



**Citizens Advisory Committee
Bicycle/Pedestrian Subcommittee**

September 17, 2013

12:30 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

600 South Main Street, Orange, California, 92863

Conference Room 103/4

Agenda

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Welcome/Chairman's Remarks | <i>Roy Shahbazian, Subcommittee Chair</i> |
| 2. I-405 Bike/Ped Impacts | <i>Niall Barrett, Program Manager</i> |
| 3. MPAH Policies | <i>Charlie Larwood, Planning Manager</i> |
| 4. Pedestrian Priorities Update | <i>Roy Shahbazian, Subcommittee Chair</i> |
| 5. Planning Update
<i>District 1 & 2 Bikeways Collaborative</i> | <i>Carolyn Mamaradlo, Transportation Analyst</i> |
| 6. Subcommittee Member Comments | <i>Roy Shahbazian, Subcommittee Chair</i> |
| 7. Staff Liaison | <i>Kelley Jimenez, Strategic Communications</i> |
| 8. Public Comments | <i>Roy Shahbazian, Subcommittee Chair</i> |
| 9. Adjournment / Next Meeting
<i>December 17, 2013</i> | |

Agenda Descriptions/Public Comments on Agenda Items

The Agenda descriptions are intended to give notice to members of the public of a general summary of items of business to be transacted or discussed. Members from the public wishing to address the Committee will be recognized by the Chairman at the time the Agenda item is to be considered. A speaker's comments shall be limited to three (3) minutes.

Any person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in this meeting should contact the OCTA at (714) 560-5611, no less than two (2) business days prior to this meeting to enable OCTA to make reasonable arrangements to assure accessibility to this meeting.

CAC
Bicycle/Pedestrian Subcommittee
Fiscal Year 2012-2013 Attendance Record

● = Present ⊙ = Absent R = Resigned

Members	9/18/12	1/15/13	3/19/13	6/18/13
Adams, Paul	●	●	●	●
Bacerra, Phil	⊙	●	⊙	⊙
Bahadori, Hamid	⊙	●	⊙	⊙
Buck, Vince	●	●	●	●
Chapel, David	●	⊙	●	⊙
DiCandia, Carla	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
Garner, Tom	⊙	⊙	●	●
Gonzales-Hayes, Dolores	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
Kalmick, Dan*	N/A	●	●	⊙
Lahtinen, Leonard	⊙	●	⊙	●
Pepper, Pat	⊙	●	●	●
Reifer, Jane	●	●	●	●
Shahbazian, Roy	⊙	●	●	●
Thompson, Jeff	●	⊙	●	⊙

Additional Attendees

Pete van Nuys	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
Rye Baerg	●	⊙	⊙	⊙
Paul Martin	●	⊙	⊙	●
Michelle Lieberman	●	⊙	⊙	⊙
Pauline Chow	●	●	⊙	⊙
Megan Taylor	●	⊙	⊙	⊙
Antonio Chavira	⊙	⊙	●	⊙
Lindsay Horn	⊙	⊙	●	⊙
Kelly Broberg	⊙	⊙	●	⊙
Michele Martinez	⊙	⊙	●	⊙

*Dan Kalmick was added to the subcommittee on 10/29/12



**Citizens Advisory Committee
Bicycle/Pedestrian Subcommittee
Meeting Notes**

September 17, 2013

12:30 p.m. –2:30 p.m.

*600 South Main Street, Orange, California, 92863
Conference Room 103/4*

1. Welcome/Chairman's Remarks

Roy Shahbazian, Chair, thanked the committee for attending.

2. I-405 Bike/Ped Impacts

Niall Barrett, Program Manager

Niall said the largest project they currently have underway is the I-405 Improvement Project, which is in the environmental phase. Last May, the project EIR/EIS was released. This project goes from the I-5 to the SR-73. As part of the draft last year, they received comments from some subcommittee members as well as cities and members of the public. They have met with Jane and Roy to discuss issues that can and cannot be addressed. The final EIR includes the public comments and the responses approved by Caltrans. OCTA has considered how to improve bicycle and pedestrian access at the 17 overcrossings on the I-405 are replaced. The new bridges will be longer because they have to span a wider freeway, and most will be built in the Master Plan of Arterial Highways. There is an opportunity to provide increased pedestrian and bike access. They have reviewed the collaborative bike plan and included that as part of the DEIR/EIS. The number of bike lanes has been doubled in the new plan.

OCTA and Caltrans have also focused on pedestrian and bicyclist interaction with traffic, which was stunted by cities wanting to have more vehicle lanes on the freeways leaving little room for pedestrian projects. Cities also like free on- and off-ramps with no traffic signals to encourage traffic flow which makes crossing difficult for pedestrians. They met with consultants, Caltrans and cities about these issues, but Caltrans will make the final decision because it is the owner/operator of the I-405. They have met with Fountain Valley, Westminster and Huntington Beach. They have met with Roy to discuss T-ing off ramps and going back to the cities. If they get a resolution they will go to Caltrans to talk about design standards and resolve these issues ahead of finalizing the EIR. Although the OCTA board selected alternative one, there are still ongoing discussions to see if the new board will switch to a different

alternative. They welcome feedback from the subcommittee members and will respond to these and include them in the EIR because they need justification for improvements they propose to Caltrans and the cities.

A subcommittee member said he saw a report about the I-405 bridges on the news and heard mostly positive comments.

Vince commented about the danger of on-ramps for bicyclists, specifically noting the one in Irvine around Sand Canyon with two lanes coming out at high speeds. The cyclist has to be careful of the cars while crossing both lanes, which is difficult to do while balancing on a bike.

Niall said these comments help defend access when they discuss guideways with cities and Caltrans. He agrees that there are certain places pedestrians and cyclists choose not to go because they are unsafe. There will always be a tradeoff between maximum vehicle throughput and pedestrian crossing.

Vince said at least pedestrians have time to look both ways when crossing these lanes, but bicyclists do not have this luxury because they are moving and this is a dangerous situation.

Niall said he realizes these dangers as a cyclist.

Jane asked if during the comment period the subcommittee will hear engineers' comments about these projects and see their input reflected there.

Niall said the subcommittee may see improvements, but cities such as Fountain Valley have been saying they want to keep cars on busy and wide streets like overcrossings. They are more willing to put pedestrians and cyclists on less busy streets. This is one of the challenges the subcommittee can expect to see in the final. Niall said he will meet with the subcommittee again prior to publishing the final EIR/EIS to show them any progress he has made with the cities and Caltrans.

Jane said it was interesting to see the engineers think about how these projects could be made safer for pedestrians and cyclists because it sounded like they had not focused on this as much as they could have. She asked how many overcrossings still do not have pedestrian and cyclist access.

Niall said he thinks ten of the overcrossings have bike lanes so far. He said the problem lies with the on- and off-ramps and safety concerns there especially if there is a dedicated right turn lane next to a bike lane. Ideally, some crossings would be signalized, but Caltrans has not bought in on this idea. Niall suggested laying out crossings better to give pedestrians and cyclists more time to see cars coming.

Jane said asked if they could pressure Caltrans further for creative solutions to these problems.

Niall said the way Jane and Roy are going about it is probably the best they can do. Engaging with Caltrans and the cities might create better outcomes for pedestrians. He encouraged the subcommittee to read the draft and give him information to back up their efforts with Caltrans.

Jane asked if Roy had any comments about this and mentioned the lack of pedestrian mitigation policies at OCTA besides keeping one side of a bridge open while construction is occurring. She said she disagrees with Vince that cyclists are at a greater disadvantage than pedestrians. She said there are many people who have no other means of transportation and OCTA should consider a fare-free shuttle to the other side of the construction on these bridges when they are unavailable for use by pedestrians.

Niall said Jane should raise the issues with the buses.

Jane said the committee does not talk about buses, but this issue concerns pedestrians.

Niall said if this is in the comments he can run it by the cities.

Leonard asked if Caltrans was getting similar input from other counties.

Niall said he does not know because he does not work for Caltrans. He said he would be surprised if Orange County was the only one.

Charlie said when he started at Caltrans, opinions were much worse for pedestrians and cyclists than they are today. Caltrans takes concerns of the state into consideration and tries to balance all modal needs. They have come a long way, but they are looking at the entire state and different counties have different preferences.

Joe Alcock, OCTA Planning, said bike and pedestrian issues were elevated on Caltrans radar in the last couple years.

Jane thanked Niall for representing OCTA and giving strong recommendations on the committee's behalf because OCTA has not emphasized this enough in the past.

Roy asked, between Caltrans and the city engineers, who is more amenable to signalized or non-signalized perpendicular intersections.

Niall said he could not say one way or another. One of the things about Caltrans is they are reluctant to get involved until the board makes its decision between the alternatives.

Roy said he learned recently one of the issues is having storage lanes for cars to queue up so they don't back up onto the freeway. His understanding is this is not the case for on-ramps, however, and at least those should have perpendicular crossings.

Roy also commented that implementing right-turn arrows at on-ramps instead of having free rights would allow pedestrians to cross, but probably would not have high walking traffic so that cars could freely flow onto the freeway the remainder of the time.

Roy passed out a few pages from the highway design manual to the subcommittee. He said there is a part about optional free right turns where cars can either go straight or turn right, which is problematic for pedestrians. Caltrans has some guides about lanes that should not be used such as these and multiple right turn lanes. He marked a few points in the manual he thought were interesting.

A committee member commented that some of the lanes are carpool lanes on on-ramps.

Another committee member said those would be good candidates for signals.

3. MPAH Policies

Charlie Larwood, Planning Manager
Joe Alcock, MPAH Program Manager

Charlie introduced Joe Alcock, who would speak to the technical aspects of the plan. He said the MPAH has been around for about 50 years. It started in the county. The guidelines are dynamic and are vetted through the Technical Advisory Committee which consists of public works engineers and directors. This is included in the Ordinance because the cities in Orange County agreed that arterials should be consistent—it's the ultimate plan.

Joe said the MPAH was entirely focused on meeting vehicular needs when it was formed. The county administered the MPAH until 1995, when it was transferred to OCTA. The MPAH is approximately 1400 miles of arterial streets throughout the county and approximately 82% built. OCTA is responsible for working with cities and the county to make sure arterial integrity is maintained. However in recent years there has been a strain as demand has increased for all modes. In addition, jurisdictions have had

trouble complying with M2 eligibility requirements and the Complete Streets Act.

Charlie said when the city wants to add lanes, but there is no room, OCTA suggests they get rid of bicycle lanes. In this case, right of way is still an issue. OCTA does not own or operate any facilities. The cities own these.

Leonard asked for a definition of arterial highways.

Joe replied they are streets throughout the county and Charlie added they are six- to eight-lane streets. These have design standards applied to them that cities use. OCTA does not set these standards, but they are set by cities and Caltrans.

Joe said cities' eligibility for M2 funding depends on their city general plan being consistent with the MPAH. His department checks for consistency. If they are not consistent that presents an eligibility issue and cities are challenged in getting M2 funding. This process is more tied to funding with input from stakeholders.

Charlie said OCTA gets blamed by city officials often, but this blame is wrongly placed because OCTA works with cities to find solutions and consensus when roads affect outside cities. Issues come with adding new infrastructure to 50-year-old infrastructure.

A committee member asked if the MPAH includes compliance with bikeway standards.

Joe said it does not. It only has to do with streets.

A committee member inquired if that means there are no funding repercussions for cities who take bike lanes out.

Joe said there are not, but the MPAH allows OCTA to support cities building bike lanes within existing arterials.

A committee member asked if there was a way OCTA could get more "clout."

Joe said there are mechanisms to help cities. The MPAH guidance has recently been updated. There are about five different options for cities to comply with complete streets:

- Reclassification – more lanes to less
- Letter agreements – interim
- Functional equivalency – shifting capacity between facilities
- Non-standard lane widths – shaving off lane size

- Buy right of way

Jane asked if reclassification is a mechanism that can be used to make sure bike lanes are in. Joe replied yes.

Charlie said they have used the interim option in about six or seven cities where they made the center median into a left turn lane in front of a school. Joe said the interim option has less impact than reclassification.

Joe said OCTA does not count lane width in funding cities.

Charlie said cities usually do not buy right of way because it is unpopular with residents. More than 90% of trips on arterials are in cars. There is a new state law that says cities must consider all modes of transportation. OCTA is focusing on developing a regional bikeway system and getting buy-in from all the cities.

Joe said this plan is currently being retrofitted to a vehicle-based plan. There are a few options to work with cities and nine to ten have been receptive.

Jane asked how the MPAH affects sidewalks.

Joe said OCTA has worked with cities and pulled streets off the MPAH so they can make them more pedestrian-friendly where there are not high volumes.

Charlie said OCTA's job is to facilitate cooperation and communication between cities to get consensus on building projects that are interconnected.

Jane asked if OCTA bus operations could be included in MPAH communications so buses can service renovated pedestrian areas.

Charlie said his staff reviews environmental documents and looks for impacts on transit service and bike lanes.

A committee member asked about the new Dana Point bus destination and when it will occur.

Charlie said in the next 3-5 years. He has been working with a pedestrian problem on an on-ramp and it has been a good success story.

A committee member asked about an accident in Dana Point.

Charlie said there is now a class 1 bike facility in that area.

A committee member asked about OCTA's input to designing intersections.

Joe said there must be an amendment and impact analysis to take lanes out. Charlie said OCTA was not consulted on the issue and it was the city's decision. The city may have been trying to maintain its own service standard. OCTA does not maintain this and there is no penalty. Charlie said cities do need to conform to their own general plan which has these kinds of requirements. OCTA weighs in if they are consulted.

Charlie said OCTA is internally discussing plans to develop more focused responses to these questions.

Jane asked if being on the MPAH meant your road could compete for funding.

Joe said yes, having your road classified on the MPAH makes it eligible to compete.

Roy asked how the MPAH addresses weak points. Joe responded the roadway diet best allowed cities to put in bike lanes.

Vince said OCTA should have a workshop addressing these issues.

Roy said in the roadway classifications optional free right turn lanes are allowed if warranted by demand. Joe said he would review this.

4. Pedestrian Priorities Update

Roy Shahbazian, Subcommittee Chair

Roy said there were four categories with individual priorities underneath. The highest priorities are in bold at the top of each column. He wanted to vote on the priorities and send off to the CAC.

Jane wanted to add Measure M2 eligibility guidelines in the documents section. She said the driveway issue is to provide safety and awareness for other transportation modes. On the fourth point of item 2 about superblocks she said providing safe, direct access to building entrances should be a focus. This was a comment on the narrative.

Jane said the first one should say OCTA will implement and strengthen policies so that OCTA would take on the review of the policies as they pertain to active transportation.

Roy said they could clarify this in the narrative.

Jane said she wanted to emphasize the role of OCTA.

Kelley said OCTA will let the subcommittee know what their role will be versus the cities' roles.

Roy asked when they would receive feedback.

Kelley said once this is approved by the committee.

Roy asked whether it would make sense to add footnotes.

Alice said it would make sense to include these in the narrative.

Charlie said staff is working on a response.

A committee member said there could be an indicator on items OCTA is responsible for.

Roy asked if there were any objections.

Jane said they need to be clear that OCTA cannot change documents but can implement them.

Roy said this could be addressed in the narrative.

Jane asked how city general plans can fit into this. Maybe OCTA could have general plan verbage.

Roy and Alice pointed out that this is already included.

Jane was making sure this was explicit.

Roy said this could go in the narrative.

Jane moved to approve the pedestrian priorities.

Alice said since Leonard left the meeting, the subcommittee lost its quorum. She suggested the members present approve moving the priorities forward by taking a straw vote.

Roy asked if any members opposed approval of pedestrian priorities. No one was opposed.

Roy said the narrative was created to address questions people had about the bullet points in the chart.

Alice said looking at the first sentence, “during the first year” and “in Orange County” should be added. She also said issues might not be a good word to use since that would mean marketing is an aspect. A committee member suggested the word “aspects” instead.

Jane noticed in number two the words were not exactly the same as in the chart.

Alice said this would be really important to send to the CAC as well. Roy asked the committee to stay later to finish the narrative.

Roy clarified the pedestrian priorities do not deal with bikes.

A committee member suggested removing “superblocks.” Jane suggested defining it. Roy said there is a sentence defining it in the narrative. Alice said it could be taken out if Jane’s suggestions were added.

Jane suggested adding corresponding numbers next to bold paragraphs.

Roy said they talked about including general planning in the fourth paragraph and asked for suggestions.

A committee member said this is implicit in what is already said.

Alice said it could say “portions of documents such as city general plans and the model design of...” Roy said keep the sentence but add “into documents such as the general plan.” Kelley suggested the word “incorporate.”

Jane suggested calling the first column “Policy & Design.” She wanted the last paragraph to refer to the first paragraph of the section.

Jane proposed adding a fifth column and splitting up policy and design. Policy should be the first priority.

Jane would like the document to be more detailed. She would like to see relevant documents included and policies spelled out and included in a semi-technical manner. How can the committee develop this into a prime document?

Roy suggested the subcommittee talk about next steps at the next meeting after the CAC has approved the priorities.

5. Planning Update

Carolyn Mamaradlo, Transportation Analyst

Districts 1 & 2 are nearing development of a bike strategy which was released between August and early September. Last week they had a workshop with Costa Mesa city where they walked people through the draft which was well received. They will be addressing comments they received about education and safety. Roy had some comments about cost-benefit analysis. These will be addressed in the draft.

The District 5 consultants have been approved by the board. The first technical committee meeting will be October 17 in Laguna Hills. Outreach will be conducted through fall. They will be at a Rancho Santa Margarita for comments.

6. Subcommittee Member Comments

Roy Shahbazian, Subcommittee Chair

There were no subcommittee member comments.

7. Staff Liaison

Kelley Jimenez, Strategic Communications

Alice said the tentative kick-off date is October 9 and they have been working closely with Bike Nation. They have stations planned at the Fullerton train station, City Hall, North Port Justice Center, College Plaza, First Christian Church, Fullerton College, five sites on CSUF campus, Walgreens, Wilshire and the museum. This pilot project is being phased in so it is starting small. Alice said there is a chance they will not be ready by October 9.

Kelley said there is a LRTP roundtable the subcommittee would host replacing the December meeting with a November roundtable. She asked if the subcommittee would be amenable to that and communicate individually with her. She said the event would be a lunch from 12:30 to 2:00 p.m. at OCTA. This pushes out further discussion of the priorities until March.

8. Public Comments

Roy Shahbazian, Subcommittee Chair

There were no public comments.

9. Adjournment/Next Meeting

TBD