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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 VISION, PRIORITIES, & STRATEGIES
1.2 WHAT IS ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION?
1.3 PLAN SETTING
1.4 RELATIONSHIP TO MONTCLAIR SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL (SRTS) PLAN
1.5 HOW TO USE THIS PLAN
PLAN VISION

A City of Montclair that is healthier and more equitable due to safer and more connected roadways through the provision of active transportation options.
1.1 PLAN PRIORITIES & STRATEGIES

Contribute to a healthier Montclair

- The Plan will strive to improve the physical and mental well-being of Montclair community members.
- Promote and expand existing programs that encourage different groups to be more active.
- Create new programs such as walking tours, group hikes, or bicycling events that encourage Montclair community members to get active together.
- Engage in campaigns to educate community members about the benefits of active transportation.

Provide a safe active transportation system

- The Plan will create a safer Montclair for community members to partake in active transportation.
- Reduce vehicle collisions involving bicyclists and pedestrians through improved street design.
- Address existing gaps in the bikeway and walkway network through the construction of new bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
- Remove infrastructural barriers to walking and biking.
- Develop educational programs to teach community members about existing city, state, and federal active transportation-related regulations.
- Adopt a citywide policy that addresses bike riding on sidewalks.
- Explore a citywide policy that discourages the creation of new driveways.
Connect people to destinations

The Plan will develop a more connected active transportation network that would allow community members to have more convenient access to local and regional destinations.

Strategy 1
Implement a connected network of active transportation facilities on primary east-west and north-south corridors.

Strategy 2
Prioritize active transportation infrastructure projects at important community locations such as schools, community centers, parks, civic institutions, commercial districts, and employment centers.

Strategy 3
Invest in active transportation infrastructure that links population centers to transportation facilities such as transit stations and regional trails that allow for regional travel.

Strategy 4
Work with nearby jurisdictions and regional agencies regularly to discuss forthcoming plans about active transportation projects and leverage opportunities to enhance regional connectivity.

Encourage Equitable Outcomes

The Plan will aspire towards a Montclair where community members will have access to equitable transportation outcomes.

Strategy 1
Prioritize infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects that serve communities with the highest needs.

Strategy 2
Develop educational, encouragement, and engagement programs that are inclusive and culturally-sensitive to the Montclair community.
Promote placemaking and a vibrant community

The Plan will contribute to a livelier and more economically-vibrant Montclair by leveraging opportunities from increased use of active transportation.

Strategy 1
Identify locations for and install street furniture, public art, and short-term bicycle parking at key community locations such as schools, community centers, parks, civic institutions, commercial districts, and employment centers.

Strategy 2
Collaborate with local businesses to identify and develop strategies for end-of-trip amenities such as long-term bicycle parking and showers.

Strategy 3
Work with local retailers to offer pedestrians and bicyclists incentives to shop in Montclair.

Strategy 4
Activate streets through programs and events such as open streets events and bike rodeos.

1.2 WHAT IS ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION?

Active transportation, also known as active mobility, refers to the type of transportation that uses human power to get from one place to another. It typically includes modes of transportation such as walking and biking.
1.3 PLAN SETTING

Improving active transportation infrastructure in the City of Montclair can be beneficial to the City’s residents, businesses, and visitors. The City is home to approximately 40,000 residents. It is located 35 miles east of Downtown Los Angeles in San Bernardino County. With warm weather almost all year round and a flat terrain, the City offers many opportunities for more active transportation activities to occur.

THE CASE FOR ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION IN MONTCLAIR

HEALTH & SAFETY
Better active transportation infrastructure can improve the health and safety of Montclair community members. In the five-year period between 2014-2018, a total of 163 pedestrian and bicycle-related collisions occurred in Montclair. Of these collisions, 84 involved a pedestrian and 79 involved a bicyclist. These collisions accounted for approximately 14% of all collisions.

An analysis of citations issued by the Montclair Police also supports the need for better active transportation infrastructure. Between 2013 and 2017, Montclair Police issued more than 15,500 citations. Of these, 65.1% (approximately 10,100 citations) were related to traffic safety. Of the citations related to traffic safety, 29.5% were cited as a result of motorists failing to stop at a stop sign limit, crosswalk, or entrance of intersection, and another 27.3% were due to motorists failing to obey Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) regulatory signs and signals.

EQUITY
Many residents live in areas considered a “Disadvantaged Community”. A Disadvantaged Community is an area that is disproportionately vulnerable to multiple sources of pollution and other environmental risk factors, and the designation is based upon multiple sources of environmental and socio-economic data. Of the eight census tracts that are fully within the City, seven of them are considered disadvantaged, some of which have a score in the 90th percentile or greater. Active transportation options could provide alternatives to address some of the environmental burdens that Montclair residents bear.

Active transportation could be particularly beneficial to low-income communities or households with limited vehicle access. In Montclair, the area south of Kingsley Street between Mills Avenue and Central Avenue has a high concentration of households with a low Median Household Income. Meanwhile, more than a third of residents (38.8%) have no access to a vehicle or one vehicle. Active modes of transportation could offer these residents an additional means of getting around.

CONNECTIVITY
The demand for active transportation facilities is also evident in the City’s existing pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. The City’s existing bicycle infrastructure consists of 0.75 miles of Class I bike trails and 4.4 miles of Class II bike lanes, many of which are recent improvements. Existing bicycle infrastructure offers limited East-West or North-South connectivity, and they provide limited access to the adjacent cities of Pomona, Claremont, Upland, and Ontario. The City
has 770,215 linear ft. of existing sidewalk and 229,133 linear ft. of missing sidewalk. Approximately a quarter of the City (22.93%) is still in need of sidewalks.

The City’s existing pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure is adequate. However, much more can be done. Approximately 72% of the City’s area is connected by corridors with low Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) - a measure of the comfort of roadways for bicyclists. Furthermore, findings from the Pedestrian Level of Comfort (LOC) analysis showed that almost the entire city is connected by roadways that are comfortable for pedestrians. Despite this, many corridors that offer key East-West and North-South connectivity receive poor rankings in both analyses. This finding supports the need to continue the work for better active transportation infrastructure in the city.

1.4 RELATIONSHIP TO MONTCLAIR SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PLAN

The Montclair Active Transportation Plan and Montclair Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Plan are closely related to each other. Both plans focus on providing active transportation improvements in the City; however, while the Montclair ATP is a citywide effort, the Montclair SRTS Plan focuses on the active transportation needs of individual schools.

1.5 HOW TO USE THIS PLAN

This document is comprised of four remaining chapters that form the four pillars of the Montclair Active Transportation Plan. Chapters 2 & 3 offer a description of the community engagement process that took place and provide an understanding of the community’s needs. The Montclair Active Transportation Network and detailed recommendations for priority corridors are provided in Chapter 4. The Plan concludes with Chapter 5, which lays out the implementation strategy for the recommendations discussed in the previous chapter.

The Plan also includes six appendices, each providing additional information to support the content discussed in the Plan.
Chapter 2

COMMUNITY INPUT

2.1 INTRODUCTION
2.2 OUTREACH STRATEGIES
2.3 OUTREACH TIMELINE
2.4 PUBLIC WORKSHOPS AND COMMUNITY EVENTS
2.5 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
2.6 SURVEY
2.7 ONLINE PLATFORM
2.1 INTRODUCTION

Community engagement was an integral and critical component of the Montclair Active Transportation Plan. The Montclair ATP is a guidance document that seeks to serve the Montclair community’s active transportation needs. Through effective public outreach strategies, the Montclair ATP team had opportunities to listen, engage, and respond to the community’s concerns, needs, and input.

This chapter summarizes the outreach efforts that occurred between September 2019 and September 2020. A more detail discussion of the outreach approach can be found in Appendix B: Outreach and Engagement Plan. Summaries of individual outreach events are available in Appendix C: Summary Sheets.

2.2 OUTREACH STRATEGIES

The Montclair ATP team used a customized set of outreach strategies to engage with Montclair’s diverse communities, many of whom speak Spanish.

Project Branding
The Montclair ATP team developed a project logo and project style templates to use for all communications materials.

Collaborative Partnerships
Collaboration with community stakeholders provided a forum for open discussions between members of the community and the Montclair ATP team. Community stakeholders brought a range of unique perspectives towards the development of the Plan.

Dual-Language Outreach
Outreach activities, from workshop notifications to participation at public events, were conducted in both English and Spanish to engage with the large Hispanic population.
Chapter 2: Community Input

“The Montclair Active Transportation Plan and Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan are long-awaited and much-needed. The Plans will play a vital role in encouraging and promoting healthy habits and active transportation in the City of Montclair.”

- Mayor Javier Dutrey

Workshops and Community Events

Participation in community events and workshops allowed for the direct exchange of ideas between the Montclair community and the project team.

Online Engagement

Online engagement opportunities supplemented in-person communication strategies to provide opportunities for those that can’t attend workshops or community events to participate in the planning process.
2.3 OUTREACH TIMELINE

2.4 PUBLIC WORKSHOPS AND COMMUNITY EVENTS

The Montclair ATP team hosted one public workshop and five Walking Safety Assessments (WSA) to seek input from the Montclair community. Through this effort, the project team engaged with more than 150 community members who provided many insightful comments toward the project.
Community Kick-Off Workshop
(Tuesday, September 3, 2019)

The ATP Team presented to more than 15 elected officials and community members at the Community Kick-off Workshop. The workshop was co-hosted with a workshop for the Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan since both projects had similar goals. The goal of the event was to introduce the Montclair Active Transportation Plan effort to the Montclair community and identify concerns and potential improvements.
Montclair High School Walking Safety Assessment
(Tuesday, September 10, 2019)

The ATP team hosted a Safe Routes to School seminar with Montclair High School students. The event provided opportunities for student to identify barriers and challenges that they face while walking and biking to school and offered a forum to help them develop their leadership skills. A total of 38 people attended the seminar, which was comprised of 35 students and 3 school staff members.
Buena Vista Arts - Integrated Magnet School Walking Safety Assessment
(Thursday, September 12, 2019)

The ATP team met with 13 school staff and parents to discuss concerns that students face while walking and biking to and from Buena Vista Arts Integrated Magnet School. The event was held jointly with the Vernon Middle School Walking Safety Assessment. At the workshop, the ATP team documented participants’ concerns and discussed potential solutions.
Montclair Senior Walking Safety Assessment
(Wednesday, October 16, 2019)

The ATP Team hosted a Walking Safety Assessment for seniors at the Montclair Senior Center. At the event, seniors participated in a virtual walk using Google Earth where a facilitator guided the participants along different streets in Montclair and discussed their concerns. Some seniors also shared photos of neighborhood streets and intersections where issues exist.
San Antonio Creek Channel Walking Safety Assessment  
(Thursday, November 21, 2019)

The ATP team led a Walking Safety Assessment at the Montclair Youth Center to discuss opportunities for the San Antonio Creek Channel. At the workshop, attendees participated in a lively round table discussion. They also took a virtual walk around the channel and adjacent streets, and they brainstormed a vision for a multi-use trail along the San Antonio Creek Channel.
Montclair TransCenter/ Metrolink Pop-Up Workshop
(Wednesday, February 26, 2020)

On Wednesday, February 26, 2020, the ATP team had a Pop-up Workshop at the Montclair Transcenter/ Metrolink Station. The purpose of the pop-up workshop was to engage with transit riders to discuss barriers to taking active modes of transportation to and from the location as well as throughout the City. Over the course of the event, the ATP team engaged with 35 participants and gathered many valuable comments.
2.5  TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was also established for the Montclair ATP. TAC Members were made up of City, County, SCAG, and Caltrans staff along with community stakeholders. TAC members lent their time and shared their expertise through the meetings. Each meeting was designed to address and gather feedback for a different component of the Plan. Their participation in the effort provided a breadth of community insights towards the development of the Montclair Active Transportation Plan.

2.6  SURVEY

The Montclair Active Transportation Plan survey was designed for the Montclair community to give their feedback for the project. The survey attempts to understand community members’ travel behavior and preferences for intervention to encourage more active transportation activities. In total, the Project Team collected more than 100 surveys.

The survey was printed in both English and Spanish to offer community members the opportunity to share their input. It was available in both paper and digital formats. Surveys were distributed at various locations throughout the city and at community events.

The Montclair ATP survey and survey results can be found in Appendix E: Project Survey. Findings from survey results are discussed in Section 3.3 Community Needs Assessment.

2.7  ONLINE PLATFORM

In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, two Online Platforms were developed to engage with Montclair community members for the remainder of the project effort. The Online Platforms - one in English and another in Spanish - provided a comprehensive overview of the project and proposed treatments, and it included opportunities for feedback of proposed treatments.

The Online Platforms received 76 clicks from community members. Of the clicks, 23 were derived from the Spanish Platform and 53 were from the English Platform. Comments received from the platforms were incorporated into the recommendations.
Chapter 3

PLANNING CONTEXT

3.1 INTRODUCTION
3.2 EXISTING PLANS, POLICIES, & PROGRAMS
3.3 COMMUNITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT
3.1 INTRODUCTION

This Chapter provides a summary of the existing planning context that contributed to the recommendations identified in Chapter 4: Recommendations. It is comprised of two sections:

- Existing Plans, Policies, and Programs
- Community Needs Assessment

The Existing Plans, Policies, and Program section identified the existing and ongoing planning-related efforts and programs in the City of Montclair and the broader region. It also discusses how the Plan contributes to or complements existing endeavors to achieve the vision and goals set forth in the planning documents.

The following section complements the Existing Plans, Policies, and Programs section by discussing the City’s active transportation needs. Through rigorous analyses of demographic, travel, health, and infrastructure data, the section sheds light on pertinent questions such as who needs active modes of transportation to get around, where are the key barriers, and what are opportunities for improvement.

3.2 EXISTING PLANS, POLICIES, AND PROGRAMS

The Montclair Active Transportation Plan is a vehicle to help the City achieve its vision and goals as they relate to active transportation. In developing the recommendations that aspire to help achieve these goals, an important step involves understanding the relevant existing policies and programs.

Municipal Planning Efforts
Between 2018 and 2020, the City had three major planning efforts where active transportation played an integral role in shaping the City’s future. These included the General Plan update, the Systemic Safety Analysis Safety Report, and the Safe Routes to School Plan.

The planning efforts complemented the City’s three specific plans: North Montclair Downtown Specific Plan (2017) which is an update from the North Montclair Specific Plan (1998) and the Holt Boulevard Specific Plan (1991).

Municipal Initiatives and Programs
The City had undertaken many initiatives and programs to improve the health and safety of people walking and biking. In 2010, the City established Healthy Montclair to promote the health and well-being of residents. Active transportation ideas were an important part in the strategy. In 2019, the City enacted Ordinance Municipal Code 8.28.020 (A) which allowed the City to issue citations to pedestrians who cross the street while demonstrating behaviors identified to be distracted.

The planning efforts complemented the City’s three specific plans: North Montclair Downtown Specific Plan (2017) which is an update from the North Montclair Specific Plan (1998) and the Holt Boulevard Specific Plan (1991).
Regional Planning Efforts
Active transportation, either as a mode of travel, recreation, or both, is also an important component of many planning efforts across San Bernardino County and the greater Southern California region. The Montclair ATP will help the City attain the goals set forth in or align with the efforts identified in planning documents such as the Non-Motorized Transportation (San Bernardino County), Pedestrian Points of Interest Plan (San Bernardino County), and Connect SoCal (Southern California Association of Governments).

Planning Efforts At Adjacent Cities
Adjacent municipalities also have many planned active transportation projects. A network that connects with these planned projects can help improve regional connectivity. The ATP team reviewed planning efforts from adjacent cities to ensure that recommendations were consistent with and provide pedestrian and bicycle connectivity to planned projects.

A list of relevant city and regional planning efforts that were reviewed are identified in Table 3-1. Appendix A: Planning Context provides a detailed description of each planning-related document and program as they pertain to Montclair’s active transportation effort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Current and Ongoing Planning-Related Efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Municipal Planning Efforts            | • Montclair General Plan (2020)  
• Montclair Systemic Safety Analysis Report (2020)  
• Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan (2020)  
• North Montclair Downtown Specific Plan (2017)  
• North Montclair Specific Plan (1998)  
• Holt Boulevard Specific Plan (1991) |
| Municipal Initiatives and Programs    | • Healthy Montclair  
• Municipal Code 8.28.020 (A)                                                  |
| Regional Planning Efforts             | • Connect SoCal (Southern California Association of Governments)  
• Non-Motorized Transportation Plan (SBCTA)  
• Points of Interest Pedestrian Plan (SBCTA)  
• Access to Transit Access for Cyclists and Pedestrian Report (SBCTA)  
• Safe Routes to School Phases I & II Plans (SBCTA)  
• Comprehensive Pedestrian Sidewalk Inventory Plan (SBCTA) |
| Adjacent Agency Planning Effort       | • City of Ontario (San Bernardino County)  
• City of Upland (San Bernardino County)  
• City of Chino (San Bernardino County)  
• City of Pomona (Los Angeles County)  
• City of Claremont (Los Angeles County) |

Table 3-1: Summary Of Plans, Policies, And Programs Reviewed
3.3 COMMUNITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The Community Needs Assessment highlights the Montclair community’s active transportation needs and opportunities through multiple angles. Analyses of demographic and travel characteristics shed light on who are the current and prospective users of active transportation. An examination of health and safety data allowed the ATP team to identify areas where community members can benefit from active transportation improvements. Meanwhile, an understanding of existing environmental and infrastructure conditions provided insights on barriers and opportunities to more active transportation activities in Montclair. Collectively, the findings from this section help inform the recommendations in Chapter 4: Recommendations.

The discussions from this section are an excerpt from the Community Needs Assessment. The full report is available in Appendix D: Community Needs Assessment - Full Report.
Chapter 3: Planning Context
Vehicle, Pedestrian-Involved, and Bicycle-Involved Collisions

Analysis of pedestrian and bicycle collisions supported the need for better pedestrian and bicycle facilities to protect Montclair community members who walk and bike. In the five-year period between 2014-2018, a total of 163 pedestrian and bicycle-related collisions occurred in Montclair. Of these collisions, 84 involved a pedestrian and 79 involved a bicyclist. These collisions accounted for approximately 14% of all collisions. Since 2015, the total number of bicyclist and pedestrian-involved collisions per year has gradually declined. During the study period, bicyclist-involved collisions in Montclair saw a large decrease while pedestrian-involved collisions saw a slight increase over the same timeframe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Collisions</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Collisions</td>
<td>1174</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ped &amp; Bike Collisions</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-2: Summary Of Total Pedestrian And Bicycle Collisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Collisions</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely Injured</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible Injury</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint of Pain</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-3: Injury Status Of Victims That Were Involved In Pedestrian Collisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Collisions</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely Injured</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible Injury</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint of Pain</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-4: Injury Status Of Victims That Were Involved In Bicycle Collisions
TOP COLLISION CORRIDORS

Of the 84 pedestrian-involved collisions, 65% occurred on ten different corridors. The top five pedestrian-involved collision corridors (with number of collisions) were:

1. Central Avenue – 12
2. Monte Vista Avenue – 9
3. Ramona Avenue – 9
4. Orchard Street – 5
5. Mills Avenue – 4

Of the 79 bicyclist-involved collisions, 67% occurred on ten different corridors. The top five bicyclist-involved collision corridors (with number of collisions) were:

1. Holt Boulevard – 12
2. Central Avenue – 9
3. Orchard Street – 6
4. Ramona Avenue – 5
5. Monte Vista Avenue – 4

PRIMARY COLLISION FACTOR

The top two most frequent collision factors for pedestrian-involved collisions were:

1. Pedestrian right-of-way
2. Pedestrian violation

1. The pedestrian right-of-way collision factor is a violation committed by the non-pedestrian party.
2. The pedestrian violation collision factor is a violation committed by the pedestrian party in which the pedestrian violated the right-of-way of the motorist or bicyclist.

Meanwhile, the top two most frequent collision factors for bicyclist-involved collisions were:

1. Automobile Right-of-Way
2. Traffic Signals & Signs

3. This violation notes that the bicyclist infringed on the automobile right-of-way, therefore being deemed at fault in the collision.
4. The traffic signals & signs collision factor illustrates sign and signal violation or notes faulty or confusing signage and signals.

Figure 3-1: Violation Categories Of Primary Collision Factors
COLLISION BY CRASH TYPE
Approximately 80% of pedestrian-involved collisions were classified as the Vehicle/Pedestrian crash type. This indicates that the collision was directly between a motorist and a pedestrian. Approximately 60% of bicyclist-involved collisions were classified as a Broadside crash; this shows that the motorists or bicyclists collided at a “T”, also known as a “T-Bone” collision.

PEDESTRIAN-INVOLVED COLLISIONS BY PEDESTRIAN ACTION
The largest portion of pedestrian-involved collisions occurred when a pedestrian was crossing at an intersection (42.9%). This was followed by collisions where a pedestrian was not crossing at a crosswalk (28.6%) and where a pedestrian was walking in the road, using the available shoulder. Collisions where a pedestrian was using the vehicle right-of-way accounted for more than half (61.5%) of all fatalities or collisions that involved severe injuries.

COLLISIONS BY TIME OF DAY, DAY OF THE WEEK, AND LIGHTING CONDITIONS
Pedestrian-involved collisions were most prevalent during morning and afternoon peak hours on weekdays while bicyclist-involved collisions saw similar trends with a slight surge of collisions occurring during midday hours on weekdays.

Pedestrian-and bicyclist-involved collisions occurred under similar lighting conditions. Approximately 67% of collisions occurred during the daylight hours and 25% occurred during the night hours where streetlights were present.
Montclair Police Citations

Analysis of citations given by enforcement officers in Montclair revealed additional hotspots and potential risks of walking and biking in the city. Between 2013 and 2017, the Montclair Police gave out more than 15,500 citations in the city. Of these, more than 10,100 were related to this study. Montclair Police gave an average of 5.67 citations per day.

Of the collisions related to this study, 29.5% were cited as a result of motorists failing to stop at a stop sign limit, crosswalk, or entrance of intersection, and another 27.3% were due to motorists failing to obey Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) or regulatory sign and signals. The most frequent time for police citations was Tuesday morning from 6:00AM-8:59AM. The top three intersections and locations with the greatest frequency of citations were Monte Vista Avenue and I-10 ramps, Central Avenue and Palo Verde Street, and along Monte Vista Avenue. Other notable intersections and locations included along Ramona Avenue and Orchard Street.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation Description</th>
<th># of Citations</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failure to stop at stop sign limit, crosswalk, or entrance of intersection</td>
<td>2978</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to obey MUTCD or regulatory sign or signal</td>
<td>2757</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to stop at red traffic signal</td>
<td>1538</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding [speed greater than in reasonable]</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning against red arrow signal</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to obey turning movement sign/signal</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe turning/lane change</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3-2: Police Citation By Violation Categories
Urban Form and Land Use

Land use and urban form in Montclair are informed by the General Plan. The vision presented in the General Plan offered many opportunities for more active transportation activities to occur.

According to the General Plan, the basic organizing place types are neighborhoods, corridors, centers, and districts. Neighborhoods form the basic building block of the city, and they are envisioned to have a mixture of social activities and functional use. Meanwhile, corridors would not only serve as transportation thoroughfares that connect neighborhoods, centers, and/or districts, but also act as drainage channels or green parkways. The corridors that were identified in the General Plan include Central Avenue, Holt Boulevard, Mission Boulevard, and Arrow Highway.

Centers are mixed-use areas that may include a mixture of jobs, civic, and cultural uses. Example of centers include major intersections such as Central Avenue & Holt Boulevard and Ramona Avenue & Holt Boulevard in the southern part of the City as well as the new downtown area in the northern portion of Montclair.

Districts are areas that focus on specific types of activities; districts could be industrial or commercial. Industrial districts include the portion of Montclair bounded by Holt Boulevard to the north, Mission Boulevard to the south, Central Avenue to the east, and the western city boundary. Commercial districts include the downtown area to the north.

The bulk of residential land uses can be found in the middle of the city between the I-10 San Bernardino Freeway and Holt Boulevard. Among the residential land uses are small groupings of public/municipal facilities and a few centers along major intersections.

Key Attractors

The City has many existing and planned local destinations that community members can reach by active modes of transportation. Key attractors in the City of Montclair can be categorized into four groups: civic facilities, parks, schools, and shopping centers. Key attractors are generally dispersed across the city. However, there are three areas where there are larger clusters of attractors: North Montclair, South Montclair, and Central Avenue.

Key attractors in the northern portion of Montclair are predominately commercial areas. The area can be loosely defined as located between Arrow Highway to the north and Palo Verde Street to the south where the I-10 San Bernardino Freeway intersects with Central Avenue. This group consists of the Montclair Place Mall and several other retail shops and restaurants that surround the area. With the development of the North Montclair Downtown Specific Plan, the City is planning a mixed-use downtown in the area as well.

Local destinations in southern Montclair are located along or in proximity to Holt Boulevard. The cluster predominately consists of small shopping centers. Development along Holt Boulevard is planned for in the Holt Boulevard Specific Plan which calls for a commercial area in the southern Montclair area.

Central Avenue is one of the City’s important thoroughfares that provides access and connectivity between north and south Montclair. Key attractors that are located along or near Central Avenue include the Montclair Civic Center, Alma Hofman Park, and several commercial areas.
2. Urban Form

The allocation of separate land use districts is already in place. This approach focuses reinvestment where viable infrastructure or infrastructure investment in existing buildings and minor improvements. Majority of the new growth investment will be directed to the downtown area, the corridors, and Arrow Highway District. Listed in the following pages are places that address “form and character” of a place. The General Plan informs the policy, regulation, and the techniques used to implement the community vision for places that address “form and character” of intended change in different nature of a place. The General Plan identifies a range of neighborhoods with a balanced mix of human activity with uses that are the basic building types within a walkable network of green corridors, and Arrow Highway District.

Montclair is a built out city that will not grow in area where redevelopments are likely to occur are programmed maintained, and areas where redevelopment areas. The stable areas are preserved and nature of intended change in different level of change ranges from reinvestment where viable infrastructure or infrastructure investment in existing buildings and minor improvements. The level of change ranges from reinvestment where viable infrastructure or infrastructure investment in existing buildings and minor improvements. Majority of the new growth investment will be directed to the downtown area, the corridors, and Arrow Highway District. Listed in the following pages are places that address “form and character” of a place. The General Plan informs the policy, regulation, and the techniques used to implement the community vision for places that address “form and character” of intended change in different nature of a place. The General Plan identifies a range of neighborhoods with a balanced mix of human activity with uses that are the basic building types within a walkable network of green corridors, and Arrow Highway District.

The basic organizing place types are a block with missing buildings, open space pedestrian oriented blocks, or completing addition of new streets may be necessary development pattern. In some instances, development that completes the prevalent public realm, to the occasional infill improvements to utility infrastructure and investments in existing buildings and minor improvements to utility infrastructure and investments in existing buildings and minor improvements. This approach focuses reinvestment where viable infrastructure or infrastructure investment in existing buildings and minor improvements. Majority of the new growth investment will be directed to the downtown area, the corridors, and Arrow Highway District. Listed in the following pages are places that address “form and character” of a place. The General Plan informs the policy, regulation, and the techniques used to implement the community vision for places that address “form and character” of intended change in different nature of a place. The General Plan identifies a range of neighborhoods with a balanced mix of human activity with uses that are the basic building types within a walkable network of green corridors, and Arrow Highway District.

3. Land Use Category

The General Plan is to protect, enhance and create complete, compact and connected neighborhoods that provide a high quality of life for residents. Montclair neighborhoods will mix a variety of residential buildings, and parks. The vision of the block of Montclair. The General Plan are the basic building types within a walkable network of green corridors, and Arrow Highway District.


daily shopping needs. schools and neighborhood centers to serve types of activities and exhibiting distinct characteristics. Districts are areas of activity that is functionally specialized with supportive uses and are somewhat more automobile-oriented. Districts play an important role in a city since they are areas emphasizing specific concentrations of jobs, civic and cultural service commercial oriented and provide districts. Some Centers are retail and transitions between neighborhoods and/or districts. Listed in the following pages are places that address “form and character” of a place. The General Plan informs the policy, regulation, and the techniques used to implement the community vision for places that address “form and character” of intended change in different nature of a place. The General Plan identifies a range of neighborhoods with a balanced mix of human activity with uses that are the basic building types within a walkable network of green corridors, and Arrow Highway District.

Figure 3-3: Land Use Map Of Montclair

Retrieved From The General Plan

Chapter 3: Planning Context
ENVIRONMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Existing Bikeways

The City has several bicycle facilities that provide bicyclists with opportunities to reach destinations within the city and beyond. However, the bicycle network could be greatly enhanced to provide even more access and better connectivity.

Montclair’s existing bicycle infrastructure is consisted of 0.75 miles of Class I Bike Trails and 4.4 miles of Class II Bike Lanes. The existing bicycle facilities within the City boundary are as followed:

• Class II Bike Lane on Orchard Street – 1.96 miles; from Mills Avenue to Benson Avenue.
• Class II Bike Lane on Mills Avenue – 1.87 miles; from Holt Boulevard to Moreno Street.
• Class II Bike Lane on San Bernardino Street – 0.32 miles; from Mills Avenue to Kimberly Avenue.
• Class II Bike Lane on Monte Vista Avenue – 0.25 mile; from northern Montclair city boundary to Arrow Highway.
• Class I Bike Path (Pacific Electric Trail) – 0.75 miles; from northwest city boundary to Central Avenue.

The two most prominent existing bicycle facilities are the Class II Bike Lanes on Orchard Street and Mills Avenue. Orchard Street provides intracity access from the eastern city boundary to the west, offering connectivity from the existing Class III Bike Route along Orchard Street in Ontario to the Class II Bike Lane on Mills Avenue. The Class II Bike Lane on Mills Avenue provides north/south access along the western portion of the city. It connects bicyclists to existing bicycle infrastructure in Pomona and Claremont, and the Pacific Electric Trail.

Existing Pedestrian Facilities - Sidewalks

The City of Montclair has a substantial amount of sidewalk coverage; however, much more can be added to close gaps in the sidewalk network. According to data collected from the Comprehensive Pedestrian Sidewalk Inventory Project from the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA), the City needs a total of 999,348 ft. of sidewalk. The City currently has 770,215 linear ft. of sidewalk, which represents 77.07% of the total amount needed. The City still needs 229,133 linear ft. of sidewalk (22.93%).

The City’s existing and missing sidewalk infrastructure are evenly spread throughout the City. Most of the existing and missing sidewalk infrastructure are located in the residential areas between the I-10 San Bernardino Freeway and State Street. State Street, which has industrial land uses, lacks sidewalk infrastructure on many portions of the roadway segment.
Figure 3-4: Montclair Existing Bikeways
Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) / Level of Comfort

Level of Traffic Stress (LTS), also referred to as Level of Comfort (LOC), is one of the transportation industry’s best practices for analyzing the comfort and connectivity of bicycle and pedestrian networks.

A traditional Bicycle LTS analysis ranks roadways segments based on the “Four Types of Cyclists”, originally structured by Roger Geller at the City of Portland:

1. No Way, No How: People unwilling to bike even if high-quality bicycle infrastructure is in place
2. Interested but Concerned: People willing to bike if high-quality bicycle infrastructure is in place
3. Enthused and Confident: People willing to bike if some bicycle-specific infrastructure is in place
4. Strong and Fearless: People willing to bike with limited or no bicycle-specific infrastructure

The Pedestrian LOC analysis complements the Bicycle LTS by providing insights for pedestrian comfort and connectivity. Table 3-6: Bicycle LTS Ranking Scheme and Table 3-7: Pedestrian LOC Ranking Scheme offer a description of each ranking. The lower the ranking is, the more comfortable and connected a roadway is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LTS 1</td>
<td>Suitable for almost all ages and bicycling abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTS 2</td>
<td>Suitable for most adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTS 3</td>
<td>Suitable for more skilled and confident bicyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTS 4</td>
<td>Not suitable for most bicyclists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-6: Bicycle LTS Ranking Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Traffic Stress</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOC 1</td>
<td>Suitable for almost all pedestrians, including children that are trained to safely cross the intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 2</td>
<td>Suitable for most adults pedestrians, but demand more attention for children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 3</td>
<td>Suitable for most adult pedestrians and older children with little or no supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 4</td>
<td>Suitable for adults and children with parental supervision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-7: Pedestrian LOC Ranking Scheme
ENVIRONMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Bicycle And Pedestrian Connectivity

The majority of the city’s existing bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure offer a low stress/high comfort active transportation network. Findings from the Bicycle LTS Connectivity Analysis showed that approximately 72% of the city’s area is connected by a bicycle LTS 1 or LTS 2 segment. Meanwhile, the Pedestrian LOC Connectivity Analysis revealed that almost the entirety of the city is connected by a pedestrian LOC 1 or LOC 2 segment.

Bicycle LTS Connectivity

Low traffic volumes and the availability of bicycle facilities were two roadway characteristics that contributed to low level of traffic stress along the majority of the city’s roadways. Areas that are accessible by an LTS 1 segment include the southern portion of Mills Avenue or along the entirety of Orchard Street. Areas that are located along the northern city border are accessible by the Pacific Electric Trail, which is classified as a LTS 1.

There are a few areas with high LTS bicycle connectivity. These include the area in the northeast portion of the City, bounded by Moreno Street and Central Street, and the area adjacent to Holt Boulevard.

Pedestrian LOC Connectivity

The vast majority of the City (97.47%) is connected by a pedestrian LOC 1 or LOC 2 segment. The pedestrian LOC linear network is weighted heavily by the presence of sidewalk. Since a majority of roadways have full or partial coverage, specifically in the north region of the City, low stress connectivity is enhanced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bicycle LTS Score</th>
<th>Square Miles</th>
<th>Percentage Shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LTS 1</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>17.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTS 2</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>54.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTS 3</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>21.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTS 4</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>6.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-8: Bicycle LTS Area Coverage By Census Block

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrian LOC Score</th>
<th>Square Miles</th>
<th>Percentage Shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOC 1</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>84.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 2</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>12.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 3</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 4</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-9: Pedestrian LOC Area Coverage By Census Block
Figure 3-5: Bicycle Level Of Traffic Stress Connectivity In Montclair

Montclair Active Transportation Plan
Figure 3-6: Pedestrian Level Of Comfort Connectivity In Montclair
Transit Connectivity

Active transportation is an important mode of transportation to travel to and from transit facilities. It provides an alternative solution to what is commonly known as the “first mile/last mile” problem for transit. The problem refers to 1) how a traveler gets to a transit facility from their origin location, and 2) after they get off transit, how do they reach their final destination.

Transit users in Montclair have four predominant transit services to choose from. Bus transit services are provided by Omnitrans, Foothill Transit, and Riverside Transit. Meanwhile, Metrolink offers commuter rail services to regional destinations.

Each bus transit provider connects the City to multiple counties and cities within Southern California. Omnitrans provides intracity connectivity and services to adjacent cities, as well as the greater San Bernardino County.

Foothill Transit has transit lines that allow for interregional travel. Its services allow transit users to reach regional destinations such as Downtown Los Angeles and the Brea Mall in Orange County.

The Riverside Transportation Authority (RTA) bus services connect Montclair to Riverside County. The RTA 204 starts at the Montclair Transit Center and passes through Ontario until it reaches the University of California, Riverside (UCR) Extension in Riverside.

The Metrolink San Bernardino Line offers rail options to Montclair community members. Passengers can take the train at the Montclair Metrolink Station which is located next to the Montclair TransCenter.

FOOTHILL GOLD LINE EXPANSION

The Montclair TransCenter is the planned terminus of the Metro Foothill Gold Line extension from Glendora. The service would offer an alternative rail service from Montclair to Downtown Los Angeles.

MONTCLAIR TRANSCENTER

The Montclair TransCenter is a regional multimodal transportation hub located in north Montclair along Richton Street and east of Monte Vista Avenue. All bus and rail transit services offer stops at the facility which offer opportunities for first/last-mile connectivity to other parts of the city.
Figure 3-7: Transit Connectivity In Montclair
SURVEY RESULTS

Purpose & Methodology

The Montclair ATP Survey aimed to gain an understanding on four topics related to walking, biking, and taking transit via walking and biking: travel behavior, attitude, perception of existing conditions, and appropriate encouragement measures.

The Montclair ATP Survey was conducted between February and October 2020. In February, the ATP team embarked on an outreach effort to collect paper surveys from Montclair community members. However, the onset of the COVID-19 Pandemic disrupted the effort. In response, the ATP team provided an online version of the survey as an activity through the Online Platforms. The survey was available in both English and Spanish.

A total of 73 community members participated in the survey. Of the respondents, slightly more than 2/3 (71%) have frequent activities in Montclair: 46% were Montclair residents, 32% were frequent visitors to the city, and 3% had employment opportunities in the city. The remaining 1/3 (19%) were not frequent visitors to the city. Data is limited resulting from the challenges of collecting during the pandemic. As a result, it should be noted that this survey should only be considered a best possible estimate of trends and public opinion within the city and not as a set of definitive conclusions.

Results & Findings

TRAVEL BEHAVIOR
The majority of respondents engaged in walking but not biking activities. Approximately 2/3 (64%) of respondents walked to a destination. Of these, 27% walked daily. In contrast, almost 4/5 (78%) of participants did not bike. Of the respondents, 11% biked a couple of times a week, and 6% biked daily or multiple times a week.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS WALKING + BIKING
Respondents were asked to pick the top three reasons they chose to walk or bike. Respondents generally had similar attitudes towards walking and biking. The majority of respondents listed walking and biking to exercise or improve their health as one of their three reasons, 77% and 40%, respectively. The second most popular response was they walk and bike for fun or recreation (36% and 21%).

CONDITIONS IN WALKING + BIKING ENVIRONMENT
Survey respondents overwhelmingly viewed the conditions for walking to be fair or better. However, that did not hold true for conditions for biking. Of the survey participants, almost 4/5 (77%) said the walking conditions in Montclair were fair or good. Another 14% said the conditions were excellent. A small minority (8%) said the conditions were poor.

In contrast, just 47% of participants felt that biking conditions were fair or better, and less than 5% said the conditions were excellent. Almost ¼ of respondents felt that the biking conditions in Montclair were poor.
ENCOURAGEMENT MEASURES
Of the respondents that selected a preference, survey participants were optimistic about different infrastructure, traffic calming, and land use measures that would encourage them to walk and bike. Respondents identified having more destinations within walking distance (80%), better lighting on roadways (74%), and slower vehicle traffic (73%) as the top three ways to encourage them to walk. To encourage biking, participants noted having more bike facilities (71%), better lighting on roadways (68%), and slower vehicle traffic (69%). These measures had a positive correlation with respondents’ perception of conditions in walking and biking.

TRANSIT
The majority of survey participants did not walk or bike to take transit. Of the respondents, 70% indicated they did not walk to take transit and 81% did not bike to take transit. 18% of respondents did indicate they walk to take transit several times a week or couple times a month, and 7% partake in that activity daily. Significantly fewer participants bike to take transit: 4% bike a couple times a month and 1% daily. Of the respondents that selected a preference, they were optimistic that better transit service (69%) would encourage them to walk to transit stops. However, approximately half the respondents noted that having more transit stops within walking or biking distance would not encourage them to walk or bike.
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4.1 INTRODUCTION

Recommendations for the Plan is comprised of three separate, yet interrelated components. They are a culmination of research findings, existing conditions analyses, community feedback, and field research. The components include:

- Active Transportation Network (ATN)
- Prioritized Corridors
- Bicycle Network
- Citywide Recommended Infrastructure Treatments
- Priority Corridor Factsheets

The components were developed to reflect the range of macro and micro-level planning approaches. The Active Transportation Network provides a roadmap for addressing community needs at the citywide scale. A toolbox of recommended infrastructure treatments provides a range of potential treatments that the City can implement along the corridors identified in the ATN. Meanwhile the improvements identified in the Priority Corridor Factsheets offer location-specific recommendations that the City can seek funding for improving existing roadway conditions along four corridors.

4.2 ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION NETWORK

The Active Transportation Network (ATN) serves as the foundation for a transportation system that prioritizes active modes of transportation. Corridors in the network would have a combination of pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure improvements, as well as treatments that would improve access to transit hubs. In total, the Active Transportation Network is comprised of 18 corridors: 9 Local Corridors and 9 Regional Corridors.

Corridors were selected to address the Montclair community’s need for and benefits from pedestrian and bicycle improvements. The criteria for corridor selection include:

- Community need and equity
- Health
- Safety
- Community support
- Accessibility and comfort
- Network connectivity

The ATN is consisted of two types of corridors: Local Corridor and Regional Corridor. Local Corridors connect to local destinations such as schools, parks, and civic institutions. Meanwhile, regional corridors provide access to regional destinations, either through connectivity to regional multi-use facilities, bikeways, or transit hubs.
Figure 4-1: Active Transportation Network
### Table 4-1: Regional Network Corridors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Length (Mile)</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arrow Highway Hwy</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>Western City Boundary</td>
<td>Benson Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>San Bernardino St</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>Mills Ave</td>
<td>Benson Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Orchard St</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>Mills Ave</td>
<td>Benson Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Holt Blvd</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>Mills Ave</td>
<td>Benson Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mission Blvd</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>San Antonio Creek Channel</td>
<td>Central Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mills Ave</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>Moreno St</td>
<td>Holt Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>San Antonio Creek Channel</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>Northern City Boundary</td>
<td>Mission Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Monte Vista Ave</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Northern City Boundary</td>
<td>Southern City Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Central Ave</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>Arrow Hwy</td>
<td>Southern City Boundary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4-2: Local Network Corridors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Length (Mile)</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Moreno St</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Mills Ave</td>
<td>Benson Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>San Jose St</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>Mills Ave</td>
<td>Monte Vista Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Palo Verde St (W of Helena)</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>Mills Ave</td>
<td>Helena Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Palo Verde St</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>Mills Ave</td>
<td>Benson Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Benito St</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>Mills Ave</td>
<td>Benson Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bandera St</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>Kingsley St</td>
<td>Central Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Howard St</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Pipeline Ave</td>
<td>Central Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ramona Ave</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Palo Verde St</td>
<td>Southern City Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Helena St</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>Palo Verde St</td>
<td>Benito St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>North Fremont Ave</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>Arrow Hwy</td>
<td>Moreno St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>South Fremont Ave</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>Palo Verde St</td>
<td>Kingsley St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Vernon Ave</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>Benson Ave</td>
<td>Brooks St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Benson Ave</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>Arrow Hwy</td>
<td>Brooks St</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 CORRIDOR PRIORITIZATION

The Corridor Prioritization Strategy uses a data-driven approach to rank each corridor in the Active Transportation Network. Table 4-3: Corridor Prioritization Categories present the categories and weights used to rank each corridor. Weighting factors are adjusted to reflect project priorities. A list of prioritized projects along with their respective ranking criteria is available in Table 4-4: Prioritized Corridors List.

The City is encouraged to consider the construction of active transportation treatments in higher-ranking corridors first. However, the City may choose to advance specific projects identified in other strategies or as certain types of funding become available. Additional analyses should be conducted periodically in response to major changes in the construction of active transportation facilities, community, population, and the environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Group Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Support</td>
<td>Vulnerable Population</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Vehicle Access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disadvantaged Community (DAC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Disability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Heart Attack Rate</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asthma Attack Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Bicycle and Pedestrian Collisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle Citations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Support</td>
<td>Resource Synergy</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility and Comfort</td>
<td>Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (LTS)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Level of Comfort (LOC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nearby Attractors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Connectivity</td>
<td>Potential Pedestrian Use</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential Bicyclist Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-3: Corridor Prioritization Categories
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Monte Vista Ave</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Holt Blvd</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kingsley St</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>San Bernardino St</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ramona Ave</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Central Ave</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>San Antonio Creek Channel</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Orchard St</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Benson Ave</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Benito St</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Vernon Ave</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Helena St</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Bandera St</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Moreno St</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mills Ave</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Arrow Highway</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Palo Verde St</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>San Jose St</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>North Fremont Ave</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Palo Verde St (W of Helena)</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>South Fremont Ave</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mission Blvd</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Howard St</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-4: Prioritized Corridors List

4.4 BICYCLE NETWORK

The Bicycle Network supplements the Active Transportation Network with more detailed recommendations about the specific bicycle facilities along with additional corridors that could benefit from bicycle facilities. The proposed Bike Network would add 36.36 miles of new bicycle facilities in the city.

The Bicycle Network recommends 3.06 miles of Class I Off-Street Shared Use Paths, 2.64 miles of Class II Bike Lanes, 2.87 miles of Class II Buffered Bike Lanes, 14.16 miles of Class IV Separated Bike Lanes, 5.92 miles of...
Class III Bike Boulevards, and 7.71 miles of Class III Bike Routes.

Of the recommended Class IV Separated Bike Lanes, 12.34 miles are recommended to be Bike Lanes with Buffer in the short term. In the long term, the City could convert the facilities to Class IV Separated Bike Lanes. Recommendations identified in the Bicycle Network are based on high-level planning evaluations; additional studies are warranted to fully evaluate the feasibility and constructibility of corridors in the network.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richton St</td>
<td>Monte Vista Ave</td>
<td>Central Ave</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>E/W</td>
<td>Buffered Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Arrow Hwy</td>
<td>City Boundary (West)</td>
<td>Benson Ave</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>E/W</td>
<td>Bike Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio Creek Path</td>
<td>PE Trail</td>
<td>City Boundary (South)</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>Shared Use Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreno St A</td>
<td>S Mills Ave</td>
<td>Monte Vista Ave</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>E/W</td>
<td>Bike Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreno St B</td>
<td>Monte Vista Ave</td>
<td>Benson Ave</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>E/W</td>
<td>Short-term: Buffered Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term: Separated Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose St A</td>
<td>S Mills Ave</td>
<td>Monte Vista Ave</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>E/W</td>
<td>Bike Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Mills Ave</td>
<td>Moreno St</td>
<td>Holt Blvd</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>Buffered Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Verde St A</td>
<td>S Mills Ave</td>
<td>Helena Ave</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>E/W</td>
<td>Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Verde St B</td>
<td>Monte Vista Ave</td>
<td>Central Ave</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>E/W</td>
<td>Buffered Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Verde St C</td>
<td>Central Ave</td>
<td>Benson Ave</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>E/W</td>
<td>Bike Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon Ave A</td>
<td>Benson Ave</td>
<td>San Bernardino St</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>Bike Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena Ave</td>
<td>Palo Verde St</td>
<td>Benito St</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>Bike Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino St</td>
<td>San Bernardino Ct</td>
<td>Benson Ave</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>E/W</td>
<td>Short-term: Buffered Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term: Separated Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramona Ave A</td>
<td>Palo Verde St</td>
<td>Holt Blvd</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>Bike Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont Ave</td>
<td>Palo Verde St</td>
<td>Kingsley St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>Bike Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ave</td>
<td>PE Trail</td>
<td>Phillips Blvd</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>Short-term: Buffered Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term: Separated Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson Ave</td>
<td>City Boundary (North)</td>
<td>Brooks St</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon Ave B</td>
<td>San Bernardino St</td>
<td>Brooks St</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>Bike Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benito St</td>
<td>S Mills Ave</td>
<td>Benson Ave</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>E/W</td>
<td>Bike Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsley St</td>
<td>S Mills Ave</td>
<td>Benson Ave</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>E/W</td>
<td>Bike Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandera St</td>
<td>Kingsley St</td>
<td>Central Ave</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>E/W</td>
<td>Bike Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt Blvd</td>
<td>City Boundary (West)</td>
<td>Benson Ave</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>E/W</td>
<td>Short-term: Buffered Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term: Separated Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Blvd</td>
<td>City Boundary (West)</td>
<td>Central Ave</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>E/W</td>
<td>Short-term: Buffered Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term: Separated Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard St</td>
<td>Pipeline Ave</td>
<td>Central Ave</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>E/W</td>
<td>Bike Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramona Avenue B</td>
<td>Holt Blvd</td>
<td>Phillips Blvd</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>Short-term: Buffered Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term: Separated Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Vista Ave</td>
<td>E Arrow Hwy</td>
<td>Phillips Blvd</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>Short-term: Buffered Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term: Separated Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-5: Bicycle Network Corridors
Figure 4-2: Bicycle Network
4.5 CITYWIDE INFRASTRUCTURE TREATMENTS GUIDE

The menu of infrastructure treatments recommended includes a mixture of pedestrian, bicycle, and traffic calming elements. Some treatments are more specific to certain areas, such as transit hubs and school zones. Treatments are grouped by their location along the roadway, e.g., the sidewalk realm, intersection, roadway, and traffic control, signage, and markings for ease of navigation. Depending on the context, treatments may need to be enhanced with additional infrastructure such as new signage, striping, and traffic signal modification that are not documented.

Many guidelines and engineering design standards were considered when providing the recommendations. These include, but are not limited to, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD), National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) and Caltrans Design Standards and Specifications.
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**Table 4-6: Summary of Infrastructure Treatments for Montclair**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Traffic Calming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIDEWALK AREA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERSECTIONS &amp; CROSSINGS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Visibility Crosswalk</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Ramp</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Extension (Bulb-Out)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Refuge Island</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-block Crosswalk</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Circle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Intersection</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROADWAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class I Off-Street Shared Use Path</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II Bike Lane</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II Buffered Bike Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class IV Separated Bike Lane</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III Bike Route</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III Bike Boulevard</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Narrowing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Reconfiguration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRAFFIC CONTROL, SIGNAGE, MARKINGS &amp; TRANSIT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Signal Strategies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Feedback Sign</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Zone Signage</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Word, Symbol, and Arrow Markings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit-Oriented Treatments</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sidewalk is the primary structure of a pedestrian network. It is physically separated from the roadway by a curb or unpaved buffer space, providing dedicated space intended for use by pedestrians that is safe, comfortable, and accessible.

**BENEFITS:**

- Enhances pedestrian network connectivity
- Provides opportunities for walking
- Provides connections to neighborhoods and key community destinations

**CONSIDERATIONS:**

- Right-of-way availability
- Utility conflicts

Bicycle parking offers short term secure locations for users to use at destinations (i.e. parks, shopping, and entertainment).

**BENEFITS:**

- Improves first and last mile connections when installed near bus stops, schools, parks, and other destinations

**CONSIDERATIONS:**

- Different types of bicycle facilities serve different purposes. For instance, long term parking could be more useful at locations such as the Metrolink Station and employment centers whereas short term parking is more applicable at parks and commercial areas.
- Long-term bicycle parking are more costly to maintain and implement over short term bicycle parking
HIGH VISIBILITY CROSSWALK

A high visibility crosswalk increases the visibility of pedestrian crossings by extending the sight distance for motorists and using a more detectable crosswalk pattern.

**BENEFITS:**
- Pedestrians could be more visible to approaching motorists and improve yield behavior
- Creates a more comfortable and safe crossing experience for pedestrians

**CONSIDERATIONS:**
- Site location and pedestrian demand
- Engineering judgment may be required to assess need
- High visibility crosswalks should be provided at all mid-block crossings, and should be considered at uncontrolled intersections
- Different types of crosswalk have different construction and maintenance costs

CURB RAMP

A curb ramp is a ramp cutting through a curb or built up to it to provide a route to safely transition from a roadway to a curbed sidewalk. Curb ramps are a critical component of an accessible and safe transit and pedestrian network.

**BENEFITS:**
- Eliminates the vertical edge of the curb for easy access
- Provides access to the sidewalk for people in wheelchairs and strollers

**CONSIDERATIONS:**
- Must meet specific standards for width, slope, cross slope, placement, and other features in order to be compliant with the Title II of the American with Disabilities Act
- Additional detectable warnings are required
CURB EXTENSION (BULB-OUT)

A curb extension, also known as a bulb-out, provides pedestrians with decreased crossing distances and time spent within the vehicle right-of-way by extending the sidewalk into the roadway. A curb extension also increases the visibility for pedestrians as they wait to cross and increases pedestrian visibility for motorists as they approach a crossing.

**BENEFITS:**

- Increases pedestrian visibility while waiting to cross
- Creates shorter crossing distances and decreases pedestrian exposure while crossing the roadway
- Increases space for street furniture and landscaping

**CONSIDERATIONS:**

- Could impact existing drainage facilities
- May require the relocation of fire hydrants to maintain access for emergency vehicles
- Require turning template analysis to ensure all vehicles can turn adequately

MEDIAN REFUGE ISLAND

A refuge island serves as an aid to pedestrian movement by providing a protected space while they cross the streets.

**BENEFITS:**

- Can help increase safety by providing a protected waiting space for pedestrians to cross streets more comfortably
- Reduces crossing length which decreases exposure to the vehicular right-of-way
- Can help narrow roadway or intersection and reduce vehicle speeds

**CONSIDERATIONS:**

- Right-of-way availability and turning movements of vehicles and trucks

*Image: NACTO*
**TRAFFIC CIRCLE**

A traffic circle, also known as a mini roundabout, features a circular island in the center of an intersection. They are typically used at unsignalized intersections to help lower vehicular speeds, while still promoting a continuous flow of traffic.

**BENEFITS:**
- Allows motorists and bicyclists to yield instead of making complete stops
- Reduces vehicle speeds by forcing motorists to maneuver around them

**CONSIDERATIONS:**
- The traffic circle should facilitate through and turn movements of bicyclists along a bicycle boulevard
- Consider traffic volume for all movement and drainage

---

**MID-BLOCK CROSSWALK**

A mid-block crosswalk facilitates crossings to places that people want to go but that are not well served by existing infrastructure.

**BENEFITS:**
- Allows pedestrians to cross in the middle of a long block without walking all the way to an intersection

**CONSIDERATIONS:**
- Pedestrian demand for the facility
- Could be supplemented with other enhancements such as curb extensions, raised median islands, advanced yield markings, and signage to better enhance pedestrian safety
- Design needs to consider stopping sight distances, effects of grade and cross slope, need for lighting, and other factors, and making use of warrants similar to those used for standard intersections

---
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PROTECTED INTERSECTION

A protected intersection redesigns the traditional mixing zone that persist where a bicycle lane ends and the right turn lane begins. The design places bicyclists in a separated channel from motor vehicles and pedestrians at the intersection, improving yield rates amongst all users of the intersection.

**BENEFITS:**
- Increases visibility of bicyclists for approaching vehicles
- Reduces the potential risk of left or right hook collisions
- Offers an alternative to implementing bicycle signals

**CONSIDERATIONS:**
- Lane transitions on approach and at intersection
- Level of pedestrian and vehicular movement
- Drainage

CLASS I OFF STREET SHARE-USE PATH

An off-street, multi-use facility is physically separated from any street or highway, commonly planned along right-of-way such as waterways, utility corridors, flood control access roads, railroads, and the like that offer continuous separated walking and riding opportunities.

**BENEFITS:**
- Generally used to serve corridors not served by streets and highways or where wide right-of-way exists
- Can provide recreational opportunities or serve as regional commuting routes

**CONSIDERATIONS:**
- Right-of-way availability
- High costs associated with new construction and long term maintenance
A portion of the roadway that is designated by striping, signaling, and/or pavement markings for the exclusive use of bicyclists. Bike lanes are established along streets and corridors where there is significant demand, and where there are distinct needs.

**BENEFITS:**

- Delineates right-of-way assigned to bicyclists and motorists and provides for more predictable movements by each
- Provides bicyclist access to local businesses along corridor

**CONSIDERATIONS:**

- Roadway reconfiguration may be needed if insufficient room exists for side-by-side sharing of existing streets by motorists and bicyclists
- Regular maintenance of the bike lane to clear debris

---

A buffered bike lane is a bike facility with an additional striped buffer which provides greater separation between bicyclists and motorized vehicles. Buffered bike lanes are recommended where roadway space allows.

**BENEFITS:**

- Provides a buffer between motor vehicles and bicyclists
- Provides space for bicyclists to pass another bicyclist without encroaching into the adjacent motor vehicle travel lane

**CONSIDERATIONS:**

- Requires additional maintenance when compared to a conventional bicycle lane, such as keeping the facility free of potholes, broken glass, and other debris
- Requires additional right-of-way or roadway space to accommodate buffer alongside the bike lane
CLASS IV SEPARATED BIKE LANE

A separated bike lane, also known as a cycle track, has a physical barrier between bicyclists and motor vehicles within the roadway. It combines the user experience of a shared use path with the on-street infrastructure of a conventional bike lane.

BENEFITS:

- Dedicates and protects roadway space for bicyclists in order to improve perceived comfort and safety
- Reduces risk and fear of collisions with over-taking vehicles
- Reduces risk of ‘dooring’ compared to a bike lane and eliminates the risk of a doored bicyclist being run over by a motor vehicle

CONSIDERATIONS:

- Streets with high bicyclist volumes
- Streets with high motor vehicle volumes and/or speeds

CLASS III BIKE ROUTE

A bike route is a designated roadway where bicyclists and motor vehicles share a roadway. Design standards require specific signage, but additional enhancement can be provided by using shared roadway markings, or "sharrows".

BENEFITS:

- Provides continuity to other bicycle facilities

CONSIDERATIONS:

- Assures that the route is suitable as a shared roadway
- Prior to designation as a bikeway, the route may need additional improvements for bicyclist travel
- Maintain route in a manner consistent with the needs of bicyclists
CLASS III BIKE BOULEVARD

A bicycle boulevard is a low stress shared roadway designed to offer a more comfortable experience for bicyclists while they share the local street with motor vehicles.

**BENEFITS:**
- Increases comfort for bicyclists by reducing motorist speeds and volumes, if diverters or roundabouts are included
- Connects residential roads to commercial corridors/community services

**CONSIDERATIONS:**
- May require additional paved surface such as curb extension to provide sidewalk space for pedestrians
- Diversion designs can restrict vehicle movements if used
- Traffic volumes should generally be less than 3,000 vehicles per day

LANE NARROWING

Lane narrowing is a typical traffic calming treatment. By narrowing existing travel lanes, streets can better accommodate multiple roadway users. The treatment is intended to improve the overall safety and traffic flow of the roadway and potentially accommodate the additional of a bikeway facility.

**BENEFITS:**
- Helps with managing vehicle travel speeds and volumes, thus improving safety
- Reduces vehicle-to-vehicle conflict

**CONSIDERATIONS:**
- School bus and emergency access, and truck volumes must be considered
ROADWAY RECONFIGURATION

Also known as a road diet, roadway reconfigurations typically involve reducing the number of lanes to better accommodate other roadway users. The treatment reallocates roadway space for other purposes, potentially adding turn lanes, bus lanes, pedestrian refuge islands, bike lanes, sidewalks, bus shelters, or landscaping.

**BENEFITS:**

- Can reduce vehicle speeds, weaving of traffic, left-turn conflicts, and number of lanes for pedestrians to cross
- Dedicates more space for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users

**CONSIDERATIONS:**

- Geometric design and features should be carefully considered and applied during design reconfiguration

---

PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL STRATEGIES

Strategies for traffic signals such as providing Leading Pedestrian Intervals, exclusive pedestrian phase, pedestrian push buttons, and countdowns can be used to control pedestrian and vehicle movements and allow for safe movement of users.

**BENEFITS:**

- Create opportunities for pedestrians to be more visibility to motorists which can reduces vehicular-pedestrian collisions
- Allocate more time for pedestrians to safely cross the roadway

**CONSIDERATIONS:**

- Requires signal timing adjustments
A pedestrian hybrid beacon (PHB) is a traffic control device used to increase motorists’ awareness of pedestrian crossings at an uncontrolled marked crosswalk location. A PHB is distinct from pre-timed traffic signals and constant flash warning beacons because it is only activated by pedestrians when needed.

**BENEFITS:**
- Can lead to lower conflict and collision rates for pedestrians
- Clearly indicates that a crosswalk is being used and that all motorists must come to a complete stop

**CONSIDERATIONS:**
- Should be located outside of the functional area of a signalized intersection and outside of any turn lanes or acceleration lanes

A Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) is a type of active warning beacon that combines a pedestrian warning sign with user-activated light emitting diodes (LEDs). The device flashes amber when activated through a pedestrian push button or by pedestrian detection.

**BENEFITS:**
- Increases motorists’ yield behavior at crossings because they use an irregular flash pattern similar to emergency flashers on police vehicles

**CONSIDERATIONS:**
- Use in combination with a crosswalk, wheelchair ramps, advance warning signs or pavement markings, and overhead lighting
- Usually implemented at high volume pedestrian crossings
A speed feedback sign is a type of dynamic traffic calming device that alerts approaching motorists of their travel speeds. If motorists are speeding, the feedback sign will flash exceed speed along with “SLOW DOWN” or “YOUR SPEED”.

**BENEFITS:**
- Generally activates when motorists exceed a speed limit by five miles per hour
- Can be effective in reducing motorist speeds on wide roadways

**CONSIDERATIONS:**
- Static and dynamic text, sign color, and sight distance are dependent on the existing conditions of the roadway and area, and the type of roadway

School zone signage includes a series of signs that can be placed in school zones to convey messages to influence traffic behavior near schools.

**BENEFITS:**
- Can bring more awareness about crossings near schools
- Low cost compared to infrastructure treatments

**CONSIDERATIONS:**
- Context and placement of the signs
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BENEFITS:

• May encourage more community members to walk and bike to transit facilities
• Can create a safer environment for pedestrians and bicyclists to access transit facilities

CONSIDERATIONS:

• Treatments each have their own unique set of considerations

---

**SCHOOL ZONE WORD, SYMBOL, AND ARROW MARKINGS**

The markings are text on the roadway that help convey messages to motorists about a school zone. Example of text include “SCHOOL XING” and “SLOW SCHOOL XING”.

**BENEFITS:**

• Compliment other traffic control devices such as traffic signs and signals
• Convey information without diverting motorists’ attention from the road

**CONSIDERATIONS:**

• Context and placement of the word, symbol, and arrow markings

---

**TRANSIT-ORIENTED TREATMENTS**

Treatments such as transit signal priority lanes, bus stop amenities, bus bulbs, and floating bus pads can create a more comfortable and convenient transit-riding experience. Transit agencies including Omnitrans offers design guidelines for treatments at transit stops and hubs.

**BENEFITS:**

• May encourage more community members to walk and bike to transit facilities
• Can create a safer environment for pedestrians and bicyclists to access transit facilities

**CONSIDERATIONS:**

• Treatments each have their own unique set of considerations
4.6 PRIORITY CORRIDOR FACTSHEETS

The following section provides a project overview for four corridors identified in the Montclair Active Transportation Network. The corridors were selected based on the prioritized projects list, and they aimed to reflect the two types of roadway corridors (local and regional corridors) in each direction (North/South and East/West).

For each corridor, the factsheet includes the following information:

- General corridor description and roadway characteristics
- Overview of recommendations
- Existing and proposed typical cross-section(s)
- Concept plan of a selected intersection
- Detailed recommendation for selected segments and intersections

Recommendations were derived from planning-level analyses combined with high-level engineering judgment. Certain recommendations were also adopted from other planning documents to ensure continuity across the plans.

The context surrounding the corridors may change over time (e.g. new development, changes in land uses, volumes, etc.) As such, it is important to continually evaluate these conditions to determine the appropriate treatments.

Furthermore, additional studies would be needed to determine the actual feasibility of the recommendations. These studies include but not limited to the following:

- Drainage Study - Applicable to recommendations such as protected intersections and curb extensions.
- Warrant Study and Volume Review - Applicable to recommendations such as areas that would require roadway reconfiguration, right turn lanes removal, and signal phasing modification.
- In-Depth Collision Analysis - Applicable to recommendations that seek to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety and other related goals.
- Pedestrian and Bike Activity/Volume Review - Applicable to recommendations that seek to improve pedestrian and bicycle accessibility, connectivity, and other related goals.
- Truck Turning Templates - Applicable to recommendations such as protected intersections or curb extensions impact bus stops/routes.
Assumptions for Cost Estimates

The ATP team made the following assumptions to attain the cost estimates for each corridor:

• Roadways would not be widened to provide additional right-of-way space for the proposed recommendations, hence the majority of improvements would involve signing and striping.
• For Class II Buffered Bike Lanes, the cost assumed that there would be a pavement legend and bike route sign at 200’ spacing.
• For the Class IV Separated Bike Lanes, the cost included flex posts that were added to the striping costs.
• The majority of the segments reflected the improvements shown on the report cross sections.
• For intersection improvements, assumptions were made about utility/service locations.
The Monte Vista Avenue Corridor is a regional corridor in the Montclair Active Transportation Network, and it runs along the entirety of the city in the North-South direction. The corridor provides access to a wide mixture of local and regional destinations which includes the Montclair Place Mall, Montclair Hospital Medical Center, and multiple schools. It also connects community members to the Montclair TransCenter and Montclair Metrolink Station which offer opportunities for regional travel.

Traffic calming, bicycle, and pedestrian treatments are proposed for the Monte Vista Corridor. Traffic calming and bicycle treatments are recommended for the entirety of the corridor to improve accessibility and provide connectivity to local and regional destinations, including transit hubs.

**Corridor Length:** 3.35

**Extents:** Pacific Electric Trail to Phillips Blvd

**Primary Land Use:** Commercial, Residential, Industrial

**Functional Classification:** Major

**Truck Route:** Partially

**# of Transit Stops:** 14

**# of Pedestrian & Bicycle Collisions:** 17

**Connectivity To:** Montclair Place, Montclair Hospital Medical Center, Montclair Transcenter/ Montclair Metrolink, Pacific Electric Trail, and multiple schools.

**Planned Effort:** General Plan, North Montclair Downtown Specific Plan, Holt Blvd Specific Plan, Systemic Safety Analysis Report, Chino Plans: Planned Class IV Separated Bikeway
The Plan envisions a reduction in travel lanes to calm vehicular traffic and provide sufficient width to accommodate a Class II Buffered Bike Lane in the short-term and a Class IV Separated Bikeway in the long-term for the segments of the corridor where it’s feasible. The facility would provide the critically-missing infrastructure for bicyclists to bike in the North/South direction and reach destinations in Upland, Chino, and beyond.

Along the entire corridor, all street lighting is recommended to be upgraded to LED safety lighting and pedestrian signal heads should include countdown functionality.

Additionally, specific pedestrian treatments are proposed at 14 intersections that were selected to address traffic safety concerns and access to transit, schools, and nearby destinations. Proposed pedestrian treatments include protected intersections, curb extensions (bulb-outs), crosswalks, ADA curb ramps, Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons, and traffic signal modifications.

Given the complexity of the proposed treatments, the City is recommended to conduct additional studies to further evaluate the feasibility of the proposed treatments modifications.
CORRIDOR CONCEPT: MONTE VISTA AVE & BANDERA AVE

- Remove existing pavement legend
- Remove existing assembly D (CA) sign
- Install limit line (typ)
- Install R10-6
- Install high visibility x-walk
- Install high visibility x-walk
- Install red curb paint
- Furnish and install countdown LED red head (typ)
- Remove existing signs and post
- Remove existing pavement legend

SIGN LEGEND:

- STOP ON RED R10-23
- NO TURN ON RED R10-11
- STOP HERE ON RED R10-6

1" = 100’ GRAPHIC SCALE
### Chapter 4: Recommendations

**DETAILED PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS: BY SEGMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richton St to Arrow Hwy</td>
<td>85’</td>
<td>• 2 Travel lanes in the northbound Direction with a Class II Buffered Bike Lane</td>
<td>Short-term: Install a Class II Buffered Bike Lane in the southbound direction</td>
<td>The segment currently has a Class II Bike Lane in the southbound direction and a Class II Buffered Bike Lane in the northbound direction. In the short-term, a Class II Buffered Bike Lane in the southbound direction would complement the existing bike facility in the northbound direction. In the long-term, Class IV Separated Bike Lanes would provide for a safer and more comfortable biking experience to and from the Pacific Electric Trail and other regional destinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 3 Lanes in the southbound Direction with a Class II Bike Lane</td>
<td>Long-term: Install a Class IV Separated Bike Lane in each direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrow Hwy to Moreno St</td>
<td>65’</td>
<td>• 2 Travel lanes in each direction</td>
<td>Short-term: Install a Class II Buffered Bike Lane</td>
<td>The existing curb-to-curb width is insufficient to accommodate neither short-term nor long-term recommendations. The City is recommended to reduce a travel lane in each direction, remove on-street parking, remove the center median, or explore a combination of strategies to provide adequate space to accommodate the treatments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Two Way Left Turn Lane</td>
<td>Long-term: Install a Class IV Separated Bike Lane in each direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• On-street parking on the west side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No-parking on the east side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreno St to I-10 Fwy north ramps</td>
<td>80’</td>
<td>• 2 Travel lanes in each direction</td>
<td>Short-term: Install a Class II Buffered Bike Lane</td>
<td>The existing curb-to-curb width is insufficient to accommodate neither short-term nor long-term recommendations. The City is recommended to reduce a travel lane in each direction, remove on-street parking, remove the center median, reduce the width of the travel lanes, or explore a combination of strategies to provide adequate space to accommodate the treatments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Two Way Left Turn Lane</td>
<td>Long-term: Install a Class IV Separated Bike Lane in each direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• On-street parking on the west side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No-parking on the east side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-10 Fwy north ramps to I-10 Fwy south ramps</td>
<td>50’</td>
<td>• 2 Travel lanes in each direction</td>
<td>Install a Class III Bike Route in each direction</td>
<td>The existing curb-to-curb width is insufficient to accommodate any bicycle facilities other than a Class III Bike Route. As of the development of this Plan, Caltrans does not have plans to expand the I-10 Overpass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Two Way Left Turn Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• On-street parking on the west side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No-parking on the east side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DETAILED PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS: BY SEGMENT (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-10 Fwy south ramps to San</td>
<td>70’</td>
<td>• 2 Travel lanes in each direction</td>
<td>Short-term: Install a Class II Buffered Bike Lane</td>
<td>The existing curb-to-curb width is insufficient to accommodate neither short-term nor long-term recommendations. The City is recommended to reduce a travel lane in each direction, remove on-street parking, remove the center median, reduce the width of the travel lanes, or explore a combination of strategies to provide adequate space to accommodate the treatments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernardino St</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Two Way Left Turn Lane</td>
<td>Long-term: Install a Class IV Separated Bike Lane in each direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• On-street parking on the west side on some segments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No-parking on the east side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino St to Benito St</td>
<td>45’</td>
<td>• 1 Travel lane in each direction</td>
<td>Short-term: Install a Class II Buffered Bike Lane</td>
<td>The existing curb-to-curb width is insufficient to accommodate neither short-term nor long-term recommendations. The City is recommended to remove on-street parking on one side of the roadway to provide adequate space to accommodate the treatments or provide a Class II Bike Route in each direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• On-street parking on both sides</td>
<td>Long-term: Install a Class IV Separated Bike Lane in each direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benito St to Kingsley St</td>
<td>60’</td>
<td>• 2 Travel lanes in each direction</td>
<td>Short-term: Install a Class II Buffered Bike Lane</td>
<td>The existing curb-to-curb width is insufficient to accommodate neither short-term nor long-term recommendations. The City is recommended to reduce a travel lane in each direction, remove on-street parking, or explore a combination of strategies to provide adequate space to accommodate the treatments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• On-street parking on the both sides</td>
<td>Long-term: Install a Class IV Separated Bike Lane in each direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No street parking on the both sides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsley St to Bandera St</td>
<td>50’</td>
<td>• 2 Travel lanes in each direction</td>
<td>Short-term: Install a Class II Buffered Bike Lane</td>
<td>The existing curb-to-curb width is insufficient to accommodate neither short-term nor long-term recommendations. The City is recommended to reduce a travel lane in each direction, or provide a Class III Bike Route in each direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No street parking on the both sides</td>
<td>Long-term: Install a Class IV Separated Bike Lane in each direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No street parking on the both sides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandera St to Holt Blvd</td>
<td>60’</td>
<td>• 2 Travel lanes in each direction</td>
<td>Short-term: Install a Class II Buffered Bike Lane</td>
<td>The existing curb-to-curb width is insufficient to accommodate neither short-term nor long-term recommendations. The City is recommended to reduce a travel lane in each direction, remove on-street parking, or explore a combination of strategies to provide adequate space to accommodate the treatments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• On-street parking on the west side</td>
<td>Long-term: Install a Class IV Separated Bike Lane in each direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No street parking on the east side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Segment Width Existing Conditions Recommendation Comment

#### Holt Blvd to State St
- **Width:** 60’
- **Existing Conditions:** 2 Travel lanes in each direction, Two Way Left Turn Lane, On-street parking on the both sides
- **Recommendation:** Short-term: Install a Class II Buffered Bike Lane, Long-term: Install a Class IV Separated Bike Lane in each direction
- **Comment:** The existing curb-to-curb width is insufficient to accommodate neither short-term nor long-term recommendations. The City is recommended to reduce a travel lane in each direction, or provide a Class III Bike Route in each direction.

#### State St to Mission Blvd
- **Width:** 60’
- **Existing Conditions:** 2 Travel lanes in each direction, On-street parking on the both sides
- **Recommendation:** Short-term: Install a Class II Buffered Bike Lane, Long-term: Install a Class IV Separated Bike Lane in each direction
- **Comment:** The existing curb-to-curb width is insufficient to accommodate neither short-term nor long-term recommendations. The City is recommended to remove on-street parking in each direction.

#### Mission Blvd to Howard St
- **Width:** 60’
- **Existing Conditions:** 2 Travel lanes in each direction, On-street parking on the both sides
- **Recommendation:** Short-term: Install a Class II Buffered Bike Lane, Long-term: Install a Class IV Separated Bike Lane in each direction
- **Comment:** The existing curb-to-curb width is insufficient to accommodate neither short-term nor long-term recommendations. The City is recommended to remove a travel lane in each direction, remove on-street parking, or explore a combination of strategies to provide adequate space to accommodate the treatments.

#### Howard Ave to Phillips St
- **Width:** 40’
- **Existing Conditions:** 1 Travel lane in each direction, Two Way Left Turn Lane, On-street parking on the both sides
- **Recommendation:** Short-term: Install a Class II Buffered Bike Lane, Long-term: Install a Class IV Separated Bike Lane in each direction
- **Comment:** The existing curb-to-curb width is insufficient to accommodate neither short-term nor long-term recommendations. The City is recommended to explore acquiring the right-of-way for the dirt shoulder on the west side of the roadway, or reduce the two-way left-turn lane to provide adequate space to accommodate the treatments.

#### Phillips St to Main St
- **Width:** 40’
- **Existing Conditions:** 1 Travel lane in each direction
- **Recommendation:** Install a Class III Bike Route in each direction
- **Comment:** The existing curb-to-curb width is insufficient to accommodate any bicycle facilities other than a Class III Bike Route. The land use is mainly comprised of residential uses and traffic volume is lower than other segments; these characteristics support having a Class III Bike Route.
## DETAILED PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS: BY INTERSECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Monte Vista Ave & Arrow Hwy | • Install curb extensions at all four corners  
• Provide ADA curb ramps at each curb extension  
• Install a center median and center refuge island on Arrow Hwy  
• Reduce one left turn lane and one right turn lane in each direction on Arrow Hwy | Recommendations are consistent with the Arrow Highway Streetscape Improvement Plans |
| Monte Vista Ave & Moreno St | • Install a protected intersection with high visibility crosswalk and ADA-compliant curb ramps  
• Upgrade existing traffic signals to provide pedestrian signal heads with countdown functionality and modify accordingly to accommodate the protected intersection | A protected intersection would compliment the proposed recommendations for both Monte Vista Avenue and Moreno Street Corridors which calls for Class II Buffered Bike Lanes in the short term. |
| Monte Vista Ave & San Jose St | • Install raised curb extensions at all four corners to complement the reduction in travel lanes and installation of bicycle facilities  
• Upgrade existing pedestrian push buttons with accessible pedestrian signals  
• Upgrade signal timing to include Leading Pedestrian Interval | May require coordination with Caltrans |
| Monte Vista Ave & I-10 Fwy north ramps | • Reduce the corner radii at the on and off freeway ramps  
• Improve curb ramps to be ADA-compliant | Recommendations are consistent with the Systemic Safety Analysis Report |
| Monte Vista Ave & I-10 Fwy South ramps/ Palo Verde St | • Install a protected intersection with high visibility crosswalk and ADA-compliant curb ramps  
• Upgrade existing traffic signals to provide protected left-turns on southbound approach and clearance timing | Recommendations are consistent with the Systemic Safety Analysis Report |
| Monte Vista Ave & San Bernardino St | • Install high visibility yellow ladder style school crosswalks at all legs  
• Upgrade existing pedestrian push buttons with accessible pedestrian signals  
• Upgrade traffic signal to provide protected left-turns on all approaches and clearance timing, as well as a Leading Pedestrian Phase on all approaches for pedestrian crossings  
• Improve curb ramps to be ADA-compliant | Recommendations are consistent with the Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan and Systemic Safety Analysis Report |
| Monte Vista Ave & Benito Ave | • Upgrade traffic signal to provide protected left-turns on all approaches and clearance timing, as well as a Leading Pedestrian Phase on all approaches for pedestrian crossings  
• Upgrade existing pedestrian push buttons with accessible pedestrian signals  
• Improve curb ramps to be ADA-compliant  
• Install conflict zone markings through intersection for the bike lanes on Orchard St  
• Establish a right turn lane on Orchard St and re-stripe the bike lanes | Recommendations are consistent with the Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan and Systemic Safety Analysis Report |
| Monte Vista Ave & Orchard St | • Upgrade traffic signal to provide protected left-turns on all approaches and clearance timing, as well as a Leading Pedestrian Phase on all approaches for pedestrian crossings  
• Upgrade existing pedestrian push buttons with accessible pedestrian signals  
• Improve curb ramps to be ADA-compliant  
• Install conflict zone markings through intersection for the bike lanes on Orchard St  
• Establish a right turn lane on Orchard St and re-stripe the bike lanes | Recommendations are consistent with the Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan and Systemic Safety Analysis Report |
## Chapter 4: Recommendations

### DETAILED PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS: BY INTERSECTIONS (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Monte Vista Ave & Kingsley St | • Install new high visibility yellow ladder style school crosswalk at all legs  
• Improve all four existing curb ramps to be ADA-compliant  
• Upgrade traffic signal to provide protected left-turns on all approaches and clearance timing, as well as a Leading Pedestrian Phase on all approaches for pedestrian crossings  
• Replace all existing pedestrian push buttons with accessible pedestrian signals | Recommendations are consistent with the Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan and Systemic Safety Analysis Report |
| Monte Vista Ave & Canoga St | • Install new high visibility yellow ladder style school crosswalks on the east and west legs  
• Improve and/or reconstruct all four existing curb ramps to be ADA-compliant  
• Install speed feedback sign on Monte Vista Ave | Recommendations are consistent with the Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan                         |
| Monte Vista Ave & Bandera St | • Install pedestrian hybrid beacon on Monte Vista Ave  
• Install raised curb extension on the SE corner to shorten the crossing distance on Monte Vista Ave  
• Install painted curb extensions on the NW corner to shorten the crossing distance on Bandera St  
• Install new high visibility yellow ladder style school crosswalks at the east, west, and south legs  
• Provide red curb paint along Bandera St | Recommendations are consistent with the Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan and Systemic Safety Analysis Report |
| Monte Vista Ave & Holt Blvd | • Upgrade traffic signal to provide protected left-turns on southbound and northbound approaches and clearance timing, as well as a Leading Pedestrian Phase on all approaches for pedestrian crossings  
• Install raised curb extensions at all four corners to complement the reduction in travel lanes and installation of bicycle facilities  
• Improve all existing curb ramps to be ADA-compliant  
• Replace existing pedestrian push buttons with accessible pedestrian signals | Recommendations are consistent with the Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan and Systemic Safety Analysis Report |
| Monte Vista Ave & Mission Blvd | • Install raised curb extensions at all four corners to complement the reduction in travel lanes and installation of bicycle facilities  
• Upgrade traffic signal to provide protected left-turns on all approaches and clearance timing.  
• Improve all existing curb ramps to be ADA-compliant  
• Replace existing pedestrian push buttons with accessible pedestrian signals  
• Upgrade existing Stop signs embedded LEDs that flash during school hours at each corner on Monte Vista Ave  
• Put red curb paint at the NE, SE, and SW corners | Recommendations are consistent with the Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan and Systemic Safety Analysis Report |
| Monte Vista Ave & Howard St | • Install high visibility ladder style school crosswalks pavement markings at all legs  
• Install curb extensions at the SW, SE, NW, and NE corners  
• Upgrade existing Stop signs embedded LEDs that flash during school hours at each corner on Monte Vista Ave  
• Put red curb paint at the NE, SE, and SW corners | Recommendations are consistent with the Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan                         |
Central Avenue is classified as a regional corridor in the Montclair Active Transportation Network. It is one of the two corridors in Montclair that provides access to destinations along the entirety of the city in the North-South direction. It provides access to commercial and civic institutions such as the Montclair Place Mall, Montclair City Hall, and Montclair Public Library, residential neighborhoods, industrial areas, and transit hubs.

Traffic calming, bicycle, and pedestrian treatments are proposed for the Central Avenue Corridor. Traffic calming and bicycle treatments are recommended for the entirety of the corridor to improve accessibility and provide connectivity to local and regional destinations, including transit hubs.

**Corridor Length:** 3.08

**Extents:** Pacific Electric Trail to Phillips Blvd

**Primary Land Use:** Commercial

**Functional Classification:** Major

**Truck Route:** Yes

**# of Transit Stops:** 16

**# of Pedestrian & Bicycle Collisions:** 26

**Connectivity To:** MacArthur Park, Montclair City Hall, Montclair Public Library, Montclair Civic Center, Alma Hofman Park, Saratoga Park, Commercial areas, Montclair Place, Kaiser Permanente Montclair Mental Health Offices

**Planned Effort:** General Plan, North Montclair Downtown Specific Plan, Holt Blvd Specific Plan, Systemic Safety Analysis Report
Chapter 4: Recommendations

OVERVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The City is recommended to reduce one or more travel lanes in each direction, reduce parking, or explore a combination of strategies to calm vehicular traffic and provide sufficient width to accommodate a Class II Buffered Bike Lane in the short-term and a Class IV Separated Bikeway in the long-term. The treatments would provide for a safer and more comfortable walking and biking experience for users along one of the City’s main thoroughfares in the North/South direction and connect them to both local and regional destinations.

Along the entire corridor, all street lighting is recommended to be upgraded to LED safety lighting and pedestrian signal heads should include countdown functionality.

Additionally, specific pedestrian treatments are recommended at 14 intersections. The intersections represent areas where pedestrian and bicycle collisions had occurred, police citations were issued, and they provide access to transit hubs, schools, and other destinations. Proposed pedestrian treatments include protected intersections, curb extensions (bulb-outs), crosswalks, ADA curb ramps, Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons, and traffic signal modifications.

The proposed treatments would involve many roadway modifications. The City is recommended to conduct additional studies to further evaluate the feasibility of proposed treatments.

ROADWAY CHARACTERISTICS

- **Roadway width:** 85’ to 150’
- **Lane geometry:** Two travel lanes to multiple travel lanes in each direction with a center median
- **On-street parking:** Available on various segments

ESTIMATED COST

- **Short term:** $6,607,675
- **Long term:** $7,303,628

Intersection of Central Ave at Arrow Hwy
CROSS SECTION - CENTRAL AVE BETWEEN ORCHARD ST AND Holt BLVD

Existing

Proposed Improvement
CROSS SECTION - CENTRAL AVE BETWEEN MORENO ST AND ARROW HWY

Existing

Proposed Improvement
CORRIDOR CONCEPT: CENTRAL AVE & ORCHARD ST

- Bike lane conflict striping (typ.)
- Construct bus island at existing bus stop
- Re-optimize traffic signal timing operations
- Construct ADA curb ramps (typ.)
- Construct protected intersection improvements with high-visibility crosswalks and green bikeway crossings
### DETAILED PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS: BY SEGMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| P.E Trail to I-10 Fwy north ramps      | 95’   | • Multiple lanes in each direction                                                   | Short-term: Install a Class II Buffered Bike Lane in each direction  
                              |       | • Center median                                                                     | Long-term: Install a Class IV Separated Bike Lane in each direction  
                              |       | • On-street parking on both sides                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|                                        |       | The existing curb-to-curb width is insufficient to accommodate neither short-term nor long-term recommendations. However, given the high speed and traffic volume along the segment, a Class II Buffered Bike Lane or Class IV Separated Bike Lanes in each direction is needed to provide bicyclists with a safe and comfortable environment to travel along. The City is recommended to remove a travel lane in each direction, reduce the size of the center median, or explore a combination of strategies to provide adequate space to accommodate the bicycle facility. |
| I-10 Fwy north ramps to I-10 Fwy south ramps | 150’  | • Multiple lanes in each direction                                                   | Install a Class III Bike Route in each direction    | The existing curb-to-curb width is insufficient to accommodate any bicycle facilities other than a Class III Bike Route. As of the development of this Plan, Caltrans’ plans for the I-10 overpass do not provide space to accommodate bicycle facilities. |
| I-10 Fwy south ramps to San Bernardino St | 85’   | • Multiple lanes in each direction                                                   | Short-term: Install a Class II Buffered Bike Lane in each direction  
                              |       | • Center median                                                                     | Long-term: Install a Class IV Separated Bike Lane in each direction  
                              |       | • On-street parking on the west side                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|                                        |       | The existing curb-to-curb width is insufficient to accommodate neither short-term nor long-term recommendations. The City is recommended to remove a travel lane in each direction or explore a combination of strategies to provide adequate space to accommodate the bicycle facility. |
| San Bernardino St to Bandera St         | 85’   | • 2 Travel lanes in each direction                                                   | Short-term: Install a Class II Buffered Bike Lane in each direction  
                              |       | • Center median                                                                     | Long-term: Install a Class IV Separated Bike Lane in each direction  
<pre><code>                          |       | • On-street parking on both sides                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
</code></pre>
<p>|                                        |       | The existing curb-to-curb width is insufficient to accommodate neither short-term nor long-term recommendations. The City is recommended to remove a travel lane in each direction, reduce the size of the center median, or explore a combination of strategies to provide adequate space to accommodate the bicycle facility. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Bandera St to Holt Blvd | 100'  | • Multiple lanes in each direction  
• Center median  
• On-street parking on both sides | Short-term: Install a Class II Buffered Bike Lane in each direction  
Long-term: Install a Class IV Separated Bike Lane in each direction | The existing curb-to-curb width is insufficient to accommodate neither short-term nor long-term recommendations. The City is recommended to remove a travel lane in each direction, reduce the size of the center median, or explore a combination of strategies to provide adequate space to accommodate the bicycle facility. |
| Holt Blvd to Howard St | Varies  | • 2 Travel lanes in each direction  
• Center median  
• On-street parking on both sides | Short-term: Install a Class II Buffered Bike Lane in each direction  
Long-term: Install a Class IV Separated Bike Lane in each direction | The curb-to-curb width varies significantly along this segment, thus compared to other segments, some small portions of the segment have sufficient width to accommodate the recommended bike facility in each direction. For portions where there is insufficient width to accommodate the bike facilities, the City is recommended to remove a travel lane in each direction, reduce the size of the center median, or explore a combination of strategies. |
| Howard St to Phillips Blvd | 100'  | • 2 Travel lanes in each direction  
• Center median  
• On-street parking on both sides | Short-term: Install a Class II Buffered Bike Lane in each direction  
Long-term: Install a Class IV Separated Bike Lane in each direction | The segment has sufficient width to accommodate the recommended bike facilities pending the removal of on-street parking on both sides. Currently, there are no restrictions on on-street parking; however, the roadway is separated from the residential neighborhood with a wall. Removal of on-street parking is unlikely to have an impact on the residents. |
## DETAILED PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS: BY INTERSECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Ave &amp; Richton St</td>
<td>• Install raised curb extensions at all four corners to complement the reduction in travel lanes and installation of bicycle facilities</td>
<td>Recommendations are consistent with the Arrow Highway Streetscape Improvement Plans up to the centerline of Central Ave and Systemic Safety Analysis Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ave &amp; Arrow Hwy</td>
<td>• Install curb extensions at NW and SW corners&lt;br&gt;• Provide ADA curb ramps at each curb extension&lt;br&gt;• Install a center median and center refuge island on Arrow Hwy&lt;br&gt;• Upgrade traffic signal to provide protected left-turns on all approaches and clearance timing</td>
<td>A protected intersection would help facilitate safer crossings for pedestrians and bicyclists. The facility would also compliment the proposed bikeway recommendations for both Central Avenue and Moreno Street Corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ave &amp; Moreno St</td>
<td>• Install a protected intersection with high visibility crosswalk and ADA-compliant curb ramps&lt;br&gt;• Upgrade existing traffic signals to provide pedestrian signal heads with countdown functionality and modify accordingly to accommodate the protected intersection</td>
<td>Recommendations are consistent with the Systemic Safety Analysis Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ave &amp; I-10 Fwy north ramps</td>
<td>• Reduce the corner radii at the on and off freeway ramps&lt;br&gt;• Improve curb ramps to be ADA-compliant&lt;br&gt;• Re-stripe crosswalks</td>
<td>May require coordination with Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ave &amp; I-10 Fwy south ramp</td>
<td>• Reduce the corner radii at the on and off freeway ramps&lt;br&gt;• Improve curb ramps to be ADA-compliant&lt;br&gt;• Re-stripe crosswalks</td>
<td>May require coordination with Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ave &amp; Palo Verde St</td>
<td>• Install raised curb extensions on the NW and SW corners to shorten the crossing distance on Palo Verde St and realign the crosswalk on the south leg</td>
<td>Recommendations are consistent with the Systemic Safety Analysis Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ave &amp; San Bernardino St</td>
<td>• Install a protected intersection with high visibility crosswalk and ADA-compliant curb ramps&lt;br&gt;• Upgrade existing traffic signals to provide pedestrian signal heads with countdown functionality and modify accordingly to accommodate the protected intersection</td>
<td>Recommendations are consistent with the Systemic Safety Analysis Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ave &amp; Benito St</td>
<td>• Upgrade traffic signal to provide protected left-turns on all approaches and clearance timing</td>
<td>Recommendations are consistent with the Systemic Safety Analysis Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DETAILED PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS: BY INTERSECTIONS (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Ave &amp;</td>
<td>• Install a protected intersection with high visibility crosswalk and</td>
<td>Recommendations are consistent with the Systemic Safety Analysis Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard St</td>
<td>ADA-compliant curb ramps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Upgrade existing traffic signals to provide pedestrian signal heads with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>countdown functionality and modify accordingly to accommodate the protected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intersection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ave &amp;</td>
<td>• Upgrade traffic signal to provide protected left-turns on all</td>
<td>Recommendations are consistent with the Systemic Safety Analysis Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsley St</td>
<td>approaches and clearance timing, as well as signal timing for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Repaint existing crosswalks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve curb ramps to be ADA-compliant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ave &amp;</td>
<td>• Install raised curb extensions on the NW and SW corners to shorten the</td>
<td>The facility would also compliment the proposed segment recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandera St</td>
<td>crossing distance on Bandera St</td>
<td>for both Central Ave and Holt Blvd Corridors which calls for Class II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve curb ramps to be ADA-compliant</td>
<td>Buffered Bike Lane in the short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Repaint existing crosswalks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ave &amp;</td>
<td>Recommendations are consistent with the Systemic Safety Analysis Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt Blvd</td>
<td>• Install a protected intersection with high visibility crosswalk and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADA-compliant curb ramps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Upgrade existing traffic signals to provide pedestrian signal heads with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>countdown functionality and modify accordingly to accommodate the protected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intersection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ave &amp;</td>
<td>• Install raised curb extensions on the all corners to shorten the</td>
<td>One corner of the intersection has existing edge line striping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Blvd</td>
<td>crossing distance on Mission Blvd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve curb ramps to be ADA-compliant</td>
<td>The intersection currently has decorated crosswalks; the proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Re-stripe crosswalks</td>
<td>treatments would require changes to the existing infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ave &amp;</td>
<td>Recommendations are consistent with the Montclair Safe Routes to School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard St</td>
<td>Howard St</td>
<td>Plan and Systemic Safety Analysis Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Re-stripe existing crosswalks on the east, north, and west legs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Widen the center median and provide center refuge island on Central Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The intersection currently has decorated crosswalks; the proposed treatments would require changes to the existing infrastructure.
The San Bernardino Street Corridor is classified as a regional corridor in the Montclair Active Transportation Network, and it offers access to destinations along the entirety of the city in the East-West direction. The corridor connects to existing and planned bicycle facilities in Pomona to the west and Ontario to the east, allowing users to travel to destinations beyond the city. The corridor provides access to residential neighborhoods, and local and regional destinations such as Montclair High School, Vernon Middle School, Buena-Vista Arts Integrated Magnet school, Waterwise Community Center, and Montclair Hospital Medical Center.

Traffic calming, bicycle, and pedestrian treatments are proposed for the San Bernardino Street Corridor. Traffic calming and bicycle treatments are recommended for the entirety of the corridor to improve accessibility and provide connectivity to local and regional destinations, including transit hubs.

**SAN BERNARDINO STREET**

Corridor Length: 1.87
Extents: Mills Ave to Benson Ave
Primary Land Use: Residential
Functional Classification: Major
Truck Route: No
# of Transit Stops: 10
# of Pedestrian & Bicycle Collisions: 10

Connectivity To: Waterwise Community Center & Chino Basin Water Conservation District, Montclair Hospital Medical Center, Kaiser Permanete Montclair Mental Health Services, Commercial Areas, Vernon Middle School, Buena Vista Arts-Integrated Magnet, Montclair High School, Class II Bike Lanes in Pomona

Planned Effort: General Plan, Systemic Safety Analysis Report, San Bernardino Non-Motorized Transportation Plan: Proposed Class II Bike Lanes
The Plan envisions a reduction in travel lanes to calm vehicular traffic and provide sufficient width to accommodate a Class II Buffered Bike Lane in the short-term and a Class IV Separated Bikeway in the long-term for the corridor segments where it’s feasible and appropriate to do so. The bicycle facility would bridge a critical gap between the Class II Bike Lane west of Kimberly Avenue and proposed bicycle facilities east of Benson Ave in the City of Ontario to facilitate regional travels in the East-West direction.

Along the entire corridor, all street lighting is recommended to be upgraded to LED safety lighting and pedestrian signal heads should include countdown functionality.

Additionally, specific pedestrian treatments are recommended for 7 intersections that were selected to address traffic safety concerns and access to transit, schools, and nearby destinations. Proposed pedestrian treatments include protected intersections, curb extensions (bulb-outs), crosswalks, ADA curb ramps, Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons, and traffic signal modifications.

The City is recommended to conduct additional studies to further evaluate the feasibility of the recommendations.
Chapter 4: Recommendations

CROSS SECTION - SAN BERNARDINO ST BETWEEN KIMBERLY AVE AND BENSON AVE

Existing

Proposed Improvement
CORRIDOR CONCEPT: SAN BERNARDINO ST & VERNON AVE

- Install new street light and foundation (typ.)
- Install intersection control beacon
- Relocate street light
- Install red curb paint (typ.)
- Connect power pole to provide power
- Install high visibility yellow crosswalk
- Construct curb extension
- Install double yellow centerline per Caltrans Std. Plan A20A, Detail 22

LEGEND

- → PROPOSED INTERSECTION CONTROL BEACON
- ○ PROPOSED STREET LIGHT
- ● PROPOSED SERVICE CABINET
- S SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION

*NOTE: THE PROPOSED SERVICE POWER SOURCE IS A GENERAL EXAMPLE OF A TYPICAL POWER SOURCE, COORDINATE WITH UTILITY SERVICE COMPANY AND VERIFY LOCATION.
## DETAILED PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS: BY SEGMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Ave to Benson Ave</td>
<td>64”</td>
<td>Two travel lanes per direction</td>
<td>Class II Buffered Bike Lane</td>
<td>The existing curb-to-curb width is insufficient to accommodate the bicycle facility. However, given the high speed, poor ranking on the Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress, high citation rate, and high collision rate, a Class II Buffered Bike Lane is needed to provide bicyclists with a safe and comfortable environment to travel along. The City is recommended to reduce a travel lane in each direction, remove on-street parking, or explore a combination of strategies to provide adequate space to accommodate the treatments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## DETAILED PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS: BY INTERSECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| San Bernardino St & Ramona Ave | • Install an intersection control beacon on new lighting fixtures  
• Install painted curb extensions bulb-outs with bollards at the SW and NE corners  
• Install red curb paint along San Bernardino St in both directions  
• Install new standard white crosswalks at the north, east, and south legs | Recommendations are consistent with the Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan                              |
| San Bernardino St & Helena Ave | • Install an intersection control beacon on new lighting fixtures at minimum two corners  
• Install red curb paint along San Bernardino St | Recommendations are consistent with the Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan                              |
| San Bernardino St & Monte Vista Ave | • Install a protected intersection with high visibility crosswalk and ADA-compliant curb ramps  
• Upgrade existing traffic signals to provide pedestrian signal heads with countdown functionality and modify accordingly to accommodate the protected intersection | A protected intersection would help facilitate safer crossings for pedestrians and bicyclists. The facility would also compliment the proposed Class II Buffered Bike Lanes/ Class IV Separated Bikeway Lanes for both San Bernardino St and Monte Vista Ave Corridors |
## DETAILED PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS: BY INTERSECTIONS (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| San Bernardino St & Central Ave | • Install a protected intersection with high visibility crosswalk and ADA-compliant curb ramps  
                                 | • Upgrade existing traffic signals to provide pedestrian signal heads with countdown functionality and modify accordingly to accommodate the protected intersection                                           | Recommendations are consistent with the Systemic Safety Analysis Report |
| San Bernardino St & Vernon Ave | • Install curb extensions on NE, SE, and SW corners to reduce the crossing distance on San Bernardino St  
                                 | • Install red curb paint along San Bernardino St on the SW corner  
                                 | • Install intersection control beacon along San Bernardino  
                                 | • Install high visibility yellow ladder style school crosswalk at south and east legs                                                                 | Recommendations are consistent with the Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan |
| San Bernardino St & Benson Ave | • Install curb extensions on NW, SW, and SE corners to reduce the crossing distance on Benson Ave  
                                 | • Install red curb paint along San Bernardino St on the SW corner  
                                 | • Install intersection control beacon along Benson Ave  
                                 | • Install high visibility yellow ladder style school crosswalk at south, west, and east legs                                                                 | Recommendations are consistent with the Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan |
The Kingsley Street Corridor is classified as a local corridor in the Active Transportation Network, and it runs along the entirety of the city in the East-West direction. It provides access to residential neighborhoods and local destinations such as Lehigh Elementary School, Kingsley Elementary School, Sunset Park, and Saratoga Park.

Traffic calming, bicycle, and pedestrian treatments are proposed for the Kingsley Street Corridor. Traffic calming and bicycle treatments are recommended for the entirety of the corridor to improve accessibility and provide connectivity to local and regional destinations, including transit hubs.

**Connectivity To:** Lehigh Elementary School, Sunset Park, Saratoga Park, Kingsley Elementary School, and existing Class III Bike Route in Pomona

**Planned Effort:** General Plan, Systemic Safety Analysis Report
OVERVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS

A Class III Bike Boulevard is recommended for the corridor. The corridor has Average Daily Traffic volumes between 4,000 to 6,000 vehicles which correspond to low traffic volumes. It also has low Level of Traffic Stress ranking which is an indicator for a safe and comfortable environment for biking. The bicycle facility would calm traffic and create a safe and more comfortable experience for bicyclists and other users to reach their destinations.

Along the entire corridor, all street lighting is recommended to be upgraded to LED safety lighting and pedestrian signal heads should include countdown functionality.

Additionally, specific pedestrian treatments are proposed at 8 intersections that were selected to address traffic safety concerns and access to transit, schools, and nearby destinations. Proposed pedestrian treatments include installing Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons, Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons, curb extensions (bulb-outs), crosswalks, and ADA curb ramps.

A bike boulevard is typically consisted of a combination of traffic calming, bicycle, and pedestrian treatments. The City is recommended to conduct additional studies to identify the most appropriate treatments for the Kingsley Street Corridor.

ROADWAY CHARACTERISTICS

- **Roadway width**: 45’
- **Lane geometry**: One unmarked travel lane in each direction
- **On-street parking**: Available on both sides

ESTIMATED COST

$1,805,992
CROSS SECTION - KINGSLEY ST BETWEEN MILLS AVE AND BENSON AVE

Existing

Proposed Improvement
CORRIDOR CONCEPT: KINGSLEY ST & CENTRAL AVE

- Furnish and install new poles to provide protected left-turns on all approaches.
- Re-optimize traffic signal timing.
- Reconstruct existing curb ramps with ADA-compliant curb ramps with cast-in-place detectable warning surfaces.

FURNISH AND INSTALL APS PUSH BUTTON ON EXISTING POLE (TYP.)

DETAIL "A" (TYP.)

RA
YA
GA

ALL 12" LENSES (PROTECTED LEFT TURN)

LEGEND

EXISTING VEHICLE HEAD
EXISTING LUMINAIRE
EXISTING PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL HEAD
EXISTING POLE
PROPOSED 12" TRAFFIC SIGNAL HEAD
PROPOSED 3-12" TRAFFIC SIGNAL HEAD WITH LT ARROW
PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL HEAD
PROPOSED APS PUSH BUTTON

SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION

NOTE: IMPLEMENTATION OF PROTECTED-ONLY LEFT TURN SIGNAL PHASE SHALL BE SUPPORTED BY AN APPROVED/CERTIFIED ENGINEERING STUDY INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, A LEFT-TURN SIGNAL PHASE WARRANT ASSESSMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE STANDARD PRACTICES AND GUIDANCE OF THE LATEST CALIFORNIA MUTCD.
### DETAILED PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS: BY SEGMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mills Ave to Benson Ave</td>
<td>45'</td>
<td>• Unmarked travel lane per direction</td>
<td>Class III Bike Boulevard</td>
<td>The segment has low Pedestrian Level of Comfort and low Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress rankings. The low rankings are indicators of a good environment for active transportation activities to take place. A Class III Bike Boulevard would leverage this opportunity, and provide users with an enhanced infrastructure that would further facilitate active transportation activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• On-street parking on both sides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DETAILED PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS: BY INTERSECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingsley St &amp; Lehigh Ave</td>
<td>• Install Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons at the existing crosswalk to cross Kingsley St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Install raised curb extensions at the NE and SW corners</td>
<td>Recommendations are consistent with the Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Install painted curb extensions with bollards at the NE corner of the intersection and the western corner of the unnamed alleyway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Install red curb paint on the south side of Kingsley St and west side of Lehigh Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Install a Stop sign and high visibility ladder style school crosswalk at the unnamed alleyway for vehicles in the northbound direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Install a high visibility ladder style school crosswalk at the north leg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsley St &amp; Ramona Ave</td>
<td>• Install painted curb extensions at all corners</td>
<td>Recommendations are consistent with the Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Install a high visibility ladder style school crosswalk at the west leg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Upgrade existing Stop signs with embedded LEDs that flash during school hours at the northbound and southbound approaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Repaint red curbs leading into and out of the intersection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsley St &amp; Helena Ave</td>
<td>• Install a new white ladder style crosswalk at the west leg</td>
<td>Recommendations are consistent with the Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Install Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons to facilitate crossings across Kingsley St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Install raised curb extensions to shorten the crossing distance on Kingsley St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsley St &amp; Monte Vista Ave</td>
<td>• Install new high visibility yellow ladder style school crosswalk at all legs</td>
<td>Recommendations are consistent with the Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve all four existing curb ramps to be ADA-compliant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Replace all existing pedestrian push buttons with accessible pedestrian signal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsley St &amp;</td>
<td>• Install new white ladder style crosswalks at the west leg</td>
<td>Recommendations are consistent with the Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont Ave</td>
<td>• Install raised curb extensions to shorten the crossing distance on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kingsley St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Upgrade existing Stop signs with embedded LED lights on Kingsley St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsley St &amp;</td>
<td>• Upgrade traffic signal to provide protected left-turns on all</td>
<td>Recommendations are consistent with the Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ave</td>
<td>approaches and clearance timing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Repaint existing crosswalks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Replace pedestrian push buttons with accessible pedestrian signals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve curb ramps to be ADA-compliant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsley St &amp; Del Mar Ave</td>
<td>• Install pedestrian hybrid beacons along Kingsley St</td>
<td>Recommendations are consistent with the Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Repaint the existing high visibility yellow ladder style school crosswalk at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the west leg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Repaint the existing yellow standard school crosswalk at the north leg to a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high visibility yellow ladder style school crosswalk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Install a raised curb extension at the NW corner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsley St &amp; Benson Ave</td>
<td>• Install new high visibility yellow ladder style school crosswalks at</td>
<td>Recommendations are consistent with the Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all legs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Install raised bulb-outs at each corner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Upgrade existing Stop signs with embedded LEDs that flash during school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hours at each corner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less costly options for traffic signal modifications could be explored in lieu of the proposed improvement; however, they might not be as effective.
Chapter 5

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

5.1 INTRODUCTION
5.2 COST ESTIMATES
5.3 PROJECT PHASING
5.4 FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES
5.1 INTRODUCTION

Implementation of the recommendations identified in Chapter 4 can take many forms. This chapter discusses the cost estimates along with two sets of strategies that the City can use to build the Active Transportation Network and Bicycle Network: Project Phasing and Project Funding Opportunities. The Project Phasing strategy uses a structured approach to implement the recommendations, and it highlights the anticipated amount of time it will take to implement them.

Meanwhile, the Project Funding Opportunities strategy implements recommendations based on funding opportunities that are available. Funding sources come in many forms that can be loosely categorized into federal, state, and local programs, and they may have dissimilar goals and requirements. As such, proposed treatments may qualify for funding from different programs.

These strategies – used either alone or in combination with each other- offer the City greater flexibility in identifying projects from the recommendations for implementation.

Together, these tools equip the City with actions to fulfill the vision of this plan: A City of Montclair that is healthier and more equitable due to safer and more connected roadways through the provision of active transportation options.
5.2 COST ESTIMATES

The recommendations identified in Chapter 4: Recommendation has an estimated cost of $XX,XXX. Planning-level cost assumptions are derived from similar projects across Southern California. Key cost assumption factors include design, environmental, construction management, mobilization, construction, and other contingencies to ensure cost reflects as accurately as possible implementation financial expectations. Table 5-1: Summary of Cost Estimates provides a summary of the total estimated cost to construct the Active Transportation Network and Bicycle Network. Appendix G: Cost Estimates offers a breakdown of the cost estimates by corridor.

Table 5-1: Summary of Cost Estimates
5.3 PROJECT PHASING

The Project Phasing approach allows the City to construct projects according to different phases of time and levels of complexity. The strategy offers the City greater flexibility in selecting projects that are most suitable for the level of commitment and resources available. The categories below group projects by different time frames and levels of difficulty for implementation.

**SHORT TERM (0-2 YEARS)**

Projects that are phased as “short-term” present opportunities for more rapid implementation, reflect strong community support, and has an impactful effect on the community.

**Types of Improvements**

ADA curb ramps, high visibility crosswalks, pavement markings, signage, rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), pedestrian intersection enhancements, new Class II bike lane, and conversion of existing bike lane to buffered bike lane.

**MID TERM (2-5 YEARS)**

Mid-term projects require additional research or are ready for implementation, but impacts on vehicular right-of-way, utility easements, and/or other constraints must be considered.

**Types of Improvements**

Off-street shared use path, sidewalk (with curb and gutter), curb extensions / bulbouts, bike lane with buffer, restriping existing bike lanes and buffered bike lanes, and off street bike path or shared use path.

**LONG TERM (5+ YEARS)**

These projects can be considered as forecasted projects and require added resources prior to implementation. These projects require more attention in the engineering and design phases or include the need for coordination with adjacent agencies or county governing bodies.

**Types of Improvements**

Grade separated freeway or roadway crossing for shared use path or bike path, traffic signals, roundabouts, and any project that requires the City to modify/add hard wiring infrastructure.
5.4 FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

Many sources of funding are available for the City to pursue to plan, design, and construct the Active Transportation Network. Funding sources are available at the federal, state, and local levels. Programs could fund a variety of infrastructure projects that target areas such as active transportation, air quality, and safety education.

The funding sources are showcased in Table 5.2: Federal Funding Sources, Table 5.3: State Funding Sources, and Table 5.4: Local Funding Sources. This list is subject to change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Source</th>
<th>Administering Agency</th>
<th>Matching Requirement</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Program via FAST Act</td>
<td>United States Dept. of Transportation through SBCTA</td>
<td>Established by SBCTA</td>
<td>The program funds transportation projects likely to contribute to the attainment or maintenance of a national ambient air quality standard, with a high level of effectiveness in reducing air pollution, and be included in the MPO’s current transportation plan and transportation improvement program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)</td>
<td>United States Dept. of Transportation through Caltrans</td>
<td>10% Match</td>
<td>HSIP funds projects that improve safety for any public road, publicly owned bicycle, pedestrian pathway, or trail. Projects must show safety improvement and cost benefits. In addition to infrastructure improvements, the program also funds SRTS education and encouragement programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG)</td>
<td>United States Dept. of Transportation through SBCTA</td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>The Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG), formerly the Surface Transportation Program (STP), provides flexible funding that may be used by states and localities for projects to preserve and improve the conditions and performance on any Federal-aid highway, bridge and tunnel projects on any public road, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and transit capital projects, including intercity bus terminals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development (BUILD)</td>
<td>United States Dept. of Transportation</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Formerly the TIGER grant, the BUILD focuses on projects with significant regional or local impacts. While biking and walking projects are eligible, the emphasis is on larger transportation projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)</td>
<td>Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>The CDBG is a flexible program that provides communities with resources to address a wide range of unique community development needs. On the local level, these funds are administered by the San Bernardino County Community Development and Housing Department. The program can fund a range of projects including building community facilities, parks, and roads; providing new and increased public services; and supporting initiatives that create new jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program (AHSC)</td>
<td>Strategic Growth Council and Department of Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>Has funding commitment requirements</td>
<td>The Program funds land-use, housing, transportation, and land preservation projects to support infill and compact development that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5-3: State Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Source</th>
<th>Administering Agency</th>
<th>Matching Requirement</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation Program (ATP)</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>The program funds active transportation-related infrastructure projects, plans, and education/encouragement/enforcement activities. It consolidated previous programs (Transportation Alternatives Program, Bicycle Transportation Account, and Safe Routes to Schools) into one program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Communities Grant (a part of the</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>11.47% minimum</td>
<td>The effort provides funding for infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects that plan for reductions in GHG and VMT, and/or integrate Land Use and Transportation planning. This includes: SRTS, ATP, trail master plans, pedestrian master plans, bicycle master plans, Vision Zero, bike parking facilities planning, educational outreach, traffic calming, health equity studies, first mile/last mile, station area planning, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant Program</td>
<td>CA Natural Resources Agency</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>The program funds projects that enhance or mitigate environmental impacts caused by future transportation projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP)</td>
<td>CalSTA and Caltrans Division of Rail and Mass Transportation</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>The TIRCP provides grants from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) to fund transformative capital improvements that will modernize California's intercity, commuter, and urban rail systems, and bus and ferry transit systems, to significantly reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, vehicle miles traveled, and congestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Transportation Planning Grant</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>The Community-Based Transportation Planning grant program aims to engage the community in transportation and land use projects. Projects support concepts such as livable and sustainable communities with a transportation or mobility focus. They should also promote community identity and quality of life, as well as provide transportation and land use benefits to communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway Operation and Protection Program</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>SHOOP offers funding for capital improvement projects that relate to the state highway system. Projects focus on reducing collisions, enhancing mobility, restoring damage to roadways, and preserving bridges and roadways. This can include pedestrian and bicycle facility projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubberized Pavement Grant Program</td>
<td>CA Dept. of Resources Recycling and Recovery</td>
<td>$350,000 maximum per application, $7,750,000 for FY 18-19</td>
<td>The program offers funding for on-street bikeway and roadway projects that use 100% California waste tires. The grant program is designed to promote markets for recycled-content surfacing products derived from only California-generated waste tires. It is aimed at encouraging first-time or limited users of rubberized pavement in two project types – Hot-Mix and Chip Seal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Greening Grant Program</td>
<td>CA Natural Resources Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding for the Urban Greening Program comes from revenue generated from the state’s Cap and Trade program. Projects that qualify for grants from the program are required to show net GHG benefits along with other benefits; additionally, they must include one of three project activities: sequester and store carbon by planting trees, reduce building energy use by strategically planting trees to shade buildings; and/or reduce commute vehicle miles traveled by constructing bicycle paths, bicycle lanes or pedestrian facilities that provide safe routes for travel between residences, workplaces, commercial centers, and schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 5-3: State Funding Sources (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Source</th>
<th>Administering Agency</th>
<th>Matching Requirement</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Impact Fees</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Funds sourced from Developer Impact Fees can help pay for SRTS improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Communities Program</td>
<td>Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>The program offers grants that can be used toward planning and policy efforts that allow for the implementation of the regional RTP/SCS. Grants in the program fall into three categories: Integrated Land Use – Sustainable Land Use Planning, Transit Oriented Development (TOD) and Land Use &amp; Transportation Integration; Active Transportation – Bicycle, Pedestrian and Safe Routes to School Plans; Green Region – Natural Resource Plans, Climate Action Plans (CAPs) and Green House Gas (GHG) Reduction programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportaiton Development Act: Local Transportation Fund (LTF) and State Transit Assistance (STA)</td>
<td>SBCTA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The Local Transportation Fund (LTF) and State Transit Assistance (STA) Fund were created from the Transportation Development Act. These funds support a variety of transportation projects across the state. A portion of the LTF is set-aside for pedestrian and bicycle projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure I</td>
<td>SBCTA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Under Measure I, San Bernardino County collects a half-cent sales tax for transportation improvements. The revenue collected from each of the six subarea could only be used within that subarea. The City of Montclair is located in the Valley Subarea, south of the mountains.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-4: Local Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Source</th>
<th>Administering Agency</th>
<th>Matching Requirement</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformative Climate Communities</td>
<td>Strategic Growth Council and Department of Conservation</td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>The Program funds community-led development and infrastructure projects that achieve major environmental, health, and economic benefits in California’s most disadvantaged communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Transportation Equity Program</td>
<td>Air Resources Board</td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>STEP is a new program that began in 2020 that aims to address community residents’ transportation needs, increase residents’ access to key destinations, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions with grant funding to support clean transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Partnership Program (LPP)</td>
<td>California Transportation Commission</td>
<td>One-to-one match with some exceptions</td>
<td>The primary objective of this program is to provide funding to counties, cities, districts, and regional transportation agencies in which voters have approved fees or taxes dedicated solely to transportation improvements or that have imposed fees, including uniform developer fees, dedicated solely to transportation improvements. Funding includes $200M/year to improve aging Infrastructure, Road Conditions, Active Transportation, Transit and rail, Health and Safety Benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets and Roads (LSR) Program</td>
<td>California Transportation Commission</td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>The purpose of the program is to provide approximately $1.5 billion per year to cities and counties for basic road maintenance, rehabilitation, and critical safety projects on the local streets and roads system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions for Congested Corridors (SCCP)</td>
<td>California Transportation Commission</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>The purpose of the program is to provide funding to achieve a balanced set of transportation, environmental, and community access improvements to reduce congestion throughout the state. This statewide, competitive program makes $250 million available annually for projects that implement specific transportation performance improvements and are part of a comprehensive corridor plan by providing more transportation choices while preserving the character of local communities and creating opportunities for neighborhood enhancement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A1 MUNICIPAL PLANS

Montclair General Plan (forthcoming 2020/2021)

The General Plan presents a new vision to reimagine the City of Montclair. Eight Guiding Principles collectively form the vision. Extracted from the General Plan, the Guiding Principles are:

- **Our Natural Community**: Promote and ensure equitable access to clean air and water, parks and open space, and develop an integrated green infrastructure.
- **Our Prosperous Community**: Attract and retain jobs within growth industries; nurture small entrepreneurial businesses; redevelop underutilized properties along key corridors and districts; and build the city’s fiscal capacity.
- **Our Well Planned Community**: Conserve and enhance stable areas, promote contextual infill, and direct new growth to downtown, Arrow Highway Mixed-Use District, and corridors.
- **Our Accessible Community**: Transportation networks support and encourage mobility and broader community goals of safety, health, economic development, and environmental sustainability.
- **Our Healthy Community**: Promote health and well-being for all through inclusive approaches where healthy habits are encouraged.
- **Our Safe Community**: Promote a safer community by minimizing threats to life from natural and man-caused hazards.
- **Our Active Community**: Promote and ensure inclusive and equitable access to a range of opportunities for physical activities including parks, open space, and recreation.
- **Our Creative Community**: Enhance our creative community through strengthening partnerships, integrating public art, creating and enhancing venues; and leveraging our creative economy.

The vision rests upon several key ideas that are important to the development of the Montclair Active Transportation Plan. These ideas include:

- Organization of the city into a green network consists of creek, trails, green streets, open spaces, and parks.
- Reimagine four main streets: Central Avenue, Holt Avenue, Arrow Highway, and Mission Boulevard.
- Identification of catalytic projects, many of which are streetscape enhancement and streetscape improvement projects
- Proposal of new urban form structure and land use classifications.


The Systemic Safety Analysis Report provides a framework that aims to reduce the number and
severity of collisions in the City of Montclair. The collisions identified in the report include vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle collisions. The Report lists ten priority locations and provides countermeasures for these locations, many of which would benefit pedestrians and bicyclists.

Priority locations include a mixture of systemic locations, segments locations, and spot locations, and include the following:

- Monte Vista Avenue Intersections with Permissive Lefts
- Central Avenue Intersections with Permissive Lefts
- Ramona Avenue & Mission Boulevard
- Ramona Avenue Multi-Lane Stop-Controlled Intersections
- Mills Avenue Stop-Controlled and Offset Intersections
- Orchard Street Stop-Controlled Intersections
- Bandera Street, between Ramona Avenue and Central Avenue
- Holt Boulevard, East of Monte Vista Avenue to Central Avenue
- Central Avenue, North of Benito Street to San Bernardino Street
- Kingsley Street, between Amherst Avenue and Helena Avenue

**North Montclair Specific Plan (1998)**

The North Montclair Specific Plan provides guidance on the development/redevelopment of an approximately 640-acreage area in the northern portion of Montclair. The area lies within the City’s northern boundary to the north, Palo Verde Street and the I-10 San Bernardino Freeway to the south, and Benson Avenue to the east. The Specific Plan offers three main goals:

- Develop the area into a shopping and employment center where the Montclair TransCenter would play an important role in the area’s long-term development effort.
- Improve the image (visual character) of the area through a combination of urban design techniques.
- Provide for safe and convenient movement of people and goods throughout the area.

**North Montclair Downtown Specific Plan (2006), Updated 2017**

The North Montclair Downtown Specific Plan builds upon the vision developed in the 1998 North Montclair Specific Plan. It proposes Transit-Oriented Development around the Montclair TransCenter, transformation of the Montclair Place area, and the use of a new street typology, which
include the following:

- Mixed-use/ Retail Main Street (Parallel Parking)
- Mixed-use/ Retail Main Street (Mixed Parking)
- Residential Street (Free-flow)
- Slow Residential Street
- Yield Residential Street

The Plan also provides proposed recommendations to transform Arrow Highway, Fremont Ave, and Richton Street into more pedestrian-friendly roadways.

Arrow Highway Mixed-Use District (AHMUD) Specific Plan (forthcoming-2020)

The forthcoming AHMUD Plan uses form-based code to plan for an area in the northeast corner of Montclair. The Plan is anticipated to be completed in late 2020.

Holt Blvd Specific Plan (1991), Updated 2007

The Holt Boulevard Specific Plan offers guidance on the land use and community design along the Holt Boulevard Corridor. The Plan seeks to stimulate economic activity in the southern portion of Montclair. The corridor encompasses the entirety of Holt Boulevard within the city’s jurisdiction, and is approximately 2.2 miles extending from Mills Avenue to Benson Avenue.

The Plan identifies many opportunities pertinent to active transportation along the corridor including:

- Designation of Mills Avenue at Holt Boulevard, Central Avenue at Holt Boulevard, and Benson Avenue at Holt Boulevard as Gateways. Through the designations, the City hopes that it can encourage the construction and improvement of those intersections and reduce the rate of collisions.
- Provision of a wide, landscape raised/center median on Holt Boulevard. Through this design, the corridor would have a singular consistent urban design element.

Montclair Programs and Policies

Healthy Montclair

Established in 2010, Healthy Montclair is a community program that aims to improve the quality of life of its residents. Healthy Montclair uses three key approaches to achieve its goals:

- Encourage active living through easier access to physical activities
- Improve food choices by providing more healthy food options
- Improve health services through increasing the number of health services and facilities available

These programs consist of making city improvements, providing services to residents, and providing recreational centers/parks for residents.

Municipal Code 8.28.020 (A)

In 2018, the City passed an ordinance codified in the City of Montclair Municipal Code 8.28.020 (A) which states, “No pedestrian shall cross a street or highway while engaged in a phone call, viewing a mobile electronic device or with both ears covered or obstructed by personal audio equipment.” The law allows enforcement officers to fine pedestrians who perform these activities while crossing the City’s roadways.

Other Municipal Programs

The City of Montclair has many community programs and policies that are relevant to active transportation planning efforts. Programs such as the Montclair Mini School, Montclair After School...
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• Richton Street (East-West direction)
• San Bernardino Street (East-West direction)
• Orchard Street (East-West direction)
• Mission Boulevard (East-West direction)
• Benson Avenue (North-South direction)

Points of Interest Pedestrian Plan (SBCTA)
The Points of Interest Pedestrian Plan (PIPP) identifies key destinations at each municipality that are in need of active transportation improvements. According to the Plan, the following three destinations/areas in Montclair had the highest needs:

• Alma Hofman Park, Montclair Library, and Civic Center
• Kingsley Park and Saratoga Park
• Wilderness Basin Park, Serrano Middle School, and Hospital Medical Center

Additionally, the Plan also proposes two other possible locations:

• Moreno Elementary School and Montclair Plaza
• Lehigh Elementary School and Sunset Park

The Plan provides specific planning recommendations for the Alma Hofman Park, Montclair Library, and Civic Center area.

Safe Routes to School Plan: Phase I & II (2017), SBCTA
The Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Plan aims to address the active transportation needs of San Bernardino County students and school areas. It had two main goals:

• Promote walking and cycling to school
• Improving the overall health of the students

A.2 REGIONAL PLANS

Connect SoCal – The 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Community Strategies (2020), SCAG

Adopted in 2020 by the Southern California Association of Governments, Connect SoCal is Southern California’s long-range strategy to improve the region’s mobility, economy, and sustainability. Active Transportation efforts are integral components of achieving the goals identified in the planning document. Its significance is highlighted in a stand-alone technical report on the impact of Active Transportation. The report also discusses many strategies for increasing active transportation options in Southern California.

Non-Motorized Transportation Plan (Updated 2018), SBCTA

In 2018, the San Bernardino County Transit Authority (SBCTA) adopted the Non-motorized Transportation Plan (NMTP). The NMTP has four key goals:

• Increased bicycle and pedestrian access
• Increased travel by cycling and biking
• Routinely consider bicyclists and pedestrians in planning efforts
• Improved bicycle and pedestrian safety

For the City of Montclair, the NMTP calls for Class II Bikeways along the following corridors:

Program (MAP), and Montclair Walkers provide opportunities for community members to be engaged in active transportation-related activities. Meanwhile, the Por La Vida program which trains women to become local health ambassadors frequently hosts classes in elementary schools to promote healthy behaviors.
and community by providing safer and more accessible facilities for these modes of transportation.

Phase II of this strategy prioritized site-specific SRTS infrastructure improvements. For the City of Montclair, the plan provided pedestrian and bicycle-related recommendations for Moreno Elementary School and Serrano Middle School.

**Improvement To Transit Access For Cyclists And Pedestrians Study (2012)**

The study identified barriers and opportunities for non-motorized transportation access to six Metrolink Stations located along the San Bernardino Gold Line and within San Bernardino County and four sbX Bus Rapid Transit (BSRT) Stations. For the Montclair Metrolink Station, the study proposed improvements such as sidewalk construction, crossing improvements for the Pacific Electric Trail, improved access to the station from Monte Vista Ave, and upgraded secure bicycle parking.

**Comprehensive Pedestrian Sidewalk Inventory Plan (SBCTA)- Ongoing**

The Comprehensive Pedestrian Sidewalk Inventory Plan effort aims to identify areas for potential sidewalk improvements across San Bernardino County. This effort is a joint collaboration between SBCTA and local jurisdictions, including the City of Montclair.
## A.3 Adjacent Agency Planning Efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Relevant Plans</th>
<th>Connectivity to Montclair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Upland      | • General Plan  
 • Non-Motorized Transportation Plan (NMTP), SBCTA | • **Pacific Electric Trail**: The Pacific Electric Trail is a Class I Bike Trail that runs in the east to west direction. It connects the most northern part of Montclair to Upland’s southern region along the northern city boundary of Montclair.  
 • **Benson Avenue**: A Class II Bike Route runs in the north-south direction where it continues through Montclair. The route intersects with the Pacific Electric Trail, which offers bicyclists with opportunities for more regional accessibility and connectivity. The NMTP shows that the existing bicycle facility will be upgraded to a Class II Bike Lane in the future.  
 • **Monte Vista Avenue**: Monte Vista Avenue contains an existing Class II Bike Lane that runs through the western portion of Upland, dips into the northern part of Montclair, and ends at the intersection of Monte Vista Avenue and Arrow Highway. This route also intersects with the Pacific Electric Trail. |
| Chino       | • General Plan  
 • Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan  
 • Non-Motorized Transportation Plan (NMTP), SBCTA | • **Monte Vista Avenue**: The Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan calls for a Class IV Cycle Track along Monte Vista Avenue. While the bicycle facility will provide bicycle connectivity to the northern boundaries of Chino, it will not provide direct access to Montclair since there are unincorporated areas of San Bernardino County in between the two cities.  
 • **G Street**: An existing Class II Bike Route is available on G Street. The forthcoming Ontario Active Transportation Master Plan is anticipated to have more proposed connectivity to Montclair. |
| Ontario     | • The Ontario Plan (General Plan)  
 • Non-Motorized Transportation Plan (NMTP), SBCTA |  
 | Pomona      | • General Plan  
 • Active Transportation Master Plan  
 • Active Transportation Strategic Plan (LA Metro) | • **San Bernardino Avenue**: San Bernardino Avenue has a Class II Bike Lane that runs in the east to west direction and ends at San Bernardino Avenue in Montclair. It intersects with the Class II Bike Lane on Mills Avenue, which provides connections to other bike facilities in Pomona, Montclair, and Upland.  
 • **Kingsley Avenue**: Kingsley Avenue contains a Class III Bike Route that runs from east to west and stops at the intersection of Mills Avenue and Kingsley Avenue. Like the Class II Bike Lane on San Bernardino Avenue, this connectivity gives riders access to bike facilities in Pomona, Montclair, and Upland.  
 • **Mission Boulevard**: According to the ATSP, Mission Boulevard is a planned on-street bicycle facility.  
 • **San Jose Avenue** and **Huntington Drive**: According to the ATSP, both San Jose Avenue and Huntington Drive have planned on-street bicycle facilities. |
| Claremont   | • General Plan  
 • Active Transportation Strategic Plan (LA Metro) |  

Table A-1: List Of Adjacent Agency Planning Efforts Reviewed
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OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT PLAN

As a planning effort that had the potential to touch upon the lives of all Montclair residents, visitors, and businesses, the outreach efforts for the Montclair Active Transportation Plan provided multiple opportunities for and leverage available communication tools to engage with the Montclair community. The Outreach and Engagement Plan (OEP) served as a road-map that provided guidance and direction towards meeting the goal of meeting the Montclair community’s active transportation needs.

The Plan was updated on an as-needed basis to reflect new opportunities and challenges. One of the most important changes to the outreach effort occurred due to the COVID-19 pandemic. In response to the pandemic, the ATP Team switched to Online engagement opportunities to reach Montclair community members.

The Consulting team used a variety of community engagement strategies to involve Montclair’s community. The primary engagement elements included:

1. Stakeholders Engagement
2. Community workshops and Walking Safety Assessments
3. Communication branding and material
4. Communication campaign and channels
5. Feedback tools
6. Coordination with neighboring jurisdictions

1. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT
The Montclair Active Transportation Plan stakeholders included a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) as well as members of the community. The Consultant Team established a 9-15 member Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The Technical Advisory Committee’s primary responsibility included providing community insights about the Montclair ATP. Members were made up of City, County, and SCAG Staff, Healthy Montclair, Omnitrans, and other key stakeholders. The ATP Team leveraged the TAC member’s community knowledge to include additional project stakeholders.

The Technical Advisory Committee met on a quarterly basis throughout the course of the project where members reviewed event milestones and provided input on deliverables. The TAC was also invited to participate in Montclair ATP workshops.

Community stakeholders contributed a unique perspective to the Montclair ATP based on their experience of living and working in the City. These members included residents, employees/employers, students, or advocates. Stakeholders were encouraged to participate in community workshops, Walking Safety Assessments, and other outreach activities.
2. COMMUNITY WORKSHOP AND WALKING SAFETY ASSESSMENTS

The outreach efforts included two types of opportunities to interact face to face with the Montclair community: workshops and Walking Safety Assessments. A Tactical Urbanism demonstration was planned; however, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the ATP Team did not install the demonstration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Type</th>
<th># Meetings</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Plan Introduction, Information Gathering, Draft Recommendations, and Final Plan</td>
<td>City Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Safety Assessment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Walking/Biking; Group Discussion</td>
<td>Walk/Bike/ Bus Safety Assessments</td>
<td>Various Locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tactical Demonstration</td>
<td>Mini Temporary Installations</td>
<td>Planned but not installed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The community workshops were conducted using a community-based planning style. At the workshops, community members:

1. Were introduced to the Montclair Active Transportation Plan
2. Provided comments and ideas on active transportation improvements
3. Gave feedback on preliminary recommendations

The ATP Team hosted five Walking Safety Assessments at various locations throughout the City. Two of the assessments were held at schools, while the remaining three were held at major attractors within the community.
3. COMMUNICATION BRANDING AND MATERIAL

The ATP Team developed a project logo and project style templates to be used for all communications materials. The logo took inspiration from existing logos to tie the Montclair ATP with similar efforts such as the Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan and Healthy Montclair Initiative.

The ATP Team also created a package of communication materials that were used to publicize the workshops and Walking Safety Assessments. Information was provided in both English and Spanish. These materials included:

- Project fact sheet
- Flyer
- Social media postings
- Press release

4. COMMUNICATION CAMPAIGN AND CHANNELS

Project communications and outreach content distributed through a variety of channels, as deemed appropriate. These communication channels included:

Social Media – Social media platforms such as Instagram, Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and Nextdoor were used to generate interest with the general public. The ATP Team worked with the City to develop templates for social media platforms.

Email Blasts - The ATP Team coordinated with the City to use the existing email listservs and communication tools to disseminate information about the Montclair ATP to interested stakeholders and the general public.

Physical Flyer Distribution- Hard copy notification material will be posted throughout the City at key locations.

The Consultant Team also worked with the Technical Advisory Committee and Public Stakeholders to help get the word out about the outreach activities.

5. FEEDBACK TOOLS

In addition to workshops and Walking Safety Assessments, the ATP Team also provided a variety of feedback tools to capture the public’s sentiment. These technology-based tools included:

Project Email/Phone - A unique project email address and phone number were created for public inquiries.

Online Platform - The ATP Team developed an Online Platform to educate community members about the ATP effort and gather community input on draft recommendations.

Online and Paper Surveys – The ATP Team worked with the City to develop Online and paper surveys for the Montclair community to give their feedback. Paper surveys were distributed at key locations as well as community events. The ATP Team also hosted the survey on the Online Platform to gain a broader audience.

6. COORDINATION WITH NEIGHBORING JURISDICTION

Interagency coordination ensured that the Montclair ATP provides for regional connectivity. The City of Montclair shares a border with the cities of Ontario, Upland, Claremont, Chino, and Pomona. As part of the outreach effort, the ATP Team worked with neighboring agencies to discuss proposed recommendations.
OVERVIEW

The Montclair Active Transportation Plan (ATP) team presented to more than 15 elected officials and community members at the Community Kick-off Workshop. The workshop was co-hosted with the Initial Public Engagement Workshop for the Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan since both projects have similar goals. The goal of the event was to introduce the Montclair Active Transportation Plan effort to the Montclair community and identify concerns and potential improvements.

ACTIVITIES

Presentation: The project team gave a project overview to introduce workshop participants to the Montclair ATP effort. The presentation included topics such as community outreach strategies and efforts, data collection and preliminary analyses, and upcoming events.

Display Boards: The project team engaged with participants through series of display boards. Comments received from the activity will help inform project recommendations.

Handouts: Workshop participants received a project factsheet and upcoming events flyer. They were encouraged to participate in upcoming Walking Safety Assessments and other outreach events.
COMMUNITY KICK-OFF WORKSHOP

Tuesday, September 3, 2019 | 5:45 PM - 7:00 PM

Questions? Call us at (909) 295-2475 or email MontclairATP@gmail.com.
**SUMMARY**

On Wednesday, October 16th, 2019, the Montclair Active Transportation Plan (ATP) Team hosted a Walking Safety Assessment Workshop for seniors at the Montclair Senior Center. The Safety Assessment was conducted through a virtual walk, using Google Earth, where the facilitator guided the participants along different streets in Montclair. Some seniors shared photos of neighborhood streets and intersections where issues currently exist. Input received from the event will be used to inform recommendations.

**SENIOR INPUT ISSUES**

The seniors discussed the following concerns that help inform their transportation decisions:

- Traffic conditions
- Cost
- General health
- Safety
- Use of assistive devices (canes, walkers, and wheelchairs)

**PARTICIPANTS**

12 Seniors

2 City Staff

Questions? Call us at (909) 295-2475 or email MontclairATP@gmail.com.
TRAVEL BEHAVIOR
Most seniors arrived at the event either by driving alone (50%) or carpool (40%).
On a typical day, most seniors get around town using multiple modes of transportation. The most popular modes include: by foot (90%), and car, either by driving alone (80%) or with a friend (70%).

LOCAL DESTINATIONS
Event participants identified the following places as local destinations:

• Montclair Community Center: The center offers seniors a wide variety of activities and amenities. Seniors can enjoy food with each other, socialize, volunteer, and exercise.
• Montclair transit center: Public transit gives seniors the freedom to go to places. It offers them access to local and regional destinations.
• Montclair Place Mall: It is a local retail mall for shopping. Montclair Walkers group also uses the mall for exercise.
• Parks: Parks are recreational destinations for exercise and relaxing. They are places that encourage healthy living activities.
• Hospitals/ doctors’ office: A major activity for some seniors is visiting the hospital or doctor’s office to maintain health.
• Local businesses: Restaurants and breweries are places seniors enjoy going to for food and socializing.

LOCATION SPECIFIC ISSUES
Event participants discussed many location-specific comments. Comments received will help inform recommendations for the Montclair Active Transportation Plan.
SUMMARY

On Thursday, November 21, 2019, the Montclair Active Transportation Plan (ATP) Team hosted a Walking Safety Assessment Workshop at the Montclair Youth Center. At the workshop, attendees participated in a lively round table discussion, using Google Earth and ArcGIS maps to look at the San Antonio Creek Channel. They were able to take a virtual walk around the channel and adjacent streets. Input received from the event will be used to inform recommendations.

THE VISION FOR A MULTI-USE TRAIL

Event participants brainstormed a vision for a multi-use trail along the San Antonio Creek Channel. They envisioned the trail to be used by pedestrians, bicyclists, and other micro-mobility devices. Participants identified the following types of users that may use the trail:

- Seniors and community members with disability
- Families, children, and pets
- Elementary, high school, and college students
- Commuters

USER-SPECIFIC NEEDS

As part of the discussion, participants delved into the specific needs of each user group.

Seniors and community members with disability
- Separated facilities for fast and slow users
- Accessible parking
- ADA-compliant ramps for rolling walkers and other assistive devices
- Cameras and other technologies to create a safe space

Families, children, and pets
- Trailhead entry points spaced wide enough for strollers
- Informational signs in English and Spanish
- Pet stations with pet waste bags and other amenities

Elementary, high school, and college students
- Connectivity to the Pacific Electric Trail
- Physical activity exercise stations
- Community murals

PARTICIPANTS

14 Participants

4 City Staff
WALKING SAFETY ASSESSMENT (WSA) SUMMARY
Thursday, November 21, 2019 | 9:00 AM - 11:00 AM

USER-SPECIFIC NEEDS (CONT.)
Commuters
• First/last mile connections to the trail and local commuter shuttle
• Minimum stops and crossings
• Smooth trail
• Bike parking

LOCATIONS OF INTEREST
At the breakout session, event participants expressed their thoughts about the following specific crossings at intersections:
• Arrow Highway
• Interstate 10 underpass
• San Bernardino Street
• Ramona Avenue
• Mission Boulevard
• Benito Street

LOCATION SPECIFIC ISSUES
Participants discussed many infrastructural considerations and opportunities for a multi-use trail along the creek channel. Comments received will be incorporated into the Montclair Active Transportation Plan.

OTHER DISCUSSION TOPICS
In addition to infrastructural considerations, participants also discussed topics related to programming and social issues. They explored activities such as after school clinics and bike safety education that can be incorporated into the programming effort for the trail.
SUMMARY

On Wednesday, February 26, 2020, the Montclair Active Transportation Plan (ATP) Team hosted a Pop-up Workshop at the Montclair Transcenter and Metrolink Station. The purpose of the pop-up workshop was to engage with transit riders to discuss barriers to taking active modes of transportation to and from the Transcenter and Metrolink Station, as well as throughout the City. Over the course of the event, the ATP team engaged with 35 participants and gathered many valuable pieces of comments.

ACTIVITIES

Montclair ATP Display Boards: The ATP team set up display boards at the booth to introduce participants to the project and seek input. One poster board provided a map of key destinations in Montclair while the other board invited transit users to share their input. Transit users gave many insightful comments about their traveling behavior to and from the Transcenter and Metrolink Station, as well as observations they made about the location.

Survey Collection: The Active transportation team collected 21 surveys at the event. Data collected from the surveys will be integrated into the wider data collection effort and used to inform recommendations.

Handouts: The project team utilized small vicinity maps to converse with transit riders about possible improvements they would like to see in both the Transcenter and Metrolink Station, as well as throughout the City of Montclair. Project team members took notes and recorded locations of possible barriers on the vicinity maps for later reference. They filled out 13 vicinity maps at this event.
MONTCLAIR TRANSCENTER AND METROLINK STATION
POP-UP WORKSHOP SUMMARY
Wednesday, February 26, 2020 | 3:00 PM - 8:00 PM

Participant engagement

Example of comments received

Pop-up workshop setup

Questions? Call us at (909) 295-2475 or email MontclairATP@gmail.com.
Project team staff met with school staff and parents to identify barriers and challenges that students face while walking and biking to and from Buena Vista Arts Integrated Magnet School. The event was held jointly with Vernon Middle School’s Walking Safety Assessment. During the workshop, project team staff documented participants’ concerns and discussed potential solutions.

**Behavior-related and infrastructure-related comments:** Participants reported concerns with motorists speeding, double parking, and not yielding to pedestrians along corridors adjacent to the school. They also mentioned pedestrians cross mid-block to reach the school or vehicles.

**Programming-related comments:** Participants would like to see more enforcement and educational programs regarding overall safety for both students and adults.

The comments documented in this event summary are not the final recommendations of the Safe Routes to School plan; however, they will be considered along with other data collected for the final recommendations.

**SUMMARY**

**GENERAL FEEDBACK AND OBSERVATIONS**

Questions? Call us at (909) 235-6356 or email MontclairSRTS@gmail.com.

Thursday, September 12th, 2019 | 1:00 PM - 2:30 PM
Street segments where vehicles are perceived to travel faster than the posted speed limit.

Key Concerns

Existing Conditions

- San Bernardino St: wide roadway (65’), motorists on opposite directions may not see pedestrians crossing the roadway and do not yield to pedestrians
- high volume of vehicle and pedestrian traffic with posted speed of 40mph
- need for improved school signage and pavement markings
- motorists double park, perform U-turns, and form long queues for student pick-up
- motorists double park and perform U-turns mid-block
- pedestrians cross midblock to vehicles parked on the west side
- motorists do not yield to pedestrians and do not stop completely at the stop-controlled intersection
- SW corner: vegetation obstructs visibility of the stop sign
- wide roadway (65’) on Benson Ave: motorists on opposite directions may not see pedestrians crossing the roadway
- parked vehicles on both sides of the roadway obstruct visibility of pedestrians crossing the roadway
- NW corner: vegetation obstruct visibility of pedestrians crossing the roadway
- high volume of vehicle and pedestrian traffic
- insufficient street lighting
- west side: parked vehicles and long queues along travel lanes in the southbound direction obstruct visibility of pedestrians using the crosswalk
- east side: lack of advanced warning signs for motorists to yield to pedestrians using the crosswalk
- high volume of vehicle and pedestrian traffic
- insufficient street lighting
- wide roadway (65’) on Benson Ave: motorists on opposite directions may not see pedestrians crossing the roadway
- parked vehicles on both sides of the roadway obstruct visibility of pedestrians crossing the roadway
- NW corner: vegetation obstruct visibility of pedestrians crossing the roadway
- high volume of vehicle and pedestrian traffic
- insufficient street lighting
- wide roadway (65’) on Benson Ave: motorists on opposite directions may not see pedestrians crossing the roadway
- parked vehicles on both sides of the roadway obstruct visibility of pedestrians crossing the roadway
- NW corner: vegetation obstruct visibility of pedestrians crossing the roadway

Questions? Call us at (909) 235-6356 or email MontclairSRTS@gmail.com.
SUMMARY

On Tuesday, June 10th, 2019, the Montclair Active Transportation Plan (ATP) Team presented a Safe Routes to School seminar for students at Montclair High School. The goals of the seminar included providing opportunities for student to identify barriers and challenges that they face while walking and biking to school and offering a forum to help them develop their leadership skills.

GENERAL FEEDBACK AND OBSERVATIONS

Behavior-related and Infrastructure-related comments:
Students reported concerns with motorists speeding, double parking, and not yielding to pedestrians walking on roadways adjacent to the school. They also noted a lack of crosswalks, mid-block crossings, and visibility concerns due to parking and foliage.

Programming-related comments:
Students would like to see more enforcement and education regarding overall safety around the school neighborhood.

PARTICIPANTS

35 Students
3 School Staff Members

The comments documented in this event summary are not the final recommendations of the Safe Routes to School plan; however, they will be considered along with other data collected for the final recommendations.
On Tuesday, June 10th, 2019, the Montclair Active Transportation Plan (ATP) Team presented a Safe Routes to School seminar for students at Montclair High School. The goals of the seminar included providing opportunities for student to identify barriers and challenges that they face while walking and biking to school and offering a forum to help them develop their leadership skills.

**SUMMARY**

Behavior-related and Infrastructure-related comments: Students reported concerns with motorists speeding, double parking, and not yielding to pedestrians walking on roadways adjacent to the school. They also noted a lack of crosswalks, mid-block crossings, and visibility concerns due to parking and foliage.

Programming-related comments: Students would like to see more enforcement and education regarding overall safety around the school neighborhood.

**PARTICIPANTS**

35 Students

3 School Staff Members

The comments documented in this event summary are not the final recommendations of the Safe Routes to School plan; however, they will be considered along with other data collected for the final recommendations.

Questions? Call us at (909) 235-6356 or email MontclairSRTS@gmail.com.
MEETING PURPOSE

The purpose of Technical Advisory Committee is to serve as a guiding task force to the Montclair Active Transportation Plan (ATP) project team throughout the course of the project. The goals of the first TAC Meeting were to:

1. Introduce the TAC to the Montclair ATP project team and the project
2. Inform the TAC of their project involvement
3. Update the ATAC with past and upcoming efforts
4. Gather preliminary feedback regarding active transportation in Montclair

EVENT ATTENDEES

A total of 8 individuals participated in the meeting. Participants included regional agencies representatives, community advocates, and City Staff.

EVENT STRUCTURE

Presentation: Following the introductions, the project team gave a presentation to inform the TAC about past and upcoming efforts, along with their involvement in the project.

Breakout Session 1 - ATP Visioning: After the presentation, the project team led two activities. For the first activity, the project team led a visioning exercise to brainstorm project priorities. Among many, the group discussed topics such as public health, safety, accessibility, mobility, and public health. With the input provided, the project team will develop a vision statement that will guide the Montclair Active Transportation Plan.

Breakout Session 2 - Question & Answer: In the second activity, participants had an opportunity to engage with the project team through different exhibits available. Some exhibits were informative, while others were aimed at generating conversations and gathering ideas.
MEETING SUMMARY

On Monday, February 10, 2020, the Technical Advisory Committee had its second meeting. The primary goals of the meeting were twofold:

• to educate the TAC on potential transportation solutions that could address barriers and concerns to walking, biking, and taking transit in the City of Montclair
• to brainstorm potential active transportation improvements in the city

To achieve the meeting goals, the Montclair ATP team gave a presentation to guide the discussion about various transportation elements that the TAC could consider installing in the city.

After the presentation, the TAC broke out into small groups. Within their groups, TAC members discussed specific locations that could be areas of focus for future pedestrian improvements, brainstormed corridors that could be benefit from bicycle facilities or address barriers to connectivity, and identify potential treatments to improve accessibility to transit.
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INTRODUCTION

The Montclair ATP team analyzed an array of data to understand the Montclair community’s active transportation needs. Data analyzed fall along four categories:

- demographic statistics
- travel characteristics
- health and safety
- environment and infrastructure conditions

Table D-1 illustrates the data collected and analyzed by category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Statistics</td>
<td>Demographic characteristics such as race, median household income, age, and language capabilities give a snapshot of the characteristics of the Montclair Community.</td>
<td>• 2017 American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Characteristics</td>
<td>An understanding of travel characteristics allows the Montclair ATP Team to better develop recommendations that can lead to lasting change.</td>
<td>• 2017 American Community Survey, Montclair ATP Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety</td>
<td>Analysis of health and safety indicators provide an understanding of the community’s need for active transportation facilities and programs.</td>
<td>• Transportation Injury Mapping System (TIMS) (2014-2018), Montclair Police Citations (2013-2017), CalEnviroScreen 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Infrastructure</td>
<td>Analyses of the environment and existing infrastructure show physical locations that can benefit from engineering improvements.</td>
<td>• Existing Planning Documents, Field Observations, Comprehensive Pedestrian Sidewalk Inventory Plan (San Bernardino County Transportation Authority)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-1: Data Collected And Analyzed By Category
Median Household Income

The median household income (MHHI) in the City of Montclair is $55,200. This is slightly below the countywide median of $57,156. There is a high concentration of households with a low Median Household Income south of Kingsley Street between Mills Avenue and Central Avenue.

Age

Montclair has a mostly young population with the majority of the City’s residents being younger than 35. This presents opportunities to encourage active modes of transportation.

Households with Limited English Capabilities

With 70.69% of Montclair’s population being Hispanic or Latino, there are many households in the City with limited English capabilities. Areas that contain the highest concentration of households with limited English capabilities are mostly found along the western border of the City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $25,000</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $149,999</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 or More</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-2: Median Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 or younger</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 34</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 49</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 64</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 or older</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-3: Age Of Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Capabilities</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Only Speaking Households</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Speaking Household</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Speaking Households w/ Limited English</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited English Households</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-4: Language Capabilities Of Residents
Figure D-1: Median Household Income In Montclair
Commuter Patterns
Montclair is an auto-oriented city. The majority of residents (77.7%) prefer the use of motor vehicles to commute to work. Additionally, approximately 14.4% of commuters prefer to carpool. However, a small percentage of residents (5.2%) does use an active or public mode of transportation to get to and from work.

Commuter Time
A review of commuter time characteristics shows the importance of providing access and connectivity to nearby municipalities, San Bernardino County, and the broader Southern California. Approximately half (44.6%) of Montclair residents have a commute time that is longer than 30 minutes. This suggests that a large share of resident’s commute to work locations outside of the City. Comparatively, only 1.5% of resident’s have a commute time that is less than 15 minutes and 34.6% of residents have a commute time between 15 and 30 minutes.

Low Vehicle Access
Low vehicle access, which is measured from a combination of households with no vehicles and households with one vehicle, accounts for approximately 40% of households. The average household size is 3.62 while 46.3% of households have one or more members younger than 18 years old. This suggests that there are many members that don’t have access to a vehicle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commute Mode</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work from Home</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Vehicle</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-5: Commuting Modes Of Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15 Minutes</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 29 Minutes</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 44 Minutes</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Minutes or More</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-6: Commute Time Of Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Of Vehicles</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Vehicle Households</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Vehicle Households</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Vehicle Household*</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-7: Low Vehicle Ownership By Household

*Low Vehicle Household is defined as households with one or fewer vehicles.
Low Vehicle Access Households

- Less than 20%
- 20 - 30%
- 30 - 40%
- 40 - 50%
- More than 50%

Data acquired from ACS 2016 5-Year Estimates
Date Created: 02/02/2020

Figure D-2: Limited Vehicle Households In Montclair

Appendix D: Community Needs Assessment - Full Report
Vehicle, Pedestrian-Involved, and Bicycle-Involved Collisions

Analysis of pedestrian and bicycle collisions shows the need for better pedestrian and bicycle facilities to protect Montclair community members who walk and bike. In the five-year period between 2014-2018, a total of 168 pedestrian and bicycle-related collisions occurred in Montclair. Of these collisions, 89 involved a pedestrian and 79 involved a bicyclist. These collisions account for approximately 12% of all collisions. Since 2015, the total number of bicyclist and pedestrian-involved collisions per year has gradually declined. During the study period, bicyclist-involved collisions in Montclair saw a dramatic decrease while pedestrian-involved collisions saw a slight increase over the same timeframe. Based on the collision data within the timeframe, pedestrians are 1.12 times more likely to be involved in a collision than bicyclists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Collisions</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Collisions</td>
<td>1174</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ped &amp; Bike Collisions</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-8: Summary Of Total Pedestrian And Bicycle Collisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Collisions</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely Injured</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible Injury</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint of Pain</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Injured or Killed</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-9: Injury Status Of Victims That Were Involved In Pedestrian Collisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Collisions</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely Injured</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible Injury</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint of Pain</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Injured or Killed</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-10: Injury Status Of Victims That Were Involved In Bicycle Collisions
TOP COLLISION CORRIDORS

Of the 89 pedestrian-involved collisions, 65% occurred on ten different corridors. The top five pedestrian-involved collision corridors (with number of collisions) were:

1. Central Avenue – 12
2. Monte Vista Avenue – 9
3. Ramona Avenue – 9
4. Orchard Street – 5
5. Mills Avenue – 4

Of the 79 bicyclist-involved collisions, 67% occurred on ten different corridors. The top five bicyclist-involved collision corridors (with number of collisions) were:

1. Holt Boulevard – 12
2. Central Avenue – 9
3. Orchard Street – 6
4. Ramona Avenue – 5
5. Monte Vista Avenue – 4

PRIMARY COLLISION FACTOR

The top two most frequent collision factors for pedestrian-involved collisions were:

1. Pedestrian right-of-way
2. Pedestrian violation

1. The pedestrian right-of-way collision factor is a violation committed by the non-pedestrian party.
2. The pedestrian violation collision factor is a violation committed by the pedestrian party in which the pedestrian violates the right-of-way of the motorist or bicyclist.

Meanwhile, the top two most frequent collision factors for bicyclist-involved collisions were:

1. Automobile Right-of-Way
2. Traffic Signals & Signs

3. The automobile right-of-way collision factor is a violation committed by the bicyclist party.
4. The traffic signals & signs collision factor illustrates sign and signal violation or notes faulty or confusing signage and signals.

Figure D-3: Violation Categories Of Primary Collision Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation Category</th>
<th>Pedestrian Involved</th>
<th>Bicyclist Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Right-of-Way</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Violation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signals &amp; Signs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile Right-of-Way</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper Turning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong Side of Road</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe Speed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving or Bicycling Under the Influence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Improper Driving</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Hazardous Violation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unusual Steering or Bucking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other than Driver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lights</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper Passing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure D-4: Pedestrian-Involved Collision Hotspots in Montclair
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Figure D-5: Bicycle-Involved Collision Hotspots in Montclair
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Fatal/Severe Injury</th>
<th>Other Injury</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Approximately 80% of pedestrian-involved collisions were classified as the Vehicle/Pedestrian crash type. This indicates that the collision was directly between a motorist and a pedestrian. Approximately 60% of bicyclist-involved collisions were classified as a Broadside crash; this shows that the motorists or bicyclists collided at a “T”, also known as a “T-Bone” collision.

![Figure D-6: Pedestrian And Bicycle Collisions By Crash Type](image)

### PEDESTRIAN-INVOLVED COLLISIONS BY PEDESTRIAN ACTION

The largest portion of pedestrian-involved collisions occurred when a pedestrian was crossing at an intersection (42.9%). This was followed by collisions where a pedestrian was not crossing at a crosswalk (28.6%) and where pedestrians were walking in the road, using the available shoulder. Collisions where a pedestrian was using the vehicle right-of-way accounts for more than half (61.5%) of all fatalities or collisions that involved severe injuries. This suggests that there is a lack of pedestrian facilities where they are needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrian Action</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Fatal/Severe Injury (#)</th>
<th>Fatal/Severe Injury (%)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using Intersection Crosswalk</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Mid-Block Crosswalk</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Not at Crosswalk</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Road, Using Shoulder</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Road</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fatal/sever injury percentages are based on the total for each category, not total pedestrian collisions.

Montclair Active Transportation Plan
COLUMNS BY TIME OF DAY, DAY OF THE WEEK, AND LIGHTING CONDITIONS

Pedestrian-involved collisions were most prevalent during morning and afternoon peak hours on weekdays while bicyclist-involved collisions saw similar trends with a slight surge of collisions occurring during midday hours on weekdays.

Pedestrian-and bicyclist-involved collisions occurred under similar lighting conditions. Approximately 67% of collisions occurred during the daylight hours and 25% occurred during the night hours where streetlights were present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lighting Conditions</th>
<th>Bicyclist-Involved</th>
<th>Pedestrian-Involved</th>
<th>Total Collisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark (Street Lights)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dusk - Dawn</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark (No Street Lights)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark (Street Lights Not Functioning)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-12: Lighting Conditions Of Pedestrian- And Bicyclist-Involved Collisions
Montclair Police Citations

Analysis of citations given by enforcement officers in Montclair reveals additional hotspots and potential risks of walking and biking in the city. Between 2013 and 2017, the Montclair Police gave out 15,500 citations in the city. Of these, 10,100 were related to this study. Montclair Police gave an average of 5.67 citations per day. Their efforts could have prevented collisions if a pedestrian or bicyclist was present at that specific moment.

Of the collisions related to this study, 29.5% were cited as a result of motorists failing to stop at a stop sign limit, crosswalk, or entrance of intersection, and another 27.3% were due to motorists failing to obey MUTCD, regulatory sign, and signals. The most frequent time for the police citations were Tuesday mornings from 6:00AM-8:59AM.

The top three intersections and locations for citation frequency are Monte Vista Avenue and I-10 ramps, Central Avenue and Palo Verde Street, and along Monte Vista Avenue. Other notable intersections and locations include along Ramona Avenue and Orchard Street.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation Description</th>
<th># of Citations</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failure to stop at stop sign limit line, crosswalk, or entrance of intersection</td>
<td>2978</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to obey MUTCD/regulatory sign/signal</td>
<td>2757</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to stop at red traffic signal</td>
<td>1538</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding (speed greater than in reasonable)</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning against red arrow signal</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to obey turning movement sign/signal</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe turning/lane change</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-13: Citation Violations By Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th># of Citations</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00-2:59AM</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-5:59AM</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00-8:59AM</td>
<td>2582</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00-11:59AM</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-2:59PM</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-5:59PM</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00-8:59PM</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00-11:59PM</td>
<td>1374</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-14: Citations By Time Of Day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of The Week</th>
<th># of Citations</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>1739</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>1801</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>1431</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-15: Citations By Day Of The Week
### Figure D-7: Citations By Violation Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation, Description</th>
<th>21453(A), Failure to stop at red traffic signal</th>
<th>21453(C), Turning against red arrow signal</th>
<th>21461(A), Failure to obey MUTCD/regulatory sign/signal</th>
<th>21802(A), Failure to stop at stop sign or yield right-of-way at intersection with stop sign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Figure D-8: Citations Frequency By Time And Date Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>12:00 - 2:59 AM</th>
<th>3:00 - 5:59 AM</th>
<th>6:00 - 8:59 AM</th>
<th>9:00 - 11:59 AM</th>
<th>12:00 - 2:59 PM</th>
<th>3:00 - 5:59 PM</th>
<th>6:00 - 8:59 PM</th>
<th>9:00 - 11:59 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure D-9: Police Citations Hotspots in Montclair
Disadvantaged Communities
Montclair is home to approximately 40,000 residents, and yet many live in areas considered a “Disadvantaged Community”. The disadvantaged communities designation is an important tool in advancing environmental justice in California. Census tracts are quantified as a disadvantaged through the CalEnvironScreen 3.0 tool. Developed by the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA), CalEnviroScreen 3.0 is an index that utilizes environmental and socio-economic data to identify California communities that are disproportionately burdened by, and vulnerable to, multiple sources of pollution. Census tracts that score above the 75th percentile are designated as California’s disadvantaged communities.

Montclair has eight census tracts that are fully within the City boundary. Of the eight census tracts, seven of them are considered disadvantaged, some of which with a score in the 90th percentile or greater. Together, the City ranks at the 84th percentile among all census tracts within California.

Diabetes and Heart Disease Rates
Through more active transportation facilities and programs, the City can enhance opportunities to physical activities and increase access to healthy food sources. This can help reduce the prevalence of diabetes and heart disease in Montclair. Diagnosed diabetes and heart disease scores measure the number of adults over the age of 18 who report having ever been told by a medical professional that they have diabetes or heart disease. Montclair has an adult diabetes rate of approximately 15%, which is higher than the County rate of 13% (SCAG 2019 Local Profiles – Montclair). Additionally, Montclair has an adult heart disease rate of 7.6%, almost double the County’s rate of 4.5% (SCAG 2019 Local Profiles – Montclair).

Cardiovascular Disease and Asthma Rates
Opportunities for more active transportation activities to take place can help replace trips taken by vehicles which can help improve air quality conditions. This in turn can help reduce chronic diseases such as cardiovascular disease and asthma where poor air quality conditions are major causes of the diseases (U.S. EPA, Health and Environmental Effects of Particulate Matter (PM)). Poor air quality conditions resulting from vehicle emissions and toxic releases from facilities have a strong correlation with increased rates of asthma.

Montclair ranks at the 75th percentile among all census tracts for the average rate of hospital visits related to cardiovascular disease. It also ranks in the 71st percentile for asthma rates, slightly higher than San Bernardino County (64th percentile).
Figure D-10: Disadvantaged Communities in Montclair
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Figure D-11: Percentile Of Areas With Asthma
Figure D-12: Percentile Of Areas With Cardiovascular Disease
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Appendix D: Community Needs Assessment - Full Report
Urban Form and Land Use

Land use and urban form in Montclair is informed by the General Plan. The vision presented in the General Plan offered many opportunities for more active transportation activities to occur.

According to the General Plan, the basic organizing place types are neighborhoods, corridors, centers, and districts. Neighborhoods form the basic building block of the city, and are envisioned to have a mixture of social activities and functional use. Meanwhile, corridors would not only serve as transportation thoroughfares that connect neighborhoods, centers, and/or districts, but also act as drainage channels or green parkways. The corridors that were identified in the General Plan include Central Avenue, Holt Boulevard, Mission Boulevard, and Arrow Highway.

Centers are mixed-use areas that may include a mixture of jobs, civic, and cultural uses. Example of centers include major intersections such as Central Avenue & Holt Boulevard and Ramona Avenue & Holt Boulevard in the southern part of the City, as well as, the new downtown area in the northern portion of Montclair.

Districts are areas that focus on specific types of activities; districts can be industrial or commercial. Industrial districts include the portion of Montclair bounded by Holt Boulevard to the north, Mission Boulevard to the south, Central Avenue to the east, and the western city boundary. Commercial districts include the downtown area to the north.

The bulk of residential land uses can be found in the middle of the city between the I-10 San Bernardino Freeway and Holt Boulevard. Among the residential land uses are small groupings of public/municipal facilities and a few centers along major intersections.
Montclair is a built out city that will not grow in land area, but can grow in density. Montclair is predominantly developed with single family homes, whereas more automobile-oriented. Development is already in place. This approach focuses on reinvestment where viable infrastructure and buildings, and parks. The vision of the General Plan is to protect, enhance and create complete, compact and connected neighborhoods that provide a high quality of life for residents. Montclair neighborhoods will mix a variety of residential types of activities and exhibiting distinct characteristics. Districts are areas of activity that is functionally specialized by their urban and walkable character and define a range of neighborhoods with a balanced mix of human activity with uses. Multi-family residences may also be transitions between neighborhoods and corridors. Listed in the following pages are corridors serving as both connectors and thoroughfares that frequently encompass commercial destinations, including transit routes. Natural corridors can be those such as drainage channels or green parkways. Urban corridors can be transportation routes. Urban Form

3. Land Use Category

- Low (0-7.9 units per acre)
- Medium (8-14.9 units per acre)
- High (15-29.9 units per acre)
- Urban Core (30-75 units per acre)
- Commerce (15-29.9 units per acre)
- Neighborhood (15-29.9 units per acre)
- Mixed-use (8-14.9 units per acre)
- Parks & Open Space

Figure D-13: Land Use Map Of Montclair

Retrieved From The General Plan

Appendix D: Community Needs Assessment - Full Report
Key Attractors

The City has many existing local destinations that community members can reach by active modes of transportation. The key attractors in the City of Montclair can be categorized into four groups: civic facilities, parks, schools, and shopping centers. Key attractors are generally dispersed across the city; however, there are three areas where there are larger clusters of attractors: North Montclair, South Montclair, and Central Avenue.

Key attractors in the northern portion of Montclair are predominately commercial areas. The area can be loosely defined as located between Arrow Highway to the north and Palo Verde Street to the south where the I-10 San Bernardino Freeway intersects with Central Avenue. This group consists of the Montclair Place Mall and several other retail shops and restaurants that surround the area. With the development of the North Montclair Downtown Specific Plan, the City is planning a mixed-use downtown in the area as well.

Local destinations in the southern Montclair are located along or in proximity to Holt Boulevard. The cluster is predominately consisted of small shopping centers. Development along Holt Boulevard is planned for in the Holt Boulevard Specific Plan which calls for a commercial area in south Montclair.

Central Avenue is one of the City’s important thoroughfares that provides access and connectivity between north and south Montclair. Key attractors that are located along or near Central Avenue include the Montclair Civic Center, Alma Hofman Park, and several commercial areas.
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Figure D-14: Key Attractors In Montclair
Existing Bikeways

The City has several bicycle facilities which provide bicyclists with opportunities to reach destinations within the city and beyond. However, the bicycle network can be greatly enhanced to provide even more access and connectivity.

The City of Montclair’s existing bicycle infrastructure is consisted of 0.75 miles of Class I Bike Trails and 4.4 miles of Class II Bike Lanes. The existing bicycle facilities within the City boundary are as followed:

- Class II Bike Lane on Orchard Street – 1.96 miles; from Mills Avenue to Benson Avenue
- Class II Bike Lane on Mills Avenue – 1.87 miles; from Holt Boulevard to Moreno Street
- Class II Bike Lane on San Bernardino Street – 0.32 miles; from Mills Avenue to Kimberly Avenue
- Class II Bike Lane on Monte Vista Avenue – 0.25 mile; from northern Montclair City Boundary and Arrow Highway
- Class I Bike Path (Pacific Electric Trail) – 0.75 miles; from northwest city boundary to Central Avenue

The two most prominent existing bicycle facilities are the Class II Bike Lanes on Orchard Street and Mills Avenue. Orchard Street provides intracity access from the eastern city boundary to the west, offering connectivity from the existing Class III Bike Route along Orchard Street in Ontario to the Class II Bike Lane on Mills Avenue. The Class II Bike Lane on Mills Avenue provides north/south access along the western portion of the city. It connects bicyclists to existing bicycle infrastructure in Pomona, Claremont, and the Pacific Electric Trail.
Figure D-15: Montclair Existing Bikeways
Existing Pedestrian Facilities - Sidewalks

The City of Montclair has a substantial amount of sidewalk coverage; however, much more can be added to improve the pedestrian experience. According to data collected from the Comprehensive Pedestrian Sidewalk Inventory Project from the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA), the City needs a total of 999,348 ft. of sidewalk. The City currently has 770,215 ft. of sidewalk, which represents 77.07% of the total amount needed. The City still needs 229,133 ft. of sidewalk (22.93%).

The City’s existing and missing sidewalk infrastructure is evenly spread throughout the City. Most of the existing and missing sidewalk infrastructure is located in the residential areas between the I-10 San Bernardino Freeway and State Street. State Street, which has industrial land uses, lacks sidewalk infrastructure on many portions of the roadway segment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalk (ft.)</th>
<th>No Sidewalk (ft.)</th>
<th>Grand Total (ft.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>770,215</td>
<td>229,133</td>
<td>999,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.07%</td>
<td>22.93%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-16: Amount Of Sidewalk And Missing Sidewalk In Montclair
Figure D-16: Montclair Existing And Missing Sidewalks
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Existing Pedestrian Facilities - Signalized Intersection Inventory

The City has many signalized intersections, yet many lack the Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APS) that are useful for pedestrians with disability to cross the roadway. APS, through vibro-tactile and auditory feedback, convey directives to pedestrians with disabilities as they trigger and wait for pedestrian walk phasing. Full APS designations imply that all corners and pedestrian push buttons offer an audible and tactile push button, as well as, a visual pedestrian count down display.

Through the Comprehensive Pedestrian Sidewalk Inventory Project by SBCTA, a citywide inventory of signalized intersections was collected to better understand and assess the infrastructure by which the motorized and non-motorized users are controlled by. In total, 49 signalized intersections were studied to establish existing locations and inventoried for existing Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APS).

According to the data collected, four intersections offer full APS coverage (8.1%), while two intersections offer a mixture of both APS and non-APS pedestrian push buttons (4%). The majority of signalized intersections do not offer APS pedestrian push buttons or count down displays. Of the 49 signalized intersections, 43 (87.8%) do not have APS pedestrian push buttons or countdown displays.
Figure D-17: Location Of Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APS)
Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) / Level of Comfort

Level of Traffic Stress (LTS), or sometimes referred to as Level of Comfort (LOC), is one of the transportation industry’s best practices for analyzing the comfort and connectivity bicycle and pedestrian networks.

A traditional Bicycle LTS analysis ranks roadways segments based on the “Four Types of Cyclists”, originally structured by Roger Geller at the City of Portland:

1. **No Way, No How**: People unwilling to bicycle even if high-quality bicycle infrastructure is in place
2. **Interested but Concerned**: People willing to bicycle if high-quality bicycle infrastructure is in place
3. **Enthused and Confident**: People willing to bicycle if some bicycle-specific infrastructure is in place
4. **Strong and Fearless**: People willing to bicycle with limited or no bicycle-specific infrastructure

The Pedestrian LOC analysis complements the Bicycle LTS by providing insights for pedestrian comfort and connectivity. Table D-17: Bicycle LTS Ranking Scheme and Table D-18: Pedestrian LOC Ranking Scheme offer a description of each ranking. The lower the ranking is, the more comfortable and connected a roadway is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LTS 1</td>
<td>Suitable for almost all ages and bicycling abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTS 2</td>
<td>Suitable for most adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTS 3</td>
<td>Suitable for more skilled and confident bicyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTS 4</td>
<td>Not suitable for most bicyclists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-17: Bicycle LTS Ranking Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Traffic Stress</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOC 1</td>
<td>Suitable for almost all pedestrians, including children that are trained to safely cross the intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 2</td>
<td>Suitable for most adults pedestrians, but demand more attention for children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 3</td>
<td>Suitable for most adult pedestrians and older children with little or no supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 4</td>
<td>Suitable for adults and children with parental supervision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-18: Pedestrian LOC Ranking Scheme
Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (LTS)

A significant portion of the City’s roadways received a LTS score of 1 or 2. Non-interstate citywide segments had a total of 96 centerline miles. Of these, roughly 68 miles (71%) of all centerline miles received a LTS 1 or LTS 2 score.

Table D-19: Bicycle LTS Segment Coverage defines the total linear coverage for each LTS score.

Table D-19: Bicycle LTS Segment Coverage defines the total linear coverage for each LTS score.

This suggests that the majority of the roadways are either suitable for bicyclists of all ages or suitable for all adults.

Segments that received a LTS 1 score include:

- Mills Avenue (South of Benito Street)
- Orchard Street
- Pacific Electric Trail located on the northern city boundary

Mills Avenue and Orchard Street received LTS 1 scores due to the presence of an existing on-street bicycle facility and low vehicle ADT volumes. The Pacific Electric Trail is an off-street bicycle facility, and as such is automatically classified as a LTS 1.

Other segments with LTS 1 or LTS 2 scores received the ranking due to low ADT volumes. High vehicle volumes can increase the stress level of bicyclists due to their direct interactions on the roadway.

Examples of corridors that are more stressful for bicyclists include:

- Arrow Highway
- Moreno Street (East of Monte Vista Avenue)
- San Bernardino Street (East of Ramona Avenue)
- Holt Boulevard
- Monte Vista Avenue
- Central Avenue
- Mission Boulevard
- Brooks Street
- Ramona Avenue (South of State Street).

These corridors received high LTS scores due to a lack of existing bicycle facilities, high vehicle Average Daily Traffic (ADT) volumes, high-posted speed limits, or a combination of these factors.

A significant portion of roadways were LTS 4 or LTS 3 vs. LTS 2 or LTS 1. More specifically, 62% of non-Interstate, non-local, and non-private roads received a LTS 3 or LTS 4 score whereas, 38% received a LTS 1 or LTS 2 score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bicycle LTS Score</th>
<th>Segment Miles</th>
<th>Percentage Shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LTS 1</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTS 2</td>
<td>64.15</td>
<td>67.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTS 3</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>9.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTS 4</td>
<td>18.70</td>
<td>19.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-19: Bicycle LTS Segment Coverage
Figure D-18: Bicycle Level Of Traffic Stress In Montclair
A large majority of the City’s roadways are comfortable for pedestrians to walk along. Non-interstate citywide segments had a total of 96 centerline miles. Of these, approximately 68 miles (82%) of all centerline miles received a LTS 1 or LTS 2 score. Table D-20: Pedestrian LOC Segment Coverage defines the total linear coverage for each LTS score.

Examples of less comfortable segments for pedestrians, which are mostly limited to local or private roads, include: segments within the neighborhood bound by Orchard Street, Monte Vista Avenue, Kingsley Street, and Ramona Avenue, and the neighborhood that resides to the east of Montclair Town Center.

All but one LOC 4 segment had missing sidewalk coverage. Central Avenue between Mission Boulevard and Maitland Street had partial sidewalk coverage but had high vehicle volumes, high speeds and no sidewalk separation.

All other segments of Central Avenue received a LOC 2 or LOC 3 score due to full sidewalk coverage.

The presence of sidewalk and sidewalk width are the driving factors for a high comfort pedestrian network. Missing sidewalk gaps can significantly influence the overall functionality and comfort of the pedestrian network.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrian LOC Score</th>
<th>Segment Miles</th>
<th>Percentage Shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOC 1</td>
<td>57.60</td>
<td>59.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 2</td>
<td>21.35</td>
<td>21.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 3</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>12.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 4</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>6.48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-20: Pedestrian LOC Segment Coverage
Pedestrian Level of Comfort (LOC)

- LOC 1
- LOC 2
- LOC 3
- LOC 4

City Boundary
San Antonio Creek Channel

Data acquired from City of Montclair and SBCTA
Date Created: 12/19/2019

Figure D-19: Pedestrian Level Of Comfort In Montclair
**Intersection Pedestrian Level of Comfort (LOC)**

A large proportion of the City’s intersections are comfortable for pedestrians to cross. The Pedestrian Level of Comfort (LOC) Analysis analyzed 37 hotspot intersections in the city to understand the comfortable level for pedestrians to cross. Pedestrians are most exposed at controlled and uncontrolled pedestrian crossings, making them vulnerable to all modes of travel. Of the intersections analyzed, 17 were signalized, 16 were controlled unsignalized, and 4 were uncontrolled unsignalized.

Of the intersections studied, 25 received a LOC 2 or 3, while none of the intersections received a LOC 1 score. The criteria to receive a LOC 1 is more restricted than for LOC 2 or 3. For unsignalized intersections, a LOC 1 intersection would involved having a crossing distance less than 60 feet and a speed limit less than or equal to 25 mph. For signalized intersections, a LOC 1 intersection would need a crossing distance less than 80 feet, greater than or equal to 50% APS coverage, and a speed limit less than or equal to 25 mph.

A total of 12 hotspot intersections, 10 signalized and 2 uncontrolled unsignalized, received a LOC 4 score. All LOC 4 intersections were intersected by either a Major or Secondary Arterial, which typically has high vehicle volumes, high posted speed limits, and long crossing distances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Crossing Distance (Ft.)</th>
<th>Speed (mph)</th>
<th>LOC Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingsley St. and Ramona Ave.</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsley St. and Vernon Ave.</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Verde St. and Vernon Ave.</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon Ave. and Benito St.</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benito St. and Monte Vista Ave.</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsley St. and Monte Vista Ave.</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills Ave. and Moreno St.</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Vista Ave. and Howard St.</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard St. and Fremont Ave.</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard St. and Ramona Ave.</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard St. and Vernon Ave.</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramona Ave. and Brooks St.</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramona Ave. and Grand St.</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-21: Intersection Pedestrian Level Of Comfort Ranked
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Distance (Ft.)</th>
<th>Speed (mph)</th>
<th>LOC Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ramona Ave. and Howard St.</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino St. and Helena Ave.</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino St. and Ramona Ave.</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino St. and Vernon Ave.</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-10 and Central Ave.</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-10 and Monte Vista Ave.</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Vista Ave. and Arrow Hwy</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard St. and Monte Vista Ave.</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino St. and Central Ave.</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose St. and Monte Vista Ave.</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benito St. and Helena Ave.</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td>Uncontrolled</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramona Ave. and Bandera St.</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td>Uncontrolled</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramona Ave. and Benito St.</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benito St. and Central Ave.</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ave. and Costco Driveway</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt Blvd. and Monte Vista Ave.</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt Blvd. and Ramona Ave.</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsley St. and Central Ave.</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Vista Ave. and Moreno St.</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreno St. and Central Ave.</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard St. and Central Ave.</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Verde St. and Central Ave.</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Vista Ave. &amp; Bandera St.</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td>Uncontrolled</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard St. and Tudor Ave.</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td>Uncontrolled</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-21: Intersection Pedestrian Level Of Comfort Ranked (Cont.)
The City’s existing bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure offer a low stressed/ high comfort active transportation network. Findings from the Bicycle LTS Connectivity Analysis show that approximately 72% of the City’s area is connected by a bicycle LTS 1 or LTS 2 segment. Meanwhile, the Pedestrian LOC Connectivity Analysis reveals that almost the entirety of the city is connected by a pedestrian LOC 1 or LOC 2 segment.

**Bicycle LTS Connectivity**
Areas in the city have low level of traffic stress because a majority of segments within the linear network occupy low vehicle volumes. This in turn lowers the stress level of the segment. Areas that are accessible by an LTS 1 segment are located adjacent to existing on-street Class II Bike Lanes, either along the southern portion of Mills Avenue or along the entirety of Orchard Street. Areas that are located along the northern city border are accessible by the Pacific Electric Trail, which is classified as a LTS 1.

There are a few areas with high LTS bicycle connectivity. These include the area in the northeast portion of the City, bounded by Moreno Street and Central Street, and the area adjacent to Holt Boulevard.

**Pedestrian LOC Connectivity**
The vast majority of the City (97.47%) is connected by a pedestrian LOC 1 or LOC 2 segment. The pedestrian LOC linear network is weighted heavily by the presence of sidewalk. Since a majority of roadways have full or partial coverage, specifically in the north region of the City, low stress connectivity is enhanced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bicycle LTS Score</th>
<th>Square Miles</th>
<th>Percentage Shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LTS 1</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>17.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTS 2</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>54.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTS 3</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>21.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTS 4</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>6.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table D-22: Bicycle LTS Area Coverage By Census Block*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrian LOC Score</th>
<th>Square Miles</th>
<th>Percentage Shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOC 1</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>84.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 2</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>12.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 3</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC 4</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table D-23: Pedestrian LOC Area Coverage By Census Block*
Figure D-20: Bicycle Level Of Traffic Stress Connectivity In Montclair
Figure D-21: Pedestrian Level Of Comfort Connectivity In Montclair

Montclair Active Transportation Plan
ENVIRONMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Transit Connectivity

Active transportation is an important mode of transportation to reach to and from transit facilities. It provides an alternative solution to what is commonly known as the “first mile/last mile” problem for transit. The problem refers to 1) how a traveler gets to a transit facility from their origin location, and 2) after they get off transit, how do they reach their final destination.

Transit users in Montclair have four predominant transit services to choose from. Bus transit services are provided by Omnitrans, Foothill Transit, and Riverside Transit. Meanwhile, Metrolink offers commuter rail services to regional destinations.

Each bus transit provider connects the City to multiple counties and cities within Southern California. Omnitrans provides intracity connectivity and services to adjacent cities, as well as the greater San Bernardino County.

Foothill Transit has transit lines that allow for inter-regional travel. Its services allow transit users to reach regional destinations such as Downtown Los Angeles and the Brea Mall in Orange County.

The Riverside Transportation Authority (RTA) bus services connect Montclair to Riverside County. The RTA 204 starts at the Montclair Transit Center, passes through Ontario until it reaches the University of California, Riverside (UCR) Extension in Riverside.

The Metrolink San Bernardino Line offers rail options to Montclair community members. Passengers can take the train at the Montclair Metrolink Station which is located next to the Montclair TransCenter.

FOOTHILL GOLD LINE EXPANSION
The Montclair TransCenter is the planned terminus of the Metro Foothill Gold Line extension from Glendora. The service would offer an alternative rail service from Montclair to Downtown Los Angeles.

MONTCLAIR TRANSCENTER
The Montclair TransCenter is a regional multi-modal transportation hub located in north Montclair along Richton Street and east of Monte Vista Avenue. All bus and rail transit services offer stops at the facility which offer opportunities for first/last-mile connectivity to other parts of the city.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line/ Route</th>
<th>Cities Serviced From Montclair</th>
<th>Major Destinations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Omnitrans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 66: Fontana – Montclair</td>
<td>Montclair, Fontana, Rancho</td>
<td>Epicenter Stadium, Fontana Metrolink, Foothill Market Place,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cucamonga, and Upland</td>
<td>Montclair Civic Center, Montclair Metrolink, Montclair Plaza, Rancho San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medical Center, and San Antonio Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 85: Chino – Chaffey College</td>
<td>Montclair, Chino, Ontario,</td>
<td>Montclair Plaza, Montclair Transit Center, San Antonio Hospital,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upland, and Rancho Cucamonga</td>
<td>Kaiser Clinic Rancho Cucamonga, and Chaffey College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 88: Chino Hills – Montclair</td>
<td>Montclair and Chino Hills</td>
<td>Chino Transit Center, The Shoppes at Chino Hills, Montclair High School,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Montclair Plaza, and Montclair Transit Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 290: San Bernardino – Montclair Transit Center</td>
<td>Montclair, Upland, Ontario, Fontana, Bloomington, Colton, and San Bernardino</td>
<td>Montclair Transit Center, Ontario Mills, Arrowhead Regional Medical Center, and San Bernardino Transit Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foothill Transit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 188: Montclair – Azusa</td>
<td>Montclair, Claremont, La Verne, San Dimas, Glendora, and Azusa</td>
<td>Montclair Plaza, the Claremont Colleges, Claremont Village, and Citrus College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 197: Pomona – Montclair</td>
<td>Montclair, Pomona, and Claremont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 480: Montclair – West Covina</td>
<td>West Covina, Covina, Pomona, Montclair, and Claremont</td>
<td>Foothill Transit Colonnade, Claremont Village, Sheraton Suites Fairplex, Pomona Fairplex, Pomona Raceway, Pomona Valley Hospital Medical Center, and Bonelli Regional County Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 492: Montclair – El Monte</td>
<td>Montclair, Claremont, La Verne, San Dimas, Glendora, and Azusa</td>
<td>Montclair Plaza, Claremont Colleges, Claremont Village, Pomona Library, Cal Poly Pomona, Bonelli Regional County Park, Mt. SAC, Plaza West Covina, and Eastland Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 690 Montclair – Glendora</td>
<td>Montclair, Claremont, La Verne, San Dimas, Glendora, and Azusa</td>
<td>Montclair Plaza, Claremont Colleges, Claremont Village, La Verne Library, and the APU/Citrus College Gold Line station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 699: Montclair – Downtown Los Angeles Express Service</td>
<td>Claremont, Montclair, Pomona, West Covina, Industry, El Monte, and Los Angeles</td>
<td>Montclair Plaza, Doctors Hospital, Olvera Street, and Downtown Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silver Streak</strong></td>
<td>Downtown Los Angeles, El Monte, San Dimas, Glendora, Pomona, and Montclair</td>
<td>Pomona Library, Rio Hondo Bike Path, Olvera Street, and Downtown Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metrolink</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino Line</td>
<td>Montclair, Downtown Los Angeles, and San Bernardino</td>
<td>Montclair TransCenter, Montclair Plaza, Downtown Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Riverside Transit Authority</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 201 Montclair TransCenter - UCR</td>
<td>Montclair, Ontario, and Riverside</td>
<td>Montclair TransCenter, Montclair Plaza, Ontario Mills, and University of California, Riverside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-24: Transit Routes That Service Montclair
Transit Routes and Infrastructure

Riverside Transportation Authority
- RT 204

Foothill Transit
- Silver Streak
- RT 188
- RT 197
- RT 480

Omnitrans
- RT 61
- RT 66
- RT 85
- RT 88
- RT 290

Montclair TransCenter

Data acquired from the Omnitrans, RTA, and Foothill
Date Created: 11/25/2019

Figure D-22: Transit Connectivity In Montclair
appendix E

PROJECT SURVEY
Please give us your input on how to make the City of Montclair a better place to walk, bike, and take transit!

Please fill in each bubble completely like this: ●

1. Please describe your relationship to the City of Montclair: (select one)
   ○ I live here
   ○ I work here
   ○ I play/hang out/shop/see people here regularly
   ○ I’m just visiting (I don’t come often)

2. How often do you walk to a destination without the use of an automobile? (example: to run errands, go to work/ school)
   ○ Daily
   ○ Several times a week
   ○ A couple of times a month
   ○ Once a month or less
   ○ Never

3. How often do you walk to take transit?
   ○ Daily
   ○ Several times a week
   ○ A couple of times a month
   ○ Once a month or less
   ○ Never

4. How would you rate overall walking conditions in Montclair?
   ○ Excellent
   ○ Good
   ○ Fair
   ○ Poor

5. What are the reasons you choose to walk? (Choose up to three)
   ○ Exercise or to improve my health
   ○ For fun/recreational purposes/ walk my pet
   ○ To take transit
   ○ Save money
   ○ Convenient way to reach destinations
   ○ Want to improve the environment
   ○ Prefer not to drive / I do not have access to a car
   ○ Other:

6. What would encourage you to walk more?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>Somewhat unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction of missing sidewalk/ repair broken sidewalks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More street trees and shade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer and more accessible ways to cross streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slower vehicle traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More destinations within walking distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Taking transit) More transit stops/facilities within walking distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Taking transit) Better transit service and amenities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How often do you bike to a destination without the use of an automobile?
   ○ Daily
   ○ Several times a week
   ○ A couple of times a month
   ○ Once a month or less
   ○ Never

8. How often do you bike to take transit?
   ○ Daily
   ○ Several times a week
   ○ A couple of times a month
   ○ Once a month or less
   ○ Never

9. How would you rate overall bicycling conditions in Montclair?
   ○ Excellent
   ○ Good
   ○ Fair
   ○ Poor

10. What are the reasons you choose to bike? (Choose up to three)
    ○ Exercise or to improve my health
    ○ For fun/recreational purposes
    ○ To take transit
    ○ Save money
    ○ Convenient way to reach destinations
    ○ Want to improve the environment
    ○ Prefer not to drive / I do not have access to a car
    ○ Other:

11. What would encourage you to bike more?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>Somewhat unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More bike lanes and facilities throughout the city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better maintenance of bike facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More bike parking /storage/repair stations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike education and encouragement programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slower vehicle traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More destinations within biking distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking transit: More transit stops/facilities within biking distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions? Contact us at (909) 295-2475 or MontclairATP@gmail.com
¡Por favor comparta su opinión para hacer de la Ciudad de Montclair un mejor lugar para caminar, montar bicicleta y mobilizarse en transporte público!

Rellenar el círculo completamente como en la figura:

1. ¿Cuál es su afiliación con la Ciudad de Montclair?: (seleccione sólo una)
   - Vivo en Montclair
   - Trabajo en Montclair
   - Vengo de compras, a pasear y visitar amigos/familiares
   - Estoy de visita (no vengo con frecuencia)

2. ¿Con qué frecuencia camina a su destino sin usar el vehículo? (Por ejemplo, al completar mandados, ir a trabajar o a la escuela)
   - A diario
   - Una vez al mes o menos
   - Varias veces a la semana
   - Nunca
   - Un par de veces al mes

3. ¿Con qué frecuencia se mobiliza en transporte público?
   - A diario
   - Una vez al mes o menos
   - Varias veces a la semana
   - Nunca
   - Un par de veces al mes

4. ¿Cómo evaluaría el ambiente por el que camina?
   -Excelente
   - Bueno
   - Malo

5. ¿Cuáles son las razones que la(o) incentivan a caminar? (seleccione hasta tres)
   - Ejercitarme o mejorar mi salud
   - Diversión/recreación/pasear a mi mascota
   - Para tomar el transporte público
   - Ahorrar dinero
   - Es una forma fácil de llegar a mi destino
   - Me preocupa el medio ambiente
   - Prefiero no manejar/no tengo acceso a un carro
   - Otro:

6. ¿Qué lo(a) motivaría a caminar más?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Razón</th>
<th>Muy improbab</th>
<th>Algo improbab</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Probable</th>
<th>Muy probable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construcción de nuevas banquetas/ reparación de banquetas rotas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Más árboles que provean sombra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mejor iluminación</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Más seguridad al cruzar las calles y avenidas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menor velocidad del tráfico vehicular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Más destinos a donde pueda llegar a pie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mejor servicio de transporte público</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. ¿Con qué frecuencia monta bicicleta a su destino sin usar un vehículo?
   - A diario
   - Una vez al mes o menos
   - Varias veces a la semana
   - Un par de veces al mes
   - Nunca

8. ¿Con qué frecuencia monta bicicleta para llegar a una estación de transporte público?
   - A diario
   - Una vez al mes o menos
   - Varias veces a la semana
   - Un par de veces al mes
   - Nunca

9. ¿Cómo evaluaría las condiciones para montar bicicleta en la Ciudad de Montclair?
   - Excelente
   - Bueno
   - Malo

10. ¿Cuáles son las razones por las que monta bicicleta? (Selezione hasta tres)
    - Ejercitarme o mejorar mi salud
    - Diversión/Recreación/pasear a mi mascota
    - Para tomar el transporte público
    - Ahorrar dinero
    - Es una forma fácil de llegar a mi destino
    - Me preocupa el medio ambiente
    - Prefiero no manejar/no tengo acceso a un carro
    - Otro:

11. ¿Qué lo(a) motivaría a montar más bicicleta?
    - Más ciclovías en la Ciudad
    - Más cuidado de la infraestructura actual
    - Más sitios para estar en los lugares cercanos a la ciudad
    - Más estaciones de transporte público
    - Mejor iluminación
    - Menor velocidad del tráfico vehicular
    - Más destinos a los que se pueda montar bicicleta
    - Más estaciones de transporte público

¿Preguntas? Contáctenos al (909) 295-2475 o por correo electrónico a MontclairATP@gmail.com
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Describe your relationship to the City of Montclair (Select One)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I live here</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I play/hang out/shop/see people here regularly</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm just visiting - I don't come often</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work here</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you walk to a destination without the use of an automobile?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a week</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A couple of times a month</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month or less</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you walk to take transit?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>69.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a week</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A couple of times a month</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month or less</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you rate overall walking conditions in Montclair?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are three reasons you choose to walk? (Choose up to three)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exercise or to improve my health</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>76.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For fun/recreational purposes/walk my pet</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to improve the environment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To take transit</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save money</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient way to reach destinations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to drive/I do not have access to a car</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage to walk: Construction of missing sidewalks/repair broken sidewalks</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unlikely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encourage to walk: More street trees and shade</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unlikely</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encourage to walk: Better lighting</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unlikely</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encourage to walk: Safer and more accessible ways to cross streets</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unlikely</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encourage to walk: Slower vehicle traffic</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unlikely</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ballot Results Report

### Encourage to walk: More destinations within walking distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unlikely</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Encourage to walk: More transit facilities within walking distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unlikely</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Encourage to walk: Better transit service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unlikely</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How often do you bike to a destination without using an automobile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>78.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A couple of times a month</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month or less</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a week</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How often do you bike to take transit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>80.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A couple of times a month</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month or less</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ballot Results Report

#### How would you rate overall bicycling conditions in Montclair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### What are the reasons you choose to bike? (Choose up to three)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exercise or to improve my health</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For fun/recreational purposes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to improve the environment</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save money</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient way to reach destinations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to drive - I do not have access to a car</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To take transit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Encourage to bike: More bike lanes and facilities throughout the city

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unlikely</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Encourage to bike: Better maintenance of bike facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unlikely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Encourage to bike: More bike parking/storage/ repair stations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unlikely</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ballot Results Report

### Encourage to bike: Bike education and encouragement programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unlikely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Encourage to bike: Better lighting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unlikely</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Encourage to bike: Slower vehicle traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unlikely</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Encourage to bike: More destinations within biking distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unlikely</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Encourage to bike: More transit facilities within biking distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unlikely</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
appendix F

ONLINE PLATFORM
Welcome! The City of Montclair is developing the Active Transportation Plan (ATP) and Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Plan, and we need your help!

Click the "Start" button above or any of the tabs below to begin.

This online platform is also available in Spanish

I. Welcome!

II. Active Transportation Plan

- ATP Vision and Priorities
- Possible Infrastructure Treatments
- Active Transportation Network
III. SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PLAN

SRTS Purpose and Goals

Buena Vista Arts Integrated Magnet School

Howard Elementary School

Kingsley Elementary School

Lehigh Elementary School

Montclair High School

Monte Vista Elementary School

Montera Elementary School

Ramona Elementary School

Vernon Middle School

IV. FEEDBACK OPPORTUNITIES

Active Transportation Plan Survey

Safe Routes to School Parent Survey

Join Our Mailing List

V. LET’S KEEP IN TOUCH!

Project Contact Information
Introduction

City of Montclair

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

and

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PLAN
The Online Engagement Tool is comprised of five sections. Each section is independent from each other, so you can jump between sections and give your feedback.

1. Section 1: Introduction serves as the introduction to the Online Engagement Tool.

2. Section 2: Active Transportation Plan focuses on the Active Transportation Plan (ATP). Please scroll through the section and share your thoughts in the comment boxes.

3. Section 3: Safe Routes to School Plan discusses and presents draft treatments for the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Plan. Please navigate to the school(s) that you are affiliated with and provide comments for each school.

4. Section 4: Feedback Opportunities presents surveys for both the ATP and SRTS Plans. Please take a few minutes and give your input for both efforts.

5. Section 5: Let's Keep In Touch is the last section of this tool. Please leave your contact information so we can keep in touch with you!

CONTINUE
The Active Transportation Plan (ATP) seeks to identify ways to improve pedestrian and bicycle mobility and access. Specifically, the ATP aims to improve walking and bicycling conditions within the City to provide residents with greater access to transit, jobs, goods, services, and other key destinations.

Plan Vision

A City of Montclair that is **healthier** and **more equitable** due to **safer** and **more connected** roadways through the provision of active transportation options.
Plan Priorities

CONTRIBUTE TO A HEALTHIER MONTCLAIR: The Plan will strive to improve the physical and mental well-being of Montclair community members.

PROVIDE A SAFER ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM: The Plan will create a safer Montclair for community members to take part in active transportation.

CONNECT PEOPLE TO DESTINATIONS: The Plan will develop a more connected active transportation network that allows community members to have more convenient access to local and regional destinations.

ENCOURAGE EQUITABLE OUTCOMES: The Plan will aspire towards a Montclair where community members will have access to equitable transportation outcomes.

PROMOTE PLACEMAKING AND VIBRANT ECONOMY: The Plan will contribute to a livelier and more economically-vibrant Montclair by leveraging opportunities from increased use of active transportation.
Possible Infrastructure Treatments

Infrastructure treatments can include many elements that help create an environment that is walkable, bikeable, and accessible through other modes of transportation such as transit!

Pedestrian Treatments

A **SIDEWALK** is a physically separated infrastructure from the roadway that provides a clear and unobstructed paved path for pedestrians.

A **CURB RAMP** eliminates the vertical edge of an existing curb, thus providing a safe transition from a roadway to a sidewalk.

A **HIGH VISIBILITY LADDER CROSSWALK** provides a designated walkway for pedestrians to cross from one side of a street to the other.
A CURB EXTENSION (BULB-OUT) offers pedestrians with a shorter crossing and better visibility by extending the curb into the roadway.

A RECTANGULAR RAPID FLASHING BEACON (RRFB) is a type of active warning beacon that increases driver yielding behavior at crossings by using an irregular flash pattern.

A MEDIAN REFUGE ISLAND provides a space for pedestrians to pause mid-crossing and decreases the crossing distance required for pedestrians to cross at a time.

**Bicycle Treatments**

A MULTI-USE LANE allows pedestrians and bicyclists to travel along a path that is separated from the roadway, offering more continuous, enjoyable, and potentially safer travel to destinations.

A PROTECTED BIKEWAY (also known as cycle track) includes a physical barrier between bicyclists and motor vehicle traffic, offering bicyclists with a dedicated and protected space to bike on.

A BUFFERED BIKE LANE is a bike lane that provides a lateral separation between motorists and bicyclists.
A **BIKE LANE** is an exclusive bicycle pathway on a roadway that incorporates striping and/or pavement markings to delineate a right-of-way assigned to bicyclists.

A **BIKE BOULEVARD** is a low-stress shared roadway designed to offer priority for bicyclists operating within a roadway shared with motor vehicle traffic.

**BIKE AMENITIES** such as bicycle parking, repair station, bike station, showers, and bottle water fountains can improve the overall biking experience.

### Traffic Calming Treatments

A **TRAFFIC CIRCLE** is type of intersection treatment with a circle in the middle that forces motorists to maneuver around it. It reduces vehicle speed and the risk of right-angle collisions.

A **PROTECTED INTERSECTION** is an intersection design that keeps bicyclists physically separated from motor vehicles and pedestrians at the corners of the intersection.

**LANE MANAGEMENT** is a treatment wherein motor vehicle lanes are removed or narrowed to accommodate a left turn lane, parking, bike lanes, or bus stops.
Active Transportation Network

The Active Transportation Network is comprised of corridors that would enable community members to access local and regional destinations, including transit hubs, by foot and bike.

The network has two types of corridors: local corridors and regional corridors. Local corridors offer connectivity to local destinations such as schools, city parks, and municipal civic institutions. Meanwhile, regional corridors expand opportunities to reach destinations inside as well as outside of the City of Montclair by providing connectivity to regional pedestrian and bicycle facilities, regional destinations, and transit hubs.
Referring to the map above, which roadway should be considered a **priority corridor** in the Active Transportation Network? (A priority corridor is a roadway where the City should focus pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure improvement on)
The Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Plan identifies a list of infrastructure and programming projects for the City to implement in the surrounding areas of nine schools. The Montclair SRTS Plan aims to encourage students to take part in more physical activity, increase the use of public facilities such as bicycle and walking paths, create safer routes to school, and ensure that streets in the City are designed and maintained with all users in mind.

**Project Goals**

**SAFETY.** The Plan will strive to create a safer environment for students, parents, and the Montclair community to walk, bike, take transit, and use other forms of active transportation to arrive at and depart from schools in Montclair.
ACCESSIBILITY. The Plan will seek to improve accessibility via foot, bike, transit, and other active modes to and from schools in Montclair.

PUBLIC HEALTH. The Plan will aim to improve the physical well-being of students in Montclair.

EQUITY: The Plan will aspire to build a better Montclair where students, parents, and the Montclair community have equitable outcomes from choices of going to and from their schools.

Press Continue to learn about the preliminary engineering recommendations for each school involved in the Plan, and give your feedback!
Buena Vista Arts Integrated Magnet School

Preliminary Engineering Treatment Recommendations

The project team developed the following set of treatment recommendations for Buena Vista Arts Integrated Magnet School. Identification of the treatments represents the first step for the City to implement the infrastructure on the roadways adjacent to the school.

Please let us know in the comment box following the map your thoughts on the proposed recommendations. The legend at the bottom of the map shows the proposed treatments for the school, while map indicates where the treatment will be installed.
Tell us how we did!

Do you like the recommendations? Do we need to make some changes? Please fill out the comment box to answer these questions as we finalize these treatments.
Please answer these quick questions to let us know how we are doing with the preliminary engineer treatments. 

Háganos saber cómo lo hicimos con los tratamientos preliminares de ingeniería.

Start

If you have a student(s) who attends another school, please navigate to that school tab and let us know your thoughts about the treatments proposed there as well!
The project team developed the following set of treatment recommendations for Howard Elementary School. Identification of the treatments represents the first step for the City to implement the infrastructure on the roadways adjacent to the school.

Please let us know in the comment box following the map your thoughts on the proposed recommendations. The legend at the bottom of the map shows the proposed treatments for the school, while map indicates where the treatment will be installed.
Tell us how we did!
Do you like the recommendations? Do we need to make some changes? *Please fill out the comment box to answer these questions as we finalize these treatments.*

Please answer these quick questions to let us know how we are doing with the preliminary engineering treatments. 

*Háganos saber cómo lo hicimos con los tratamientos preliminares de ingeniería.*

- Start press Enter

If you have a student(s) who attends another school, please navigate to that school tab and let us know your thoughts about the treatments proposed there as well!
Preliminary Engineering Treatment Recommendations

The project team developed the following set of treatment recommendations for Kingsley Elementary School. Identification of the treatments represents the first step for the City to implement the infrastructure on the roadways adjacent to the school.

Please let us know in the comment box following the map your thoughts on the proposed recommendations. The legend at the bottom of the map shows the proposed treatments for the school, while map indicates where the treatment will be installed.
Tell us how we did!
Do you like the recommendations? Do we need to make some changes? Please fill out the comment box to answer these questions as we finalize these treatments.

Please answer these quick questions to let us know how we are doing with the preliminary engineering treatments.

Háganos saber cómo lo hicimos con los tratamientos preliminares de ingeniería.

Start press Enter

If you have a student(s) who attends another school, please navigate to that school tab and let us know your thoughts about the treatments proposed there as well!
Lehigh Elementary School

Preliminary Engineering Treatment Recommendations

The project team developed the following set of treatment recommendations for Lehigh Elementary School. Identification of the treatments represents the first step for the City to implement the infrastructure on the roadways adjacent to the school.

Please let us know in the comment box following the map your thoughts on the proposed recommendations. The legend at the bottom of the map shows the proposed treatments for the school, while map indicates where the treatment will be installed.
Tell us how we did!
Do you like the recommendations? Do we need to make some changes? Please fill out the comment box to answer these questions as we finalize these treatments.

Please answer these quick questions to let us know how we are doing with the preliminary engineering treatments. 

Háganos saber cómo lo hicimos con los tratamientos preliminares de ingeniería.

Start

If you have a student(s) who attends another school, please navigate to that school tab and let us know your thoughts about the treatments proposed there as well!
Preliminary Engineering Treatment Recommendations

The project team developed the following set of treatment recommendations for Montclair High School. Identification of the treatments represents the first step for the City to implement the infrastructure on the roadways adjacent to the school.

Please let us know in the comment box following the map your thoughts on the proposed recommendations. The legend at the bottom of the map shows the proposed treatments for the school, while map indicates where the treatment will be installed.
Tell us how we did!
Do you like the recommendations? Do we need to make some changes? Please fill out the comment box to answer these questions as we finalize these treatments.

If you have a student(s) who attends another school, please navigate to that school tab and let us know your thoughts about the treatments proposed there as well!
Monte Vista Elementary School

Preliminary Engineering Treatment Recommendations

The project team developed the following set of treatment recommendations for Monte Vista Elementary School. Identification of the treatments represents the first step for the City to implement the infrastructure on the roadways adjacent to the school.

Please let us know in the comment box following the map your thoughts on the proposed recommendations. The legend at the bottom of the map shows the proposed treatments for the school, while map indicates where the treatment will be installed.
Tell us how we did!
Do you like the recommendations? Do we need to make some changes? *Please fill out the comment box to answer these questions as we finalize these treatments.*

Please answer these quick questions to let us know how we are doing with the preliminary engineering treatments. *Háganos saber cómo lo hicimos con los tratamientos preliminares de ingeniería.*

Start press Enter ↵

ℹ️ If you have a student(s) who attends another school, please navigate to that school tab and let us know your thoughts about the treatments proposed there as well!
The project team developed the following set of treatment recommendations for Montera Elementary School. Identification of the treatments represents the first step for the City to implement the infrastructure on the roadways adjacent to the school.

Please let us know in the comment box following the map your thoughts on the proposed recommendations. The legend at the bottom of the map shows the proposed treatments for the school, while map indicates where the treatment will be installed.
Tell us how we did!
Do you like the recommendations? Do we need to make some changes? Please fill out the comment box to answer these questions as we finalize these treatments.

Please answer these quick questions to let us know how we are doing with the preliminary engineering treatments. *Háganos saber cómo lo hicimos con los tratamientos preliminares de ingeniería.*

Start press Enter

ℹ️ If you have a student(s) who attends another school, please navigate to that school tab and let us know your thoughts about the treatments proposed there as well!
Ramona Elementary School

Preliminary Engineering Treatment Recommendations

The project team developed the following set of treatment recommendations for Ramona Elementary School. Identification of the treatments represents the first step for the City to implement the infrastructure on the roadways adjacent to the school.

Please let us know in the comment box following the map your thoughts on the proposed recommendations. The legend at the bottom of the map shows the proposed treatments for the school, while map indicates where the treatment will be installed.
Tell us how we did!
Do you like the recommendations? Do we need to make some changes? *Please fill out the comment box to answer these questions as we finalize these treatments.*

Please answer these quick questions to let us know how we are doing with the preliminary engineering treatments.

*Háganos saber cómo lo hicimos con los tratamientos preliminares de ingeniería.*

Start press Enter ↵

If you have a student(s) who attends another school, please navigate to that school tab and let us know your thoughts about the treatments proposed there as well!
Preliminary Engineering Treatment Recommendations

The project team developed the following set of treatment recommendations for Vernon Middle School. Identification of the treatments represents the first step for the City to implement the infrastructure on the roadways adjacent to the school.

Please let us know in the comment box following the map your thoughts on the proposed recommendations. The legend at the bottom of the map shows the proposed treatments for the school, while map indicates where the treatment will be installed.
Tell us how we did!
Do you like the recommendations? Do we need to make some changes? *Please fill out the comment box to answer these questions as we finalize these treatments.*

Please let us know how we did with the preliminary engineering treatments.  
*Háganos saber cómo lo hicimos con los tratamientos preliminares de ingeniería.*

Start  press Enter ↵

If you have a student(s) who attends another school, please navigate to that school tab and let us know your thoughts about the treatments proposed there as well!
We would like to hear from you! Please take a few minutes to share your feedback for the Montclair Active Transportation Plan and press "Continue" once you are finished.
Safe Routes to School Parent Survey

The Parent Survey is an important tool to help develop final recommendations for the Montclair Safe Routes to School Plan. Please take a few minutes to fill out this quick survey, which is available in both English and Spanish.
Thank you for taking time to give your feedback! Please join our mailing list to get the latest project updates!

Name (Nombre): *

Type your answer here...

Powered by Typeform
Questions? Please email us at MontclairATP@gmail.com.
¡BIENVENIDO! La ciudad de Montclair está desarrollando el Plan de Transporte Activo (ATP) y el Plan de Rutas Seguras a la Escuela (SRTS), y necesitamos su ayuda!

¡Haga en "Start" para comenzar!

I. BIENVENIDO!

II. PLAN DE TRANSPORTE ACTIVO (ATP)

- ATP Visión y Prioridades
- Posibles Tratamientos de Infraestructura
- Red de Transporte Activo

III. PLAN DE RUTAS SEGURAS A LA ESCUELA (SRTS)

- Propósito y Metas de SRTS
Escuela Buena Vista Arts Integrated Magnet

Escuela Howard Elementary

Escuela Kingsley Elementary

Escuela Lehigh Elementary

Escuela Montclair High

Escuela Monte Vista Elementary

Escuela Montera Elementary

Escuela Ramona Elementary

Escuela Vernon Middle

IV. OPORTUNIDADES DE COMENTAR

Encuesta del Plan de Transporte Activo

Encuesta para padres sobre SRTS

V. ¡MANTENGÁMONOS EN CONTACTO!

Únete a nuestra lista de correos

Información de Contacto del Proyecto
Introducción

Ciudad de Montclair

PLAN DE TRANSPORTE ACTIVO y PLAN DE RUTAS SEGURAS A LA ESCUELA
La Herramienta de participación virtual consta de cinco secciones. Cada sección es independiente entre sí, por lo que puede pasar de una sección a otra y dar su opinión.

1. Sección 1: Introducción sirve como introducción a la Herramienta de participación en virtual.

2. Sección 2: Se centra en el Plan de Transporte Activo (ATP). Desplácese por la sección y comparta sus pensamientos en los cuadros de comentarios.

3. Sección 3: El Plan de Rutas Seguras a la Escuela (SRTS) presenta los tratamientos preliminares. Navegue a la (s) escuela (s) a las que está afiliado y proporcione comentarios para cada escuela.

4. La Sección 4: Oportunidades de Comentarios presenta encuestas para los planes ATP y SRTS. Tómese unos minutos y dé su opinión para ambos esfuerzos.

5. Sección 5: Mantengámonos en Contacto es la última sección de la herramienta. ¡Deje su información de contacto para que podamos mantenernos en contacto con usted!
El Plan de Transporte Activo (ATP) busca identificar formas de mejorar la movilidad y el acceso de peatones y bicicletas. Específicamente, el ATP tiene como objetivo mejorar las condiciones para caminar y andar en bicicleta dentro de la ciudad para brindar a los residentes un mayor acceso al tránsito, trabajos, bienes, servicios y otros destinos clave.

Visión del Plan

Una ciudad de Montclair más saludable y equitativa debido a carreteras más seguras y conectadas a través de la provisión de opciones de transporte activo.
Prioridades del Plan

- **CONTRIBUIR A UN MONTCLAIR MÁS SALUDABLE**: El Plan se esforzará por mejorar el bienestar físico y mental de los miembros de la comunidad de Montclair.

- **PROPORCIONAR UN SISTEMA DE TRANSPORTE ACTIVO MÁS SEGURO**: El Plan creará un Montclair más seguro para que los miembros de la comunidad participen en el transporte activo.

- **CONECTAR A LAS PERSONAS CON LOS DESTINOS**: El Plan desarrollará una red de transporte activo más conectada que permita a los miembros de la comunidad tener un acceso más conveniente a los destinos locales y regionales.

- **FOMENTAR RESULTADOS EQUITATIVOS**: El Plan aspirará a crear un Montclair donde los miembros de la comunidad tendrán acceso a resultados de transporte equitativos.

- **PROMOVER LA REALIZACIÓN DE LUGAGES Y UNA ECONOMÍA VIBRANTE**: El Plan contribuirá hacia un Montclair más animado y económicamente vibrante al aprovechar las oportunidades del mayor uso del transporte activo.
Los tratamientos de infraestructura pueden incluir muchos elementos que ayudan a crear un entorno en el que se puede caminar, andar en bicicleta y ser accesible a través de otros modos de transporte, como el tránsito.

**Tratamientos para Peatones**

Una ACERA es una infraestructura separada físicamente de la carretera que proporciona un camino pavimentado despejado y sin obstrucciones para los peatones.

Una RAMPA de acera elimina el borde vertical de una acera existente, proporcionando así una transición segura de una calzada a una acera.

Un CRUCE DE PEATONES DE ALTA VISIBILIDAD proporciona un cruce designado con rayas blancas paralelas a la trayectoria de los vehículos para que los peatones crucen de un lado de una calle al otro.
Una **EXTENSIÓN DE BORDE (BULBO-OUT)** ofrece a los peatones un cruce más corto con mejor visibilidad al extender el bordillo hacia la calle.

Una **BALIZA RECTANGULAR DE PARPADEO RÁPIDO (RRFB)** es un tipo de advertencia activa que aumenta el comportamiento de ceder el paso del conductor en los cruces mediante.

Una **ISLETA DE RESGUARDO** proporciona un espacio para que los peatones se detengan a la mitad del cruce y disminuye la distancia de cruce requerida para que los peatones crucen a la vez.

---

**Tratamientos para Bicicletas**

Un **CARRIL MULTIUSO** permite a los peatones y ciclistas viajar a lo largo de un carril que está separado de la carretera, lo que ofrece viajes más continuos, agradables y potencialmente más seguros a destinos.

Un **CARRIL BICI PROTEGIDA** (también conocida como pista para bicicletas) incluye una barrera física entre los ciclistas y el tráfico de vehículos motorizados, ofreciendo a los ciclistas un espacio dedicado y protegido para andar en bicicleta.

Una **CICLOVIA CON AMORTIGUAMIENTO** es un carril para bicicletas que proporciona una separación lateral entre vehículos y ciclistas.
Un **CARRIL BICI** exclusivo para bicicletas que incorpora rayas y / o marcas en el pavimento para delinear un derecho de paso asignado a los ciclistas.

Un **BULEVAR DE BICI** es un camino compartido de bajo estrés diseñado para ofrecer prioridad a los ciclistas que operan dentro de una calle compartido con vehículos.

**COMODIDADES PARA BICICLETAS** como el estacionamiento de bicicletas, la estación de reparación, la estación de bicicletas, las duchas y las fuentes de agua pueden mejorar la experiencia general del ciclismo.

---

**Tratamientos Calmantes del Tráfico**

Un **CÍRCULO DE TRÁFICO** es un tipo de tratamiento de intersección que obliga a los conductores a maniobrar a su alrededor. Reduce la velocidad del vehículo y el riesgo de colisiones de vuelta a la derecha.

Una **INTERSECCIÓN PROTEGIDA** es un diseño de intersección que mantiene a los ciclistas físicamente separados de los vehículos y de los peatones en las esquinas de la intersección.

**ADMINISTRACIÓN DE CARRILES** es un tratamiento en el que los carriles se eliminan o se enanogasta para dar cabida a un carril de giro a la izquierda, estacionamiento, carriles para bicicletas o paradas de autobús.
La Red de Transporte Activo está compuesta por corredores que permitirían a los miembros de la comunidad acceder a destinos locales y regionales, incluyendo los centros de tránsito, a pie y en bicicleta.

La red tiene dos tipos de corredores: corredores locales y corredores regionales. Los corredores locales ofrecen conectividad a destinos locales como escuelas, parques de la ciudad e instituciones cívicas municipales. Mientras tanto, los corredores regionales amplían las oportunidades para llegar a destinos dentro y fuera de la ciudad de Montclair al proporcionar conectividad a instalaciones regionales para peatones y bicicletas, destinos regionales y centros de tránsito.
Propósito y Metas de SRTS

El Plan de Rutas Seguras a la Escuela (SRTS) identifica una lista de proyectos de infraestructura y programación para que la Ciudad pueda implementar en las áreas circundantes de nueve escuelas. El Plan SRTS de Montclair tiene como objetivo alentar a los estudiantes a participar en más actividad física, aumentar el uso de instalaciones públicas como senderos para bicicletas y para caminar, crear rutas más seguras a la escuela y garantizar que las calles de la ciudad se diseñen y mantengan con todos los usuarios en mente.

Metas del Proyecto

**SEGURIDAD.** El Plan se esforzará por crear un entorno más seguro para que los estudiantes, los padres y la comunidad de Montclair caminen, anden en
bicicleta, tomen el transporte público y utilicen otras formas de transporte activo para viajar hacia y desde las escuelas en Montclair.

**ACCESIBILIDAD.** El plan buscará mejorar la accesibilidad a pie, en bicicleta, transporte público y otros modos activos hacia y desde las escuelas en Montclair.

**SALUD PÚBLICA.** El Plan tendrá como objetivo mejorar el bienestar físico de los estudiantes de Montclair.

**EQUIDAD:** El Plan aspirará a construir un Montclair mejor donde los estudiantes, los padres y la comunidad de Montclair tengan resultados equitativos de las opciones de ir y venir de sus escuelas.

Presione **Seguir** para conocer las recomendaciones preliminares de ingeniería para cada escuela involucrada en el Plan y ¡Dé su opinión!
Recenduciones Preliminares de Tratamiento de Ingeniería

El equipo del proyecto desarrolló el siguiente conjunto de recomendaciones de tratamiento para la Escuela Buena Vista Arts Integrated Magnet. La identificación de los tratamientos representa el primer paso para que la Ciudad implemente la infraestructura en las carreteras adyacentes a la escuela.

Háganos saber en el cuadro de comentarios que sigue al mapa sus pensamientos sobre las recomendaciones propuestas. La leyenda en la parte inferior del mapa muestra los tratamientos propuestos para la escuela, mientras que el mapa indica dónde se instalará el tratamiento.
¡Cuéntanos cómo lo hicimos!
¿Te gustan las recomendaciones? ¿Necesitamos hacer algunos cambios? Complete el cuadro de comentarios para responder estas preguntas a medida que finalizamos estos tratamientos.

Please answer these quick questions to let us know how we are doing with the preliminary engineer treatments. Háganos saber cómo lo hicimos con los tratamientos preliminares de ingeniería.

Start  press Enter ⌘

Si tiene un estudiante que asiste a otra escuela, navegue hasta la pestaña de esa escuela y háganos saber sus pensamientos sobre los tratamientos propuestos allí también.
Recomendaciones Preliminares de Tratamiento de Ingeniería

El equipo del proyecto desarrolló el siguiente conjunto de recomendaciones de tratamiento para la Escuela Howard Elementary. La identificación de los tratamientos representa el primer paso para que la Ciudad implemente la infraestructura en las carreteras adyacentes a la escuela.

Háganos saber en el cuadro de comentarios que sigue al mapa sus pensamientos sobre las recomendaciones propuestas. La leyenda en la parte inferior del mapa muestra los tratamientos propuestos para la escuela, mientras que el mapa indica dónde se instalará el tratamiento.
¡Cuéntanos cómo lo hicimos!

¿Te gustan las recomendaciones? ¿Necesitamos hacer algunos cambios? Complete el cuadro de comentarios para responder estas preguntas a medida que finalizamos estos tratamientos.

Please answer these quick questions to let us know how we are doing with the preliminary engineering treatments.

Háganos saber cómo lo hicimos con los tratamientos preliminares de ingeniería.

Si tiene un estudiante que asiste a otra escuela, navegue hasta la pestaña de esa escuela y háganos saber sus pensamientos sobre los tratamientos propuestos allí también.
Recomendaciones Preliminares de Tratamiento de Ingeniería

El equipo del proyecto desarrolló el siguiente conjunto de recomendaciones de tratamiento para la Escuela Kingsley Elementary. La identificación de los tratamientos representa el primer paso para que la Ciudad implemente la infraestructura en las carreteras adyacentes a la escuela.

Háganos saber en el cuadro de comentarios que sigue al mapa sus pensamientos sobre las recomendaciones propuestas. La leyenda en la parte inferior del mapa muestra los tratamientos propuestos para la escuela, mientras que el mapa indica dónde se instalará el tratamiento.
¡Cúéntanos cómo lo hicimos!

¿Te gustan las recomendaciones? ¿Necesitamos hacer algunos cambios? Complete el cuadro de comentarios para responder estas preguntas a medida que finalizamos estos tratamientos.

Please answer these quick questions to let us know how we are doing with the preliminary engineering treatments. *Háganos saber cómo lo hicimos con los tratamientos preliminares de ingeniería.*

Si tiene un estudiante que asiste a otra escuela, navegue hasta la pestaña de esa escuela y háganos saber sus pensamientos sobre los tratamientos propuestos allí también.
Recomendaciones Preliminares de Tratamiento de Ingeniería

El equipo del proyecto desarrolló el siguiente conjunto de recomendaciones de tratamiento para la Escuela Lehigh Elementary. La identificación de los tratamientos representa el primer paso para que la Ciudad implemente la infraestructura en las carreteras adyacentes a la escuela.

Háganos saber en el cuadro de comentarios que sigue al mapa sus pensamientos sobre las recomendaciones propuestas. La leyenda en la parte inferior del mapa muestra los tratamientos propuestos para la escuela, mientras que el mapa indica dónde se instalará el tratamiento.
Please answer these quick questions to let us know how we are doing with the preliminary engineering treatments.

Háganos saber cómo lo hicimos con los tratamientos preliminares de ingeniería.
Recomendaciones Preliminares de Tratamiento de Ingeniería

El equipo del proyecto desarrolló el siguiente conjunto de recomendaciones de tratamiento para la Escuela Montclair High. La identificación de los tratamientos representa el primer paso para que la Ciudad implemente la infraestructura en las carreteras adyacentes a la escuela.

Háganos saber en el cuadro de comentarios que sigue al mapa sus pensamientos sobre las recomendaciones propuestas. La leyenda en la parte inferior del mapa muestra los tratamientos propuestos para la escuela, mientras que el mapa indica dónde se instalará el tratamiento.
¡Cuéntanos cómo lo hicimos!

¿Te gustan las recomendaciones? ¿Necesitamos hacer algunos cambios? Complete el cuadro de comentarios para responder estas preguntas a medida que finalizamos estos tratamientos.

Please answer these quick questions to let us know how we are doing with the preliminary engineering treatments. Háganos saber cómo lo hicimos con los tratamientos preliminares de ingeniería.

Start

Si tiene un estudiante que asiste a otra escuela, navegue hasta la pestaña de esa escuela y háganos saber sus pensamientos sobre los tratamientos propuestos allí también.
Recomendaciones Preliminares de Tratamiento de Ingeniería

El equipo del proyecto desarrolló el siguiente conjunto de recomendaciones de tratamiento para la Escuela Monte Vista Elementary. La identificación de los tratamientos representa el primer paso para que la Ciudad implemente la infraestructura en las carreteras adyacentes a la escuela.

Háganos saber en el cuadro de comentarios que sigue al mapa sus pensamientos sobre las recomendaciones propuestas. La leyenda en la parte inferior del mapa muestra los tratamientos propuestos para la escuela, mientras que el mapa indica dónde se instalará el tratamiento.
¡Cuentanos cómo lo hicimos!

¿Te gustan las recomendaciones? ¿Necesitamos hacer algunos cambios? 
**Complete el cuadro de comentarios para responder estas preguntas a medida que finalizamos estos tratamientos.**

Please answer these quick questions to let us know how we are doing with the preliminary engineering treatments.  
**Háganos saber cómo lo hicimos con los tratamientos preliminares de ingeniería.**

Start press Enter ↵

Si tiene un estudiante que asiste a otra escuela, navegue hasta la pestaña de esa escuela y háganos saber sus pensamientos sobre los tratamientos propuestos allí también.
El equipo del proyecto desarrolló el siguiente conjunto de recomendaciones de tratamiento para la Escuela Montera Elementary. La identificación de los tratamientos representa el primer paso para que la Ciudad implemente la infraestructura en las carreteras adyacentes a la escuela.

Háganos saber en el cuadro de comentarios que sigue al mapa sus pensamientos sobre las recomendaciones propuestas. La leyenda en la parte inferior del mapa muestra los tratamientos propuestos para la escuela, mientras que el mapa indica dónde se instalará el tratamiento.
Recomendaciones Preliminares de Tratamiento de Ingeniería
¡Cuéntanos cómo lo hicimos!

¿Te gustan las recomendaciones? ¿Necesitamos hacer algunos cambios? Complete el cuadro de comentarios para responder estas preguntas a medida que finalizamos estos tratamientos.

Please answer these quick questions to let us know how we are doing with the preliminary engineering treatments.

Háganos saber cómo lo hicimos con los tratamientos preliminares de ingeniería.

Start

Si tiene un estudiante que asiste a otra escuela, navegue hasta la pestaña de esa escuela y háganos saber sus pensamientos sobre los tratamientos propuestos allí también.
Recomendaciones Preliminares de Tratamiento de Ingeniería

El equipo del proyecto desarrolló el siguiente conjunto de recomendaciones de tratamiento para la Escuela Ramona Elementary. La identificación de los tratamientos representa el primer paso para que la Ciudad implemente la infraestructura en las carreteras adyacentes a la escuela.

Háganos saber en el cuadro de comentarios que sigue al mapa sus pensamientos sobre las recomendaciones propuestas. La leyenda en la parte inferior del mapa muestra los tratamientos propuestos para la escuela, mientras que el mapa indica dónde se instalará el tratamiento.
¡Cuéntanos cómo lo hicimos!
¿Te gustan las recomendaciones? ¿Necesitamos hacer algunos cambios? Complete el cuadro de comentarios para responder estas preguntas a medida que finalizamos estos tratamientos.

Please answer these quick questions to let us know how we are doing with the preliminary engineering treatments. 

Háganos saber cómo lo hicimos con los tratamientos preliminares de ingeniería.

Start press Enter ↵

Si tiene un estudiante que asiste a otra escuela, navegue hasta la pestaña de esa escuela y háganos saber sus pensamientos sobre los tratamientos propuestos allí también.
Recomendaciones Preliminares de Tratamiento de Ingeniería

El equipo del proyecto desarrolló el siguiente conjunto de recomendaciones de tratamiento para la Escuela Vernon Middle. La identificación de los tratamientos representa el primer paso para que la Ciudad implemente la infraestructura en las carreteras adyacentes a la escuela.

Háganos saber en el cuadro de comentarios que sigue al mapa sus pensamientos sobre las recomendaciones propuestas. La leyenda en la parte inferior del mapa muestra los tratamientos propuestos para la escuela, mientras que el mapa indica dónde se instalará el tratamiento.
¡Cuéntanos cómo lo hicimos!

¿Te gustan las recomendaciones? ¿Necesitamos hacer algunos cambios? Complete el cuadro de comentarios para responder estas preguntas a medida que finalizamos estos tratamientos.

Please let us know how we did with the preliminary engineering treatments. 
Háganos saber cómo lo hicimos con los tratamientos preliminares de ingeniería.

Start

Si tiene un estudiante que asiste a otra escuela, navegue hasta la pestaña de esa escuela y háganos saber sus pensamientos sobre los tratamientos propuestos allí también.
¡Nos gustaría saber de ti! Tómese unos minutos para compartir sus comentarios sobre el Plan de transporte activo de Montclair. Presione "Seguir" una vez que haya terminado.
La Encuesta para Padres es una herramienta importante para ayudar a desarrollar recomendaciones finales para el Plan de SRTS de Montclair. Tómese unos minutos para completar esta encuesta rápida, que está disponible en español.
Gracias por tomarse el tiempo para enviar sus comentarios. Únase a nuestra lista de correo para recibir las últimas actualizaciones del proyecto!

Type your answer here...

Shift ⇧ + Enter ↵ to make a line break

CONTINUE
Información de Contacto del Proyecto

Preguntas? Envíenos un correo electrónico a MontclairATP@gmail.com.