

Active Transportation and Livable Communities (ATLC) Advisory Group Meeting

Thursday, November 19, 2015 1:30 PM – 3:30 PM
Caltrans Headquarters
1120 N Street, Room 2116
Sacramento, CA 95814

Meeting Summary Notes

1. Welcome and Introductions

Alyssa Begley, Office Chief, Sustainable Community Planning, opened the November 19, 2015, meeting and welcomed the ATLC group.

ATTENDANCE

External Agencies – ATLC Members

Bob Planthold, California Pedestrian Advisory Committee & California WALKS
Jeanie Ward-Waller, California Bicycle Coalition
Kate Meis, Local Government Commission
Laura Cohen, Rails-to-Trails Conservancy
Stacy Alamo-Mixson, California Department of Public Health
Tracy Hadden Loh, Rails-to-Trails Conservancy
Wendy Alfsen, California WALKS

Caltrans Representatives – ATLC Members

Alyssa Begley, Office Chief, Sustainable Community Planning
Coco Briseno, Deputy Director, Planning and Modal Programs
Danny Yost, for Melanie Perron, Asst. Deputy Director, Legislative Affairs (via phone)
Katie Benouar, Division Chief, Transportation Planning
Rebecca Mowry, for Rachel Falsetti, Acting Division Chief, Construction

External Agencies – Interested Parties

Mary Strode, California Department of Public Health
Channel Fletcher, Safe Routes to School of National Partnership
Jim Barross, California Bicycle Advisory Committee (via phone)
Kenneth Ryan, Mt. Shasta Recreation and Parks District (via phone)
Lindell Price, El Dorado County resident
Stanley Price, El Dorado County resident

ATTENDANCE

Caltrans

Anika Jesi, Sustainable Community Planning
Ann Mahaney, Branch Chief, Smart Mobility
Bruce de Terra, Division Chief, Programming
Collette Armao, Aeronautics
David Chursenoff, Research and Innovation (via phone)
Emily Burstein, Rail & Mass Transportation
Janice Benton, Design
Jannette Ramirez, Sustainable Community Planning
Jila Priebe, Rail & Mass Transportation
Josh Pulverman, Branch Chief, Transit Programs, Rail & Mass Transportation
Marlon Flournoy, District 3, Planning & Local Assistance
Mike Navarro, District 6 (via phone)
Scott Forsythe, Acting Branch Chief, System Planning
Steven Cliff, Assistant Director, Sustainability
Teresa McWilliam, Local Assistance
Tracey Frost, Acting Office Chief, Regional Planning

2. Announcements – Coco Briseno, Deputy Director, Planning and Modal Programs

Coco Briseno, Deputy Director, Planning and Modal Programs thanked everyone for coming. She stated that the agenda consisted of many items, and emphasized the need for good timekeeping in order to get through all of the scheduled presentations. She reminded the group about an action item from the prior ATLC meeting, which was to send any future desired agenda items to Alyssa. Coco encouraged the group to send agenda items to Alyssa for ATLC meetings.

Coco announced that the due date for the FY 2016-17 Caltrans Sustainable Transportation Planning grants was extended until December 31st, 2015, with an expected award date of June, 2016. She urged prospective applicants to contact Andy Knapp in the Division of Transportation Planning at (916) 651-8202 with any questions, and to visit the Caltrans Planning Website (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/grants.html>) for further information regarding these grants.

In regards to the Active Transportation Program, Coco announced that the statewide Small Urban & Rural lists were voted on at the October California Transportation Commission (CTC) meeting and were posted at the CTC Website (<http://www.catc.ca.gov/>). The Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) list will be voted on at the December, CTC meeting and posted to the CTC website pending their subsequent approval.

Finally, Coco mentioned that Emily Burstein of the Division of Rail and Mass Transportation is available to provide an update on the California Rail Plan, if time permits. Otherwise, this item would be pushed to the following ATLC meeting.

Following Coco's announcements, Jeanie Ward-Waller of the California Bicycle Coalition asked how many bike and pedestrian projects were awarded through the recent Highway

Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) awards. She stated that safety was a concern in this area, so she would expect the amount of awards involving bicycle and pedestrian projects to increase. Her comment was acknowledged as an agenda item for the next ATLC meeting.

3. Opening Comments – Janice Benton, Division of Design

Alyssa Begley introduced Janice Benton, the Assistant Division Chief for the Caltrans Division of Design. Janice introduced herself and greeted the ATLC group. Janice explained that during the August 20, 2015 ATLC meeting, she had provided an update of the status of the Caltrans Class IV Bikeway Guidance, so in an effort to not duplicate the information shared at that meeting, today she will provide an update on the progress of the bikeway guidance since the August.

Janice provided the following updates to the ATLC group:

- The Division of Design solicited for membership on an external advisory committee to inform the development of the Class IV Bikeway Guidance. The committee consists of City and County representation, as well as external stakeholder groups such as ATLC, California Bicycle Advisory Committee (CBAC), California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC) and Caltrans Accessibility Advisory Committee (CtAAC).
- Members of the advisory committee from ATLC include Tony Dang, Bob Planthold and Dave Synder. Other members include Jim Barross, Allen Wachtel, Keith Williams from CBAC; Veronica Elsy and Pat Tobin from the CtAAC; Brian Jones and Dan Gutierrez from CTCDC; Mike Sallaberry from San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), James Serrano from the City of Salinas, Josh Mellow from the City of Palo Alto, Philip Soares from the City of Modesto, Daniel Quintana from the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.
- Using the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) Separated Bike Lane Planning and Design Guide that was released in May, as well as the NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide as their base, the Caltrans Class IV Bikeway Guidance will provide supplemental information in the form of a Design Information Bulletin (DIB) that goes along with the FHWA's guide.
- The DIB will focus on aspects of the FHWA's guide that cannot be applied in California, as well as additional information that has been identified. The external advisory committee is identifying issues to address in the DIB. It will emphasize the application of the guidance, with a direction that is intended to be flexible and not prescriptive. The DIB is not establishing standards, but instead providing criteria and design information for consideration as the facility is designed.
- Some of the key points in the DIB will be:
 - Emphasizing ADA compliance in all facilities (intersections, driveways, transit)
 - Coordination with other types of facilities (Class IV is appropriate in some, not all, locations)
 - Adequate signing and striping because Class IV is new type of facility in California

- The DIB is intended to be a living document. It will be continuously updated as more information is gathered and shared.
- A preliminary draft of the Caltrans Class IV Bikeway Guidance/DIB was shared with the external advisory committee, who had a chance to provide their comments. Those comments were addressed in a revised draft.
- Within a few days, the Division of Design will provide a draft of the Caltrans Class IV Bikeway Guidance/DIB to districts and internal divisions within Caltrans, as well as with various committees such as ATLC, CBAC, CTAC, etc. They are requesting feedback from their internal and external partners. For instance, districts are encouraged to share the draft DIB with local partners and stakeholders to solicit their feedback.
- There will be a three week period of comment and feedback. Once Design has reviewed the feedback, they will develop final guidance. January 1st is the date that the final Class IV Bikeway Guidance must be published.
- Because most people are not familiar with the term “Class IV”, the Class IV Bikeway Guidance will establish a common nomenclature of referring to these types of bike facilities as “Separated Bikeways” throughout the guidance. (The term ‘Separated Bike Lanes’ that FHWA uses does not work well for California’s bike system.)
- Up until this point, the Class IV Bikeway Guidance has relied on feedback from the external advisory committee and now they are requesting outside feedback in order to make further adjustments to the guidance.

Alyssa asked whether the anticipated updates to the DIB would be on an ad-hoc schedule. Janice responded there is no set schedule for updating the DIB because they do not want to constrain the incorporation of new information, data, and lessons-learned as it relates to the implementation of new Class IV facilities, as well as new information gathered about preexisting Class IV facilities.

Bob Planthold, California WALKS, made a comment that the Caltrans Class IV Bikeway Guidance should include not just ADA access guidelines, but also reference Title II language which specifies that all *programs* must be accessible. He suggested that adding this additional language would demonstrate not just ADA compliance, but accessibility responsiveness.

Kenneth Ryan, Mt. Shasta Recreation and Parks District, asked if the external advisory committee had a representative for rural areas on it. Following his question, he provided two follow-up comments. The first, was that between Mt. Shasta and Redding, I-5 is the accepted route for bicycles except where it goes through urban areas. The result is that there is no access between I-5 and city streets for bicyclists in this area. Ken suggested the guidance address this gap in bicycle access. His second comment was in reference to a bridge that cuts through the Shasta reservoir, which, to his knowledge, does not include bicycle or pedestrian access. He suggested that when Caltrans does major bridge rebuilds, pedestrian and bicycle access is provided as part of the reconstruction. Ken said he hoped that the guidelines would take that into consideration.

Janice responded that the guidelines try to represent all locations, not just the main streets or urban areas. Similar feedback was received at an earlier Class IV Bikeway Summit. For Ken's first question, she said that Keith Williams of CBAC who is a current member of the external advisory committee, is from the Redding/Shasta area and would serve as their rural representative for that area. Janice made a note that on the Caltrans Division of Design website, there is a section titled "What's New" (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd/index.htm>) which includes a link to further information about the external advisory committee, as well as the preliminary draft of the guidance.

Coco made a comment in regard to Ken's point of the need to improve bicycle and pedestrian connections, stating that Caltrans recently launched the California State Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, with the intention of looking at how to improve safety and access for everyone across modes, in particular bicycle and pedestrian. She suggested that this could be a helpful resource for looking out how to better access in these areas.

Stanley Price, El Dorado County resident, asked about the initial draft of the Class IV Bikeways Guidance, saying that it referenced diagrams from another document that he did not have easy access to. He wondered if these diagrams could be included in the guidance.

Janice responded that those diagrams were from the Federal Highway guide, and that she did not know if Caltrans has the rights or capabilities to put the diagrams in the DIB. She stated that she will look into it, although the goal is to not repeat information from Federal Highway's Guide in the DIB. Caltrans will work to make accessing the Federal Highway's Guide a simpler process.

Bob Planthold asked if there would be another external advisory committee meeting in December for last minute revisions to the DIB. Janice answered that they might not have a meeting, but they would have some sort of email or phone call communication in that regard.

Wendy Alfsen, California WALKS, asked if a previous comment was not addressed in the upcoming draft of the DIB, would that comment need to be refiled following the release of the draft. Janice answered that this was not necessary, as the Division of Design was keeping track of all comments as they come in.

Ken Ryan said he did not hear any comments regarding Caltrans internal decisions on bridge access, and wondered if Janice would care to make any comments at that time. Janice said that insofar as his comment pertained to separated bikeways, the guidance for intersection application would include guidance for connection to other facilities.

Wendy Alfsen commented that the Caltrans guidance addresses how the separated bikeway interfaces with an intersection or vehicle traffic, but it does not address how a person using the facility is supposed to interface with pedestrian traffic or marked/unmarked crosswalks. Those rights of way are prescribed by code. Janice responded that the Federal guidance addresses pedestrian interfaces: midblock crossings to access transit, accessible parking, and intersections. It was agreed that Janice and Wendy would talk offline about the pedestrian design items in Federal Highway's Guide.

Lindell Price, El Dorado County Resident, mentioned that she was concerned about the inclusion of the impacts to pedestrian crossings within the guidance, specifically the effect that separated bikeways would have on increasing pedestrian walking and crossing distance. She suggested there be a balance in treatment of pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and perhaps making adjustments to motor vehicle speeds in some areas. Janice responded that the guidance addresses all of these challenges, in a way that encourages consideration of these concerns, rather than being prescriptive.

Action Items:

Alyssa will send the Design website link to the ATLC group.

Janice and Alyssa will advise the ATLC committee when the new draft DIB is ready for review.

4. T-MAP – Laura Cohen & Tracy Hadden-Loh, Rails-to-Trails Conservancy

Laura Cohen, Western Regional Director of Rails-to-Trails Conservancy (RTC), introduced herself and Tracy Hadden-Loh, the Research Director of RTC, to the ATLC group. She explained that while Rails-to-Trails has interacted with the ATLC group and Caltrans in the past on matters related to policy and trail planning, the conservancy also has a robust research program. The purpose of the research program is to provide tools, reports and best practices to share with local and state agencies and trail advocates, to help them make the case for trail investment, and to educate on the economic and mobility benefits of trails. Tracy is currently halfway through a three-year initiative called the Trails Mapping and Assessment Platform (T-MAP), which will provide a series of urban trail planning tools and data collection instruments to help inform trail development and assessment. Laura suggested that these tools may have relevance to the California Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian plan, as well as to the goals outlined in the 2015-2020 Caltrans Strategic Management Plan, specifically the goal of tripling bicycle trips and doubling pedestrian trips by the year 2020. Laura turned it over to Tracy to further explain her work with T-MAP. The PowerPoint presentation is available at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/ATLC/documents/RTC_TMAP_presentation_ATLC_11-19-15_final.pdf).

Tracy introduced herself, stating that much of the research she would be presenting was not yet complete, and she would appreciate feedback and initial reactions from the group, all of which would help her tailor her research to meet the needs of practitioners and contribute to shaping the final outcome.

Tracy explained that RTC is a mission-based non-profit that is focused on trail building. At the heart of the mission statement is the idea of creating a network of trails, and in doing so, increasing health. While this has always been a priority for the conservancy, the idea of creating research based on those principles is new to RTC.

In the past, when there were significantly fewer trails, it was easier to measure the success of trail building efforts by the number of trail miles built. Now that there are significantly more trails in the U.S., the trend has been to turn to other metrics for measuring success. RTC as an organization has moved past using “trail miles built” as a measure of success in trail building,

and has turned towards using a “proximity measure,” which emphasizes proximity to a trail as evidence of success (e.g., by 2020, 90% of Americans will live within three miles of a trail system). However, Tracy pointed out that this metric can be misleading, as just because a population is in close proximity to a trail, does not necessarily mean that trail access is spread equally among that population. Additionally, Tracy emphasized the need to measure trail use, and not just proximity to a trail, due to the fact that just because an individual lives near a trail, does not necessarily mean they will use it. Therefore, much work is still needed to find the best measure of success in trail building.

During Tracy’s attempts to create a “trail score,” issues of data set availability were raised. RTC determined that to be able to create a data set for trail users, the organization needed to learn more about them, and therefore set out to collect a national data set of trail uses and trail users. The intent was to create a set of tools from these combined data sets to be able to start measuring benefit versus cost, and answer the questions of “how do we know when we have enough trails?” and “how do we know how many trails we need?”.

In an effort to answer these questions, RTC is in the process of creating four models, and collecting three data sets to support the development of those models. One large impediment to making these tools, and one of the main reasons that no one has done this type of work before, is because there is a large hole in the data to support this type of work, hence the need to collect data sets to make this work possible. In order to collect these data sets and create these tools, RTC is working with a team of academics (from various universities), as well as an advisory committee to help guide the research and make sure that the work stays on target.

Tracy described the four models, and what each of them do, in hopes of getting feedback and reactions from the ATLC group, specifically about what would be the best way to go about getting the tools to the public, in order to make the best case for trails. The four tools are explained as follows:

Temporal Adjustment Factors:

For a given road, you might want to know how many people are driving on it. The FHWA or a State DOT might approach this is by doing periodic counts at various locations, and then using inflation factors, or *temporal adjustment factors*, to convert a short term estimate into an annual estimate, in an effort to understand roughly how many people are using that facility. The idea for this tool, is to create the same type of estimate for trails. It is difficult to apply this concept to trails because there is currently no method in place for doing “traffic counts” on trails. The challenge is getting a sufficient amount of data to be able to create these factors. The intent of this tool is to be able to answer a few basic questions that trail managers, or those proposing a new trail facility, might need to know, such as “how many people are using a trail,” “what is peak trail use,” and “what is the modal distribution of users (bike vs. pedestrian)”.

To collect the data necessary to be able to use temporal adjustment factors to surmise the traffic on a given trail, RTC developed a smart phone application to conduct short term manual counts on trails. This work was originally done through paper counts and spreadsheets, so the application will help to mitigate the data entry cost associated with doing trail counts, as well as

improve the ease of basic short term counts. Data is uploaded and various reporting formats are available. The application will soon be available on Android and iPhone platforms.

A temporal adjustment factor cannot be the same for all trails everywhere. Some of the factors that impact difference in trail traffic are the variations in climates across the U.S., as well as the differences in bike vs. pedestrian traffic. RTC is addressing to this by developing different factors for each climactic zone in the continental U.S., as well as a separate factor for bicyclists and for pedestrians.

Demand Forecasting:

The demand forecasting tool is being designed to be able to estimate how many people will use a trail that does not yet exist. This tool would consist of a formula where you would take predicted variables related to trail use, and then observe the predicted variables for a sample of trails with known traffic volumes, to produce a model coefficient that would allow you to make predictions for hypothetical trails with hypothetical values. This work is currently not being done only because there exists such limited data for traffic monitoring on trails. RTC has established fifty (50) trail monitoring stations nationwide, thus providing a large sample to inform their research in this area.

Economic Impact Assessment:

This tool is being designed to be able to value the financial and economic benefits of trail use, specifically those related to health and physical activity. Research suggests that the health benefits of trail use alone are bigger than all other benefits of trail use combined. Several tools already exist to perform a health economic assessment, as it relates to the amounts of walking and biking. However, these tools focus on an economic model, as opposed to a *fiscal* economic model. The issue with a purely economic model is that it quantifies the health benefits of walking/biking as a dollar amount that is too large to be tangible to anyone. However, the fiscal economic mode will translate the benefits of trail use into an actual amount that can appear as a line item on a budget. It will focus specifically on two health benefits of trail use, namely disease prevention, and vehicle miles avoided. In order to do this, more data must be gathered about trail users, specifically a trail user's risk for disease, amount of trail use total, amount of trail use per individual, mode type (walking or biking), and if trip purpose was in fact a vehicle mile avoided (such as a commute), or just recreation. RTC is attempting a national survey of trail users in order to come up with this data.

System Connectivity:

The System Connectivity tool is a desktop ArcGIS extension exclusively for bicycle facilities, not pedestrian or trail facilities. The tool was made with the understanding that a trail network will never be a complete network of trails alone, but will most likely be combination of trails and bike paths. The tool generates a "better bike score" for the potential implementation of a bike plan, as well as projects theoretical traffic flows, which can be used to show which routes are more desirable, and therefore rank the priority of bike facility improvement projects.

The tool allows the user to choose destinations where they think it would be important for people to get to, and then factors in the marginal rate of substitution (the rate at which people might be

willing to go out of their way in order to have a nicer or safer ride). This is done by estimating the amount of traffic stress in every link of a network, to determine how much people will detour in order to access stress-reducing facilities. This gives you a percentage of residents that can reach the destination using a low-stress bike route, so that you can determine what affect a bicycle facility improvement project may have on this number.

Tracy asked what ATLC members thought about the work and whether there was any suggestions for how to use the tools.

Bob Planthold posed a question about pedestrians being dissuaded from using certain routes and trail facilities due to an abundance of bicyclists, specifically those that may not be conscientious to pedestrians. He asked if there had been any thought about establishing good behavior guidelines for bicyclists on trails. He also stated that he was worried pedestrians might be deterred from using a specific trail because of signage that favors bicyclists. He suggested that if RTC's national trail survey found their statistics short on pedestrians, this could be one reason for that.

Tracy answered that her team had thought about breaking up the factor sets by mode (pedestrian vs. bicyclists), but they had wondered if that was getting too detailed.

Laura also responded to Bob's question by saying that this was more an issue of trail design for projected users and user types, rather than a research-related question. She mentioned that the issue of multi-user conflicts is something that comes up quite frequently in trail design, and RTC addressed this issue through a major communication campaign titled "Share the Path". She suggested that this was an important question that extends beyond just the research realm.

Stanley Price made a comment about the differences between transportation and recreation, and suggested that a transportation facility was required to be open 24 hours, 7 days a week, when independently operated (such as a road). He suggested that RTC look at the trail system in that light, and determine what part is for viable transportation. He also asked Tracy what trail user attributes the survey included.

Tracy responded that the survey asks every trail user for age, gender, origin, destination, trip purpose, and health questions. She said that the way bike researchers generally determine if a trail is for recreation or (commute) transportation, is by looking at its AM and PM peak. However, she suggested that an AM and PM peak pattern is not always indicative of trail use for (commute) transportation purposes alone, as there still might be recreation occurring during these peak periods (e.g. using the trail immediately before or after work). Weekend use might be a better measure of trail use types. She stated that the trip purpose variable in the survey is very important because of the difficulty in determining trail use based solely on peak usage.

Lindell Price asked about the System Connectivity tool as it relates to health benefits for low-income individuals. She suggested that if a trail required driving to it in an automobile, then that trail may not be as accessible to a lower income population.

Laura responded saying that the System Connectivity tool was a good resource for addressing these type of equity questions, because it allows the user to choose an origin and destination, and see what effect a proposed bike plan may have on a population.

Tracy pointed out that the System Connectivity tool was still very much hypothetical at the moment, because she does not know how to go about distributing it for these kind of uses.

Lindell Price suggested that Tracy do outreach to professional groups such as Women's Transportation Seminar (WTS), as well as various public health organizations.

Kate Meis, Local Government Commission, offered to help with outreach to partner agencies and local governments. She also asked a question related to the user side, wondering if RTC was tapping into the data collected by phone applications that were already in use by trail users, such as Map My Ride or Strava.

Tracy answered that the users of these applications are a small subset of the population because they already have a strong preference for trails, own smart phones, and are interested in self-improvement. She was worried that using this data would skew the survey results. Additionally, she suggest that the group of people that use these applications already have good access to trails. To reach this population, RTC had created an online survey, as well as emailed the survey to their full e-list (which includes over a million trail users in the United States, 80% of which are bicyclists). Tracy thought that would be sufficient in capturing this population of trail users.

Jeanie Ward-Waller, California Bicycle Coalition, commented that having those trail users take the survey online was still important, because it is those individuals that are the most likely not to stop to take a survey while on the actual trail (because they are racing by at high speeds).

Ann Mahaney, Caltrans Smart Mobility Branch, suggested that there should be a question on the survey about the type of mode that trail users used to get to the trail.

Tracy responded that the survey does include a trail access question about the modes used by trail users to get to the trail.

Teresa McWilliam, Caltrans Local Assistance, asked if any of the survey counts were electronic.

Tracy answered that yes, the factors are based on data from a nationwide network of fifty electronic trail traffic monitoring stations, which are permanently installed at various trails around the country, and continuously measure multi-modal traffic on the trails where they are located.

Wendy Alfsen, California Walks, commented that she believes there is an opportunity for the RTC National Trail User survey to share data, or supplement its data, with other similar surveys that have been done in the past related to bicycle and pedestrian facilities, such as the National Household Travel Survey and the California Household Travel Survey.

Tracy agreed that there was an opportunity to share data among other similar surveys and

platforms related to pedestrian and bicycle facilities, however, she suggested it was just a matter of figuring out how to define their goals in order to get the exact data they were looking for.

Ken Ryan made a comment regarding issues of trail connectivity in rural areas, specifically in the Mt. Shasta region. He noticed that for many of the trails in the region, the only way visitors could access them was through driving, rather than biking, or using other trail facilities to access the major trail head. He suggested Tracy explore this connectivity gap in her research.

Steven Cliff, Assistant Director of Sustainability at Caltrans, spoke about his office trying to develop an accessibility score. He said that the work Tracy and her team had done was very similar to what he had in mind for developing his livability score, specifically the aspect of using it as a tool to prioritize projects. He expressed interest in the tool for informing the work the Office of Sustainability is doing. Steven also made a secondary comment about the difference between recreation and transportation as it relates to the survey, suggesting that there is a fine line the two, and he cautioned against classifying trips as one or the other when they may serve a dual purpose.

Tracy answered that the real question the survey is trying to get at is not necessarily the trip purpose, but whether the trip was a substitution for another mode, and if it would have been made if the trail did not exist.

Steven also pointed out that in Tracy's fiscal analysis, she did not include a dollar amount associated with a reduced carbon emission. He noted that in California there is a fiscal value associated with reducing carbon, and he recommended adding that dollar value into Tracy's analysis.

As a follow-up to Steven's comment, Lindell Price suggested that rather than categorizing a specific trip by its purpose, we look at a facility and see if it provides for commuting needs (i.e. safe and reliable year round, such as a road), or if it is designed and operated in such a way that it is useful only as a recreational facility (i.e. only open during specific weather conditions and hours). She suggested that RTC's research look more at what kind of facility is needed in a specific area, and then make design choices based on that.

Danny Yost, Legislative Affairs, made a comment about his own surveying experience. When conducting surveys with pedestrians, he used to walk with the survey-taker. He recommended this as a method.

Tracy responded that she is not too concerned about survey responses since they have a 75% response rate, which is high for a survey of this nature.

Jeanie Ward-Waller, California Bicycle Coalition, asked how statistically significant the survey data would be in California.

Tracy said that they have only one survey location in California and they are expecting around three-hundred (300) responses from that location. She suggested not breaking up the survey data regionally, but instead analyzing it as a national data set.

Laura said discussion could happen around whether there funding at the state or regional level to get a good sample for California, or a region in California.

Action Item:

Coco suggested that the follow-up action be arranging a small subgroup of ATLC members who are interested in learning more about the survey methodology, models, and other aspects of the T-MAP project.

5. 2018 California State Rail Plan – Emily Burstein, Division of Rail & Mass Transportation

Emily Burstein, Caltrans Division of Rail & Mass Transportation, introduced herself and gave an update on the upcoming 2018 California State Rail Plan and the outreach her division is doing surrounding the plan. She provided the ATLC group with a two-page overview of the rail plan outreach program. (Handout found here:

http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/ATLC/documents/CSRP_2018_Outreach_Sheet.docx)

Emily explained that her division had just begun the process of developing the 2018 California State Rail Plan, with a draft of the document projected to be released by March 2017, and the final document to be released in 2018. Emily was seeking early input from the ATLC members, among other groups, to incorporate into the rail plan draft.

The California State Rail Plan is required under state and federal law, and allows access to federal rail capital grants, including passenger and freight rail. What will be different about this rail plan from past plans, is that it will include a twenty (20) year vision for an integrated passenger rail network that includes commuter, inner city, and high-speed rail. Emily explained that for this 20-year visioning scope, her division was looking to a European-type model, where separate rail systems are hubbed together at station locations. Linking three different types of passenger rail would allow integrated rail trips over longer distances and more effective service.

The plan would be looking at first and last mile station connectors, including bicycle and pedestrian facilities, which, as Emily explained, was why she was interested in ATLC feedback.

The parts of the plan that will specifically address bicyclists and pedestrians are as follows:

- Inventory of commuter and inner-city rail stations, which will include an assessment of non-motorized transportation access to rail, including bike facilities.
- Summary of local land-use and transportation plans including station area plans for areas with existing and proposed rail stations; local land use plans include bicycle and pedestrian plans
- Incorporation of the California Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan's policy material into the Rail Plan and ensuring the two plans are consistent

Jeanie Ward Waller, California Bicycle Coalition, offered a suggestion to look beyond just the first and last mile connectors, as the need for connectivity often extends more than just one mile.

She suggested that the plan look at broader radius of bicycle access to rail than just the first and last mile since bicyclists will travel farther to access rail stations.

Stanley Price commented that he would like to see tandem bicycles and electric assist bicycles be allowed on trains.

Wendy Alfsen, California Walks, asked if this plan would be consistent with the California Freight Mobility Plan (CFMP).

Emily answered that the CFMP was released in 2014 and has a 5-year cycle for update. The freight division is currently working on a multi-agency Freight Sustainability Action Plan, which will be released in June-July of 2016. Emily's division is focusing their coordination efforts with that plan, in order to facilitate the development of rail freight policies. Emily suggested that the 2018 California State Rail Plan will be consistent with the Freight Sustainability Action Plan, which will likely feed into the next California Freight Mobility Plan.

Wendy stressed the importance of including policy related to transit, bicycle and pedestrian facility access to train stations in the rail plan.

Emily responded that the plan would likely deal with accessibility issues by discussing best practices and including an inventory of existing stations in an effort to be able to categorize these stations in terms of the quality of access.

Wendy suggested the need to stress existing federal guidelines related to multi-modal access of train stations in the upcoming rail plan. She asked how the plan would deal with connector busses to rail.

Emily responded that the Amtrak rail system has a very extensive feeder bus system, and they plan to document that in the rail plan, and continue to support that as a way to extend the rail system moving forward.

Coco noted that the rail plan is strictly a plan, not a programming document, so it sets the direction of policy. She suggested that the plan is in its early stages, so there is still plenty of time to receive input.

Emily explained some of the proposed outreach for the 2018 California State Rail Plan:

- Continue to come periodically to ATLC meetings, as well as the Statewide California Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan TAC to get input from both groups
- Established a fairly large rail plan advisory group (38 people), made up primarily of freight and rail experts, as well as four (4) types of advocacy groups (livable communities, environment, disadvantaged communities and agriculture). A representative from Local Government Commission is in the group. A disadvantaged community representative is sought. TransForm cannot participate due to current staffing levels. A representative from Policy Link is being requested. Wendy Alfsen, California Walks, suggested that Caltrans tap the Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability if Policy Link is not available.

- Planning to release a survey in December to get early reactions. The survey will be distributed to the email list of the ATLC group and the California Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Technical Advisory Committee.

6. Open Discussion and Closing Remarks – Coco Briseno, Deputy Director, Planning and Modal Programs

Since the meeting time was up, Coco Briseno, Caltrans Planning & Modal Deputy, ended the meeting and asked for closing statements and action items.

Jeanie Ward-Waller requested that a discussion about how the California State Rail Plan would interface with High Speed Rail, especially station area planning, be placed on the February 18th ATLC agenda.

Alyssa stated that she would send out the link to the California State Rail Plan website when it goes live in the next few weeks.

Coco mentioned that the 2016 meeting dates were on the agenda, and for everyone to add those to their calendars if they hadn't already. She also requested for the group to continue sending potential ATLC agenda ideas to Alyssa.

Coco thanked everyone for participating, and the meeting was adjourned. The next ATLC meeting will be on February 18, 2016.

Caltrans Contacts

Alyssa Begley – (916) 261-3389

Anika Jesi – (916) 653-3529