

Appendix

First Site Visit Information.....	85
Site Visit Agenda, Focus Group Meeting Notes, Community Priorities	
Second Site Visit Information.....	103
Site Visit Agenda, Stakeholder Meeting Notes, Community Meeting Notes, Walk Audit Notes	
Intersection Data Collection.....	111
Intersection Data Collection, Intersection Data Collection Key, Intersection Forms	

Appendix - A

First Site Visit Information

City of Marina – Walkable Communities Team

*City of Marina Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure Study
Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District*

Agenda for February 11-14, 2003 (Tuesday – Friday)

Tuesday, February 11, 2003

Time	Meeting Purpose	Location
8:00 am - 9:30 am	Walkable Communities Team meeting	
9:30 am - 11:00 am	Kick-off meeting with principal City Staff (subtask 1.3)	City Council Chambers
11:00 am - 2:00 pm	Tour and Lunch (subtask 2.2)	Leave from City Hall
2:00 pm - 3:00 pm	Focus Group #1 – City Staff except Public Safety: Jeff Dack John Heiser Jim Felton Craig Oliver BethAnn Skamser Tony Altfeld Gary Cramblett Charles Johnson Steve Johnston Peter Lee Quinton Roland Susan Hilinski Dan Gibson	City Council Chambers
3:15 pm - 4:15 pm	Focus Group #2 – Public Safety Staff: Lee Drummond Harold Kelly Mark Morgan Private Ambulance Operator – Central Coast Ambulance	City Council Chambers
4:30 pm - 5:00 pm	Focus Group #3 – City Council – Agendized meeting	City Council Chambers
5:30 pm - 6:30 pm	Focus Group #4 – Appointed Officials: Recreation and Community Services Commission City Services and Improvement Commission Tree Committee	Marina Airport Conference Room
6:45 pm - 8:00 pm	Focus Group #5 – Economic/Retail Interests: Chamber of Commerce Board (Director: Roger Williams) MBA (Jaryd McRae) Former Downtown Committee Members MSBI (Business Incubator Staff) (Jennifer Bliss, Susan Barich) Albertson's Manager Long Drug's Manager Marina Grocery Outlet Manager (David Cramer) Walgreens Mgr. Mortimers	Marina Airport Conference Room

Wednesday, February 12, 2003

Time	Meeting Purpose	Location
8:00 am - 9:00 am	Walkable Communities Team Meeting	
9:00 am - 10:00 am	Steering committee meeting with principal City staff	UCMBEST Conf. Room
10:00 am - 11:00 am	Focus Group #6 – Regional interests: AMBAG (Kate McKenna or Todd Muck) MST TAMC CSUMB Air District State Parks UCMBEST (Lora Lee Martin, Director, Graham Bice, Patti Ponzini) FORA (Steve Endsley, Jim Feeney)	UCMBEST Conf. Room
11:15 am - 12:15 am	Focus Group #7 –Environmental and Recreational Groups: Sierra Club (Steve Ruth) Land Watch (Chris Fitz) Boyer’s Sports Rotary Veteran’s Transitional Ctr. Green Belt Committee (Tim Miller, Tina Walsh, Dana Cleary, Barbara Fernell, Nancy Fortman, Paul Jesson, Ken Leach, Jennifer Lagier,) Community Human Services (Robin McRae)	UCMBEST Conf. Room
12:30 pm - 1:00 pm	Lunch	
1:00 pm - 3:00 pm	Walking Audit (Will be filmed by Dateline NBC)	Leave from City Hall
3:00 pm - 4:00 pm	Dan Burden to be interviewed by Dateline NBC (Michael Moule and Bismarck Obando to prepare for evening meeting)	UCMBEST or MSBI Conf. Room
3:00 pm - 6:00 pm	Prepare for evening meeting (primarily Dan Burden). Work with City staff to identify the study network. Start to revise the vision and develop goals, objectives, and performance measures. Review existing mapping, the General Plan, policies, City standards and other resources. (Michael Moule and Bismarck Obando) (Finish Subtask 1.3, Begin subtasks 1.6, 1.7, 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5)	MSBI (Incubator) Conference Room
6:00 pm - 8:00 pm	Public Kick-off Workshop #1 (subtask 1.5)	MSBI Conf. Room
8:00 pm -	Debriefing with city staff, discuss data collection format Dan Burden departs	

Thursday, February 13, 2003

Time	Meeting Purpose	Location
9:00 am - 12:00 pm	Meet with city staff to finalize data collection format and develop field data collection sheets.	City Council Chambers
1:00 pm - 6:00 pm	Conduct sample field inventory, train City staff on collection procedures. (subtask 2.6)	City Council Chambers

Friday, February 14, 2003

Time	Meeting Purpose	Location
8:00 am - 12:00 pm	Possibly continue field inventory (subtask 2.6) and/or work on production of subtasks 1.6 – 1.9 and 2.3 – 2.5 Michael Moule and Bismarck Obando depart	City Hall Conf. Room

**FOCUS GROUP
MEETING NOTES**

**Walkable Communities Team
City of Marina
Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Study
February 11, 2003**

Focus Group: City Staff

ATTENDEES:

Peter Lee, P.E. – Associate Civil Engineer – Public Works Department
A. Charles E. Johnson, P.E. – Director of Public Works/City Engineer
Jim Felton – Planning Department
John Heiser – Planning Department
Jeff Dack – Planning Director
Susan Hilinski – Planning Department
Tony Altfeld – City Manager
BethAnn Skamser – Housing and Community Development Director
Quinton Roland – Grants Manager

GENERAL NOTES:

1) What things would you like to see come out of the process? How is the information gathered going to help build a great community for Marina?

- To be less car dependent, encourage people to get out of their cars and walk.
- Help identify linkages that will promote greater pedestrian usage.
- Help us identify road improvements that would facilitate pedestrian use and create a pedestrian friendly community.
- Create a Town Center.
- Topography is an issue.
- Develop pedestrian malls, inhibiting vehicle traffic in some areas.
- To help capitalize on emerging technologies like the Segway HT.
- Development of University Corridors.
- Don't create "old Marina" vs "new Marina" situation.
- Need direction on moving toward implementation.
- One solution is that making it difficult to park cars will encourage non-motorized transportation.
- Park and Ride lots.
- Ideas and Guidance on how to update the redevelopment 5-year plans.
- There are neighborhoods with sidewalks but because of segmented zoning, people don't walk.
- Like to see it help implement what could be valid parts of general plan.
- Pedestrian connectivity off of streets and between the car-oriented strip centers – take what Marina has and make it better for pedestrian connections.
- The product needs to be presented in a way to assist and facilitate ease of implementation so whatever comes out of this process gets in the ground without a lot of additional staff work.
- It is important that this not just become another study that sits on the shelf. (Turnkey)
- Need a comprehensive document that provides guidance for the future so we don't need to reinvent the wheel when identifying future projects and that can be updated easily.

- Would love to have a very walkable environment for my son as he grows up; would love for him to be able to bike to school or sports practice.
- Identifying projects so that we can more readily obtain grant funding; developing relationships with organizations that provide funding.
- Happy that we are looking at existing plans and documents to help update and improve these projects.
- Need recommendations on types of bike facilities for new construction projects Class I, II, III.
- On some streets, priority should be for car traffic with ped and bike issues separate.
- Grew up in neighborhoods without cul-de-sacs where people biked and walked places. Wanted to be a parent that allowed kids to bike and walk to places. Frustrated by needing to chauffeur children to school and events.
- Developers and others pushing to design streets in less friendly ways without planter strips.
- Housing that has been built for the past ten years has sidewalks but the development is automobile-oriented, so it doesn't really promote walkability.
- Losing almost all opportunities for connectivity as undeveloped lots that provided shortcuts are being developed.
- Has been difficult to get off-street connections on new developments.

2) Is there an existing implementation Strategy that calls for walkable designs?

- For some areas of Reservation Road, yes, but otherwise no.
- Our general Plan reflects particular snapshot of where we were in 2000, but we are still trying to figure how to do it.

3) If we were to take the values of the community and we assume that the developers are building what they want, how well has the very recent past development matched with the values of the community?

- In the past, it has been spotty, but for the projects that are being reviewed now, we are being successful.
- We are in the process of updating ordinances to make sure that developers build projects that meet the community's values.
- In very recent years, we have had a grass roots effort to implement connectivity in the community.
- Changing the regulations is important, but it is also an impediment because it is an excruciating process to go through.
- Would like to see the City allocate a small amount every year to construct infill sidewalks – maybe \$20,000 to \$50,000 per year.
- Also to upgrade curb ramps to current ADA standards.
- We just recently adopted a new public facility impact fee that should generate sizable income stream to fund some of this infill and work. This City does not have a capital improvement program, and we are hoping to create one, potentially with revenue for impact fees.
- Is there a grant strategy that we can put in place to help get grants? Dan's answer – until you have certain plans and elements in place (many of which will come from this project) some organizations won't fund projects.

**FOCUS GROUP
MEETING NOTES**

**Walkable Communities Team
City of Marina
Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Study
February 11, 2003**

Focus Group: City Public Safety Department

ATTENDEES:

Harald Kelley – Division Chief/Fire Marshall – City Public Safety Department
Mark Morgan – Police Commander – City Public Safety Department
Steve Johnston – Marina Airport Manager

GENERAL NOTES:

- 1) What challenges and issues do you have in providing Public Safety in the City? And what are the most important things for us to know in providing a walkable, bicycle friendly City?**
 - First I'll give you some history. We transformed to a combined police and fire department. But in the past 20 years we grew from 30 officers to 32 officers, but the size of the city has grown tremendously. The geographic area that we cover has tripled and response times have increased.
 - Only one Fire Fighter is at one fire station, while the other 3 to 4 are on patrol (as police) and ready to respond if needed. The other station is not staffed.
 - The City does not have a response time standard although the standards exist in national and international fire codes. Due to our station locations and staff limitations we have some areas where we are pushing 7 to 8 minutes on response time. We want to establish a total of 5 minute response time – 1 minute start time, 4 minute travel time.
 - The public is not allowed on airfield property due to safety regulations, so having trails and recreation facilities there is not an option. Routes to the airport facility and adjacent industrial areas for pedestrian and bicycle access is definitely going to be a concern and something that needs to be addressed.
 - Airport income comes from land revenues; but less than 15% has actively been developed.
- 2) What do you see as the reasons that people are not walking and what improvements can be made to encourage people to walk?**
 - Our "downtown" area is not very well defined.
 - Our streets have missing links in sidewalks.
 - Reservation Road is a raceway and a heavily traveled thoroughfare. People have trouble crossing this and other streets.
 - Beyond Crescent Avenue there is very little reason to walk anywhere.
- 3) What particular areas of concern.**
 - Seacrest and Crescent near Reservation Road.
- 4) What about Traffic Safety – Do you have good records?**
 - We have good records, but we don't have maps of crash locations. Primary collision factors are speed and running stop signs.
 - Have hard copy of monthly traffic summary (crashes).
- 5) Is it safe to say that you have high crash locations?**
 - Imjin Road and Reservation Road is the higher crash location.
- 6) Is good signal progression a possible tool?**

- It isn't in place.

7) Do people generally obey the speeds?

- Not too much, especially east of Crescent on Reservation.

8) Are you familiar with roundabouts and what are your thoughts about them on major streets?

- I've seen them work in Europe and traffic moves at a good clip (low delay), it would take some getting used to.
- How will roundabouts work on 4 lane streets?
- Are they non-signal or do they have signals?

9) Bike trails and other facilities.

- Had some issues with Crime rates going up because of the natural habitat along trails.
- Have had some bicycle and pedestrian fatalities, especially on Reservation Road.

10) Upcoming projects.

- Talked about FORA project on Imjin Road that is almost complete. Are very concerned that it is going to become a problem for them with high speeds. Are especially concerned about the intersection of Imjin Parkway and Abrams.
- Also are very concerned about the planned 2nd Street widening project. Its 4-lane design will create other safety problems.

11) Other issues.

- In general we are not opposed to alternatives to the way to we do things, but we need to be informed.
- We don't have the luxury of having several engine companies for fire response. Our needs are based on our specific tactical restrictions and limitations.

**FOCUS GROUP
MEETING NOTES**

**Walkable Communities Team
City of Marina
Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Study
February 11, 2003**

Focus Group: Marina City Council

ATTENDEES:

Michael Morrison – Mayor Pro Tem
Ken Gray – City Council Member
Bruce Delgado – City Council Member
Dave McCall – City Council Member
Chris Fitz – Deputy Director – LandWatch Monterey County
Bart Bruno – Owner – Monterey Peninsula Engineering
Jennifer Cartafiane – Marina Arts Council – Public Arts Administration
Candy Myers Owen – Economic Development Comm./Marina Arts Council
Bob Schaffer – Marina Community Partners
Jeff Dack – Planning Director – City of Marina

GENERAL NOTES:

1) When we finish the plan, what is it that you most hope that this plan will cover? What are the biggest issues facing Marina that people will need to face that will allow people to want to live here for years to come?

- For the past two years we have been trying to identify our downtown area. As we develop from that area I would like to see us make everything in the downtown area less car-oriented.
- I like the fact that recently I can now walk to Starbucks. Things are starting to happen, this is the first time that I can actually walk somewhere.
- Marina has traditionally been a bedroom community, so whatever concepts come out of this plan need to have some focus on economic viability. In addition, we need to build community. Need to improve revenue so we can enhance services like a library, a true community center.
- Want to protect our open spaces and have access to our open spaces.
- The aesthetic aspect of our environment because this goes hand in hand with economic viability.
- The arts council is deeply involved in a public arts plan. If this plan is approved it will encourage people to walk around and look at public art. So this bike and pedestrian study needs to work well to enhance the public arts plan.
- Safety and comfort; Police and security. Concern about skateboarders conflicting with pedestrians.
- We will never get rid of the automobile, so we need to have a smooth transition between bus, walk, and driving.
- Need to have a big draw or anchor downtown.
- Need to have continual stimulated growth in the core area and mechanisms in place to maintain the viability.
- Most of the places that I've lived in the past have had some walkability features about it. We could walk every when I grew up. Somehow there needs to be a safe community where people can walk.

- I lived in Vail where cars are not allowed to come in to many areas. I envision a real plaza area where cars are not allowed.
- I envision a well-planned system of greenbelts and bicycle and pedestrian pathways. An example is the new bike path in Marina between Imjin Road and Salinas Road. But right now it starts and ends in a bicycle unfriendly place.
- The new City limits are immense, and we will need to create several walkable areas throughout the City. Then we will need to connect the potential many future walkable areas.
- Tie into the existing schools with good pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure.
- It would be desirable to get a review of the 2nd Avenue project.

2) Are there any places that you would like to emulate, that you would like to have Marina feel like?

- Tempe Arizona – buildings are built with mixed uses in mind, around the university. How do we make our community all-inclusive for students, residents, tourists, etc.

3) Is there anything else that you would like to say at this point?

- Are there any web sites that we can look at? (www.walkinginfo.org; www.lgc.org; www.walkable.org.)
- I would like to have the Plan address some of the emerging technologies (like the Segway HT) using sidewalks. Will our sidewalks have the space for these technologies.
- Has anybody brought up the idea of pets?
- Would like to promote the new designs where the garages in the back. Children cannot even ride their bikes safely down the sidewalk. (New Urbanist design)

**FOCUS GROUP
MEETING NOTES**

**Walkable Communities Team
City of Marina
Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Study
February 11, 2003**

Focus Group: Appointed Officials

ATTENDEES:

Richard Boynton – Design Review Board

Paul Jessen – City Services Commission

Mike Owen – Tree Committee

Chris Fitz – Deputy Director – LandWatch Monterey County

John Heiser – Associate Planner – City of Marina

GENERAL NOTES:

1) When we finish the plan, what is it that you most hope that this plan will cover? What are the biggest issues facing Marina that people will need to face that will allow people to want to live here for years to come?

- Greenbelts, preserving open space. Like the fact that the areas are remote, but providing access is a good idea.
- Equal focus on the existing City and how to link the existing City with the new development projects.
- Very concerned about how the 23,000 acres gets developed.
- 8,000 acres of BLM land will have new trails, and 80 acres along the beach that will have recreational opportunities and we need to figure out how to link walking and biking to that.
- Linking CSUMB campus to Marina as well.
- Make sure that it is a bicycle friendly community so people will not need to climb into their cars to get to all of these areas and to do day-to-day chores.
- Carpool to Monterey with somebody who cannot drive a car. When she was walking her dog, a bicyclist said “this is not for you”. Would like some walking paths that are not adjacent to paved bicycle paths.
- Some of the new development is planned as cul-de-sac development. Developers need to be required to install paths that connect some of the disconnected areas. Wants connectivity in part so that people walking or jogging can more easily make loops.
- There are 80 percolation ponds in the City. We are working with Charlie at public works to install vertical wells that will open up the areas where percolation ponds are for development of pocket parks and some might allow for connections.

2) What holds people back from riding their bikes now?

- There are not many dedicated trails or bike lanes.

3) It is important to have a park within 1/8 mile of every house. What are some of the other resources that can help accomplish this?

- The percolation ponds might help with this.

4) One of the other things we think about is putting in lots of connections. Do we have some good locations where we can do some example projects to get neighborhood support?

- There are a couple of existing connections, but the neighbors have asked that they be closed. People don't like the idea of providing this sort of connectivity.
- There are several possibilities to put walking connections into Armstrong Ranch.

- The south end of Crescent Avenue to connect to the redeveloping Cypress Knolls neighborhood and the school to the south.

5) Is the notion to place housing or other “eyes on the trail” along trails one that would be accepted?

- Yes, in some situations.

6) Have the topics been covered? Final thoughts.

- Looking forward to seeing what comes out of it.
- Try to get cul-de-sacs out of neighborhoods.

**FOCUS GROUP
MEETING NOTES**

**Walkable Communities Team
City of Marina
Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Study
February 11, 2003**

Focus Group: Economic/Retail Interests

ATTENDEES:

Patti Bradshaw – Chair – Planning Commission

Jennifer Bliss – Assistant Director – City of Marina Small Business Incubator

Grace Silva-Santella – Downtown Commission

Jim Felton – Principal Planner – City of Marina

GENERAL NOTES:

1) What would you say are the most important things for us to produce in this plan to pedestrian and bicycle and pedestrian conditions in Marina?

- Del Monte Blvd. – It's heavily used road and many, many children, sometimes with adults crossing mid-block. Very concerned about safety for both long term street reconstruction and also immediate short term problem.
- Reservation Road.
- Area between Reservation Road, Beach Road, Vince DiMaggio Park is a great opportunity.
- Armstrong Ranch, Crescent Avenue extension, and California Avenue extension – How do we get kids from new neighborhoods to schools and other older locations. How are people going to get to wooded area near Marina Heights neighborhood.
- Need to consider pedestrian ways along with calming efforts on Del Monte Blvd. and Reservation Road.
- Wheeled transportation (bikes, etc) vs. pedestrian access. E.g. Cypress Knolls – what about seniors using golf carts or other small vehicles on some of these trail connections.
- Would like to have segregated trails for pedestrians and bicyclists.
- A feeling of isolation out at the MBEST center – there is no access for pedestrians and bicyclists to this area.
- No places to eat and other services near MBEST.
- I don't feel comfortable walking along the sidewalks because traffic is moving so fast. Need things like curb extensions to provide a better buffer and slow traffic.
- Marina lacks trees – part of the problem is climate, part is City Public Works staff. Need urban forester for the City and encourage the City to install and maintain street trees.
- Until 30 years ago, Marina was Sand Dunes, Potato Fields and Pig Farms.

2) When trying to attract business, are you finding that people are hesitant to come because there is a lack of walkability?

- We have lost several potential clients because they located in a nicer area (like Monterey). They were concerned about isolation at MBEST, and in general they weren't impressed with Marina, they were looking for a real town.
- Anecdote about getting off Highway 1 at Del Monte Boulevard, then driving all the way through town, not finding the town center, and ending up back on Highway 1.
- Even the new roads (like the MBEST road off Imjin) are very bare, with no green, 4' curb tight sidewalks, and too much width.

- What about the possibility of providing walking and biking trails from the airport (Neeson Road) around and through the habitat area north of Reservation Road.

3) Tell us about the Overpass of Del Monte Boulevard and how it is used.

- I see several people using it in the morning and evening, but a lot of people don't use it.
- It is an eyesore.
- A lot of people go way too fast on Del Monte.

4) Are there any other issues that you want to be sure that we address?

- Monterey-Salinas Transit District is proposing a transit station across from the post office. There is somewhat of a goal to create a small transit oriented development. Would like us to look at plans that are in the works for the Transit Center.
- There is a parcel next to the post office that could make a great pocket park. The old road right-of-way connecting to Carmel Avenue would be a great connection, but the apartment owner is very opposed to any change.
- The lot next to the future transit center and the area behind the Transit Center as well as two lots that front Carmel Avenue, are a potential area to add some grid streets for a TOD as well as provide some connectivity back to Carmel Avenue.
- Marina was designed with way to many cul-de-sacs. However there are a few spots where there may be able to be some connectivity. Percolation ponds are some of the possibilities.

**FOCUS GROUP
MEETING NOTES**

**Walkable Communities Team
City of Marina
Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Study
February 12, 2003**

Focus Group: Regional Interests

ATTENDEES:

Kenneth Kao – Transp. Planner – Transportation Agency for Monterey County
Jeffrey Morgan – Junior Transportation Planning Engineer – TAMC
Melissa Gutheil – Campus Planning Analyst – Cal State Univ. Monterey Bay
Graham Bice – Director of Physical Planning – UCMBEST Center
Steve Endsley – Director of Planning and Finance – FORA

GENERAL NOTES:

1) What is it that you want to make sure that we don't forget in our final report on this project?

- GB - UCMBEST Center has 500 Acres of land that they are in the process of developing. It is a research center that will be operated by the university. Looking at mixed use – the initial work will be all job-generating, without residential. Later, we have one area that we are calling our East Campus (adjacent to the East Garrison of former Fort Ord) that has been identified for a future modern urban village with true mixed use. This will also allow us to dovetail with the East Garrison which is very residential and our mixed use will fit in with that. The two areas are linked by a 1000 foot gap that is set aside as open preserve.
- JM - TAMC is the local regional Transportation Planning Agency. We are very involved with alternate modes and walkability issues. We are in the process of acquiring the railroad lines through Marina. Trying to connect rail service to San Francisco as well as Light rail in the Monterey bay area. The Station will be along Highway 1 near the CSUMB campus. This will also include a bike path connection to the trail along Highway 1.
- JM - The old army barracks in this area is slated for mixed use in the area between 2nd Street and Highway 1.
- KK - We would like this study to be a good model for the rest of the County. We have programs for Transit oriented communities.
- MG – In addition to work at CSUMB, am also involved with a small group called the Sustainable Base Reuse Institute.
- MG – At CSUMB, we have been doing workshops with students on campus regarding non-motorized issues.
- MG – We need a good connection from CSUMB to Marina, how do we connect the on-campus trails and pathways to Marina and the Coast Trail. We also need better connections from our East Campus (where students and faculty live) to our main campus. The existing road is used by both bicyclists and motorists and it isn't built well to share.
- MG – In addition we are building a "North Campus Housing" area and we need good pedestrian connection
- MG – We are especially concerned about connections from the University Villages to the main campus. (2nd Street bisects these two areas).
- SE – FORA is set up by law to direct the reuse of portions of Fort Ord. Each City has to submit their plans to FORA for review, which makes the City's plans FORA's plans.

- SE – We decided to put some teeth into the policies for walkable communities and smart growth, storm drainage.
 - SE – I get involved in these projects because I want to make the reuse plan better and get people out of their cars, linking people to place in alternative ways.
 - SE – All three jurisdictions have planned housing projects and for the most part they are using good principles of mixed use.
 - GB – We need linkages between the job generating uses that UCMBEST is creating with housing areas near the East Garrison and Marina Heights and Old Marina.
 - GB – We need a strong concept for downtown.
- 2) Are there models in this area that would be good to look at for Marina.**
- MG – The Cannery Row project in Monterey.
 - JM – It would be great to see a trail like that in Marina.
 - KK – The south county connection – there is a bus line that runs from South County to Salinas and back. This service has been very successful. The towns in south County (King City, Greenfield, Soledad, and Gonzalez) are still very compact so a lot of people walk to the stations.
- 3) It seems like the appropriate buzzwords are being used, but in practice there may be a disconnect, is there a way to make sure that the actual results are being done appropriately.**
- SE – We are trying to do a lot of communication and training with our staff and others to make sure they really understand the issues.
 - SE – We are in the process of designing a Sustainable Village concept with both text and pictures.
 - We need more of this type of public meeting format to share ideas.
 - GB – It needs to be focused properly, because if the decision makers don't understand, then it can get watered down and not built properly.
- 4) What about the concept of Active Living by Design? What are your thoughts on that?**
- SE – We are working with SRBI and Surface Transportation Policy Project to apply for the ALBD grants from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.
- 5) What is missing today for Marina to have a real downtown?**
- GB - Right now there are just two strips.
 - GB - A downtown needs to be accessible in many ways (both modes and routes), and it needs to have many uses within a walkable distance and area.
 - MG – Need more options like the Wild Thyme Café and an appropriate mix of retail uses.
 - SE – The City of Marina is at cross-purposes with itself. It has a downtown that is full of vacant lots and holes. It is strip mall of America at its worst. The street connectivity is poor. They've tried to create commercial areas that have failed. The people spoke during the last election that they don't want to create sprawl and that they want to focus on nodes and connections between these nodes.
- 6) Would it be better for getting you together on weekdays or weekends?**
- Everyone – work days.
- 7) Is there anything else that you can share with us now?**
- MG – The FORA website is a good research www.fora.org
 - SE – Pascal Volet is the Transportation Consultant that FORA is using to help with the road projects like 2nd Avenue.

**FOCUS GROUP
MEETING NOTES**

**Walkable Communities Team
City of Marina
Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Study
February 13, 2003**

Focus Group: Planning Commission

ATTENDEES:

Patti Bradshaw – Chair – Planning Commission
Gary Wilmot – Planning Commissioner – Planning Commission
Armando Cuaderno – Planning Commissioner – Planning Commission
George Powell – Planning Commissioner – Planning Commission
Bob Drake – Planning Commissioner – Planning Commission
David Burnett – Planning Commissioner – Planning Commission

GENERAL NOTES:

1) What is it that you want to make sure that we don't forget in our final report on this project?

- Addressing issues of pedestrian connectivity that doesn't tie to roadways
- No access to parks w/out driving
- Reclaiming pathways that have mid-blocks to get to park or destination
- Process for recapturing Reservation Road, not a through road to make walkable street for pedestrians
- Carmel, sideyards, for cobblestone pathway
- Benefits of connectivity and education for the residents
- Shrinking the size of area so that residents can at least contemplate the idea of walking
- Change the mentality of "Marina not being a walkable community"
- Public safety willing to compromise to make it more walkable
- Maximum of private parking policies, reduce amount of on-site parking to promote higher densities
- Address issues of square footage of buildings
- Cost and priority of projects
- Financing plan and how they pay for it?
- Arrange maximum coordination with state parks
- Encouragement for access to parks and open space
- Schools and libraries: routes to access these destinations
- Who will be served with these new recommendations
- Alternative ways to look at bicycle routes
- Concerns of location from library and how it connects to shopping center
- We have a lot of high density near the downtown area, but few pedestrian sidewalks and ways. Want to make sure that the plan includes linkages from these areas to downtown.
- Connecting California Street to Reservation Road.
- The ability to walk all the way from Windy Hill park, through Vince DiMaggio Park, to Patton Park to Gloria Jean Tate Park – Connecting the parks. And to the core area downtown.

City of Marina Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure Study: Community Priorities

Priority List	Total Votes
The City & CSUMB should work collaborative to develop a joint plan.	11
The city should have more trees.	11
Establishing a downtown or town center in Marina.	11
Develop better connections to Fort Ord	10
Design improvements on the intersection of Reservation Rd & Del Monte.	10
Street design for 2nd Ave. is TOO wide.	9
Increase the frequency of public transportation.	9
Create pedestrian only zones.	9
Improving pedestrian connectivity & street crossing safety.	9
Increase greenbelts & open space	8
City staff needs to follow the general plan.	8
Decrease the amount of asphalt and dead space.	7
Job creation in Marina.	7
Safe & fun network of bikeways.	7
Build a high school in the City of Marina	6
Create small commuter hubs and villages.	5
Increase the number of pocket parks.	5
Create a plan for a multi-use park.	5
Marina needs to have destinations for residents to visit.	5
Create attractive gateways into the city.	4
The lack of a connection between the post office and Albertson's.	4
The city needs more dispersed public safety.	3
Restriping bike lanes.	3
Nice town hall.	3
Individuals who work in Marina, should live in Marina.	3
The city needs a town/gown connection.	3
Maintain the landscape of city-owned public areas.	3
There are too many fences in the city.	3
Increase the public art in the city.	3
Increasing densities in the city.	3
Improving the aesthetics of the city.	3
Preserve the diversity of the community.	2
Street improvements on Crescent Avenue.	2
The need to create a trail crossing off Del Monte Boulevard.	2
Integrate flex buildings in neighborhoods.	2
Traffic flow on the streets.	2
Tie the heritage of the city to aesthetic improvements.	1
Street improvements on Beach Road.	1
There is a plan for too much parking.	1
Develop small square footage detached homes.	1
The need for satellite post office and library.	1
Improve under-developed commercial areas.	1
Traffic speed on the streets.	1
Drivers running red lights.	0

Appendix - B

Second Site Visit Information

City of Marina — Walkable Communities Team
City of Marina Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure Study
April 16 –19, 2003 (Wednesday – Saturday)

DRAFT AGENDA

Wednesday, April 16th

City Hall Conference Room

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| 1:00pm | Design Team & City Staff Meeting |
| 2:00pm | Focus Group Meeting With Jeannie Cartabiano, Marina Arts Council |
| 2:15-5:00pm | Design Team Field Work <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Data Collection• Maps |

Thursday, April 17th

City Hall Conference Room

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| 8:00am | Design Team & City Staff Meeting |
| 9:00-5:00pm | Design Team Field Work <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Data Collection• Conceptual Designs |
| 6:30-7:30pm | Planning Commission Meeting on Narrow Streets <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Presentation by Dan Burden |

Friday, April 18th

Marina Community Center

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| 8:00am | Design Team & City Staff Meeting |
| 9:00-1:00pm | Design Work With Marina Stakeholders <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Jeff Dack, Peter Lee, Tony Alfteld, John Heiser, Jim Felton Susan Hilinski, Mark Morgan, Harald Kelly,• Elected Officials/Appointed Officials• TAMC, CSUMB, UCMBEST, FOR A, Monterey Landwatch, Tree Committee, Marina Arts Council, AMBAG, APCD, Caltrans, Monterey County, Greenbelt Committee |
| 1:00-2:00pm | LUNCH |
| 2:00-3:00pm | Design Work With Marina Stakeholders |
| 3:00-5:00pm | Design Team Preparation for Public Workshop |

Saturday, April 19th

Marina Community Center

8:00-9:30am	Walk Audit
9:30-10:00am	Set-Up for Public Workshop
10:00-4:00pm	Public Workshop Introduction: Dan Vision Statement – Michael Goals and Objectives – Michael and Bismarck Training/Presentation – Dan Burden Lunch and Survey Citizens work with maps to identify needs and deficiencies. (This will involve several activities) Next Steps/ Wrap-up
4:00-5:00pm	Debriefing of Design Team & City Staff

City of Marina Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure Study: 2nd Stakeholder Meeting Minutes

- I. What is a Walkable Community?
 - A. Stakeholder Responses
 1. A place where residents enjoy and prefer walking to schools, shops, work, and for leisure.
 2. A walkable community is not the same as a bicycle friendly community. It is geared for shorter distances. However, a walkable community is a place where residents are more likely to go to wooded areas or are exclusively for walking.
 3. A city in which it is possible to walk between homes, work, and run errands on foot. This requires paths, connectivity, crucial destinations (post office, grocery store, etc), crosswalks across streets that are short and have islands for slower walkers, stoplights with long signals. Also useful are parks and greenbelts that are attractive for walking.
 4. A city that has continuous sidewalks, additional linkages to commercial centers, open space, parks, and reduction of overly wide street widths.
- II. What is a bicycle-friendly Marina
 - A. Stakeholder Responses
 1. A city that has a reduction or elimination of right hand turn lanes or arterials. It also has provision of Class II or Class I bike lanes on major streets (i.e. Reservation Road, Imjin) and provide bicycle facilities to park bikes in specific destinations and commercial centers.
 2. A bicycle friendly Marina is one that inspires a bicycle commute to work, recreation, and exercise with a network of safe interesting and convenient bike paths and facilities such as parking racks and lockers.
 3. A city where streets have Class II lanes or Class III shoulders, bike routes on connector routes and where stop lights have detector loops marked so cyclists know where to stop to trigger the light to change. Paths should be wide enough to allow space for bikes and pedestrians to share without conflicts. Lighting is also helpful. Bike racks encourage bicycle commuting.
- III. Creating Non Vehicular Path to Have Better Connections
 - A. Put schools centrally located to apartments and single family houses
 - B. A radius of 1/8 of a mile is usually owned and maintained by local residents
 - C. Key successes for walkability
 1. Security
 2. Convenience
 3. Efficiency
 4. Comfort
 5. Welcoming
- IV. Designing of Marina Villages
 - A. Dan Burden proposes 3 villages
 - B. 1 village can have a public safety substation
 - C. Proposed Villages
 1. MST Transit Village
 - a. This should be a priority node
 - b. It's adjacent to post office
 2. Village Center of Vista Del Camino
 3. Village Center on old K-mart site
 - a. Good housing stock for existing neighborhood
 - b. That area is not part of redevelopment. It would be hard to finance

- c. This could be a destination for tourists. It has a series of hotels, some restaurants.
Will need more restaurants and entertainment so it has its own character and charm.
- V. Transit-Making
 - A. Create a direct access to future library site
 - B. Connect the possible 3rd Village to the ocean with bike routes and trails.
- VI. Parks
 - A. There are approximately 85 perk lots that can be used as public parks and open space. Good sites are on Reindollar and California.
 - B. There is concern about converting perk lots into public parks because of liability because of their existing use as a drainage system.
 - C. There is a possibility of having the drainage system altered from some perk lots so that some of them can be converted into public parks.
- VII. Marina Heights
 - A. More connections are needed in the proposed development
 - B. Needs to be attractive
 - C. Accessory units are looking onto public space
 - D. Imjin Road will carry approximately 25,000, - 30,000 cars
- VIII. Where is Marina Heading?
 - A. Create pocket parks through the possible use of perk lots to bring neighborhoods alive.
 - B. Convert parking lots on Del Monte into public places through the use of public/private partnerships.
 - C. Improvements of curvilinear sidewalks used on Crescent and Carmel as well as California Avenue.
 - D. Use native plants of the region for all new developments.
 - E. Continue to work with the Marina Arts Council.

City of Marina Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure Study: 2nd Community Meeting Minutes

- I. What is a Walkable Community?
 - A. Community Responses
 1. The opportunity to get from and to anywhere in Marina comfortably, safely, enjoyably via foot, stroller, rollerblades, bicycle, wheelchair, and even skateboards.
 2. A five minute walk from any home to at least a small commercial area.
 3. A walkable/bike rideable Marina would be one where your first thought upon wanting or needing to go out on some trip was not "Where did I put my keys to my car?"
 4. A walkable Marina is one that is safe, calm, has separation from traffic, provides an opportunity for interaction with other walkers, has destinations for residents and visitors to visit, has trees, and access to the beach and open space.
 5. A walkable Marina is a place where people can walk to activity centers or daily needs from their home or office.
 6. A walkable community has sidewalks and wheelchair accessibility.
 7. A walkable community is safe and convenient for walking, shopping and provides access to stores and friends. They also have narrow streets, short block lengths, direct paths, and mixed-uses.
 8. To get to a destination in 10 minutes and have many places to walk once you get there.
 9. A community designed to invite people to walk with features that make walking safe, enjoyable, and practical.
 10. Pedestrian oriented pathways and access routes to all community business, recreational, and transportation facilities. Pathways should be safe, comprehensive and landscaped.
 11. A walkable Marina has paths to all places: stores, doctor's, office, library, public facilities, and schools.
 12. A community that allows people to walk from Point "A" to Point "B" in a straight line without barriers.
 13. The opportunity to live, work, and shop with 1 mile.
 14. A center where shops, restaurants, and public offices are located. Parking in lots behind buildings and streets with parks, trees, and wide sidewalks.
 15. One in which you both can and want to walk from Point "A" to Point "B" in the most direct manner without fear created by speeding and unsafe intersections.
- II. What is a bicycle-friendly Marina
 - A. Community Responses
 1. A city that has bike lanes and locker facilities throughout the City.
 2. A safe and attractive bicycle route with direct connections between destinations.
 3. Clearly designated, safe, and comprehensive bike lanes for running errands and recreation.
 4. A place where cars and bicycles are not in conflict.
 5. A bicycle friendly Marina is one with wide outside lanes on busy streets, loops that are sensitive to bicyclists, bike parking at stores and offices, Road networks that serve travel and resolving barriers to bicycle travel and traffic enforcement.
 6. Continuous bike paths separate from auto traffic and foot paths.
 7. Clearly marked lanes off of major arterials, multiple routes, intermodal connections and connecting residential centers to work, shopping centers, and schools.

- III. Rebuilding Streets
 - A. The elements that are needed in rebuilding streets are the following:
 - 1. Links
 - 2. Paths
 - 3. Sidewalks
 - 4. Lane/Street
 - 5. Refuge
 - 6. Channel
 - 7. Trails
 - 8. Roundabouts
 - B. Marina streets are overbuilt
 - C. Efficient intersections allow for more vehicles to travel on.
- IV. Conversions
 - A. Placemaking through public art and preservation.
 - B. Creating places for residents and visitors to go to.
 - C. Using open spaces to convert to placeamaking places.
 - D. Zoning ordinance updates.
- V. Streetscapes
 - A. Marina new developments don't meet ADA requirements.

City of Marina Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure Study: Walk Audit Notes

Del Monte Boulevard and Palm (Area by city hall)

- a. The area by city hall is not ADA accessible.
- b. It is not inviting to the public.
- c. City hall needs to be the best example of ADA and entry point to the city.
- d. The streets in this area have no edge. Hard to determine where the sidewalk is located.
- e. Car capacity on this street can be managed in two lanes.
- f. Get rid of excess lanes
- g. Conversion of some of the existing buildings on Del Monte Blvd. to a 3-story mixed-use project.
- h. According to city officials, the city has already increased the Floor Area Ratio (FAR)
- i. Potential for gateway conversion on Del Monte and Reindollar with roundabout.

Intersection of Del Monte Boulevard and Palm

- a. Push buttons shouldn't be required
- b. Overpasses not recommended because they are usually ugly and not ADA compliant.
- c. Signalization should always activate itself.
- d. The problems in the intersection are not a financial issue, but more of an operational system.

Del Monte and Carmel

- a. The design of the older sidewalks are okay, but the newer sidewalks are not meeting ADA requirements.
- b. Move all traffic to one side of Del Monte and sell parts of the street to pay for infrastructure costs.
- c. New developments do not meet ADA requirements.

Intersection of Del Monte Boulevard and Reservation Road

- a. This is the most troubled intersection.
- b. The double right turn is a problem.
- c. This intersection can be modeled for a roundabout to move traffic, makes it safer for pedestrians, and allows for access to new public facilities.

Reservation Road

- a. This street is too wide.
- b. It has no bike lanes.
- c. The intersection of Reservation Road and Vista El Camino is an ideal site for a village.
- d. The sidewalk on the Walgreen's site is not ADA compliant.

Intersection of Reservation and Seacrest

- a. The corners of the intersection do not meet ADA requirements. They should have 2 ramps on each corner.
- b. The median should have a nose to protect pedestrians.
- c. Crosswalk markings should be highlighted.

Appendix - C

Intersection Data Collection

Intersection Data Collection

As described under major intersections in Chapter 2, detailed data was collected for five intersections on Del Monte Boulevard and Reservation Road. These intersections are as follows:

- Del Monte Boulevard at Palm Avenue
- Del Monte Boulevard at Reservation Road
- Reservation Road at Seacrest Avenue
- Reservation Road at DeForest Road
- Reservation Road at Crescent Avenue

These data collection sheets are included as the next several pages of this appendix. In addition, the Intersection Data Collection Key is included after the data collection sheets. This key provides detailed information about the codes and terms used on the data collection sheets.

In addition to the information found in the data collection key, the following information explains the content of the data collection sheets.

1. If a field has a dash (-) in it, then this feature does not exist or this field is otherwise not applicable at this intersection.
2. If a field is blank, then this data was not available for collection or was otherwise not collected.
3. If a field is highlighted in red then the corresponding feature is substandard or needs repair or replacement. The fields in red indicate that action should be taken to correct the problem.

Intersection Data Collection Key

Intersection Data – The box at the top of the data collection sheet should be used to collect the following brief information about the intersection field review:

- 1) No.: This is a unique number for each intersection, possibly taken from existing data for the City or generated to create unique numbers for a particular study.
- 2) Intersection: List the intersection streets, starting with the Higher Volume street. E.G. "Main St. @ First St.
- 3) Date: the date of the field review
- 4) Time: The approximate time of the field review
- 5) Team: List the people doing the field review.

General note – Choose the leg of the intersection that is most closely aligned with due north. Your detailed intersection leg and corner data collection will start here; use the data collection box labeled "1 North Leg". Once you have collected the data for this leg, follow the intersection around in a clockwise direction, filling out the data in the order of the numbered boxes on the data collection sheet.

For ratings with options of Excellent, Good, Fair, and Poor, the initials E, G, F, and P can be used.

For each leg, several data fields are shown in the data collection sheet (in boxes 1, 3, 5, and 7). Each data field to be collected is described below:

General Info

- 6) Street: The name of the street on this leg
- 7) Posted Speed: The posted speed of this street

- 8) 85% Speed = 85th Percentile speed: The measured 85th percentile speed in the vicinity of this street (if available). For stop controlled approaches, write "N/A".
- 9) Avg. Speed = Average Speed: The measured mean speed in the vicinity of this street (if available). For stop controlled approaches, write "N/A".
- 10) ADT = Average Daily Traffic: The measured bi-directional volume of this street. If a measured volume is not available, the data collector can estimate the volume and include "est." after the number.
- 11) %Trucks = Percent trucks: The approximate truck percentage = the approximate truck percentage of this street
- 12) Control: The type of traffic control for this approach
 - Signal
 - Stop sign
 - Yield sign
 - Uncontrolled

Dimensions. All dimensions should be measured perpendicular to the curb line. Widths should be measured from the center of lane stripes and from the face of curbs; include the gutter width. If the item does not exist, write "N/A." All items after the word "Approach" in the data collection sheet are measurements on the side of the street approaching the intersection; items after "Departure" are on the departing side of the street.

- 13) Curb-Curb: The curb to curb width.
- 14) (Approach) ND: Distance to the **N**earest **D**riveway on the approach.
- 15) (Approach) PL: Width of the **P**arking **L**ane on the approach side (if parking is allowed but unmarked, input 7' for the parking dimension and use an * like this: 7*).
- 16) (Approach) RTL: Width of the **R**ight **T**urn **L**ane
- 17) (Approach) SH/BL: Width of the **S**Houlder or **B**ike **L**ane on the approach side. If it is marked or signed as a bike lane, circle BL, if not circle SH. Add an * if the bike lane or shoulder is to the right of the right turn lane.
- 18) (Approach) OTL: Width of **O**utside **T**hrough approach **L**ane (if parking is allowed but unmarked, subtract measure the distance from the curb to the lane line, then subtract 7' for the parking width).
- 19) (Approach) MTL: Width of **M**iddle **T**hrough approach **L**ane
- 20) (Approach) ITL: Width of **I**nside **T**hrough approach **L**ane
- 21) (Approach) LTL: Width of the **L**eft **T**urn **L**ane
- 22) (Departure) ITL: Width of **I**nside **T**hrough departure **L**ane
- 23) (Departure) MTL: Width of **M**iddle **T**hrough departure **L**ane
- 24) (Departure) OTL: Width of **O**utside **T**hrough departure **L**ane (if parking is allowed but unmarked, subtract measure the distance from the curb to the lane line, then subtract 7' for the parking width).
- 25) (Departure) SH/BL: Width of the **S**Houlder or **B**ike **L**ane on the departure side. If it is marked or signed as a bike lane, circle BL, if not circle SH.
- 26) (Departure) PL: Width of the **P**arking **L**ane on the departure side (if parking is allowed but unmarked, input 7' for the parking dimension and use an * like this: 7*).
- 27) (Departure) ND: Distance to the **N**earest **D**riveway on the departure.

Median – All information and measurements for the median should be measured at the intersection, even though the median width and features may be different away from the median.

- 28) Type: The type of median used at the intersection.
 - None
 - Painted
 - Textured = flush median with textured surface, e.g. brick, or pavers
 - FL = **F**lush **L**andscaped median with no curbs.
 - Conc = Raised Concrete
 - CL = Curb, Lndscp = **C**urbed, **L**andscaped median.
- 29) Width: The width of the flush or raised median, measured from curb face to curb face.

- 30) Opening width: For raised medians, the width of the cut-through for pedestrians. If instead of a cut-through, the median has a ramp up to curb height, measure the ramp width and include an * after the width. For flush planted medians, include the width of any walkway that cuts across the median.
- 31) Nose: Provide information about the placement of the nose of the median beyond the cut-through or walkway with respect to how well it protects pedestrians.
 - None = no nose past the pedestrian walkway.
 - Excellent, good, fair, or poor –if a nose extends past the pedestrian walkway, rate how well it protects pedestrians.

Crosswalk

- 32) Markings/signs: Style of crosswalk marking and any signage used at or in advance of the crossing. Sometimes more than one type of marking might be used at the same crosswalk.
 - Closed
 - Unmarked
 - Transverse = two parallel lines transverse to the roadway
 - Longitudinal = multiple line longitudinal to the roadway, sometimes called ladder markings or international markings
 - Diagonal = multiple lines at 45 degree angles.
 - Staggered longitudinal = longitudinal markings that are spaced to intentionally miss the wheel paths of vehicles.
 - Gap longitudinal = longitudinal markings with a gap in the middle to create a smooth surface for wheelchair surface
 - Paver = Brick or Concrete pavers
 - Stamped Concrete = concrete stamped to look like brick or pavers.
 - Stamped Asphalt = Asphalt stamped and often colored to look like bricks.
 - Lights = In-Roadway warning lights in use.
 - Warning = Warning signs in place at or before the crossing.
 - Yield Ped = Yield to Pedestrian signs in place at or before the crossing for through traffic at unsignalized locations or for turning traffic at signalized intersections.
 - Stop Ped = Stop for Pedestrian signs in place at or before the crossing
 - NTOR = No Turn on Red signs in place on this approach.
- 33) Marking Quality: a rating of the quality and age of the marking.
 - Excellent = New thermoplastic marking with no gaps
 - Good = New paint crossing or slightly worn thermoplastic marking with no gaps
 - Fair = Somewhat faded thermoplastic or painted marking with minor gaps and worn off areas.
 - Poor = very worn markings with large gaps and missing portions.
- 34) Line Width: The width of the crosswalk marking lines. In the event that a crosswalk is marked with transverse lines in combination with longitudinal lines or diagonal lines, measure the width of the longitudinal or diagonal lines.
- 35) Length: The crosswalk length measured along the center of the crosswalk from curb face to curb face
- 36) Width: The crosswalk width measured from the outer edges of the crosswalk markings or between the centers of stripes for transverse markings.
- 37) Stop Line: The distance between the stop bar and the crosswalk line at the closest point (measured from center of lines).
- 38) Sight Lines: A rating of the sight lines from the crosswalk to any vehicular traffic flows that conflict with the crosswalk.
 - Excellent = Unobstructed view for a long enough distance down the street for pedestrians to **easily** find an appropriate gap in traffic, or for drivers to easily see crossing pedestrians.
 - Good = Mostly unobstructed view for a long enough distance for pedestrians to detect an adequate gap, or for drivers to see pedestrians.
 - Fair = Somewhat obstructed view that may not be long enough for some pedestrians to find an adequate gap or may make it difficult for drivers to see pedestrians.

- Poor = Severely restricted sight distance from the crosswalk that makes it very difficult and dangerous for pedestrians to cross the street.

Signals

- 39) Type: the mounting style of the signal heads for this approach. If multiple styles are on the same approach, list both styles.
- Mast = Signals mounted on mast arm
 - Post = Post mounted signals
 - Box Span = signals hanging from span wires where each span is hung across one street and the signal heads are across the intersection from the approach that the signals are for.
 - Diag Span = Diagonal Span: one span is placed diagonally across the intersection, resulting In signals being a varying distance from the driver.
- 40) Size: the size of the signal heads, circle 8 or 12
- 41) Placement: a rating of the placement of the signal heads for visibility by the driver
- Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor
- 42) Veh. Det. = Vehicle Detection
- FT = **F**ixed **T**ime – entire intersection runs on a fixed timing pattern
 - R = **R**ecall – Semi-actuated signal, but the signal recalls to this approach.
 - Actuated – Green Phase does not come up unless a vehicle detected by one or more of the following methods (enter the detection type below not “Actuated.”)
 - ◇ DL = **D**iamond **L**oop
 - ◇ CL = **C**ircular **L**oop
 - ◇ QL = **Q**uadrupole **L**oop
 - ◇ BL = **B**icycle **L**oop – Add if there is an additional loop detector for bicycles in the bike lane or outside through approach lane.
 - ◇ V = **V**ideo
 - ◇ M = **M**icrowave
- 43) Ped Signal Type. The type of pedestrian signal hardware for the crosswalk across this approach. More than one of the following items can be listed in this blank.
- None – no pedestrian signal heads used installed
 - Symbol – standard walking man and hand symbols.
 - Word message – old Walk and Don't Walk Word messages
 - Bulb – Indicates that a single incandescent bulb lights the message.
 - LED – indicates that the symbols are lit with LEDs
 - APS – indicates that an audible accessible pedestrian signal is in use.
 - Countdown – indicates that a countdown pedestrian signal is used.
 - Roving Eyes – roving eyes pedestrian signal head is used.
- 44) Alignment and Placement: This rating is to measure how well the Pedestrian signal heads are placed and aligned for viewing from the other side of the street and from the crosswalk itself.
- Excellent - Both signal heads are located in line with the crosswalk and there is no visual clutter that makes either signal head hard to see.
 - Good – Both signal heads are located fairly close to being in line with the crosswalk or they are in line but there is a little visual clutter in the vicinity.
 - Fair – One or both of the ped signal heads are difficult to see because they significantly away from the crosswalk, aligned improperly, or placed near significant visual clutter.
 - Poor – One or both of the ped signal heads are impossible or very difficult to see due to poor alignment, significant distance from the crosswalk, and/or there is significant visual clutter blocking or hiding the view.
- 45) Pedestrian detection:
- Recall – pedestrian phase comes up every cycle
 - Passive – some form of video, infrared, microwave, or other automatic passive detection is in place
 - Pushbutton - requires the user to push a button to be detected.

- 46) Walk Interval: Also known as the release time – the number of seconds that the walking person symbol or "WALK" legend is displayed - if there are no pedestrian signals, then the adjacent green interval should be used. If this crosswalk has a leading pedestrian interval, then indicate LPI after the walk interval value (i.e. "13/LPI")
- 47) Ped Clearance Interval: The number of seconds that the flashing hand symbol or flashing "Don't Walk" legend is displayed - if there are no pedestrian signals, then the adjacent yellow interval should be used.
- 48) Max Ped Delay = the maximum possible delay that a pedestrian might experience if he or she just missed a walk phase: The amount of time between the end of one walk interval and the beginning of the next.

For each corner, several data fields are shown in the data collection sheet (in boxes 2, 4, 6, and 8). Each data field to be collected is described below:

Corner Geometry

- 49) Type: A description of the type of corner geometry in place.
- Single = A Single radius tangent to both curb lines. Many corners have slightly irregular radii with either a small compound radius, or a single radius that is not tangent but meets one or both curbs at a slight angle. These corners can be approximated as a single radius so choose "single" and estimate an approximate radius below.
 - Compound = a compound corner with a two- or three-centered curve
 - Channel = Right Turn Channelization, where a raised island creates a slip lane for right turning traffic.
 - Curb Extension: Denote whether a curb extension is in place on the corner. A single radius will be assumed in this case.
- 50) Angle: The measured angle in degrees between the two curb lines that form this corner. This approximates the skew of this portion of the intersection
- 51) Curb Radius: For a single radius, measure the actual (or approximated radius for slightly irregular corners); for compound two- or three-centered curves, measure the smallest radius, for right turn channelization, measure the smallest radius along the slip lane.

Channelization

- 52) Angle = the approximate angle of approach for vehicles entering the new roadway. This should be an obtuse angle.
- 53) Crosswalk Offset: The distance from the far edge of the crosswalk to the point where vehicles enter the new roadway (measured along the center of the travel lane).

Accessibility

- 54) Ramps: Enter the number of curb ramps on the corner.
- 55) Ramp Placement: A rating of the ramp placement on the corner relative to the crosswalks and relative to each other. (Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor)

The following items should be rated for each of the ramps at the corner. Ramp 1 is defined as the first ramp when moving clockwise around the intersection

- 56) Type = the type or style of curb ramp in use
- Perp. = Perpendicular: Ramp with downward slope parallel to the curb with standard flares.
 - Parallel: ramp with downward slope parallel to the curb.
 - Combo = Combination: Ramp with both perpendicular and parallel components.
 - Perp NF = Perpendicular ramp without flares or with curb returns (generally used where there are planter strips)
- 57) Lip: The height (in inches) of any lip at the base of the ramp (Zero is required)
- 58) Angle: The angle between the ramp and the curb at the center of the ramp (90° required)
- 59) Width: the width (in feet) of the ramp.

- 60) Slope: the running slope along the ramp (8.33% Is the maximum allowed)
- 61) X-Slope = Cross Slope: the cross slope on the ramp (2% is the maximum allowed)
- 62) Landing Width: The width (in feet) measured parallel to the ramp of the landing at the top of a perpendicular ramp or at the bottom of a parallel ramp. If no appropriate landing is in place, just enter "None".
- 63) Landing Slope the maximum slope of the landing in any direction (2% maximum allowed)
- 64) Tactile Warning: Is there an ADA approved Tactile Warning Strip covering the bottom 2 feet of a perpendicular ramp or in the front 2 feet of the landing at the base of a parallel ramp.
 - Yes: It is in place and it meets standard
 - NS = Not Standard: Some sort of texturing is in place but it does not meet the current standard for the type of treatment or the proper location
 - No: No texture is in place on the ramp.
- 65) Pushbutton Placement: A rating of the placement of the pushbutton (Excellent, Good Fair Poor). This includes lateral placement relative to the ramp and landing as well as the height.
- 66) Pushbutton Size
 - Large: 2" or greater - Large buttons can be easily pushed with the flat side of one's hand or fist.
 - Small: Smaller than 2" - Requires the user to use a single finger or thumb to depress the button

Other: This section is for inputting any other possible information that might make the intersection difficult for pedestrians and bicyclists. The description should identify the location of the problem area. Here are some of the items to consider:

- Broken equipment or other maintenance issues, e.g. malfunctioning pushbuttons or other equipment, severely broken sidewalks or ramps, very bad pavement, debris blocking pedestrian ramps, RYG signals or pedestrian signals burned out.
- Crosswalks with angle points or turns without an island to provide guidance
- Evidence of trucks frequently driving on curbs indicating that a radius that might be too small.
- Drainage problems that will result in water ponding in crosswalk areas or heavy volumes of water flowing through crosswalks.
- Barnes' Dance or "Scramble" Pedestrian Phasing.
- Raised Intersections, Raised Crosswalk, or other Traffic Calming feature not indicated elsewhere in the sheet.
- Obstacles in the street or on the sidewalk (e.g. storm drains, poles, signal boxes) that are not evident in any of the data fields or ratings.
- Pushbuttons in the median.
- Double right turn lanes conflicting with pedestrian phase.
- Offset or skewed intersections.
- In general any data collection item on the sheet that is severely substandard.

No. _____ Intersection Del Monte Boulevard @ Palm Avenue Date 2/13/03 Time 5:30 PM Team Moule/Obando

1 North Leg

General Info: Street Del Monte Boulevard
 Posted Speed 35 85% Speed _____ Avg. Speed _____
 ADT 29,500 %Trucks 1% Control Signal

Dimensions: Curb-Curb 102 Approach: ND None PL -
 RTL 13 SH/BL - OTL 11 MTL - ITL 11 LTL 13
 Departure: ITL 12 MTL - OTL 22 SH/BL - PL - ND 85

Median: Type Curb Lndscp Width 17 Opening width none Nose None
Crosswalk: Markings/Signs Transverse Marking Quality Fair
 Line width 12" Length 111" Width 11 Stop Line none Sight Lines Exc.

Signals: Type Mast & Post Size 8 12 Placement good Veh. Det. Quad L
 Ped Signal Type Symbol Bulb Placement good Ped Detection PB
 Walk Interval 11 sec Ped Clearance Interval 14 sec Max Ped Delay 85 sec

8 NW Corner

Corner Geometry: Type Single Angle 90°
 Curb Radius 21 Channelization: Angle - Crosswalk Offset -

Accessibility: Ramps 1 Ramp Placement Fair
Ramp 1: Type Perpendicular Lip 0 Angle 55° Width 80"
 Slope 4% X-Slope 4% Landing Width none Landing Slope _____
 Tactile Warning No Pushbutton Placement G Pushbutton Size Large
Ramp 2: Type - Lip - Angle - Width -
 Slope - X-Slope - Landing Width - Landing Slope -
 Tactile Warning - Pushbutton Placement E Pushbutton Size Small

2 NE Corner

Corner Geometry: Type Single Angle 90°
 Curb Radius 33 Channelization: Angle - Crosswalk Offset -

Accessibility: Ramps 1 Ramp Placement Fair
Ramp 1: Type Perpendicular Lip 1/4" Angle 90° Width _____
 Slope 8.5% X-Slope 0% Landing Width 48" Landing Slope 3%
 Tactile Warning NS Pushbutton Placement G Pushbutton Size Large
Ramp 2: Type - Lip - Angle - Width -
 Slope - X-Slope - Landing Width - Landing Slope -
 Tactile Warning - Pushbutton Placement G Pushbutton Size Small

7 West Leg

General Info: Street Palm Avenue
 Posted Speed 25 85% Speed _____ Avg. Speed _____
 ADT _____ %Trucks _____ Control Signal

Dimensions: Curb-Curb 36 Approach: ND none PL -
 RTL 10 SH/BL - OTL 10 MTL - ITL - LTL -
 Departure: ITL - MTL - OTL 16 SH/BL - PL - ND none

Median: Type None Width - Opening width - Nose -
Crosswalk: Markings/Signs Transverse Marking Quality Fair
 Line width 12" Length 42 Width 10 Stop Line none Sight Lines good

Signals: Type Mast & Post Size 8 12 Placement good Veh. Det. QL
 Ped Signal Type Sym. Bulb&LED Placement good Ped Detection Recall
 Walk Interval 5 sec Ped Clearance Interval 6 sec Max Ped Delay 70 sec

3 East Leg

General Info: Street Palm Avenue
 Posted Speed 25 85% Speed _____ Avg. Speed _____
 ADT _____ %Trucks _____ Control Signal

Dimensions: Curb-Curb 60 Approach: ND 114 PL -
 RTL 17 SH/BL - OTL 11 MTL - ITL - LTL 12
 Departure: ITL - MTL - OTL 13 SH/BL - PL 7* ND 80

Median: Type None Width - Opening width - Nose -
Crosswalk: Markings/Signs Transverse Marking Quality G
 Line width 12" Length 75 Width 11 Stop Line none Sight Lines Fair

Signals: Type Mast & Post Size 8 12 Placement G Veh. Det. QL
 Ped Signal Type Symbol, Bulb Placement Exc. Ped Detection PB
 Walk Interval 11 sec Ped Clearance Interval 14 sec Max Ped Delay 43 sec

6 SW Corner

Corner Geometry: Type Single Angle 90°
 Curb Radius 16 Channelization: Angle _____ Crosswalk Offset _____

Accessibility: Ramps 1 Ramp Placement Excellent
Ramp 1: Type Perpendicular Lip 0 Angle 90° Width 85"
 Slope 6% X-Slope 2% Landing Width none Landing Slope _____
 Tactile Warning No Pushbutton Placement - Pushbutton Size -
Ramp 2: Type - Lip - Angle - Width -
 Slope - X-Slope - Landing Width - Landing Slope -
 Tactile Warning - Pushbutton Placement G Pushbutton Size Large

4 SE Corner

Corner Geometry: Type Single Angle 90°
 Curb Radius 22 Channelization: Angle _____ Crosswalk Offset _____

Accessibility: Ramps 1 (xw closed) Ramp Placement Exc
Ramp 1: Type Perpendicular Lip 1" Angle 90° Width 54"
 Slope 8.4% X-Slope 1% Landing Width 56" Landing Slope 1%
 Tactile Warning No Pushbutton Placement F Pushbutton Size Small
Ramp 2: Type - Lip - Angle - Width -
 Slope - X-Slope - Landing Width - Landing Slope -
 Tactile Warning - Pushbutton Placement - Pushbutton Size -

5 South Leg

General Info: Street Del Monte Boulevard
 Posted Speed 35 85% Speed _____ Avg. Speed _____
 ADT 32,000 %Trucks 1% Control Signal

Dimensions: Curb-Curb 95 Approach: ND 69 PL -
 RTL - SH/BL - OTL 21 MTL - ITL 12 LTL 16
 Departure: ITL 13 MTL - OTL 19 SH/BL - PL - ND none

Median: Type Curb Lndscp Width 14 Opening width - Nose None
Crosswalk: Markings/Signs Closed Marking Quality -
 Line width - Length - Width - Stop Line - Sight Lines -

Signals: Type Mast & Post Size 8 12 Placement good Veh. Det. QL
 Ped Signal Type Closed Placement - Ped Detection -
 Walk Interval - Ped Clearance Interval - Max Ped Delay -

Other: *The crosswalk across the north leg of the intersection is bent.
 There is a median pushbutton in use on the north leg, and the signal timing is set to only allow access to the Median*

No. _____ Intersection Del Monte Boulevard @ Reservation Road Date: 4/17/03 Time 5:00 PM Team Moule

1 North Leg

General Info: Street Del Monte Boulevard
 Posted Speed 35 85% Speed _____ Avg. Speed _____
 ADT 5,200 %Trucks _____ Control Signal

Dimensions: Curb-Curb 90 Approach: ND None PL -
 RTL - SH/BL - OTL 13 MTL - ITL 11 LTL 26(2)
 Departure: ITL 20 MTL - OTL 13 SH/BL - PL - ND 147

Median: Type Curb Lndscp Width 5 Opening width - Nose None
Crosswalk: Markings/Signs Transverse Marking Quality Fair
 Line width 12" Length 107 Width 10' Stop Line none Sight Lines Fair

Signals: Type Mast & Post Size 8 12 Placement good Veh. Det. ??
 Ped Signal Type Symbol Bulb Placement good Ped Detection PB
 Walk Interval 25 sec Ped Clearance Interval 12 sec Max Ped Delay 62 sec

8 NW Corner

Corner Geometry: Type Single Angle _____
 Curb Radius 35 Channelization: Angle - Crosswalk Offset -

Accessibility: Ramps 1 Ramp Placement good
Ramp 1: Type Perpendicular Lip 1/4" Angle 90* Width 312"
 Slope 8% X-Slope 2% Landing Width 84" Landing Slope 3%
 Tactile Warning No Pushbutton Placement G Pushbutton Size Large
Ramp 2: Type - Lip - Angle - Width -
 Slope - X-Slope - Landing Width - Landing Slope -
 Tactile Warning - Pushbutton Placement G Pushbutton Size Large

Corner Geometry: Type Single Angle _____
 Curb Radius 35 Channelization: Angle - Crosswalk Offset -

Accessibility: Ramps 1 Ramp Placement Fair
Ramp 1: Type Perpendicular Lip 1/4" Angle 90* Width 52"
 Slope 8% X-Slope 1% Landing Width 10' Landing Slope 3%
 Tactile Warning NS Pushbutton Placement G Pushbutton Size Large
Ramp 2: Type - Lip - Angle - Width -
 Slope - X-Slope - Landing Width - Landing Slope -
 Tactile Warning - Pushbutton Placement G Pushbutton Size Large

7 West Leg

General Info: Street Reservation Road
 Posted Speed 35 85% Speed _____ Avg. Speed _____
 ADT 5,000 %Trucks _____ Control Signal

Dimensions: Curb-Curb 58 Approach: ND none PL -
 RTL - SH/BL 4 OTL 16 MTL - ITL 13 LTL -
 Departure: ITL - MTL - OTL 17 SH/BL 8 PL - ND none

General Info: Street Reservation Road
 Posted Speed 35 85% Speed _____ Avg. Speed _____
 ADT 31,000 %Trucks _____ Control Signal

Dimensions: Curb-Curb 92 Approach: ND 200 PL -
 RTL 12 SH/BL - OTL 11 MTL - ITL - LTL 27(2)
 Departure: ITL 11 MTL - OTL 24 SH/BL - PL - ND 91

Median: Type None Width - Opening width - Nose -
Crosswalk: Markings/Signs Transverse Marking Quality Fair
 Line width 12" Length 76 Width 11 Stop Line none Sight Lines exc.

Signals: Type Mast & Post Size 8 12 Placement fair Veh. Det. QL
 Ped Signal Type Symbol, Bulb Placement good Ped Detection Recall
 Walk Interval 9 sec Ped Clearance Interval 6 sec Max Ped Delay 75 sec

Median: Type Curb Lndscp Width 9 Opening width - Nose none
Crosswalk: Markings/Signs Transverse Marking Quality poor
 Line width 12" Length 112' Width 10 Stop Line none Sight Lines good

Signals: Type Mast & Post Size 8 12 Placement good Veh. Det. ?
 Ped Signal Type Sym,LED,Cntdwl Placement good Ped Detection PB
 Walk Interval 22 sec Ped Clearance Interval 6 sec Max Ped Delay _____

6 SW Corner

Corner Geometry: Type Single Angle _____
 Curb Radius 30 Channelization: Angle - Crosswalk Offset -

Accessibility: Ramps 1 Ramp Placement Good
Ramp 1: Type - Lip - Angle - Width -
 Slope - X-Slope - Landing Width - Landing Slope -
 Tactile Warning - Pushbutton Placement - Pushbutton Size -
Ramp 2: Type Perp Lip 1/4" Angle 90* Width 300"
 Slope 1.1% X-Slope 1% Landing Width 59" Landing Slope 1%
 Tactile Warning NS Pushbutton Placement G Pushbutton Size Large

Corner Geometry: Type Single Angle _____
 Curb Radius 33 Channelization: Angle - Crosswalk Offset -

Accessibility: Ramps 1 Ramp Placement Poor
Ramp 1: Type Perpendicular Lip 1" Angle 90* Width 36"
 Slope 10% X-Slope 2% Landing Width 90" Landing Slope 1%
 Tactile Warning No Pushbutton Placement F Pushbutton Size Large
Ramp 2: Type - Lip - Angle - Width -
 Slope - X-Slope - Landing Width - Landing Slope -
 Tactile Warning - Pushbutton Placement - Pushbutton Size -

5 South Leg

General Info: Street Del Monte Boulevard
 Posted Speed 35 85% Speed _____ Avg. Speed _____
 ADT 28,000 %Trucks _____ Control Signal

Dimensions: Curb-Curb 98 Approach: ND 207 PL -
 RTL 30(2) SH/BL - OTL 11 MTL - ITL - LTL 12
 Departure: ITL 24 MTL - OTL 13 SH/BL 8 PL - ND none

Median: Type Curb Lndscp Width 7 Opening width - Nose none
Crosswalk: Markings/Signs Closed Marking Quality -
 Line width - Length - Width - Stop Line - Sight Lines -

Signals: Type Mast & Post Size 8 12 Placement good Veh. Det. QL
 Ped Signal Type Closed Placement - Ped Detection -
 Walk Interval - Ped Clearance Interval - Max Ped Delay -

Other: Two-way path runs along west side and crosses the west approach.
 There are stop signs on the path even though the crosswalk is controlled by a pedestrian signal.
 There are pushbuttons in the median on the north leg.
 A northbound to eastbound double right turn conflicts with the east leg crosswalk.
 The pushbutton on the southwest corner appears to be malfunctioning. There are bent crosswalks on the north and east legs, these should be straight.

No. _____ Intersection Reservation Road @ Seacrest Avenue Date: 4/17/03 Time 11:00 AM Team Moule & Burden

1 North Leg

General Info: Street - _____
 Posted Speed _____ 85% Speed _____ Avg. Speed _____
 ADT _____ %Trucks _____ Control _____
Dimensions: Curb-Curb _____ Approach: ND _____ PL _____
 RTL _____ SH/BL _____ OTL _____ MTL _____ ITL _____ LTL _____
Departure: ITL _____ MTL _____ OTL _____ SH/BL _____ PL _____ ND _____

Median: Type _____ Width _____ Opening width _____ Nose _____
Crosswalk: Markings/Signs _____ Marking Quality _____
 Line width _____ Length _____ Width _____ Stop Line _____ Sight Lines _____
Signals: Type _____ Size 8 12 Placement _____ Veh. Det. _____
 Ped Signal Type _____ Placement _____ Ped Detection _____
 Walk Interval _____ Ped Clearance Interval _____ Max Ped Delay _____

8 NW Corner

Corner Geometry: Type _____ Angle _____
 Curb Radius _____ Channelization: Angle _____ Crosswalk Offset _____
Accessibility: Ramps 1 Ramp Placement excellent
Ramp 1: Type _____ Lip _____ Angle _____ Width _____
 Slope _____ X-Slope _____ Landing Width _____ Landing Slope _____
 Tactile Warning _____ Pushbutton Placement _____ Pushbutton Size _____
Ramp 2: Type Perpendicular Lip 1/2" Angle 90° Width 48"
 Slope 9% X-Slope 2% Landing Width 57" Landing Slope 2%
 Tactile Warning No Pushbutton Placement G Pushbutton Size Large

Corner Geometry: Type _____ Angle _____
 Curb Radius _____ Channelization: Angle _____ Crosswalk Offset _____
Accessibility: Ramps 1 Ramp Placement Fair
Ramp 1: Type _____ Lip _____ Angle _____ Width _____
 Slope _____ X-Slope _____ Landing Width _____ Landing Slope _____
 Tactile Warning _____ Pushbutton Placement _____ Pushbutton Size _____
Ramp 2: Type Perpendicular Lip 1/4" Angle 90° Width 48"
 Slope 10% X-Slope 2% Landing Width 48" Landing Slope 3%
 Tactile Warning No Pushbutton Placement _____ Pushbutton Size _____

7 West Leg

General Info: Street Reservation Road
 Posted Speed 35 85% Speed _____ Avg. Speed _____
 ADT 29,000 %Trucks _____ Control Signal
Dimensions: Curb-Curb 95 Approach: ND _____ PL _____
 RTL 12 SH/BL _____ OTL 14 MTL _____ ITL 14 LTL _____
Departure: ITL 12 MTL _____ OTL 14 SH/BL _____ PL 7° ND _____

General Info: Street Reservation Road
 Posted Speed 35 85% Speed _____ Avg. Speed _____
 ADT 28,000 %Trucks _____ Control Signal
Dimensions: Curb-Curb 100 Approach: ND 27 PL 7°
 RTL _____ SH/BL _____ OTL 19 MTL _____ ITL 13 LTL 11
Departure: ITL 13 MTL _____ OTL 26 SH/BL _____ PL _____ ND 216

Median: Type Curb Lndscp Width 22 Opening width _____ Nose None
Crosswalk: Markings/Signs Transverse Marking Quality Fair
 Line width 12" Length 97 Width 9 Stop Line none Sight Lines exc.
Signals: Type Mast & Post Size 8 12 Placement good Veh. Det. recall
 Ped Signal Type Symbol, Bulb Placement good Ped Detection PB
 Walk Interval 11 sec Ped Clearance Interval 13 sec Max Ped Delay 48 sec

Median: Type Curb Lndscp Width 9 Opening width _____ Nose poor
Crosswalk: Markings/Signs Transverse Marking Quality fair
 Line width 12" Length 100 Width 10 Stop Line none Sight Lines fair
Signals: Type Mast & Post Size 8 12 Placement good Veh. Det. recall
 Ped Signal Type Symbol, Bulb Placement good Ped Detection PB
 Walk Interval 11 sec Ped Clearance Interval 13 sec Max Ped Delay 48

6 SW Corner

Corner Geometry: Type Single Angle _____
 Curb Radius 25 Channelization: Angle _____ Crosswalk Offset _____
Accessibility: Ramps 1 Ramp Placement fair
Ramp 1: Type Perpendicular Lip 1/4" Angle 90° Width 48"
 Slope 12% X-Slope 1% Landing Width 48" Landing Slope 4%
 Tactile Warning No Pushbutton Placement P Pushbutton Size large
Ramp 2: Type _____ Lip _____ Angle _____ Width _____
 Slope _____ X-Slope _____ Landing Width _____ Landing Slope _____
 Tactile Warning _____ Pushbutton Placement G Pushbutton Size Large

Corner Geometry: Type Single Angle 90
 Curb Radius 25 Channelization: Angle _____ Crosswalk Offset _____
Accessibility: Ramps 1 Ramp Placement fair
Ramp 1: Type Perpendicular Lip 1/8" Angle 90° Width 50"
 Slope 10% X-Slope 1% Landing Width 38" Landing Slope 4%
 Tactile Warning No Pushbutton Placement F Pushbutton Size small
Ramp 2: Type _____ Lip _____ Angle _____ Width _____
 Slope _____ X-Slope _____ Landing Width _____ Landing Slope _____
 Tactile Warning _____ Pushbutton Placement fair Pushbutton Size small

5 South Leg

General Info: Street Seacrest Avenue
 Posted Speed _____ 85% Speed _____ Avg. Speed _____
 ADT _____ %Trucks _____ Control Signal
Dimensions: Curb-Curb 40 Approach: ND 215 PL _____
 RTL 11 SH/BL _____ OTL _____ MTL _____ ITL _____ LTL 11
Departure: ITL _____ MTL _____ OTL 18 SH/BL _____ PL _____ ND 104

Median: Type None Width _____ Opening width _____ Nose _____
Crosswalk: Markings/Signs Transverse Marking Quality fair
 Line width 12" Length 55 Width 9 Stop Line none Sight Lines good
Signals: Type Mast & Post Size 8 12 Placement good Veh. Det. QL
 Ped Signal Type Symbol, Bulb Placement exc. Ped Detection PB
 Walk Interval 7 sec Ped Clearance Interval 9 sec Max Ped Delay 59

Other:
 Ramp on the northeast corner has debris blocking the landing behind the ramp.
 There are pushbuttons in the median on both the east and west legs and the pedestrian clearance interval is set in a manner that allows slow pedestrians to only get to the median.

No. _____ Intersection Reservation Road @ DeForest Road Date: 4/17/03 Time 2:00 PM Team Moule

1 North Leg

General Info: Street DeForest Road
 Posted Speed 25 85% Speed _____ Avg. Speed _____
 ADT Low %Trucks _____ Control Signal

Dimensions: Curb-Curb 40 Approach: ND 97 PL -
 RTL 10 SH/BL - OTL 10 MTL - ITL - LTL -
 Departure: ITL - MTL - OTL 20 SH/BL - PL - ND 117

Median: Type None Width - Opening width - Nose -
Crosswalk: Markings/Signs Transverse Marking Quality Fair
 Line width 12" Length 58' Width 11 Stop Line none Sight Lines Exc.

Signals: Type Mast & Post Size 8 1/2 Placement Exc. Veh. Det. QL
 Ped Signal Type Symbol, Bulb Placement Exc. Ped Detection PB
 Walk Interval 6 Ped Clearance Interval 11 Max Ped Delay 62

8 NW Corner

Corner Geometry: Type Single Angle 90°
 Curb Radius 25' Channelization: Angle - Crosswalk Offset -

Accessibility: Ramps 1 Ramp Placement fair
Ramp 1: Type Perpendicular Lip 1/4" Angle 90° Width 46
 Slope 7% X-Slope 0% Landing Width 0 Landing Slope -
 Tactile Warning No Pushbutton Placement G Pushbutton Size small
Ramp 2: Type - Lip - Angle - Width -
 Slope - X-Slope - Landing Width - Landing Slope -
 Tactile Warning - Pushbutton Placement fair Pushbutton Size small

2 NE Corner

Corner Geometry: Type Single Angle 90°
 Curb Radius 26' Channelization: Angle - Crosswalk Offset -

Accessibility: Ramps 1 Ramp Placement Fair
Ramp 1: Type Perpendicular Lip 0 Angle 90° Width 48
 Slope 8% X-Slope 1% Landing Width 0 Landing Slope -
 Tactile Warning No Pushbutton Placement E Pushbutton Size small
Ramp 2: Type - Lip - Angle - Width -
 Slope - X-Slope - Landing Width - Landing Slope -
 Tactile Warning - Pushbutton Placement G Pushbutton Size small

7 West Leg

General Info: Street Reservation Road
 Posted Speed 35 85% Speed _____ Avg. Speed _____
 ADT 28,000 %Trucks _____ Control Signal

Dimensions: Curb-Curb 96 Approach: ND 235 PL -
 RTL 12 SH/BL - OTL 14 MTL - ITL 13 LTL 11
 Departure: ITL 13 MTL - OTL 21 SH/BL - PL - ND 142

Median: Type Curb Lndscp Width 12 Opening width - Nose None
Crosswalk: Markings/Signs Transverse Marking Quality Fair
 Line width 12" Length 98 Width 12 Stop Line none Sight Lines good

Signals: Type Mast & Post Size 8 1/2 Placement fair Veh. Det. QL
 Ped Signal Type Symbol, Bulb Placement good Ped Detection PB
 Walk Interval 12 sec Ped Clearance Interval 12 sec Max Ped Delay 72 sec

3 East Leg

General Info: Street Reservation Road
 Posted Speed 35 85% Speed _____ Avg. Speed _____
 ADT 27,000 %Trucks _____ Control Signal

Dimensions: Curb-Curb 95 Approach: ND 116 PL 7°
 RTL - SH/BL - OTL 14 MTL - ITL 13 LTL 12
 Departure: ITL 13 MTL - OTL 26 SH/BL - PL - ND 185

Median: Type Curb Lndscp Width 11 Opening width - Nose None
Crosswalk: Markings/Signs Transverse Marking Quality fair
 Line width 12" Length 101 Width 11 Stop Line none Sight Lines good

Signals: Type Mast & Post Size 8 1/2 Placement good Veh. Det. QL
 Ped Signal Type Symbol, Bulb Placement good Ped Detection PB
 Walk Interval 12 sec Ped Clearance Interval 12 sec Max Ped Delay 72 sec

6 SW Corner

Corner Geometry: Type Single Angle 90°
 Curb Radius 20 Channelization: Angle - Crosswalk Offset -

Accessibility: Ramps 2 Ramp Placement good
Ramp 1: Type Parallel Lip 1/2" Angle 90° Width 99"
 Slope 9% X-Slope 1% Landing Width 48" Landing Slope 3%
 Tactile Warning NS Pushbutton Placement G Pushbutton Size small
Ramp 2: Type Parallel Lip 1/4" Angle 90° Width 102"
 Slope 10% X-Slope 3% Landing Width 48" Landing Slope 4%
 Tactile Warning No Pushbutton Placement G Pushbutton Size small

4 SE Corner

Corner Geometry: Type Single Angle 90°
 Curb Radius 20 Channelization: Angle - Crosswalk Offset -

Accessibility: Ramps 1 Ramp Placement fair
Ramp 1: Type Parallel Lip 1/4" Angle 90° Width 96"
 Slope 11% X-Slope 3% Landing Width 48" Landing Slope 3%
 Tactile Warning NS Pushbutton Placement G Pushbutton Size small
Ramp 2: Type - Lip - Angle - Width -
 Slope - X-Slope - Landing Width - Landing Slope -
 Tactile Warning - Pushbutton Placement G Pushbutton Size small

5 South Leg

General Info: Street DeForest Road
 Posted Speed _____ 85% Speed _____ Avg. Speed _____
 ADT Low %Trucks _____ Control Signal

Dimensions: Curb-Curb 40 Approach: ND 238 PL -
 RTL 10 SH/BL - OTL 10 MTL - ITL - LTL 11
 Departure: ITL - MTL - OTL 20 SH/BL - PL - ND 107

Median: Type None Width - Opening width - Nose -
Crosswalk: Markings/Signs Transverse Marking Quality fair
 Line width 12" Length 52 Width 11 Stop Line none Sight Lines Exc.

Signals: Type Mast & Post Size 8 1/2 Placement G Veh. Det. QL
 Ped Signal Type Symbol, Bulb Placement G Ped Detection PB
 Walk Interval 7 sec Ped Clearance Interval 11 sec Max Ped Delay 86

Other:
 Non-functioning Pushbutton on SE Corner
 DeForest has a 23' offset.
 The programmed signal heads on the west approach cannot be seen very well by all lanes of traffic.

No. _____ Intersection Reservation Road @ Crescent Avenue Date: 4/17/03 Time 3:30 PM Team Moule

1 North Leg

General Info: Street Crescent Avenue
 Posted Speed 25 85% Speed _____ Avg. Speed _____
 ADT Medium %Trucks _____ Control Signal
Dimensions: Curb-Curb 64 Approach: ND 198 PL 7*
 RTL 14 SH/BL - OTL 11 MTL - ITL - LTL -
 Departure: ITL - MTL - OTL 25 SH/BL - PL 7* ND 165

Median: Type None Width - Opening width - Nose -
Crosswalk: Markings/Signs Transverse Marking Quality good
 Line width 92 Length 92 Width 11 Stop Line none Sight Lines Exc.
Signals: Type Mast & Post Size 8 12 Placement G Veh. Det. QL
 Ped Signal Type Symbol, Bulb Placement G Ped Detection PB
 Walk Interval - Ped Clearance Interval - Max Ped Delay -

8 NW Corner

Corner Geometry: Type Single Angle 90*
 Curb Radius 40 Channelization: Angle - Crosswalk Offset -
Accessibility: Ramps 1 Ramp Placement good
Ramp 1: Type Perpendicular Lip 3/4" Angle 90* Width 40"
 Slope 1.1% X-Slope 5% Landing Width 0 Landing Slope -
 Tactile Warning No Pushbutton Placement G Pushbutton Size large
Ramp 2: Type - Lip - Angle - Width -
 Slope - X-Slope - Landing Width - Landing Slope -
 Tactile Warning - Pushbutton Placement G Pushbutton Size large

Corner Geometry: Type Single Angle 90*
 Curb Radius 35 Channelization: Angle - Crosswalk Offset -
Accessibility: Ramps 2 Ramp Placement Excellent
Ramp 1: Type Perpendicular Lip 1/4" Angle 90* Width 46"
 Slope 14% X-Slope 2% Landing Width 2" Landing Slope 7%
 Tactile Warning No Pushbutton Placement G Pushbutton Size large
Ramp 2: Type Perpendicular Lip - Angle 90* Width 50"
 Slope 1.3% X-Slope 0% Landing Width 48" Landing Slope 2%
 Tactile Warning No Pushbutton Placement G Pushbutton Size large

7 West Leg

General Info: Street Reservation Road
 Posted Speed 35 85% Speed _____ Avg. Speed _____
 ADT 27,000 %Trucks _____ Control Signal
Dimensions: Curb-Curb 95 Approach: ND 170 PL -
 RTL 12 SH/BL - OTL 14 MTL - ITL 13 LTL 11
 Departure: ITL 12 MTL - OTL 15 SH/BL - PL 7* ND 260

General Info: Street Reservation Road
 Posted Speed 35 85% Speed _____ Avg. Speed _____
 ADT 26,000 %Trucks _____ Control Signal
Dimensions: Curb-Curb 90 Approach: ND 80 PL 7*
 RTL - SH/BL - OTL 14 MTL - ITL 13 LTL 11
 Departure: ITL 13 MTL - OTL 14 SH/BL - PL 7* ND 85

Median: Type Curb Lndscp Width 12 Opening width - Nose None
Crosswalk: Markings/Signs Transverse Marking Quality good
 Line width 12" Length 120 Width 11 Stop Line none Sight Lines exc.
Signals: Type Mast & Post Size 8 12 Placement good Veh. Det. QL
 Ped Signal Type Symbol, Bulb Placement good Ped Detection PB
 Walk Interval 7 sec Ped Clearance Interval 15 sec Max Ped Delay 72 sec

Median: Type Curb Lndscp Width 11 Opening width - Nose None
Crosswalk: Markings/Signs Transverse Marking Quality fair
 Line width 12" Length 90 Width 9 Stop Line none Sight Lines good
Signals: Type Mast & Post Size 8 12 Placement good Veh. Det. QL
 Ped Signal Type Symbol, Bulb Placement good Ped Detection PB
 Walk Interval 7 sec Ped Clearance Interval 15 sec Max Ped Delay 70 sec

6 SW Corner

Corner Geometry: Type Single Angle 90*
 Curb Radius 28 Channelization: Angle - Crosswalk Offset -
Accessibility: Ramps 1 Ramp Placement good
Ramp 1: Type Perpendicular Lip 1/4" Angle 90* Width 48"
 Slope 8% X-Slope 8% Landing Width 48" Landing Slope 8%
 Tactile Warning NS Pushbutton Placement G Pushbutton Size large
Ramp 2: Type - Lip - Angle - Width -
 Slope - X-Slope - Landing Width - Landing Slope -
 Tactile Warning - Pushbutton Placement G Pushbutton Size large

Corner Geometry: Type Single Angle 90*
 Curb Radius 5' Channelization: Angle - Crosswalk Offset -
Accessibility: Ramps 1 Ramp Placement fair
Ramp 1: Type Perpendicular Lip 0 Angle 90* Width 40"
 Slope 11% X-Slope 4% Landing Width 55" Landing Slope 3%
 Tactile Warning no Pushbutton Placement G Pushbutton Size large
Ramp 2: Type - Lip - Angle - Width -
 Slope - X-Slope - Landing Width - Landing Slope -
 Tactile Warning - Pushbutton Placement fair Pushbutton Size large

5 South Leg

General Info: Street Crescent Avenue
 Posted Speed 25 85% Speed _____ Avg. Speed _____
 ADT Medium %Trucks _____ Control Signal
Dimensions: Curb-Curb 80 Approach: ND 40 PL -
 RTL 14 SH/BL - OTL 12 MTL - ITL - LTL 12
 Departure: ITL - MTL - OTL 28 SH/BL - PL 7 ND 165

Median: Type Concrete Width 7 Opening width - Nose none
Crosswalk: Markings/Signs Transverse Marking Quality fair
 Line width 12" Length 88 Width 11 Stop Line none Sight Lines Exc.
Signals: Type Mast & Post Size 8 12 Placement G Veh. Det. QL
 Ped Signal Type Symbol, Bulb Placement Exc. Ped Detection PB
 Walk Interval 12 sec Ped Clearance Interval 12 sec Max Ped Delay 50 sec

Other: Pushbuttons on NE and NW corner for crossing Crescent Avenue are broken
 Median pushbuttons are in place on East, South and North leg, it is better to remove these and ensure that the pedestrian clearance interval is long enough to cross the entire width of the street.
 The south leg crosswalk has a kink in it and the median blocks most of the crosswalk.