

APPENDIX

D

STAKEHOLDER MEETING LISTENING SESSION NOTES





Caltrans Bay Area Bike Highway Study

Stakeholder Meeting: SR 116

Tuesday, November 2nd, 2021 – 3:00-4:00pm

Teleconference

Time	Topic	By
3:00	<p>Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review Attendees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dana Turrey, SCTA - Eris Weaver, SCBC - Ken Tam, Sonoma County Parks - JP Harries, City of Cotati - Steven Schmitz, Sonoma County Transit - Janice Thompson, County of Sonoma 	All
3:05	<p>Bike Highway Study Overview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background and objectives • Design best practices and outreach • Suitability and feasibility analyses 	Caltrans
3:10	<p>Case Study Conceptual Design Task</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Six case study corridors and focus areas chosen based on typical land use and roadway typologies. NOTE: these are not necessarily project proposals. • Task objective: develop illustrative concepts applicable to a range of corridors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The typology for this corridor is “rural unconstrained” ○ Similar State Highway Corridors include SR 130 in Santa Clara County, SR 84 in San Mateo County, and SR 12 in Sonoma County • Informed by public survey 	Caltrans
3:15	<p>Plan and Project Consistency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conceptual designs should incorporate the local vision for bicycle transportation. • Which plans, projects, studies, etc. should the concept be consistent with? • Are there other outcomes from local planning that we should keep in mind (i.e. attitude towards parking removal, difficult property owners, etc.) • W Cotati Ave intersection to be relocated 50-100 ft to the east to be squared up. Traffic signal to be installed • Fields on the north side of 116 will be developed with housing developments • US 101 interchange major barrier – most bikers use tunnel south of US 	Partner Orgs

	<p>101 and informal path</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planned Class II on W Cotati Ave. • Ken Tam: more site constraints at other locations. Not the most representative chunk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stony Point road area ○ Show curved areas – rural properties (homes and businesses) with driveways ○ Gossage Creek Trail to Stony Point Rd road as alternate focus area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Showing separated bridge over Greek, Gossage Creek trail connection at Derby cul-de-sac, Stony Point Rd intersection 	
<p style="text-align: center;">3:35</p>	<p>Design Elements/Considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concepts will be based on Design Best Practices. • The purpose of this concept is to illustrate the following design elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rural class I BH ○ Class I interchange treatments ○ Connections with local bikeways • Where specifically should these design elements be applied within the focus area? • What other design elements should the case study include? • Heavy truck traffic: show trucks in rendering? • Transit considerations: one route along the corridor. Some bus stops within the focus area need to be improved. Two of both WB and EB bus stops within area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Steven to share the standards and guidance to reference • Environmental considerations: endangered species in grassland (make note of this in description?) • Crossing needs: show Redwood Drive and W Cotati Ave intersection improvements 	<p style="text-align: center;">Partner Orgs</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">3:55</p>	<p>Next steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft concept development: now-Dec • Feedback on concepts: January-Feb • Final concepts: March 	<p style="text-align: center;">Caltrans</p>



Caltrans Bay Area Bike Highway Study
Stakeholder Meeting: El Camino Real (SR 82)
Thursday, November 4th, 2021– 3:30-4:30pm
Teleconference

Time	Topic	By
11:00	<p>Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review</p> <p>Attendees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sergio • Elliot • Clarrissa Cabansagan SVBC • Kaki Cheung, C/CAG • Michael Smith, San Bruno • Andrew Kin, San Bruno 	All
11:05	<p>Bike Highway Study Overview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background and objectives • Design best practices and outreach • Suitability and feasibility analyses 	Caltrans
11:10	<p>Case Study Conceptual Design Task</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Six case study corridors and focus areas chosen based on typical land use and roadway typologies. NOTE: these are not necessarily project proposals. • Task objective: develop illustrative concepts applicable to a range of corridors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Urban unconstrained Class IV typology ○ Similar corridors to highlight: ALA/CC 123, SM/SCL 82 (other segments, SM 84) • Informed by public survey (and focus group workshop) 	Caltrans
11:15	<p>Plan and Project Consistency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conceptual designs should incorporate the local vision for bicycle transportation. • Which plans, projects, studies, etc. should the concept be consistent with? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ San Bruno Walk ‘n Bike Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ WB I-380 on-ramp realignment ○ C/CAG BPMP and San Bruno General Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Both designate ECR as a “pedestrian focus area” – i.e. the concept should be particularly mindful of ped/bike interactions • Are there other outcomes from local planning that we should keep in mind (i.e. attitude towards parking removal, difficult property owners, etc.) 	Partner Orgs

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Need for lighting in this area, especially under the I-380 undercrossing ○ Discussions around public art throughout the city – it would be nice to show art under the undercrossing as well ○ Major redevelopment of Tanforan Mall upcoming (TOD). This may result in realignment of Tanforan Way, so the concept shouldn't reflect any proposed changes (i.e. concept should illustrate existing conditions) ○ Travel lane removal may be an issue. Avoid removal of travel lane for 3-lane portion if at all possible (sidewalk-level bikeway?). Should be okay to look at realignment where the roadway widens at approach to Tanforan Way. ○ Class IV under development on Huntington Ave – reference this on example wayfinding signs, if included? ● General comment: C/CAG is looking for “transformative projects” to fund and are interested in bike highways for a longer segment of ECR as a candidate. 	
<p>11:35</p>	<p>Design Elements/Considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Concepts will be based on Design Best Practices. ● The purpose of this concept is to illustrate the following design elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Class IV along high-speed/volume roadways ○ Freeway interchange treatments, including ramp realignment ○ Travel lane removal ○ Intersection improvements ○ Intelligent transportation system features ○ Comment: the other conventional highway concepts (29 and 185) should reference other segments of ECR that are similar. ● Where specifically should these design elements be applied within the focus area? ● What other design elements should the case study include? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lighting, art (see above) ○ The concept should be mindful of intended user (mall worker, commuter?). The bikeway should encourage people who are not currently comfortable biking to bike. Can this be accomplished with at-grade facility and “conventional” BH elements? If not, then perhaps an elevated bikeway is appropriate for the freeway ramp crossings. How to go “above and beyond” should be highlighted regardless – highlight how we’re attracting ridership! Challenge is how to balance local access in a design like this. ○ Connections to local facilities (the mall, most likely) 	<p>Partner Orgs</p>

11:55	Next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Draft concept development: now-Dec• Feedback on concepts: January-Feb• Final concepts: March	Caltrans
--------------	--	----------



Caltrans Bay Area Bike Highway Study

Stakeholder Meeting: SR 4

Monday, November 8th, 2021 – 1:00-2:00pm

Teleconference

Time	Topic	By
11:00	<p>Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review</p> <p>Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elliot • Mauricio • Sergio • Kamala Parks, BART • Heath Maddox, BART • Winnie Chung, Concord • Colin Clarke, CCTA • Stephanie Hu, CCTA • Robert Sarmiento, Contra Costa County • Monish Sen, Contra Costa County • Gina Haynes, Pittsburg • Jordan Davis, Pittsburg • Nhat Phan, Pittsburg • Ole Ohlson, Bike East Bay • Devan Reiff, East Bay Parks 	All
11:05	<p>Bike Highway Study Overview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background and objectives • Design best practices and outreach • Suitability and feasibility analyses 	Caltrans
11:10	<p>Case Study Conceptual Design Task</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Six case study corridors and focus areas chosen based on typical land use and roadway typologies. NOTE: these are not necessarily project proposals. • Task objective: develop illustrative concepts applicable to a range of corridors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The typology for this corridor is “rural/suburban freeway-adjacent” ○ Similar corridors include SCL 237 and ALA 580 • Informed by public survey and focus group workshop 	Caltrans

<p>11:15</p>	<p>Plan and Project Consistency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conceptual designs should incorporate the local vision for bicycle transportation. • Which plans, projects, studies, etc. should the concept be consistent with? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project at South ramps and BART access ramp at South leg of Bailey Rd intersection. Affordable housing/mixed use development there. ○ Delta de Anza trail connection to the planned BART access improvements EB ramp intersection ○ Bailey Rd Class IV (Kamala shared plans via email) ○ MTC and CCTA developed SR4 Design Alternative Assessment (DAA) to assess the potential of Managed Lanes on SR4. This is nearing completion. ○ CCTA is interested in developing a vision study for the SR4 corridor that includes operational improvements and multimodal elements. ○ CCTA is also working on an East County Integrated Transit Study, to be completed in 2022. ○ https://eastcountyttransit.com ○ North Concord to Antioch BART Access Study found at https://www.bart.gov/about/planning/station-access/eastcocoaccess ○ North Concord Specific Plan (in process, led by Concord): https://www.concordreuseproject.org/157/Specific-Plan ○ The County is in the process of entitling a mixed-use affordable housing development (called Ambrose Village) at the southeast quadrant of the eastbound SR-4 ramps/BART Access Road/Bailey Road/Delta De Anza Trail intersection. The County , along with other stakeholders, would like to see a more robust bike/ped crossing at the intersection. Looking into possibly applying for a future round of AHSC funds, or possibly another grant program to fund the crossing improvements. Want to make sure we coordinate with Caltrans on potential improvements to that intersection. • Are there other outcomes from local planning that we should keep in mind (i.e. attitude towards parking removal, difficult property owners, etc.) 	<p>Partner Orgs</p>
<p>11:35</p>	<p>Design Elements/Considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concepts will be based on Design Best Practices. • The purpose of this concept is to illustrate the following design elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Transit connections ○ Sound/pollution barriers ○ Cantilever bridge treatments ○ Connections to regional bikeways • Where specifically should these design elements be applied within the focus area? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Willow Pass to San Marco – current trail on north side of the highway (CT R/W) ○ Contra Costa Canal R/W between Willow Pass and Bailey Rd 	<p>Partner Orgs</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Look at Canal alignment under the Bailey Rd ramp ○ Naval Weapons Station planning area – lots of activity in the planning stage, including higher education campus and office space. Argument for the south side alignment ○ if we’re not utilizing existing facilities, there’s an argument for the South side of the SR 4 corridor. Direct access to BART. ○ Project vicinity map should be revised to include connectivity to/from the entire cloverleaf? (east of Bailey Road). All participants concurred. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What other design elements should the case study include? 	
<p>11:55</p>	<p>Next steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft concept development: now-Dec • Feedback on concepts: January-Feb • Final concepts: March 	<p>Caltrans</p>



Caltrans Bay Area Bike Highway Study

Stakeholder Meeting: SR 29

Monday, November 8th, 2021 – 3:30-4:30pm

Teleconference

Time	Topic	By
3:30	<p>Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review</p> <p>Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elliot • Sergio • Mauricio • Diana Meehan, NVTA • Lee Huo, Bay Trail • Toshi Shepard-Ohto, MTC • Brent Rosenwald, STA • David Belef, STA BAC • Phillip Sales, Vine Trail • Mark Helmbrecht, Vallejo 	All
3:35	<p>Bike Highway Study Overview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background and objectives • Design best practices and outreach • Suitability and feasibility analyses 	Caltrans
3:40	<p>Case Study Conceptual Design Task</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Six case study corridors and focus areas chosen based on typical land use and roadway typologies. NOTE: these are not necessarily project proposals. • Task objective: develop illustrative concepts applicable to a range of corridors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The typology for this corridor is “suburban unconstrained” ○ Similar highway corridors include SR 12 in Sonoma County and SR 84 in San Mateo County • Informed by public survey 	Caltrans

3:45	<p>Plan and Project Consistency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conceptual designs should incorporate the local vision for bicycle transportation. • Which plans, projects, studies, etc. should the concept be consistent with? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Vine Trail isn't a "recreational facility" – connects communities ○ Bay Trail/Vine Trail project: these projects complement each other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Connectivity from Wilson Ave to American Canyon ▪ Watson Ranch ○ Bay Trail splits off here along Meadows drive ○ SR 29 is sterile – who is the audience we're trying to serve? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Commute users vs. local users ○ SHOPP project will add bike lanes south of the project area ○ Vallejo has been granted \$17k for Vine Trail wayfinding signs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Plans and comments from those plans for corridor are still available ○ • Are there other outcomes from local planning that we should keep in mind (i.e. attitude towards parking removal, difficult property owners, etc.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary reason for deviating from SON 29 at this segment was the railroad track crossing: lots of challenges for this segment ○ High-speed ramp crossings as well ○ Flood potential is seasonal and significant ○ Unhoused population: something to consider and keep in mind. BATC to put together a talk on topic. ○ 	Partner Orgs
4:05	<p>Design Elements/Considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concepts will be based on Design Best Practices. • The purpose of this concept is to illustrate the following design elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Transition from Class IV to Class I bikeway ○ BH under a structure ○ Interaction with commercial areas ○ Interaction with trails – commute function of BH • Where specifically should these design elements be applied within the focus area? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ West side has issues because of sound walls <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would have done boardwalk through marsh to housing development ▪ Was nixed because of environmental concerns ○ Median alignment? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hasn't been studied ▪ Challenges from Caltrans perspective – not a standard ▪ DDI at Fairgrounds Drive includes center-running bikeway • What other design elements should the case study include? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ General Bay Trail concept – accommodate pedestrians <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This is a Bay Trail alignment, anywhere a BH includes 	Partner Orgs

	<p>should include pedestrians and should include clear wayfinding for the Bay Trail system vs. BH</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bay Trail network interactions as a highlight of the focus area ▪ Lighting standards should be consistent with the Bay Trial ▪ Multiple facilities that that split and then re-integrate: think about in wayfinding design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consistent signage for Vine Trail across 13 different jurisdictions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Trail courtesy signs ○ Lighting, in particular where it gets dark. ○ Accommodation for people using larger bicycles (tricycles, quad cycles, trailers, cargo bikes) ○ Radar mph speed feedback signs ○ How will you define users? Based on speed? Class of device? Have to highlight interactions between trail users. ○ From the perspective of the State and Regional Plan, these facilities would be providing an alternative to induce mode shift, not necessarily recreational trips, although they can be used (and likely preferred) by both types of users ○ NVTA Travel Behavior Study: https://www.nvta.ca.gov/travel-behavior-study 	
<p>4:25</p>	<p>Next steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft concept development: now-Dec • Feedback on concepts: January-Feb • Final concepts: March 	<p>Caltrans</p>



Caltrans Bay Area Bike Highway Study

Stakeholder Meeting: SR 185

Wednesday, November 10th, 2021 – 10:00-11:00am

Teleconference

Time	Topic	By
10:00	Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review	All
10:05	Bike Highway Study Overview <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background and objectives • Design best practices and outreach • Suitability and feasibility analyses 	Caltrans
10:10	Case Study Conceptual Design Task <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Six case study corridors and focus areas chosen based on typical land use and roadway typologies. NOTE: these are not necessarily project proposals. • Task objective: develop illustrative concepts applicable to a range of corridors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The typology for this corridor is “business-fronting urban constrained on-street bikeway” ○ Similar corridors include ALA/CC 123, SM/SCL 82, SM 84 • Informed by public survey and focus group workshop 	Caltrans
10:15	Plan and Project Consistency <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conceptual designs should incorporate the local vision for bicycle transportation. • Which plans, projects, studies, etc. should the concept be consistent with? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ San Leandro Bike Plan ○ ACTC E 14th Corridor Plan – Comments from Aleida Andrino-Chavez: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bikeway alternatives to present to local agencies for a Class IV – move to environmental clearance for San Leandro corridor ▪ San Leandro Blvd to Plaza Drive along 185 ▪ Sergio and Greg included in phase 1 ▪ Trying to implement through SHOPP CAPM (2024) ▪ Public outreach spring 2022 (March-April) 	Partner Orgs

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Up to 35% detail – issue RFP for 100% ▪ Bus improvements including bus boarding islands, far-side relocation ▪ Any potential improvements should be consistent with future BRT (i.e. maintain median) ▪ Think of this project as a way to implement an early BH example ○ Bay Fair Station Area Plan (shared by Keith Cooke before the meeting) ○ Class IV on Fairmont between 185 and Hesperian (construction 2022 – plans shared by Sheila) ○ Class IV Study on Bancroft/Williams – outreach summer 2022 • Are there other outcomes from local planning that we should keep in mind (i.e. attitude towards parking removal, difficult property owners, etc.) 	
<p>10:35</p>	<p>Design Elements/Considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concepts will be based on Design Best Practices. • The purpose of this concept is to illustrate the following design elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Driveway interactions ○ Intersection treatments ○ Bus stop interaction ○ Parking vs. travel lane removal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Keith Cooke: Parking vs. travel lane removal vs. median removal (although see note by Aleida re: BRT) -- all on the table ▪ Be clear about compromises ▪ Dave Campbell: may be able to accomplish all of bus, travel, parking, and bike lane if you remove the median ○ Interactions with small business frontage • Where specifically should these design elements be applied within the focus area? • What other design elements should the case study include? • Dave Campbell: transit improvements may be ACTC focus if not Caltrans. Transit and ped safety first and foremost above bikeway <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Bus service and pedestrian safety approach should be consistent ○ Bikeways often designed “block-by-block” but should be consistent ○ Come up with standards for basic minimums when we’re talking to the community. ○ Helps frame the conversation in a productive way – what’s the basic safety/convenient improvements for corridor approach ○ Establish consistent goals for BH network ○ “I think the expression I was looking for is “purpose and need.” Let’s land on this and stick to it while developing the best project” • Comment from all: EB Greenway is the transformative option (vs. SR 185): reference this for SR 4/680 concepts? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Look at SWG 2 meeting notes for Dave’s comments re: Greenway-like BH experience ○ Richmond Greenway as an example 	<p>Partner Orgs</p>

10:55	<p>Next steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft concept development: now-Dec • Feedback on concepts: January-Feb <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Important to coordinate outreach efforts and messaging to not confuse the public. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Likely need follow-up meeting in December to discuss this • Final concepts: March 	Caltrans

-



Caltrans Bay Area Bike Highway Study

Stakeholder Meeting: Interstate 680

Friday, November 19th, 2021 – 3:30-4:30pm
Teleconference

Time	Topic	By
3:30	Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review	All
3:35	Bike Highway Study Overview <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background and objectives • Design best practices and outreach • Suitability and feasibility analyses 	Caltrans
3:40	Case Study Conceptual Design Task <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Six case study corridors and focus areas chosen based on typical land use and roadway typologies. NOTE: these are not necessarily project proposals. • Task objective: develop illustrative concepts applicable to a range of corridors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The typology for this corridor is “urban constrained freeway-adjacent.” ○ Similar corridors include ALA 80, CC 680, and SOL 80 • Informed by public survey 	Caltrans
3:45	Plan and Project Consistency <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conceptual designs should incorporate the local vision for bicycle transportation. • Which plans, projects, studies, etc. should the concept be consistent with? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ VTA Bicycle Superhighway Implementation Plan • Are there other outcomes from local planning that we should keep in mind (i.e. attitude towards parking removal, difficult property owners, etc.) 	Partner Orgs

<p>4:05</p>	<p>Design Elements/Considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concepts will be based on Design Best Practices. • The purpose of this concept is to illustrate the following design elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Elevated bikeway ○ Constrained interchange treatments ○ Connections to regional bikeways ○ Sound/pollution barriers • Where specifically should these design elements be applied within the focus area? • What other design elements should the case study include? 	<p>Partner Orgs</p>
<p>4:25</p>	<p>Next steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft concept development: now-Dec • Feedback on concepts: January-Feb • Final concepts: March 	<p>Caltrans</p>



Caltrans Bay Area Bike Highway Study

Stakeholder Meeting: SR 4

Wednesday, April 20th, 2022 – 9:00-10:00am
Teleconference

Time	Topic	By
9:00	<p>Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review</p> <p>Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mauricio Hernandez – Senior Planning Associate, Project Manager • Libby Nachman – Assistant Project Manager • Sergio Ruiz – Complete Streets Coordinator • Gregory Currey – Active Transportation Branch Chief • Bruce Ole Ohlson – Resident • Robert Sarmiento – CCC Transportation Planning • Nhat Phan – City of Pittsburg • Amber Moran – Caltrans D4 • Kamala Parks – BART • Heath Madox – BART • Richard Abono – City of Pittsburg, Director of Public Works/City Engineer • Colin Clarke – CCTA 	All
9:05	<p>Bike Highway Study Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study team provided a quick recap of the study, goals, objectives and timeline. • Objectives (best practices with recommendations for Bay Area/CA, corridor suitability and feasibility, bike highway concepts as case studies, next steps for implementation) • Bike Highways are high quality, direct/dedicated and long-distance bikeways that accommodate high-speed and sometimes low-speed travel. • Bike Highway is an “overlay” route rather than a single facility type 	Caltrans
9:15	<p>Present Conceptual Design</p> <p>CONCEPT BOARD: https://app.conceptboard.com/board/4hms-kcad-khom-y1ab-22mn</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Typology: Suburban (low constraint) • Similar State Highway Corridors: SR 237 (Santa Clara), I-580 (Alameda) • Features showcased: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Interactions with BART corridor; ○ Planned changes in Land Use; ○ Improved interchange treatments ○ Sound/pollution barriers; ○ Connections to regional bikeways 	Alta

- Delta de Anza Trail

Comments

- Robert: Can you provide more information on the Class 1 shared use path along Bailey road? County not aware of a facility right there.
 - Sergio: Baily Road Plan includes a 12-foot sidewalk; enough width to formally designate as a class 1 path but currently a sidewalk.
- Robert: Bailey Road north of SR4 County is constructing a two-way cycletrack on north side. Who turns the project into a class 1?
 - Sergio: Could sign the sidewalk as Class 1, could add to the cycletrack project or other opportunities.
- Heath: Is there room for a Class 1 under the freeway?
 - Study Team: It requires lane reconfiguration
- Kamala: Not cutting through bulb-out. One inflow and one outflow lane, with one right-turn lane. Concept does not match what the plans are at corner of Bailey Rd and BART Access Road.
 - Study Team: That is correct. The Study team proposed some upgrades to the proposed improvements set forth on the design concepts provided by BART.
- Robert: SE corner of Delta de Anza Trail, plans for direct access from new development to Delta de Anza Trail. Is that appropriate for a bike highway?
 - Study Team: Short answer yes.

Discussion

- Nhat: Did Study Team coordinate with City of Concord? Willow Pass Rd is dangerous, if it doesn't connect down to Landana Road then you won't get people to the bike highway.
 - Study Team – Yes. The city provided the proposed long term land use plans
- Ole: Free right turn is never used (Willow Pass Road to SR4). Please consider a better connection to the Deanza Trail north of SR 4.
- Nhat: Would like a study for traffic control (Willow Pass Road/SR4).
- Robert: Willow Pass/Evora Rd – County will be constructing warehouses on north side, not sure what impacts on traffic will happen here. Bike Highway at San Marco Blvd – there's a trail on the N side of SR 4 (Willow Pass Rd N of SR4). Would that be part of bike highway? How would it connect to proposed alignment?
 - Unclear. That is a conversation that will need to be had down the road when the concepts are more advanced.
- Ole: Need to get south of freeway at San Marco Blvd interchange to get to new bike highway south of SR4
- Ole: San Marco Blvd interchange has space under the bridge under the freeway on the W side of San Marco Blvd, just need to cross 2 lane onramp, southbound/westbound San Marco, that would get folks east onto bike highway. South side of freeway has a bigger hill than north side. Want to keep existing N side bike path.

9:25

Alta

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robert: Trail east of BART veers away from SR4, so how does that fit into long term bike highway vision? Anything on west chicago highway or just this segment? • Robert: Can we give an update in May to BPAC? 	
<p>9:55</p>	<p>Next steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study Team will use feedback received during meeting to update/modify design concepts. • Study Team will be working on putting together the final report. This will be published by the end of June 	



Caltrans Bay Area Bike Highway Study

Stakeholder Meeting: SR 82

Friday, April 22nd, 2022 – 9:00-10:00am

Teleconference

Time	Topic	By
11:00	<p>Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review</p> <p>Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audrey Shiramizu, Transportation Program Specialist – C/CAG • Kaki Cheung, Program Director – C/CAG • Andrew Kin, DPW engineer – San Bruno • David Wong, DPW engineer – San Bruno • Michael Smith, City Planning – San Bruno • Anthony Montes, Community Organizer – SVBC • April Webster, Volunteer, D4 BAC – SVBC • Sandhya Laddha, Policy / Advocacy Director – SVBC • Joel Mandella – Caltrans • Sergio Ruiz – Caltrans 	All
11:05	<p>Bike Highway Study Review</p> <p>Sergio presented the concept study of CA/Bay Area Bike Highways on-screen. Requested attendee feedback today regarding Bike Highway concept case studies.</p> <p>Read more background on Study: https://d4bikehighwaystudy.org/ Current Survey (closing 4/22/2022): bit.ly/D4BikeHighway2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kaki asked what are future roles/expectations for local agencies and Caltrans in implementing these Study concepts? Sergio responded next steps TBD, and any feedback is valuable. Probably Caltrans will partner with counties/cities currently in process of developing candidate Bike Highways like the East Bay Greenway, Peninsula Bikeway, and VTA's Central Bikeway. No Caltrans-led effort at this time. • April asked how the meeting attendees can help generally. Sergio responded possible leveraging of stakeholders in the next steps, will follow up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Action: Sergio to schedule next steps discussion on how to involve attendees 	Caltrans
11:15	<p>Present Conceptual Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Median bikeway • Class IV (two-way and one-way) • Bikeway at freeway ramps • Protected intersection • Bicycle signal priority 	Caltrans

	<p>Sergio presented 6 conceptual designs on-screen, case studies that could be applied where appropriate, not necessarily the location pictured. San Bruno rendering (median bikeway) addressed in more detail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • April asked if Study were applied to ECR, would it strengthen case for Class IV bikeways / aid current plans? Sergio said the study helps via a clear set of best practices, extensive stakeholder engagement, and cohesive vision for Bay Area bike highways. • April asked if Study might be useful for current ECR plans in Mountain View? Sergio noted the ECR work in Mountain View is being implemented via a paving project, which has limitations. Next step recommendations for Study should examine limitations of various program (like SHOPP). VTA's Central Bikeway an example of seeking funds for environmental clearance of the entire corridor before phased implementation, pursuing \$100M+ but seeking it outside of Caltrans SHOPP. 	
11:25	<p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What elements of the concept would you suggest incorporating for use in this location and other similar locations? • What changes or additions would you suggest at this specific location? • What changes or additions would you suggest at other similar locations? • Sandhya noted San Bruno rendering shows 3 classes of bike facilities: a 2-way Class IV, a median-running Class IV, and a 1-way Class IV on two sides, and asked how to ensure consistency so riders aren't confused. April seconded. Sergio responded that consistent branding crucial to indicate bikeway path, and details are critical. Noted City of San Mateo, 3rd avenue crossing of 101 as example of median bikeway. Noted concepts today concern bike-only cycletracks, not for pedestrians. Some Study concepts in rural and suburban settings are Class I shared paths for people biking and walking. • Sandhya asked if the Study coordinated with VTA to have consistent paint and signage. Sergio responded there isn't yet a plan on signage or branding because currently very high-level. Study best practices notes importance of consistency between bike highway corridors. Lots of limitations exists in current MUTCD regarding allowable signage/branding/pictographs, might lead to growing pains. • Sandhya asked how Study plans to coordinate with the study for BRT on ECR. Sergio noted Caltrans is involved in both and will make sure that the BRT study reflects all other planning efforts in the corridor. Sandhya suggested inviting Reimagine SamTrans folks. Sergio agreed. Kaki echoed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Action: Caltrans staff to explore Reimagine SamTrans as part of ECR BRT study • Kaki said integration of transit into Bike Highway Study concept would be really helpful. Bikes / SamTrans buses must coexist in this environment. Liked median-running bikeway, concerned about off-ramp vehicles and right turns. Asked how Study imagines bikes accessing the median safely, and what kind of median protection is considered. Sergio noted no specific crossing treatments have been proposed, but potentially bike signal faces with no-turn-on-red restrictions or blank-outs if feasible operationally. Raised curbs/railing/concrete barrier is possible median 	

protection. April, Michael, and Sandhya echoed importance of barrier for safety, biker confidence.

- Sandhya noted Bogota as a great example of transit / Class IV coexisting: <https://photos.fareast.mobi/photo?id=12055>
- April asked who is spearheading the VTA project? Sandhya said Lauren Ledbetter and Brent Pearse.
- Sergio asked city staff if the 2-way Class IV along the mall majorly conflicts with any plans the city is aware of, requiring further generalization of rendering. Michael said no, Tanforan site will be redeveloped but Master Plan and schematics still TBD. Plans for 1000+ units of housing, 100-300k sq ft of office plus commercial uses (maybe hotel) and retail. Doesn't think San Bruno will mind these renderings.
- Sergio asked if any circulation recommendations exist. Michael said no, developer's plan to be submitted to city latter half of 2022.
- Michael asked why the 2-way is designed on one side, because ~2000 units of housing exist on other side. Sergio responded the mall redevelopment thought to provide opportunity in terms of ROW.
- Kaki asked if the Study could include rough cost estimates, useful in seeking funds for actual Bike Highway implementation. Sergio noted no cost estimates specific to each concept currently, but could explore high level costs like cost/mile or cost/crossing. Central Bikeway has cost estimate for the corridor as a whole (~\$216M).
 - **Action:** Sergio to look into Study including cost estimates for concepts
- Audrey asked if pedestrians have access to these Bike Highways. Sergio said not here due to urban area space constraints, but some Study concepts are Class I shared paths in rural and suburban settings. Study should consider opportunity for Class IV vs. Class I. Audrey noted ebikes, scooters, etc, all at different speeds but want to use, so need to take more space from cars. Sandhya agreed. Sergio noted Study best practices include preference for wider bikeways beyond minimum standards, but space constraints still exist, e.g. parking, or turn lane re-configuration.
- Sandhya asked about funding opportunities for Bike Highways. <https://www.transportation.gov/grants/SS4A/webinars> Sergio noted potential in SB1 program, Solutions for Congested Corridors Program (SCCP), other state and federal funds, because Active Transportation Program very oversubscribed. Sandhya asked about Vision Zero or Safe Streets funding. Sergio said it potentially could apply to corridors with high crash rates. Section of Mission Blvd in Fremont (state highway) is seeking HSIP funds for Class IV, and connects to East Bay Greenway alignment.
- Kaki invited Sergio to present on Study and San Bruno Concept at next County Bike and Ped Committee Meeting (in May)
 - **Action:** Kaki to invite Sergio to next County Bike and Ped Committee Meeting
 - **Action [ANYONE]:** Reach out to Sergio with any additional Study feedback

11:55	Next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Public outreach: now through end of April• Draft study: May• Final study: June	
--------------	--	--



Caltrans Bay Area Bike Highway Study

Stakeholder Meeting: SR 116

Friday, April 22nd, 2022 – 11:00-12:00pm

Teleconference

Time	Topic	By
11:00	<p>Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review</p> <p>Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dana Turrey – Sonoma County Transportation Authority • David Ripperda – Sonoma County Transportation Authority • Ken Tam – Sonoma County Regional Parks • Matt Frazier – Sonoma County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee • JP Harries – City of Cotati • Sergio Ruiz – Caltrans • Jake Buffenbarger – Caltrans 	All
11:05	<p>Bike Highway Study Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caltrans staff provided an update on the study progress and outreach efforts 	Caltrans
11:15	<p>Present Conceptual Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connection to local/regional Class I path • Connections to local transit stops • Partially protected intersection 	
11:25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion • What elements of the concept would you suggest incorporating for use in this location and other similar locations? • What changes or additions would you suggest at this specific location? • What changes or additions would you suggest at other similar locations? • Ken – Vallejo, interested to connectivity to Hwy 37 route. Have you provided concepts to Caltrans team working on the SR 37 corridor? • There was an in-depth discussion on the proposed conceptual case study and feedback on potential issues to address that may be common in a rural setting like Sonoma. • JP – concept doesn't reflect input from the previous stakeholder meeting, where streams and driveway crossings were discussed. This does not represent challenges we have in rural settings. • JP -- Typical challenges include stream crossings, private driveways 	

	<p>(property access in general), and drainage facilities that are often in the form of open ditches.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David – If intersections are proposed to be redesigned, turn radii need to accommodate farm equipment. • Dana – There is a bus stop here on SR 116 and another on Stony Point Road. Transit connections are still important in a rural setting. Sidewalks should extend to bus stops near intersections. • Ken – Are there separate crossings for pedestrians and bicyclists? • Dana – The need to separate walking and biking modes may be less needed in rural settings depending on the volumes and frequency of users. • Ken – Sonoma County is looking into trail branding and wayfinding along certain corridors, such as the Lower Russian River Trail. • JP – Maps can help with wayfinding, posted at strategic location. • Ken – Sonoma County Regional Parks is working on three regional trail corridors, the Sonoma Valley Trail, Lower Russian River Trail, and Petaluma-Sebastopol Trail. • The County is also prioritizing a project at SR 121 and 8th Street East, which includes path crossings. • Ken – The County indicated it would be helpful for Caltrans to provide clearer guidance on paths parallel to highways and driveway crossings. There are some challenges with this along SR 12 for the Sonoma Valley Trail. • Another issue that was brought up is coordinating and planning for garbage pickup on roadways with bike lanes. • Ken – Electric bike charging and rest stops along a bike highway would be useful. 	
<p>11:55</p>	<p>Next steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public outreach: now through end of April • Draft study: May • Final study: June 	



Caltrans Bay Area Bike Highway Study

Stakeholder Meeting: SR 185

Monday, April 25th, 2022 – 1:00-2:00pm

Teleconference

Time	Topic	By
1:00	<p>Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review</p> <p>Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greg Currey – Caltrans D4 • Sergio Ruiz – Caltrans D4 • Jake Freedman – Caltrans D4 • Aleida Andrino-Chavez – Alameda CTC • Sheila Marquises – City of San Leandro • Hoi-Fei Mok – City of San Leandro 	All
1:05	<p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted that this concept is similar to what Alameda County Transportation Commission has proposed for this corridor • Coordinate with AC Transit on far-side bus stop relocation • AC Transit’s policy is to allow in-lane stops as long as prevailing speeds are 37mph or lower (note, this came from Alameda CTC, as AC Transit was not represented at this meeting) • Note that the portion of Class IV on Fairmont Dr southwest to where it becomes Halcyon Dr has already been constructed • AC Transit has planned to extend existing BRT/Tempo service to Bay Fair BART, along the SR 185 corridor. 	



Caltrans Bay Area Bike Highway Study

Stakeholder Meeting: I 680

Tuesday, April 26th, 2022 – 11:00-12:00pm

Teleconference

Time	Topic	By
11:00	<p>Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review</p> <p>Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greg Currey – Caltrans D4 • Jasmine Stitt – Caltrans D4 • Diana Crumedy – Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition • Sandhya Laddha – SVBC • Daniela Castañeda – SVBC • John Brazil – City of San Jose • Neil Ong – CSJ • Josephine Kimura – CSJ • Lauren Ledbetter – Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority • David Kobayashi – VTA • Gene Gonzalo – VTA • Lola Torney – VTA 	All
11:05	<p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design should include features that will discourage motor vehicle encroachment/access • Landscaping will help make the space more inviting, and may help shield it from highway noise • Should be designed to discourage encampments • Ensure that the bike highway, particularly where it crosses under the roadways, will have plenty of lighting • Look at 101/De La Cruz Blvd, 101/Blossom Hill Rd interchanges as examples of bikeways through interchanges. Consider referencing these in the Plan. • Consider other measures that can infuse joy into the bike highway. • Branding, wayfinding, place-making is very important. • Make sure that, in addition to regional travel, the bike highway is useful for local residents, particularly when traveling through disadvantaged communities. Provide frequent connections to local roadways and paths. • Identified corridor appears to be a PG&E right-of-way or easement. Coordination with them will be necessary. 	



Caltrans Bay Area Bike Highway Study

Stakeholder Meeting: SR 29

Thursday, April 28th, 2022 – 10:00-11:00am

Teleconference

Time	Topic	By
10:00	<p>Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review</p> <p>Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mauricio Hernández – Senior Planning Associate, Project Manager • Libby Nachman – Assistant Project Manager • Sergio Ruiz – Complete Streets Coordinator • Gregory Currey – Active Transportation Branch Chief • Diana Meehan – NVT A • Joel Shaffer – MTC • Kara Vernor – Napa County Bicycle Coalition • Lee Huo – Bay Trail • Lily Brown – MTC • Mark Helmbrecht – City of Vallejo • Nicola Szibbo – MTC/Bay Trail • Shawn Casey-White – Napa Vine Trail 	All
10:05	<p>Bike Highway Study Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quick Recap of Study 	Caltrans
10:15	<p>Present Conceptual Design</p> <p>CONCEPT BOARD: https://app.conceptboard.com/board/6sza-9xi0-6ykh-ma5b-xmu8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Typology: Suburban unconstrained • Similar State Highway Corridors: SR 12 (Sonoma), SR 84 (San Mateo) • Features showcased: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Elevated bikeway ○ Environmental considerations ○ Bicycle structure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lighting within and adjacent to structure ▪ Optional public art, planting and wayfinding ○ Intersection improvements ○ High visibility crossings (people walking and biking) ○ Connections to regional bikeways <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existing Bay Trail ▪ Proposed Bay Trail connection ▪ Proposed Class IV on Rt 29 	Alta

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Intelligent transportation system figures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Signal priority for people bicycling ▪ Bicycle signals 	
<p>10:25</p>	<p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What elements of the concept would you suggest incorporating into this typology for use in this location and in other similar locations? • What changes would you suggest at this specific location? • What changes would you suggest at other similar locations? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joel: Elevated is more expensive. Have you determined vehicle volume or speed thresholds to determine the need for an overpass/underpass vs signaling an intersection? E.g. NACTO design guide has tables for when you should apply certain treatments. Would like a numerical component to this. • Diana: Separation is only option for this intersection. SR37 WB off-ramp is challenging, especially with proposed at-grade crossing. Concern about two right-turn lanes with skewed intersection and lots of truck traffic. <p>Vine trail is on Broadway (starts on west side, then mid-block switches to east side). Bay Trail is along the 37 off-ramp, up Sonoma Blvd, to Meadows Drive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark: Why spend money to elevate, then come back to grade and force an at-grade crossing? Recommend elevate over Sonoma Blvd and join with Bay Trail on NE side of intersection. Make the case about where elevation is warranted, and freeway/highway interchanges seem like where we should continue grade separation. • Kara: Intersection is very industrial, people aren't thinking about walking/biking and are looking left before making a right turn. People might not pay attention to people crossing at that location. • Mark: Waiting for signal runs contrary to concept of faster travel. • Lee: Thinking about transformative concepts while meeting Caltrans standards. Since it's a vision, should be "big" and not fit into existing policies for Caltrans. Shouldn't force the design to fit existing requirements. Look at what the vision requires, and modify requirements to fit that vision. • from Diana Meehan to everyone: 10:36 AM <p>To Lee's point, if the intention is something transformative, then the goal should be to exceed traditional standards, which have often been prohibitive</p> <p>Mark: Class 1 already achieves a conventional bike highway already. Need to think about connections onto and off facility. Best to start with highest-level concept you can. Shoot for the moon.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • from Joel Shaffer to everyone: 10:42 AM <p>Here is a website from the Northeastern University study abroad program I participated in the Netherlands. Students documented the various treatments along a bike highway between Rotterdam and Delft (a large city and small college town with farmland in between). These are informal assessments but they provide some pretty insightful information. https://web.northeastern.edu/holland2018sustrans/bike-highways/</p>	<p>Alta</p>

	<p>Mark: Avoid a crossing if you can. Not a pleasant place to bike (along a highway). Rails to trails corridors would be more enjoyable to create a facility like this. Think about experience compared to a class 1 trail on the edge of the freeway. Suggest citing case study in SF/Presidio connecting to GGB along 101.</p> <p>Lee: Agrees with Mark about non-highway parallelism.</p> <p>Shawn: What problem is this solving?</p> <p>Diana: What does Caltrans think about making adjustments to interchanges? Consider: Why are vehicle movements the way they are, how can they be adjusted? Can't forget about intersection. Think about interim improvements.</p> <p>Kara: Standards for bike highways (e.g. number of stops, design speed, etc.)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • from Diana Meehan to everyone: 10:59 AM Class I facility recommendations are (ideal conditions) are to have as few crossings/stops as possible 	
<p>10:55</p>	<p>Next steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public outreach: Now through end of April • Draft Study: May • Final Study: June 	