



December 14, 2009

**To: Matt Bonanno, City of Richmond  
 Josh Meyer, Local Government Commission  
 Meghan Mitman, Fehr and Peers  
 Richmond Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee**

**Fm: Nancy Baer**

**Re: Potential Richmond Pedestrian Safety Assessment (PSA) and Pedestrian Plan (PP) Walk Audit Areas**

Having been asked for input on potential locations for pedestrian assessment and improvement, I reviewed various historical and current documents and used my familiarity with completed and planned projects in the City to complete the following chart.

The documents reviewed included the pedestrian collision map completed by CCHS and the City in 2006, selected pages of the draft Land Use Element of the General Plan, the PSA Technical Guide, and the City's application to Cal Trans for the Pedestrian Master Plan. Matt and I also had a phone conversation that resulted in the recommendations for the PSA Walk Audit Sites.

1. The 8 locations below are identified in the LU Element as change areas for future mixed-use, pedestrian friendly development.

Area	Collision Hot Spot	Low-Income Diverse Neighborhood	Notes	Walk Audit during PSA or PP?
Downtown, around the BART Station, and along Macdonald Ave.	No, but lower Macdonald around 4 <sup>th</sup> Street is/was	Yes	Pedestrian improvements are already completed from Harbour to 19 <sup>th</sup> , and at the eastern end of Macdonald. From 19 <sup>th</sup> to 37 <sup>th</sup> has not been designed, nor have streets coming in to the BART Station, from both north and south	PSA
San Pablo Avenue		No	Neighboring Cities of El Cerrito and San Pablo have San Pablo Avenue Specific Plans in progress. The El Cerrito one includes Macdonald/San Pablo. There is a larger regional effort to turn San Pablo Avenue into a "world class boulevard".	PSA?
23 <sup>rd</sup> Street	Yes, 3 hot spots	Yes	Streetscape Improvement Plan for 23 <sup>rd</sup> Street was completed in 2008, significant ped improvements already planned.	None needed
Harbour Way	No, but collision maps shows significant	Yes	Identified as one of the Gateways to Richmond in GP, and, at the intersection with Cutting, a node for mixed use pedestrian development	PSA and PP, could be done with Cutting as

	collision density along its length, particularly in the downtown area and N. to Pennsylvania			one area
Cutting	Yes, at Carlson, where the RR crossing is. Kennedy High Students living on south side have to cross this to get to school		Prior to the completion of Hwy 580, Cutting provided access to the San Rafael Bridge. It is a wide street no longer needed for traffic and the space can be reclaimed for public use. In the GP there were some very compelling simulations that shows Cutting with a park like atmosphere and lots of ped/bike improvements	PSA and PP, could be done with Harbour, as one area
Carlson	Yes, at Cutting, as above	Yes, west of 47 <sup>th</sup> . No, east of 47 <sup>th</sup>	Matt suggested a Walk Audit from the I-80 overcrossing/Tehama south to the El Cerrito Border. This is potentially a very walkable area near San Pablo Avenue, but Carlson is quite daunting. New striping is currently underway, and it has been identified as a potential bike route	PSA
Marina Way	No	Yes	Identified in GP to be developed as a Gateway street and connector from the waterfront to downtown, with some nodes developed at Cutting and Ohio (near the Richmond Greenway). The first few blocks south of the BART Station are currently identified as a bike route, and may be part of the bike plan currently being initiated by the City.	PP
Ohio	No	Yes	Buildings with an address on Ohio back up to the Richmond Greenway. Envisioned as a mixed use street with nodes at Harbour and Marina and a stronger neighborhood character favoring peds and bikes.	PP

2. The following areas have been discussed as focus areas for Pedestrian Plan, but are not part of the Change Areas identified in the General Plan. They have various origins, as described.

Area	Collision Hot Spot?	Low-Income Diverse Neighborhood	Notes	Walk Audit during PSA or PP?
Pennsylvania	No, but enough to raise concern	Yes	The City identified Peres School and the neighborhood surrounding it as one of the priority areas for implementation of the GP Health & Wellness Element, which is currently underway. At a recent community meeting, residents identified Pennsylvania Avenue outside of the school as a dangerous	PP

			one, where traffic is fast and sometimes cars do “donuts”. Until the Richmond Parkway was constructed, Pennsylvania went through to Garrard. Now there is a concrete sound barrier there, and 4 traffic lanes where 2 would be adequate. This space could be reclaimed for a higher use.	
North Richmond	No, but certainly enough collision density to be concerned about.	Yes, likely the lowest income area of the City	Harbour Way and then 7 <sup>th</sup> Street meander into N. Richmond from the Iron Triangle, becoming 3 <sup>rd</sup> St after it goes under the RR tracks. On the county side of N. Richmond, there have been significant improvements to the block that includes the Center for Health and Senior Housing. This is a very neglected corner of the community, and deserves consideration in this planning process.	PP
Vale Rd./29th	No	Yes	This was on Matt’s list and is just inside the Richmond border near Dr’s Medical Center, which will be expanded to replace the Richmond Health Center with \$12 mil in stimulus package funds. When the new health center is developed, it would make sense to review access from within Richmond via 29 <sup>th</sup> St. to the Health Center. If changes are needed they should be consistent with the “Complete Street” concept.	Premature, but worth keeping an eye on
Yellow Brick Road	N/A	Yes, mostly	The Yellow Brick Road (YBR) concept was developed by a group of young people who mapped safe routes to and from school in the Iron Triangle. In addition to referencing the Wizard of Oz, it refers to the historic Ford Building, which is made out of yellow brick. The YBR concept is being embraced by community members planning park to school improvements, and likely will be adopted by Groundwork Richmond, a new non-profit organization.	N/A, but a cool and very local concept that has some community traction and the Ped Plan could help shape
Greenway Fingers	N/A	Yes	Groundwork Richmond – which will begin outdoor improvement projects on the Richmond Greenway and then more broadly throughout the community – has identified the concept of “fingers” extending from the Greenway, which are both green and pedestrian-friendly	N/A, as above, a uniquely local idea that can be brought to life through the Ped Plan

### 3. Recommendations and more notes:

- a. As indicated above, per Matt’s and my discussion, Macdonald from 19<sup>th</sup> – 37<sup>th</sup>, Cutting, Harbour, and Carlson should be part of the PSA Walk Audit. San Pablo Avenue should be considered for the PSA process as well

because it is not a good candidate for it does not border low-income neighborhoods, it is not necessarily a good candidate for the Caltrans funded Ped Plan

- c. The Cutting/Harbour Way area may be worth doing a Walk Audit both during the PSA and the Ped Plan, since the PSA does not allow for broad resident involvement and the Ped Plan does.
- d. What about Barrett? It is getting a new “road diet” with bike lane striping and signage. Does it need further pedestrian attention?
- e. All of the others should be considered as Walk Audit sites during the Ped Planning process, but we may have to whittle it down a little. These are all site where there is a significant need/opportunity for involvement from interested residents as well as relevant development or community improvement efforts.
- f. I would really like to fit in the Yellow Brick Road, (safe routes between schools and other key destinations, such as parks and community centers) and Greenway Fingers into this process somewhere.
- g. There are a couple of issues that don’t seem to fit anywhere in this scenario, but are important nonetheless. 1) Over the last 10 years or so there has been a big hue and cry in the North & East regarding traffic calming in general and Roosevelt Avenue in particular. Roosevelt is a neighborhood street with no traffic controls, and thus people zoom along it all the time. In N&E and Richmond Annex (and possibly other neighborhoods) there are some blocks with 4 way stops and some with none at all. The City practice has been for the Council to approve resident requests for stop signs over the recommendations of City staff for a more rational policy. Can this fit into the PSA or the Ped Plan somewhere?