



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: Cutting Boulevard Transit Priority Project

Project Area/Location(s):

The project is located in the cities of Richmond and El Cerrito on Cutting Boulevard between and including I-580 and San Pablo Avenue.

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

The Cutting Boulevard Transit Priority Project seeks to improve transit access, operations and safety along Cutting Boulevard between (and including) I-580 and San Pablo Avenue by implementing Transit Signal Priority (TSP) and bus stop improvements for the Golden Gate Transit Route 580, which serves travel across the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge.

This project will enhance corridor traffic and transit operations along Cutting Blvd (Golden Gate Transit Line 580 and AC Transit lines 76, 376, 681, 675). The corridor is approximately 2.49 miles long. The Project will install transportation infrastructure improvements to decrease traffic delay and increase operational reliability for buses along the length of the corridor. The project will also improve riders' experience through bus stop relocations, new bus shelters, and accessibility improvements.

The project will ensure that more routes (Golden Gate Transit Route 580; WestCAT Routes JPX, JX, JR/JL; Soltrans Routes R and G; Vine Route 29; and AC Transit Lines 7, 72, 72M, 72R, 76, 667, 675, L) can use the existing TSP at the at I-80 and San Pablo Avenue intersections along Cutting. Because of the multiple bus routes traveling in different directions at these intersections, and the existing TSP along San Pablo Avenue corridor, analysis of these intersections and additional adjacent signalized intersections along San Pablo Avenue will be required.

AC Transit also received Cap and Trade Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) funds for the AC Transit-only bus stop improvements on the corridor, including bus stop relocations, bus bulbs, bus shelters and benches, longer bus stops and other accessibility improvements (ADA curb ramps, sidewalk repairs). The project will improve rider experiences, transit operations and pedestrian safety.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Contact Name & Title: Michelle Go, Principal Planner, Bay Area Toll Authority Sean Diest Lorgion, Senior Transportation Planner, AC Transit	Contact Email: mgo@bayareametro.gov sdiestlo@actransit.org	Contact Phone: 415.778.6649 (510) 520-5753
--	---	---

Agency: Bay Area Toll Authority / AC Transit

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
1. Bicycle, Pedestrian and Transit Planning	Does Project implement relevant Plans, or other locally adopted recommendations? Plan examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City/County General + Area Plans 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Please provide detail on Plan recommendations affecting Project area, if any, with Plan adoption date.

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bicycle, Pedestrian & Transit Plan Community-Based Transportation Plan ADA Transition Plan Station Access Plan Short-Range Transit Plan Vision Zero/Systematic Safety Plan 			<p>If Project is inconsistent with adopted Plans, please provide explanation.</p> <p>The Project is consistent with the Bay Area Forward Program identified in Plan Bay Area 2050 (adopted 2021), which includes improvements such as transit signal priority in toll bridge corridors.</p> <p>The Project team will also work with the City of Richmond to prioritize identified pedestrian safety improvements in the Richmond Bicycle Pedestrian Action Plan (adopted 2023), such as directional ramps and high-visibility crosswalks, and evaluate for feasibility within the project budget. However, because the project scope and funding is focused on transit priority for the corridor, it does not include improvements such as installing new bikeways, identified in the 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-</p>

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
				<p>Way." . See Attachment 1.</p> <p>Parts of Cutting Blvd overlap with the AT network, from Hoffman Blvd. to 19th St., 26th St to 39th Ave, and I-80 to San Pablo Ave. The project proposes to install new curb ramps, amenities such as shelters, benches, and trash cans, make sidewalk improvements for ADA access, and restripe crosswalks in accordance with the Accessibility Guidelines for Pedestrian Facilities in the Public Right-of-Way.</p>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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>The full project extent of Cutting Blvd. is included on MTC's Regional High Injury Network, as well as the City of Richmond's High Injury Network as identified in the city's Local Roadway Safety Plan (LRSP, adopted 2023). The plan identifies 90 total collisions on Cutting Blvd between Hoffman Blvd and Carlson Blvd, of which 22 involved bicycles or pedestrians.</p> <p>The Project team will also work with the City of Richmond to prioritize identified pedestrian</p>

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
				safety improvements in the Richmond Bicycle Pedestrian Action Plan (adopted 2023), such as directional ramps and high-visibility crosswalks, and evaluate for feasibility within the project budget.
	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 project will improve pedestrian access to bus stops with sidewalk, curb ramp, and crosswalk improvements.</p> <p>In addition to the above, the LCTOP-funded bus stop project will also be implementing bus bulbs at some bus stops. Where possible, bike lanes will be designed to pass the bus on the right side, reducing conflicts between bicyclist and buses.</p>
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>Golden Gate Transit Route 580</p> <p>AC Transit Lines 76, 376, 675, 681</p> <p>Soltrans Routes R and G</p> <p>Vine Route 29</p> <p>WestCAT Routes JPX, JX, JR/JL</p>
	B. Have all potentially affected transit agencies had the	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project scope is currently under review

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
	opportunity to review this project?			by affected transit agencies.
	C. Is there a MTC Mobility Hub 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>The project is less than a quarter mile from the El Cerrito Del Norte BART mobility hub. Staff has coordinated with relevant transit agencies but not other mobility providers. The Project will improve existing transit service.</p>
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 project will install new curb ramps, make sidewalk improvements for ADA access, and restripe crosswalks in accordance with adopted local jurisdiction standards.</p> <p>In addition to the above, the LCTOP-funded bus stop project will also implement a pedestrian bulb to improve visibility for pedestrians crossing Cutting Blvd. in accordance with adopted local jurisdiction standards.</p>
6. Equity	Will Project improve active transportation in an Equity Priority Community?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Please list EPC(s) affected.</p> <p>The full extent of the project is within EPCs. These include Census Tracts:</p> <p>379000</p>

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
				380000 381000 382000 386000
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Please provide meeting date(s) and a summary of comments, if any. Scheduled for CCTA BPAC 5/20/24

Statement of Compliance	YES
The proposed Project complies with California Complete Street Act of 2008 (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).	<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	Multiple lanes per direction		Protected Bicycle Lane
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

**Cutting Blvd Transit Priority/Bus Stop Project:
PRELIMINARY Proposed Pedestrian/Bike Improvements**

Project Name	Funding Source	Cross Street	Direction	Location	Stop Control	Pedestrian/Bicycle Improvement
Cutting Blvd Transit Priority Project	RM3	Harbour Way S	EB	FS	Signalized	1) New ADA ramp at southeast corner of intersection 2) Crosswalk refreshed
Cutting Blvd Transit Priority Project	RM3	S. 11th Street	WB	FS	Uncontrolled	1) New directional ADA curb ramps north leg on north side of Cutting Blvd Avenue across S. 11th Way. 2) Sidewalk repairs
Cutting Blvd Transit Priority Project	RM3	Marina Way S	WB	FS	Signalized	1) Add new directional ADA curb ramps at southeast corner 2) Crosswalk refreshed
Cutting Blvd Transit Priority Project	RM3	Marina Way S	EB	FS	Signalized	1) Add new directional ADA curb ramps at southeast corner 2) Crosswalk refreshed
Cutting Blvd Bus Stop Project	District/LCTOP	S.17th Street	WB	NS	Uncontrolled	1) Bus stop relocated to far side of uncontrolled intersection. 2) Landscape strip needs to be filled in at new location 3) Crosswalk refreshed
Cutting Blvd Bus Stop Project	District/LCTOP	S.17th Street	EB	FS	Uncontrolled	1) Bus stop relocated to far side of uncontrolled intersection. 2) Landscape strip needs to be filled in at new location 3) Crosswalk refreshed
Cutting Blvd Bus Stop Project	District/LCTOP	S. 20th Street	WB	FS	Signalized	1) New directional ADA ramp at northwest corner of intersection
Cutting Blvd Bus Stop Project	District/LCTOP	S. 20th Street	EB	NS	Signalized	1) Landscape strip to be filled in 2) New directional ADA ramp at southwest corner of intersection 3) Bus bulb may reduce crossing distance 4) Crosswalk refreshed
Cutting Blvd Transit Priority Project	RM3	S. 23rd Street	EB	NS	Signalized	1) ADA ramp at northeast corner of intersection 2) Crosswalks refreshed
Cutting Blvd Transit Priority Project	RM3	Marina Bay Prkway	EB	FS	Signalized	1) New directional ADA ramp at southeast corner of intersection 2) Crosswalks refreshed
Cutting Blvd Bus Stop Project	District/LCTOP	S. 26th Street	WB	NS	Signalized	1) New directional ADA ramp at northeast corner of intersection 2) Crosswalk refreshed
Cutting Blvd Bus Stop Project	District/LCTOP	S. 26th Street	EB	NS	Signalized	1) Bus stop relocated to far side 2) Repair sidewalk 3) Bus Bulb may reduce crossing distance 4) Crosswalk refreshed
Cutting Blvd Bus Stop Project	District/LCTOP	Spring Street	WB	FS	Uncontrolled	1) New directional ADA ramp at northwest corner of intersection 2) Repair sidewalk 3) Crosswalk refreshed
Cutting Blvd Bus Stop Project	District/LCTOP	S. 31st Street	EB	NS	Uncontrolled	1) Relocate bus pole 50' east of curb return at S. 30th Street. 2) New ADA curb ramp at southeast corner of intersection
Cutting Blvd Transit Priority Project	RM3	Carlson Blvd	WB	NS	Signalized	1) Repair sidewalk 2) Landscape strip needs to be filled in 3) Shorten driveway and reconstruct and re-level sidewalk 4) Crosswalk refreshed
Cutting Blvd Transit Priority Project	RM3	S. 35th Street	EB	NS	Uncontrolled	1) Bus stop relocated to far side of uncontrolled intersection. 2) Landscape strip needs to be filled in at new location 3) Crosswalk refreshed
Cutting Blvd Bus Stop Project	District/LCTOP	S. 36th Street	WB	FS	Uncontrolled	1) Consolidation of stops at far side of 37th Street (signalized) places bus stop closer to signalized intersection. 2) Bus bulb with bike lane behind bus bulb reduces conflict between buse and bikes
Cutting Blvd Bus Stop Project	District/LCTOP	S. 38th Street	WB	NS	Uncontrolled	
Cutting Blvd Bus Stop Project	District/LCTOP	S. 37th Street	EB	FS	Signalized	1) Landscape strip needs to be filled in 2) Crosswalk refreshed
Cutting Blvd Transit Priority Project	RM3	S. 41st Street	WB	FS	Signalized	1) Old tree wells needs to be filled in 2) Crosswalk refreshed
Cutting Blvd Transit Priority Project	RM3	S. 41st Street	EB	NS	Signalized	1) Landscape strip needs to be filled in 2) Crosswalk refreshed
Cutting Blvd Bus Stop Project	District/LCTOP	S.45th Street	WB	NS	Signalized	1) Bus stop relocated to far side 2) Bus bulb with bike lane behind bus bulb reduces conflict between buse and bikes 3) Bus Bulb may reduce crossing distance 4) Crosswalk refreshed
Cutting Blvd Bus Stop Project	District/LCTOP	S.45th Street	EB	EB	Signalized	1) Landscape strip needs to be filled in 2) Crosswalk refreshed
Cutting Blvd Transit Priority Project	RM3	S.49th Street	WB	NS	Signalized	1) Landscape strip needs to be filled in 2) Crosswalk refreshed
Cutting Blvd Transit Priority Project	RM3	S.49th Street	EB	FS	Signalized	1) Landscape strip needs to be filled in 2) Crosswalk refreshed
Cutting Blvd Bus Stop Project	District/LCTOP	Peerless Avenue	WB	NS	Uncontrolled	1) New ADA curb ramp across Cutting Blvd.
Cutting Blvd Bus Stop Project	District/LCTOP	Peerless Avenue	EB	NS	Uncontrolled	1) Pedestrian bulb across Cutting Blvd. 2) New ADA curb ramps at southwest corner of intersection