



## **WCCTAC**

**West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee**  
West Contra Costa Transit Enhancement Strategic Plan  
&  
West Contra Costa/Albany Transit Wayfinding Plan

**Working Group Meeting**  
Thursday, November 18, 2010  
10:30 a.m.

### **AGENDA**

- I. Introductions
- II. October 14 Working Group Meeting Notes/Key Actions
- III. Meeting Objectives
- IV. Update on Data Collection Efforts, Audits, Focus Groups Information
- V. Transit Toolbox Workshop Discussion
- VI. Draft Summary of Wayfinding Documents Information
- VII. Next Working Group Meeting – December 9 Information
  - Wayfinding Workshop
- VIII. Adjourn



## **WCCTAC**

**West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee**  
West Contra Costa Transit Enhancement Strategic Plan  
&  
West Contra Costa/Albany Transit Wayfinding Plan

### **Working Group Meeting**

Thursday, October 14, 2010  
10:30 a.m.

### **MEETING NOTES**

Attendees: John Rudolph, Linda Young (WCCTAC); Yvetteh Ortiz (City of El Cerrito); Jamar Stamps (Contra Costa County); Steven Tam (City of Richmond); Aaron Priven (AC Transit); Bob Grandy, Brooke Dubose (Fehr & Peers); Linda Rhine (Nelson/Nygaard)

#### **I. September 9 Meeting Notes**

The Working Group had no requested changes to the September 9 meeting notes.

#### **II. Draft Transit Center Catchment Maps**

Bob walked through the catchment maps and described their purpose. The following comments were received.

- John mentioned the 3 corridor specific plans in Pinole. Pinole was the recipient of I-80 project funding for pedestrian improvements on San Pablo Avenue.
- John noted that Hercules staff had mentioned that residents are actively involved in helping to plan bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the waterfront development, and there may be opportunities, with Hercules staff support, to engage the community in the walk and bike audits.



## WCCTAC

- It was noted that WestCAT was the recipient of I-80 funds for pedestrian improvements.
- For El Cerrito, several planned facilities have been partially improved but are not at their ultimate status. As such, the catchment maps should stay as is. Richmond Street is an example.

### III. Draft Schedule for Pedestrian & Bike Audits

Bob and Brooke reviewed the draft schedule and the proposed agenda for the pedestrian and bike audits. It was noted that the bike audits will be on bicycle, unless the hosting agency requests otherwise. The amount of time spent on pedestrian vs. bike audits will vary by community based on need. The following comments were provided by the Working Group.

- Contra Costa College – there are three contacts that Linda Young will provide, including Sgt. Huddleston and the San Pablo BPAC. Campus police perform the transportation and parking functions. Parking is \$3 per day on campus.
- Schedule – it was noted that Nov. 11 is Veteran’s Day and this date should be deleted.
- Some members of the working group felt they needed more time to prepare and that it may be necessary to do some audits after Thanksgiving. The working group asked that Fehr & Peers be flexible, and work with each member individually to work out scheduling.
- El Cerrito del Norte map – add Cutting east of San Pablo (to Snowdon). Add Portrero and 55<sup>th</sup> Street as well.
- El Cerrito Plaza map – show the location of the previous walk audit. Fairmount should be removed, as the City just completed a streetscape project in 2006. Add Richmond Street. Modify the map to reflect the impact of the Ohlone Greenway on the catchment area.
- Richmond BART map – Steven Tam indicated that the railroad grade separation at Marina Bay will be an undercrossing. He noted that this will help connectivity to South Richmond. Add railroad tracks on the south side of I-580 to the map.



## WCCTAC

Show the planned underpass. Look at 37<sup>th</sup> Street at McDonald for possible wayfinding needs (follow up with Josh regarding Pedestrian Master Plan work).

- El Cerrito has designated pedestrian routes. Can these be added to the maps?

**ACTION ITEM** – Fehr & Peers: Modify catchment maps as noted above.

### IV. Draft List of Wayfinding Review Documents

The Working Group suggested adding the following document.

- Ohlone Greenway Plan

### V. Discussion of Outreach Process

Niko Letunic provided an overview of the outreach approach. It was noted that the Transit Focus Group meeting will be held on Nov. 5 and the TDM Focus Group meeting on Nov. 16.

Linda Rhine and Linda Young described the format of the TDM Focus Group meeting. Linda Rhine and Niko Letunic described the format of the Transit Focus Group meeting.

The group discussed the fact that there is a difference between the perspectives of advocates that have regional vs. local purposes, and asked if regional advocates will be involved in the process. The working group requested a longer-range schedule for outreach activities.

**ACTION ITEM** – Eisen/Letunic: Prepare and distribute draft outreach schedule.

### VI. Draft Transit Needs Assessment Methodology Memo

The working group asked about the status of data collection efforts to date.



## WCCTAC

- Some ridership data has been provided to date. It was suggested that we contact Howard Derr at AC Transit to get additional data.
- Accident data – has been obtained by the consultant team and mapped.
- Pedestrian/Bike Counts – no data has been received to date. El Cerrito has recent bicycle and pedestrian counts, and will provide to the team.
- Parking Data – no data has been received to date. It was noted that no recent parking surveys have been conducted in Richmond or El Cerrito. El Cerrito is the only jurisdiction with a Residential Permit Parking program and will provide the policy documents.

### VII. Next Working Group Meeting

The next Working Group meeting will be November 18 at 10:30 am. The focus of the November meeting will be a workshop on the Transit Toolbox.

Future meetings and preliminary topics are as follows.

- December 9 – Wayfinding workshop



# WCCTAC Wayfinding Plan

## Summary of Wayfinding Review Documents

### DRAFT 1

4 November 2010

## Table of Contents

<b><u>GENERAL WAYFINDING DOCUMENTS</u></b>	<b><u>3</u></b>
Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices Part 9 – Traffic Control for Bicycle Facilities	3
Best Practice in Pedestrian Wayfinding within Urban Areas	3
Best Practices in Bicycle & Pedestrian Wayfinding in the Washington Region	5
San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan, Appendix B: Bicycle Design Guidelines / Best Practices Manual	6
Guidelines for Successful Pedestrian & Bicycle Facilities in the Denver Region	6
City of Oakland Bicycle Wayfinding Guidelines – Survey and Comparison of Other Cities	6
<b><u>BAY AREA STANDARDS &amp; GUIDELINES</u></b>	<b><u>7</u></b>
Contra Costa County Trail Design Resource Handbook	7
MTC Transit Connectivity Report	7
MTC Transit Connectivity Plan Final Summary Report	7
MTC Regional Transit Hub Signage Program Technical Standards & Guidelines	7
BART Station Access Guidelines	9
Access BART Final Report	9
City of Oakland Design Guidelines for Bicycle Wayfinding Signage	9
City of El Cerrito Signage & Wayfinding Program: Graphic Standards Manual	10
BART Chinatown Pedestrian Signage Program Standards Guide	10
BART MacArthur Wayfinding Project	11
City of Berkeley Bicycle Boulevard Signage Program Standards Guide	11
<b><u>TRANSIT PLANS</u></b>	<b><u>13</u></b>
BART Short-Range Transit Plan FY08-FY17 & Capital Improvement Program FY08-FY32	13
BART Bicycle Access and Parking Plan, Volume 1	13
Bicycles on BART Survey and State of Bicycle Access and Amenities on BART Report	13
El Cerrito del Norte BART Station Comprehensive Station Plan	13
El Cerrito Plaza BART Station Access Plan	14
Richmond BART Station Comprehensive Station Plan	14
Richmond BART Station Access Plan	14
WCCTA Short Range Transit Plan FY08-17	15
AC Transit Bicycle & Parking Report	15

**environmental graphics,  
planning & design**

23 waverly place  
suite 2p  
new york ny 10003  
212 242 3366  
212 242 3399 fax

340 bryant street  
suite 210  
san francisco ca 94107  
415 222 9667  
415 222 9668 fax

<b><u>BICYCLE &amp; PEDESTRIAN MASTER PLANS</u></b>	<b>16</b>
2009 Contra Costa County Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan	16
Ohlone Greenway Master Plan	16
El Cerrito Ohlone Greenway Wayfinding Program	16
City of Albany Bicycle Master Plan	16
Buchanan Bicycle & Pedestrian Path Project	16
City of El Cerrito Circulation Plan for Bicyclists & Pedestrians	17
City of El Cerrito Pedestrian Safety Assessment	17
City of Richmond Pedestrian Safety Assessment	17
City of Richmond Bicycle Master Plan	17
City of Albany San Pablo Streetscape Master Plan	18
City of El Cerrito and City of Richmond San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan	18
City of Pinole Three Corridors Specific Plan	18

## General Wayfinding Documents

### Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices Part 9 – Traffic Control for Bicycle Facilities

(FHWA, December 2009)

- Provides guidelines for the application, placement, and design of bicycle signs (p 790 to 793; 798 to 802)

### Best Practice in Pedestrian Wayfinding within Urban Areas

(Grant & Herbes, December 2007)

- Pedestrian needs (p 3):
  - Most direct and safest route between origins and destinations
  - Road crossings
  - Building access
  - Links to public transport
  - Public facilities (e.g. public restrooms)
- Design principles:
  - Styling and information should be consistent (p 3)
  - Materials should be durable and easy to maintain (p 4)
  - Signs should utilize a system to allow for updating of information (p 4)
  - Progressive disclosure: provide just enough information, but not too much (p 4)
  - Connect areas, regions, and transportation systems (p 4)
  - Avoid clutter; have as few signs as possible, and as many as necessary (p 4)
- Recommends the following types of signs:
  - “Heads-up” style maps (where maps identify the area “in front of” the viewer rather than North up). Research shows that map-based signage is superior to all other types of wayfinding signage for pedestrians because it allows for (p 3, 5, 6):
    - Greater physical area to be illustrated
    - More destinations to be included
    - Use of symbols
    - Approximate walking times to be shown
    - Inclusion of 3D depictions of landmarks
    - Scale (p 10):
      - Reference map: shows entire city (all of the area to be signed and mapped), and the location of precincts; minimal information
      - Precinct map: shows city precinct; provides major urban elements and key destinations
      - Pedestrian map: usually at a scale of 1:1000; limited to the immediate area ahead and shows infrastructure such as crossing, steps, and all destinations
    - Map content guidelines
      - Exclude private sector buildings; exceptions include historic landmark buildings, “iconic” commercial buildings (p 12)
      - Maps should include (p 12):

- Sidewalks and areas of safe pedestrian access
- Street and alley names
- Crosswalks
- Major attractions and landmark buildings
- Building footprints of significant buildings for reference
- Through routes (pedestrian access through retail centers)
- Public transportation stops, stops with wheelchair access, train stations, taxi stands, major bus interchanges and stops
- Public toilets (including accessibility information), post offices, information centers
- Walking routes, with walking time from sign location
- Secondary information, to be included where appropriate (p 13):
  - Shared paths (ped/bike)
  - Motorcycle and bicycle parking
  - Public transportation routes, walking and biking routes
  - Seating, private toilets, baby change facilities, ATMs, public phones, picnic areas, skate areas, drinking fountains, playgrounds
  - Building access ramps, street/footpath gradients, elevators
  - Index of destinations and grid references
  - Legend showing key to symbols/color coding
  - Multilingual labeling
- Directional signs (fingers pointing to different destinations on one signpost) are useful supplements to maps (p 8)
  - Allows for additional destinations to be added
  - Provides positive directions
  - Intuitive for users
  - Can be seen over 360 degrees
  - Guidelines for finger signs (p 12)
    - Where an area has a large concentration of destinations close together, it may be unwieldy to list them all on separate finger signs pointing in the same direction; use a “generic” label, and only mention individual destinations at decision points
    - Limit finger signs to four or five in one direction
    - Finger signs should follow the way a pedestrian will walk rather than “as the crow flies”
- Trail marker signs provide walkers reassurance that they are on the right track (p 8)
- Identification signs provide reassurance that a pedestrian has arrived in a particular precinct or destinations; also include banners (p 8)
- Signage location strategy should be based on locating signs at “decision points on the pedestrian network, such as (p 3):
  - Trip origins (e.g. transit stops and hubs, parking lots)
  - Trip destinations (e.g., tourist attractions, community facilities, sporting venues, retail areas)
  - Areas of ambiguity (e.g., major intersections and open areas)
  - Long routes where there may be uncertainty to provide confirmation
- Signs siting (p 15)

- In the normal field of view for the proposed user; those intended to be viewed at a close distance should be mounted between 0.9 and 1.5 m above the ground
- Perpendicular to the direction of travel (within 30 degrees)
- Should not be placed in the through route
- Pedestrians reading the sign should not become an obstruction for other pedestrians or place themselves or other road users in danger
- Located where street lights or other types of light exist; or provide an additional light source
- City of Bendigo (Australia) system includes (p 7):
  - "Full Area Maps" in "prime" locations (heads-up style); show the full extent of the Bendigo CBD; also used to produce hand held maps of the area
  - "Information Panel" maps show the area of the CBD immediately in front of each panel
  - Directional signs (similar to street signs) can be attached to the IPs; point to important "off-panel" destinations

### Best Practices in Bicycle & Pedestrian Wayfinding in the Washington Region (COG/TPB, Draft May 2007)

- Bicycle wayfinding:
  - Generally follows MUTCD (p 4)
  - European signs typically show destination, direction, distance, bicycle symbol, and route number on one panel (p 5)
  - The Swiss place route signs where routes cross or change direction; often are angled for visibility. "Straight ahead" markers are placed periodically on straight stretches. (p 5)
  - Chicago has developed an alternative to the MUTCD system, which requires multiple signs; Chicago combines direction, distance, and destination on one sign, eliminates the words "Bike Route" in favor of a bicycle symbol. Placed after every turn and after every major signalized intersection, or every ¼ mile. Destination, direction, distance panel signs are placed where routes intersect. (p 6)
    - In 2006, NCUTCD Bicycle Technical Committee recommended the Chicago signage be included in the MUTCD guidelines (p 5)
- Pedestrian wayfinding:
  - No national standard (p 4)
  - Includes directionals and maps; can include more detail than those for bicyclists and motorists (p 4)
  - Usually intended to direct pedestrians over short distances (½ mile or less) (p 13)
  - Philadelphia – color coded maps and wayfinding signs for tourists
  - Maps should show the area within a reasonable walking distance – ½ mile or 1 mile radius, and show important buildings, streets, parks, and transit facilities (p 15)

**San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan, Appendix B: Bicycle Design Guidelines / Best Practices Manual**  
(SANDAG, 2008)

- Includes a short discussion on wayfinding signage (p 17)
  - Destination signage includes distance, direction, and sometimes estimated travel time
  - Route network signage shows route number and corresponding direction
    - Bike route signs – green background and white lettering; top third portion is customizable for the city or region (e.g., SF has GG Bridge)
- Examples of signage (p 16)

**Guidelines for Successful Pedestrian & Bicycle Facilities in the Denver Region**  
(Denver Regional Council of Governments, July 2010)

- Discusses wayfinding on off-street multi-use trails pathways:
  - Wayfinding signs should include directional arrows, maps, destinations, and distances to key locations (p 10)

**City of Oakland Bicycle Wayfinding Guidelines – Survey and Comparison of Other Cities**

(City of Oakland, July 2009)

- Includes images and descriptions of bicycle route signs for Oakland, Portland, Chicago, Washington DC, Berkeley, San Francisco

## Bay Area Standards & Guidelines

### Contra Costa County Trail Design Resource Handbook

(County of Contra Costa, March 2001)

- Provides drawings of and guidelines for trail signage
- Provides conceptual designs for various types of intersections, including sign locations

### MTC Transit Connectivity Report

(MTC, January 2005)

- Recommends the development of a regional wayfinding signage and information assistance program (p 24)

### MTC Transit Connectivity Plan Final Summary Report

(MTC, May 2006)

- Recommends the development of a regional wayfinding signage and information assistance program at regional transit hubs to address the following issues (Transit Connectivity Program):
  - Identification of the hub facility using operator logos (p 3-2)
  - Improved wayfinding signage within the hub to direct passengers to connecting bus stops, shuttle stops, taxi stands, bicycle/pedestrian pathways (p 3-3)
  - Clear identification of transit loading platforms, using operator logos and colors and easily read route numbers and/or destinations (p 3-3)
  - Clear identification of local transit connections, including regional and local maps (p 3-4)
  - Up-to-date information (p 3-4)
  - "Last mile" wayfinding signs to the station and bicycle parking (p 3-15)

### MTC Regional Transit Hub Signage Program Technical Standards & Guidelines

(MTC, Draft, undated)

- Provides standards for connectivity signage at Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) designated regional transit hubs within the nine San Francisco Bay Area counties, including (p 2):
  - Wayfinding signage
  - Transit information displays
  - Real-time displays
- Wayfinding program elements (p 4 to 5):
  - Hub identification signage for all user groups, including use of operator logos
  - Wayfinding signage including directional signage and maps to connecting bus stops, shuttle stops, taxi stands, bicycle routes, pedestrian routes, nearby destinations
  - Clear identification of local transit connections, including operator logos
  - Transit connectivity information:
    - Maps at both local and regional scales

- Schedule and fare information
  - Real-time information displays at various locations:
    - Directly outside the paid area
    - Within the station
    - At the stop
- Wayfinding design principles (p 5 to 6):
  - Develop wayfinding as an integral part of architecture and site design; design with clarity of wayfinding in mind; keep hubs compact
  - Analyze trip segments to nearby destinations; include directional signage at decision points; along routes between decision points to reinforce direction
  - Provide information in an appropriate sequence and level of detail and specificity
  - Recognize decision points vary among users
  - Provide continuous wayfinding leading from the local community to transit and back
  - Follow the principles of universal design: address needs of all groups, including first-time and infrequent transit riders, non-English speakers, foreign visitors, elderly, physically and mentally impaired
- Signage design principles (p 7):
  - Ensure consistency throughout MTC hubs
  - Ensure clarity, simplicity, and appropriateness
  - Meet codes and standards of local jurisdictions in public right of ways
  - Maximize graphic symbol; use concise text where appropriate
  - Ensure visibility and legibility
  - Locate signage effectively; review and modify or remove existing signage as necessary
  - Avoid over-signing; prioritize wayfinding signage
- Pictograms (p 8; images on p 9 to 12)
- Directional arrows (images and ordering conventions on p 13-16)
- Message conventions (p 16)
- Typography, abbreviations, punctuation, typeface, colors (p 16 to 19)
- Sign types:
  - Wayfinding kiosks are freestanding signs placed on the street or at the periphery of hubs (p 20 to 21; images on p 2 and 4 of Appendix-Artwork):
    - Pole-mounted, double-sided kiosks that include ID banner (top), map (middle), key (bottom)
    - North-oriented map, with “You are here” icon and walking radius (1/8-mile increments)
    - Shows operator logos, transit boarding areas, station exits, key destinations
    - Shows 511 logo and information, and contact information
  - Directional signage to direct transit users to platforms, bus stops, taxis, parking, bicycle parking, adjacent streets, exits (p 21 to 22; image on p 5 of Appendix-Artwork)
    - Use icons for each transit mode and transit information (orange “i”)
    - Use logos for operators where there is more than one operator providing the same mode
    - White text on black background
  - Transit entrance identification signage helps identify the entrance to the hub (p 22 to 23)
    - Prominently feature hub name and operating agencies’ logos

- Tailor design to station type and architecture; examples include “post/pylon sign,” and signs mounted to architecture
- Must be easily legible from a distance
- Exit identification signage (p 23; image on p 5 of Appendix-Artwork)
  - Include “exit” icon, “EXIT” text, specific number/letter naming convention for exit, street names
  - White text on green background
- Transit information displays (TIDs) (p 23 to 26; image on p 6 to 11 of Appendix-Artwork)
  - Common “look and feel” between hubs
  - Details for station map, transit stop map, transit route map, and fare/schedule information on p 24 to 26)
- Real time information displays (p 26 to 27; image on p 12 of Appendix-Artwork)

### **BART Station Access Guidelines**

*(BART, April 2003)*

- Includes wayfinding access guidelines (p 3-1 to 3-3). Key points relating to wayfinding signage include:
  - Minimize the need for signage by providing direct line-of-sight connections along pedestrian desire lines; use transparent materials
  - Provide the following maps in prominent locations in each station:
    - Map of the surrounding area with local destinations marked
    - Station plan showing locations of parking, transit connections, bicycle racks, car-sharing services, and passenger amenities

### **Access BART Final Report**

*(BART, December 2006)*

- Strategic assessment of areas around BART station areas that evaluates the trade-offs between TOD opportunities and access investments (parking garages, bicycle facilities, etc.). Provides long-term direction for BART’s TOD and access planning
- Does not include guidelines or standards for wayfinding or signage

### **City of Oakland Design Guidelines for Bicycle Wayfinding Signage**

*(City of Oakland, July 2009)*

- Destination, direction, and distance information will be included on designated bikeways. The system supports approximately 100 destinations (p 3 of PDF):
  - Primary destinations (downtown, adjoining jurisdictions) are signed at distances of up to 5 miles
  - Secondary destinations (transit stations, districts) are signed at distances of up to 2 miles
  - Tertiary destinations (parks, landmarks, colleges, hospitals, high schools) are signed at distances of up to 1 mile
- Follows the sign standards included in the MUTCD and the California MUTCD, with specific modifications and standards to provide a wayfinding system that is more robust than the state and national standards (p 3 of PDF)
- Sign types (p 4 of PDF; image of types on p 13; Bay Trail signs on p 28):

- Confirmation signs; located mid-block or far-sides, include destinations and associated distances, but not directional arrows
- Turn signs; located at near side of intersection
- Decision signs; located at near side of intersections, include destinations and associated directional arrows, but not distances
- Four to five bikeway guide signs for each directional mile of bikeway (p 5 of PDF)

### **City of El Cerrito Signage & Wayfinding Program: Graphic Standards Manual** (City of El Cerrito, July 2008)

- Program is designed to facilitate vehicular wayfinding in the City of El Cerrito to a select list of major city destinations and contribute a sense of place by creating and reinforcing a strong civic identity (p 1.1).
- Project is concentrated on San Pablo Avenue, and approaches to San Pablo Avenue from I-80 and I-580. Signage also provided at city limits (p 1.1).
- Sign types (p 1.1):
  - Wayfinding: directional information to specific destinations (images on p 2.3)
  - Identification: city identification signs at city limits and at specific destinations (images on p 2.1, 2.2)
- Mounting and placement (p 1.1):
  - Freestanding monuments
  - Post-and-panel units
  - Pole-mounted sign panels
- Materials (p 1.1; images on p 4.1):
  - Designed for durability with minimum maintenance
  - Aluminum and steel (high recycled content, highly recyclable)
  - Applied coatings kept to a minimum (reducing future maintenance and the release of VOCs)
  - Colored panels are produced using porcelain enamel
  - Aluminum components brushed with a random orbital pattern, allowed to oxidize naturally
  - Steel components fabricated with Cor-Ten, which forms its own rust-colored oxide coating
  - Hardware and fasteners are stainless steel

### **BART Chinatown Pedestrian Signage Program Standards Guide** (BART, March 2005)

- Program is designed to facilitate pedestrian wayfinding between Oakland Chinatown and the Lake Merritt and 12<sup>th</sup> Street BART stations, provide directional information to destinations in the Chinatown core and surrounding area, and strengthen placemaking by providing a graphic identity for the neighborhood. Serves as a model for other Oakland neighborhoods; the graphic panel allows for each neighborhood to develop its own graphic identity, if desired. (p A.02)
- Signs include the following information, mounted on existing light posts (p A.02; mock-ups on p C.04 to C.06):
  - Directional wayfinding information (English and Chinese) (images on B.01-B.04)
  - Graphic identity (image on B.05)
- Materials (p A.02):
  - Painted aluminum; artwork screenprinted
  - Mounting hardware is stainless steel

- Three areas, with different sign treatments (p A.02):
  - Chinatown core – includes bilingual directional information and graphic identity signage (images on B.03 and B.04)
  - Greater Chinatown – includes bilingual directional information (images on B.03 and B.04)
  - Surrounding area – includes directional information, with key messages bilingual; accent color is green instead of red (images on B.01 and B.02)

### **BART MacArthur Wayfinding Project**

*(BART, June 2009)*

- Program is designed to facilitate pedestrian wayfinding around the MacArthur BART station. Modeled after Chinatown project.
- Signs include directional information mounted on existing light posts or custom poles where necessary (mock-up images on p A.2, B.2.1, B.2.2)
- Materials (p A.1):
  - Signs are 0.12" aluminum and painted and/or silkscreened on both sides
  - Fasteners and related components are stainless steel; screws have tamper-resistant heads
- B.2.1 shows how signs are mounted to fit around existing signage

### **City of Berkeley Bicycle Boulevard Signage Program Standards Guide**

*(City of Berkeley, July 2003)*

- Program is designed to facilitate bicycle wayfinding on bicycle boulevards throughout the City of Berkeley (p 1.03)
  - Seven routes were designated as bicycle boulevards (map on p 1.06)
- Materials (p 2.1)
  - 1/8" aluminum with reflectorized sheeting on both sides; screen printed on both sides; Anti-Graffiti overlay film on both sides
- Sign Type 1 (p 1.04; image on inside cover):
  - Provide wayfinding information on bicycle boulevards
  - Include graphic identity, boulevard name, and directional information including destination and distance
  - Two-sided
  - Mounted on own posts using a custom bracket. No other signs are attached to these posts
  - Generally one sign per block in each direction
- Sign Type 2 (p 1.05; image on inside cover):
  - Provide wayfinding information near bicycle boulevards, leading cyclists to boulevards via bike lanes or routes
  - Mounted on existing sign posts or lighting poles, or new posts if necessary
  - Placement concepts:
    - Along major arterials that are not bicycle-friendly to direct cyclists to parallel bike boulevards
    - At major bicycle "generators"
- Sign Type 3 (p 1.05; image on inside cover):
  - Replace existing street signs along the boulevard, identifying the street as a bike boulevard to all users
  - Replace existing signs
- Sign Type 4 (p 1.05; image on inside cover):

- Advance street sign that informs motorists that the street they are approaching is a bike boulevard, warning motorists to look out for potential bicycle cross-traffic, and to reconsider turning onto the street
- On major streets crossing the bike boulevards
- Ideal placement on existing light poles; however, feedback is being considered as to whether these are necessary due to difficulty in placing them

## Transit Plans

### BART Short-Range Transit Plan FY08-FY17 & Capital Improvement Program FY08-FY32

(BART, September 2007)

- Provides financial forecasting and capital planning information for BART
- Mentions the following wayfinding and signage program already in progress (B-3):
  - MacArthur Station Safe Routes to Transit Grant for Improvements – developing and testing a bicycle and pedestrian wayfinding signage program. Results will be incorporated into the BART signage standards

### BART Bicycle Access and Parking Plan, Volume 1

(BART, August 2002)

- Includes recommendations for bicyclist wayfinding and signage (p 2-2, 3-1, 3-11)
  - Provide wayfinding signs on closest arterials and bikeways
  - Identify and mark separate bicycle entrance(s) to station, if preferable and available, depending on the configuration and location of existing bikeways
  - Provide signage to direct bicyclists to the location of bicycle racks
  - Provide maps and signage in the station and at exits to help bicyclists and pedestrians find the most direct route to their destination
  - Integrate bicycle-related signage with signage for other modes when possible
  - Recommends that BART develop a standard “Bicycles to BART” signage program

### Bicycles on BART Survey and State of Bicycle Access and Amenities on BART Report

(BART, November 2009)

- Results of satisfaction surveys
  - Wayfinding signage pointing to bike amenities (e.g., stairs, elevators, parking, etc.) achieved an average satisfaction rating (3/5) (p 18)
  - Wayfinding signage rated low in importance (lowest of all choices), but still rated above average (3.2/5) (p 19)

### El Cerrito del Norte BART Station Comprehensive Station Plan

(BART, June 2004)

- Recommends the following for station area wayfinding signage:
  - Pedestrian wayfinding signs along San Pablo, Cutting, Hill, and other residential streets, as appropriate (Medium term: 2006-2010; BART lead; Tier 3 funding: future BART and regional funds)
  - Bicycle wayfinding signage to and from the station (Medium term: 2006-2010; BART lead; Tier 3 funding: future BART funds)
  - Transit connectivity wayfinding signage and information within the station (Short to Medium term: 2005-2010; BART lead; Tier 3: future regional funds)

## El Cerrito Plaza BART Station Access Plan

(BART, August 2002)

- Recommends the following for station area wayfinding signage:
  - Bicycle wayfinding signage at entrances to bicycle parking, including the new City of El Cerrito lockers (Short term: up to 2005; BART and City lead; Tier 3 funding: future BART and non-BART funds)
  - Bicycle wayfinding signage from the station to surrounding key bikeways (Short term: up to 2005; BART and City lead; Tier 3 funding: future BART and non-BART funds)
  - In-station wayfinding signs directing BART passengers to and from the station and other major local destinations (Short and medium term: 2005-2010; BART and City lead; Tier 2 funding: limited parking revenue enhancement funds)
  - Signage and crosswalk markings at the Ohlone Trail crossing at Fairmount Avenue (Medium term: 2006-2010; City and BART lead; Tier 3 funding: future BART and non-BART funds)
- AC Transit has initiated a pilot wayfinding project to improve navigation for visually impaired patrons within the bus intermodal area; this project included placing tactile strips (6" wide bar tile) from the fare gates to the bus stop poles closest to Fairmount Avenue

## Richmond BART Station Comprehensive Station Plan

(BART, June 2004)

- Recommends the following for station area wayfinding signage:
  - Wayfinding signage along local streets and throughout the transit village, in particular, Nevin, Barrett, and Macdonald Avenues. Ensure that the Transit Village and BART pathfinding signage are compatible (Long term: 2010+; BART lead; Tier 3 funding: future BART and City funding)
  - Bicycle wayfinding signage within the Transit Village and surrounding neighborhoods (Short term: up to 2005; Funded – included in RTV project)
  - Bicycle signage on key access bike routes, including Macdonald Avenue from Richmond Parkway to San Pablo Avenue; Harbour Way from Richmond Marina to Richmond BART; 17<sup>th</sup>/19<sup>th</sup> Street corridor from Richmond BART to Market Street (City of San Pablo) (Medium and long term: 2005-2010; City lead; Tier 3 funding: future regional or local bike/ped programs; City of Richmond; Measure C Renewal funds)
  - Vehicular wayfinding from I-80 and Richmond Parkway to station (Medium term: 2006-2010; BART lead; Tier 2 funding: limited parking revenue enhancement funds)
  - Vehicular wayfinding signs along Macdonald and Barrett Avenues to station (Medium term: 2006-2010; BART lead; Tier 2 funding: limited parking revenue enhancement funds)

## Richmond BART Station Access Plan

(BART, August 2002)

- See Comprehensive Station Plan (similar recommendations)

### **WCCTA Short Range Transit Plan FY08-17**

*(WCCTA, undated)*

- Provides financial forecasting and capital planning information for WCCTA
- Does not mention wayfinding or signage, other than the provision of real-time information signage

### **AC Transit Bicycle & Parking Report**

*(AC Transit, September 2009)*

- Includes a brief wayfinding and signage discussion (p 39)
- Recommends the following elements:
  - Wayfinding signs, with major destinations and distances (shows image of typical green signs); located at adjacent transit hubs, bikeways, and major arterials/collectors
  - Maps of bicycle facilities and/or preferred routes approaching bus stops and major destinations posted at the bus stop shelters/ information boards and online
  - Maps of bicycle parking locations for transit riders posted at the bus stop, and online
  - "How to Bicycle to AC Transit" info campaign – how to take a bicycle on board, how to access lockers/racks; include print, online and/or radio/television promotions

## Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plans

### 2009 Contra Costa County Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan

(Contra Costa County, October 2009)

- Includes some discussion of bicycle wayfinding signage:
  - Measure J includes funding for comprehensive wayfinding signage for Central County and West Contra Costa BART stations (p 20)
  - Recommends that the CC Transportation Authority takes the lead in working with local agencies to develop a coordinated wayfinding and informational system for CC that builds on the system recently adopted by the City of Oakland (see “Design Guidelines for Bicycle Wayfinding Signage”)
  - El Cerrito has funding for bicycle improvements, including pavement restriping, wayfinding signage, and detection loops on San Pablo Avenue, Richmond, Ashbury, Carlson, Key, Hill, Central, and Fairmount. (p E-26)

### Ohlone Greenway Master Plan

(City of El Cerrito, June 2009)

- Design Guidelines include Signage Guidelines. Types include (images of proposed examples can be found on p 29):
  - Directional/wayfinding (direct users and indicate distances to local amenities)
  - Geographical/identity (street-type signs at street intersections)
  - Recreational (distance markers)
  - Safety (warning signs for traffic conflict areas, and “rules of the road” etiquette signs)
  - Interpretive (educational, historical, habitat, or other sign relevant to the site)

### El Cerrito Ohlone Greenway Wayfinding Program

(City of El Cerrito)

- Pilot program for wayfinding signage along the Ohlone Greenway multi-use path
- Signage includes (on one sign):
  - Identity graphic for both the Ohlone Greenway and the City of El Cerrito
  - Directional/wayfinding information to direct users to local amenities; including distances
  - Cross street
  - Contact information

### City of Albany Bicycle Master Plan

(City of Albany, February 2003)

- Recommends the installation of signs along bike routes (p 14)

### Buchanan Bicycle & Pedestrian Path Project

(City of Albany, website)

- Buchanan Street bicycle path project was first envisioned in the Albany Bicycle Master Plan to close the east-west gap between the Ohlone Greenway and the Bay Trail

- Aligns path on south side of Marin Ave, south side of Buchanan St, crossing to the north side of Buchanan St at Taylor or Pierce St

### **City of El Cerrito Circulation Plan for Bicyclists & Pedestrians**

*(City of El Cerrito, June 2007)*

- Includes some discussion of bicycle wayfinding signage:
  - Recommends signage improvements to provide a safer connection between the Ohlone Greenway and San Pablo Avenue on the following streets (p 41):
    - Knott Ave, Blake St (near El Cerrito del Norte BART)
    - Manila Ave, Portola Dr, Waldo Ave (in between Del Norte and El Cerrito Plaza BART)
    - Lincoln Ave (near El Cerrito Plaza BART)
  - Recommends the installation of wayfinding signage on the completed network of Class I, II, and III facilities. Recommends coordination with BART and the Bay Trail to ensure complementary and effective signs. (p 51)
    - Signage and striping should conform to the 2006 California MUTCD
    - All signs should convey the “Four D’s”: Direction, Destination, Distance, and Distinction
    - Page 88-90 details the segments to be included in the Wayfinding Signage Project

### **City of El Cerrito Pedestrian Safety Assessment**

*(City of El Cerrito, May 2009)*

- Recommends directional signage for trail users at Cutting Boulevard and Ohlone Greenway (near Del Norte BART), indicating BART access and the Ohlone Greenway

### **City of Richmond Pedestrian Safety Assessment**

*(City of Richmond, May 2010)*

- Does not mention wayfinding signage

### **City of Richmond Bicycle Master Plan**

*(City of Richmond, September 2010)*

- Recommends a comprehensive wayfinding signage program, especially to connect the on-street and off-street bike network (p 52)
- Design Guidelines recommend the adoption of a system similar to the one that was adopted by the City of Oakland. The green sign system includes the following types (p 181; images on p 183):
  - Confirmation signs: confirm that a cyclist is on a designated bikeway; often located mid-block or on the far side of intersections, and include destinations and distances
  - Turn signs: indicate where a bikeway turns from one street onto another street; located on the near side of intersections, and include directional arrows
  - Decision signs: mark the junction of two or more bikeways; located on the near side of intersections, and include destinations and directional arrows

### City of Albany San Pablo Streetscape Master Plan

(City of Albany, February 2001)

- Establishes a schematic design plan for the San Pablo Avenue corridor within Albany (p 1)
- Does not include provision of signage other than cast iron “City of Albany” entry features (Figure 8)

### City of El Cerrito and City of Richmond San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan

(Cities of El Cerrito and Richmond, Draft, July 2009)

- Recommends the following bicycle and signage improvements:
  - Provide signage to highlight bicycle and pedestrian routes and connections with the Ohlone Greenway (vol 2, p 57)
  - Provide vehicular, pedestrian, and bicyclist wayfinding signage to the two BART stations, the Ohlone Greenway, major bus stops, and key community amenities such as the Community Center and Theater (vol 2, p 57)
  - Build off of the recently established streetscape signage conventions from the City of El Cerrito; coordinate colors, shapes, and graphics on signage with both the Cities of Richmond and El Cerrito’s signage systems (vol 2, p 57)
  - Emphasize connections to the Ohlone Greenway from the Del Norte BART station and San Pablo Avenue. Design signage and layout of plazas to announce entrances to the Ohlone Greenway (vol 2, p 62; p 69)

### City of Pinole Three Corridors Specific Plan

(City of Pinole, May 2010)

- Provides guidelines on signage (p 8.0-20):
  - Signage can be used to provide a unifying theme for the Specific Plan Areas – recommends that each area have a logo and signage program to distinguish it from other areas of Pinole (e.g., Old Town sub-area of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan has an existing distinct logo and signage program)
  - Discusses vehicular directional signage, street signage, and street banners.
- Recommended wayfinding project:
  - Develop and implement wayfinding system and comprehensive signage program for Old Town and other Specific Plan Corridors, providing informational kiosks and signage oriented to pedestrians (4-7 year time range; lead departments are Community Development and Public Works; possible funding includes Redevelopment/ Grants) (p 10.0-15)