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Agenda

Welcome, Meet & Greet
1 - Committee Effectiveness
2 - Committee Efficiency
3 - Bicycle Facilities
4 – Going Forward
Wrap-up, final Q&A
Introduction

• Welcome
  Amelia Conlen, Chair
  Thomas Travers, Staff Liaison

• Opening
  Amelia Conlen

• Announcements and Overview
  Thomas Travers

• Committee History
  Rick Hyman, Member
Introduction

Committee History - Rick Hyman

• Founding
• Past Work
• Successes
Committee Effectiveness
Advocates, Advisors, and Staff

- **Advocate (noun):**
  “a person who pleads for a cause or propounds an idea”

- **Advisor (noun):**
  “an expert who gives advice”

- **Staff (noun):**
  “a group of persons, as employees, charged with carrying out the work of an establishment or executing some undertaking”
Public Process - Roles

- Officials: Approve, strategize, listen
- Staff: Plan, review, implement, maintain
- Advisors: Understand, advise
- Advocates: Campaign, educate, promote
- Public: Travel, provide input
Committee Process

- Meetings
- Activities between meetings (subject to Brown Act)
Committee Process

• Activities between meetings (subject to Brown Act)
  – Subcommittees
  – Researching / educating
  – Individual contacts (public, leaders, other city staff - project tracking)
  – Being proactive with staff, while recognizing the time and budget constraints of RTC bicycle planning
Member Skills

- Packet reading (staff reports)
  - In advance, not at meeting
  - Ask questions of staff before meeting date
- Plan reading
- Perspective
  - Long-term, “collegial” (don’t burn bridges)
  - Public interest (vs. single-issue)
  - “Ambassadorship”
Break
Committee Efficiency

- Makeup
- Chair’s Role
- Subgroups
  - Subcommittees, Working Groups, Ad-Hoc Committees
- Work Program
- Relationships
The Chair’s Role

- Provide input to staff on agenda
- Run meetings
  - Schedule / time allotment / sequence
  - Formal rules (Rosenberg’s Rules of Order)
  - Informal rules (decorum / courtesy / civility)
- Facilitate
  - Entertain motions, guide refinement
- Compose letters to outside agencies on behalf of Committee
Committee Member Role

- Share updates from your jurisdiction
- Maintain relationship with your Public Works staff
- Subcommittee or Ad-Hoc Committee work
Rosenberg’s Rules of Order

- Quorum
- Chair’s Role
- The “Floor”
- Agenda Item Discussion
- Motions, Seconds, Amendments, Withdrawal
- Discussion / Debate
- Calling the Question
- Voting, Counting Votes
Committee Work - 1

- Review grant applications
- Review projects
  - Unincorporated county, city, countywide
- Review plans
  - General, Bicycle / Active Transportation, Specific
  - Objectives, Goals, Policies, Action Statements
Committee Work - 2

• Respond to opportunities and threats
  – Reactive (fix, avoid)
  – Proactive (policies, relationships)

• Promote Bike Week & safety education
  – RTC funds these programs
  – Committee has seats for Ecology Action’s BTW program and CTSC
Notable Past Projects Reviewed

- Contra-flow bike lane on Pacific Avenue
- Bicycle wayfinding signage
- Arana Gulch bike path
- Branciforte Creek bridge and other levee projects along SLR
- Watsonville slough trails
- Hwy 1 path to Wilder Ranch
- Multiple bike lane projects
Relationships - 1

- **Agencies**
  - Public Works, Planning, Parks, Law Enforcement
  - County HSA (CTSC, South County Bike & Ped Work Group)
  - Santa Cruz (City) Transp. & Public Works Commission
  - Caltrans District 5

- **Officials and Boards**
  - Supervisors, RTC

- **Other County Advisory Groups (peers)**
  - TAMC
  - Bay Area (VTA, San Mateo CO, SF, Alameda CO)
Committee Work

Bicycle Advisory Committee

- List of Projects Proposed for RTC-discretionary funding (RTIP)
  - "Every 2 years Recommend"
- Regional Transport Plan (RTP)
  - Policies/Programs/Projects
  - Every 4 years Recommend
- Other RTC Plans/Studies/Programs
  - Hwy 9/SLV Plan
  - MBSST Plan
  - Etc.
  - Advise & Recommend
- Funding & Grant Priorities
  - Assist & Advise
- Advocate for the public, identify needs
- Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBST) Network
  - Advise & Review
- RTC Staff & RTC Board
- Local Jurisdictions
- TDA, RTC-Funded, Regional-Scale Projects
  - Advise & Review
- Small Locally-Funded Projects
  - OPTIONAL review
- RTC-Funded Programs
  - Advise & Review
- Local Bike Plans & Policies
  - OPTIONAL review

Bicycle Advisory Committee

SCCRTC
Relationships - 2

- Local Advocacy
- Bicycle Retailers
  - Shop visits, flyers
  - Group rides
- Educators
  - SR2S, School Safety, CTSC
- The Committee itself (gatherings, retreats)
- "You are an Ambassador"
Joe Simitian’s Tips for Advocates

1. Develop a relationship before you arrive
2. Understand what motivates your audience
3. Understand what is possible and what is not
4. Find a Floor Manager
5. Tell me what you want (prerequisite: know what you want)
6. Tell me why I should care (as an elected representative and fiscal manager)
Joe Simitian’s Tips for Advocates

7. Bring me solutions, not problems
8. Describe the elements of a solution rather than insisting on your solution
9. Do not chastise, insult, or threaten
10. Understand that sometimes less (public comment) is more
11. Layer your campaign
12. 90% is just showing up
Bicycle Facilities

Bicycle Committee Effectiveness and Efficiency
October 7, 2019
Bicycle Facilities

- Envisioning
- Planning
- Funding
- Designing
- Building
- Operating / Maintaining
Bicycle Facilities - Envisioning

- Individuals
- Community
- Charrettes
- Committee
Facilities - Studies and Plans

- **Types of Plans**
  - General, Specific, Master ("Active Transportation Plan"), Corridor, Development, Feasibility Study

- **Adoption process**

- **Update cycles and requirements**
  - Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA)
  - Other
Current Local & State Planning Documents

- City of Santa Cruz
  - Active Transportation Plan (2017)
- Local jurisdiction Bicycle Plans
  - Adopted between 2008 and 2012
- State of California
  - State Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan (2017)
  - District 5 Active Transportation Plan
Facilities – Funding Sources

- **Federal / State**
  - **Regional Surface Transp. Program (RSTP)** - allocated by RTC
    - $10M of FY19-FY21 funds allocated by formula to cities/county
    - $350K available on competitive basis to non-city/non-county entities
  - **Active Transportation Program (ATP)**
    - Includes SB1, Federal TAP, and state highway funds (previously SRTS and Bicycle Transportation Account)
    - Selected by CTC
  - **State Highway Operations (“SHOPP”)**
    - Selected by Caltrans and CTC
    - Focus: Maintenance and safety on state highways
  - **FLAP – Federal Lands Access Program**
    - Funding Rail Trail Segment 5
  - **Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)**
Facilities – Funding Sources

- State
  - State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)
    - Nominated by RTC
  - SB1 (Senate Bill 1)
    - Local Streets / Roads
    - Congested Corridors
    - Local Partnership Program (match to Measure D)
Facilities – Funding Sources

• Regional
  - Transportation Development Act ("TDA") Article 3
    • Local Transportation Fund / LTF = $\frac{3}{8}$ of state sales tax on gasoline
  - AB2766
    • Air Quality
    • Currently not for bike projects (may change)

• County
  - Measure D Countywide Sales Tax

• Cities
  - General Fund / Capital Improvement Program ("CIP")
  - Developer assessments
  - Maintenance
Example of a Construction Plan

(Review)
Bicycle Facilities - Designing

- Conceptual (planning-level)
- Refinement
  - 10%, 30%, 65%, 90%
  - 100% (construction documents / “bid package”)
- Constraints at each stage
  - ROW
  - Stakeholders
  - Environmental / Riparian / Historic / Archeological
Bicycle Facilities - Building

- Composition of a Plan Set (types of sheets)
  - Title Page, Sheet Index, Existing, Demolition, Landscape/planting, Electrical, Pavement Delineation, Signage

- Construction documents vs. “As-Builts”

- Views
  - Plan (top), Elevation (side, end), Section
  - Details and callouts
Policy Documents

• Streets and Highways Code (“SHC”)
  – Defines bikeways, expresses Legislature’s intent
• California Vehicle Code (“CVC”)
• Caltrans Deputy Directive 64 Revision 1
  – “Complete Streets – Integrating the Transportation System” (a.k.a. “Routine Accommodation”)
• Local resources for bicycle transportation
  – sccrtc.org/services/bike
  – cruz511.org/bike
Manuals and Guidebooks - 1

- AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities
- Caltrans Highway Design Manual (HDM) [Paths: Ch. 1000]
- FHWA Separated Bike Lane Planning & Design Guide 2015
- MUTCD (California 2014, FHWA 2009)
- California Vehicle Code - Bicycle sections
- Caltrans Complete Intersections 2010
- MassDOT Separated Bike Lane Planning & Design Guide
  - 2015. Protected Intersections
- Alta “Evolution of the Protected Intersection”, 2015
Manuals and Guidebooks - 2

- NACTO.org (*National Association of City Transportation Officials*)
  - Urban Bikeway Design Guide
  - Urban Street Design Guide

- IBPI (*Portland State U. – Initiative for Bicycle & Pedestrian Innovation*)
  - Bicycle Boulevard Planning and Design Guidebook
  - Master Planning Guidebook

- APBP Bicycle Parking Handbook

- Tactical Urbanist’s Guide to Materials and Design
  - (*StreetPlans Collaborative*)
Bikeways: Typology & Terminology

- **Shared Use Path**
  - Caltrans “Class I Bikeway”
  - Includes mode-separated segments, a.k.a. “twinned paths”

- **Bike Lane**
  - Caltrans “Class II Bikeway”
  - Includes buffered bike lanes

- **Signed Shared Roadway**
  - Caltrans “Class III Bikeway”

- **Cycle Track, a.k.a. Separated Bike Lane**
  - 1-way or 2-way
  - No pedestrians, unlike SUP / Class I
  - Caltrans “Class IV Bikeway”
Bikeway Typology, continued

- **Bicycle Boulevard / Neighborhood Greenway**
  - Signed Shared Roadway with bike priority
    - Motor traffic volume strongly limited, speed calmed
    - STOP sign use minimized in Boulevard direction
    - Parallel to busier street(s) with bike destinations
    - All properties remain accessible to motor traffic
    - Pioneers: Palo Alto, Berkeley

- **Protected Intersection ("Dutch Junction")**
  - Corners: set-forward bike & ped refuges
  - "Cross-bikes" adjacent to crosswalks
  - Support 2-stage left turns via crossbikes

- **Two-Stage-Turn Queuing Box ("Turn Box")**

- Bicycle Signal
Thinking Outside the Box

• Planning-level exceptions
• Design exceptions
• Experimental treatments
  – Experimentation process (FHWA, CTCDC)
• “Innovative treatments”
• Temporary / “pop-up” demonstration facilities (“Tactical Urbanism”)
California Vehicle Code

- Structure
- Definitions
- Key sections applicable to bicyclists
  - 21200
  - 21202, 21208: Riding away from right edge
- Speed Law
  - Limit setting
  - Basic speed law
Two-Stage Turn Queue Box
(“Turn Box”)

Cycle Track Buffer Configuration

Parking Lane Configuration

Crosswalk Setback Configuration
Wider corner radii, set back pedestrian crossing, and/or narrowed bikeway space, provides opportunity for queue box.

T-intersection Parking Lane Configuration

T-Intersection “Jughandle” Sidewalk Configuration

Figures: NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide
Two-Stage Turn Queue Box
San Francisco (Market at 10th St / Polk / Fell)

1. Approach (EB Market)
   Right turn lane “shadows” box

2. Looking back toward approach

3. Looking toward destination after the turn (Polk St)

4. Destination: “contraflow” bike lane with bike signal
Two-Stage Turn Queue Boxes
San Francisco – Market at 10th St / Polk / Fell

- Polk bikes OK
- Bike signal
- Streetcar tracks

- Market
- Fell
- 10th St
1-Way Cycle Track: SF Folsom St

Parking-buffered (note door buffer)

Parking becomes RT lane on left (bike signal ahead)

Bus boarding island

Parking then RT lane on right with “early entry” yield
2-Way Cycle Track: Alameda (Shoreline Dr)

- Bus boarding island
- Raised crosswalk
- Bikes wait here to cross
Protected Intersection ("Dutch Junction")

- Corner Refuge Island
- Forward Bicycle Queuing Area
- Motorist Yield Zone
- Pedestrian Crossing Island
- Pedestrian Crossing of Separated Bike Lane
- Pedestrian Curb Ramp
Massachusetts DOT Separated Bike Lane Planning & Design Guide

Elements & key geometry

- **Approach Taper**
- **Setback Bicycle Crossing**
- **Pedestrian Safety Island**
- **Corner Apron**
- **Corner Safety Island**
- **Signal Operations**
- **Forward Stop Bar**
- **Yield to Pedestrians**

**Crossing Setback**
19.5 ft preferred if conflicting turning movements are allowed.

**Corner Radius**
20 ft or greater based on control vehicle.

**Apron Radius**
If applicable, 10-20 ft based on passenger car turning speed.

**Bicycle Queuing**
8 x 6.5 ft Preferred

**Pedestrian Island**
6.5 - 14 ft

**Approach Taper**
For smooth transition to setback crossing.
Protected Intersection - Example
(Rotterdam, Netherlands)
“Pop-up” demonstrations ("Tactical Urbanism")

TACTICAL URBANIST’S GUIDE TO MATERIALS AND DESIGN

RECLAIMING THE RIGHT OF WAY

A Toolkit for Creating and Implementing Parklets

BARRIER ELEMENTS • PG 27

LANDSCAPING ELEMENTS • PG 66

SURFACE TREATMENTS • PG 45

SIGNS • PG 72

STREET FURNITURE • PG 59

PROGRAMMING • PG 80
Pop-up example: Protected Intersection (Minneapolis, Alta)

Protected Bike Lane
Pop-up protected bike lane created with astro turf and homemade planters leads up to the intersection (spec sheet pages 68 - 69)

Barrier Element
Insulation panels cut to the shape of medians and painted gray to look like concrete create low-cost barrier elements to define the protected intersection.

Surface Treatments
Chalk arrows direct people biking around the protected intersection, helping illustrate how it is used. Tar paper crosswalks demonstrate high visibility crosswalks.
Break
Going Forward
Local Projects
(see handout list)
Goals & Actions

- **Goals for the Committee?**
  - (Relative to its mission)

- **What would you like to work on?**
  - Individually
  - Subgroups / task forces
Adjournment
Questions?