, *Mean Streets 2004: How Far Have We Come?*, November 2004, page 6.

² Surface Transportation Policy Project, *Mean Streets 2004: How Far Have We Come?*, November 2004, page 15.

Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) recently released program guidance communicating their expectation that every transportation agency accommodate walking as a routine part of their activities. The FHWA clearly states that there should be safe, convenient pedestrian access to almost all highways and transportation facilities and that not accommodating pedestrians should be the exception rather than the rule. The California Department of Transportation also issued a policy directive (Deputy Directive 64) that requires all regional agencies to consider "...pedestrians, bicyclists and persons with disabilities in all programming, planning, maintenance, construction, operations and project development activities and products." Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) and other project sponsors must consider these policies when they select their projects for inclusion in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), the primary funding mechanism for transportation projects in California.

B. Report Overview

This report, an overview of pedestrian planning efforts in the Bay Area, is part of a larger study commissioned by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to encourage and improve pedestrian planning in the Bay Area. The purpose of this report, the first of several work products resulting from the *Pedestrian Districts Study*, is to provide a summary of the types of pedestrian planning occurring in the Bay Area. It is not intended as an exhaustive inventory of all pedestrian planning efforts in the Bay Area. Rather, it is a survey of how and in what form pedestrian planning is being addressed by Bay Area cities and counties. It also includes a summary of funding available for pedestrian planning efforts, and a discussion of how cities and counties use advisory working groups, such as pedestrian advisory committees (PACs) to guide their pedestrian planning work.

This report includes the following chapters:

Chapter 1: Introduction. The introduction introduces the Bay Area Pedestrian Districts Study, describes the contents and summarizes the key findings contained in this report.

Chapter 2: Pedestrian Planning Documents. This chapter describes the types of documents and studies that city, counties, Caltrans and other agencies use as tools for completing pedestrian planning efforts. The chapter is organized by type of document, and includes a description of how pedestrian planning is typically addressed by each type of document or study. Each discussion includes case studies of specific examples from around the Bay Area.

Chapter 3: Pedestrian Advisory Committees. Chapter 3 summarizes how cities and counties around the Bay Area are, or are not, using advisory working groups to help guide pedestrian planning efforts. This section describes the typical composition of these committees, who they report to, the nature of the issues they typically tackle, and how these bodies work to address pedestrian issues.

Chapter 4: Concepts of Pedestrian Districts. Building on the research presented in Chapter 2, Chapter 5 presents conclusions about how concepts of pedestrian districts are used by Bay Area cities and counties to assist their pedestrian planning efforts.

Appendix A: Pedestrian Planning Funding Sources. This appendix provides an overview of the funding sources available to help cities and counties conduct pedestrian planning.

Appendix B: Documents Reviewed. This appendix provides a list of the documents reviewed for this report.

C. Key Findings

Each chapter in the report concludes with a findings section. Some of the key points from each chapter are summarized below.

1. Findings from Pedestrian Planning Documents Overview

Overall, pedestrian issues were covered in a variety of different types of planning documents. The nature and scale of attention paid to pedestrian issues varies by type of document. For example, General Plans tend to have broad goal language addressing the desire to create pedestrian friendly neighborhoods, but little specific guidance. Specific Plans and Pedestrian Master Plans often contain specific conceptual designs for pedestrian projects and implementation and funding strategies.

A number of major issues are consistently addressed by the planning documents reviewed for this report. These include:

- ◆ Creating pedestrian friendly neighborhoods
- ◆ Improving the safety of pedestrians by addressing conflicts between cars, transit and pedestrians
- ◆ Increasing pedestrian access to key destinations
- ◆ Enhancing convenience and comfort for pedestrians
- ◆ Creating land use patterns to support pedestrian travel (higher densities, mixed use)
- ◆ Preparing design guidelines that encourage “human” scale or pedestrian orientation

Most typically, three types of neighborhoods are singled out for pedestrian improvements: transit stations, shopping districts and public service destinations. Finally, more attention is generally paid to pedestrian issues at rail stations than along bus corridors in Bay Area pedestrian planning efforts.

2. Pedestrian Advisory Committees

Design, Community and Environment (DC&E) heard from 33 jurisdictions and/or agencies about the use of pedestrian or combined bicycle and pedestrian advisory committees. Of these, two reported standing Pedestrian Advisory Committees (PACs), ten had combined Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committees (BPACs), three had temporary BPACs created ad hoc to address specific issues or projects and three reported using other commissions to address pedestrian issues. 15 communities had no pedestrian advisory body at all.

Overall, the following factors were found to contribute to the success of B/PACS:

- ◆ Significant technical expertise on the committee
- ◆ A limited number of participants
- ◆ Access and a regular reporting schedule to the decision-making body
- ◆ A Balance between bicycle and pedestrian advocates on BPACs
- ◆ Capable and committed staff
- ◆ Elected officials willing to promote and support pedestrian aims

Areas of concern about the efficacy of these advisory bodies included the need to balance pedestrian and bicycle issues in one committee, overlapping responsibility among different committees due to conflicting funding requirements and not having a permanently dedicated pedestrian advisory body.

3. Concept of Pedestrian Districts

Generally, cities and counties are not using the pedestrian districts concept as an overarching way to organize their thinking about pedestrian issues in their jurisdiction.

Many have identified individual pedestrian “districts” or areas that receive particular attention in a planning document. For instance:

- ◆ In its *Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan*, San Leandro comes closest to dissecting its city as a series of different types of pedestrian districts. They identify Pedestrian Improvement Areas that are areas in which improv-

ing walkability should take priority over other concerns. They also identify pedestrian locations and hotspots, which areas require special attention to pedestrian issues, but not large enough to constitute a district, such as a park or elementary school.

- ◆ The City of San Jose also includes a well developed concept of pedestrian districts that distinguishes between core areas and corridors, and provides a different intensity of improvements for each type of area.
- ◆ The Contra Costa Transportation Authority, in its *Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan*, define criteria for determining if a place is a pedestrian district. They do not, however, apply these criteria to neighborhoods in the county and identify the actual districts.

2 PEDESTRIAN PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Communities throughout the Bay Area are undertaking pedestrian planning efforts, resulting in a variety of documents that address pedestrian issues in different ways. This chapter provides a brief synopsis and case studies from around the nine counties to describe how those documents are being used. The planning efforts covered in this chapter include:

- ◆ General Plans
- ◆ Pedestrian and Combined Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plans
- ◆ Neighborhood Plans
- ◆ Transit Agency Efforts
- ◆ ADA Transition Plans
- ◆ Local Capital Improvement Programs
- ◆ Countywide Transportation Planning Efforts
- ◆ Pedestrian Safety and Engineering Studies

A. *General Plans*

General plans are required documents for all jurisdictions in California. They cover seven mandated subject areas, including land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise and safety. Additionally, they may cover other topics that a jurisdiction determines to be important for the future development of their community, such as community character. These subjects are presented in chapters usually referred to as elements.

Most general plans in the Bay Area include broad goals and policy language for making a community more pedestrian-friendly, although they do not commonly include specific implementation strategies or design guidance. General plans range widely in the level of detail and their emphasis on pedestrian needs. As described below, some jurisdictions integrate pedestrian planning with an overall vision for the future of community. General plans for these cities and counties include more comprehensive pedestrian planning policies that are carried throughout the document, in all elements. In other jurisdictions, pedestrian planning is addressed as an additional amenity to the

community. General plans in these communities tend to have discrete goals for including pedestrian amenities in particular areas or at hot spots.

Many plans combine planning for pedestrian and bicycle issues in a single policy or group of policies designed to call attention to pedestrian and bicycle needs. Most general plans also include a small number of policies that are specifically targeted to pedestrian planning. Although, in the majority of cases these policies are limited to trail facilities and sidewalk networks. The sections below describe how various elements of general plans address pedestrian planning, including how, and if, pedestrian priorities are identified and what types of funding and implementation strategies are identified.

1. Elements of a General Plan that Address Pedestrian Planning

Most commonly, general plans in the Bay Area address pedestrian issues in a number of different elements, primarily in the land use, circulation and public facilities elements. As described below, each of these elements addresses a different aspect of the pedestrian environment. Additionally, some general plans include community character or urban design elements – these often deal with pedestrian-related issues – and open space or recreation elements, which may include trail planning and pedestrian access to parks and recreation areas.

a. Land Use Elements

Usually, land use elements include some policy language to create pedestrian friendly environments. The most common policies in land use elements are those that call for enhanced walking environments through streetscape improvements. It is increasingly common to find language in land use elements that address the connection between land use and pedestrian environment. Plans tend to encourage a mixture of land uses (and may stipulate retail or service uses in ground floor spaces), call for increased intensity or density of development, and require particular attention to urban design and architectural issues as ways to increase pedestrian activity. Many general plans are now including policies that promote a diversity of architectural types, human

scale development, and siting of buildings to maximize pedestrian comfort and convenience.

Less common, but still widely used, are policies determining the layout of streets. Communities that wish to encourage walking generally prefer grid layouts with small blocks to dendritic street layouts with curving streets and cul-de-sacs. Some land use elements also include policies about creating a complete, continuous pedestrian network to provide access between neighborhoods and districts, to transit or to recreational facilities. These policies are usually reinforced by more specific policies in the circulation element. A few communities include parking management strategies in the land use element to create more pedestrian friendly environments, though this issue is more commonly addressed in the circulation element. Trail networks are often covered in land use elements, but may also appear in open space and recreation elements. The goals and policies included in a land use element range significantly from one jurisdiction to another. Some cities and counties include just a few policies addressing pedestrian issues in some way, while other include all of the themes outlined above.

b. Circulation Elements

Circulation elements often focus on specific aspects of the pedestrian network. The most common goals provide for the needs, movement and safety of pedestrians through improvements to the pedestrian network. Common improvements cited include new facilities to increase access, pedestrian safety enhancements and traffic calming, as well as pedestrian amenities. Other policies address traffic flow and access management, level of service, and roadway design to accommodate pedestrians and intersection signalization.

c. Community Character and Urban Design Elements

Optional community character and urban design elements often contain more specific goals and policies in the subject areas outlined under the land use section. These types of elements often provide particular guidance for different types of areas within a city as well as detailed graphics illustrating

such urban design characteristics as scale, façade design and street furniture, all of which have a significant impact on the pedestrian experience.

d. Public Facilities Elements

Public facilities elements, which are not always included in general plans, can cover a very diverse range of topics. In some jurisdictions, they are used to cover all public facilities, including the roadway network and thus the element replaces the circulation element. In other cities, public facilities elements cover recreational facilities such as trails and parks.

e. Conservation, Open Space, Parks and/or Recreation Elements

Recreational facilities for pedestrians are often addressed in the required Conservation and Open Space elements. Although these elements are sometimes supplemented with elements covering parks and recreation issues more specifically. General plan policies regarding pedestrian recreation usually address the network and design of recreational trails throughout a community. They also are commonly concerned with improving pedestrian access to open space and conservation areas.

2. Pedestrian Planning Priorities

General plans often designate particular areas to focus pedestrian improvements, although they do not commonly refer to these areas as pedestrian districts. Rather, jurisdictions identify areas where they would like to encourage pedestrian traffic in coordination with other goals such as increased transit use, economic development, downtown preservation or a more generalized livability agenda. There are four types of areas that are commonly singled out for pedestrian improvements:

- ◆ Transit Areas (e.g., neighborhoods and streets around transit infrastructure)
- ◆ Shopping Districts (e.g., main streets, business districts, downtown areas, etc.)
- ◆ Primary Public Service Destinations (e.g., civic centers, schools, hospitals, libraries, etc.)
- ◆ Residential Neighborhoods

Cities often plan the same types of pedestrian improvements for transit neighborhoods and main streets or downtown areas. In these areas, the primary concern in most general plans is to create an environment that is conducive to walking and which minimizes the impact of vehicle circulation on pedestrians. Around primary public service destinations, policy emphasis is usually placed on access to service sites and the safety of major routes. In residential neighborhoods, policies tend to focus on safety, completing networks and managing traffic volume and vehicle speed. Goals and actions generally identify opportunities for new pedestrian facilities, street beautification and traffic calming.

3. Implementation and Funding

The implementation programs for pedestrian planning included in general plans are not very detailed. Most general plans refer to other city programs or documents that the jurisdiction intends to use to implement their goals and policies. The most common of these are capital improvement programs (described later in this chapter), the development or design review process, development fees or transportation impact fees. In addition, many jurisdictions write specific plans, downtown plans or other site-specific documents to implement pedestrian policies for particular neighborhoods or districts. Design guidelines, traffic management, or pedestrian safety studies are other types of implementation tools used to implement general plan goals. Finally, jurisdictions may also elect to create pedestrian or combined bicycle and pedestrian master plans to achieve their pedestrian planning goals.

4. Case Studies

The following case studies provide a snapshot of how pedestrian planning is being integrated into general plans in the Bay Area.

a. City of San Jose General Plan

The City of San Jose is one of the few jurisdictions in the Bay Area to use the concept of pedestrian districts. In the San Jose 2020 General Plan, adopted in May 2004, the City identifies two distinct types of “Pedestrian Priority Areas.” Pedestrian priority areas are separated into two types of areas: pedes-

trian cores and pedestrian corridors. The General Plan describes them this way:

- ◆ **Pedestrian Cores** encompass the downtown core of the City and the neighborhoods that frame that core. Additionally, pedestrian cores encompass all areas within a 3,000-foot radius of CalTrain, BART, or other heavy rail stations; a 2,000-foot radius of light rail stations; or communities with specific plans.
- ◆ **Pedestrian Corridors** include corridors designated in the General Plan for transit-oriented development and neighborhood shopping streets. These corridors are intended to increase neighborhood connectivity, linkages to transit stations and connections to pedestrian cores.

San Jose's pedestrian planning is focused in the downtown core, along pedestrian corridors near schools, parks and transit. Walking trips between and within neighborhoods are also encouraged. The City has separate policies for bicycle and pedestrian issues. Development standards encourage pedestrian-oriented uses and discourage automobile-oriented uses. Pedestrian-oriented development standards favor high density, mixed use development built to a human-scale. Architectural interest and diversity are emphasized, as are the siting for pedestrian convenience and the creation of distinct edges for districts and neighborhoods.

The City has a goal to double the percentage of walking trips every decade and make walking a viable mode of transportation through its circulation and street improvements policies. Strategies include the establishment of gridiron pattern of streets and blocks in new development areas, placing long-term, peripheral parking lots to divert traffic from high activity areas, increasing connections to light and heavy rail, and capitalizing on the County's bus and light rail transit system hubs in downtown.

Circulation policies exempt downtown from the City's Transportation Level of Service (LOS) policy. LOS policies throughout the city integrate pedestrian goals and traffic mitigation measures. Indeed, San Jose is also proposing to amend its Transportation Impact Policy to allow some exceptions to the

City's LOS D policy. The exceptions would support development of multi-modal transportation systems and developments. In exchange for granting exceptions, offsetting improvements would be required in the form of pedestrian facilities, traffic calming, transit enhancements and/or bicycle facilities.

The plan also calls for the creation of an interconnecting trail system to provide pedestrian access to the regional parks and open spaces in or adjoining the City and diverse recreational opportunities for hiking, walking and jogging. Separate trails are provided for equestrians and bicyclists. Trail design emphasizes sufficient light, vertical and horizontal clearance, and setbacks from adjacent development to ensure a safe and aesthetically pleasing recreational experience. Trail standards were established by the Department of Neighborhood Services.

The pedestrian policies in the plan will largely be implemented through the City's Capital Improvement Program, fees paid by new development for connections to city sidewalks and services, and General Fund resources for siting housing as feasible and appropriate. Additionally, the plan directs the City to create a number of specific plans for areas near BART and light rail stations (3,000-foot radius) that emphasize pedestrian connectivity and pedestrian/transit oriented land uses.

b. Town Of Danville

The Danville 2010 General Plan, adopted by the Town of Danville in August 1999, focuses pedestrian planning in the downtown area and the surrounding areas. The Plan concentrates on preserving and enhancing the historic center of Danville, which retains its pedestrian-oriented street grid and human-scaled buildings. In Danville, pedestrian facilities are planned as an amenity to the downtown experience with the goals of economic development and historic preservation. Recreational opportunities for pedestrians are also addressed in the plan.

One key objective of the Danville General Plan is to enhance the pedestrian orientation of Downtown Danville and some surrounding areas. Mixed use,

high intensity development is encouraged in the downtown core and policies offer broad guidance to provide adequate pedestrian facilities and to enhance the existing character of amenities in the downtown area. Pedestrian enhancements are encouraged, including outdoor dining places, public art, streetscape improvements such as benches and pocket parks, and pedestrian controls such as crosswalks. In particular, ground floor space is set aside for retail and pedestrian-oriented service uses. Some design measures are also required to accommodate pedestrian access to and through new development projects. Additional land use policies address the need to provide new access to areas surrounding the downtown and between residential areas.

Circulation policies generally require balance between pedestrian needs and other modes of transportation. Physical and operational improvements to roadway and intersection capacities are required to be sensitive to pedestrian and bicycle needs, but explicit specifications are not included as to how this should be accomplished. More specific circulation policies limit curb cuts and manage access to and from roadways so as not to impair the movement of pedestrians.

The plan includes a number of specific pedestrian policies related to recreation. One specific policy recommendation is not to allow at-grade crossings of public transit to minimize pedestrian/transit conflicts and thus avoid safety hazards. Instead, the town recommends that new transit infrastructure be placed in the Highway 680 right-of-way. An existing railroad right-of-way is to be used for a trail facility. Off street trails and accessways are another important component of the plan, providing recreational facilities and access to open space, local and regional parks.

The overall goal of pedestrian policies in the Danville General Plan is to provide a pleasant and safe environment for pedestrian movement. These policies are intended to be implemented through other documents including the Downtown Master Plan and the Downtown Design Guidelines and Ordinance. These two documents specify that development should be high density, pedestrian-oriented and mixed-use, and provide specific design guidelines

on how to achieve these goals. Another implementation document is the Downtown Parking and Management Study, which addresses financing for parking production and management and requirements to encourage pedestrian and bicycle access. Pedestrian improvements are mostly funded through the Town's general fund, development or design review fees, capital improvement program and transportation improvement fees. Developer fees are assessed for parking and pedestrian connections for new development projects.

B. Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plans

A small, but growing, number of cities and counties in the Bay Area, including the cities of Oakland, San Francisco and Berkeley as well as Contra Costa and Solano Counties, have completed or are completing Pedestrian Master Plans. These documents focus solely on goals, policies, designs and implementation strategies for pedestrian improvements. More commonly, jurisdictions combine pedestrian planning efforts with their bicycle planning, producing combined Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plans. This section summarizes the ways in which Pedestrian Master Plans and combined Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plans address pedestrian planning. It also highlights case studies from the cities of Oakland and San Leandro and the County of Solano.

1. Pedestrian Master Plans

Along with neighborhood plans discussed Section C, Pedestrian Master Plans provide the most specific guidance for the development of a pedestrian network and amenities of all the documents reviewed. There are only a couple completed plans in the Bay Area. However, these documents seem to be growing in popularity, which may indicate an important direction for pedestrian planning in the Bay Area.

Pedestrian plans often arise as a result of other planning processes. In Oakland and Berkeley, pedestrian plans arose out of the general plan process,

while in San Francisco and in Solano County pedestrian master plans were made possible by grant or tax funding opportunities. The pedestrian plans reviewed for this study articulate the safety, health, livability and economic development benefits of walkable cities and describe in detail how individual communities intend to achieve these benefits. They tend to focus on pedestrian circulation, connections to transit and land uses, safety improvements, and creating attractive places for walking. As described below, both the City of Oakland and the Solano and Alameda County Pedestrian Plans include specific guidelines for building walkable places as well as implementation plans to keep projects moving. Communities are also recognizing that pedestrian plans can help them attract additional funding for high priority projects. Plans generally include a list of specific pedestrian projects and articulate priorities for their completion.

2. Combined Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans

Several sources of bicycle funds require a bicycle master plan, or comparable document, as an pre-requisite of eligibility. These sources include the California Bicycle Transportation Act (BTA) and the Transportation Development Act (TDA). Competitive grants from countywide tax measure funds, such as Alameda County's Measure B, also often include requirements that bicycle projects be part of an adopted bicycle plan or general plan transportation element to be eligible. The requirements of BTA funding source are generally considered the most challenging, so many cities and other public entities develop bicycle or combined bicycle/ pedestrian plans to pursue federal and other state funding sources.

In general, combined bicycle and pedestrian plans offer significantly less detail about the pedestrian environment, although there is some variation. Some plans, like the City of San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, outlines a system of walkways; provides guidance about design, maintenance and safety requirements; and specifies a list of projects to be completed. Other plans, like the City of Emeryville's, simply identify key pedestrian facilities. In either case, the overall goal of the combined bicycle and pedestrian plans is

to highlight key pedestrian issues and to promote development patterns that will encourage alternative forms of transportation that include walking.

3. Case Studies

The following case studies illustrate how pedestrian and combined bicycle and pedestrian plans are used in cities and counties in the Bay Area.

a. City of Oakland Pedestrian Master Plan

The Land Use and Transportation Element of the Oakland General Plan recommends the creation of a Pedestrian Master Plan for the City as part of its goal to increase the use of alternative modes of transportation. The resulting Pedestrian Master Plan emphasizes the simultaneous provision of pedestrian safety, access and convenience in downtown Oakland.

The key policy concern in writing the Master Plan was to link this emphasis to federal and State policies and state-of-the-art engineering studies. Federal and State policies stress the importance of fully considering the needs of non-motorized travelers in all street programming and development activities. Engineering studies provide conclusive research findings supporting design solutions that integrate pedestrian facilities into the road network. In writing the plan, City staff determined that it was important to make these links explicit in order to persuade local engineers to support necessary design changes to create the desired pedestrian environment.

The Master Plan also established a Pedestrian Route Network, emphasizing safe routes to transit and safe routes to schools, and creating a Downtown Pedestrian District. While the concept of “safe routes to schools” is familiar to many jurisdictions, the concept of “safe routes to transit” is an innovative strategy targeting street improvements to promote alternative modes of transportation. These improvements emphasize pedestrian safety and access along routes that connect homes to light rail stations and bus routes. It also recognizes the different needs of Transit Streets, designated in the Oakland General Plan, where transit needs are emphasized.

The Downtown area, which covers several distinct neighborhoods, was recognized as a Pedestrian District because it is an area with high levels of pedestrian activity, good connectivity and many pedestrian trip generators. To create the pedestrian district, every street in Downtown was determined to be a pedestrian route and will receive the highest priority for improvements.

The concept of the pedestrian district is still being developed in Oakland. A subsequent grant application prepared by the City, the MTC Transportation for Livable Communities Grant Application for Renewing Chinatown, also includes the concept. However, the idea is further refined to cover a smaller, discrete area in which pedestrian needs are prioritized.

b. Solano Countywide Pedestrian Plan

The goal of the Solano County Pedestrian Plan is to increase walking as a form of transportation. The strategies to increase walking trips are two fold: on the one hand, the County is striving to improve connections that support pedestrian movements and on the other it wants to spur the creation and enhancement of existing walkable places. The goals in the Pedestrian Plan mirror those in the County's parallel effort to encourage transit- and pedestrian-supportive land use patterns, which is funded by a Transportation for Livable Communities Program supported by the Metropolitan Transportation. The Pedestrian Plan was funded by a Caltrans Community-Based Planning Grant.

The County's objective is to create an overall vision and systematic plan based on shared criteria that will spur individual agencies to undertake more detailed pedestrian planning. The plan documents and consolidates existing plans and programs from the cities and transit agencies within Solano County rather than undertaking new studies. It provides an overview of projects being conducted throughout the county and highlights the priorities for its diverse communities. As part of the inventory of projects, the county identified types of projects including: Pedestrian District Projects and Main Street Pedestrian Design Projects, Pedestrian Corridor Projects, Pedestrian Access to Transit Projects, Crossing Improvement Projects, and Pedestrian Connection Projects.

After summarizing the existing and planned projects in the area, the Pedestrian Plan provides guidelines for planning and designing pedestrian routes and places. Guidelines cover land use, site planning and design, street system planning and layout, and pedestrian routes, spaces and amenities. The Pedestrian Plan also includes an implementation plan that provides guidance for local governments entering into the pedestrian planning process, and a list of funding sources for specific types of projects.

c. City of San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan

The City of San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan is divided into six chapters that address existing conditions, a recommended bicycle and pedestrian network, support facilities, bicycles and transit, pedestrian safety, education and enforcement, and a capital improvement plan to help guide implementation.

Like the combined plans described above, San Leandro's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan focuses on the bicycle network. However, the Master Plan does have more detail than some plans. It provides a description of components for a walkable community that encompasses short block lengths, frequent crossing opportunities, different land uses and transit located within walking distance of one another, frequent pedestrian amenities, wide sidewalks with buffer zones, and compact intersections with short crossing distances. It also identifies Pedestrian Improvement Areas, where it specifies that walkability should take priority. Finally, the plan includes diagrams illustrating typical pedestrian improvements at a variety of street crossings.

d. Contra Costa County Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan

The Contra Costa Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (CBPP), adopted in 2003, was created by the Contra Costa Transportation Authority to implement the pedestrian and bicycle goals articulated in the 2000 Update to the Contra Costa Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan. The goals of the CBPP goals are to increase, improve and maintain bicycling and walking facilities, improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians, encourage bicycle and

walking trips, support local efforts to encourage walking and bicycling and to plan for the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians. Key strategies to accomplish these goals include:

- ◆ Improving the pedestrian network
- ◆ lessen the negative effects of automobiles in neighborhoods through traffic calming
- ◆ Creating safe routes to transit
- ◆ Providing pedestrian improvements at transit stops and on vehicles
- ◆ Implementing targeted education and marketing programs

Additionally, the CBPP identifies two priority pedestrian programs: designating and developing pedestrian districts, and, improving mobility for people of all abilities consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) improvements. As discussed further in Chapter 4, the CPBB defines pedestrian districts as “areas of mixed or dense land use and intense or potentially intense pedestrian activity.” Additional characteristics include proximity to transit, walkable sized district with visually interesting, pedestrian-scaled buildings and a safe and well-connected set of pedestrian facilities and parking lots separated from pedestrians.

Although the Authority has a role as the holding a forum to discuss and resolve countywide issues and supporting the efforts of local jurisdictions, CCTA assumes that local jurisdictions and agencies will have the major responsibility for implementing the Plan. The CBPP identifies various possible local actions including more local planning efforts, revised policies, and cooperation among agencies to help cities implement plan goals. The CBPP includes planning-level cost estimates for pedestrian projects and other recommended programs to determine funding needs and help cities plan for project costs. The CBPP estimates that between 44 and 86 percent of the projects and programs identified in the Plan might be funded from federal, State, and local funding sources. There is an anticipated deficit of between \$33 and \$130 million.

C. Neighborhood Plans

This section describes how pedestrian planning issues are addressed in neighborhood plans, which for purposes of this report include specific plans, station area plans, downtown plans, streetscape master plans, or any planning document that addresses a specific neighborhood, community or corridor within a larger city or county.

1. Elements of Neighborhood Plans

Generally, neighborhood plans cover areas in much more detail than a city's general plan does, typically providing more specific policies regarding land use, design and zoning changes. Neighborhood plans often include conceptual designs for streets within the area, identifying specific improvements to the pedestrian environment.

2. Pedestrian Priorities

Most neighborhood plans reviewed for this report stated explicitly that improving the pedestrian environment, encouraging walking or improving pedestrian access to a specific destination such as a transit station were key goals of the plan. The priorities outlined in these plans are very similar to those described for general plans and pedestrian or combined bicycle and pedestrian master plans. However, because neighborhood plans tend to cover a more defined area than other plans, they generally include specific design guidance for buildings and streetscapes along certain sections of the roadway.

3. Case Studies

The Union City Intermodal Station District and Transit Facility Plan and the San Jose Downtown Streetscape Master Plan provide two examples of the ways neighborhood plans address pedestrian issues.

- a. City of Union City Intermodal Station District and Transit Facility Plan
The City of Union City collaborated with BART and AC Transit to create a plan for a new compact, pedestrian-friendly mixed-use district around the city's inter-modal transit station, centered at the Union City BART station.

The long-term goal is to create a lively 24 hours a day 7 days a week destination to encourage residents and transit riders alike to live, work, shop, and play in Union City. The Transit Facilities Plan was coordinated with the drafting of the General Plan for the City of Union City so that the plans would reinforce each other.

The plan identified the following pedestrian priorities:

- ◆ Minimize conflicts with automobiles and other vehicles
- ◆ Create pedestrian/bicycle links from the transit station to the surrounding district and neighborhoods
- ◆ Use design to enhance pedestrian experiences of riding transit and encourage people to walk to the station

The plan includes a number of land use goals for the station area including creating a mix of uses such as community facilities, social services, office/research and development, commercial uses, housing, and retail uses. The plan also has a strong focus on pedestrian improvements around a transit district. Pedestrian movement and safety were established as the primary design considerations for the circulation network around and within the transit station. Streets are designed to accommodate pedestrians as well as bicycles and to create strong connections within the station area and to the surrounding residential neighborhoods. The plan calls for pedestrian greenways integrated with the City's network of pedestrian and bicycle trails as laid out in the Park and Recreation Master Plan. A series of public spaces, connected by a pedestrian underpass, are being designed to link the transit station to the rest of the City. A system of clear wayfinding and signage will be integrated with the identity programs of the City and the transit providers. The design of the Intermodal Transit Facility itself includes passenger amenities.

In addition to the pedestrian network and design features in the plan, the plan emphasizes on parking demand management. A parking demand management district was created to regulate the amount, pricing and enforcement of parking policies in and around the station area. Reduced parking requirements for surrounding land uses are established and shared parking agreements are en-

couraged. Parking design standards were also developed so as not to detract from the pedestrian access or experience of walking to the station.

b. San Jose Downtown Streetscape Master Plan

The goal of San Jose's Downtown Streetscape Master Plan is to ensure that City streets provide a rich walking environment and bolster the livability of this rapidly growing community. The Streetscape Master Plan provides design plans, street typologies, streetscape policies and comprehensive design guidelines for the development of the pedestrian network in the downtown area. It is a complete implementation plan for the creation of a downtown pedestrian district that was identified and called for in the San Jose General Plan. Plan objectives are to:

- ◆ Create a hierarchy of streets and sidewalks that give pedestrians clear indications of their locations and create a strong sense of identity to the varying districts within the urban core.
- ◆ Improve pedestrian safety and accessibility by resolving traffic and pedestrian conflicts at hotspots and providing a basic level of pedestrian safety and comfort on all streets.
- ◆ Ensure a continuous pedestrian network by identifying and filling gaps in the downtown streetscape and ensuring that crosswalks and other pedestrian pathways link areas together.
- ◆ Promote a pedestrian-scale design for sidewalks and streets that includes comfortable street widths, curb radii, and other engineering features that affect walking comfort and safety.

The Design Plan concept, which is a core of the Downtown Streetscape Master Plan, classifies streets based on use, function, patterns of city life and symbolic significance. There are seven street types including:

- ◆ Urban Structure Streets
- ◆ Downtown Pedestrian Network Streets
- ◆ Downtown Paseos
- ◆ Downtown Residential Streets

- ◆ Destination Areas/Segments
- ◆ East/West Connections
- ◆ Historic Districts

The classification establishes an urban form and hierarchy that contributes to the overall clarity, continuity, legibility and memorability of the downtown area. Another distinguishing characteristic of the San Jose streetscape plan is the identification of specific zones within the pedestrian realm. The plan identifies a curb zone, a pedestrian through zone, a building zone, a building setback zone, a corner clear zone, and crosswalks as identifiable areas with separate requirements and thus different specifications for design. The plan includes many other specific recommendations for street furniture, design, transit accommodations and other elements of street design.

D. Transit Agency Efforts

Transit agencies have determined that pedestrian-oriented design, and the related field of transit-oriented design, are important to enhancing the use of transit in the Bay Area. Most larger local transit agencies have policies to encourage pedestrian- and transit-oriented design in their strategic plans, including Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART), Sonoma-Marín Area Rail Transit (SMART), Santa Clara Valley Transit Authority (VTA), San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans), and Alameda County Transit (AC Transit). Some have also developed guidelines for their transit stations as well as guides for local governments for the development of properties around transit stations.

1. Pedestrian- and Transit Oriented Design Guidelines

In general, design policies and guidelines prepared by transit agencies focus on minimizing the distance between key land uses and stations, enhancing pedestrian comfort and safety along these routes, increasing the ease and number of pedestrian connections between modes and to nearby uses, and balancing the needs of pedestrians with other modes that need to access transit stops. Tran-

sit-oriented development guidelines include significant emphasis on pedestrian-oriented building and site design and encourage a mix of uses within a quarter to a half mile of transit stations. Most of the agencies are focused on pedestrian access to rail transit. The major exception is AC Transit, which has developed its Designing with Transit Guidelines to assist local governments in accommodating bus traffic. To a lesser extent, the Livermore-Amador Valley Transit Authority (LAVTA) is working on encouraging pedestrian trips through coordination with local governments to site of high density housing and employment uses along already established fixed routes.

A major reason that transit agencies are focusing on pedestrian issues is their need to increase overall ridership. According to BART documentation, investments that increase the number of pedestrian trips to transit are the most cost-effective investments that transit agencies can make. This is because pedestrian infrastructure costs less, requires less space, and is more environmentally-sensitive than other types of investments. Increased pedestrian traffic also enhances safety for all people out on the street and has important benefits for surrounding communities, such as supporting local businesses and creating an attractive, vibrant district.

2. Pedestrian Planning Priorities

Transit agency priorities for pedestrian planning are two-fold: the first set of priorities encompass the design of the stations themselves, the second covers the design of the areas around the stations. Transit agencies are directly responsible for the design of transit stations. For rail stations, this responsibility covers the areas within the stations as well as any immediately adjacent parking areas. For bus stations, transit agency are primarily responsible for the design of shelters, although agencies generally coordinate very closely with local jurisdictions to ensure that changes to streets or designs for new streets accommodate buses. Many agencies also engage in joint development projects for any non-transit development that takes place on agency owned land or on land adjacent to their properties.

In general, transit agency guidance for pedestrian- and transit-oriented development focus on areas that range from one quarter to one half mile around transit stations. Within these areas, guidelines for pedestrian planning emphasize increased density and a mix of uses around transit stations to shorten the distances that people must walk to access transit. Some of the guidelines also include architectural and site design standards to enhance the attractiveness of walking to transit encouraged by creating districts that are interesting, built to human-scale and comfortable for pedestrians. Other priorities include enhancing sidewalks and other streetscape amenities to improve the comfort and safety of pedestrians, and creating interconnected pedestrian networks to minimize delays and barriers to pedestrians.

As previously mentioned, most pedestrian design guidelines address rail transit station areas. The two agencies that address pedestrian issues around bus transit, AC Transit and LAVTA, recommend concentrating development closer to bus transit stations than is recommended for rail transit stations – generally concentrated within a one quarter mile rather than one half mile – to encourage ridership. Transit agencies also tend to recommend lower intensity development around bus stations than rail stations although both types of transit require higher intensities than exist in auto-oriented areas. In addition, design around bus stops usually address bus shelters, street access and flow of traffic around bus stops.

3. Implementation and Funding

The actual development of station areas is most frequently the responsibility of the local jurisdiction. Some projects, such as the Union City Intermodal Station described in the section on neighborhood plans, take place as a joint-development project between the transit agency and the local jurisdiction.

4. Case Studies

This section provides two examples of transit agency efforts to encourage pedestrian projects.

a. BART Access Guidelines and Station Access Plans

In 1999, the newly adopted BART Strategic Plan called for station access improvements for all modes of travel. In May 2000, the BART Board followed the Strategic Plan by adopting an Access Management and Improvement Policy Framework and directing staff to prepare 11 station access plans to implement the framework. In April of 2003, BART released Station Access Guidelines, focused on physical design, to show how the authority plans to optimize access to stations by all modes and assist BART staff and contractors in designing facilities at both new and existing stations. The guidelines also provide a resource for agency partners, such as cities, counties and other transit agencies, that collaborate with BART on development of station areas and connections to other modes of transportation to conduct their own station access plans. The BART Station Access Guidelines are supplemented by BART Transit-Oriented Development Guidelines, which encourage pedestrian-friendly building and site design. BART staff use the Station Access Guidelines to create Station Access Plans. Of the 44 BART stations in the four participating Bay Area counties, 15 have station access plans to date. The two sections below describe the guidelines and examine a Station Access Plan completed for BART's Coliseum/Oakland Airport BART Station.

i. *Access Guidelines*

"Access," as referred to in the Station Access Guidelines document, indicates both the trip to the BART station, and the trip from the station to the final destination. The agency envisions access combinations such as "walk-bus-BART-walk" or "drive-BART-bus-walk." The Guidelines consider access at all times of the day. The design guidelines are structured to maximize access to BART for all modes to create a seamless journey to BART stations with the stated goal of making BART travel competitive with the private automobile. However, the agency also established a hierarchy of access trips that it would like to increase, with walking at the top. BART's goal is to increase pedestrian trips to almost a quarter of all access trips by 2010.

The pedestrian priorities articulated in the guidelines are similar to those reflected in other transit agencies' documents to encourage pedestrian trips to

transit. BART's priorities, which range from land use development to street design and circulation are outlined below.

- ◆ Promote dense, infill development with lower parking requirements around stations in order to achieve its goals for pedestrian access.
- ◆ Concentrate development within ½ mile of transit stations to minimize the distance of walking routes.
- ◆ Create intersection crossings and street designs that maximize pedestrian comfort and safety and minimize travel delays.
- ◆ Design the pedestrian network and streets surrounding the stations to include network continuity and directness, human-scale development, adequate lighting and natural surveillance from surrounding uses and design to ensure visibility of pedestrians to other road users, particularly in the evening. Other design considerations include: sidewalk width, on-street parking to create buffers, street trees, and signalized crosswalks.
- ◆ Balance the needs of the different modes that must access BART stations. For the most part, BART recommends that pedestrian needs supercede the needs of other modes or at minimum are not impaired. Some examples where the issue of balance is addressed are in the design for bus turn-outs, parking lots, and intersection design, which prioritizes pedestrian crossing over maximizing traffic volume.
- ◆ Emphasize wayfinding as an important element of improving access. The document recommends clear, consistent signage along all access routes.

The guidelines do not include information about implementation or financing of access projects. The guidelines do specify that all projects that affect access to BART stations should submit Access Circulation Diagrams and supporting Access Guideline information. Recommendations include that project applicants submit drawings of access routes and circulation patterns for each mode with dimensions of facilities, signage, pavement markings, traffic controls and wayfinding facilities; traffic volumes and turning movements around the site, as appropriate; a description of access issues and items to be coordinated or resolved with outside agencies. The guidelines also recom-

mend that diagrams identify the amount, size, location and access to and from all parking facilities, including all-day commuter parking, bicycle, short stay/pick-up and carpool parking.

ii. Coliseum/Oakland Airport BART Station Access Plan

As with all Station Access Plans (SAPs), the purpose of the Coliseum/Oakland Airport BART SAP is to increase access to the BART station. In order to best achieve this goal, BART staff assessed the development conditions around the station by conducting a review of local and regional plans, soliciting input from BART departments and partner agencies such as City of Oakland staff, and reaching out to stakeholders for their advice about necessary improvements. The current community and ridership demographics and mode split data for the station was also assessed and targets for future mode splits were set. Future development plans for the area were also reviewed.

With this information, the BART staff identified opportunities and constraints for each mode of travel to the station. For instance, at the Coliseum BART, staff found a lack of pedestrian-friendly streets and limited safe access points to the station, particularly at night. They also identified safety hazards, such as an isolated underground tunnel connecting one neighborhood to the station. The Coliseum BART Access Plan recommends implementing a transit village concept, creating a network of walking routes and improving safety around the station, implementing Oakland's bike network recommendations around the station, increasing transit feeder service and improving the efficiency and convenience of the coordination between the other transit providers, such as AC Transit, serving the station.

b. Sonoma-Marín Area Rail Transit District

Pedestrian planning is part of a larger strategy for Sonoma-Marín Area Rail Transit District (SMART) to increase transit ridership, which includes transit-oriented development (TOD). SMART is looking for opportunities to work with local jurisdictions to plan and implement pedestrian/TOD strategies. In a combined pedestrian and bicycle facilities assessment, SMART has determined that almost all sites need pedestrian and bicycle access improvements.

The key pedestrian concerns for SMART are connectivity, street design and the community context around the station. In terms of connectivity, the most important factors are the interconnections of the street network for walking and bicycling, the design of intersection elements to avoid barriers for pedestrians and increasing the routes that provide access to transit for pedestrians and bicyclists.

In terms of street character, SMART is concerned with designing travelways so as not to obstruct pedestrian movements and building sidewalks to improve pedestrian comfort and safety. Community context strategies encourage a mix of land uses within one half mile of transit, pedestrian-oriented site planning, human-scaled architectural design and constructing parking scale and location of parking. Relevant TOD policies encourage higher density housing and employment densities near transit and pedestrian oriented design.

SMART's concept is to support local land uses and regional transportation functions with their pedestrian and TOD policies as the programs must be implemented in collaboration with local jurisdictions and other transit agencies. The agency has identified stations areas that have existing or planned TODs. These include Downtown San Rafael, Downtown Novato, Caulfield, Downtown Petaluma, Cotati, Downtown Santa Rosa, Jennings, and Windsor. They have also identified station areas with the potential for TOD infill development with further planning. These stations include: San Quentin Ferry, Larkspur Ferry, Marin Civic Center, Corona, Rohnert Park (Civic Center), Healdsburg, and Cloverdale. On large sites, such as in Petaluma and Santa Rosa Downtowns, SMART would like to develop station areas jointly with the jurisdictions.

E. ADA Transition Plans

Title II of the ADA requires all state and local governments to operate so that they are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities. All

public entities, regardless of size, were required to conduct a self-evaluation to determine how well they were meeting accessibility standards. When structural modifications were identified as necessary to make a program, service, or activity accessible to people with disabilities, public entities with 50 or more employees were required to develop “transition plans,” with the involvement of the disabled community. Some accommodations were excepted from the rules if they would result in a fundamental change in the nature of the service provided or in undue financial or administrative burdens.

In addition to the requirements of the ADA, California law requires that all publicly funded buildings, structures, sidewalks, curbs, and related facilities built after 1968 or substantially remodeled be accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities. Jurisdictions often address these regulations, commonly referred to as Title 24, in the ADA Transition Plans as well.

The Department of Justice (DOJ) issued rules on July 26, 1991 dictating how State and local governments should comply with Title II of the ADA. The final rules permit State and local governments to use Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG) or the Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards (UFAS) as accessibility standards for new construction and alterations of buildings.

1. Components of the ADA Transition Plan

The U.S. Department of Justice ADA Title II Technical Assistance Manual indicates that the following components must be included in every transition plan:¹

- ◆ Descriptions of the physical barriers which limit access to and use of programs, services, and activities for people with disabilities, including communications features which are structural in nature;
- ◆ Detailed plans to make the facilities accessible;

¹ US Department of Justice, *The Americans with Disabilities Act, Title II Technical Assistance Manual Covering State and Local Government Programs and Services*. <http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/ada/taman2.html#II-8.3000>

- ◆ A schedule for barrier removal (covering several years if necessary); and
- ◆ The name of the individual who is responsible for implementing the transition plan.

Existing facilities were defined as those already constructed, or had broken ground prior to January 26, 1992. New or altered facilities must comply with the Standards for Accessible Design and be fully accessible and usable.

2. Implementation and Funding

The original legislation required that transitions plans be completed by July 26, 1992 and that structural changes to existing buildings meet program accessibility requirements by January 26, 1995. However, implementing an ADA Transition Plan, particularly for a large jurisdiction, can take many years and a considerable amount of funding. Though the federal government set a three year timeline to complete facilities improvements, a community is generally considered to be in compliance if they can show reasonable progress in improving public facilities. Jurisdictions must continue to use the plans to prioritize and implement improvements to buildings and roadways, showing that they are moving towards the goals of making all facilities accessible as funding becomes available.

3. Contra Costa County ADA Transition Plan

Contra Costa County drafted its first ADA Transition Plan, as required by law. In order to create the first transition plan, a self-evaluation was conducted which identified the barriers to accessibility to facilities throughout the County. The County identified buildings that required structural changes and prioritized improvements based on the amount of use each building received from the public. The original Transition Plan has been periodically evaluated and updated and now includes an evaluation of accessibility to county-managed parks and right-of-ways.

The most recent version of the Transition Plan was started in 2001 and includes detailed accessibility surveys of 36 buildings followed by proposals for architectural solutions to remove existing barriers. The criteria for setting priorities for making buildings, facilities, and parks fully accessible have been

updated as well. County staff now uses the following criteria as the basis for prioritizing facilities for removal of architectural barriers. Countywide, buildings that house programs are given high priority for improvements if the facilities:

- ◆ Receive a high level of public use
- ◆ House unique programs that cannot occur at another location
- ◆ Are distributed throughout the County and can ensure maximum access for all residents
- ◆ Provide essential services related to health, safety and administration of justice receive a high priority

Accessibility at the main entrance of a facility or to improve a path of travel to the portion of the facility where program activities take place (e.g., parking, walks, ramps, stairs, doors, corridors, etc.) is the number one priority in terms of improvements within a facility.

As the responsible public entity for sidewalks, the County must also plan for the transition of public walkways to meet ADA accessibility standards. Federal guidelines require that the Transition Plan include a schedule for installing curb ramps along existing walkways. By law, priority must be given to walkways serving entities covered by the ADA. The County must install curb ramps on newly constructed or altered streets, roads and highways.² Although, all County streets and sidewalks complied, at the time they were built, with then existing state and federal standards those standards continue to evolve. Therefore, the County includes a survey program of one third of its sidewalks every year to ensure that sidewalks stay safe and accessible to the public. Maintenance and construction staff also notify property owners of illegal encroachments into County sidewalks. Additionally, traffic signals

² The Department of Justice has determined that resurfacing a road “beyond normal maintenance” is an alteration and requires the installation of curb ramps. ADA, Title II Technical Assistance Manual, Section II-6.6000, supp. 1994.

must meet ADA standards for certain pedestrian features. These are also surveyed periodically to ensure that they continue to meet federal standards.

Contra Costa County funds its ADA-related facilities improvements through the General Fund, Capital Facilities funds, and Community Development Block Grants, as these are available. Building improvements throughout the County are scheduled to take place through 2014. The County has several funding sources for road related projects, including State Gas Tax, Sales Tax, and State and Federal Grant funds used for road capital improvements. Some of the funds are discretionary and some are designated for specific projects. The County also works with the Redevelopment Agency to upgrade pedestrian facilities in Redevelopment Areas.

F. Capital Improvement Programs

Capital Improvement Programs (CIP) are generally multi-year planning instruments used by jurisdictions and agencies to plan for the construction of new and the expansion, rehabilitation, or replacement of existing publicly-owned assets, including streets, sidewalks and many pedestrian-oriented transportation projects. The CIP is used by city and county staff as a guide for project prioritization to accomplish community goals. Local public works departments usually compile a list of projects scheduled for upcoming years from a review of department requests and planning documents. The draft CIP is presented to the local policy board and revised and adopted by that body.

Although CIPs generally include funding criteria and priorities, the extent to which pedestrian projects are included in a community or agency CIP is generally determined by the priorities set in planning processes under various departments. Most of the pedestrian planning documents that were reviewed for this report listed the CIP as one of the implementation tools for the goals and objectives in the plan. CIPs are usually updated annually to allow for

project completion, changing priorities, new priorities, and funding availability.

G. Countywide Transportation Planning

Congestion Management Agencies, County Transportation Authorities and County Tax Authorities are established for different purposes. However, they all are concerned with the funding, planning and functioning of countywide transportation systems. Their pedestrian planning efforts are discussed in this section.

1. Pedestrian Planning Priorities

Depending on their specific charter, County agencies and authorities may produce countywide planning documents, expenditure plans, design guidelines and grant funding criteria. All of these efforts influence local planning decisions at various levels. In recent years, as funding for new roads has diminished and local concerns about air quality, congestion and livability have increased, these countywide agencies and authorities have embraced pedestrian and other alternative modes planning as a necessary means to reduce congestion and provide choice. These agencies have used their countywide planning efforts and the authority to distribute transportation funds to encourage local governments to emphasize pedestrian needs. Some of these efforts have already been discussed in this chapter. Others are addressed in Appendix A on funding sources. This section provides two case studies of countywide transportation agency efforts currently underway.

2. Case Studies

Countywide efforts to encourage pedestrian planning can include a wide range of activities. The following case studies provide two examples.

- a. Solano Transportation Authority's Land Use and Transportation Toolkit
The Solano Transportation Authority, the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District, and the Yolo County Transportation District jointly spon-

sored preparation and publication of the Land Use and Transportation Toolkit to promote policies contained in STA's Solano Comprehensive Transportation Plan, as detailed in its Alternative Modes Element as well as comparable documents in Yolo and Sacramento Counties.

The toolkit provides techniques and resources to help Solano and Yolo County communities identify, plan, and implement their own land use, transportation, and urban design projects that directly or indirectly encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation including walking, bicycling, ridesharing, and transit. The toolkit supports a regional planning effort using case studies that both support local cities' efforts and highlight good planning practices. The toolkit includes a section on Pedestrian and Bicycle Friendly Design.

b. Marin County Transportation Sales Tax Expenditure Plan

Marin County drafted the Transportation Sales Tax Expenditure Plan as part of the process to get the Transportation Sales Tax passed by voters in 2004, and thus created a local source of revenue for transportation projects. The Expenditure Plan articulated the rationale for becoming a "self-help county". The county needs local funds to provide a balanced transportation system that includes all modes – roadways and transitways, bikeways and pedestrian facilities – and includes services that are targeted to the diverse communities within Marin County.

The plan allocates 26.5 percent or approximately \$88 million towards maintaining, improving, and managing Marin County's transportation infrastructure, including major and local roads, bikeways, sidewalks, and pathways. An additional \$36.5 million, approximately 11 percent of the expected revenues, is allocated to reduce school related congestion and provide safer access to schools. This funding is directed towards maintaining and expanding the Safe Routes to Schools Program, providing crossing guards at key intersections and granting capital funding for Safe Pathways to School projects.

H. Pedestrian Safety and Engineering Studies

Pedestrian safety and the effectiveness of specific pedestrian facilities are a significant concern for most communities engaged in pedestrian planning. It is particularly important to governments and funding bodies to assess whether pedestrian and traffic safety projects are actually fulfilling their purpose of reducing accident rates or reducing vehicle trips. Research to compare improvements, such as examining whether traffic roundabouts work better than stop signs, can be very costly and time consuming and thus large transportation agencies (such as MTC and VTA) and non-profits or research institutions often take on the burden of conducting large scale studies. On the other hand, local governments may retroactively assess the effectiveness of a specific improvement at a particular location. This section provides a brief overview of some of the best practices studies available from large government agencies and non-profits or research institutions, and the types of improvements that local governments are looking at in the Bay Area.

1. Government Agencies, Non-Profits or Research Institutions

Conducting conclusive research studies is usually beyond the capacity of local jurisdictions. Instead, the Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) and State agencies, primarily the State Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the Office of Traffic Safety, along with non-profits and other statewide, regional and local organizations generally conduct extensive studies and provide resources about best practices that typically include research results from an array of studies, design guidance and references for further study. Key best practices resources include:

- ◆ FHWA's Pedestrian Facilities Users Guide: Providing Safety and Mobility (www.walkinginfo.org/pdf/peduserguide/peduserguide.pdf)
- ◆ AASHTO Guide for the Planning, Design and Operation of Pedestrian Facilities (www.transportation.org/publications/bookstore.nsf/)
- ◆ MTC's Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Toolbox (www.bayareatrafficsignals.org/toolbox/Index.html)
- ◆ The walkinginfo.org's Pedestrian Safety Guide and Countermeasure Selection System (www.walkinginfo.org/pedsafe/)

- ◆ Context Sensitive Solutions.org's Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities: Flexibility in the AASHTO Guidelines Excerpts and Publications (www.contextsensitivesolutions.org/content/reading/ped_bike_flex/)
- ◆ Transportation and Land Use Coalition's Pedestrian Infrastructure Campaigns (www.transcoalition.org/ia/pedinfra/01.html#body)

Common topics covered in these publications include:

- ◆ Number and width of lanes
- ◆ Traffic calming measures (i.e., roundabouts, transverse rumble strips, chicanes, etc.)
- ◆ Access management techniques (i.e., raised median islands, pedestrian refuges, frontage roads, etc.)
- ◆ Lower speed limits, visual cues and other driver modification techniques
- ◆ Synchronized signals
- ◆ Parking management
- ◆ Street landscaping, lighting, furnishings, banners and decorations
- ◆ Gateway monuments and transportation art

2. Local Jurisdictions

Local jurisdictions are particularly interested in the effectiveness of particular improvements at specific intersections or along particular roadway corridors. Additionally, some cities are evaluating the effects of land use and density on pedestrian safety, activity levels and economic development. This research is often supported by the State of California Office of Traffic Safety, which funds education, equipment and enforcement grants to reduce pedestrian accidents, and the research institutions like the University of California at Berkeley Traffic Safety Center. Three such efforts in the cities of Fairfield, Livermore and Oakland are described in this section.

a. City of Fairfield

The City of Fairfield partnered with local school districts and the County Sheriff's and Health Departments to reduce accidents in a school zone along a busy traffic corridor and studied the results. The City program increased enforcement of traffic laws during peak hour and installed In-roadway Warn-

ing Lights (IRWLs) along crosswalk markings, flashing school zone beacons and automatically activated “Smart Walk” pedestrian detectors. The program also enhanced roadway signs and pavement marking and provided education to students about pedestrian safety.

Data collected before and after the project showed that traffic slowed by three miles per hour in the 85th percentile (from 36 mi/h to 33 mi/h) and by four miles per hour for median speeds (from 31 mi/h to 27 mi/h). In addition to improving the pedestrian environment by slowing traffic speeds, the improvements decreased vehicle crashes decreased from 11 per year before the project to seven in the year afterward. The City concluded that the installation of crosswalk IRWL systems and the supplemental use of speed limit warning flashers in their school zone has successfully improved pedestrian safety.

b. City of Livermore

The City of Livermore is studying the impacts of its downtown plan on the number of pedestrians that walk Downtown. The plan includes a combination of land use and pedestrian amenity improvements and City staff is hoping that these improvements will increase walking trips. With funding from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, the Engineering Department conducted pedestrian counts before any improvements were made, and will repeat the process once the Downtown improvements are complete.

c. City of Oakland

Oakland’s Chinatown is a very dense urban neighborhood that must accommodate a high concentration of pedestrians and large volumes of cars. Additionally, more than 24 percent of Chinatown’s pedestrians are over the age of 65. An independent pedestrian safety assessment by a local non-profit organization, Asian Health Services, determined that crossing times at major intersections in the neighborhood were too short for elderly pedestrians. As a result, Asian Health Services – in cooperation with the City of Oakland’s Traffic Engineering Department – installed a pedestrian scramble device at the intersection of Webster and 8th Streets, giving pedestrians an exclusive walk

phase for crossing that intersection on the diagonal as well as in the traditional crosswalks.

The University of California at Berkeley's Traffic Safety Center conducted a study of the pedestrian scramble device and discovered that conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles decreased by 40 percent after installation of the scramble device. However, non-compliance with pedestrian signals also increased 25 percent. The center is conducting additional research on pedestrian scramble intersections in San Francisco's Chinatown, as part of their PedSafe collaboration with San Francisco's Department of Parking and Traffic.

I. Findings from Pedestrian Planning Documents

The overview of planning efforts presented in the preceding sections resulted in the following general findings about pedestrian planning in the Bay Area.

1. Planning Document Strengths

Overall, pedestrian issues are covered in a wide-array of planning documents. The nature and scale of attention paid to pedestrian issues varies by type of document.

- ◆ General plans tend to have goal language addressing the desire to create pedestrian friendly neighborhoods, but little specific guidance. They work best for articulating a vision of how pedestrian issues will be addressed in the community as a whole.
- ◆ Pedestrian master plans, and to a lesser extent combined bicycle/pedestrian plans, focus specifically on pedestrian issues. They are suited to addressing overall network connections, facility requirements and design specifications, and specific implementation programs.
- ◆ Neighborhood plans often contain specific conceptual designs for pedestrian projects and implementation and funding strategies along with land use policies that can support walking. As area-specific plans, they are less well-suited to address overall network issues.

- ◆ Countywide transportation plans, like general plans, tend to provide big picture planning for an entire county. However, they also set funding priorities for regional transportation funds, and thus can have a significant impact on the types and locations of pedestrian projects built in a county.
- ◆ Transit agency efforts concentrate on the relationship between pedestrian and transit facilities, although many have started addressing land use issues as well. Key concerns include access to stations and stops, land use mix, parking and balancing different modes of travel in a limited space.
- ◆ ADA Transition Plans are important planning documents for implementing federal ADA requirements and continue to be used, although are often not integrated into other pedestrian planning efforts.
- ◆ Pedestrian safety studies, research studies about the effectiveness of specific improvements, are used sporadically by local jurisdictions to assess the effectiveness of their pedestrian investments. Best practices research is usually conducted by larger governmental entities and non-profits.
- ◆ Capital improvement programs are used by public works departments to implement and fund pedestrian improvements rather than as planning or policy tools on their own.

2. Major Issues

A number of major issues are consistently addressed by the planning documents reviewed for this report. These include:

- ◆ Creating pedestrian friendly neighborhoods
- ◆ Improving the safety of pedestrians by addressing conflicts between cars, transit and pedestrians
- ◆ Increasing pedestrian access to key destinations
- ◆ Enhancing convenience and comfort for pedestrians
- ◆ Creating land use patterns to support pedestrian travel (higher densities, mixed use)

- ◆ Preparing design guidelines that encourage “human” scale or pedestrian orientation

Typically, three types of neighborhoods are singled out for pedestrian improvements: transit stations, predominantly rail and multi-modal; shopping districts and public service destinations (e.g. schools or civic centers).

Generally, more attention is paid to pedestrian issues at rail stations than along bus corridors in Bay Area pedestrian planning efforts. Finally, more attention is typically paid to pedestrian issues at rail stations than along bus corridors in Bay Area pedestrian planning efforts.

3. Effective Pedestrian Planning

Jurisdictions that are most successful in implementing their pedestrian goals create a comprehensive program that includes both an idea or vision of the type of place they want to walk in and a plan to build that place. There is no one formula for developing or articulating either the vision or the implementation plan. However, successful cities and counties in the Bay Area are including the following components in their planning efforts:

- ◆ A vision for their community that identifies locations for pedestrian improvements.
- ◆ Network plans linking pedestrian facilities to key destinations such as transit and key neighborhoods.
- ◆ Pedestrian plans or neighborhood plans to specify the types and design of improvements desired.
- ◆ Design guidelines to assist private developers and city staff implement pedestrian planning goals.
- ◆ An implementation plan, linked to the Capital Improvement Program, that identifies funding sources such as federal, State and regional grant programs as well as local programs such as developer fees and transportation impact fees.

- ◆ Local funding programs that may include transportation, developer or design review fees targeted towards pedestrian improvements, the use of tax increment financing or special districts to accrue funds for specific projects.

3 PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEES

DC&E consulted members of the MTC Pedestrian Study Technical Advisory Committee and representatives from other jurisdictions to determine how communities use Pedestrian Advisory Committees (PACs) or combined Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committees (BPACs) to assist in making decisions about pedestrian issues. In the 33 jurisdictions and agencies consulted as part of this study, there are:

- ◆ Two Pedestrian Advisory Committees
- ◆ Ten Combined Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committees
- ◆ Three Temporary BPACs for a specific purpose
- ◆ Three alternative advisory arrangements
- ◆ 15 communities with no pedestrian advisory body

A brief description of the PACs, BPACs and other advisory bodies is provided in this chapter.

A. Types of Committees

Many Bay Area cities, counties and other agencies responsible for pedestrian planning have established advisory committee to ensure technical and community input about pedestrian issues. A sampling of the nature and composition these advisory bodies is briefly described below.

1. Pedestrian Advisory Committees

The Cities of San Francisco and Berkeley reported having dedicated PACs to address pedestrian issues in their communities. These cities also have separate committees to address bicycle issues.

a. City and County of San Francisco

San Francisco has a Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC) run through the San Francisco Department of Parking and Traffic (DPT) Engineering Department Pedestrian Program. The PSAC has representatives from:

- ◆ Three Pedestrian Safety Organizations

- ◆ Two Senior or Disability Organizations
- ◆ One Bicycle or Non-motorized Wheeled Personal Transport Organization
- ◆ One Transit or Environmental Organization
- ◆ One Child Advocacy or School Support Organization
- ◆ One Public Health Organization
- ◆ Two At-Large Citizens

The DPT Pedestrian Program works on pedestrian projects with other City and County agencies, including the Department of Public Works, Recreation and Parks Department, and the Golden Gate Concourse Authority, as well as with pedestrian advocates such as Walk SF and Senior Action Network. In addition to the PSAC, San Francisco has a Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) and two Citizen Advisory Committees (CAC) that often deal with bicycle and pedestrian issues. The CAC to Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) is a transit-oriented informational forum that advises the Traffic Engineering Department of DPT. The CAC to the Transportation Authority (TA) reviews funding proposals for pedestrian and bicycle projects.

b. City of Berkeley

The Transportation Commission, appointed by City Council, has a Pedestrian subcommittee made up of three volunteer members from the Transportation Commission. The Pedestrian Committee reports to the Transportation Commission, which in turn reports to City Council. The subcommittee also provides the community at-large opportunities to learn more about pedestrian issues and offer their input to staff and commissioners.

2. Joint Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committees

Many jurisdictions and agencies combine their bicycle and pedestrian planning bodies into one joint Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), as described below. MTC requirements for Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 funding require that each county and city have a Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) to review and/or prioritize TDA Article 3 bicycle projects and to participate in the development and review of com-

prehensive bicycle plans.¹ BACs are mandated by State Transportation Control Measure (STCM #9), adopted by MTC on November 28, 1990. MTC intends that BACs be composed of both bicycle and pedestrian advocates as the committees provide input on pedestrian and bicycle projects. Many jurisdictions opt to more formally combine bicycle and pedestrian concerns into a BPAC to meet this requirement.

a. Contra Costa County

Contra Costa County established a bicycle advisory committee to provide feedback to the County and member cities on bicycle and pedestrian projects for Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds and on bicycle planning matters. The Countywide Bicycle Advisory Committee meets once a year to advise the County Board of Supervisors on which projects should be a priority for application of Transportation Development Act funds. The Countywide Bicycle Advisory Committee (CBAC) has 16 members with one representative from:

- ◆ Each of five supervisorial districts
- ◆ Each of the eight bicycle organizations in Contra Costa County
- ◆ The Mayors' Conference
- ◆ The East Bay Regional Park District
- ◆ The Bicycle Industry

The California Highway Patrol and Superintendent of Schools serve as resources only. The qualifications for membership on the committee are to live or work in the County

b. Contra Costa Transportation Authority

Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) also has a Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC) that was formed to help develop the Contra Costa Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. The

¹ Metropolitan Transportation Commission Resolution No. 875, Adopted November 26, 1980; Current revision April 28, 2004.
http://apps.mtc.ca.gov/meeting_packet_documents/agenda_283/tmp-0875.doc

CBPAC also provides feedback on projects applying to receive regional funds allocated by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission for programs such as Transportation for Livable Communities and the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program as well as for the State Transportation Improvement Program.

There are a total of 13 members on the CBPAC, selected as follows:

- ◆ One staff member and one citizen member familiar with bicycle or pedestrian issues is appointed by each of the four Regional Transportation Planning Committees (for a total of eight members)
- ◆ Two staff members represent the County
- ◆ One member represents the East Bay Regional Parks District
- ◆ One member represents the City-County Engineers Advisory Committee
- ◆ One member represents the East Bay Bicycle Coalition

The CBPAC makes recommendations to the Technical Coordinating Committee, which makes recommendations to the CCTA Board. CCTA has four other committees that advise the Authority on pedestrian issues. These committees are the: Citizens Advisory Committee, Bus Transit Coordinating Committee, Paratransit Committee, and Technical Coordinating Committee.

c. City of San Jose

The City of San Jose has a Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), made up of 11 volunteers appointed by the Director of Transportation. The BPAC reports to staff in the Department of Transportation. Staff responds to BPAC requests and provides information on pedestrian and bicycle related issues, while retaining the ability to bring larger issues to Council attention, as needed.

d. City of Brisbane

The City of Brisbane has a BPAC made up of one Council Member, two at-large citizen members, and one ex-officio staff member, generally the City Engineer. The group reports to the City Council.

e. City of Emeryville

The City of Emeryville has a BPAC that meets monthly and consists of 13 voting members: two City Council members, one Public Works Department employee, one Planning Department employee, one Police Department employee, two members from bicycle organizations, and up to 6 members who are bicyclists that live or work in Emeryville. The BPAC makes recommendations to the Transportation Committee which may send them on to the City Council. The composition of the committee is under consideration to determine if pedestrian concerns need to be better accommodated.

f. City of San Carlos

The City of San Carlos has a BPAC that is made up of one member of the Traffic and Transportation Commission, one member of Parks and Recreation Commission, one member of Youth Advisory Council and four other volunteers at-large appointed by the City Council. Some members of the commission are bicyclists. The group makes recommendations to City staff and if necessary to the City Council.

g. City of Oakland

The City of Oakland's BPAC is composed of City staff and citizen advocates. The BPAC was chartered in 1995 to advise the City on the design of bicycle and pedestrian facilities and related issues. The committee meets monthly and reports to the Transportation Services Division of the Public Works Agency.

h. City of Fremont

The five-member Bicycle and Pedestrian Technical Advisory Committee (BPTAC) is an advisory committee to staff in the City of Fremont's Traffic and Transportation Engineering Section on matters pertaining to bicycle and pedestrian issues. The committee meets monthly.

i. City of Santa Rosa

The City of Santa Rosa has had a Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) since 1993. The BPAC primary function is the programming of TDA-Article 3 funding and the preparation and oversight of the Bicycle and

Pedestrian Master Plan. It also advises Council on all bicycle related items and on pedestrian issues related to class 1 paths. Council determined that there should be three public-at-large members plus one representative each from the following groups:

- ◆ Santa Rosa Cycling Club
- ◆ Redwood Empire Cycling Team
- ◆ Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition
- ◆ League of Women Voters
- ◆ Santa Rosa Junior College
- ◆ Santa Rosa High School
- ◆ Chamber of Commerce

Representatives are selected by the member groups; the public-at-large members are selected by Council.

j. Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority
Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority (ACTIA) has a BPAC composed of 11 members, each appointed by a Board member. The group reports to the ACTIA Board. There is no required membership for bicycle versus pedestrian representation. However, the goal is to have a committee with a balance of bicycle and pedestrian knowledge and interests.

k. Congestion Management Agency for San Mateo County
The Congestion Management Agency for San Mateo County (C/CAG) has a BPAC made up of elected officials and public members. The BPAC reports to the C/CAG Board.

3. Other Arrangements

Many Bay Area cities and counties do not have a dedicated PAC or BPAC. Some of these are:

- ◆ City of Alameda
- ◆ City of Calistoga
- ◆ City of Dublin
- ◆ City of Fairfield

- ◆ City of Hayward
- ◆ City of Livermore
- ◆ City of Napa
- ◆ City of Newark
- ◆ City of Piedmont
- ◆ City of Pleasanton
- ◆ City of Suisun
- ◆ City of Vacaville
- ◆ City of Walnut Creek
- ◆ Alameda County
- ◆ Napa County

These cities do sometimes have Bicycle Advisory Committees (BAC) that take up pedestrian issues. Additionally, cities without PACs or BPACs may use other bodies to advise on pedestrian issues. For instance, the City of Millbrae does not have a dedicated BPAC committee. However, the Parks and Recreation Commission in the City oversees and makes recommendations on pedestrian- and bicycle-related facilities to the City Council. The City of Albany's Transportation Committee advises on pedestrian issues. Napa County Transportation Planning Agency has three bodies that sometimes address pedestrian issues as part of their other tasks: a BAC, a technical advisory committee and a Paratransit Coordinating Council.

Other communities without dedicated advisory bodies establish PACs or BPACs for a specific purpose, such as drafting and adopting a pedestrian, bicycle or combined bicycle and pedestrian plan. A few examples include the cities of San Leandro, Union City and Redwood City.

B. Findings

Staff from the jurisdictions consulted for this report interviewed described that PACs and BPACs are generally effective bodies for communicating citizen and technical advice on pedestrian issues. The following characteristics of

committees were identified by interviewees as improving the effectiveness of these bodies in a number jurisdictions:

- ◆ Significant technical expertise on the committee
- ◆ A limited number of participants
- ◆ Access and a regular reporting schedule to the decision-making body
- ◆ A balance between bicycle and pedestrian advocates on BPACs
- ◆ Capable and committed staff
- ◆ Elected officials willing to promote and support pedestrian aims

Some concern was expressed that having no dedicated pedestrian advisory body made it difficult to address pedestrian issues. Some jurisdictions reported that having a joint BPAC worked effectively to address pedestrian issues, while others felt that bicycle concerns often overshadowed pedestrian issues. A similar concern was expressed from agencies where responsibility for pedestrian issues fell to a department with other duties. The effectiveness of the committee seemed to be determined by the balance of advocates for pedestrian issues compared to those concerned with other issues such as bicycle or recreational needs. Another key determinant is support from elected officials.

Another area of concern about advisory committees arose around funding programs requirements. Grant funds often carry requirements for the creation of an advisory body to oversee allocation of grant funds. Problems arise in some jurisdictions when different programs have conflicting requirements for the membership of these bodies (such as some advisory bodies are required to have only user members and others may have both staff and public representatives). In these cases, communities may end up with several committees that are essentially advising decision-makers about one issue but for several pots of money.

4 CONCEPTS OF PEDESTRIAN DISTRICTS

The concept of pedestrian districts has started to be used in pedestrian planning in the Bay Area. However, few jurisdictions use a pedestrian districts concept as an overarching way to organize their thinking about pedestrian issues. Below are description of a few planning efforts where the concept of pedestrian districts has been used to some degree. Brief descriptions of the kinds of environments that jurisdictions are trying to create using the pedestrian districts concept are also included.

A. City of Oakland

Oakland uses a pedestrian district concept in its Pedestrian Master Plan to designate specific areas for pedestrian improvements. The Pedestrian Master Plan designates a Downtown Pedestrian District which covers a large portion of the city and several distinct neighborhoods. The designation is based on the analysis that there are high levels of pedestrian activity and a significant number of pedestrian trip generators as well as a pedestrian-friendly street grid in the extended downtown area. It also reflects the high density of commercial, residential, cultural, and recreational uses within walking distance of the downtown areas in the pedestrian district as well as the fact that the area is well-served by transit. The designation signifies that every street in the pedestrian district is a pedestrian route, which is a designation shared by other streets throughout the City. Downtown streets are the most important streets for prioritizing pedestrian improvements.

Implementation of the Downtown Pedestrian District is taking place through a number master plans and grant proposals to implement portions of the improvements envisioned for the district. For example, a recent grant application for MTC's Transportation for Livable Communities Grant Application entitled "Revive Chinatown" used the concept of a pedestrian district as the organizing concept for the application. Chinatown is one of the smaller neighborhoods within the Downtown Pedestrian District.

B. City of San Leandro

The City of San Leandro's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, adopted November 2004, identifies Pedestrian Improvement Areas where, the plan specifies that, walkability should take priority over other concerns. Six initial Pedestrian Improvement Areas, also referred to in the plan as pedestrian districts, were identified including:

- ◆ Two primary vehicle corridors that provide access to employment centers and pedestrian generators such as schools, libraries, and parks
- ◆ The area around the San Leandro BART Station
- ◆ One large commercial district
- ◆ One small commercial district that accommodates high volumes of pedestrian traffic from the surrounding neighborhoods and experience significant influxes of pedestrians during community events
- ◆ The marina area along the Bay Trail, which experiences high volumes of pedestrian traffic

The plan outlines the factors affecting walkability including the proximity of uses, the presence of buffers from traffic, and sidewalks that are wide enough to share comfortably with others. However, it does not provide more specific guidance about how the Pedestrian Improvement Areas should be developed. Districts are distinguished from key pedestrian locations or hotspots, which require special attention but may not be large enough to encompass an entire district. These key pedestrian destinations such as commercial intersections, schools, and parks.

C. City of San Jose

The General Plan for the City of San Jose uses a concept of Pedestrian Priority Areas that is comparable to pedestrian districts. These Pedestrian Priority Areas are separated into two types of pedestrian facilities: pedestrian cores and pedestrian corridors.

Pedestrian Cores include the Downtown Core and surrounding areas, areas around rail stations, and a number of planned communities throughout the city. For light rail stations, a core is defined by a circle with a radius of 2,000 feet. For CalTrain, BART, or other heavy rail stations, the area is defined by a circle with a radius of 3,000 feet.

Pedestrian Corridors include Transit-Oriented Development Corridors and neighborhood shopping streets designated in the General Plan. The Pedestrian Corridors are intended to increase neighborhood connectivity, and linkages to transit stations or Pedestrian Cores.

In addition, the City of San Jose has several specific plans, precise plans and neighborhood business districts that identify pedestrian and improvements. Examples include the San Jose Redevelopment Agency Strong Neighborhood Initiative (SNI) and Neighborhood Business Districts, the Coyote Valley Specific Plan, and the Downtown Streetscapes Master Plan.

D. Contra Costa Transportation Authority

The Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC) for the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) discussed the idea of identifying specific pedestrian districts as part of the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (CBPP). However, the committee recommended that the plan not identify specific districts. Rather, the committee suggested that jurisdictions identify and improve pedestrian districts. This recommendation was incorporated into the Plan.

Pedestrian districts are defined as areas of mixed or dense land use and intense or potentially intense pedestrian activity. The CPBB recommended that to delineate a pedestrian district, jurisdictions should locate areas that meet, or could meet, most of the following characteristics:

- ◆ Zoned to encourage a dense mix of residential and commercial uses and discourage auto-oriented uses.
- ◆ Have convenient and frequent transit connections and welcome bicycles with ample facilities throughout the district to encourage non-motorized movement.
- ◆ Be large enough to promote a relatively substantial amount of development and land use mix but not so large that people may feel compelled to drive to reach destinations within the district. The CPBB references the Portland Pedestrian Plan recommendation of no less than 600 feet and no more than one mile in any direction.
- ◆ Have visually interesting and pedestrian-scaled buildings to create a sense of place and welcoming environment.
- ◆ Include a safe and well-connected set of pedestrian facilities. (The Authority is considering changes to the level-of-service standards in its Growth Management Program to avoid penalizing jurisdictions that emphasize pedestrian movement within these districts.)
- ◆ Have parking lots that are separated from pedestrians, do not dominate views from the sidewalk but also permits visibility from the sidewalk for security reasons. Direct pedestrian connections should be provided to parking lots and walking routes should be well-lit when passing between buildings and along pathways within parking lots.

The CBPP recommends that jurisdictions designate pedestrian districts where the number of people walking is already significant or where increasing the number of pedestrians would support local goals for the district. Local jurisdictions can, and often do, designate pedestrian districts in their General Plan or in Specific Plans. Such designations often focus on pedestrian-friendly development as part of a larger effort to make the area more vital and economically vibrant.

The Pedestrian District designation should be accompanied with the establishment of policies and guidelines to create a well-functioning pedestrian sys-

tem and supporting land uses. The CPBB recommends that local jurisdictions use general plans to provide basic policy direction and to designate each district. Specific plans or redevelopment plans should be used to outline detailed improvements to these pedestrian areas.

E. Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority

Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority (ACTIA) does not use the concept of pedestrian districts. However, the Authority has a funding program for bicycle and pedestrian projects of “countywide significance”. In order to implement the program, they had to define the concept of countywide significance, that is areas that where the agency believes that pedestrian improvements will benefit more than one jurisdiction and therefore will have county level benefits. As a result, the Authority defined certain areas as high pedestrian priorities for the scoring of funding applications. High priority areas for pedestrian funding include:

- ◆ Areas at or around a Transit Stop or Station
- ◆ Activity Centers, (e.g., schools, health care facilities, shopping, parks, employment centers, recreational facilities, commercial centers, major entertainment complexes, etc.) There is a particular emphasis on regionally serving activity centers (e.g., community colleges, regional parks, etc).
- ◆ Regional Connectors (e.g., bridges)
- ◆ High Existing or Potential Pedestrians Volume Areas

The types of projects supported in these areas include connectivity projects to close gaps in the pedestrian network, safety and access improvements, and projects serving mainly utilitarian or commute trips.

F. Solano Transportation Authority

The Solano Transportation Authority (STA) included a concept of pedestrian districts in its Countywide Pedestrian Plan as a means to classify the types of projects taking place around the County. Pedestrian districts and main street projects are grouped together and defined as “projects to plan and develop specific districts or areas that have, or are expected to have, intense pedestrian use.” Districts and main streets are intended to have unique identities supported through coherent urban design and a wide range of pedestrian improvements that might include widened sidewalks, curb extensions, street lighting and signage.

The concept of pedestrian districts is found throughout the Countywide pedestrian plan in individual policy recommendations. However, the typology of different types of pedestrian places is not carried throughout the document in a systematic fashion.

G. City of San Francisco

The Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC) is San Francisco does not use the concept of pedestrian districts. When the idea was considered in the past, pedestrian advocates voiced opposition to the idea because they felt that all streets should receive improvements and be made safer for pedestrians, not just ones that are in identified districts. As a result, pedestrian districts are not used as a concept in San Francisco.

H. High Priority Pedestrian Areas

In Chapter 2 of this report, planning documents from around the Bay Area were summarized to identify pedestrian planning priorities. Although, only a handful of those documents called out the concept of the pedestrian district, many of them identify priority areas for pedestrian improvements.

As described in the section on General Plans, there are four types of areas that are commonly singled out for pedestrian improvements:

- ♦ Transit Areas (e.g., neighborhoods and streets around transit infrastructure)
- ♦ Shopping Districts (e.g., main streets, business districts, downtown areas, etc.)
- ♦ Primary Public Service Destinations (e.g., civic centers, schools, hospitals, libraries, etc.)
- ♦ Residential Neighborhoods

Of these, transit areas and shopping districts most closely match the concept of a pedestrian district. Although, major concentrations of public service destinations, like those that would be found in a civic center, should also be included. Many jurisdictions are recognizing the importance of these areas for pedestrians through policies that emphasize non-motorized access, convenience and safety. Particularly in these areas, jurisdictions are beginning to give pedestrian needs priority over the needs of other modes of transportation. In part, this is because increased pedestrian traffic in shopping, transit and civic areas generally complements other goals for these areas, such as increased transit use, economic development, downtown preservation or a more generalized livability agenda.

Although, few jurisdictions are designating these areas as pedestrian districts, they are concentrating their efforts in a few key locations. In doing so, they have begun to confront many of the issues important to the concept of pedestrian districts. Such issues include: balancing the needs of pedestrians and other modes of transportation, developing new levels of service requirements in areas with high pedestrian traffic, and specifying appropriate land use mixes and designs for walkable districts. These concerns are pervasive in the planning documents reviewed for this study.

I. Findings

Generally, cities, counties and agencies are not using the pedestrian districts concept as an overarching way to organize their thinking about pedestrian issues in their jurisdiction. Many have identified individual pedestrian “districts” or areas that receive particular attention in a planning document. However, these areas are not necessarily codified in regulations or given priority for funding.

There are a few jurisdictions that have started to define specifically pedestrian areas. For instance:

- ◆ In its Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, San Leandro dissects its city as a series of different types of pedestrian districts. They identify Pedestrian Improvement Areas that are areas in which improving walkability should take priority over other concerns. They also identify pedestrian locations and hotspots, which areas require special attention to pedestrian issues, but not large enough to constitute a district, such as a park or elementary school.
- ◆ The City of San Jose also includes a well developed concept of pedestrian districts that distinguishes between core areas and corridors, and provides a different intensity of improvements for each type of area.
- ◆ The Contra Costa Transportation Authority, in its Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, define criteria for determining if a place is a pedestrian district. They do not, however, apply these criteria to neighborhoods in the county.

There are a number of common concerns in these pedestrian districts, which include:

- ◆ Balancing level of service for cars, bicycles and pedestrians
- ◆ Identifying paths of travel
- ◆ Creating attractive and safe urban spaces for walking

OVERVIEW OF BAY AREA PEDESTRIAN PLANNING
PEDESTRIAN DISTRICTS STUDY
CONCEPTS OF PEDESTRIAN DISTRICTS

- ◆ Assuring that key destinations (e.g. land uses and transit stops) are appropriately and conveniently located
- ◆ Providing facilities for people traveling to and from the site (e.g., parking, adequate transit, etc.)
- ◆ Building amenities to the appropriate scale for the neighborhood.
- ◆ Addressing adjacent neighborhoods and streets.

OVERVIEW OF BAY AREA PEDESTRIAN PLANNING
PEDESTRIAN DISTRICTS STUDY
CONCEPTS OF PEDESTRIAN DISTRICTS

APPENDIX A

PEDESTRIAN PLANNING FUNDING SOURCES

Several local, regional, state and federal funding sources are available to support pedestrian-related projects. This chapter provides a brief summary of some of these programs. This section is not intended as an exhaustive list of funding sources.

A. Local Programs

Most commonly, cities fund their pedestrian programs through a combination of federal, State and regional grants and money allocated from their General Funds through their capital improvement programs. However, some cities have created additional local funding programs to implement their pedestrian planning goals and policies. Some examples of programs where local funds are targeted towards pedestrian improvements include: development or design review fees, development or transportation impact fees. As discussed in Chapter 3, below is brief description of how a sampling of some cities fund their pedestrian projects.

1. Development Fees for Pedestrian Connections – City of San Jose

The pedestrian policies in the City of San Jose General Plan are funded in part by fees paid by new development for connections to city sidewalks and services. New development is required to construct and dedicate to the City all public improvements directly attributable to the site, including neighborhood or community parks and recreation facilities, street improvements, sidewalks, street lighting, fire hydrants and the like. Additionally, development is required to assist in the implementation of level of service policies for transportation, and neighborhood and community parks by financing improvements to nearby intersections, dedicating land, and paying an in lieu fee or financing improvements for parks and recreation needs that would result from the development. The City also imposes a series of taxes on new growth to finance the construction and improvement of

facilities and infrastructure systems where need cannot be directly attributed to a particular development.

2. Tax Increment Financing and Special Districts – Town of Danville

The Town Of Danville funds pedestrian improvements in its downtown through a combination of developer fees for facilities improvements (similar to those described for the City of San Jose), payments for parking improvements, development and design review fees, and transportation improvement fees. Additionally, tax increment financing, derived from the area's status as a redevelopment area, is used to fund a large portion of the improvements. Finally, the Downtown Plan anticipates the creation of a variety of financing districts to implement pedestrian improvements in the downtown including:

- ◆ Assessment District
- ◆ Maintenance District
- ◆ Parking District
- ◆ Beautification District

These districts allow for the financing of improvements over a period of time through bond sales. Debt repayment is assigned among properties based on relative benefits received.

3. County Transportation Taxes

Transportation sales taxes -- local sales taxes earmarked for transportation improvements -- are a financing option used by many urban counties in the state to secure long-term funding for major transportation projects and programs. Although they are susceptible to downturns in the economy, these taxes provide a funding source that seems more predictable and secure than state funding, and offer a reliable source of local matching funds to help secure grants from other agencies. Prior to placing a proposal before voters, county officials develop detailed plans for spending the potential new revenue. The projects often need state and federal funding to complement the

local contribution. Many Bay Area counties, including San Francisco, San Mateo and Contra Costa Counties, Santa Clara, Marin and Alameda have passed such “self-help” taxes.

B. Regional Programs

Regional funding sources for pedestrian-related projects are available from a variety of funding sources described in this section.

1. MTC Grant Funding Summary

MTC has a number of grant programs to fund long-range planning efforts, capital projects and bicycle and pedestrian projects. These programs are funded through a combination of federal and State funding grants that MTC allocates to different programs. These grants include: Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA), Surface Transportation Program (STP), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) and Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds. These funds are distributed to the Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) program, which currently consists of three different grants: Capital Grants, Community Design Planning Grants and Housing Incentive Program (HIP) Grants. In addition, MTC will begin a pilot program this summer for a fourth TLC Grant – Station Area Planning Grants. MTC also funds the Regional Bike/Pedestrian Fund Program and the Regional Transportation for Livable Communities Programs.

Separate from its TLC grant program, MTC also offers grants through its Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program to fund the construction of bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Each grant program is described below. Information about all smart growth funding from MTC is available at: www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/smart_growth/.

a. Capital Grants

TLC Capital grants fund the construction of specific transportation infrastructure projects that improve pedestrian, transit and bicycle facilities, and support an serve higher density residential and mixed-use development. Eligible activities include pedestrian and bicycle facilities, streetscape improvements, traffic calming designs and transit stops/station improvements. Grants typically range from \$500,000 to \$2 million and may be as high as \$3 million per project. MTC requires a 11.5 percent local match. Last year, \$18 million was available in funding.

b. Community Design Planning Grants

TLC Community Design Planning grants fund community planning processes to revitalize existing neighborhoods, downtowns, commercial cores and to make transit stations more accessible and pedestrian and bicycle friendly. Eligible activities include local community planning, design and visioning efforts, conceptual design plans for pedestrian, bicycle, or transit station improvements, transportation/land use plans for downtowns, transit corridors or redevelopment areas and non capital planning projects. Grants may be up to \$75,000 per project with a required 20 percent local match. Last year, \$500,000 was available in funding.

c. Housing Incentive Program Grants

HIP grants are intended to create incentives for jurisdictions to build high density housing and mixed-use development near transit centers. New housing units must be within one third of a mile of a transit station (one half of a mile for rail transit) with 15 minutes headways. Thirty-minute headways are allowed for projects located in a downtown area in Marin, Sonoma, Napa and Solano counties. Grant funds may be used for capital transportation projects that meets TLC goals. The capital project can serve either the housing project or the larger community. Eligible activities are similar to the TLC Capital Grant projects and include pedestrian and bicycle facilities connecting new housing to nearby land uses and transit; improved sidewalks

and crosswalks linking the project to a nearby community facility; and streetscape improvements that support increased pedestrian, bicycle and transit use and safety.

Grant funding is based on the density of the proposed housing development, with a bonus granted for affordable units. Dollar amounts range from \$1,000 to \$2,500 per bedroom, depending on the project's density. Bonuses for affordability range from \$400 to \$800, depending on the level of affordability. The maximum grant amount per jurisdiction is \$3 million. A federal local match of 11.5 percent is required.

d. Station Area Planning Grants

The goal of the new Station Area Planning Grants program is to help cities and counties develop local land-use plans and policies that encourage new infill development near bus, ferry and train stations. The key objective of this program is to help increase the cost-effectiveness of the region's public transit investments by maximizing the number of transit riders who live, work and study in close proximity to transit stations and corridors.

Currently in the middle of its first, pilot round of funding, the Station Area Planning Program provides grants to local governments wanting to develop planning documents and policies that will help to increase transit ridership, enhance station access for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit, and promote livable, walkable communities. MTC has allocated \$2.5 million as part of an initial Station Area Planning pilot program in FY2005-06. A minimum of \$75,000 and a maximum of \$750,000 is available per grant, with the average grant amount anticipated to be \$500,000. A local match of 20 percent is required. The first round of Station Area Planning Grants will be targeted to fund station area plans in Resolution 3434 transit corridors

e. Regional Bike/Pedestrian Fund Program

The purpose of the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program (RBPP) is to support the construction of pedestrian and bicycle facilities throughout the Bay Area to encourage mode shift. Bicycle projects should be on the Regional Bicycle Network or improve access to schools or transit. Pedestrian projects should create or improve access to schools, transit or regional activity centers. The RBPP provides funding for projects that are developed through an inclusive community planning effort and have the support of the community. The first funding cycle occurred in 2005. Eligible activities include:

- ◆ Bicycle and pedestrian paths and bridges
- ◆ On-street bike lanes
- ◆ Pedestrian street crossings
- ◆ Traffic calming design features such as pedestrian bulb-outs
- ◆ Way-finding signage

Funding requests must be at least \$300,000 and not more than \$4 million or more than the county's 12-year population share of funds, whichever is less (MTC provides a table). Marin, Napa, Solano and Sonoma counties may fund projects below the \$300,000 limit. MTC requires a non-federal local match of 11.5 percent of the total RBPP project cost.

f. Regional Transportation for Livable Communities Programs

Recently, MTC revised the TLC program to include a separate Countywide TLC component that allows Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) to administer a percentage (based on population) of the TLC funds for countywide priority projects. One third of the TLC program funding will now be available each cycle for local planning and capital funds for county projects that otherwise would not be as competitive in the regional TLC program.

2. Safe Routes to Transit

Bay Area voters approved the Safe Routes to Transit (SR2T) Program in March 2004 through Regional Measure 2. In coordination with the Transportation and Land Use Coalition (TALC) and the East Bay Bicycle Coalition (EBBC), MTC will allocate \$20 million of the SR2T funds on a competitive grant basis to projects with a “bridge nexus,” meaning that they reduce congestion on one or more state toll bridges by facilitating walking or bicycling to transit services or City CarShare pods. SR2T funds may be used for secure bicycle storage at transit stations, safety enhancements for pedestrian or bicycle station access, removal of pedestrian or bicycle barriers near transit stations and system wide transit enhancements to accommodate bicyclists or pedestrians. TALC and EBBC are the SR2T program administrators and will take the primary role in selecting projects. MTC, the public administrator of the project, is working closely with TALC and EBBC to set up the SR2T program requirements and coordinate the funding cycles and grant awards. Once projects are selected for funding, individual agencies will work directly with MTC for funding allocation. Information is available at: www.transcoalition.org/c/bikeped/bikeped_saferoutes.html.

C. State Programs

A variety of State departments, legislative funding bills and statewide agencies fund pedestrian-related projects. These funding sources are described in this section.

1. California Department of Transportation Programs

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is a major source of funding for pedestrian related transportation projects.

a. State Transportation Improvement Program

The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is a multi-year state funding program for capital improvement and development costs to improve transportation. Pedestrian-related eligible projects funded by STIP can include improving local roads, public transit (including buses), pedestrian and bicycle facilities, sound walls, intermodal facilities, pedestrian safety improvements, and environmental enhancement and mitigation. Information is available at: www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/STIP.htm.

b. Community Based Planning Grant

The Community Based Planning Grant (CBTP) grant program is administered by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to seed planning activities that encourage livable communities. CBTP grant funds, offered under the Transportation Planning Grants program, may be used by local agencies to integrate land use and transportation planning, to develop alternatives for addressing growth and to assess efficient infrastructure investments that meet community needs. These planning activities are expected to leverage projects that foster sustainable economies, increase available affordable housing, improve housing/jobs balance, encourage transit-oriented and mixed-use development, expand transportation choices, reflect community values, and include non-traditional participation in transportation decision making. A 20 percent local match is required. Information is available at: www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/cbtpg.htm.

c. Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) of 1971 states that one quarter cent of the retail sales tax is returned to the county of origin for the purpose of funding transportation improvements in that county and allows Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPA) to earmark two percent of the Local Transportation Fund for bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Generally, the TDA stipulates that cities and counties are eligible to apply and Each RTPA may set its own additional criteria for allocating TDA funds.

Some Regional Transportation Planning Agencies allocate the funds to the local jurisdictions according to population while others allocate on a competitive basis. . MTC's criteria are set forth in MTC Resolution 875 which allocate much of MTCs funds on a competitive basis as described in the section on MTC. Information is available at:

www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/STA-TDA/2003_TDA_Book.pdf and
apps.mtc.ca.gov/meeting_packet_documents/agenda_283/tmp-0875.doc.

d. State Transportation Enhancements Activities (TEA) Program

Eligible projects include pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities and related signage; safety activities for pedestrians and/or bicycles; acquisition of historic sites; historic/scenic highway programs (including tourist and welcome centers); landscaping, streetscapes, and other scenic beautification; historic preservation; rehabilitation of historic transportation buildings, structures or facilities; preservation of abandoned railway corridors (including the conversion for use as bicycle and pedestrian trails); and transit shelters or amenities related to a transit village or pedestrian-oriented development. Information is available at: www.dot.ca.gov/hq/TransEnhAct/.

e. Safe Routes to School

The Safe Routes to School program is a legislatively-funded construction program intended to improve and enhance the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists along school routes. Funding may be used to improve pedestrian and bicycle facilities as well as related infrastructure. Costs for programs or activities related to education, enforcement or encouragement (often referred to as "3E" by school safety and law enforcement officials) also are eligible for reimbursement when those costs are related to the construction improvement and incidental to the overall cost of the project. Information is available at www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/saferoute2.htm.

f. **Bicycle Transportation Account**

The Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) funds city and county projects that improve safety and convenience for bicycle commuters. To be eligible for BTA funds, cities and counties must have a Bicycle Transportation Plan (BTP). This fund may be applicable to pedestrian planning where paths and trails are designed for both bicyclists and pedestrians. Information is available at: www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/bta/btaweb%20page.htm.

2. Office of Traffic Safety

The California State Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) helps local communities develop traffic safety programs. Each October - November, OTS requests proposals addressing traffic safety problems from all interested and eligible agencies. Typically, state and local agencies submit proposals upon request; however, they may at any time approach OTS for a traffic safety grant. While OTS accepts proposals on a daily basis, priority funding consideration is given to those submitted by January 31. OTS reviews proposals against several criteria including: potential traffic safety impact, collision statistics, seriousness of identified problem(s), and performance on previous grants. OTS funds grants in several priority areas including a Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety and Roadway Safety Program. Information is available at: www.ots.ca.gov/profile/overview.asp.

3. Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program

The Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program (EEMP) was established by the State Legislature in 1989 to be run by the Resources Agency. It offers a total of \$10 million each year for grants to local, state, and federal governmental agencies and to nonprofit organizations for projects to mitigate the environmental impacts caused by new or modified state transportation facilities. Information is available at: resources.ca.gov/eem/.

4. Urban Park Act of 2001 - Proposition 40 Funds

The passage of Proposition 40 created two funding programs: the Roberti-Z'berg-Harris Competitive Grants Program and the Urban Park Act, run by California Department of Parks and Recreation, that can help with the financing for pedestrian projects. Information on all Proposition 40 funds is available from the California Department of Parks and Recreation at 916-651-8579.

a. Roberti-Z'berg-Harris Competitive Grants Program

The Roberti-Z'berg-Harris Competitive Grants Program funds the acquisition, development, rehabilitation, and special major maintenance of park and recreation lands and facilities, and the creation of innovative recreation programs to meet the urgent need for safe, open and accessible local park and recreation facilities. Information is available at 916-651-8579.

b. Direct Grants from the Urban Park Act

The Urban Park Act also provides direct funding for the acquisition and/or development of property for new urban parks, recreational or multipurpose facilities in neighborhoods that are currently least served by park and recreation providers. Information is available at www.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=22294.

D. Federal Programs

Federal funds for are usually distributed through state or regional or local agencies. The primary sources of federal funding that could be used for pedestrian projects are described in this section.

1. Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program

The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Program provides funding for projects in areas that have non-attainment status in terms of air

quality. Funds are allocated to State and regional MPOs who determine how funds should be spent. Eligible projects include public transit improvements; employer-based transportation management plans and incentives; traffic flow improvement programs (signal coordination); bicycle and pedestrian facilities; flexible work-hour programs; and outreach activities establishing Transportation Management Associations (TMAs). Information is available at: www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/STPCMAQ/stp-cmaq-tea.htm.

2. Federal Community Development Block Grant Program

The Federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program provides annual grants on a formula basis to entitled cities, urban counties and states to develop viable urban communities by providing decent housing and a suitable living environment, and by expanding economic opportunities, principally for low- and moderate-income persons. Grants are generally administered through state bodies, although cities are generally responsible for issuing calls for appropriate projects. Grantees may use CDBG funds for activities that include (but are not limited to): acquiring real property; reconstructing or rehabilitating housing and other property; building public facilities and improvements, such as streets, sidewalks, community and senior citizen centers and recreational facilities; paying for planning and administrative expenses, such as costs related to developing a Consolidated Plan and managing CDBG funds; provide public services for youths, seniors, or the disabled; and initiatives such as neighborhood watch programs. Information is available at: and at www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/about/staff/fodirectors/9/ad.cfm.

E. Recreational Trails Programs

1. San Francisco Bay Trail

The Bay Trail Project, in partnership with the State Coastal Conservancy, offers competitive grants to local governments, special districts and qualified

non-profit groups to build or design new Bay Trail segments. Grant funds are targeted to projects that complete Bay Trail gaps, provide strong leverage with local and in-kind matching contributions, demonstrate partnerships, encourage creative solutions and employ the California Conservation Corps. Information about the grant program is available at: baytrail.abag.ca.gov/grants05.html.

2. Bay Area Ridge Trail Council

The Bay Area Ridge Trail Council plans, promotes, and constructs the Bay Area Ridge Trail, a 400-mile multi-use trail connecting parks and preserved open spaces along the ridgelines surrounding California's San Francisco Bay. The Ridge Trail Council receives funding through the state Coastal Conservancy's Bay Area Program, Proposition 40 funds and direct contributions from members. These funds are used to bridge gaps in the trail often in partnership with local land management agencies, including cities and counties. The Ridge Trail Council does not maintain a formal grant program. However, they may make small direct grants for signage or other similar projects and contribute the staff time of an expert trail builder to help plan, design and build segments of the trail. Additionally, in stances where local land management agencies wish to acquire land or build portions of the Bay Area Ridge Trail, the Council may be willing to partner on grant proposals to fund the projects and to assist in planning and construction. Information is available at www.ridgetrail.org.

3. San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy Program

The San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy Program (Bay Program), administered by the Coastal Conservancy, may award grants to: (1) protect, restore, and enhance natural habitats and other open-space resources of regional significance throughout the nine-county area; (2) improve public access and related facilities to and around the Bay, its surrounding hills, and the coast, through completion of bay, coast, and ridge trails that are part of a regional trail system; and (3) promote projects that provide open space that is

accessible to urban populations for recreational and educational purposes. Information is available at: www.scc.ca.gov.

4. Coastal Conservancy Non-Profit Grants Program

The Coastal Conservancy provides grants to land trusts, non-profits and government agencies to fund projects in line with the goals of California's Coastal Act, the San Francisco Bay Plan, and the San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy. Some examples include construction of trails and other public access facilities, restoration of public piers and urban waterfronts. Information is available at:

www.coastalconservancy.ca.gov/Programs/pandp.htm

APPENDIX B

PLANNING DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

This Appendix provides a list of the planning documents consulted for this study. It only lists the types of planning documents reviewed for this report, including:

- ◆ General Plans
- ◆ Pedestrian and Combined Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plans
- ◆ Neighborhood Plans
- ◆ Transit Agency Efforts
- ◆ ADA Transition Plans
- ◆ Local Capital Improvement Programs
- ◆ Countywide Transportation Planning Efforts
- ◆ Pedestrian Safety and Engineering Studies

Additional reference works including research papers, position pieces and other background documents may have been consulted as well.

A. *General Plans*

- ◆ *Eden Area General Plan*, Alameda County Board of Supervisors, Draft General Plan to be released May 2005
- ◆ *Envision Oakland: City of Oakland General Plan Land Use and Transportation Element*, City of Oakland, 1998
- ◆ *San Jose 2020 General Plan*, City of San Jose, Adopted November 1994, Last amended May 2005
- ◆ *Berkeley General Plan*, City of Berkeley, December 2001
- ◆ *Town of Danville 2010 General Plan*, Town of Danville, August 1999
- ◆ *City of Petaluma General Plan*, City of Petaluma, Update Underway as of April 2005
- ◆ *Novato General Plan*, City of Novato, 1996, Amended 2003
- ◆ *San Francisco General Plan*, City of San Francisco, June 1996

- ◆ *City Of Alameda General Plan*, City of Alameda, 1991
- ◆ *City of Dublin General Plan*, City of Dublin, 2002 updated
- ◆ *Hayward General Plan*, City of Hayward, 2002
- ◆ *2003 General Plan*, City of Livermore, 2003
- ◆ *2003 General Plan Update*, City of Calistoga, October 2003

B. Pedestrian/Combined Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plans

- ◆ *City of Petaluma Bicycle Plan*, City of Petaluma, Under Revision as of May 2005
- ◆ *Contra Costa County Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan*, Contra Costa Transportation Authority, December 2003
- ◆ *Pedestrian Master Plan*, City of Oakland, November 2002
- ◆ *Solano Countywide Pedestrian Plan*, Solano Transportation Authority, October 2004
- ◆ *Emeryville Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan 1998-2010*, City of Emeryville, July 1998
- ◆ *San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan*, City of San Leandro, November 2004
- ◆ *Berkeley Bicycle Plan Draft for Inclusion in the General Plan*, City of Berkeley, December 1998
- ◆ *City of San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan*, City of San Rafael, February 2002
- ◆ *Fremont Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan*, City of Fremont, October 2002
- ◆ *Fremont Bicycle Master Plan*, City of Fremont, March 2005

- ◆ *City of Livermore Bikeways and Trails Master Plan*, City of Livermore, December 2001, Amended December 2002
- ◆ *City of Petaluma Bicycle Plan*, City of Petaluma, August 2000
- ◆ *Berkeley Pedestrian Plan*, City of Berkeley, Underway as of April 2005
- ◆ *Marin County Bike and Pedestrian Master Plan*, Marin County, February 2001
- ◆ *San Francisco Pedestrian Master Plan*, City of San Francisco, Underway as of April 2005

C. *Neighborhood Plans*

- ◆ *Union City Intermodal Station District and Facility Plan*, City of Union City in collaboration with BART and AC Transit, September 2001
- ◆ *Application for Renewing Chinatown Transportation for Livable Communities Grant*, City of Oakland, July 2004
- ◆ *Danville Downtown Master Plan*, Town of Danville, November 1986
- ◆ *Downtown Design Guidelines and Ordinance*, Town of Danville, 1984
- ◆ *Coyote Valley Specific Plan*, City of San Jose, February 2006 before city council
- ◆ *San Jose Downtown Streetscapes Master Plan*, San Jose Redevelopment Agency, October 2003
- ◆ *Bay Meadows Specific Plan*, City of San Mateo, 1997
- ◆ *Strong Neighborhood Initiative (SNI) and Neighborhood Business Districts*, San Jose Redevelopment Agency, On-Going
- ◆ *Crow Canyon Specific Plan*, City of San Ramon, August 2004
- ◆ *North Burlingame/Rollins Road Specific Plan*, City of Burlingame, September 2004

D. Transit Agency Efforts

- ◆ *Designing with Transit: Making Transit Integral to East Bay Communities*, Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit), 2004
- ◆ *BART Station Access Guidelines*, Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART), April 2003
- ◆ *BART Transit- Oriented Development Guidelines*, BART, June 2003
- ◆ *BART Strategic Plan*, BART, 1999, updated 2003
- ◆ *Caltrain 2004- 2023 Strategic Plan*, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain), 2004
- ◆ *LAVTA Short Range Transit Plan 2004*, Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority (LAVTA), September 2003
- ◆ *A Vision for Rapid Transit in San Francisco*, San Francisco Municipal Railway (MUNI), N/A
- ◆ *Interim Short Range Transit Plan FY 2003/04 – 2012/13*, San Mateo County Transit District, September 2004
- ◆ *Transit-Oriented Development and Pedestrian-Oriented Design Policy Policy Background*, Sonoma-Marín Area Rail Transit, June 2004
- ◆ *Transportation and Land Use Toolkit*, Solano Transportation Authority, Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District and Yolo County Transportation District, April, 2003
- ◆ *Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Program*, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, On-Going
- ◆ *Dublin/Pleasanton Bart Station Access Plan*, Bay Area Rapid Transit Planning Department, August 2002

- ◆ *Fruitvale Bart Station Access Plan*, Bay Area Rapid Transit Planning Department, August 2002
- ◆ *West Oakland Bart Station Access Plan*, Bay Area Rapid Transit Planning Department, August 2002
- ◆ *Pleasant Hill Bart Station Access Plan*, Bay Area Rapid Transit Planning Department, August 2002
- ◆ *Coliseum/Oakland Airport Bart Station Access Plan*, Bay Area Rapid Transit Planning Department, August 2002
- ◆ *Petaluma-Corona Station Concept Plan*, Sonoma-Marín Area Rail Transit, October 2003

E. ADA Transition Plans

- ◆ *The Americans with Disabilities Act Title II Technical Assistance Manual Covering State and Local Government Programs and Services*, US Department of Justice, N/A
- ◆ *Code of Federal Regulations Excerpt from 28 CFR Part 36: ADA Standards for Accessible Design*, Department of Justice, Revised as of July 1, 1994
- ◆ *Napa Valley College ADA Transition Plan*, Napa Valley College,
- ◆ *Contra Costa County ADA Transition Plan*, Contra Costa County, August 2004

F. Pedestrian Safety and Engineering Studies

- ◆ *Main Streets: Flexibility in Design & Operations*, California Department of Transportation, January 2005
- ◆ *Marin County Safe Routes to School Program Evaluation*, Marin County Bicycle Coalition, 2004

- ◆ *Evaluation of Pedestrian Scramble in Oakland, CA*, University of California Berkeley, Traffic Safety Center, December 2003
- ◆ *MTC Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety TAP - Final Program Summary*, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, December 2004
- ◆ *An Enforcement and Engineering Analysis of Traffic Safety Programs*, City of Millbrae, August 2003

G. County-Wide Transportation Plans

- ◆ *Contra Costa Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan*, Contra Costa transportation Authority, Updated 2000
- ◆ *2004 Transportation Expenditure Plan*, San Mateo County Transportation Authority, 2004
- ◆ *2003 Marin County Congestion Management Program*, Marin County Congestion Management Agency, January 2004
- ◆ *Transportation Sales Tax Ordinance "Traffic Relief Plan for Solano County"* Ordinance No. 2004-01, Solano Transportation Improvement Authority, July 2004
- ◆ *Measure A Fact Sheet*, San Mateo County Transportation Authority, N/A
- ◆ *Draft Solano Comprehensive Transportation Plan*, Solano Transportation Improvement Authority, January 2005