



Complete Streets Checklist

Implementation of MTC's Complete Streets Policy, Resolution 4493, Adopted 3/25/22

Background

Since 2006, MTC's Complete Streets (CS) Policy has promoted the development of transportation facilities that can be used by all modes. In March 2022, MTC updated its CS policy (Resolution 4493) with the goal of ensuring that people biking, walking, rolling, and taking transit are safely accommodated within the transportation network. This policy works to advance Plan Bay Area 2050 objectives of achieving mode shift, safety, equity, and vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emission reductions, as well as state & local compliance with applicable CS-related laws, policies, and practices, specifically the California Complete Street Act of 2008 (Gov. Code Sections 65040.2 and 65302) and applicable local policies such as the CS resolutions adopted before January 16, 2016 (as part of MTC's OBAG 2 requirements.)

Requirements

MTC's CS Policy requires that all projects (with a total project cost of \$250,000 or more) applying for regional discretionary transportation funding – or requesting regional endorsement or approval through MTC – must submit a Complete Streets Checklist (Checklist) to MTC.

Please note that Projects claiming exceptions to CS Policy must complete the Exceptions section on the Checklist and provide a Department Director-level signature.

Additional information and guidance for completing this Checklist can be found at the MTC Administrative Guidance: Complete Streets Policy Guidance for public agency staff implementing MTC Resolution 4493 at

<https://mtc.ca.gov/planning/transportation/complete-streets>

This form may be downloaded at <https://mtc.ca.gov/planning/transportation/complete-streets>.

Submittal

Completed Checklists **must be emailed** to completestreets@bayareametro.gov.

PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name/Title: Innovate 680 – Bollinger Canyon Road Shared Mobility Hub (SMH)

Project Area/Location(s):

The project is located in the City of San Ramon

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: (300-word limit)**Please indicate project phase (Planning, PE, ENV, PSE, CON)**

The San Ramon Transit Center SMH is located at Bollinger Canyon Road/Camino Ramon, adjacent to the I-680/Bollinger Canyon Road interchange in City of San Ramon. The transit center is located at Bishop Ranch (BR), which is a large employment center with adjacent points of interest, including the City Center retail center, Iron Horse Regional Trail (IHRT) that runs parallel to I-680, a large business campus that is the largest employment center in central Contra Costa County, and community services such as library, schools, and medical centers. BR consists of a mix of retail and commercial services with high-density residences currently under construction. The proposed SMH will facilitate smooth transfers between express/local bus services and active/shared modes, as well as provide mobility services to SMH users and nearby residents to create mode shift from SOV trips to multimodal trips. The SMH will offer amenities such as enhanced bike/pedestrian facilities, direct connectivity to IHRT, wayfinding, electrical bicycle and vehicle charging and parking, and transit improvements such as transit signal priority (TSP) and real time information displays.

The Regional Measure 3 funding will be used to complete the Environmental Clearance phase of the project.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Contact Name & Title:
Stephanie Hu, Director,
Projects

Contact Email:
stephanieh@ccta.net

Contact Phone:
510-256-4740

Agency: Bay Area Toll Authority (RM3 Sponsor) / CCTA (Implementing Agency)

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
1. Bicycle, Pedestrian and Transit Planning	<p>Does Project implement relevant Plans, or other locally adopted recommendations?</p> <p>Plan examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan Bay Area 2050 • MTC Equity Platform • MTC Regional Active Transportation Plan • MTC Regional Safety/Vision Zero Policy • Complete Streets Policy • Blue Ribbon Transit Transformation Action Plan 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Please provide detail on Plan recommendations affecting Project area, if any, with Plan adoption date.</p> <p>If Project is inconsistent with adopted Plans, please provide explanation.</p> <p>The Project supports the Plan Bay Area 2050 Climate Program and aligns with the plan's goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and VMT, improving economic</p>

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
				<p>development around transit and transportation connectivity, investing in EPC and disadvantaged communities, and establishing regionally consistent and community-oriented mobility hubs.</p> <p>The Project also aligns with several other regional and local plans, such as Countywide Transportation Plan, Vision Zero, and the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan</p>
2. Active Transportation Network	<p>Does the project area contain segments of the regional Active Transportation (AT) Network?</p> <p>[See AT Network map on the MTC Complete Streets webpage.]</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>If yes, describe how project adheres to the NACTO "Designing for All Ages & Abilities Contextual Guidance for High-Comfort Bicycle Facilities" and/or the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board's "Accessibility Guidelines for Pedestrian Facilities in the Public Right-of-Way."</p> <p>The project aligns with NACTO's Designing for All Ages & Abilities Contextual Guidance for High-Comfort Bicycle Facilities by enhancing and expanding the existing bicycle infrastructure within the project area. These improvements aim to increase bicycle safety and connectivity to key points of interest. The proposed bike facilities will be appropriately classified based on the speed and</p>

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
				characteristics of the surrounding roadways.
3. Safety and Comfort	A. Is the Project on a known High Injury Network (HIN) or has a local traffic safety analysis found a high incidence of bicyclist/pedestrian-involved crashes within the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Please summarize the traffic safety conditions and describe Project's traffic safety measures. The Bay Area Vision Zero System may be a resource.</p> <p>Pedestrian and sidewalk facilities in the project area are generally adequate. However, there are currently no bicycle facilities on Camino Ramon. The Iron Horse Regional Trail is located directly east of the project site.</p> <p>The proposed project will enhance the bicycle network in the area by adding Class II bike lanes on Camino Ramon and a Class IV cycle track on Executive Parkway, creating a key connection between Camino Ramon, the proposed Shared Mobility Hub, and the Iron Horse Regional Trail. Additionally, the project will focus on improving crosswalks, as well as optimizing traffic and transit flow in the surrounding area.</p>
	B. Does the project seek to improve bicyclist and/or pedestrian conditions? If the project includes a bikeway, was a Level of Traffic Stress (LTS), or similar user experience analyses conducted?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Describe how project seeks to provide low-stress transportation facilities or reduce a facility's LTS.</p> <p>The proposed bike facilities will be appropriate for the level</p>

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
				of traffic and speed in the area. The Class II and Class IV facilities on Camino Ramon and Executive Parkway will provide a safe and low-stress environment for bicyclists.
4. Transit Coordination	A. Are there existing public transit facilities (stop or station) in the project area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>List transit facilities (stop, station, or route) and all affected agencies.</p> <p>The project area serves the following transit lines:</p> <p>County Connection Routes 21, 35, 92X, 95X, 96X, 97X</p>
	B. Have all potentially affected transit agencies had the opportunity to review this project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Staff have been working with County Connections to discuss the project
	C. Is there a MTC <u>Mobility Hub</u> within the project area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>If yes, please describe outreach to mobility providers, and Project's Hub-supportive elements.</p> <p>Shared Mobility Hubs is one of six projects in CCTA's Innovate680 Program, which is a comprehensive, corridor-based approach to address congestion along the I-680 Corridor. In January 2023, CCTA completed a I-680 SMH Feasibility Study. The feasibility study included 8 hub locations, three of which are identified as key stops for the I-680 Express Bus Service, a recommendation</p>

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
				<p>resulting from the CalSTA funded Tri Valley Hub Study to address a rail gap identified in the 2018 State Rail Plan. Bollinger Canyon SMH is one of the three limited stops for the express bus service.</p> <p>Consistent with the MTC's SMH Playbook, CCTA's I-680 SMH Feasibility Study, which was completed in January 2023, included a Mobility Hubs Implementation Strategy Toolkit as are source for identifying the types of services and amenities and their appropriate applications and implementation considerations that can be considered for the mobility hubs.</p> <p>The proposed Shared Mobility Hub is designed to support a range of multi-modal transportation options, including transit, walking, biking, TNCs, and various other mobility devices. It will also accommodate the new Zero Emission Hydrogen Express Bus Service along the I-680 Corridor. The hub will serve as a key node for seamless transfers between express and local bus services, as well as other modes of transportation,</p>

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
				enhancing connectivity and supporting sustainable mobility in the area.
5. Design	<p>If applicable, please describe the pedestrian focused improvements and cite the design standards used (links to standards are not needed).</p> <p>If applicable, please provide Class designation for bikeways. Cite design standards used.</p>			<p>The pedestrian improvements will generally adhere to the PROWAG, NACTO design guidelines, City of San Ramon Standards, CA MUTCD, and relevant Caltrans standards.</p> <p>Class II and Class IV bike lanes will be installed</p>
6. Equity	Will Project improve active transportation in an Equity Priority Community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Please list EPC(s) affected.</p> <p>N/A</p>
7. BPAC Review	Has a local (city or county) Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission (BPAC) reviewed this checklist (or for OBAG 3, this project)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Please provide meeting date(s) and a summary of comments, if any.</p> <p>Scheduled for CCTA BPAC 1/27/24</p>

Statement of Compliance	YES
The proposed Project complies with California Complete Street Act of 2008 (<i>Gov. Code Sections 65040.2 and 65302, MTC Complete Streets Policy (Reso. 4493), and locally adopted Complete Streets resolutions (adopted as OBAG 2 (Reso. 4202) requirement, Resolution 4202).</i>)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

If no, complete Statement of Exception and obtain necessary signature.

Statement of Exception	YES		Provide Documentation or Explanation
1. The affected roadway is legally prohibited for use by bicyclists and/or pedestrians.	<input type="checkbox"/>		If yes, please cite language and agency citing prohibited use.
2. The costs of providing Complete Streets improvements are excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use (defined as more than 20 percent for Complete Streets elements of the total project cost).	<input type="checkbox"/>		If claimed, the agency must include proportionate alternatives and still provide safe accommodation of people biking, walking and rolling.
3. There is a documented Alternative Plan to implement Complete Streets and/or on a nearby parallel route.	<input type="checkbox"/>		Describe Alternative Plan/Project
4. Conditions exist in which policy requirements may not be able to be met, such as fire and safety specifications, spatial conflicts on the roadway with transit or environmental concerns, defined as abutting conservation land or severe topological constraints.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Describe condition(s) that prohibit implementation of CS policy requirements

SIGNATURES / NOTIFICATIONS

TRANSIT

The project sponsor shall communicate and coordinate with all transit agencies with operations affected by the proposed project. If a project includes a transit stop/station, or is located along a transit route, the Checklist must include written documentation (e.g. email) with the affected transit agency(ies) to confirm transit agency coordination and acknowledgement of the project. A CS Checklist Transit Agency Contact List is available for reference.

DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR-LEVEL SIGNATURE FOR EXCEPTIONS

Exceptions must be signed by a Department Director-level agency representative, or their designee, and not the Project Manager. Insert electronic signature or sign below:

Full Name: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

ATTACHMENT 1 – All Ages and Abilities and Guidelines

1. All Ages and Abilities

Designing for All Ages & Abilities, Contextual Guidance for High-Comfort Bicycle Facilities, National Association of Transportation Officials, December 2017

Projects on the AT Network shall incorporate design principles based on designing for “All Ages and Abilities,” contextual guidance provided by the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO), and consistent with state and national best practices. A facility that serves “all ages and abilities” is one that effectively serves the mobility needs of children, older adults, and people with disabilities and in doing so, works for everyone else. The all ages and abilities approach also strives to serve all users, regardless of age, ability, ethnicity, race, sex, income, or disability, by embodying national and international best practices related to traffic calming, speed reduction, and **roadway design to increase user safety and comfort. This approach also includes the** use of traffic calming elements or facilities separated from motor vehicle traffic, both of which can offer a greater feeling of safety and appeal to a wider spectrum of the public.

Design best practices for safe street crossings, pedestrian facilities, and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility at transit stops, and bicycle/micromobility facilities on the AT Network should be incorporated throughout the entirety of the project. The Proposed Public Rights-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG) by the U.S. Access Board should also be referenced during design. (See table on next page for guidelines)

2. Design Guidance

Examples of applicable design guidance documents include (but are not limited to): American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) – *A Policy on Geometric Design of Highway and Streets*, *Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities*, *Guide for the Planning, Design, and Operation of Pedestrian Facilities*; *Public Right-of-Way Accessibility Guide (PROWAG)*; *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD)*; *Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG)*; National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) – *Urban Bikeway Design Guide*.

Contextual Guidance for Selecting All Ages & Abilities Bikeways				
Roadway Context				All Ages & Abilities Bicycle Facility
Target Motor Vehicle Speed	Target Max. Motor Vehicle Volume (ADT)	Motor Vehicle Lanes	Key Operational Considerations	
Any		Any	Any of the following: high curbside activity, frequent buses, motor vehicle congestion, or turning conflicts [‡]	Protected Bicycle Lane
< 10 mph	Less relevant	No centerline, or single lane one-way	Pedestrians share the roadway	Shared Street
≤ 20 mph	≤ 1,000 – 2,000		< 50 motor vehicles per hour in the peak direction at peak hour	Bicycle Boulevard
≤ 25 mph	≤ 500 – 1,500	Single lane each direction, or single lane one-way	Low curbside activity, or low congestion pressure	Conventional or Buffered Bicycle Lane, or Protected Bicycle Lane
	≤ 1,500 – 3,000			Buffered or Protected Bicycle Lane
	≤ 3,000 – 6,000			Protected Bicycle Lane
	Greater than 6,000			Protected Bicycle Lane
	Any	Multiple lanes per direction		
Greater than 26 mph [†]	≤ 6,000	Single lane each direction	Low curbside activity, or low congestion pressure	Protected Bicycle Lane, or Reduce Speed
		Multiple lanes per direction		Protected Bicycle Lane, or Reduce to Single Lane & Reduce Speed
	Greater than 6,000	Any	Any	Protected Bicycle Lane, or Bicycle Path
High-speed limited access roadways, natural corridors, or geographic edge conditions with limited conflicts		Any	High pedestrian volume	Bike Path with Separate Walkway or Protected Bicycle Lane
			Low pedestrian volume	Shared-Use Path or Protected Bicycle Lane

*While posted or 85th percentile motor vehicle speed are commonly used design speed targets, 95th percentile speed captures high-end speeding, which causes greater stress to bicyclists and more frequent passing events. Setting target speed based on this threshold results in a higher level of bicycling comfort for the full range of riders.

[†] Setting 25 mph as a motor vehicle speed threshold for providing protected bikeways is consistent with many cities' traffic safety and Vision Zero policies. However, some cities use a 30 mph posted speed as a threshold for protected bikeways, consistent with providing Level of Traffic Stress level 2 (LTS 2) that can effectively reduce stress and accommodate more types of riders.¹⁸

[‡] Operational factors that lead to bikeway conflicts are reasons to provide protected bike lanes regardless of motor vehicle speed and volume.

Figure 1 Designing for All Ages & Abilities, NACTO https://nacto.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NACTO_Designing-for-All-Ages-Abilities.pdf

DRAFT