METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

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 the CS Policy must complete the Exceptions section on the Checklist, including the BPAC review, and provide a Department Director-level signature. Please fill out Contact Information and Project Information and then move to Statement of Exception, which is the last section.

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 ***should be submitted online via this form.***

PROJECT INFORMATION
Project Name/Title: Hesperian Boulevard Bike Lane Gap Closure
Project Area/Location(s):

Hesperian Boulevard from East 14th Street to Bayfair Drive in City of San Leandro, in Alameda County, California
Attach map if available.
Project Area Map

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: (300-word limit)
Please indicate project phase (Planning, **PE**, ENV, ROW, CON, O&M)

The Hesperian Blvd Bike Lane Gap Closure proposes to install class IV bike lanes on Hesperian Blvd from E 14th St to Bayfair Dr. Additional improvements include pedestrian crossing improvements, traffic signal modification, road dieting, and a bus boarding island.

See the Project Conceptual Plan

CONTACT INFORMATION

Contact Name & Title:	**Contact Email:**	**Contact Phone:**
Erwin Ching, Engineering Manager	eching@sanleandro.org	510-577-3439

Agency:
City of San Leandro

Do you think your project qualifies for a Statement of Exception? (see qualifying list in pg. 4)
- **Yes**
- **No**

- **No**

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: • 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	☒	☐	The Project will install a class IV bikeway on Hesperian Blvd. The Project improvements is consistent locally adopted plans including San Leandro 2035 General Plan, San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, and Vision Zero Policy.
2. Active Transportation Network	Does the project area contain segments of the regional Active Transportation (AT) Network?	☒	☐	Hesperian Boulevard has a posted speed limit of 40 mph and 26,200 ADT with existing

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
	[See AT Network map on the MTC Complete Streets webpage.]			conventional class II bike lanes. It is recommended to install a protected bicycle lane based on NACTO's Urban Bikeway Design Guide for Selecting All Ages & Abilities Bikeways.
3. Safety and Comfort	A. Is the Project on a known High Injury Network (HIN) or has a local traffic safety analysis found a high incidence of bicyclist/ pedestrian-involved crashes within the project area?	☒	☐	The Project is identified on the Alameda County 2019 HIN and a priority safety corridor on the City's Local Roadway Safety Plan. The Project will install a separated bikeway improve pedestrian crossings to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety.
	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?	☒	☐	Hesperian Blvd has existing conventional bike lanes, the Project will provide an All Ages and Abilities (AAA) bikeway. A user experience analyses was not conducted, however given the 40 mph 85th percentile speed and 26,200 ADT and identified in the 2019 HIN, it is recommended to improve the bikeway facility to provide a physical separation between the bicyclist and motorist to reduce LTS and improve bicycle safety.
4. Transit Coordination	A. Are there existing public transit facilities (stop or station) in the project area?	☒	☐	AC Transit bus stop 54517 near Hesperian Blvd and Adason Dr will be affected
	B. Have all potentially affected transit agencies had the opportunity to review this project?	☐	☒	Design phase of this project has not started, AC Transit will have

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
				opportunity to review during design.
	C. Is there a MTC Mobility Hub within the project area?	☒	☐	There is one mobility hub at Bayfair BART Station adjacent to the project area.
5. Design	Does the project meet professional design standards or guidelines appropriate for bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities?	☒	☐	NACTO Urban Design Guidance for Selecting All Ages & Abilities Bikeway recommended a Class IV bikeway based on the existing ADT and 85th percentile speed of the Project corridor.
6. Equity	Will Project improve active transportation in an Equity Priority Community (EPC)?	Yes		Please list EPC(s) affected. Census Tract 433000
7. BPAC Review	Has a local (city or county) Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission (BPAC) reviewed this checklist. The CS Checklist MTC review will begin once the BPAC meeting has occurred.	☐	☒	San Leandro BPAC will review and comment on the checklist on April 30, 2025. Summary notes will be provided.

Statement of Compliance	YES
The proposed Project complies with California Complete Street Act of 2008 (*Gov. Code Sections 65040.2 and 65302, MTC Complete Streets Policy (Reso. 4493*), **and locally adopted Complete Streets resolutions** (*adopted as OBAG 2 (Reso. 4202) requirement, Resolution 4202*).	☒

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.	☐		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).	☐		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.	☐		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.	☐	☐	Describe condition(s) that prohibit implementation of CS policy requirements

SIGNATURES / NOTIFICATIONS

TRANSIT

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

DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR-LEVEL SIGNATURE FOR EXCEPTIONS

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

Full Name: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

ATTACHMENT 1 – All Ages and Abilities and Guidelines

1. All Ages and Abilities

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

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

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

2. Design Guidance

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

-

Contextual Guidance for Selecting All Ages & Abilities Bikeways

Roadway Context				All Ages & Abilities Bicycle Facility
Target Motor Vehicle Speed*	Target Max. Motor Vehicle Volume (ADT)	Motor Vehicle Lanes	Key Operational Considerations	
Any		*Any*	*Any of the following:* high curbside activity, frequent buses, motor vehicle congestion, or turning conflicts‡	**Protected Bicycle Lane**
< 10 mph	Less relevant	No centerline, or single lane one-way	Pedestrians share the roadway	**Shared Street**
≤ 20 mph	≤ 1,000 – 2,000		< 50 motor vehicles per hour in the peak direction at peak hour	**Bicycle Boulevard**
≤ 25 mph	≤ 500 – 1,500			
	≤ 1,500 – 3,000	Single lane each direction, or single lane one-way	Low curbside activity, or low congestion pressure	**Conventional or Buffered Bicycle Lane, or Protected Bicycle Lane**
	≤ 3,000 – 6,000			**Buffered or Protected Bicycle Lane**
	Greater than 6,000			**Protected Bicycle Lane**
	Any	Multiple lanes per direction		
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.[16]

‡ 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