



302 North 1st Avenue, Suite 300 ▲ Phoenix, Arizona 85003
Phone (602) 254-6300 ▲ FAX (602) 254-6490
E-mail: mag@mag.maricopa.gov ▲ Web site: www.mag.maricopa.gov

July 9, 2009

TO: Members of the MAG Regional Bicycle Task Force and the Pedestrian Working Group

FROM: Tami Ryall, Gilbert, Chair of the MAG Regional Bicycle Task Force and Acting Chair of the Pedestrian Working Group

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Tuesday, July 21, 2009 at 1:30 p.m.
MAG Offices, Suite 200 - Cholla Room
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

A meeting of the MAG Regional Bicycle Task Force and the MAG Pedestrian Working Group will be held at the time and place noted above. Committee members may attend the meeting either **in person, by video conference or by telephone conference call**. Those attending by videoconference must notify the MAG site five days before the meeting. Those attending by telephone conference call are requested to call (602) 452-5073 at least an hour before the time of the meeting on the day of the meeting.

If you are attending in person, please park in the garage under the building. Bring your ticket to the meeting and parking will be validated. For those using transit, the Regional Public Transportation Authority will provide transit tickets for your trip. For those using bicycles, please lock your bicycle in the bike rack in the parking garage.

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), MAG does not discriminate on the basis of disability in admissions to or participation in its public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting Maureen DeCindis at the MAG office. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

Please be advised that under procedures adopted by the MAG Regional Council on June 26, 1996, all MAG committees need to have a quorum to conduct business. A quorum is a simple majority of the membership. If you are unable to attend the meeting, please make arrangements for a proxy from your jurisdiction to represent you. If you have any questions, please contact Maureen DeCindis at (602) 452-5073, or send email to mdecindis@mag.maricopa.gov.

A Voluntary Association of Local Governments in Maricopa County

City of Apache Junction ▲ City of Avondale ▲ Town of Buckeye ▲ Town of Carefree ▲ Town of Cave Creek ▲ City of Chandler ▲ City of El Mirage ▲ Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation ▲ Town of Fountain Hills ▲ Town of Gila Bend
Gila River Indian Community ▲ Town of Gilbert ▲ City of Glendale ▲ City of Goodyear ▲ Town of Guadalupe ▲ City of Litchfield Park ▲ Maricopa County ▲ City of Mesa ▲ Town of Paradise Valley ▲ City of Peoria ▲ City of Phoenix
Town of Queen Creek ▲ Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community ▲ City of Scottsdale ▲ City of Surprise ▲ City of Tempe ▲ City of Tolleson ▲ Town of Wickenburg ▲ Town of Youngtown ▲ Arizona Department of Transportation

TENTATIVE AGENDA

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the June 30, 2009 Meeting Minutes of the Pedestrian Working Group and the Regional Bicycle Task Force

3. Call to the Audience

An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address the committee on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG, or on items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. Members of the public will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes will be provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless the Task Force requests an exception to this limit. Please note that those wishing to comment on action agenda items will be given an opportunity at the time the item is heard. Please fill out blue cards for Call to the Audience and yellow cards for Action Items.

4. Staff and Member Agency Reports

Staff and committee members are invited to provide an update of pedestrian and bicycle-related activity in their agencies.

5. Complete Streets Program Update

EDAW will present the information from the Complete Streets Workshops and progress on the plan.

2. For information, discussion and action to approve the meeting minutes of the June 30, 2009 Pedestrian Working Group and the Regional Bicycle Task Force meeting.

3. For information.

4. For information and discussion.

5. For information and discussion.

6. Transportation Improvement Program Application Review

MAG staff will present the newest draft of the Bicycle/Shared Use TIP Project Application and the Pedestrian Project Application and the Criteria Evaluation sheets for committee members to discuss and approve. See attachments.

7. Next Meetings

All meetings will be on the third Tuesday of the month in the Cholla Room at 1:30 p.m., except for December meeting that begins at noon.

~~August 18, 2009~~ cancelled
September 15, 2009
October 20, 2009
November 17, 2009
December 15, 2009 (noon)

6. For information and discussion.

7. For information.

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
PEDESTRIAN WORKING GROUP AND THE
REGIONAL BICYCLE TASK FORCE

Tuesday, June 30, 2009 at 1:30 p.m.
MAG Office Building, Cholla Room
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| * Tami Ryall, Gilbert, Chair, Regional Bicycle Task Force and Acting Chair of the Pedestrian Working Group | Joe Schmitz, Goodyear |
| * Michael Sanders, ADOT | * Michael Cartsonis, Litchfield Park |
| Brian Fellows, ADOT | Denise Lacey, Maricopa County |
| * Michael Eagan, ASLA, Arizona Chapter | Jim Hash, Mesa |
| Margaret Boone-Pixley, Avondale | Brandon Forrey, Peoria |
| * Robert Wisener, Buckeye | Katherine Coles, Phoenix |
| Vacant, Carefree | Shane Silsby, Phoenix |
| Vacant, Chandler | Vacant, Queen Creek |
| * Rich Rumer Coalition for Arizona Bicyclists | Peggy Rubach, RPTA |
| * Doug Strong, El Mirage | Reed Kempton, Scottsdale |
| ^ Steve Hancock, Glendale | Eric Iwersen, Tempe |
| | Janice See, Surprise |

*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

^Attended via audio-conference

OTHERS PRESENT

Susan Conklu, Scottsdale
Susan Bookspan, Phoenix Children's Hospital
Trent Thatcher, Horrocks Engineers

1. Call to Order

Jim Hash called the meeting to order at 1: 30 p.m.

2. Approval of the April 21, 2009 Meeting Minutes of the Pedestrian Working Group and the Regional Bicycle Task Force

Denise Lacey moved to approve and Katherine Coles seconded the move to approve the meeting minutes of the Bicycle Task Force and Pedestrian Working Group for April 21, 2009. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Call to the Audience

An opportunity was provided to members of the public to address the Bicycle Task Force and the Pedestrian Working Group on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG,

or on items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. Members of the public were requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes was provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless the Bicycle Task Force and the Pedestrian Working Group requests an exception to this limit. Please note that those wishing to comment on action agenda items were given an opportunity at the time the item was heard. No one wished to address the committee.

4. Staff and Member Agency Reports

Staff and committee members were invited to provide an update of pedestrian and bicycle-related activity in their agencies.

Peggy Rubach reported on a Valley Metro and Maricopa County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) project. All 23 schools within the regional Safe Routes to School have received their materials. Valley Metro is still working with Children's Hospital and St. Joseph's. The program will be completed through Valley Metro. There will be a meeting for the technical advisory subcommittees for the developing the curriculum, incentives and tracking measures for the Enhancements project. These will take July and August to complete. Partner cities will receive an invoice for \$247 to cover legal fees and give away items, etc.

Brian Fellows noted the start of the fourth cycle of the Safe Routes to School program which is operating under continuing resolution with \$2.5 Million available. The grants will be on-line in September. Brian Fellows encouraged cities to apply for infrastructure grants. He noted that those grants are more complicated and need a longer timeframe to complete. Brian Fellows is available for consult.

Janice See noted that Surprise is developing a bike and pedestrian plan for the city. This is their first effort.

5. Complete Streets Program Update

EDAW was expected to present the information from the Complete Streets Workshops and progress on the plan. This item was moved to the July meeting.

6. Transportation Improvement Program Application Review

MAG staff presented the newest draft of the Bicycle/Shared Use TIP Project Application and the Pedestrian Project Application and the criteria evaluation sheets for committee members to discuss.

Brandon Forrey explained that the subcommittee wanted to establish an objective approach to the new criteria for the TIP application. Within the criteria, there are general guidelines for each person to rate each question.

Section I: Project Description

Reed Kempton asked "What is a convenience improvement?" Brandon Forrey noted that page two, #19 lists the types of factors to be considered. Items such as water fountains, way-finding signage, bike racks, rest areas are considered as convenience improvements.

Maureen DeCindis explained that Section I has standardized questions for all projects not just for bicycle and pedestrian projects. Peggy Rubach asked if there were more points for a certain kind of project over another. Katherine Coles responded that each project is judged on its own merits. There was discussion to change the width of the wide outside lane to five feet from four feet. Margaret Boone Pixley asked if the committee should encourage four feet with no curb/gutter even though it is in the AASHTO guidelines. Shane Silsby suggested adding the word “minimum”.

Reed Kempton suggested adding speed limit and number of travel lanes to the discussion of the “traffic on the segment”. Denise Lacey asked if the application should ask for a roadway classification such as arterial, collector and residential street. Reed Kempton replied that the speed and number of lanes would provide that information.

Reed Kempton asked the purpose of asking the question if the city owns the right-of-way. Peggy Rubach suggested that this was a federal requirement. Right-of-way cannot be counted for reimbursement if it was purchased before the grant was approved.

Section 2: Proposed Improvements

#16 Referencing Guidelines. Reed Kempton suggested using the words “cite the specific references”. Discussion followed as to how to state this requirement. Members suggested to state it in a way that is clear but not onerous. Reed Kempton noted that historically projects had been submitted that did not meet guidelines. Shane Silby suggested adding the choice of guidelines in bullet list format.

Change the bike lane width from greater than 5 foot to 6-7 feet.

Katherine Coles suggested adding the category “other” under #18 Identify the Types of Safety Improvements. Add “identify and briefly describe”. Strike the “overpass and underpass” and change to grade-separated crossing.

The Convenience Improvements question will be stated the same and asking for a brief description. Way- finding signage will be added as an option.

Linkage: Asks for project connectivity. This will give the projects more emphasis. Brandon Forrey compared the questions to the Evaluation Criteria. Shane Silsby suggested taking the word “Regional” out of the title. Reed Kempton asked if a two mile project that both Tempe and Scottsdale are working together to connect is the same as a 20 mile long facility in one city that touches the border of another city. Maureen DeCindis responded that both projects are considered regional.

In terms of the linking to sites, Brandon Forrey cited the Evaluation Criteria that describes the linkages more clearly. It was decided that the application questions would be restated to be more definitive.

Brandon Forrey noted the grouping of transit facilities with commercial location so as not to discriminate against those cities without transit. Peggy Rubach suggested adding multi-modal (bus, rail, stop, station) to the question.

Brandon Forrey reviewed the Evaluation Criteria. The committee supported making the language the same in both documents.

Constructability was discussed. Is this the same as cost estimates and cost effectiveness? Margaret Boone Pixley noted that the importance of this category was to make sure that the cities costs were accurate enough so the committee could feel confident that the project will be constructed. Margaret Boone Pixley would like to review the exact costs. Joe Schmitz noted that if this was a threshold requirement, then what is this committee evaluating. Katherine Coles noted the original purpose was to insure that the jurisdictions by going through the cost estimate process will be better prepared to actually construct the project.

Katherine Coles suggested changing the question to ask “how are you going to fund the project”. Peggy Rubach noted that this may be a very difficult question to address given the state of the economy.

Reed Kempton asked why use the number of dwelling units for population. Katherine Coles noted that this data is easier to access. Brian Fellows asked about empty dwelling units. Margaret Boone Pixley noted that facilities are being built to last and therefore will be in existence when the dwelling units are filled in better economic times. Shane Silsby noted that housing units are more uniform.

Brandon Forrey asked members to review the Regional Importance criteria. Katherine Coles noted that this was the criteria that would allow for subjectivity or the “icing” points.

Brandon Forrey asked the committee to review the Pedestrian application and criteria and to send comments to MAG staff within the next week. MAG staff will send out a revised application and criteria sheet electronically to allow members the maximum review time.

7. Next Meetings

All meetings will be on Tuesday in the Cholla Room at 1:30 p.m., unless otherwise noted:

July 21, 2009
~~August 18, 2009~~ cancelled
September 15, 2009
October 20, 2009
November 17, 2009
December 15, 2009 (noon)

PART B-BICYCLE & SHARED-USE PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

This part of the form identifies the current characteristics and proposed improvements for each project.

The purpose of Part B is to provide sufficient information to evaluate the cost estimate for the project and to provide assurance that the project will be capable of meeting the ADOT administered federal design review and clearance process. This process requires environmental, ROW and utilities clearances and a bid ready design prior to FHWA approval to encumber federal funding for construction.

Section 1 - Project Description	
1. What is the type of bicycle project? (Check all that apply)	
Bicycle lane (4' min. w/o curb/gutter)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bicycle lane (5' min. with curb/gutter)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Multi-use path (10' min.)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bridge (overpass)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tunnel (underpass)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Paved shoulders (5' min.)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Signalized crossing	<input type="checkbox"/>
Signalized midblock crossing/HAWK	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mid-block crossing w/ pedestrian refuge	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Describe:
2. Project Location - Include segment beginning and ending limits	
3. Length (Miles)	
4. Please provide a map , aerial map, graphic and photos that clearly show the segment alignment and features that connect to other bicycle facilities and that cross into or about the alignment such as: washes, canals, railroad crossings, and other crossing features that may affect the project.	Please attach map with transmittal
5. (Optional) Please provide a simple diagram of the current typical cross section, including widths, of the segment that shows the right of way limits, sidewalks and shoulders (if any), and the lanes of travel.	
6. Posted speed limit (MPH)	<input type="checkbox"/> 25 <input type="checkbox"/> 30 <input type="checkbox"/> 35 <input type="checkbox"/> 40 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 50+ <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
7. Number of travel lanes	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 7+ <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
8. Current Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	
9. Please describe methodology used to calculate ADT (nearest parallel arterial street)	Briefly describe:
10. Federal law requires that all federally funded projects comply with a federal environmental clearance. For projects that have a minimum ground disturbance, environmental surveys are required and an environmental document will need to be prepared, which typically requires 12 months to complete. Describe any known cultural, historical and biological resources, hazardous materials or other environmental issues that could affect work on the segment.	Briefly describe:
11. Current ROW: (Check all that apply)	
Agency owns all ROW Needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
ROW to be acquired	<input type="checkbox"/>
Owners will donate ROW	<input type="checkbox"/>
Agency owns easement	<input type="checkbox"/>
Agency has right-of-use (i.e. canal)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Condemnation may be required	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Please describe any right of way issues associated with the project.	Briefly describe:

13. Current Utilities in or abutting the alignment: (Check all that apply)	
None	<input type="checkbox"/>
Canals & Drainage	<input type="checkbox"/>
Power Lines & Cables	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pipelines, Sewer and Water	<input type="checkbox"/>
Private Structures	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Describe:
14. Please describe any utility conflicts that will need to be addressed.	Briefly describe:

Miscellaneous

If the jurisdiction is submitting more than one project, please identify the local jurisdiction's priority for this project.	
--	--

Section 2 - Proposed Improvements

15. Please describe the work to be performed on the project:	Briefly describe:
16. Why is the project important to the community?	Briefly describe:
17. Guidelines used to develop project: (Check all that apply)	
MAG Pedestrian Policies and Design Guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>
AASHTO Guide for Bicycle Facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Please specify:

Transportation Improvement

18. Why is this project an enhancement to the local and/or regional transportation system?	Briefly describe:
--	-------------------

Safety and Convenience Improvements

19. Please describe the current surface condition of the proposed project	
20. Safety improvements to be included: (Check all that apply)	
Wide bike lanes (6'-7')	<input type="checkbox"/>
Buffer zone	<input type="checkbox"/> Indicate typical width:
Grade-separated crossing (overpass or underpass)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Signalized crossing	<input type="checkbox"/>
Path lighting	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. Convenience improvements to be included: (Check all that apply)	
Water fountains	<input type="checkbox"/>
Way-finding signs	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bike racks	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trash receptacles	<input type="checkbox"/>
Seating/rest area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Shade	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Describe:
22. How does this project improve upon an existing safety issue?	Briefly describe:
23. How does the project improve ADA facilities for persons with disabilities?	Briefly describe:

Linkages

24. Connectivity: (Check all that apply)	
Project links with regional bikeways facility	<input type="checkbox"/> Indicate facility:
Project is multijurisdictional	<input type="checkbox"/> Indicate jurisdictions:
Project connects to other local bikeways	<input type="checkbox"/>
25. Total length of facilities connected (in miles)	

26. Activity centers (parks, libraries, senior centers, recreational centers, etc.) this project will benefit:	
Within 1/4 mile	<input type="checkbox"/> List:
Between 1/4 and 1/2 mile	<input type="checkbox"/> List:
Between 1/2 and 1 mile	<input type="checkbox"/> List:
27. Commercial destinations (malls, retail centers, business parks, etc.) and transit services (bus/rail routes, stops, and stations) this project will benefit:	
Within 1/4 mile	<input type="checkbox"/> List:
Between 1/4 and 1/2 mile	<input type="checkbox"/> List:
Between 1/2 and 1 mile	<input type="checkbox"/> List:
28. Schools (public elementary, middle, and high schools, colleges, and universities) this project will benefit:	
Within 1/4 mile	<input type="checkbox"/> List:
Between 1/4 and 1/2 mile	<input type="checkbox"/> List:
Between 1/2 and 1 mile	<input type="checkbox"/> List:
Demographics	
29. Housing Density (Number of dwelling units per acre) within 1/2 mile	<input type="checkbox"/> 15 + <input type="checkbox"/> 5 - 15 <input type="checkbox"/> < 5
30. Is the project in an area where the average household income is less than \$26,000/year? (Use blockgroup data from the Census 2000)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
31. Is the project in an area that serves adults over the age of 60 years? (Use blockgroup data from the Census 2000)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Policies and Plans	
32. Jurisdiction policies for improved bicycle/shared use facilities	
With new development and capital improvement projects, bike lanes on arterial streets are:	<input type="checkbox"/> required <input type="checkbox"/> recommended <input type="checkbox"/> not addressed
With new development and capital improvement projects, bike lanes on collector streets are:	<input type="checkbox"/> required <input type="checkbox"/> recommended <input type="checkbox"/> not addressed
With pavement restoration or regular pavement maintenance on arterial streets, bike lanes are:	<input type="checkbox"/> required <input type="checkbox"/> recommended <input type="checkbox"/> not addressed
With pavement restoration or regular pavement maintenance on collector streets, bike lanes are:	<input type="checkbox"/> required <input type="checkbox"/> recommended <input type="checkbox"/> not addressed
With new development or during development retrofits, shared-use paths are:	<input type="checkbox"/> required <input type="checkbox"/> recommended <input type="checkbox"/> not addressed
Bicycle program implemented, including bike education, safety events, and bike maps	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> somewhat <input type="checkbox"/> no
33. The project is: (Check one)	
Identified in General Plan, council adopted policy, or Capital Improvements Program	<input type="checkbox"/> List:
Consistent with general policy/practices, but not formally identified	<input type="checkbox"/> Explain:
Not addressed by jurisdiction's plans, policies, or practices	<input type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation Criteria for Bicycle/Shared Use Projects TIP 2014

Project Name (include city): _____

Member Name (include city): _____

CATEGORY	DESCRIPTION	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS EARNED
Transportation Improvement 10%	Project enhances the local and/or regional transportation system	10	
Safety and Convenience Improvements 30%	Project addresses: existing safety concern = 6-10 pts; potential safety concern 0-5 pts	10	
	Types of safety improvements included in project: three or more = 6-10 pts; two = 3-5 pts; one = 0-2 pts	10	
	Types of convenience improvements included in project: three or more = 6-10 pts; two = 3-5 pts; one = 0-2 pts	10	
Linkages 40%	Projects links with: regional facility = 6-8 pts; multi-jurisdictional facility = 4-5 pts; local facility only = 1-3 pts	10	
	Links with one or more activity centers, parks or community, senior, recreation, or adult day care centers within: 1/4 mile = 6-10 pts; 1/2 mile = 3-5 pts; 1 mile = 0-2 pts	10	
	Links with one or more commercial destinations (<i>malls, retail centers, business parks, etc.</i>) or transit (bus/rail route/stops/station) within: 1/4 mile = 6-10 pts; 1/2 mile = 3-5 pts; 1 mile = 0-2 pts	10	
	Links with one or more schools (elementary, middle, or high schools, colleges, or universities) within: 1/4 mile = 6-10 pts; 1/2 mile = 3-5 pts; 1 mile = 0-2 pts	10	
Demographics 10%	Housing density (dwelling units per acre) is: 15+ = 5 pts; 5 - 15 = 2 pts; < 5 = 0 pts	5	
	Project is located within or is adjacent to an area with an average income < \$26k/yr: yes = 3 pts; no = 0 pts	3	
	Project is located or adjacent to an area with higher elderly (age > 60 years) population: 25%+ = 2 pts; < 25% = 0 pts	2	
Policies and Plans 10%	Project is: identified in the General Plan, Council adopted policy, or CIP = 3-5 pts; consistent with general policy/practices = 1-2 pts; not addressed by jurisdiction's plans, policies, or practices = 0 pts	5	
	Jurisdiction has policies for improved bicycle/shared use facilities that are: required = 3-5 pts; recommended = 1-2 pts; not emphasized or do not exist = 0 pts	5	
		TOTAL SCORE	
Highly Recommended	Project consistently exceeds most measured goals of a Bicycle/Shared Use project. It is highly ranked for: safety & convenience; and linkages to identified facilities, destinations and schools are clear and identifiable. The project benefits underserved populations and more densely populated areas. Jurisdictional support is exhibited through existing plans and policies.		
Recommended	Project meets most measured goals of a Bicycle/Shared Use project. It demonstrates a minimum commitment to safety and convenience; linkages to facilities, destinations and schools may be identified. The project may benefit underserved populations and somewhat dense populated areas. There may be support for the project in a jurisdiction's existing plans and policies.		
Not Recommended	Project does not consistently meet the measured goals of a Bicycle/Shared Use project. Application exhibits deficiencies in most measured areas.		

PART B-PEDESTRIAN PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

This part of the form identifies the current characteristics and proposed improvements for each project.

The purpose of Part B is to provide sufficient information to evaluate the cost estimate for the project and to provide assurance that the project will be capable of meeting the ADOT administered federal design review and clearance process. This process requires environmental, ROW and utilities clearances and a bid ready design prior to FHWA approval to encumber federal funding for construction.

Section 1 - Project Description	
1. What is the type of bicycle project? (Check all that apply)	
Sidewalk (5' min.)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wide sidewalk (8' min.)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Detached sidewalk (4' min. buffer)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bridge (overpass)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tunnel (underpass)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Signalized crossing	<input type="checkbox"/>
Signalized midblock crossing/HAWK	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mid-block crossing w/ pedestrian refuge	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Describe:
2. Project Location - Include segment beginning and ending limits	
3. Length (Miles)	
4. Please provide a map , aerial map, graphic and photos that clearly show the segment alignment and features that connect to other bicycle facilities and that cross into or about the alignment such as: washes, canals, railroad crossings, and other crossing features that may affect the project.	Please attach map with transmittal
5. (Optional) Please provide a simple diagram of the current typical cross section, including widths, of the segment that shows the right of way limits, sidewalks and shoulders (if any), and the lanes of travel.	
6. Posted speed limit (MPH)	<input type="checkbox"/> 25 <input type="checkbox"/> 30 <input type="checkbox"/> 35 <input type="checkbox"/> 40 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 50+ <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
7. Number of travel lanes	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 7+ <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
8. Current Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	
9. Please describe methodology used to calculate ADT (nearest parallel arterial street)	Briefly describe:
10. Federal law requires that all federally funded projects comply with a federal environmental clearance. For projects that have a minimum ground disturbance, environmental surveys are required and an environmental document will need to be prepared, which typically requires 12 months to complete. Describe any known cultural, historical and biological resources, hazardous materials or other environmental issues that could affect work on the segment.	Briefly describe:
11. Current ROW: (Check all that apply)	
Agency owns all ROW Needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
ROW to be acquired	<input type="checkbox"/>
Owners will donate ROW	<input type="checkbox"/>
Agency owns easement	<input type="checkbox"/>
Agency has right-of-use (i.e. canal)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Condemnation may be required	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Please describe any right of way issues associated with the project.	Briefly describe:
13. Current Utilities in or abutting the alignment: (Check all that apply)	
None	<input type="checkbox"/>
Canals & Drainage	<input type="checkbox"/>
Power Lines & Cables	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pipelines, Sewer and Water	<input type="checkbox"/>
Private Structures	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Describe:
14. Please describe any utility conflicts that will need to be addressed.	Briefly describe:
Miscellaneous	
If the jurisdiction is submitting more than one project, <u>please identify the local jurisdiction's priority for this project.</u>	

Section 2 - Proposed Improvements	
15. Please describe the work to be performed on the project:	Briefly describe:
16. Why is the project important to the community?	Briefly describe:
17. Guidelines used to develop project: (Check all that apply)	
MAG Pedestrian Policies and Design Guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Please specify:

Transportation Improvement	
18. Why is this project an enhancement to the local and/or regional transportation system?	Briefly describe:

Safety and Convenience Improvements	
19. Please describe the current surface condition of the proposed project	
20. Safety improvements to be included: (Check all that apply)	
Wide sidewalks (8' min.)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Buffer zone	<input type="checkbox"/> Indicate typical width:
Grade-separated crossing (overpass or underpass)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Signalized crossing	<input type="checkbox"/>
Path lighting	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. Convenience improvements to be included: (Check all that apply)	
Water fountains	<input type="checkbox"/>
Way-finding signs	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trash receptacles	<input type="checkbox"/>
Seating/rest area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Shade	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Describe:
22. How does this project improve upon an existing safety issue?	Briefly describe:
23. How does the project improve ADA facilities for persons with disabilities?	Briefly describe:

Linkages	
24. Connectivity: (Check all that apply)	
Project links with regional pedestrian facility	<input type="checkbox"/> Indicate facility:
Project is multijurisdictional	<input type="checkbox"/> Indicate jurisdictions:
Project connects to other local pedestrian facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>
25. Total length of facilities connected (in miles)	
26. Activity centers (parks, libraries, senior centers, recreational centers, etc.) this project will benefit:	
Within 1/4 mile	<input type="checkbox"/> List:
Between 1/4 and 1/2 mile	<input type="checkbox"/> List:
Between 1/2 and 1 mile	<input type="checkbox"/> List:
27. Commercial destinations (malls, retail centers, business parks, etc.) and transit services (bus/rail routes, stops, and stations) this project will benefit:	
Within 1/4 mile	<input type="checkbox"/> List:
Between 1/4 and 1/2 mile	<input type="checkbox"/> List:
Between 1/2 and 1 mile	<input type="checkbox"/> List:
28. Schools (public elementary, middle, and high schools, colleges, and universities) this project will benefit:	
Within 1/4 mile	<input type="checkbox"/> List:
Between 1/4 and 1/2 mile	<input type="checkbox"/> List:
Between 1/2 and 1 mile	<input type="checkbox"/> List:

Demographics		
29. Housing Density (Number of dwelling units per acre) within 1/2 mile	<input type="checkbox"/> 15 +	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 - 15 <input type="checkbox"/> < 5
30. Is the project in an area where the average household income is less than \$26,000/year? (Use blockgroup data from the Census 2000)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
31. Is the project in an area that serves adults over the age of 60 years? (Use blockgroup data from the Census 2000)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Policies and Plans		
32. Jurisdiction policies for improved pedestrian facilities		
With new development and capital improvement projects, wide sidewalks (8' min.) on arterial streets are:	<input type="checkbox"/> required	<input type="checkbox"/> recommended <input type="checkbox"/> not addressed
With new development and capital improvement projects, wide sidewalks (8' min.) on collector streets are:	<input type="checkbox"/> required	<input type="checkbox"/> recommended <input type="checkbox"/> not addressed
With new development and capital improvement projects, detached sidewalks (4' min. buffer) on arterial streets are:	<input type="checkbox"/> required	<input type="checkbox"/> recommended <input type="checkbox"/> not addressed
With new development and capital improvement projects, detached sidewalks (4' min. buffer) on collector streets are:	<input type="checkbox"/> required	<input type="checkbox"/> recommended <input type="checkbox"/> not addressed
With pavement restoration or regular pavement maintenance on arterial streets, wheelchair ramp retrofits are:	<input type="checkbox"/> required	<input type="checkbox"/> recommended <input type="checkbox"/> not addressed
With pavement restoration or regular pavement maintenance on collector streets, wheelchair ramp retrofits are:	<input type="checkbox"/> required	<input type="checkbox"/> recommended <input type="checkbox"/> not addressed
With new development or during development retrofits, shared-use paths are:	<input type="checkbox"/> required	<input type="checkbox"/> recommended <input type="checkbox"/> not addressed
Pedestrian program implemented, including a list of pedestrian facility deficiencies with prioritization list	<input type="checkbox"/> yes	<input type="checkbox"/> somewhat <input type="checkbox"/> no
33. The project is: (Check one)		
Identified in General Plan, council adopted policy, or Capital Improvements Program	<input type="checkbox"/> List:	
Consistent with general policy/practices, but not formally identified	<input type="checkbox"/> Explain:	
Not addressed by jurisdiction's plans, policies, or practices	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Evaluation Criteria for Pedestrian Projects TIP 2014

Project Name (include city): _____

Member Name (include city): _____

CATEGORY	DESCRIPTION	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS EARNED
Transportation Improvement 10%	Project enhances the local and/or regional transportation system	10	
Safety and Convenience Improvements 30%	Project addresses: existing safety concern = 6-10 pts; potential safety concern 0-5 pts	10	
	Types of safety improvements included in project: three or more = 6-10 pts; two = 3-5 pts; one = 0-2 pts	10	
	Types of convenience improvements included in project: three or more = 6-10 pts; two = 3-5 pts; one = 0-2 pts	10	
Linkages 40%	Projects links with: regional facility = 6-8 pts; multi-jurisdictional facility = 4-5 pts; local facility only = 1-3 pts	10	
	Links with one or more activity centers, parks or community, senior, recreation, or adult day care centers within: 1/4 mile = 6-10 pts; 1/2 mile = 3-5 pts; 1 mile = 0-2 pts	10	
	Links with one or more commercial destinations (<i>malls, retail centers, business parks, etc.</i>) or transit (bus/rail route/stops/station) within: 1/4 mile = 6-10 pts; 1/2 mile = 3-5 pts; 1 mile = 0-2 pts	10	
	Links with one or more schools (elementary, middle, or high schools, colleges, or universities) within: 1/4 mile = 6-10 pts; 1/2 mile = 3-5 pts; 1 mile = 0-2 pts	10	
Demographics 10%	Housing density (dwelling units per acre) is: 15+ = 5 pts; 5 - 15 = 2 pts; < 5 = 0 pts	5	
	Project is located within or is adjacent to an area with an average income < \$26k/yr: yes = 3 pts; no = 0 pts	3	
	Project is located or adjacent to an area with higher elderly (age > 60 years) population: 25%+ = 2 pts; < 25% = 0 pts	2	
Policies and Plans 10%	Project is: identified in the General Plan, Council adopted policy, or CIP = 3-5 pts; consistent with general policy/practices = 1-2 pts; not addressed by jurisdiction's plans, policies, or practices = 0 pts	5	
	Jurisdiction has policies for improved pedestrian facilities that are: required = 3-5 pts; recommended = 1-2 pts; not emphasized or do not exist = 0 pts	5	
		TOTAL SCORE	

Highly Recommended	Project consistently exceeds most measured goals of a Pedestrian project. It is highly ranked for: safety & convenience; and linkages to identified facilities, destinations and schools are clear and identifiable. The project benefits underserved populations and more densely populated areas. Jurisdictional support is exhibited through existing plans and policies.
Recommended	Project meets most measured goals of a Pedestrian project. It demonstrates a minimum commitment to safety and convenience; linkages to facilities, destinations and schools may be identified. The project may benefit underserved populations and somewhat dense populated areas. There may be support for the project in a jurisdiction's existing plans and policies.
Not Recommended	Project does not consistently meet the measured goals of a Pedestrian project. Application exhibits deficiencies in most measured areas