Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee Agenda

City of Campbell, 70 N. First Street, Campbell, California

NOTE: To protect our constituents, City officials, and City staff, the City requests all members of the public follow the guidance of the California Department of Health Services', and the County of Santa Clara Health Officer Order, to help control the spread of COVID-19. Additional information regarding COVID-19 is available on the City's website at www.campbellca.gov.

This Regular Meeting of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee will be conducted in person as well as telecommunication and is compliant with provisions of the Brown Act.

Those members of the public wishing to participate virtually can access the meeting at:

https://campbellca-gov.zoom.us/j/84442276977?pwd=TFBMRGVoTHl0YllJNWlGSkq2QUJjZz09

Meeting ID: 844 4227 6977
Passcode: 535865

Public comment will also be accepted via email at Publicworks@campbellca.gov prior to the meeting. Please indicate in the subject line "FOR PUBLIC COMMENT." Written comments received by 4:00 p.m. on the day of the meeting will be posted on the website and distributed to the Committee before the meeting.

A video recording will be available on the City YouTube Channel at: https://www.youtube.com/user/CityofCampbell following the meeting.

REGULAR MEETING OF THE CAMPBELL BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, July 21, 2022 5:00 P.M
City Hall, Doetsch Conference Room
70 N. First Street

1. **Call To Order**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Oral Requests**
4. **Approval of Minutes* – Approve the BPAC Regular Meeting Minutes of May 19, 2022**

5. **Ongoing Projects**
   a. **Harriet Avenue Sidewalk Project**
   b. **FY22 Annual Pavement Maintenance Project (West Parr Avenue)**
   c. **SRTS Maps**
   d. **Campbell PDA Enhancements (OBAG)—Downtown Bicycle & Pedestrian Improvements**
   e. **Blind Spot on Los Gatos Creek Trail just north of San Tomas Expressway**
6. **OBAG 3 Candidate Projects**
   a. **Hamilton Avenue Precise Plan - Complete Streets Checklist***
7. **VTA BPAC Update**
8. **Around the Table Comments and Discussion**
9. **Next meeting: September 15, 2022 (Thursday) at 5:00 p.m.**
10. **Adjourn**

cc: Todd Capurso, Public Works Director
John Brazil, City of San Jose
Ryan Smith, City of San Jose

*** indicates written attachment**

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you require accommodation to participate in this meeting, please contact JoAnna Thomason in the Public Works Department, at least 48 hours prior to the meeting, at Joannat@campbellca.gov or (408) 866-2701.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Complete Streets Checklist

Implementation of MTC's Complete Streets Policy, Resolution 4493, Adopted 3/25/22

Background

Since 2006, MTC's Complete Streets (CS) Policy has promoted the development of transportation facilities that can be used by all modes. In March 2022, MTC updated its CS policy (Resolution 4493) with the goal of ensuring that people biking, walking, rolling, and taking transit are safely accommodated within the transportation network. This policy works to advance Plan Bay Area 2050 objectives of achieving mode shift, safety, equity, and vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emission reductions, as well as state & local compliance with applicable CS-related laws, policies, and practices, specifically the California Complete Street Act of 2008 (Gov. Code Sections 65040.2 and 65302) and applicable local policies such as the CS resolutions adopted before January 16, 2016 (as part of MTC's OBAG 2 requirements.)

Requirements

MTC's CS Policy requires that all projects (with a total project cost of $250,000 or more) applying for regional discretionary transportation funding – or requesting regional endorsement or approval through MTC – must submit a Complete Streets Checklist (Checklist) to MTC.

Please note that Projects claiming exceptions to CS Policy must complete the Exceptions section on the Checklist and provide a Department Director-level signature.

Additional information and guidance for completing this Checklist can be found at the MTC Administrative Guidance: Complete Streets Policy Guidance for public agency staff implementing MTC Resolution 4493 at *https://mtc.ca.gov/planning/transportation/complete-streets*

This form may be downloaded at https://mtc.ca.gov/planning/transportation/complete-streets.

Submittal

Completed Checklists ***must be emailed*** to completestreets@bayareametro.gov.

PROJECT INFORMATION
Project Name/Title: ***Hamilton Avenue Precise Plan***
Project Area/Location(s): ***Hamilton Avenue Corridor east and west of the Highway 17 Interchange (from approximately 220 feet west of North 3rd Street to Bascom Avenue.*** ***See Figure 1, Hamilton Avenue Precise Plan Area)***

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: (300-word limit)

This project will prepare a Precise Plan as a tool that would coordinate future public and private improvements on specific properties where special conditions of size, shape, land ownership, or existing or desired development require particular attention. Project components would include: 1) establishment of planning boundaries that overlap the Campbell PDA and Transit-Rich Areas, 2) identification of commercial properties that may serve as housing opportunity sites in Campbell's Plan for Housing (2023-2031 Housing Element Update), 3) preliminary design and cost estimates of connectivity and bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure enhancements across Highway 17 to the Hamilton Light Rail Station, 4) identification of urban design enhancements for new development, 5) nexus study and establishment of development impact fees for projects within the plan area to support construction of aforementioned connectivity enhancements, and 6) Environmental Impact Report (EIR) evaluating future development and improvements in the plan area.

Please indicate project phase (Planning, PE, ENV, ROW, CON, O&M)

Planning

May attach additional project documents, cross sections, plan view, or other supporting materials.

See Figure 1 (Hamilton Avenue Precise Plan Area)

CONTACT INFORMATION		
Contact Name & Title: **Stephen Rose, Senior Planner**	**Contact Email:** **stephenr@campbellca.gov**	**Contact Phone:** **408-866-2142**
Agency: **City of Campbell**		

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
1. Bicycle, Pedestrian and Transit Planning	**Does Project implement relevant Plans, or other locally adopted recommendations?** **Plan examples include:** • **City/County General + Area Plans**	☒	☐	Please provide detail on Plan recommendations affecting Project area, if any, with Plan adoption date. If Project is inconsistent with adopted Plans,

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
	• **Bicycle, Pedestrian & Transit Plan** • **Community-Based Transportation Plan** • **ADA Transition Plan** • **Station Access Plan** • **Short-Range Transit Plan** • **Vision Zero/Systematic Safety Plan**			please provide explanation. ***General Plan (adopted in November 2001) – Land Use and Transportation Element (adopted in August 2014)*** ***Goal LUT-2: To achieve a safe, balanced, and functional multi-modal transportation network that accommodates all users.*** ***Policy LUT-2.1: Multi-modal Transportation: Develop and implement a multi-modal transportation network that balances transportation options aimed at reducing automobile traffic and greenhouse gas emissions while promoting healthier travel alternatives for all users*** ***Strategy LUT-2.1g: Pedestrian and Bicycle Connections:*** ***Identify physical barriers at key locations and make improvements to enhance those connections.*** ***Goal LUT-11: A physically connected, efficient community with safe access and***

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
				linkages throughout the city for a variety of transportation modes and users. ***Policy LUT-11.1: Physically Connected Transportation Infrastructure: Strive to achieve physically connected transportation infrastructure.*** ***Strategy LUT-11.1d: Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections in Development: Encourage new or redeveloping projects to provide logical bicycle and pedestrian connections on site, between parking areas, buildings, and street sidewalks and to existing or planned public right-of-way facilities and encourage pedestrian passages between street-front sidewalks and rear-lot parking areas. Ensure that the bicycle and pedestrian connections interface safely.***
2. Active Transportation Network	**Does the project area contain segments of the regional Active Transportation (AT) Network?** **[See AT Network map on the MTC Complete Streets webpage.]**	☒	☐	If yes, describe how project adheres to the NACTO All Ages and Abilities design principles. See Attachment 1.

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
				Hamilton Avenue is on the AT Network. The project will identify bicycle and pedestrian connectivity and infrastructure enhancements that would lower the level of stress for traveling along the Hamilton Avenue Corridor, over Highway 17, and to the Hamilton Light Rail Station.
3. Safety and Comfort	A. Is the Project on a known High Injury Network (HIN) or has a local traffic safety analysis found a high incidence of bicyclist/ pedestrian-involved crashes within the project area?	☐	☒	**Please summarize the traffic safety conditions and describe Project's traffic safety measures. The Bay Area Vision Zero System may be a resource.** ***Although the Hamilton Avenue Precise Plan Project Area does not have a high incidence of bicyclist/pedestrian-involved crashes, the Hamilton Avenue is a high-injury corridor in that the Hamilton intersections at Salmar Avenue, Creekside Way, and Bascom Avenue have continually been in the City's top five injury crash and high crash frequency locations per year. The project aims to identify connectivity and infrastructure enhancements that would improve safety and comfort of bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users.***

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
	B. Does the project seek to improve bicyclist and/or pedestrian conditions? If the project includes a bikeway, was a Level of Traffic Stress (LTS), or similar user experience analyses conducted? ***An LTS analysis was not conducted for Hamilton Avenue in the City of Campbell. However, the LTS study conducted in San Jose, "Low-Stress Bicycling and Network Connectivity," mentions Hamilton Avenue as a street with a high level of traffic stress.***	☒	☐	Describe how project seeks to provide low-stress transportation facilities or reduce a facility's LTS. ***Project will seek to improve bicyclists' safety and comfort by identifying connectivity and infrastructure enhancements that would improve bicyclist and pedestrian safety and comfort. The Precise Plan study may include geometric design improvements, facility widening, if feasible, and other traffic control devices***
4. Transit Coordination	A. Are there existing public transit facilities (stop or station) in the project area?	☒	☐	**List transit facilities (stop, station, or route) and all affected agencies.** ***VTA light rail Green Line, Hamilton Light Rail Station, and VTA Bus Route 56 stops on Hamilton Avenue***
	B. Have all potentially affected transit agencies had the opportunity to review this project?	☒	☐	**Please provide confirmation email from transit operator(s).** **See Confirmation Email from VTA; note that project was changed from a**

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
				Specific Plan to a Precise Plan
	C. Is there a MTC Mobility Hub within the project area? ***Yes, the VTA light rail Green Line Hamilton Light Rail Station is a Mobility Hub located on the south side of Hamilton Avenue west of Creekside Way.***	☒	☐	**If yes, please describe outreach to mobility providers, and Project's Hub-supportive elements.** ***Outreach to VTA is complete per Item 4.B above. The Precise Plan will look to provide connectivity and infrastructure enhancements to improve access to the Hamilton Light Rail Station.***
5. Design	**Does the project meet professional design standards or guidelines appropriate for bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities?**	☒	☐	**Please provide Class designation for bikeways. Cite design standards used.** ***Hamilton Avenue west of Salmar Avenue is a Class II bike lane. Between Creekside Way and Bascom Avenue, Hamilton Avenue has striped edgelines and five-foot shoulders that function like a Class II bike lane without the bike lane arrows and markings.*** ***The project will consult the following design guidelines and standards: California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), Caltrans Standard Plans and Highway Design***

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
				Manual, VTA's Pedestrian Technical Guidelines, VTA's Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan, VTA's Bicycle Technical Guidelines, and National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) guidance (Urban Street Design Guide, and Urban Bicycle Design Guide), the U.S. Access Board's Proposed Public Rights-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG), and the City of Campbell Standard Details.
6. Equity	**Will Project improve active transportation in an Equity Priority Community?**	☐	☒	**Please list EPC(s) affected.** ***There is no EPC in the project area.***
7. BPAC Review	**Has a local (city or county) Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission (BPAC) reviewed this checklist (or for OBAG 3, this project)?**	☐	☒	**Please provide meeting date(s) and a summary of comments, if any.** ***The Campbell BPAC met on 7/21/22. Comments included: ???***

Statement of Compliance	YES
The proposed Project complies with California Complete Street Act of 2008 (*Gov. Code Sections 65040.2 and 65302, MTC Complete Streets Policy (Reso. 4493*), and locally adopted Complete Streets resolutions (*adopted as OBAG 2 (Reso. 4202) requirement, Resolution 4202*).	☒

If no, complete Statement of Exception and obtain necessary signature.

Statement of Exception	YES		Provide Documentation or Explanation
1. The affected roadway is legally prohibited for use by bicyclists and/or pedestrians.	☐		**If yes, please cite language and agency citing prohibited use.**
2. The costs of providing Complete Streets improvements are excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use (defined as more than 20 percent for Complete Streets elements of the total project cost).	☐		**If claimed, the agency must include proportionate alternatives and still provide safe accommodation of people biking, walking and rolling.**
3. There is a documented Alternative Plan to implement Complete Streets and/or on a nearby parallel route.	☐		**Describe Alternative Plan/Project**
4. Conditions exist in which policy requirements may not be able to be met, such as fire and safety specifications, spatial conflicts on the roadway with transit or environmental concerns, defined as abutting conservation land or severe topological constraints.	☐	☐	**Describe condition(s) that prohibit implementation of CS policy requirements**

SIGNATURES / NOTIFICATIONS

TRANSIT

The project sponsor shall communicate and coordinate with all transit agencies with operations affected by the proposed project. If a project includes a transit stop/station, or is located along a transit route, the Checklist must include written documentation (e.g. email) with the affected transit agency(ies) to confirm transit agency coordination and acknowledgement of the project. A CS Checklist Transit Agency Contact List is available for reference.

DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR-LEVEL SIGNATURE FOR EXCEPTIONS

Exceptions must be signed by a Department Director-level agency representative, or their designee, and not the Project Manager. Insert electronic signature or sign below:

Full Name: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

ATTACHMENT 1 – All Ages and Abilities and Guidelines

1. All Ages and Abilities

Designing for All Ages & Abilities, Contextual Guidance for High-Comfort Bicycle Facilities, National Association of Transportation Officials, December 2017

Projects on the AT Network shall incorporate design principles based on designing for "All Ages and Abilities," contextual guidance provided by the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO), and consistent with state and national best practices. A facility that serves "all ages and abilities" is one that effectively serves the mobility needs of children, older adults, and people with disabilities and in doing so, works for everyone else. The all ages and abilities approach also strives to serve all users, regardless of age, ability, ethnicity, race, sex, income, or disability, by embodying national and international best practices related to traffic calming, speed reduction, and **roadway design to increase user safety and comfort. This approach also includes the** use of traffic calming elements or facilities separated from motor vehicle traffic, both of which can offer a greater feeling of safety and appeal to a wider spectrum of the public.

Design best practices for safe street crossings, pedestrian facilities, and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility at transit stops, and bicycle/micromobility facilities on the AT Network should be incorporated throughout the entirety of the project. The Proposed Public Rights-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG) by the U.S. Access Board should also be referenced during design. (See table on next page for guidelines)

2. Design Guidance

Examples of applicable design guidance documents include (but are not limited to): American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) – *A Policy on Geometric Design of Highway and Streets, Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, Guide for the Planning, Design, and Operation of Pedestrian Facilities; Public Right-of-Way Accessibility Guide (PROWAG); Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD); Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG)*; National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) – *Urban Bikeway Design Guide*.

-

Contextual Guidance for Selecting All Ages & Abilities Bikeways

Roadway Context				All Ages & Abilities Bicycle Facility
Target Motor Vehicle Speed*	Target Max. Motor Vehicle Volume (ADT)	Motor Vehicle Lanes	Key Operational Considerations	
Any		*Any*	*Any of the following:* high curbside activity, frequent buses, motor vehicle congestion, or turning conflicts‡	**Protected Bicycle Lane**
< 10 mph	Less relevant	No centerline, or single lane one-way	Pedestrians share the roadway	**Shared Street**
≤ 20 mph	≤ 1,000 – 2,000		< 50 motor vehicles per hour in the peak direction at peak hour	**Bicycle Boulevard**
≤ 25 mph	≤ 500 – 1,500			
	≤ 1,500 – 3,000	Single lane each direction, or single lane one-way	Low curbside activity, or low congestion pressure	**Conventional or Buffered Bicycle Lane, or Protected Bicycle Lane**
	≤ 3,000 – 6,000			**Buffered or Protected Bicycle Lane**
	Greater than 6,000			**Protected Bicycle Lane**
	Any	Multiple lanes per direction		
Greater than 26 mph†	≤ 6,000	Single lane each direction	Low curbside activity, or low congestion pressure	**Protected Bicycle Lane, or Reduce Speed**
		Multiple lanes per direction		**Protected Bicycle Lane, or Reduce to Single Lane & Reduce Speed**
	Greater than 6,000	*Any*	*Any*	**Protected Bicycle Lane, or Bicycle Path**
High-speed limited access roadways, natural corridors, or geographic edge conditions with limited conflicts		*Any*	High pedestrian volume	**Bike Path with Separate Walkway or Protected Bicycle Lane**
			Low pedestrian volume	**Shared-Use Path or Protected Bicycle Lane**

*While posted or 85th percentile motor vehicle speed are commonly used design speed targets, 95th percentile speed captures high-end speeding, which causes greater stress to bicyclists and more frequent passing events. Setting target speed based on this threshold results in a higher level of bicycling comfort for the full range of riders.

† Setting 25 mph as a motor vehicle speed threshold for providing protected bikeways is consistent with many cities' traffic safety and Vision Zero policies. However, some cities use a 30 mph posted speed as a threshold for protected bikeways, consistent with providing Level of Traffic Stress level 2 (LTS 2) that can effectively reduce stress and accommodate more types of riders.[18]

‡ Operational factors that lead to bikeway conflicts are reasons to provide protected bike lanes regardless of motor vehicle speed and volume.

Figure 1 Designing for All Ages & Abilities, NACTO https://nacto.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NACTO_Designing-for-All-Ages-Abilities.pdf