Transportation Development Act Article 3 Funding Recommendation

Each year the City receives an allocation of funds set aside for bicycle and pedestrian projects per the Transportation Development Act (TDA), Article 3. These funds are administered by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA). The VTA has created two categories for TDA funding, a Bicycle Expenditure Program (BEP) category and a "guarantee" category. Cities can elect to compete for discretionary BEP funds if they have construction-ready projects that are in the approved VTA BEP. Or, cities can submit applications for non-BEP qualifying projects for guarantee funding, up to the amount of their guarantee. Cities also have the option of banking funds to a subsequent year if they do not have qualifying projects or if the guarantee amount is insufficient to fund an entire project. The attached call for projects provides additional information on funding and project eligibility.

Sunnyvale has typically utilized these funds for bicycle and pedestrian capital improvements. It is City policy not to use one-time grant funds for programmatic activities, such as bicycle education programs. Staff's evaluation of potential candidate projects therefore is focused on planned capital improvements.

City staff does not recommend submitting any projects for Bicycle Expenditure Program funding. Any eligible projects in Sunnyvale are not at a construction-ready status that could meet TDA project delivery requirements.

City staff has identified the following candidate projects for guarantee funding:

1. Citywide Guided Bike Routes, Phase I (sign installation) - $ 40,000

2. Wildwood Avenue Bike Lanes - $ 67,205 (full allocation)
   This project is the next priority listed in the Bicycle Capital Expenditure Program that could be constructed within the available funds.

3. Pedestrian Safety and Opportunities Study (Ped SOS) select pedestrian improvements - $ 67,205 (full allocation)
   The Ped SOS identifies a large number of potential pedestrian improvements. This year's TDA allocation would be sufficient to fund the first five priority Pedestrian Opportunity District Projects as per the enclosed list.

4. East Channel Trail (Tasman Drive to John W. Christian Greenbelt) - $ 67,205 (full allocation)

Guarantee funds would be used to offset the local matching fund requirement for a Federal grant that was secured to construct this project. One advantage of this allocation is that it could free up local funds that could then be used for a Stevens Creek Trail feasibility study.

Staff recommends that the BPAC make a recommendation to the City Council on TDA Article 3 funding priorities for 2011 from the above list of candidate projects. Should the BPAC recommend the guided bike routes project for funding, staff is assuming that remaining funds would either be banked or would be allocated to the project, and any project savings at the conclusion of the project then re-allocated to another future project.

Alternately, the BPAC could select to recommend another project or initiative that is eligible for TDA funding.

SANTA CLARA
Valley Transportation Authority

MEMORANDUM

TO: TDA Article 3 Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Grant Applicants
Technical Advisory Committee Members

FROM: Bill Hough, Transportation Planner III

DATE: February 24, 2011

SUBJECT: Call for Projects, Transportation Development Act Article 3
FY 2011/12 Program

TDA Article 3 Funds Available

This memorandum serves as the General Call-for-Projects for the FY 2011/12 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Program funding cycle. There are two components to the TDA Article 3 program:

1. Bicycle Expenditure Program

The VTA Board of Directors took action on December 9, 2004 to dedicate 25% of Santa Clara County's TDA Article 3 funds to projects on the countywide Bicycle Expenditure Program (BEP) list through 2030. On November 5, 2009, the Board committed $150,000 of the TDA3 BEP set-aside to County Expressway Pedestrian Projects.

Therefore, there is $150,000 available for BEP projects this year. **Projects must be on the current Board-adopted BEP project list.** BEP project sponsors **must** submit MTC's TDA Article 3 Project Application Form. **Project sponsors must include a transmittal letter that states when they expect the project begin construction. In the event that BEP applications are oversubscribed, preference will be given to projects that are ready for construction and/or have other funding sources that could be jeopardized if the project is not delivered in a timely manner.**

2. Guarantee Funds

Table 1 below shows each city and the County's "Guarantee" share of MTC's TDA Article 3 Fund Estimate. There is $1,008,742 available for "Guarantee" projects this year. The guarantee share is based on California Department of Finance (DOF) population projections and funds banked or rescinded from previous years, where applicable. **An agency's total applications cannot exceed its guarantee share listed in the following table:**

Table 1

2011/12 TDA ARTICLE 3 ESTIMATE FOR SANTA CLARA COUNTY

Agency	Guarantee Amount (Includes banked and rescinded funds from prior years.)
Campbell	$19,552
Cupertino	$103,179
Gilroy	$24,895
Los Altos	$13,811
Los Altos Hills	$7,677
Los Gatos	$14,739
Milpitas	$34,238
Monte Sereno	$6,670
Morgan Hill	$19,258
Mountain View	$36,264
Palo Alto	$55,597
San Jose	$489,546
Santa Clara	$56,860
Saratoga	$15,311
Sunnyvale	$67,205
Santa Clara County	$43,942
	$1,008,742

Rescind/Reallocation Requests

The guidelines for rescinding and reallocating TDA Article 3 projects have been amended by MTC. Previously, sponsors were allowed to rescind projects and reallocate the funds to other projects immediately. However, agencies may now only allocate up to their estimate in any given year. Sponsors may still rescind projects, but VTA cannot reallocate them until the next TDA funding cycle. Funds rescinded in 2011 will be added to the sponsor's guarantee in 2012.

It is the responsibility of the project sponsor to monitor project expiration deadlines and to apply for rescind/reallocation of funds in a timely manner. Failure to do so will result in the sponsor losing the funds.

Banking of Funds

TDA Article 3 funds may be banked for up to two years plus one year to program funds. To bank TDA funds, project sponsors must submit a letter or email stating that funds will be banked. If banked funds are not programmed by the end of the 3rd Year, they will be redistributed to the countywide TDA Article 3 pool for the following fiscal year. If you are planning to bank funds, please send a letter or email to that effect to Bill Hough at the address below. **A member agency must inform VTA in writing of its intent to either claim or bank its TDA3 guarantee funds; failure to do so means that the funds revert to the countywide pool in the next cycle.**

Project Types and Guidelines

Your TDA Article 3 project must be ready to implement within ONE year of the application cycle.

Eligible Project Types

The following project types are eligible for TDA Article 3 Funding:

- Design & construction of on and off-street bicycle facility projects – including but not limited to bicycle parking.
- Design & construction of on and off-street pedestrian facility projects
- Maintenance of Class I bikeways (unlimited)
- Maintenance of Class II bikeways. Countywide, the total funds allocated to Class II bikeway maintenance cannot exceed 20% of the total countywide TDA estimate. Call Bill Hough at (408) 321-5735 if you plan to exceed 20% of your agency's guarantee amount.
- Bicycle Safety Education Programs (not more than 50% of the project's budget and not more 5% of the countywide TDA Article 3 funds)
- Comprehensive Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Plans (not more than once per jurisdiction every 5 years)
- Projects identified in a recent (within 5 years) comprehensive local bicycle or pedestrian plan
- Annual TDA Article 3 Audits

Other Eligibility & Procedural Issues

Environmental clearance is required for construction projects only. If you are submitting an application for design, you are not required to submit a County stamped notice. Additional information on the TDA Article 3 procedures and criteria can be found in the MTC TDA Article 3 Rules and Procedures, which is available on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission website at:
http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/STA-TDA/RES-0875.doc

Bicycle Advisory Committee and Bicycle Plan Requirement

Cities and counties may not receive TDA Article 3 funds for bicycle projects unless the jurisdiction has established a Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) and the project is included in an adopted plan as stipulated in the MTC TDA Article 3 Rules and Procedures. This requirement does not apply to pedestrian projects.

VTA Bicycle Technical Guidelines

The VTA Board of Directors approved the *VTA Bicycle Technical Guidelines* update on December 13, 2007. The purpose of the *Guidelines* is to provide a uniform set of optimum standards for the planning, design, and construction of bicycle facilities that are part of the countywide bicycle system. Bicycle projects funded by TDA Article 3 funds

must comply with the *Guidelines*. For a copy of this document, please contact Michelle DeRobertis at (408) 321-5716 or Michelle.DeRobertis@vta. org. It is also available on the VTA website at http://www.vta.org/schedules/bikeways_program.html

Application Submittals

MTC's TDA Article 3 Project Application Form and resolution boilerplate is located at: http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/sta-tda/tda_article_3_claim_forms.doc

Project sponsors must use this form to submit applications. Late applications will not be accepted.

Complete one application for each project. PLEASE NOTE: VTA should receive 2 copies of each project application. .

2011/12 TDA Article 3 Detailed New Project Submittal Requirements

Number of Copies	Item
1 per agency	Cover letter that indicates whether application is for guarantee and/or BEP funding. The cover letter must include a statement that the project must be ready to implement within ONE year of the application cycle.
2 per agency	Governing body resolution wording and Council Resolution supporting the project(s) (***due on May 27, 2011***). The sample is on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission website: http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/STA-TDA/
2 per project	MTC's TDA Article 3 Application ***(See Application Form – available on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission website: http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/STA-TDA/)***
2 per project	A vicinity map showing the project's general location in your jurisdiction
2 per project	A detail map showing the project and phases where applicable
2 per project	Documentation of environmental clearance (*for applicable projects*). **The county clerk must stamp the environmental document.**

Completed project applications should be submitted to VTA by 4:00 p.m. on **Friday, April 15, 2011.**

Please send applications to:

Bill Hough, Transportation Planner III
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
Programming & Grants
3331 North 1st St., Bldg. B2
San Jose, CA 95134-1906

Evaluation Process, Programming and Drawing Programmed Funds

VTA staff will review project applications. The resulting countywide program will be reviewed by the VTA advisory committees before adoption by the VTA Board of Directors at its June 2011 meeting.

The VTA Board adopted project priorities will be forwarded to MTC for review and adoption. Once MTC has adopted the program, MTC's Finance Section will issue allocation instructions to your agency. Please read these instructions carefully, they will provide your agency with guidance on invoicing and annual audit and reporting requirements. **All project invoicing goes directly to MTC**. All work must be completed by June 30, 2014 and **MTC needs to receive reimbursement requests by August 1, 2014.**

TDA Audit Information

In accordance with MTC Resolution 875, all claimants that have received an allocation of TDA funds are required to submit an annual fiscal and compliance audit to MTC and to the Secretary of Business and Transportation Agency within 180 days after the close of the fiscal year. **Your audits are due to MTC by December 31 of each year**. Failure to submit the audit will prohibit MTC from making a new TDA allocation. If no TDA funds were expended during the fiscal year, the applicant should file a statement to that effect with MTC. Please contact MTC's TDA program manager Bob Bates, at 510-817-5733 or bbates@mtc.ca.gov, for additional information on audit requirements.

Table O: Potential POD Projects

POD	Main Street	Cross Street or Extent	Recommended Improvements	Cost Estimate	Score
7	Sunnyvale-Saratoga	Crescent	Reduce SE corner radii Install tactile domes Install crosswalk across Crescent	$7,300	7
5	Maude	Sunnyvale to Bayview	Install outer striping in EB direction to reduce lane widths and provide a defined area for vehicles backing out	$1,103	7
1	Bayview	Washington	Install centerline striping to make road seem narrower on Bayview Install 3 diagonal curb ramps Install high visibility crosswalk on north leg Install transverse crosswalk on east leg Red curbs near intersection to improve sight distance	$6,760	6
7	Remington	Azure	Install crossing aids on east leg Install median ped refuge	$29,400	5
7	Remington	Manet	Retrofit curb ramps Reduce radii for right-turn speed reduction and ADA accessibility	$26,800	5
6	Washington	Acalanes to Leota	Reduce curb radii at all intersections	$96,000	5
5	Maude	Bayview	Install bulb-outs at SW and SE corners Reduce radii at all other corners Install high-visibility crosswalks on west and east leg Install tactile domes Install crosswalk paddles across Maude	$55,400	5
5	Maude	Sunnyvale-Borregas	Reduce radii at NW corner to correct ADA accessibility issues and install perp curb ramps Tactile domes on all corners Install curb ramp on SW corner of Borregas No right turn on red from SB Borregas Audible signals	$18,200	5
3	Lakehaven	Hidden Lake	Install crosswalks, including high-visibility across Lakehaven Install tactile domes	$5,000	5
3	Lakehaven	Meadowlake	Install high-visibility crosswalks on all legs Install advance stop bars Install tactile domes	$7,600	5
3	Lakehaven	Silverlake	Change to 4-way stop control Install high visibility crosswalks on all legs Install tactile domes	$6,400	5
1	Murphy	Washington and Evelyn	Install raised crosswalk with transverse markings Install ped-scaled lighting Install advance stop bars Install crosswalk paddles "Yield" for pedestrians	$2,500	5

Mary Avenue Bike Lanes Project Alternative Design Concept Evaluation

The consultant team for the Mary Avenue Bike Lanes design project has completed two additional design concepts for providing bike lanes on Mary Avenue. These concepts are based on feedback received during an initial public outreach effort and refinement of concepts to better meet the intent of the Street Space Allocation Policy. The additional design concepts are posted to the web page marybikelanes.insunnyvale.com as they are too voluminous to provide in hard copy form. Individual BPAC members have had the opportunity to review full size plans prior to the meeting, and roll out plans will be available at the March 17 BPAC meeting. A total of four design concepts (the two original concepts plus the two additional refined concepts) are being considered as part of the design exercise. The consultant has also prepared evaluation criteria for the alternative design concepts and applied them to the four concepts. The evaluation criteria and initial ranking of design concepts is included as part of this agenda packet.

This evaluation does not constitute a staff recommendation on a preferred design. Staff will make its recommendation at the conclusion of the current public outreach effort. A Report to Council will be drafted for review by the BPAC at a future meeting. A public open house to allow review and feedback on the design concepts has been scheduled for March 31 at 7:00 PM at the Las Palmas Park Building, 850 Russet Drive.

Staff recommends that the BPAC provide staff with feedback on the design concepts and the evaluation of concepts. The BPAC can indicate a preferred concept at this time, but the BPAC will have the opportunity to make a final recommendation at the time of review of the Report to Council.

TJKM

Vision That Moves Your Community

Transportation Consultants

Technical Memorandum

Date: March 10, 2011

To: Jack Witthaus
Traffic and Transportation Division Manager
City of Sunnyvale

From: Rich Haygood, P.E.
Andrew Kluter, P.E.

Subject: **Mary Avenue Road Space Reallocation Study in the City of Sunnyvale – Concept Evaluation Screening Criteria and Preliminary Scoring Results**

TJKM is pleased to present the subject screening evaluation criteria and preliminary scoring results of concept design plans prepared for the subject road space reallocation study. TJKM has evaluated four concept plan options for road space reallocation, described as follows:

- Concept 1 - Alternative 1 for all segments (1,2,3) as originally presented at the last community meeting and the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
- Concept 2 - Alternative 2 for all segments (1,2,3) as originally presented at the last community meeting and the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
- Concept 3 – this concept plan refines the earlier preliminary design plans presented for Segment 1 / Alternative 1, Segment 2 / Alternative 2, Segment 3 / Alternative 2, with design adjustments based on City staff, BPAC, and community meeting input.
- Concept 4 – this concept plan refines the earlier preliminary design plans presented for Segment 1 / Alternative 2, Segment 2 / Alternative 1, Segment 3 / Alternative 1, with design adjustments based on City staff, BPAC, and community meeting input.

Based on the evaluation and scoring of the concept plans, the highest-scoring alternative will be considered for City Council approval.

Evaluation Criteria

TJKM developed road space reallocation criteria for evaluation of the proposed concept plans based on the principles of the City of Sunnyvale Policy for the Allocation of Street Space; applicable engineering standards, including the latest versions of the City of Sunnyvale Standard Details, California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Highway Design Manual (HDM); and the Santa Clara County Valley Transportation Authority's (VTA) Bicycle Technical Guidelines. The intent of the evaluation criteria is to provide a basis for evaluating the Mary Avenue project and also similar future City of Sunnyvale road space reallocation projects that may include, among other design features, Class II bicycle lanes.

TJKM used the following criteria, sorted by category, to evaluate the road space reallocation concept plans developed for the Mary Avenue project corridor:

1. Minimum safety-related design standards for motor vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians. This criterion measures the extent to which a concept plan maintains minimum widths for motor

Pleasanton
3875 Hopyard Road
Suite 200
Pleasanton, CA
94588-8526
925.463.0611
925.463.3690 fax

Fresno
516 W. Shaw Avenue
Suite 200
Fresno, CA
93704-2515
559.325.7530
559.221.4940 fax

Sacramento
980 Ninth Street
16th Floor
Sacramento, CA
95814-2736
916.449.9095

Santa Rosa
1400 N. Dutton Avenue
Suite 21
Santa Rosa, CA
95401-4643
707.575.5800
707.575.5888 fax

tjkm@tjkm.com
www.tjkm.com

vehicle travel lanes (10 feet), Class II bicycle lanes (five-foot on-street striped adjacent to curb or parking lane), and sidewalk facilities (five feet) (50 possible points):

- 100 percent of total project length = 50 points
- 95-99 percent = 45 points
- 75-94 percent = 35 points
- 50-74 percent = 25 points
- 25-49 percent = 10 points
- 1-24 percent = 5 points

2. Enhancement of Transportation Facility. Criteria under this category provide opportunities to award additional points for a concept plan that exceeds minimum design standards and/or provides enhancements and amenities for certain transportation modes.

   A. Percent of total project roadway length providing optimal six-foot bicycle lane width per the VTA Bicycle Technical Guidelines. This is a "bonus" for projects that can provide the optimal width in addition to the minimum five-foot bicycle lane width (10 possible points).
      - 100 percent of total project length = 10 points
      - 85-99 percent = 8 points
      - 75-84 percent = 6 points
      - 50-74 percent = 5 points
      - 25-49 percent = 3 points
      - 1-24 percent = 1 points

   B. Potential for lowering 85th percentile speeds of vehicles (expected with lane width reduction). This criterion is scored on a low-to-high scale. A "high" mark is received particularly for three-lane road diets, in which conflict points related to midblock corridor left turns and bicycle/pedestrian crossing areas are reduced.
      - High (10 points)
      - Medium (5 points)
      - Low (0 points)

   C. Percent reduction in pedestrian crossing distance at existing crosswalks. The greater the reduction in crossing distance along the corridor, the higher a concept plan is scored.
      - 15-25 percent (10 points)
      - 5-15 percent (5 points)
      - Less than five percent (0 points)

   D. Impacts to transit system convenience and access (10 possible points)
      - Maximum 10 points for preservation / enhancement of existing bus stop facilities
      - Graduated reduction from 10 points based on following ratio:

$$\frac{\text{Number of corridor bus stops that are modified that inconvenience transit riders}}{\text{Total bus stops along corridor}}$$

   E. Impacts to pedestrian facility convenience and access (10 possible points)
      - Maximum 10 points for preservation / enhancement of existing pedestrian facilities, specifically sidewalks along corridor
      - Graduated reduction from 10 points based on following ratio:

$$\frac{\text{Length (feet) of existing sidewalk narrowed, shortened, or moved closer to curb lane}}{\text{Total length of existing sidewalk facilities along corridor}}$$

3. Collision reduction potential – this criterion is scored on a low-to-high scale in terms of anticipated reduction in auto, bicycle, and pedestrian collisions based on proposed roadway reconfiguration. Previous engineering studies have shown road diets in particular have the potential to reduce the incidence of certain collision types such as rear end (due to installation of center turn lane) and bicycle/pedestrian (due to bicycle lane installation and shortened crosswalks). Potential reductions due to such installations would be scored as follows:
   - High (addition of center turn lane, bicycle lanes, shortened crossing distance) - 10 points
   - Medium (some, but not all, of above improvements) – 5 points
   - Low (none of the above roadway modifications) – 0 points

4. Intersection operational / capacity impacts – criteria under this category are scored based on whether a concept plan maintains acceptable existing and future year (e.g. 2020) vehicle overall level of service (LOS) according to applicable jurisdictional standards (i.e. City of Sunnyvale, Caltrans, or Santa Clara County).
   A. Plan maintains acceptable LOS at critical signalized intersections with arterials/expressways (20 possible points). Applicable Mary Avenue project intersections include:
      - Maude Avenue
      - Central Expressway
      - Evelyn Avenue (Caltrain crossing)
      - El Camino Real (State Route 82)
      - Fremont Avenue

      Scoring: for above Mary Avenue case, a two (2) point reduction for each intersection that degrades to unacceptable LOS (worse than current minimum City of Sunnyvale standards of LOS D or other applicable standards, i.e. Caltrans or Santa Clara County) as a result of the road space reallocation project. Therefore, a concept plan can score up to 10 points for Existing Conditions and another 10 points for future year conditions if no critical signalized intersections become deficient as a result of the Mary Avenue bicycle lane project.

   B. Plan maintains acceptable LOS existing and future year (e.g. 2020) vehicle overall level of service (LOS) at signalized intersections with collector streets (10 possible points). Applicable Mary Avenue project intersections include:
      - Corte Madera Avenue
      - California Avenue
      - Washington Avenue
      - Iowa Avenue
      - Heatherstone Way
      - Knickerbocker Drive
      - Remington Drive
      - Ticonderoga Drive

      Scoring: for above Mary Avenue case, a 5/8-point reduction for each intersection that degrades to unacceptable LOS (worse than current minimum City of Sunnyvale standards of LOS D or other applicable standards, i.e. Caltrans or Santa Clara County) as a result of the road space reallocation project. Therefore, a concept plan can score up to five (5) points for Existing Conditions and another five (5) points for future year conditions if no signalized intersections with collector streets become deficient as a result of the Mary Avenue bicycle lane project.

5. Roadway segment capacity impacts – criteria under this category are scored based on whether the concept plan maintains adequate roadway capacity, particularly in the case of converting a four-lane roadway segment to a three-lane road diet (which also includes bicycle lanes in the case of Mary Avenue). Concept 2, the only concept plan that does not include a road diet design, is scored highest due to no reduction in roadway capacity. Criteria are as follows:
   A. Proposed road diet conversion segment is within feasible ADT range for three-lane roadway (10 possible points for Existing Conditions)
      - 10 points for 15,000 ADT or less
      - 8 points for 15,000 to 20,000 ADT
      - 6 points for 20,000 ADT or more

   B. Proposed road diet conversion segment is within range of 1,050 vehicles per lane highest weekday peak hour (vph) for three-lane roadway (5 possible points for Existing Conditions)
      - 5 points for 1,050 vph or less
      - 2 points for above 1,050 vph

6. On-street corridor parking supply. This criterion scores a concept plan based on the ability of the existing (or remaining, in the case of removal) on-street curb parking supply along the corridor to accommodate existing observed peak parking demand. The maximum possible score is 15 points, in which no parking supply is removed. Points are deducted on a graduated basis according to a ratio of remaining on-street parking supply to existing on-street parking supply. Concept 2 is the only concept plan in which parking removal is proposed (Segment 1 between Fremont Avenue and Evelyn Avenue).

7. Comparative overall construction costs. This criterion scores concept plans in terms of construction costs relative to each other. Cost considerations include median reconstruction, roadway pavement reconstruction, curb relocation, gutter and sidewalk reconstruction, adjustments to traffic signal systems (relocated traffic loops, signal timing / phasing), traffic signing and striping, and related construction tasks. Total possible points for this criterion are 30 points. The lowest-cost concept plan would get the maximum number of points, while the other plans would receive a lower number of points based on the ratio of the lowest-cost concept plan to the other higher-cost concept plans.

Concept Plan Evaluation Results

Attachment A includes results of the concept plans evaluation based on the above scoring criteria. The results, out of a possible 200 points, are as follows:

- Concept 3 (182 points) – this concept plan rated highest based on high scores for enhancement of transportation facilities (providing optimal six-foot bicycle lanes, vehicle speed reduction potential, reduced pedestrian crossing distance, and transit / pedestrian facility convenience and access), collision reduction potential, maintenance of intersection capacity, and lack of impacts to existing on-street curb parking supply. Lower marks were given for overall construction cost, mainly due to median reconstruction along the corridor north of Evelyn Avenue.

- Concept 4 (180 points) – this concept plan rated nearly as high as Concept 3, with slightly lower marks due to less provision of optimal six-foot wide bicycle lanes and fewer instances of reduced pedestrian crossing distance. It should be noted that higher marks were given for construction cost when compared to Concept 3. This concept plan proposes less costly curb widening north of Evelyn Avenue instead of median

reconstruction as proposed under Concept 3, to achieve at least minimum five-foot wide bicycle lanes.

- Concept 1 (176 points) – this concept plan scored lower in terms of transportation facility enhancement criteria (provision of six-foot bicycle lanes, vehicle speed reduction potential, and reduced pedestrian crossing distance). Higher marks were given for maintaining existing on-street curb parking supply and lower construction costs. However, the lower costs for this concept plan are due to no proposed roadway widening or median reconstruction (north of Evelyn Avenue) to achieve minimum-width bicycle lanes, and the plan includes sharrows in some corridor sections.

- Concept 2 (168 points) – this concept plan, which is the only one in which a road diet between Fremont Avenue and Evelyn Avenue is <u>not</u> proposed, scored lower than the other concept plans for vehicle speed reduction potential, collision reduction potential, impacts to existing on-street curb parking supply (one lane proposed for removal between Fremont Avenue and Evelyn Avenue), and construction cost (primarily due to median reconstruction north of Evelyn Avenue). Compared to all other concept plans, higher marks were given for maintaining existing roadway capacity (average daily and peak hour traffic), particularly between Fremont Avenue and Evelyn Avenue, where this plan does not propose a road diet.

TJKM appreciates the opportunity to provide concept plan criteria and preliminary scoring results for the proposed Mary Avenue bicycle lane concept plans. We welcome your feedback and questions. Thank you.

Attachment A: Concept Plan Criteria Scoring Results

Attachment A – Concept Plan Criteria Scoring Results

TJKM
Transportation Consultants

Sunnyvale Mary Avenue Road Space Reallocation Project - Concept Plan Criteria Scoring Results
March 10, 2011

CRITERION	Maximum Possible Points	Concept 1 Score	Concept 2 Score	Concept 3 Score	Concept 4 Score
1. Minimum Safety-Related Design Standards for Motor Vehicles, Bicycles, and Pedestrians	50	45	50	50	50
2. Enhancement of Transportation Facility					
2a. Percent of Project Length Providing Optimal Six-Foot Bicycle Lane Width	10	6	8	8	6
2b. Potential to Lower 85th Percentile Roadway Vehicle Speeds (High=10, Med=5, Low=0)	10	5	5	10	10
2c. Percent Reduction in Pedestrian Crossing Distance at Existing Crosswalks	10	5	10	10	5
2d. Impacts to Transit System Convenience and Access	10	10	10	10	10
2e. Impacts to Pedestrian Facility Convenience and Access	10	10	10	10	10
3. Collision Reduction Potential (Motor Vehicles, Bicycles, and Pedestrians)	10	10	5	10	10
4. Intersection Operational / Capacity Impacts					
4a. Signalized Intersections with Arterials/Expressways					
Existing Conditions	10	10	10	10	10
Future (2020) Conditions	10	10	10	10	10
4b. Signalized Intersections with Collectors/Local Streets					
Existing Conditions	5	5	5	5	5
Future (2020) Conditions	5	5	5	5	5
5. Roadway Segment Capacity Impacts (Proposed Three-Lane Road Diet Section)					
5a. Existing Conditions - average daily traffic (for proposed three-lane road diet section)	10	8	10	8	8
5b. Existing Conditions - peak hour volume (for proposed three-lane road diet section)	5	2	5	2	2
6. On-Street Corridor Parking Supply Impacts	15	15	6	15	15
7. Comparative Overall Construction Costs	30	30	18	19	24
Totals	**200**	**176**	**168**	**182**	**180**

3

Pastoria Avenue Bike Lanes Project

The City applied for and is recommended to receive an Air District/VTA grant to construct bike lanes on Pastoria Avenue from Evelyn Avenue to El Camino Real. This project was selected as a priority for the VTA Bicycle Plan by the VTA Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission, and was the only eligible project that could meet the funding source project delivery deadlines.

Staff has conducted preliminary field investigations, and it is evident that implementation of bike lanes on Pastoria Avenue between Evelyn and Iowa Avenues would likely require elimination of all on-street parking in order to meet minimum design standards and to maintain two way traffic flow. Casual observation shows that off-street parking in this area of older homes is limited. Parking demand is fairly high. The project will be subject to a more detailed Street Space Allocation Study and Council action on final approval of the street configuration. It can be anticipated that this project will be controversial.

Staff requests that the BPAC discuss this project and the merits and desirability of bike lanes on this section of Pastoria Avenue, and give staff early feedback on how to continue with this project.