

MEETING AGENDA

TOWN OF CORTE MADERA

Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

Wednesday, September 28, 2016
6:00 P.M.

Corte Madera Town Hall Council Chambers
300 Tamalpais Drive, Corte Madera, CA 94925

1. CALL TO ORDER/FLAG SALUTE
2. OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC REGARDING NON-AGENDA ITEMS
3. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS
 - A. Update on Bicycle and Pedestrian Matters (CMPA Traffic Officer)
 - B. Tamalpais Drive Complete Streets Project (Staff)
 - C. Redwood Highway Multi-use Pathway Repaving (Staff)
 - D. Signage Requiring 3 feet Distance When Passing Bicyclists (Staff/ David)
 - E. BPAC Extension (Cheryl)
 - F. Bicycle Rack Installation (Cheryl)
 - G. Town Sidewalk Repair Policies
4. COMMITTEE MEMBER REPORTS
5. SENIOR ENGINEER REPORT
 - A. Capital Projects Update inc. High Canal Pathway
6. APPROVE MINUTES OF JULY 20, 2016 BPAC MEETING
7. SET NEXT MEETING DATE AND ADJOURN

Attachments:

1. Draft Minutes from 7-20-16 BPAC Meeting

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Department of Public Works at 415-927-5057. For auxiliary aids or services or other reasonable accommodations to be provided by the Town at or before the meeting, please notify the Department of Public Works at least 3 business days before the meeting in advance of the meeting date. If the Town does not receive timely notification of your reasonable request, the Town may not be able to make the necessary arrangements by the time of the meeting.

Attachment 1

Draft Minutes from 7-20-16 BPAC Meeting

BICYCLE PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 20, 2016
CORTE MADERA TOWN HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
DRAFT MINUTES

Committee members Present: Robert Ravasio, Chair
Kirby Bartlett (arrived 6:20)
David Macpherson
Marc Madden

Committee members Absent: Leif Christiansen
Cheryl Longinotti
Tomas Nofziger

Staff Present: Senior Engineer Nisha Patel
CMPA Traffic Officer Scott Niklewicz

1. Call to Order/Flag Salute

Chair Ravasio opened the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

2. Open Time for public regarding non-agenda items

Ms. Karen Gerbosi, Park View Circle, was concerned, as a pedestrian, about people riding bicycles in the sidewalk.

Ms. Jean Severinhouse, Greenbrae Boardwalk, asked the BPAC to agendize the topic of educational efforts regarding safety data and protected bikeways.

Ms. Cindy Winter, Greenbrae, stated it was legal for parents to ride on a sidewalk, at a slow pace, with young children.

Mr. Jim Robinson, Ash Avenue, asked if the Town of Corte had any regulations regarding bicycles, scooters, skateboards, riding on the sidewalk. Senior Engineer Patel stated “yes”- anything non-motorized is allowed to ride on any sidewalk.

3. Discussion/Action Items

A. Update on Bicycle and Pedestrian Matters

Officer Niklewicz reported there were no bicycle collisions last month. They are continuing the extra pedestrian safety enforcement on Tamalpais Drive. He briefly discussed the department’s efforts with respect to bicycle theft prevention. There are several active investigations and they are partnering with the City of San Rafael and the County of Marin Sheriff’s Department Task Force. He discussed the Bicycle Registration Program and stated it was a way to track and return stolen bikes. Committee member Macpherson had questions about the use of “bait bikes”. Officer Niklewicz stated they do use a “bait bike” as a part of investigations. He did not know the details.

B. Tamalpais Drive Pedestrian Crossing Safety Improvements

Senior Engineer Patel presented a staff report. She stated Mr. Andrew Lee, representing Parisi Traffic Engineering, reviewed the plans prepared by Coastland Civil Engineering.

Mr. Lee gave a Powerpoint presentation. He gave a recap of the three concepts reviewed by the BPAC at its last meeting. The first was: 1) Replacing the existing striping; 2) Seeing what opportunities exist to narrow the lanes but not necessarily putting in a bike lane; 3) Seeing what kind of widths would be there to accommodate a standard bike lane. The project includes not only bicycle improvements but also pedestrian improvements. This includes pedestrian warning signs, high visibility crosswalks, bulbouts, and some rectangular rapid flashing beacons. Tonight’s discussion would not include the pedestrian features- he would like to focus on the re-striping. Option A replicated the widths of the striping- 11’ for the left turn

lanes, 11' for the #1 lane, 11' or more for the #2 lane, and no change to the parking. Option B (narrowed striping) had the left turn lane and the #1 and #2 lanes at 10 ½'. The remainder was a 4" white strip that would go along the right edge of the #2 lane. There was also 8' for parked cars. The right edge line is intended to slow the traffic down and provide a bit of traffic calming. He is concerned about the 10 ½' width for the #2 lane due to the trucks and busses that travel along that road. Option C includes bicycle lane striping. He pointed out that the widths of the street need to be confirmed with a survey- but they estimate about 42' out there. This option shows minimum (but standard) dimensions- 10' for the lanes, 5' for a bicycle lanes, and 7' for parking. The National Association for City Transportation Officials (NATCO) has the following recommendation- the absolute minimum width from the curb face to the edge of a bike lane was 12' (7' + 5', or 8' + 4'). The preferred width is 14 ½'. He stated they need to consider the speed limit, the speed at which cars travel, the mix of the traffic (heavy vehicles, etc.), and the overall visibility of the corridor. Designing to the minimum would not be the preferred option.

Senior Engineer Patel stated there have been several requests to put the bicycle lane on the other side of the parking (roadway side). She asked Mr. Lee to sketch out the extra needed width on the white board. He referred to Option C and noted the bike lanes start around Serra Street. He pointed to where the parking starts up east of Willow Avenue. He briefly discussed the concept of "road diets" which removes a vehicular travel lane and re-designates it for a bike lane. This would keep parking on the street. The "road diet" concept could be investigated through the corridor between Eastman and Chapman.

Mr. Lee briefly discussed the concept of a protected bicycle facility- rather than having parking along the curb and then the bike lane, the bike lane would be next to the curb with a 3' to 4' wide buffer, and then 7' to 8' of parking. The advantages include an increase in comfort levels for bicyclists of all ages.

Mr. Lee discussed the fact that there are sections, particularly on the eastbound side of Tamalpais (between Meadowsweet up to Madera), where there is parking allow now but there are no homes. There are businesses with parking lots fronting the street. Removing parking in these areas would be less of an issue than removing parking in front of homes. This is a potential solution for the eastbound direction towards Madera.

Committee member Madden asked if there was data regarding the implications of any narrowing on the actual speed of vehicles. Mr. Lee stated there were studies that show that it slows traffic down. Committee member Madden asked if it decreased the number of collisions. Mr. Lee stated the severity of collisions would probably be lessened.

Committee member Macpherson stated he had been a strong advocate of Option C but he now withdraws that advocacy. There simply is not enough real estate to put in a safe 5' or more bike lane. Option A is probably a non-starter. He referred to Option B and stated he is a big fan of the "fog line" (right-hand delineated line). Having the narrower motor vehicle lanes makes sense- it contributes to both bicycle and pedestrian safety. He noted that NATCO allows for 7' parking widths and as it currently exists there are not parking "T's" to tell people how close they should park to the curb. He wondered if 7' would be within design guidelines and appropriate for this street. Mr. Lee stated they could put in a parking "T" with the "T" facing out into the street. Committee member Macpherson asked if parking would need to be eliminated to have that additional 3' of protection. Ms. Lee stated they would need to eliminate one lane in each direction to accommodate the bicycle facility and parking. If the parking were eliminated, they could keep two lanes, put in a bike lane, and that extra width could be striped as a buffer. But is would not technically be "protected" without the parking. Tamalpais Drive is complicated- there is parking in some areas and no parking in other areas. In addition, the demand for traffic capacity changes along the corridor. Committee member Macpherson asked if a "road diet" was going from two lanes to one and if a "lane diet" was taking a 13' lane and making it 10 ½' or 11'. Mr. Lee stated "yes". Committee member Macpherson stated there were numerous driveways along Tamalpais and he asked if they could recommend a protected bicycle facility when there are so many "ins and outs". Mr. Lee stated parking protected cycle tracks could be problematic for cars pulling in and out of driveways. In addition, it can result in the loss of a few parking spaces for each driveway.

Committee member Bartlett noted the lane widths seem to be similar in all the options and he asked if they considered a reduction in the #1 lane and adding the extra room and sharrows in the #2 lane. Mr. Lee stated "yes". If the BPAC choose Option B then going to a 10 1/2' for the left turn lane and the #1 lane would be fine because the majority of the large vehicles would be in the #2 lane. The #2 lane should be 11'. Putting in the edge line would slow traffic down and the parking "T's", if placed at 7', would provide

a 1' to 3' buffer space. Sharrows would be placed in the #2 lane to remind motorists that there are cyclists in the road. This is his recommended Option #1. The second recommendation (Option #2) is a bit more aggressive. There are places where the bike lanes could be installed with the preferred width with no adverse affect to parking or the number of lanes (the far west side of Tamalpais). Because of the changing conditions along the street, they would have to consider a "road diet" (between Chapman and Eastman) or the removal of parking to make a continuous bicycle facility.

Senior Engineer Patel asked if the "fog line" would deter bicyclists from driving in the shoulder area (between the #2 lane and the parking). Mr. Lee stated it clearly defines the space and is almost like a bike lane when there is no parking. Sharrows in the #2 lane would remind people about bicyclists and help to slow traffic down.

Committee member Bartlett stated Tamalpais Drive gets very wide as it gets closer to the Bank of America (at Madera Boulevard and Sanford) and he asked if they could add sharrows as it widens up. Mr. Lee stated it seems to get wide as one approaches Madera because there is parking in the eastbound direction with business parking lots that front it. The parking is not marked with "T's" or edge lines. Removing parking, putting in a bike lane, and possibly adding a buffer might be possible.

Mr. Lee noted Option #1 was a short-term, "can do right now" solution- it would not require changing parking in any meaningful way, there would be no removal of vehicular lanes, but traffic would be slowed down and thus it would be ultimately more comfortable for cyclists. The other recommendation (Option #2) was more of a long-term study option- it has a lot more factors to consider, with outreach needed to all the stakeholders, etc.

Ms. Jean Severinghouse stated in Seattle they install bike lanes going up the hill and sharrows coming down. She asked if the BPAC would consider this. She asked the BPAC to get more serious about vehicular speeds- 90% of pedestrian survive when hit by a vehicle that is traveling 20 miles per hour, half of pedestrians survive when hit by a motor vehicle at 30 miles per hour, and ten percent survive when hit at 40 miles per hour. She asked what speed limit allows for the safe use of sharrows. She would like to see separate bicycle pathways on Tamalpais Drive from the freeway in both directions into the middle of Town.

Ms. Cindy Winter, Greenbrae, agreed with Ms. Severinghouse's comments about the hills. The Highway Design Manual does recommend a wider lane for the downhill portion. She asked about the grade of that hill. She asked if they had considered taking the slower riders through Pixley and up Redwood to that hill. The Federal Highway Administration made a study regarding protected bike lanes where there are driveways and was not certain they could be recommended. She recommended heavy outreach if they plan to eliminate parking.

Mr. Jim Robinson, Ash Avenue, stated he would be leery about eliminating parking along Tamalpais. The Town continues to support bicycle and pedestrian improvements but reminded everyone that they have to be maintained.

Ms. Karen Gerbosi, Park View Circle, stated use of the term "road diet" was disingenuous- they should simply say they are eliminating a lane. She asked if there was any research about the number and frequency of bicycles along Tamalpais Drive. She asked if the fog line (edge line) was ribbed or textured or if was simply paint. Mr. Lee stated it was generally a thermo-plastic line that is reflective. It can be installed as paint or some type of raised feature. Grooves would not be installed.

Ms. Janet Furman, Chapman Drive, stated there is a lot of bike traffic on Chapman since it is a good alternative to Corte Madera Avenue. She is concerned about making a right onto Tamalpais from Chapman. She thought they could eliminate a lane to create a real bike lane on Tamalpais to the freeway. They need two lanes from Madera to Sausalito because that is where cars back up.

Mr. Lee responded to some of the questions raised by the public. An uphill bike lane from Willow or Pixley going westbound would be possible and it would not require the removal of parking or a "road diet". It might involve shifting some of the lanes to the south. He referred to the question about safe speeds limits and the use of sharrows and stated 25 miles per hour was the preferred speed- 30 mph is cutting it close. He did not have information about bike counts. Senior Engineer Patel stated staff was obtaining this information.

Committee member Bartlett stated he liked Option #1 especially if they could incorporate a couple of the bike lanes in the section of the road mentioned (uphill portion). It would help from a cyclist and driver's standpoint. This could be a lane that would become a bike box. He is sensitive to the idea of removing parking spaces and would not recommend it. There is probably enough space to put in a bike box without removing parking in front of the Bank of America.

Committee member Macpherson stated this is a great opportunity to make this area much safer for bicyclists and making Corte Madera more bicycle friendly. He is in favor of Option #1 with certain modifications that incorporate the suggestions in Option #2 and things that have come up tonight. He would recommend the following: 1) The 10'6" #1 lane and 11' #2 lane were outstanding since it creates the real estate to put in a better bicycle facility and addresses high speed motor vehicles that create safety problems; 2) He is in favor of having a raised feature along the fog line, appropriately spaced; 3) He is in favor of an uphill bike lane starting at Pixley- it does not require the removal of any parking but could require shifting of the center lane; 4) He is in favor of the bike box on the south side of Tamalpais; 5) He is in favor of eliminating parking on Meadowsweet (eastbound) from the mortuary to the Bank of America to create a bike lane subject to appropriate outreach to residents and businesses.

Committee member Bartlett asked if the raised feature would be on the fog line. Chair Ravasio stated "yes". Committee member Bartlett asked how a cyclist would feel about this. Mr. Lee stated they could be spaced about 20' apart so a cyclist could get around them. They would use some low-profile dots. Committee member Bartlett stated he would probably ride along the fog line to avoid car doors since there is a sharrow saying he is allowed in the lane. He is not in favor of the raised feature.

Chair Ravasio stated the elimination of parking would take some time because of the necessary outreach. Senior Engineer Patel stated the public would get notice before the Council meetings and have an opportunity to speak. Chair Ravasio noted they have been working on this for several years and it started with pedestrian improvements along Tamalpais Drive. They are very close to the finish line and he did not want to add a feature that would take some time. Senior Engineer Patel stated they have the necessary time.

Committee member Madden stated he was opposed to the elimination of parking whether or not the residents and businesses objected.

Committee member Bartlett stated the people who park in that area could be commuters who do not live or work in the area. They would find out through the public process. He would like to see the project move forward.

Committee member Macpherson stated he was in favor of eliminating the parking in this area and perhaps others because parked cars hinder driver's sight lines. He supported the concept of eliminating parking spaces to provide for additional pedestrian safety per the traffic engineer's recommendation.

Chair Ravasio stated the idea of eliminating parking is part of a larger effort at taking a hard look at Option #2. They need to get these pedestrian improvements done.

Committee member Macpherson asked if this project, given the minor tweaks, had to go to the Council. Senior Engineer Patel stated it would be appropriate for the Council to review the project. Vice Mayor Furst stated the project would be expensive and would need to be approved by the Council.

M/s, Madden/Bartlett, move to approve Option #1 with the addition of the following: 1) A bike lane on the uphill side of Tamalpais from Pixley to Redwood; 2) Sharrow on the downhill side, 3) A bike box on Tamalpais eastbound at Madera; 4) No parking spaces shall be eliminated from the Tamalpais corridor unless there is a safety consideration at the crosswalks per the traffic engineer's recommendation. There shall be no raised features on the fog line.

Ayes: All

C. Capital Projects/Transportation Grants Status Update

Senior Engineer Patel stated she would give an update on the High Canal Path at the next meeting.

4. Committee Member Reports

Committee member Macpherson stated the resolution authorizing the BPAC sunsets this year and the Complete Streets Program requires a jurisdiction to have a BPAC. He asked the Town Council to make the BPAC a permanent committee. Senior Engineer Patel stated an agency of less than 10,000 is not required to have a BPAC. Committee member Macpherson stated he would like this issue placed on the BPAC agenda to allow the public to weigh in on the value of the committee. Chair Ravasio stated he would place this issue on an upcoming agenda.

Chair Ravasio reported he, along with Senior Engineer Patel, attended the Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM) BPAC meeting of July 12th. TAM was making recommendations for OBAG funding. Senior Engineer Patel stated TAM recommended approval of the Redwood Highway Multi-use Path Repaving Project (from Wornum to San Clemente) and the Tamal Vista (from Madera to Fifer) Bike Lanes and Sidewalks Project. The Marin County Public Works Directors Association (MPWA) recommended the first project as a priority along with the Paradise Drive Multi-Use Pathway (from San Clemente to Sea Wolf) Project.

Chair Ravasio thanked Senior Engineer Patel for her hard work on these well written grant applications- they were very well received by the committee.

5. Senior Engineer Report

Senior Engineer Patel stated she had no reports.

6. Approve Minutes of June 23, 2016 BPAC Meeting

M/s, Madden/Macpherson, move to approve the June 23, 2016 BPAC minutes as corrected.
Ayes: All

7. Set Next Meeting Date and Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 8:01 p.m. The next meeting was scheduled for September 28, 2016 at 6:00 p.m.