

# Active Transportation and Livable Communities (ATLC)

## Advisory Group Meeting

Thursday, February 20, 2014 – 1:30 PM – 3:30 PM

Caltrans Headquarters

1120 N Street, Room 2116, Sacramento, CA 95814

### Meeting Summary Notes

#### 1. Welcome and Introductions

Alyssa Begley, Office Chief, Office of Community Planning, Division of Transportation Planning, opened the February 20, 2014 meeting and requested introductions from the members present and on the telephone.

#### ATTENDANCE

##### External Agencies – ATLC Members

Bob Planthold, California Pedestrian Advisory Committee  
Dave Snyder, California Bicycle Coalition  
Jacquolyn Duerr, California Department of Public Health  
Jeanie Ward-Waller, Safe Routes to School National Partnership  
Kate Meis, Local Government Commission  
Laura Cohen, Rails-to-Trails Conservancy (via telephone)  
Melinda Coy, Housing and Community Development (via telephone)  
Paul Zykofsky, Local Government Commission  
Stacy Alamo-Mixson, California Department of Public Health  
Tony Dang, California WALKS  
Wendy Alfsen, California WALKS

##### External Agencies – Interested Parties

Carla Blackmar, Public Health Alliance of Southern California (via telephone)  
Chris Ganson, Office of Planning and Research (via telephone)  
Carla Blackmar, Public Health Alliance of Southern California (via telephone)  
David Giongco, California Transportation Commission  
Kate White, California State Transportation Agency  
Lindell Price, Resident of El Dorado County  
Mitch Weiss, California Transportation Commission  
Susan Handy, University of California, Davis  
Tyler Summersett, Tuolumne County (via telephone)

##### Caltrans

Alyssa Begley, Office Chief, Community Planning  
April Nitsos, Local Assistance  
Barry Padilla, State Planning  
Brad Mettam, District Deputy Director Planning and Local Assistance, D1 (via telephone)  
Brian Alconcel, Traffic Operations for Dennis Agar  
Chris Ratekin, Community Planning  
Darold Heikens, Traffic Operations  
Dave Moore, District Deputy Director Planning and Local Assistance, D2 (via telephone)

## ATTENDANCE

David Sosa, District 7 (via telephone)  
Diana Portillo, Forecasting and Travel Analysis  
Emily Mraovich, Community Planning  
Jean Finney, District 4 (via telephone)  
Joan Sollenberger, Traffic Operations  
Katie Benouar, Division Chief, Transportation Planning  
Lea Simpson, Mass Transportation for Jila Priebe  
Marlon Flournoy, District Deputy Director Planning and Local Assistance, D3  
Pam Korte, Office Chief, State Planning  
Rachel Falsetti, Division Chief, Programming (via telephone)  
Ryan Ong, State Planning  
Scott Sauer, System Planning  
Shelly Chernicki, Rail Planning  
Soheila Khoii, Forecasting and Travel Analysis  
Shauna Asbury, Legislative Affairs for Melanie Perron  
Teresa McWilliam, Local Assistance  
Tim Craggs, Division Chief, Design

## **2. Opening Comments**

Katie Benouar, Division Chief, Division of Transportation Planning, thanked everyone for joining the meeting.

She announced that Kome Ajise, Deputy Director of Planning and Modal Programs, has sponsored a Bicycle Task Force as a forum to allow a focused discussion on bicycling with the intent of identifying actions that can foster a cultural shift within Caltrans to support bicycling. The goal is to advance Caltrans' active support for bicycling on and off the state highway system. The Task force is meeting monthly under the lead of Aileen Loe, Deputy District Director Planning and Local Assistance, District 5.

There is a re-schedule of the next ATLC meeting to Thursday, May 29 from 1:30 to 3:30pm. This date avoids conflicting with the PedsCount! Conference which will be held May 14-16.

Kate White was introduced. She is the Deputy Secretary for Environmental Policy and Housing Coordination at the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA). The core part of Kate's position is to better align the environmental goals of California with the Transportation Agency and the Departments under it. With the State reorganization, the housing functions moved to the Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency. There was a concern among the legislature and many stakeholders that the housing and land-use connection would be lost so for this connection to continue Kate also serves as the liaison from CalSTA to the housing department.

The Division of Traffic Operations has had some staff changes due to the Division's reorganization. Lucia Saavedra has been hired as the new engineer for the Traffic Operations non-motorized investigations position. This is a backfill of Brian Alconcel's former position with a few differing responsibilities, but it still includes pedestrian safety.

Teresa McWilliam in the Division of Local Assistance is the new Active Transportation Program (ATP) contact. She has replaced David Giongco, who was acting in that position for a few months. Teresa is presenting an update on the ATP today.

Brian Alconcel, Division of Traffic Operations, announced that Duper Tong has been hired as the new Office Chief over Traffic Engineering, where Lucia Saavedra's position resides. Duper was on every task force that Brian had lead in his previous position regarding pedestrian safety, so Duper brings a good pedestrian safety prospective to the position.

Alyssa Begley, Office of Community Planning, said she would ask Lucia and Duper to introduce themselves at a future ATLC meeting.

April Nitsos, Division of Local Assistance, added that Kevin Atkinson as been hired as the new Safe Routes to School Program Manager.

Wendy Alfsen, California WALKS, commented that she is pleased to hear of the formation of the Planning Bicycle Task Force and invites Caltrans to do the same for pedestrians.

### **3. SSTI, Program Review & Strategic Management Plan**

Katie Benouar, Division Chief, Division of Transportation Planning, gave an update on the [State Smart Transportation Initiative \(SSTI\)](#), [Caltrans Program Review](#), and the Strategic Management Plan which all have been released within the last few weeks.

Caltrans is looking at the various reviews of the department to assess our processes and developed guidance and principles to streamline our efforts to make them more effective. All of these reports together underscore what we will be working on to infuse sustainability, multimodal integration of the transportation system, and complete streets from planning to throughout the project development process. The SSTI internally has brought a lot of good discussion across functions and a desire to inform each other of the documents mentioned in the report, such as the Smart Mobility Framework and the California Transportation Plan 2040. Over the next 6 months Caltrans will be busy putting together teams and work plans to work on the recommendations presented in the SSTI.

Kate White, California State Transportation Agency, added that the Caltrans Executive Team is working on a new Mission, Vision, and Goals for Caltrans. She mentioned the mission will include sustainability. She also mentioned that another report that Secretary Brian Kelly has been working on with a group of stakeholders is the [California Transportation Infrastructure Priorities \(CTIP\)](#) which looks at funding and long-range sustainability of the transportation system. Kate mentioned that this is an exciting opportunity for Caltrans to catch up and become leaders again in the transportation field and to really embrace sustainability throughout all of our work from planning to project delivery.

Paul Zykofsky, Local Government Commission, commented that it is important for these changes to get communicated down to the local level as many local planners and traffic engineers look to Caltrans for setting the standards.

Kate White, California State Transportation Agency, and Katie Benouar, Division Chief, Division of Transportation Planning, agreed and confirmed that it would.

Wendy Alfsen, California WALKS, brought up that in order to communicate there needs to be training and the budget for this continues to shrink. All the efforts that were called out as positives in the reports need budgetary support. Training is one of those areas and locals usually get training from Caltrans or Caltrans sponsored courses.

Katie Benouar, Division Chief, Division of Transportation Planning, responded that Caltrans will look at the training recourses and adapt them to the new goals. She agreed that training is a big part of implementing this.

Laura Cohen, Rails-to-Trails Conservancy, mentioned that a few years ago a report was put together under the [Healthy Transportation Network](#) about bicycle and pedestrian training within Caltrans. The team did interviews and surveys and came up with some recommendations that are consistent with parts of the SSTI. She mentioned that this report would be worth revisiting to look at the recommendations.

Alyssa Begley, Office of Community Planning, responded that we will take this opportunity to look back on that institutional knowledge and brief management on the report.

#### **4. Strategic Highway Safety Plan Update**

Joan Sollenberger, Traffic Operations, gave a presentation on the update of the [Strategic Highway Safety Plan \(SHSP\)](#). Joan is the lead for the SHSP update in California, which is a multi-agency effort with over 400 stakeholders. She announced that Ursula Stuter, who spoke at the November ATLC meeting, will be the Project Manager for the SHSP update.

MAP-21 requires an update to the SHSP, which was started in 2005 under previous federal legislation. The SHSP addresses the 4 E's of safety: engineering, enforcement, education, and emergency services. She reported that the word "highway" in the title is a misnomer; the SHSP is for all public roads, including roads on tribal lands, and accounts for all modes of transportation.

The new priorities in the SHSP update are to gain improved data for all modes, increase involvement with local and regional agencies and Tribes, and to foster a safety culture. The SHSP will have performance measures and targets as given by a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking which should come out soon. This update will be data driven and will give us a better idea of where to strategically invest our funds. The SHSP is required to be updated prior to August 1, 2015 and outreach will begin in summer and fall of 2014.

Bob Planthold, California Pedestrian Advisory Committee, commented that for years he and Wendy Alfsen have been trying to get the California Highway Patrol (CHP) to revise the bicycle and pedestrian data reporting form on collisions and have had very little response. He urged that this be brought up again and that it get addressed.

Joan Sollenberger, Traffic Operations, responded that that is something to continue working on.

Kate White, California State Transportation Agency, offered to provide assistance since CHP is now under CalSTA. Wendy Alfsen will send Kate and Joan information on the effort.

Soheila Khoii, Forecasting and Travel Analysis, asked about the type of data that is needed for the SHSP. She commented that the California Household Travel Survey (CHTS) was just completed and could potentially help provide some of the needed data.

Joan Sollenberger, Traffic Operations, responded that the data they are looking for is collision, injury, and property damage data, but in order to get these rates they need to know the baseline numbers so the CHTS data would help. Joan will get in contact with Soheila.

Tony Dang, California WALKS, asked what the plans are to ensure that the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) is a 4 E's process. He commented that the local HSIP was the first program to allow for non-infrastructure projects and he does not believe the state HSIP allows for it. The cost benefit tool that is currently used doesn't adequately take into account non-infrastructure projects. He mentioned that there is a National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) study going on right now to develop a model on how to evaluate non-infrastructure projects against infrastructure projects. He urges Caltrans to incorporate that model in the SHSP update.

Joan Sollenberger, Traffic Operations, responded that there is flexibility in MAP-21 to use HSIP funding for non-infrastructure projects. This SHSP update will be addressing what that will look like. There are state budgeting issues that need to be adjusted in order to start using the money.

Brian Alconcel, Traffic Operations, added that on the state HSIP side, in the 015 collision reduction program there is an added category for crosswalk safety enhancements, an area where 85% of pedestrian fatalities occur.

Alyssa Begley, Office of Community Planning, added that she will arrange a future ATLC presentation to be the State HSIP.

Shelly Chernicki, Rail Planning, asked if they will be collecting any data on rail collisions.

Joan Sollenberger, Traffic Operations, responded that they will be looking at intersections where there are railroad crossings.

Wendy Alfsen, California WALKS, mentioned that at a California Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CalPED) meeting there was a presentation on the Pedestrian Safety Improvement Program, which is a data collection effort out of SHSP Challenge Area 08. There is a contract underway to develop an analysis protocol that applies to every kind of roadway and incorporates all of the different data we have been discussing. She mentioned that this may be able to fill in the data gaps and it can inform the SHSP update of the work that is currently underway.

Joan Sollenberger, Traffic Operations, said that as part of the SHSP update they will be developing a data fact sheet to go out to the Challenge Areas to find out what is already out there and what is still missing.

##### **5. Estimating Total Miles Walked and Biked by Census Tract in California & National Household Travel Survey**

This agenda item was moved up to an earlier time in the meeting. Susan Handy, University of California, Davis, gave a presentation on [Estimating Total Miles Walked and Biked by Census Tract in California](#). The work itself was done by Deborah Salon, Susan's colleague. This project is a Caltrans funded study that goes beyond basic statistical data to estimate total miles walked or bikes for people living in each census tract in California from the 2009 National Household Travel Survey (NHTS) data.

As part of the study, neighborhood types of suburban, urban, rural, and central city were assigned to all census tracts throughout California. This information was then further put into categories of gender and age group, creating 40 categories total. For each person that fell into a particular category, their walking and biking was averaged and different factors were determined. For walking, the biggest factor depended on neighborhood type, for biking the biggest factor depended on gender. To get the estimates by census tract, the tract population for each category was multiplied by the appropriate factor for that category and then summed up to get the tract estimate. As a result, the miles walked or biked highly correlate with population density.

These estimates can help us with planning infrastructure needs to show us where the highest activity of biking and walking occurs. The estimates can also look at safety by determining the rate of pedestrian and bicycle crashes from number of crashes per mile of activity occurring. Susan mentioned that the report and the estimates by census tract will be available in March, 2014 so that planners can make use of the data.

Susan also noted that the project team looked at the more recent California Household Travel Survey (CHTS) and compared the results of the two surveys. What they found was that results are different in very interesting and puzzling ways.

Bob Planthold, California Pedestrian Advisory Committee, commented that the average miles walked and biked have a substantial difference in age ranges and wanted to know why.

Susan Handy, University of California, Davis, responded that Deborah had looked at the distribution of miles walked and bikes and broke it down by the places where the curve inflected. It was based on the data of what people were actually doing.

Soheila Khoii, Forecasting and Travel Analysis, asked about the differences that were found with the CHTS data.

Susan Handy, University of California, Davis, answered that all of the analysis hasn't been completed yet, but the rates of walking and biking were looked at. In the CHTS there was less walking and biking than what the NHTS was picking up. This most likely is because the NHTS had add-on questions that prompted for better bike and pedestrian activity data.

Wendy Alfsen, California WALKS, stated that one of the issues is whether the California NHTS add-on will be funded again. The add-on is important because the data recorded is not in the CHTS. If Caltrans doesn't fund the add-on the NHTS there won't be comparative data between then and now.

Susan Handy, University of California, Davis, added that they had noticed interesting differences between what people reported on their travel diary survey day and what they would recall at a later date. You can get different measures of walking and biking depending on which way you ask the question.

Dave Snyder, California Bicycle Coalition, asked if the reason was known for the undercounting in the CHTS.

Susan Handy, University of California, Davis, responded she thinks it is due to trips that are not even reported.

Dave Snyder, California Bicycle Coalition, further asked about if the survey took into account the time of the year. Often times the survey only asks about travel that occurred over the past week. He thinks it would be valuable to know the number of people who every once in a while get on their bikes.

Susan Handy, University of California, Davis, responded that the idea of the survey is that the sample size is so large that this would average out. You might lose trips for someone who usually bikes daily but doesn't that week but it would be averaged by someone who happened to bike that week but usually doesn't. She also noted that the NHTS is given over an entire year, so any seasonal effects would be averaged out.

Tony Dang, California WALKS, asked if they had considered analyzing the data by ethnic or income categories to get estimates of disadvantaged communities in the state.

Susan Handy, University of California, Davis, stated that may have been done in the first study that was done, but it would add an interesting dimension to the categories.

Jeanie Ward-Waller, Safe Routes to School National Partnership, added that during an analysis of school data on another project this was looked at and significant differences in low income communities were found.

Wendy Alfsen, California WALKS, commented that this type of data might be useful for the Active Transportation Programs funding allocations for disadvantaged communities.

Diana Portillo, Forecasting and Travel Analysis, continued with a presentation on the NHTS add-on as it is now time for the 2015 NHTS. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) allots a certain amount of surveys per state. Last time California received 3,000 surveys so we opted to add-on 18,000 more. The add-on includes 6 additional questions that are our own questions. The [handout](#) contains the questions that were asked the last time which centered on bicyclists and pedestrians. At the time, the NHTS sample was designed to oversample San Diego due to a study that was being done in that area which concentrated on bicyclists and pedestrians. Approximately 6,000 of the 21,000 surveys were in San Diego. Recently, Caltrans has recommended that FHWA include the 6 add-on questions from the California add-on survey into the main survey as we feel they are valuable questions. If this were to occur it would give California 6 spaces to create new questions in their 2015 add-on survey.

FHWA has not announced how many surveys California will get this time around. For add-ons, the cost is \$225 per mail out survey. There also is a GPS survey option that is \$425. This type of survey could help with the underreporting. The minimum amount that we can add is 1000 surveys. FHWA needs commitment that California will participate on the add-on by July 2014. In December 2014 a deposit is needed and by December 2015 the remainder is needed. In order for the sample to be statistically valid, it was determined that California would need 22,000 mail-out surveys, estimated to cost \$5 million. This estimate is without the GPS survey option. More information on the NHTS can be found on the [NHTS website](#) including downloads of past year surveys. Right now they are still waiting on questions and information from FHWA. The funding source has not been identified yet.

Katie Benouar, Division Chief, Division of Transportation Planning, suggested that ATLC take the time to think about the information, the questions, and the funding scenario between now and the next meeting. She suggested re-visiting this topic at next ATLC meeting.

Joan Sollenberger, Traffic Operations, mentioned that she thought that last time the funding for the add-on came from extra money in Local Assistance.

Dave Snyder, California Bicycle Coalition, advocated for as large of a sample size that Caltrans can afford.

Jacquolyn Duerr, California Department of Public Health, added that CDPH has an interest in assisting in developing the questions. She also stated that it would also be good know how well the past questioned performed.

Diana Portillo, Forecasting and Travel Analysis, responded that her office can give analysis on the performance of questions.

Wendy Alfsen, California WALKS, asked how the ATLC group could show their support to help make the decision for the NHTS add-on happen by July 2014. She emphasized that other agencies have a strong interest in it, the work from UC Davis came directly out of it, and the SHSP and California Transportation Plan need to use it. Stakeholders have a critical interest in making sure the add-on happens.

Katie Benouar, Division Chief, Division of Transportation Planning, responded that she and staff will commit to working with other divisions and agencies to gather more information and report back on progress at the May ATLC meeting.

## **6. Active Transportation Program**

Teresa McWilliam, Local Assistance, gave an update on the [Active Transportation Program](#) (ATP). The California Transportation Commission (CTC) is legislatively the lead on the program and they have been working on the guidelines which have been sent to the Joint Legislative Committee. The Division of Local Assistance has a website where the application will be released and the Caltrans training sessions on the ATP application will be posted. The first call for projects, State Cycle 1, which is for 50% of the ATP funds, will be March 21, 2014. The state has required set asides for Safe Routes to School and non-infrastructure projects. Also included in this call is the 10% that is set aside for small urban and rural. The state applications are due May 21, 2014. Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) have control over the remaining 40%. They can do their own call for projects or take the projects that the state doesn't select. There will likely be a Cycle 2 call for projects sometime in November 2014, although a date has been approved.

Mitch Weiss, California Transportation Commission, clarified that the CTC is required by statute to adopt Cycle 2 of projects on April 1, 2015 so if you back up from the April deadline the November assumption is not unreasonable. However, the CTC is asking legislative staff to consider including in the next budget bill an extension to that April 1, 2015 deadline so that there will be enough time to learn what worked and what didn't work from the first cycle. This will give time for any adjustments to be made. In addition, the ATP funding is from MAP-21, which will be over when the Cycle 2 call is tentatively planned. Not to say the state doesn't has an interest in continuing this, but it will depend on the federal TAP funding which is a portion of the ATP.

Teresa McWilliam, Local Assistance, continued to announce the [ATP District Training Schedule](#) which will occur throughout April.

Lindell Price, Resident of El Dorado County, asked about a Pedestrian Account that Caltrans had

borrowed funding from. She wondered if that account was included in the ATP.

Mitch Weiss, California Transportation Commission, responded that there was a Pedestrian Account but it has been a number of years since there has been any funding for it. He mentioned that of the \$9 million for Active Transportation funding, the Governor is proposing part of it to be a payback to the Pedestrian Account.

Tony Dang, California WALKS, asked if the Pedestrian Account is closed.

Mitch Weiss, California Transportation Commission, responded that it has not been officially closed, but there has not been any activity for years.

Dave Snyder, California Bicycle Coalition, asked if there is a goal for non-infrastructure funding out of non-Safe Routes to School projects.

Teresa McWilliam, Local Assistance, said there is no goal, however they do have a goal of 5% for plans to go to disadvantaged communities.

Mitch Weiss, California Transportation Commission, gave a presentation on the details of the [ATP Guidelines](#). He spoke about project eligibility, local match requirements, and disadvantaged community requirements. Then he discussed the project screening criteria which include demonstrated need of the applicant, consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan, increasing biking and walking, safety, public participation, cost effectiveness, and improvement to public health. Applicants can be penalized if they have done a poor job in past grants. All the projects will compete in the statewide competition which is 50% of the funds, and what is not funded there, depending on where it is located, will compete in the 10% of funds given to small urban and rural or the 40% in the nine large MPO's, which each run separate competitions. The state and the small urban and rural will have a project evaluation committee and the CTC is asking for volunteers. The number of volunteers will depend on the number of applications received. They are planning to have staff recommendations on August 8, 2014 and the CTC will adopt the statewide and small urban and rural competitions on August 20, 2014. The MPO's need to have staff recommendations by the end of September 2014 and the CTC will adopt the MPO competition projects by the end of November 2014. There is a number of reporting requirements for the applicant including the achieved improvements in mobility and safety.

Laura Cohen, Rails-to-Trails Conservancy, wanted to clarify that bicycle or pedestrian master plans are not required this first round, but the project does need to be consistent with the existing regional transportation plan or another existing applicable plan.

Mitch Weiss, California Transportation Commission, responded that is basically correct, however there is about fifteen points in the scoring process for public participation and planning so if there is no plan in place, the applicant will have to be able to justify the public participation process that prioritized this project over others. There is a paragraph about it in the guidelines.

Jeanie Ward-Waller, Safe Routes to School National Partnership, reiterated that there is a lot of confusion over this requirement to many agencies.

## **7. Flexibility in Design**

Tim Craggs, Division Chief, Design, spoke about flexibility in design. He mentioned that Caltrans

is listening to what they are hearing from stakeholders, the SSTI, and Program Review about flexibility in design, specifically about documents such as the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) guides. The Division of Design is doing some quick updates to the Highway Design Manual (HDM) to include references to guides such as NACTO to encourage the local agencies and Caltrans engineers to utilize such guides in making decisions. Caltrans recognizes there is no one way to do business. We need to be looking at not only our standards but other opportunities that are out there from other research. There currently is a team that is looking at the NACTO Urban Streets Guide with American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO).

The HDM prelude chapter is actually very well written which shows that a lot of the issues are due to culture and communication and not necessarily Caltrans processes and standards. The cultural aspect is a bigger hurdle that we have to overcome. As we keep making incremental improvements in our standards and processes, hopefully the cultural shift will come along as well.

Tim shared a [list of actions](#) the Division of Design is working on now. It's a dynamic list and as new things come up they will be added to the list. Tim is also working on a memo that Malcolm will send out to Districts and other partners about flexibility in design. This memo will include a clarification that local agencies have the delegated authority to make design decisions on local streets and roads. Caltrans does establish statewide standards for design of bicycle facilities, but local agencies can make engineering decisions on their local system utilizing whatever information is out there.

Mitch Weiss, California Transportation Commission, asked if local agencies would need to go through an exception process if they deviate from Caltrans standards.

Tim Craggs, Division Chief, Design, replied that for liability purposes the local agency should have an exception process in place, which has been delegated to local agencies.

Mitch Weiss, California Transportation Commission, further asked if this done on a project by project basis or can it be done on a jurisdiction basis. For example, if a the city engineer wanted to use a certain set of guidelines, can he/she sign off on it and require all projects to be consistent with those guidelines.

Tim Craggs, Division Chief, Design, replied that it would be a local agency decision and not a Department decision.

Dave Snyder, California Bicycle Coalition, commented that there is some dispute on if this applies to bikeways or not. There is a section of the street and highways code that says that local agencies are subject to Caltrans guidelines on any street where bicycling is permitted with regard to bikeways.

Tim Craggs, Division Chief, Design, replied that it's the same thing as Caltrans being subject to our own highway standards and we have an exception process in place. The Local Programs Manual specifically delegates that responsibility to local partners. Maybe it's another communication issue or maybe the local agency just doesn't want to take that delegation on. This is one of the reasons that the HDM and the Project Development Procedures Manual is going to reference the Local Programs Manual that says that local agencies have the authority to deviate from standards.

## **8. Complete Streets Implementation Action Plan**

There was not enough time to get to this agenda item. It will be included on the agenda at the next ATLC meeting in May.

## **9. Environmental Justice/Community Based Transportation Planning Grant Hiatus**

There was not enough time to get to this agenda item. It will be included on the agenda at the next ATLC meeting in May.

## **10. Open Discussion and Closing Remarks**

Jeanie Ward-Waller, Safe Routes to School National Partnership, commented that the ATLC agendas are always incredibly packed and often we don't get to all the presentations. Given that these meetings are a rare opportunity where stakeholders who care about these issues have an opportunity to give Caltrans feedback, she asked if we could do these meetings more often. She added that a lot of these items, especially at this meeting, are very timely and really can't wait another three months for the next meeting.

Katie Benouar, Division Chief, Division of Transportation Planning, agreed that all the agenda items are very valuable and can result in meaningful in-depth discussion. She and Alyssa Begley, Office of Community Planning, will discuss that recommendation and see what they can do.

Katie Benouar, Division Chief, Division of Transportation Planning, thanked everyone for their time and adjourned the meeting. The next ATLC meeting is on May 29, 2014.

---

## **Caltrans Contacts**

Alyssa Begley – 916-651-6882

Emily Mraovich – 916-653-3087