Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Questions
November 30, 2022

Item 6.2 Transportation Development Act Article 3 and Active Transportation Funding

Question: For project 2(c) (Grant/Sleeper crossing + others), can you clarify the scope of what the $400k funding would cover? Is it just relevant for the Grant/Sleeper crossing or would it help with other projects as well?

> **Answer:** The improvements at Grant/Sleeper are included in the original project budget. Additional scope that would be covered by the $400,000 includes the pedestrian crossing improvements at the other intersections listed.

Question: For the projects with funding gaps, if not funded by this pot of money, how do we anticipate them being funded? How will the timeline of these projects be impacted by not getting funding allocated immediately (in particular, which of these projects are currently blocked on receiving enough funding vs. not needing funding until a later project stage)?

> **Answer:** Projects that are currently in design will proceed to design completion and can be recommended for advertisement/construction along with a request for additional funding through other available funding sources. Projects that have not yet started design will be evaluated through the 2-year CIP process, and funding gaps will be filled as available funds allow, or projects will be deferred to out-years based on Council priorities.

Question: In the presentation, could you provide the prioritization map that came out of the AccessMV process? A map showing the location of the crossings (2(c)) and roads (3(b)) referenced in some of the items would be particularly helpful.

> **Answer:** I have produced a Google Earth map that we can reference during clarifying questions.

Question: For the projects under item 3, do we have any rough estimates of costs?

> **Answer:** No. Without direction from the BPAC, no work has been done regarding cost estimates. Due to the inflationary pressures currently affecting the economy, it is very difficult to create useful "rough" estimates; quotes would need to be generated. Staff does not want to pursue this unless we know the project is likely to be completed. However, no single project suggested would exceed $600,000, but it is possible for a combination of projects to exceed that amount.

Question: For the projects under item 3--in particular 3(a) and 3(b), how much of a design process would we expect to have? Similarly, roughly how long do we think it would be until the projects were implemented?

> **Answer:** Project 3(a) would have a simple design process but significant community engagement and would need Council approval for parking removal. Project 3(b) would have a very simple design process and could be accomplished without further community engagement or Council approval. Both projects would likely complete towards the end of 2023.

Question: Can you clarify the scope of project 2(d)? Would this mean adding physical features on *top* of striping?

> **Answer:** No. All aspects of this project would be thermoplastic pavement markings. The thermoplastic installation process requires special tools and experience. A consultant would be hired to install the markings. All current aspects and any added aspects to the project would be only thermoplastic pavement markings.

Question: Is there a way to find out what stage each project is in (planning, design, construction)? e.g. for "El Camino Real Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements, El Camino/El Monte/Escuela Intersection Improvements, Middlefield Road Complete Streets, and Moffett Boulevard Complete Streets"

> **Answer:** For the projects being presented tonight, that information will be in the slides. Of the projects you've listed above, all are in the concept stage, with the exception of the Caltrans El Camino Real repaving project, which has completed 95 percent design, and we are expecting 100 percent design plans soon.

Question: Although there are separate groupings one to save up for a more significant project, the other to fill a gap, I'm not sure how to distinguish the two. I thought there was already some design and funding for Stierlin that was already presented to BPAC. Why is that under the "bank-the-funds" grouping and not "fill the gap"?

> **Answer:** You do not have to distinguish between the two. TDA3 or Active Transportation Improvement funding can be allocated to either group. Stierlin should not have been listed; that was a typo, apologies. That section was copied from a previous memo and should have been updated by staff to remove that project.

Question: Are there restrictions to committee members commenting on projects that are close to where they live?

> **Answer:** Yes, if you own or lease your property, any project within 1,000 feet of your property would restrict you from commenting. If you are renting, you are restricted to 500 feet of your rental.

Question: The CIP projects, e.g. 23-30 and 19-50, are very general and could include any number of smaller scale improvements. Is there an option that just funds those?

> **Answer:** Project number 23-30 is the Active Transportation Improvement fund and is intended for "small-scale" pedestrian or bicycle improvements. 19-50 is an old fund that was dedicated to pedestrian improvements ($300,000) that funded was joined with the bicycle fund, 18-67 ($300,000), to create 23-30, the Active Transportation Improvement fund. Either funding source can fund any of the presented projects.

Question: At some point, there was a proposal to prioritize projects according to points corresponding to different criteria (if I'm remembering correctly). Is that used in selecting which projects will ultimately be funded (either in the "fill-the-gap" or "bank-the-funds" categories?)

> **Answer:** A scoring criterion was used in AccessMV, to identify project priority across all modes, and a scoring criterion will be developed via the Active Transportation Plan for pedestrian and bicycle projects. Please note the purpose of the Active Transportation Improvement funding, as per the CIP, is to accomplish "small-scale" improvements. AccessMV does not evaluate minor improvements but rather major projects.

Question: Is it possible to find out what staff's recommendation is?

> **Answer:** No, not at this time. We will be providing a formal recommendation at the March BPAC meeting once we've heard your input and suggestions. However, we lean toward filling gaps in existing projects due to staffing and efficiency concerns.