

# Active Transportation and Livable Communities (ATLC) Advisory Group Meeting

Thursday, August 18, 2011 – 1:30 PM – 3:30 PM  
California Department of Transportation, Headquarters  
1120 N Street, Sacramento, CA -- Director's Board Room 2116

---

## Meeting Summary Notes

### **1. Welcome and Introductions**

Alyssa Begley, Chief, Community Planning, introduced herself and reminded everyone that the tentative 2012 ATLC meeting dates and times are shown on the bottom of the agenda. Please let Alyssa know by September if there are any conflicts, otherwise the dates will be finalized. The ATLC meeting convenes in Room 2116 from 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. on a quarterly basis.

#### **ATTENDANCE**

##### **External Agencies**

Al Casciato, San Francisco Police Department, Captain of the Traffic Company  
Barb Alberson, Department of Public Health Services  
Bob Planthold, California Walks  
Chris Morfas, Sacramento Metro Air Quality Management District  
Jacquelyn Duerr, Department of Public Health  
Laura Cohen, Rails-to-Trails Conservancy – Western Region  
Melinda Coy, Housing and Community Development  
Paul Zykofsky, Local Government Commission  
Nicola Hara, Center for Civic Partnerships (via telephone)  
Sabrina Means, California Transit Association  
Teri Duarte, WALKSacramento  
Wendy Alfsen, California Walks

##### **Caltrans**

Martin Tuttle, Deputy Director, Planning and Modal Programs  
Sharon Scherzinger, Division Chief, Transportation Planning  
Alyssa Begley, Chief, Community Planning  
Aaron Cabaccang, District 2 (via telephone)  
Alana Hitchcock, Community Planning  
Barry Padilla, State Planning  
Beth Thomas, District 4 (via telephone)  
Bruce de Terra, Chief, System & Freight Planning  
Chris Ratekin, Community Planning  
Coco Briseno, Chief, Transportation Systems Information  
Collette Armao, Aeronautics  
Denix Anbiah, Chief, Local Assistance  
Emily Mraovich, Community Planning  
Erin Thompson, Regional Planning  
Gabriel Corley, State Planning  
Jila Priebe, Mass Transportation  
Kelly Lier, System Planning  
Kevin Herritt, Design  
Lara Justine, Landscape Architecture  
Laurie Waters, State Planning

## ATTENDANCE

Marilee Mortenson, Regional Transportation  
MaryBeth Herritt, Design  
Rose Agacer-Solis, State Planning  
Seth Cutter, District 11 (via telephone)  
Steve Takigawa, Deputy Director, Maintenance and Operations  
Tim Craggs, Design  
Wayne Henley, Traffic Operations

### **2. Opening Comments**

Martin Tuttle, Deputy Director, Planning and Modal Programs, reminded everyone to keep reports to a minimum and if needed, separate meetings can be arranged to discuss the item in more detail.

### **3. DD-64-R1 Complete Streets Implementation Plan Updates**

- Project Development Procedures Manual (PDPM) Revision

Mary Beth Herritt, Design, reported that the pre-Project Initiation Document (PID) Scoping Information Sheet is one of the Complete Streets items that Design is working on with the Division of Transportation Planning (DOTP). It is expected to be rolled out as part of PID streamlining changes that will be shared in September 2011.

Design is also working with DOTP to finalize Chapter 5 of the PDPM, which is about Transportation Planning. The chapter will explain how transportation planning develops needs that feed into the project development process, with PIDs being the first step.

The Division is working to complete the *Purpose and Need* sections of the PDPM, however, due to PID streamlining efforts not much progress has been made. Gary Birch, hired as editor for the PDPM, will continue these efforts.

- Highway Design Manual (HDM) Revision

Kevin Herritt, Design, provided a handout that displays a **list of 32 external agencies** that provided comments to the Department of Transportation (Department) on the HDM. Comments were also received from 25 different Districts and Divisions within the Department and are currently being reviewed. Comments that are unclear will be clarified with the author and an effort will be made to resolve comments involving complex issues prior to the manual release date. Revisions to the HDM will be made based on the feedback that was received. The target date for release of the revised HDM is December 2011.

Laura Cohen, Rails-to-Trails Conservancy – Western Region, asked if the past review period was the only opportunity to comment or if there will be any other opportunities to comment before the proposed December release date. Kevin responded that the official commentary period is over, but he will continue to accept comments. He reminded everyone that the HDM is a living document and is always open for review.

Chris Morfas, Sacramento Metro Air Quality Management, stated that the California Bike Coalition (CBC) has strong interest in this effort. Most of the language in the manual is advisory to local jurisdictions as it pertains to most elements of roadway design, but the specific elements pertaining to bikeways are mandatory standards. He stated that CBC's comments requested that the Department consider augmenting the menu of bike facilities available to local jurisdictions. Kevin Herritt responded that Design is in the process of trying to understand all the comments and they are getting back to the author of the comments for clarification, if needed. For the more complex comments, they will talk within the Department and with others to sort out the issues. In the case that these comments cannot be solved by the manual release date, the decision may be made to discuss these complex issues and incorporate a solution at a later date.

Wendy Alfsen, California Walks, complemented Caltrans on addressing the changes and moving forward with this effort. Kevin Herritt replied that Caltrans will continue work as a partner on these issues in the future.

It was suggested that Design coordinate a webinar to be held before the release of the HDM update to report and discuss the final HDM changes.

- Main Streets Guide Revision

Lara Justine, Landscape Architecture, thanked everyone for reviewing and providing constructive feedback on the revised Main Streets Guide that was circulated over the summer. This initial review process mainly checked for errors, omissions, and redundancies. Lara and her team are addressing the comments now and will further develop the areas of the document where there were placeholders. The document will be circulated again at the end of September 2011 for a more comprehensive review.

Chris Morfas, Sacramento Metro Air Quality Management, complimented Lara and her team on this effort. He suggested that the Department might want to take advantage of the document by marketing a Main Streets program to make money and technical assistance available to local jurisdictions as part of the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) Program.

Jacquolyn Duerr, Department of Public Health, suggested a need to focus on rural communities. She stated that perhaps Strategic Growth Council can provide resources for the needs of rural communities.

Beth Thomas, District 4, stated that if Caltrans is to provide more technical assistance to local agencies then the Department needs standards that address Main Streets without needing design exceptions. This underscores the importance of the revisions being made in the design guidance of the HDM.

Wendy Alfsen, California Walks, agreed with Beth. She stated that there is lack of standards for Main Streets because the freeway standards do not apply in these situations. There should be a standard that will not require each project to go through a series of exceptions.

Tim Craggs, Design, added that one of the proposed changes within the HDM includes narrower footprints (lane widths) for urbanized types of facilities. The Department is incorporating this change so agencies will not need separate design processes for these types of facilities.

Martin Tuttle, Deputy Director, Planning and Modal Programs, replied that a lot of effort is going into the Main Streets Guide and the Department is relying on partner agencies to get the word out to promote the Document.

**Action Item:** Alyssa Begley, Office of Community Planning, will email the second, comprehensive Main Streets Guide update to the ATLC group for review and feedback. It is anticipated this will occur in September 2011. Comments need to be sent to Lara Justine.

- System Planning Guidelines

Bruce de Terra, Chief, System and Freight Planning, provided the handout, *Transportation Corridor Concept Report - Possible Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Transit Facility Datasets*, which reflects the revised draft System Planning Guidelines. Every state highway has a long range plan that is broken down into logical segments. The System Planning Guidelines tell the Districts what to provide as base data about each segment. The current guidelines have traditional measures for automobiles and trucks, and now Complete Streets measures will be added for bicycles, pedestrians, and transit. The idea behind the guidelines is to have a consistent data collection across all state routes. Referencing the handout, Bruce provided details on the revisions that have been made in response to some of the comments that have been received thus far.

The previous draft was provided to ATLC members at the last ATLC meeting held on May 19, 2011 for review and feedback. Comments were received and are being addressed.

Paul Zykofsky, Local Government Commission, asked if there is any way to measure the quality of crossings at pedestrian interchanges, for example, if an intersection causes out of direction travel. Bruce de Terra responded that pedestrian volume counts for a particular segment could demonstrate quality based on high or low usage. Also, the 'Type' measure would show which type of facilities are present or lacking. He added that if anyone has another suggestion of how this can be addressed, email the suggestion to Kelly\_Lier@dot.ca.gov.

Jacquolyn Duerr, Department of Public Health, asked how access for people with disabilities will be measured. Bruce de Terra responded that under the pedestrian 'Type' measure, American with Disabilities Act (ADA) data will be accessed for the facilities. He acknowledged that accessibility should be noted as an individual measure. Martin Tuttle, Deputy Director, Planning and Modal Programs, agreed with including an ADA compliant measure for reporting. Kelly Lier, System Planning, added that they have received the comment and will attempt to incorporate it into the Guidelines.

Wendy Alfsen, California Walks, commented that more crossing information is needed rather than just sidewalk information.

Bob Planthold, California Walks, suggested that when reporting on the measures, think of all possibilities that could occur on a highway, including what would need to be known in emergency situations for people with disabilities. For example, curb ramps built at intersections that lead to an unpaved shoulder with no sidewalk pose an increased danger in emergency situations. Facilities relating to these scenarios need to be reported.

**Action Item:** The revised draft System Planning Guidelines will be provided to ATLC members before the November 2011 ATLC meeting for review and comment.

#### **4. California Update to Manual of Uniform Transportation Control Devices (MUTCD) & California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC)**

Steve Takigawa, Traffic Operations, provided the handout, *Proposed Process to Appoint New Members to the California Traffic Control Devices Committee*. The handout shows a draft ten point process on how to nominate two non-motorized members to the CTCDC. The process will take about three months and the new members will be appointed by January 1, 2012. Anyone can apply for the positions, even if they serve on another advisory committee. There will be a defined selection criteria for choosing the new members.

Wayne Henley, Traffic Operations, provided an update on the MUTCD and presented a slide that reflected the **Table of Contents**. He explained that once the Federal Manual is released, California has two years to adopt the Federal Manual or to make the acceptable changes to the State Manual. The draft MUTCD was developed from January to June 2011, during which time comments were received and addressed. In addition, a two-day workshop was held in July 2011 in order to identify additional issues that needed to be addressed. A second draft will be published online at [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/signtech/mutcdsupp/ca\\_mutcd2011\\_draftrevisions.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/signtech/mutcdsupp/ca_mutcd2011_draftrevisions.htm) by September 1, 2011. Comments are due by October 1, 2011. A final draft will then be produced and recommended for approval on October 20, 2011. The target completion date of the Manual is December 2011.

Wayne also presented detailed information regarding the history and selection of the CTCDC. The purpose of the Committee is based on the Vehicle Code stating that Caltrans will set standards for traffic control devices in California, but it must consult with public agencies, local governments, and the public. The CTCDC is the advisory committee that represents public agencies, promotes uniform standards, reviews and evaluates proposed changes, communicates through the parent organizations, advises Caltrans on standards and policy, encourages research, and passes regulations. A slide reflecting a **list of current CTCDC members and their parent organizations** was displayed and reviewed.

As a parent organization, Caltrans' objective is to recruit two new members to the CTCDC. A selection criterion will be developed by a committee of staff persons from various advisory committees (i.e., ATLC, CBAC, ADA, Safe Routes to Schools, CalPed, etc.). Wayne will then send the draft selection criteria to ATLC members for a review and comment period of 30 days. Once the selection criteria has been established, CTCDC will send out a solicitation letter of the application to anyone who is interested in serving on the CTCDC as an expert in non-motorized transportation. Applicants will have a month to submit their application. Recommendations for the selection of new CTCDC members will take place around the end of October. Two primary members and two alternate members will be selected and recommended for appointment by the Caltrans Director. A letter welcoming new members to the CTCDC will be delivered to appointed applicants in December.

Bob Planthold, California Walks, suggested that members be informed of availability of travel expense reimbursement funds. Wayne responded that currently the CTCDC members volunteer their time and experience, however, if an appointed member is required to travel from far away, the Department will consider reimbursement for travel expenses. He added that an ideal candidate would be a Public Works Director from a progressive city who would not need travel expense reimbursement.

Bob also commented that number three on the *Proposed Process to Appoint New Members to the California Traffic Control Devices Committee* handout solicits criteria to just a few groups, while the review committee in number seven includes more groups. He asked why number three was so limited. In response, Steve Takigawa stated that it was a mistake and that all groups will be included in both steps.

Wendy Alfsen, California Walks, suggested that all members should be held to the CTCDC review and approval standards otherwise, the process should be deleted and the Caltrans Director should appoint the new members. Wayne replied that each parent organization identifies its own representative. In this case, the two new members will be specifically representing non-motorized transportation and fall under Caltrans as a parent organization, so Caltrans has the responsibility to set the criteria for its members. The criteria are being circulated to advocates for comment precisely because Caltrans wants to make sure that they are sound and reasonable for anyone to apply.

Collette Armao, Aeronautics, commented that military insulations related to aeronautics have specialized needs. She asked if these needs will be represented on the CTCDC and if not, they should be considered. Wayne replied that there is no current member for those issues, but the issues can possibly be incorporated into a chapter of the MUTCD at some point. In addition, the CTCDC can utilize an expert for a particular topic when the need arises.

**Action Item:** An update on the CTCDC process will be provided at the November ATLC meeting.

## **5. Transportation Enhancements (TE) Update**

John Haynes, Local Assistance, gave a brief overview of the TE program in the upcoming funding cycle. California has about \$75 million a year, or \$150 million each State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) cycle. The TE program has 12 categories:

1. Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities
2. Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Activities
3. Acquisition of Scenic or Historic Easement Sites
4. Scenic or Historic Highways Program including Tourist Development Centers
5. Landscape and Scenic Beautification
6. Historic Preservation of Transportation Facilities
7. Rehabilitation and Operation of Historic Transportation Structures or Facilities
8. Conversion of Abandon Railway Corridors to Trails
9. Inventory Control of Removal of Outdoor Advertising
10. Archeological Planning and Research
11. Environmental Mitigation of Run-off Pollution and Provision of Wildlife Connectivity
12. Establishment of Transportation Museums.

Throughout the state, TE is programmed in the STIP. The STIP is made up of two components: Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP), which is Caltrans' share of the STIP (25%) and, Regional Improvement Program (RIP), which is allocated to local agencies (75%). The allotment of STIP shares to counties is not reflected as Federal or State shares, but rather as county shares. If a county decides it does not want to fund a TE project, it receives the funds in state funds and the TE funds remain in the STIP. Caltrans does not want to expend these unused TE funds because doing so would reduce the amount of state funds available to the Department. The non-use of TE funds results in a federal rescission.

The deadline to submit all applications identifying which projects need to be programmed into the ITIP was due to John Haynes, Local Assistance, by August 1, 2011. The deadline for RIP TE was last December, the same date as all other RIP projects. Caltrans has identified \$41 million in projects to program into the ITIP. John anticipates receiving an excess of \$150 million in applications. Once all applications are received and deemed eligible, a committee of five individuals is formed to score the applications: two representatives from Programming, one representative from Environmental, one representative from Transportation Planning, and John Haynes. The committee has condensed the 12 categories in the TE program to the following categories:

- Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects
- Historic and Archeological
- Scenic Beautification Projects
- Water Quality and Wildlife Protection Projects
- Museums and Visitor Centers

The committee evaluates and scores each application based on statewide significance and project merits. The final scores make up the priority list, which goes to California Transportation Commission (CTC) for adoption into the STIP. For the RIP, every county has the option to either program specific projects or program a lump sum reserve. The projects that are programmed into the 2012 STIP will receive funds for construction in 2016 and 2017. The option to program a lump sum reserve is convenient for smaller and rural counties because they can decide how to use the TE funds at a future date when selecting projects. In this instance, the county must use the TE funds in the year it is programmed or they will lose it. The deadline for the ITIP/RIP will go to CTC for adoption on December 12, 2011.

Bob Planthold, California Walks, asked if TE money can be used in combination with existing transportation projects. John replied that it can.

Laura Cohen, Rails-to-Trails Conservancy – Western Region, asked what happens when counties do not program their TE or do not use their lump sum in the year it is programmed. Where does the money go? John replied that the county will receive the funds in the next STIP cycle as state shares, not as TE. Therefore, it adds to the un-programmed TE balance in the STIP. The STIP Guidelines state that if counties fail to program a lump sum TE, the Commission has the right to hold back some of the shares and program them only for TE eligible items.

## **6. California Interregional Blueprint (CIB) Status Report**

Gabriel Corley, State Planning, provided a status update on the California Interregional Blueprint (CIB). Senate Bill (SB) 375 requires Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO's) to create Sustainable Communities Strategies (SCS) to meet the Air Resources Board (ARB) greenhouse gas targets and SB 391 is the parallel process in which Caltrans must comply. The handout, [\*California Interregional Blueprint-Progress Report\*](#), reflects the means by which Caltrans will come into compliance with the requirements outlined in SB 391. The CIB will integrate the Statewide Programs and Statewide Modal Plans, as well as plans and programs such as Complete Streets, the Smart Mobility Framework, etc. Working groups are developing a methodology to best analyze the SCS and to calculate greenhouse gas levels for the next California Transportation Plan. There are two consultant contracts in place: one to develop the marketing and branding

strategy for the CIB and the other for writing and performing the analysis on the interim report. Two CIB workshops will be planned in November 2011. One workshop will be held November 1 or November 4, 2011 in Sacramento. The date is still being determined. The second workshop will be held on Nov 8, 2011 from 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. at the Caltrans District 7 office in Los Angeles. Stakeholders that will be invited include: SB 391 identified agencies and committees, various federal and state agencies, the Governor's Office, tribal governments, various working groups such as the ATLC, freight mobility groups, aviation groups, transit groups, AB 650 Committee members, and much more. A **draft agenda** for these two workshops was provided to those in attendance.

Wendy Alfsen, California Walks, asked if there is a statewide pedestrian plan or an active transportation plan that will be addressed in the CIB. Gabriel replied by stating that the matter is still being discussed, however, in many cases the guiding principles regarding pedestrians are included in Statewide Programs such as Complete Streets and the Smart Mobility Framework. Bruce de Terra, Chief, System & Freight Planning, added that pedestrian travel will be integrated into all Modal Plans as well. Bruce stated that DD-64 is one of those guiding principles.

## **7. Open Discussion and Closing Remarks**

Martin Tuttle, Deputy Director, Planning and Modal Programs, thanked everyone for attending and providing input.

**Next 2011 Meetings** – Thursday, November 17, February 16  
1:30 to 3:30 PM, Caltrans Headquarters' Room 2116

**Caltrans Contacts:** Alyssa Begley – 916-651-6882 Leslie Mazzeo – 916-653-3726  
Emily Mraovich- 916-653-3087