

Agenda Report Reviewed by:
 City Manager: 

**CITY OF SEBASTOPOL
 CITY COUNCIL
 STAFF REPORT**

Meeting Date: December 15, 2015
To: Honorable Mayor and City Councilmembers
From: Engineering Manager Henry J. Mikus
Subject: Reprioritization of Capital Improvement Project
Recommendation: Provide staff direction on use of grant in-kind money
Funding: Currently Budgeted: ___ Yes ___xxx___ No ___ N/A

Net General Fund Cost:

Amount: \$

If Cost to Other Fund(s): up to \$200,000.00
 Traffic Impact Fund

Introduction: To provide infrastructure improvements to the City streets to better accommodate bicycle traffic, a grant application was recently made to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to fund adding dedicated bicycle lanes to SR 116 through the City. To enhance the viability of the grant application, the City Council approved use of \$200,000 from the Traffic Impact Fund as local in-kind monies, that together with the \$800,000 requested via the grant would fund the expected \$1M project price tag in its entirety. Also, the City has had the project design done by a consulting engineer in order to have as nearly “shovel-ready” a project as possible. The design work is more than 90% complete.

Unfortunately, the City grant application was not successful. However, the local contribution of \$200,00 was provided for in the current Fiscal Year budget, sourced from the Traffic Impact Fund.

Discussion: With the denial of the grant application and the allocation of the local contribution of \$200,000 into the current Fiscal Year budget, the potential exists for finding a suitable use for the local contribution funds. These uses could range from holding on to the money for inclusion in a subsequent bicycle infrastructure project grant application to finding one or more smaller projects that could fit under a \$200,000 budget.

A companion project to the SR 116 bicycle lanes has been discussed. This would be to add bikeways to local (non-state route) corridors within the city. The latest estimate in the CIP for this work is approximately \$550,000.

However, a caution is in order: the temptation will exist to maximize the \$200,000 in the budget by using it fully as soon as possible. However, the SR 116 project, and the companion local bikeways project, have been set up as an integrated whole system. Doing partial or piecemeal bicycle projects carries the risk that whatever new bicycle pathways are added may be isolated and of minimal effectiveness.

Potential Projects: There are several categories of possible projects for the available grant seed money:

1. Retain the money for use as in-kind portions for future grant applications for bicycle projects.
2. Fund one or more smaller bicycle pathway improvements.
3. Use the money to complete the design for the companion, non-state route bicycle project so that it too is "shovel-ready."
4. Because of the huge benefit to the public good, use the money to fund one or more "sidewalk gap closure" projects. There exists a nexus for choosing this alternative, via the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (BPMP). This plan is the basis for the two bicycle lane improvement projects. However, the BPMP also contains items related to improved pedestrian access in the City. With the BPMP as the umbrella document, doing sidewalk gap closures might be appropriate for using the money.

The examples listed below are as concepts only to show what might be accomplished with the available money ; clearly many other similar projects could be considered.

Examples for #2 above, "smaller bicycle pathway improvements":

1. Pleasant Hill Avenue to Washington Avenue
2. Morris Street to McKinley Street
3. S. Main St., Healdsburg Avenue to Eddie Lane
4. Pleasant Hill Avenue, Covert Lane to Bodega Avenue

Examples for #4 above, "sidewalk gap closure projects":

1. Bodega Avenue between Golden Ridge and Pleasant Hill Avenue
2. Bodega Avenue between Valley View and Ragle
3. Portions of Gravenstein Highway North at Covert Lane intersection

Recommendation: If the City Council chooses any of the above-listed categories of projects as suitable for use for the \$200,000, or determines some other possible use for the money, staff recommends that they be directed to develop a viable plan including cost estimates to return to the Council for final approval.

Attachments:

Map of planned bicycle improvements from the BPMP

CITY OF SEBASTOPOL AND VICINITY


PROPOSED AND EXISTING BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

SONOMA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

0 0.1 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.2 Miles
 0 0.15 0.3 0.6 0.8 1.2 Kilometers

Author: Sonoma County Transportation Authority
 Revised: November 1, 2011
 Date: April 20, 2006
 Project: Sonoma County Transportation Authority
 Project Source: a USCA/SCTA Modeling Program (PROJECT/SB/Systems/MapData/Sebastopol_Update.mxd)
 Sources: SCTA Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, Sonoma County GIS City of Sebastopol

This map is for illustrative purposes only, and though care has been taken to ensure that data is accurate, maps and represented data are provided without warranty of any kind.



LEGEND

Bike Routes
 CLASS I - EXISTING
 CLASS I - PROPOSED
 CLASS II - EXISTING
 CLASS II - PROPOSED
 CLASS III - EXISTING
 CLASS III - PROPOSED
 CLASS IV - EXISTING
 CLASS IV - PROPOSED
 CLASS V - EXISTING
 CLASS V - PROPOSED

Bicycle Amenities
 P Bike Parking - Existing
 P Bike Parking - Proposed
 B Shower/Locker - Existing
 B Shower/Locker - Proposed

Pedestrian Crossing Enhancements
 A EXISTING
 A PROPOSED

Pedestrian Oriented Areas
 Recreation Districts
 Recreation Centers

Multimodal Connections
 EXISTING
 PROPOSED

Transportation Features
 Street to Road
 Highway
 Freeway

Geographic Elements
 City Limits of Sebastopol
 City Limits of Cloverdale
 City Limits of Ukiah
 City Limits of Eureka
 City Limits of Ukiah
 City Limits of Ukiah
 City Limits of Ukiah

Schools
 OTHER
 ELEMENTARY
 MIDDLE
 HIGH SCHOOL

NOTE: Proposed facilities outside of Sebastopol City limits are shown to illustrate connectivity with the countywide system. The City of Sebastopol has no jurisdiction over projects outside of City limits. Any proposed facilities shown outside of Sebastopol City limits have been proposed by other jurisdictions.