

Complete Streets Checklist

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

Background

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

Requirements

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

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

Additional information and guidance for completing this Checklist can be found at the MTC Administrative Guidance: Complete Streets Policy Guidance for public agency staff implementing MTC Resolution 4493 at <https://mtc.ca.gov/planning/transportation/complete-streets>

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

Submittal

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

PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name/Title: Various Locations Curb Ramp No. 19

Project Area/Location(s): 45th Ave & Ortega St, Judah & La Playa, 43rd Ave & Judah, Duncan & San Jose, Santa Clara Ave & Terrace Drive, Ogden Ave & Nevada St, and Golden Gate & Hyde.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: (300-word limit)

The project will be constructing a total of 34 new ADA curb ramps across Districts 4,5,7, and 9. All locations were carefully selected and were prioritized based on request by those with a disability, proximity to key resources, and if they were along the HIC and within Equity Priority Communities. This project will contribute towards SF Public Works and Mayors Office of Disability curb ramp goal.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Contact Name & Title: Anastasia Haddad, Project Manager	Contact Email: Anastasia.Haddad@sfdpw.org	Contact Phone: 628-271-2405
Agency: Public Works		

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
1. Bicycle, Pedestrian and Transit Planning	Does Project implement relevant Plans, or other locally adopted recommendations? Plan examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City/County General + Area Plans • Bicycle, Pedestrian & Transit Plan • Community-Based Transportation Plan • ADA Transition Plan • Station Access Plan • Short-Range Transit Plan • Vision Zero/Systematic Safety Plan 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The project is implementing the- <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ADA Transition Plan and the Vision 2. Zero/Systematic Safety Plan. 3. Complete Streets Plan
2. Active Transportation Network	Does the project area contain segments of the regional Active Transportation (AT) Network? [See AT Network map on the MTC Complete Streets webpage.]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ADA curb ramps are intended to serve pedestrians of all ages and abilities. Project will also be implnting bulbouts- a design measure to increase user safety and traffic calming
3. Safety and Comfort	A. Is the Project on a known High Injury Network (HIN) or has a local traffic safety analysis found a high incidence of bicyclist/	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Golden Gate & Hyde is classified as a Minor Arterial with three traffic lanes on each street. There is a painted safety

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
	pedestrian-involved crashes within the project area?			bulb at the NWC and a protected bike lane on Golden Gate heading east bound. The project intends to construct a full bulbout at the NWC as well as complete the ADA curb ramp accessibility at this intersection.
	B. Does the project seek to improve bicyclist and/or pedestrian conditions? If the project includes a bikeway, was a Level of Traffic Stress (LTS), or similar user experience analyses conducted?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The project will be improving accessibility for pedestrians only. No bicycle improvements.
4. Transit Coordination	A. Are there existing public transit facilities (stop or station) in the project area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SFMTA Transit Bus #8, Muni Train #N, NBUS, NOWL, Bus #12, West Portal, Bus #101, 130, 150, and 31.
	B. Have all potentially affected transit agencies had the opportunity to review this project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Once project starts the Design Phase, potentially affected transit agencies will be informed.
	C. Is there a MTC Mobility Hub within the project area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project has not yet engaged MTC Mobility Hub providers.
5. Design	Does the project meet professional design standards or guidelines appropriate for bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ADA Accessibility Standards of 2010. Issued by the DOJ and DOT.
6. Equity	Will Project improve active transportation in an Equity Priority Community?	X		Golden Gate & Hyde, Duncan & San Jose

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
7. BPAC Review	Has a local (city or county) Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission (BPAC) reviewed this checklist (or for OBAG 3, this project)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	February 26, 2024

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

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

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

SIGNATURES / NOTIFICATIONS

TRANSIT

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

DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR-LEVEL SIGNATURE FOR EXCEPTIONS

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

Full Name: Anastastia Haddad

Title: Project Manager

Date: 2/20/2024

Signature: Anastastia Haddad

ATTACHMENT 1 – All Ages and Abilities and Guidelines

1. All Ages and Abilities

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

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

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

2. Design Guidance

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

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

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

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

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

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