



NAPA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY **Active Transportation Advisory Committee Agenda Memo**

TO: Active Transportation Advisory Committee
FROM: Kate Miller, Executive Director
REPORT BY: Diana Meehan, Senior Planner
(707) 259-8327/ Email: dmeehan@nvta.ca.gov
SUBJECT: Complete Streets Checklist Review - Safe and Seamless Quick Strike Program - Napa Forward SR 29 Safety and Operational Improvements and the Napa Valley Safe Routes to School Program

RECOMMENDATION

That the ATAC review and approve Complete Streets Checklists for the Napa Forward SR 29 Safety and Operational Improvements and the Napa Valley Safe Routes to School Program.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

County Transportation Agencies (CTA's) are required to review Complete Streets Checklists and seek input from the ATAC to ensure routine accommodation is considered in the early stages of project development.

FISCAL IMPACT

Is there a Fiscal Impact? No.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

The Complete Streets Checklist was established by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Resolution 3765 to ensure that all projects funded with regional funds consider the accommodation of pedestrians, cyclists and public transit users as part of the project planning, design, funding and construction. The Complete Streets Checklist works in conjunction with the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) and the Active Transportation Program (ATP) to utilize funding to support MTC's regional transportation priorities, which

include improvements for people walking, biking and using transit as well as safe routes to school projects.

MTC has \$55 million in a one-time grant program for the purpose of funding quick-strike projects. Five million dollars from this program has been set aside for Blue Ribbon Transit Recovery Task Force efforts. MTC cannot distribute the remaining funds on formula, but have established targets loosely based on the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) formula with a minimum of \$1 million to any one county. Napa's target, as the smallest county in the region, would be \$1 million dollars. However, projects that demonstrate regional coordination are a high priority and may garner additional funds.

NVTA is working with MTC on mini roundabouts at intersections on SR 29 at Oakville Cross Road and Rutherford (SR 128) that would address safety and traffic operations concerns under the Napa Forward umbrella. MTC has already set aside \$2 million in capital funds for Napa Forward projects; of which \$1 million is for Napa Forward Commute Program. The roundabouts would greatly improve traffic operations, slow traffic to allow for cross traffic to safely turn left onto SR 29 and improve bicycle and pedestrian movements.

In addition, NVTA is applying for \$100,000 in partnership with the Napa County Bicycle Coalition to fund the Safe Routes to School Program (SRTS) for Fiscal Years 2021 to 2023. Napa Bike is requesting \$100,000 to:

- Conduct targeted education and encouragement programming at elementary and middle schools in American Canyon, Napa, and St. Helena (16 school sites).
- Build a network of Parent Champions at targeted schools to continue and expand engagement around youth walking and biking safety (safety summits at 7 schools).
- Conduct broad-based community encouragement and safety education programming, including Community Rides and Family Biking Workshops, with specific focus on Spanish-speaking populations and locally identified communities of concern.

Both the Napa Forward and SRTS projects meet the eligibility criteria and the connected mobility framework, values and goals outlined in Attachment 6. Due to the regional partnership with MTC on the Napa Forward program, NVTA is hopeful that the proposed project will garner additional funds above the Quick-Strike Program target threshold.

In order to meet deadlines for submission and programming projects, ATAC must review and make recommendations on the Complete Streets checklists for both projects prior May 21st.

Project Selection Timeline:

February 1	MTC releases call for letters of interest to CTAs
March 30	Deadline for CTAs to submit letters of interest nominating projects
April	MTC staff evaluates projects, develops recommended funding approach
Late April/ Early May	Partnership Board: Discussion of staff recommendation
May	MTC works with sponsors to refine projects & submit detailed project applications with defined scopes and funding plans
May 21	Deadline for ATAC/BAC to review Complete Streets Checklist
June 9	PAC: Discussion of proposed Safe and Seamless program of projects
June 23	Commission: Approval of Safe & Seamless program of projects
March 31	Funds obligated/authorized in an E-76

ATTACHMENTS

- (1) MTC Complete Streets Checklist - Napa Forward SR29 Safety and Operational Improvements
- (2) MTC Complete Streets Checklist – Napa Valley Safe Routes to School

Project:

Napa Forward SR 29 Safety and Operational Improvements
(/projects/1156)

Checklist:

Napa Forward SR 29 Safety and Operational Improvements

Name:

Napa Forward SR 29 Safety and Operational Improvements

Description:

The project will provide operational and safety improvements in the form of roundabouts along the up valley SR 29 corridor at the intersections of Rutherford/SR 29 and Oakville Cross Road/SR 29.

Status:

Submitted

Project:

Napa Forward SR 29 Safety and Operational Improvements (/projects/1156)

Location:

Napa County

Contact Name:

Sanjay Mishra

Contact Email:

smishra@nvta.ca.gov

Contact Phone:

7072595951

Contact Address:

625 Burnell St. Napa CA 94559

1a: What bicycle and pedestrian accommodations are currently included on the facility or on facilities it intersects or crosses? Please check all that apply.

Class I bicycle paths

Class II bicycle lanes

Class III bicycle routes

Class IV bikeways

Bicycle boxes

Raised separated bikeways

Bicycle Boulevards

Bicycle parking

Sidewalks on one side or both sides of street

Marked crosswalks

Protected intersection

Painted conflict zones

Narrow unpaved path

Pedestrian-actuated traffic signals or routine pedestrian cycle

Bulb-outs

Bicycle actuated traffic signals or routine bicyclist cycle

High visibility crosswalks

Pedestrian-level lighting

ADA-compliant ramps

Traffic signal push buttons

Refuge islands on roadways

Transit shelter

Wide curb lanes

Right turn only lanes

Transit vehicle stops

Pedestrian countdown signals

Way-finding or directional signage

None

: Other

Rural Highway intersections no sidewalk curb or gutter except some segments on the North east corner of Rutherford and south east corner of Oakville Cross Road at commercial frontage

: Please provide specifics of any items checked above.

Bike lanes will be maintained and improved with this project and will add crossings where none currently exist

1b: If there are no existing pedestrian or bicycle facilities, how far from the proposed project are the closest parallel bikeways and walkways?

0-1/4 mile

1/4 mile to 1/2 mile

1/2 mile to 1 mile

1+ mile

1c: Please indicate needed pedestrian, bicycle, or transit improvements in the project area that staff or the public have identified

Improved lighting
sidewalks

Improve intersections

Mid-block crossings
Accommodations for the elderly or disabled or school age children
School age children
Transit shelters
ADA facilities
Widened curb lanes
Bicycle parking
Traffic signals responsive to bicycles
Shorter vehicular traffic signal cycles
Addressing choke points or gaps in pedestrian or bicycle
RR crossings
Bike racks on busses
Widened or better-lit under crossings
Removed slip lanes
Right turn only lanes
None

: Other

1d: Please describe the overall context of the project area:

Rural highway with some sidewalk at commercial frontage, existing Class II bike lanes no crossings. Uncontrolled left turns create safety hazard and delays.

1e: What existing challenges could the proposed project improve for bicycle, pedestrian, or transit travel in the vicinity of the proposed project?

Unresponsive signals to bicycles
Lack of bicycle parking
Freeway on-off ramps
Narrow curb lanes
Choke points
RR crossings
No bike racks on buses
Wide roadway crossings
Long signal cycles which require pedestrians to wait long periods of time
Short signal crossing times
Narrow undercrossings, overcrossings
Slip lanes
Sidewalk obstruction or missing sidewalk
Pedestrian-level lighting
Lack of ADA compliant facilities
Lack of Transit vehicle stops

: Other

No accommodation for left turn movements for bikes/vehicles/transit. No accommodation for bikes/peds crossing highway

2a: What trip generators (existing and future) are in the vicinity of the proposed project that might attract walking or bicycling customers, employees, students, visitors or others?

Educational institutions
Transit stations
Senior centers
High-density land uses
Downtowns
Shopping areas
Medical centers
Major public venues
Government buildings
Parks

: Other

Restaurants, wineries/tasting rooms, hotels, retail

3a: Have you considered collisions involving bicyclists and pedestrians along the route of the facility?

Yes

: If so, please provide the number of collisions and describe the outcomes of each:

The five year data shows 7 collisions at Rutherford Rd. none involving bikes and pedestrians and 6 collisions at Oakville Cross Rd., one involving a bicycle resulting in severe injury

: If so, what resources have you consulted?

TIMS/SWITRS January 2014 through December 2018 (5 years)

4a: Do any adopted plans call for the development of bicycle or pedestrian facilities on, crossing or adjacent to the proposed facility/project?

City or town bicycle plan
Countywide bicycle plan
City or town pedestrian plan
Countywide pedestrian plan
Combined bicycle and pedestrian plan
ADA transition plan
General plan
Specific plan
Regional transportation Plan
Sales tax expenditure plan
Station area access plan
No plans

: Other

Napa Countywide Transportation Plan

: Is the proposed project consistent with these plans?

Yes

5a: Do any local, statewide or federal policies call for incorporating bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities into this project?

Caltrans Deputy Directive 64
Caltrans Highway Design Manual (Chapter 1000)
ACR 211
MUTCD 2003
MUTCD California supplement
Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG)
MTC Pedestrian Districts Study
None
more

: Other

: If so, have the policies been followed?

Yes

5b: N/A

No

5c: If this project includes a bicycle and/or pedestrian facility, which applicable design standards or guidelines have been followed?

AASHTO bicycle and pedestrian design guides
Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines
Caltrans Design Information Bulletin 89
Caltrans Highway Design Manual
Caltrans California MUTCD
Caltrans Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities in California
FHWA MUTCD
ITE Designing Urban Walkable Thoroughfares
NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide
N/A - no bicycle or pedestrian facilities included
None

6a: What comments have been made regarding bicycle and pedestrian accommodations at BPAC, stakeholder, or public meetings at which the proposed project has been discussed?

Need for crossings where none currently exist
Need for intersection operations improvements due to uncontrolled left turning movements, hazardous for bikes

: How have you responded to comments received?

7a: What accommodations, if any, are included for bicyclists and pedestrians in the proposed project design?

Class I bicycle paths

Class II bicycle lanes

Class III bicycle routes

Class IV bikeways

Bicycle boxes

Raised separated bikeways

Bicycle Boulevards

Bicycle parking

Sidewalks on one side or both sides of street

Widened sidewalks

Marked crosswalks

Protected intersection

Painted conflict zones

Narrow unpaved path

Pedestrian-actuated traffic signals or routine pedestrian cycle

Bulb-out

Bicycle actuated traffic signals or routine bicyclist cycle

High visibility crosswalks

Pedestrian-level lighting

ADA-compliant ramps

Traffic signal push buttons

Refuge islands on roadways

Transit shelters

Wide curb lanes

Right turn only lanes

Transit vehicle stops

Pedestrian countdown signals

Way-finding or directional signage

None

: Other

Change from conventional intersection to roundabouts with improved safety and operations for bicycle and pedestrians and vehicles

8a: Will the proposed project remove an existing bicycle or pedestrian facility or block or hinder bicycle or pedestrian movement?

No

: If yes, please describe situation in detail.

8b: If the proposed project incorporates neither bicycle nor pedestrian facilities, or if the proposed project would hinder bicycle or pedestrian travel, list reasons why the project cannot be re-designed to accommodate these facilities.

N/A

: Was a road diet or car parking removal considered?

No-this is a two lane highway

: What would be the cost of the added bicycle and/or pedestrian facility?

: If the proposed project incorporates bicycle or pedestrian improvements, what proportion is the bicycle and/or pedestrian facility of the total project cost?

15

: If right-of-way challenges are the reason for the hindrance, please explain the analysis that led to this conclusion.

9a: How will access for bicyclists and pedestrians be maintained during project construction?

Alternative signed bicycle route
Alternative signed pedestrian route
Separated pedestrian pathway
Other

: Other

10a: What agency will be responsible for ongoing maintenance of the facility?

Caltrans

10b: How will ongoing maintenance be budgeted?

SHOPP

[Edit checklist \(/checklists/1359/edit\)](/checklists/1359/edit)

[Delete checklist \(/checklists/1359\)](/checklists/1359)

Project:

Quick Strike-Napa Valley Safe Routes to School (/projects/1158)

Checklist:

Quick Strike-Napa Valley Safe Routes to School

Name:

Quick Strike-Napa Valley Safe Routes to School

Description:

Targeted education and encouragement programming at Elementary and Middle Schools in American Canyon, Napa and St. Helena in the Napa Valley. This non-infrastructure program will be implemented by the Napa County Bicycle Coalition.

Status:

Submitted

Project:

Quick Strike-Napa Valley Safe Routes to School (/projects/1158)

Location:

Napa

Contact Name:

Diana Meehan

Contact Email:

dmeehan@nvta.ca.gov

Contact Phone:

7072598327

Contact Address:

625 Burnell Street Napa CA 94559

1a: What bicycle and pedestrian accommodations are currently included on the facility or on facilities it intersects or crosses? Please check all that apply.

Class I bicycle paths
Class II bicycle lanes
Class III bicycle routes
 Class IV bikeways
 Bicycle boxes
 Raised separated bikeways
Bicycle Boulevards
Bicycle parking
Sidewalks on one side or both sides of street
Marked crosswalks
 Protected intersection
 Painted conflict zones
Narrow unpaved path
Pedestrian-actuated traffic signals or routine pedestrian cycle
 Bulb-outs
 Bicycle actuated traffic signals or routine bicyclist cycle
High visibility crosswalks
 Pedestrian-level lighting
ADA-compliant ramps
Traffic signal push buttons
 Refuge islands on roadways
Transit shelter
 Wide curb lanes
Right turn only lanes
Transit vehicle stops
Pedestrian countdown signals
 Way-finding or directional signage
 None

: Other

: Please provide specifics of any items checked above.

Some schools have the above listed facilities proximal or on-route to the facilities, and some do not. It is variable throughout the county. This program will address safety for each route.

1b: If there are no existing pedestrian or bicycle facilities, how far from the proposed project are the closest parallel bikeways and walkways?

0-1/4 mile
 1/4 mile to 1/2 mile
 1/2 mile to 1 mile
 1+ mile

1c: Please indicate needed pedestrian, bicycle, or transit improvements in the project area that staff or the public have identified

Improved lighting
sidewalks
Improve intersections
Mid-block crossings
Accommodations for the elderly or disabled or school age children
School age children
Transit shelters
ADA facilities
Widened curb lanes
Bicycle parking
Traffic signals responsive to bicycles
Shorter vehicular traffic signal cycles
Addressing choke points or gaps in pedestrian or bicycle
RR crossings
Bike racks on busses
Widened or better-lit under crossings
Removed slip lanes
Right turn only lanes
None

: *Other*

1d: Please describe the overall context of the project area:

Several of the school sites serve or are located in Communities of Concern. The program will build upon current safe routes to school safety and encouragement by focusing on schools in three Napa County jurisdictions throughout Napa County

1e: What existing challenges could the proposed project improve for bicycle, pedestrian, or transit travel in the vicinity of the proposed project?

Unresponsive signals to bicycles
Lack of bicycle parking
Freeway on-off ramps
Narrow curb lanes
Choke points
RR crossings
No bike racks on buses
Wide roadway crossings
Long signal cycles which require pedestrians to wait long periods of time
Short signal crossing times
Narrow undercrossings, overcrossings
Slip lanes
Sidewalk obstruction or missing sidewalk
Pedestrian-level lighting
Lack of ADA compliant facilities
Lack of Transit vehicle stops

: *Other*

Through safety and encouragement, eventual infrastructure changes could be made by local jurisdictions.

2a: What trip generators (existing and future) are in the vicinity of the proposed project that might attract walking or bicycling customers, employees, students, visitors or others?

Educational institutions
Transit stations
Senior centers
High-density land uses
Downtowns
Shopping areas
Medical centers
Major public venues
Government buildings
Parks

: Other

3a: Have you considered collisions involving bicyclists and pedestrians along the route of the facility?

Yes

: If so, please provide the number of collisions and describe the outcomes of each:

During the 5 year period from Jan.1 2014-Dec. 31, 2018 there were a total of 226 collisions in school zones (0-1/4 mi. and 1/4-1/2 mi.) throughout the county. 106 involved bicycles, and 120 involved pedestrians. The highest rates were in underserved communities. Of the 226 collisions within one-quarter to one-half mile of school zones, 4 were fatal and 22 were severe.

: If so, what resources have you consulted?

TIMS SRTS Collision Map Jan. 1 2014-Dec. 31 2018 (5-year)

4a: Do any adopted plans call for the development of bicycle or pedestrian facilities on, crossing or adjacent to the proposed facility/project?

City or town bicycle plan
Countywide bicycle plan
City or town pedestrian plan
Countywide pedestrian plan
Combined bicycle and pedestrian plan
ADA transition plan
General plan
Specific plan
Regional transportation Plan
Sales tax expenditure plan
Station area access plan
No plans

: Other

: Is the proposed project consistent with these plans?

Yes

5a: Do any local, statewide or federal policies call for incorporating bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities into this project?

Caltrans Deputy Directive 64
Caltrans Highway Design Manual (Chapter 1000)
ACR 211
MUTCD 2003
MUTCD California supplement
Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG)
MTC Pedestrian Districts Study
None
more

: Other

Napa Countywide Bicycle Plan and Napa Countywide Pedestrian Plan, Community Based Transportation Plan, Napa Countywide Transportation Plan, General Plans

: If so, have the policies been followed?

Yes

5b: N/A

No

5c: If this project includes a bicycle and/or pedestrian facility, which applicable design standards or guidelines have been followed?

AASHTO bicycle and pedestrian design guides
Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines
Caltrans Design Information Bulletin 89
Caltrans Highway Design Manual
Caltrans California MUTCD
Caltrans Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities in California
FHWA MUTCD
ITE Designing Urban Walkable Thoroughfares
NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide
N/A - no bicycle or pedestrian facilities included
None

6a: What comments have been made regarding bicycle and pedestrian accommodations at BPAC, stakeholder, or public meetings at which the proposed project has been discussed?

Stakeholders and BPAC/ATAC are supportive of the SRTS program. Safety is a priority in countywide long range transportation plans. New groups have recently formed (Slow Down Napa <https://slowdownnapa.com/>) to address safety issues related to speeding. This new group is very supportive of SRTS programs. Several comments at local Council meetings as well as City of Napa General Plan surveys indicate broad support for prioritizing bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements and safety education programs.

: How have you responded to comments received?

The SRTS program is available (while funded) to all Napa County public schools

7a: What accommodations, if any, are included for bicyclists and pedestrians in the proposed project design?

Class I bicycle paths
Class II bicycle lanes
Class III bicycle routes
Class IV bikeways
Bicycle boxes
Raised separated bikeways
Bicycle Boulevards
Bicycle parking
Sidewalks on one side or both sides of street
Widened sidewalks
Marked crosswalks
Protected intersection
Painted conflict zones
Narrow unpaved path
Pedestrian-actuated traffic signals or routine pedestrian cycle
Bulb-out
Bicycle actuated traffic signals or routine bicyclist cycle
High visibility crosswalks
Pedestrian-level lighting
ADA-compliant ramps
Traffic signal push buttons
Refuge islands on roadways
Transit shelters
Wide curb lanes
Right turn only lanes
Transit vehicle stops
Pedestrian countdown signals
Way-finding or directional signage
None

: Other

This is a non-infrastructure program. Funding for the current program is ending soon through OBAG 2 and ATP. This funding would support the program for an additional year while more permanent fund sources are identified for continuation of the program.

8a: Will the proposed project remove an existing bicycle or pedestrian facility or block or hinder bicycle or pedestrian movement?

No

: If yes, please describe situation in detail.

8b: If the proposed project incorporates neither bicycle nor pedestrian facilities, or if the proposed project would hinder bicycle or pedestrian travel, list reasons why the project cannot be re-designed to accommodate these facilities.

N/A

: Was a road diet or car parking removal considered?

N/A

: What would be the cost of the added bicycle and/or pedestrian facility?

: If the proposed project incorporates bicycle or pedestrian improvements, what proportion is the bicycle and/or pedestrian facility of the total project cost?

: If right-of-way challenges are the reason for the hindrance, please explain the analysis that led to this conclusion.

9a: How will access for bicyclists and pedestrians be maintained during project construction?

Alternative signed bicycle route
Alternative signed pedestrian route
Separated pedestrian pathway
Other

: Other

This is a non-infrastructure project

10a: What agency will be responsible for ongoing maintenance of the facility?

This is a non-infrastructure project that will implemented by the Napa County Bicycle Coalition through the support of NVTa

10b: How will ongoing maintenance be budgeted?

N/A

[Edit checklist \(/checklists/1361/edit\)](/checklists/1361/edit)

[Delete checklist \(/checklists/1361\)](/checklists/1361)