



Directors

Robert Jehn, Chair
Cloverdale

Mike Kerns, V. Chair
Sonoma County

Bob Blanchard
Santa Rosa

Stanley Cohen
Sonoma

Patricia Gilardi
Cotati

Mike Healy
Petaluma

Linda Kelley
Sebastopol

Paul Kelley
Sonoma County

Jake Mackenzie
Rohnert Park

Warin Parker
Windsor

Mike Reilly
Sonoma County

Lisa Schaffner
Healdsburg

**Countywide Bicycle &
Pedestrian Advisory Committee
SPECIAL MEETING
Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian
Master Plan**

AGENDA

Tuesday, May 9, 2006

2:00 p.m. – 3:30 pm

Sonoma County Transportation Authority
520 Mendocino Ave., Suite 240
Santa Rosa, CA

I. Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan

- a) Brief review of process and project progress
- b) Ongoing discussion to refine and finalize the RFP/Scope of Work*

II. Adjourn/ACTION

*Attached: Revised draft, with questions and comments inserted.

The next **CBPAC** meeting is June 27, 2006
The next **SCTA** meeting is May 8, 2006

DISABLED ACCOMMODATION: If you have a disability that requires the agenda materials to be in an alternative format or that requires an interpreter or other person to assist you while attending this meeting, please contact the SCTA at least 72 hours prior to the meeting, to ensure arrangements for accommodation.

Staff: Lynne March 565-5373
lmarch@sctainfo.org

The entire agenda packet is available online at www.sctainfo.org.

Suzanne Wilford
Executive Director

520 Mendocino Avenue
Suite 240
Santa Rosa, CA 95401
PH: 707-565-5373
FAX: 707-565-5370

DRAFT Sonoma County Transportation Authority
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

UPDATE TO BICYCLE and PEDESTRIAN MASTER PLANS
In Sonoma County

- ✓ Inserted below in BLUE FONT are topics recommended for discussion by the CBPAC. Project scope, however, should be determined in light of the limitations of project funding. While a scope inclusive of a wide array of aspects might be desirable, decisions need be made to set realistic and meaningful priorities.
- ✓ The GREEN FONT details discussion points and decisions made at the CBPAC meeting on April 25th. This discussion is to continue at the second special meeting on May 9th.
- ✓ Comments received (with initials of provider) are in RED FONT.

Introduction

The Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA) requests proposals from consultant planning and engineering teams for the preparation of a bicycle and pedestrian master plan for the County of Sonoma and the municipalities of Sonoma County. Proposals must be submitted by 3:00 p.m. on XXXXX. This Request for Proposals describes the elements requested for inclusion in the proposal. Information is provided about the component plans, processes to be used, expected contract deliverables, and information that is expected in the proposals.

Background

Sonoma County is recognized as one of the most attractive areas in the country. One aspect that makes an area livable are places where people feel comfortable walking and bicycling, whether children or adults. The County of Sonoma and seven of the nine cities and towns in Sonoma County currently have bicycle master plans in place that encourage bicycle use. None of these entities are currently known to have stand-alone pedestrian plans, however, varying levels of information about pedestrian plans/planning and related Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility is available pertaining to the entities in the plan area.

SCTA will take the lead role in this process as contract administrator. SCTA's Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC) will provide project guidance.

On behalf of the County and other participating jurisdictions, SCTA is seeking consultant services for a multi-year contract to update local agency plans (unincorporated county and incorporated cities/towns), and create a countywide master plan integrating these parts.

The schedule of plan updates will begin with the *Sonoma County Bikeways Plan* (April 1997, Sonoma County's unincorporated area bicycle master plan) and the *City of Santa Rosa Update of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan* (August 2001). The consultant is to recommend a sequencing of local plan updates for the other participating agencies. This RFP's resultant plan is to include approval by the local agency, Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), and Caltrans.

For the purposes of Bicycle Transportation Fund (BTA) eligibility, Caltrans approval expires after five consecutive funding cycles (i.e., fiscal years).

Below are listed the latest plan adoption dates and planned revision dates for the County and Sonoma County’s cities/towns.

Entity	Last Adoption	Planned Update
County of Sonoma	1997	2007
Cloverdale	1993	2006
Cotati		
Healdsburg	2004	2006
Petaluma	2000	2006
Rohnert Park	2000	2006
Santa Rosa	2001	2006
Sebastopol		
Sonoma		2006
Windsor	2002	2006

This RFP’s countywide update effort will be a voluntary opportunity for local agencies to obtain an updated plan. The consultant will refine, expand, and build upon existing current plans to guide the development of new plans.

The proposal must demonstrate the consultant teams’ qualifications as follows:

- 1) The administrative capacity to manage public funds and to meet all reporting and auditing requirements associated with SCTA.
- 2) Experience in developing bicycle and pedestrian master plans, including knowledge of successful programs outside of Sonoma County that may have features applicable to this project.
- 3) Experience working with public advocacy groups and organizations.
- 4) Engineering and planning expertise and experience in working with public agencies and professional staff, and county/city staff (e.g., engineers, planners, and landscape architects) to develop conceptual recommendations for bicycle and pedestrian facilities and enhancements, funding options, and implementation measures.
- 5) Familiarity with ADA issues and provisions relative to bicycle and pedestrian modes; and Caltrans design standards.
- 6) Experience in gathering and compiling information on facility usage, such as bicycle ridership and pedestrian counts.
- 7) Ability to produce high-quality graphic materials, including updated information on the bicycle and pedestrian master plans to agencies’ websites.
- 8) **(THIS IS TO BE ADDED)** The ability to coordinate effectively with the involved agencies and stakeholder groups, as well as having knowledge of the relevant processes and requirements related to nonmotorized funding.

Scope of Work

The following scope of work provides an outline of services that are expected to be offered as part of the development of each plan. The contract period will be multi-year (up to three years).

- ✓ Will the CBPAC want to set (or validate the existing) vision, objectives, and policies, (and/or set a mission, goals, or action steps) for the project? Please see below the relevant *Comprehensive Transportation Plan* VISION, OBJECTIVES and POLICIES.

There was consensus that the consultant should use the exiting vision, objectives and policies as a starting point, but that these should be revisited after the individual plans are updated to incorporate the results of this planning --- to update the vision, objectives and policies. There is also to be awareness that these need to more fully consider pedestrians.

SS: Countywide plan should have mission, goals and objectives. Individual plans should also include policies. Goals and objectives in countywide plan need to be drawn from individual plans and must be consistent with all the individual plans.

Task 1.0 Strategy

The consultant will meet initially with SCTA's Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC) representatives; then with individual county and city bicycle/pedestrian advisory committees to determine how the individual plans currently serve the respective areas and to establish a process for their updating, or where applicable, development of a new plan. The individual groups shall include local bicycle and pedestrian advocates, and city and/or county staff. Stakeholders will be provided opportunities to provide input to the consultant both at the meetings and in writing following the meetings.

Deliverable: Documentation of the meetings, findings, and verbal and written comments. Recommendation regarding scheduling of updates.

Task 2.0 Evaluate Existing Bicycle Master Plans and Pedestrian Plans

The consultant will evaluate existing bicycle and pedestrian plans to document current and on-going programs and projects. The consultant will also review relevant maps, databases and performance standards; assess bicycle, and where applicable pedestrian, route continuity between jurisdictions, and make recommendations including route alteration, (ADDED) gap closure, signage and mapping. The update will include a review of adjacent city/town and county plans to insure connectivity and consider MTC's *Regional Bicycle Plan*. SCTA will be working simultaneously, and on an ongoing basis, with each jurisdiction to update and maintain the various associated maps.

Deliverable: Prepare a Technical Report summarizing the adequacy of the plans, addressing connectivity, and providing recommendations for changes and additions.

Task 3.0 Inventory of Facilities and Programs

The consultant will undertake an update to the inventory of existing and proposed bicycle and pedestrian facilities and programs within the plan area, at a minimum, as required in State BTA Guidelines. The consultant will contact each entity to fill in data gaps and other information on projects that have been recently completed; are under construction; and are funded and/or proposed for the future. This information is to comply with BTA requirements and be for ongoing use by local agencies.

- ✓ Should both projects and programs be recommended --- or only projects? If programs are to be included, which ones (e.g., bike/ped incentives, amenities and/or accommodations; safety, school and/or environmental programs)?

At a minimum countywide programs should be included.

SS: A master list of all projects should be included in countywide plan, not including cost estimates or more detailed information. More detailed project lists and cost estimates should be included in each of the individual plans. Programs such as Safe Routes to Schools should be discussed in both the countywide plan and individual plans.

- ✓ Should the inventory of existing conditions include a discussion of incidents (e.g., accident data)

SS: Yes. Accident data should be discussed and analyzed in all of the individual plans. A more countywide general discussion regarding accidents should be included in the countywide plan.

- ✓ To what extent is ADA to be considered? Bear in mind that inclusion of ADA in the discussion has the potential to raise issues beyond the scope of this plan. Some plans refer to “wheelchair users,” which narrows the scope; others to “people with disabilities,” which broadens the scope.

It was agreed that this topic, while very important, has many aspects that would not be appropriate for inclusion in this plan. The plan should show coordination with ADA, however ADA is not to be discussed in depth.

SS: A general discussion of the ADA is appropriate for both the countywide plan and the individual plans. ADA specific type projects should not be listed in any of the plans. This is way beyond the scope of these plans.

- ✓ Should the plan include a discussion of geographical, social, or institutional constraints?

Deliverable: Updated database files. The information shall be provided in Microsoft Access that can be easily updated and maintained.

Task 4.0 Transportation Data Collection

The consultant will conduct select bicycle counts pursuant to MTC standards, and select pedestrian counts. Establishment of baseline usages for commute and recreation purposes are to be gathered for selected routes/paths/facilities.

- ✓ Regarding the bicyclist and pedestrian “counts,” what is hoped for? Bear in mind that an expectation might be raised that a particular project expenditure will substantially increase such numbers. This may, or may not, be the case depending on the project and the extent of connectivity/gap closure achieved. Who needs to be counted and where? Meaningful data is difficult to obtain. What methods are to be employed?

SS: Suggest looking to Marin County RFP for guidance here. Counts would be nice for each jurisdiction’s individual plans, which would then be summarized countywide in the

countywide plan. Perhaps the Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition could be tapped for volunteers to help do some of these counts?

Deliverable: Documentation of new counts for bicycle and pedestrians users of select facilities.

Task 5.0: Meetings, Workshops, and Presentations

Public workshops, presentations and meetings will be critical in the update process in order to receive input, as well as to inform citizens, staff, stakeholders, and agencies about plan updates and the overall countywide product. Individual meetings with municipalities and the County are expected to be held along with public workshops in various parts of the County. The consultant's proposal should indicate an estimated number of meetings and provide an outreach strategy that addresses local and regional bicycle and pedestrian needs.

Deliverable: Delivery of an outreach strategy, with documentation of meetings and key findings.

Task 6.0: Funding Requirements

The consultant will work with the County and each municipality to develop materials and required data to meet the intent of BTA requirements, including Streets and Highways Code Section 891.2, and any other pertaining funding-related requirements.

- ✓ Are funding sources and applicability to projects and/or programs to be requested under this RFP?

SS: Yes. This would be desirable for both the countywide plan and the individual plans.

- ✓ Should the plan include a discussion of financial constraints/implementation challenges?

SS: Yes. This discussion should be included in both the countywide plan and the individual plans.

- ✓ Are cost-benefit, performance standards, or measurements to be addressed under this RFP? Many possibilities could be included in this area. A few examples are methodologies to calculate pollution reduction or household savings resulting from non-motorized mode choices. Facility construction and O&M costs could also be discussed.

SS: If this is referring to ranking criteria, then this should be addressed in the individual plans with only a general discussion of the ranking process, perhaps, in the countywide plan.

Deliverable: Updated database files for each city/town and the County.

Task 7.0: Produce Approved Updated Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan Documents

The consultant will prepare the final updated bicycle and pedestrian master plan documents both in hard copy and electronic versions (printing-friendly, high print quality suitable for print, CD and web-based formats). Draft reports, with associated environmental documents, will be provided for approval by local governing bodies. The consultant should expect to attend such governing body meetings as requested.

- ✓ Are project and/or program costs and descriptions to be included---or only lists?

SS: Include only a general master list of projects and a description of programs in the countywide plan. More detailed descriptions and cost estimates of projects and programs should be included in the individual plans.

✓ Will project and/or program ranking be a part of the plan? If so, what criteria would be used?

SS: Project and program ranking should not be a part of the countywide plan. Project and program ranking should be included in the individual plans.

Deliverables: The final products will include:

- 1) An updated countywide SCTA master plan, the *Sonoma County Transportation Authority Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan*.
- 2) Updated bicycle and pedestrian master plans for each participating municipality and the County of Sonoma.

Task 8.0 Project Management and Oversight

The selected consultant will be expected to provide appropriate and experienced staff to work with SCTA, CBPAC, other agencies in the County, and other stakeholder groups in managing this project. The consultant is to be familiar with MTC's and Caltrans Local Assistance's approval processes and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance requirements related to bicycle and pedestrian funding, and provide expertise in appropriate management and accountability for the update projects.

Deliverable: On-going, and as needed, support related to project management, oversight and development.

Comprehensive Transportation Plan

“Bicycle Program” (page 57)

Bicycle and Pedestrian Vision:

- A fully implemented Countywide Bike Plan, with trails or designated paths that link all cities and are connected to bicycle paths within cities.
- A safe and comfortable system for bicyclists and pedestrians.
- Enhanced opportunities for tourism.
- A linkage from bike paths to rail stations and bus stops; and a path that follows the Northwestern Pacific rail right-of-way, creating a north-south linkage.

Objectives:

- Improve bike safety.
- Create continuity through cities and between communities.
- Improve intersections of major roads for bicycle and pedestrian traffic.

- Create grade separated access across Highway 101.
- Design highway interchanges so that bicyclists and pedestrians may move across them at street level.
- Implement the countywide bicycle plan with emphasis on bicycles as a transportation alternative.

Policies (the common policies drawn from all Sonoma County jurisdictions):

- When road facilities are newly constructed or upgraded careful consideration should be given to include improvements for bicycles.
- Encourage creative development or redevelopment site designs and mixed-use land uses that minimize travel distances and enhance convenience for bicyclists.
- The design of bicycle facilities should adhere to the design provisions as outlined in the Caltrans “Bikeways Planning and Design” chapter (1000) of the Highway Design Manual.
- Planning for non-motorized transportation facilities should consider critical connections to other jurisdictions and closing gaps in existing routes.
- Make use of abandoned railroad right-of-way, natural waterways, flood control right-of-way, and public lands or easements for non-motorized transportation facilities where available and appropriate.
- Where available and appropriate make use of railroad right-of-way for non-motorized transportation modes
- Encourage bicycle safety education programs for adults and youth through schools, law enforcement agencies and other appropriate interest groups.
- Promote safety of multiple user groups such as expanding the “Share the Road” program to make drivers and cyclists more aware of the other’s needs.
- Encourage employers to promote use of bicycles as a viable transportation alternative (e.g., through provisions of economic incentives and shower and bicycle parking facilities).

SS: other questions:

How are trails to be considered in this planning? **Only Class 1 paved multi-use bicycle and pedestrian pathways should be included in these plans.**

Is “Community Design” to be discussed relative to the support of bicycle and pedestrian modes? Potential topics could include “Smart Community,” “Transit Oriented Development,” assessments of “Livability,” “Walkability,” and “Bikeability,” and land use patterns, density, and transportation system design.

A general discussion of these concepts would be appropriate. However, recommendations on specific “community design” projects would be way beyond the scope of these plans.

SS: Some other thoughts:

1. Pedestrians: The Marin County RFP did not seem to include much on the pedestrian side. Perhaps inclusion of pedestrian issues in the individual plans should be at the request of each jurisdiction? A general discussion of pedestrian issues would be appropriate, at a minimum, for the countywide plan.

Inclusion of pedestrian elements is not yet required to be eligible for funding. So, it may not be prudent for us to spend too much time on this aspect. We can address it on the general level and be proactive toward perhaps having to address pedestrian issues in more detail when and if required in the future. Some jurisdictions may opt to not include pedestrian issues at all in their individual plans.

2. Environmental Review: The Marin County RFP included environmental review as one of their tasks. I think this should be included for all of the individual plans. I'm not sure if it is necessary for the countywide plan, other than a general discussion and reference to the individual plans. In most cases, we're looking at CEQA mitigated negative declarations. This is very important to the County and most other jurisdictions, I would assume.

3. Sonoma Co. Bike Coalition Map: It would be very helpful to include a copy of the SCBC map in the RFP's. There is a ton of information on this map that would be helpful for consultants to know it is already available for their use. Perhaps Chris Barney could create another layer of GIS with the SCBC data?