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The City of San Luis Obispo adopted their first Bicycle Transportation Plan (BTP) in April of 1985. Since that original adoption, the City has adopted updates to the plan in 1993, 2002, 2007 and now, 2013.

2013 Bicycle Transportation Plan Changes:

The 2013 Bicycle Transportation Plan Update is a comprehensive update of all of the Bike Plan’s policies, programs, maps, tables, and projects. With a focus on ease of use, the Plan has been reformatted to improve both presentation and content. Notable changes include:

Plan Format – Plan topics are now organized in chapters rather than appendices. The Plan’s objectives and policies are found within these chapters and glossary definitions are found topically on the page sidebars. Plan chapters and project areas can be located using graphical tabs at the tops of the pages. For locating Plan requirements relative to California Streets and Highways Code Section 891.2, a separate contents page has been included.

Implementation Actions – These have been added to identify implementation steps associated with Plan policies. They are found in the policy sections for each chapter where a relationship exists with the stated policy. They are also compiled in Appendix B, “Implementation Actions Matrix”.

Project Ranking and Presentation – For ranking projects, the same criteria established in the 2007 plan has been used, but only the project’s overall rank (First, Second, Third) is included in the 2013 presentation (Appendix A). Included in the “Bicycle Transportation Network” chapter is a discussion of the top two ranked projects by facility type. Graphics are now included to visually orient the location of each project in the City. Projects are presented in groupings by City location (Central, Northern, Eastern, Southern, and Western).

2007 BTP Accomplishments and 2013 BTP Modifications – Appendix G “Accomplishments and Updates”, provides a listing of bicycling related City accomplishments resulting from the 2007 Plan. For those wishing to compare the 2007 plan to the 2013 plan, a synopsis of the additions and modifications is included.
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**List of Acronyms**

AASHTO  American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials  
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BTP  Bicycle Transportation Plan  
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SRTS  Safe Routes to School (Federally controlled grant funding program)  
SR2S  Safe Routes to School (State controlled grant funding program)  
TDA  Transportation Development Account  
TE  Transportation Enhancements Activities (Grant Funding)  
TIF  Transportation Impact Fee  

---

**Vision and Goals**

---

**Plan Goals:**

1. **Significantly increase the percentage of all trips made by bicycle within San Luis Obispo.**

2. **Establish and maintain an integrated system of bikeways and parking facilities that enables safe and convenient bicycling, with an emphasis on travel to employment centers, commercial districts, schools and recreational destinations.**

3. **Advocate bicycling as a way of addressing climate change, preserving clean air, reducing traffic congestion and noise, conserving land and energy resources, and promoting good health.**

4. **Develop financial partnerships with other organizations when the resultant bicycle facilities or activities provide significant benefits to San Luis Obispo residents.**

---

**Vision:**

By 2026, all San Luis Obispo residents will have access to a well designed and maintained network of interconnected bikeways linking City destinations. Where bicyclists share streets with motorists, sufficient space will be reserved for their passage. Once at their destinations, bicyclists will find convenient and secure places to park.

Bicycling education opportunities will be available for both children and adults, offering the ability to learn how to safely use bicycles for daily transportation needs. Bicycling becomes an important element of the City’s economy, with connections provided to important regional destinations such as beaches and inland parks. For tourists and residents alike, the careful location and design of off-street paths (such as the Railroad Safety Trail and the Bob Jones City-to-Sea Trail) allow them to appreciate unique community features.
The City maintains bicycle racks on every block in the downtown core. For an inventory visit www.slocity.org.
# Introduction

## Purpose of Plan
- Bicycle Transportation Planning in San Luis Obispo
- Data Collection and Future Trends
- Benefits of Bicycling
- Economic Development
- Relationship to Other Documents and Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of Plan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Transportation Planning in San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection and Future Trends</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of Bicycling</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to Other Documents and Plans</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This Plan presents:

**Goals**
Broad statements of intent.
(located with the Plan’s “Vision” statement, pg. vii)

**Objectives**
Expected outcomes to implementation of this Plan’s projects, policies, and actions.
(located at the beginning of each chapter, relative to chapter content)

**Policies**
Principles that guide implementation of this Plan and other actions associated with bicycling.
(located at the end of each chapter, relative to chapter content)

**Implementation Actions**
Implementation steps associated with specific Plan policies.
(located with associated policy)

### Purpose of Plan

The provisions of this Plan apply to the planning, development and maintenance of bicycle facilities and activities within the corporate limits of San Luis Obispo. In addition, this Plan represents the City’s official policy for the design and development of bikeways in adjoining territory under County jurisdiction but within San Luis Obispo’s Urban Reserve – the anticipated outward limit of City growth.

Since 1982, San Luis Obispo’s long-range plans have promoted the use of modes of transportation other than private motor vehicles. The 1994 General Plan Circulation Element includes specific objectives for reducing vehicle use and promoting other modes – with bicycling being a very important transportation choice.

Bicycling in San Luis Obispo has many advantages: the weather is good, trip distances and times are relatively short, the cost of purchasing and maintaining a bicycle is modest, connections between origins and destinations can be direct and convenient, and bicycling is healthful – one way of combating the negative effects of a sedentary lifestyle.

However, not all bicyclists are equal. Children, seniors, and novice riders, may only feel comfortable riding on very low traffic streets, or facilities separated from traffic. More experienced riders have the ability to integrate with traffic, but still may desire additional space where traffic is moving at higher speeds and need consideration at intersections. The challenge is to provide relatively conflict-free bikeway facilities that meet the needs of the full range of bicyclists’ skill levels.

This Plan presents **goals**, **objectives**, **policies**, and **implementation actions**. Each of these terms is defined at left. The Plan Goals are stated with the “SLO Vision” prior to this introduction (pg. vii). The Plan Objectives are stated at the beginning of each chapter where their relative subjects are addressed, and Plan Policies and Actions are presented at the end of each chapter. Engineering, education, encouragement, enforcement and evaluation have been incorporated into the Plan’s Policies and Actions as tools to move the City forward as a **bicycle friendly community**. Each category provides opportunities for advocacy and awareness of the community, a tool to measure plan effectiveness, and implementation of facilities supporting bicycling.

The Objectives and Policies of the Plan are to be used by engineers, designers, and installers in creating, operating, and maintaining bicycling facilities within the City of San Luis Obispo. They are meant to complement and strengthen standards and guidelines contained within the City’s Standards Specifications and Engineering Standards, Community Design Guidelines, and State and Federal standards as prescribed in the Highway Design Manual, the Manual for Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), and American Association of State Highway and Transportation Official (AASHTO) standards.

This Plan presents **goals**, **objectives**, **policies**, and **implementation actions**. Each of these terms is defined at left. The Plan Goals are stated with the “SLO Vision” prior to this introduction (pg. vii). The Plan Objectives are stated at the beginning of each chapter where their relative subjects are addressed, and Plan Policies and Actions are presented at the end of each chapter. Engineering, education, encouragement, enforcement and evaluation have been incorporated into the Plan’s Policies and Actions as tools to move the City forward as a **bicycle friendly community**. Each category provides opportunities for advocacy and awareness of the community, a tool to measure plan effectiveness, and implementation of facilities supporting bicycling.

The Objectives and Policies of the Plan are to be used by engineers, designers, and installers in creating, operating, and maintaining bicycling facilities within the City of San Luis Obispo. They are meant to complement and strengthen standards and guidelines contained within the City’s Standards Specifications and Engineering Standards, Community Design Guidelines, and State and Federal standards as prescribed in the Highway Design Manual, the Manual for Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), and American Association of State Highway and Transportation Official (AASHTO) standards.

**Community Profile**

The City of San Luis Obispo is home to approximately 45,000 people who enjoy its temperate climate, the rolling hills of the Santa Lucia mountain range, and the compact urban design of the City which covers only 12.85 square miles. According to 2010 Census data, San Luis Obispo’s median population age is 26 years. The young age can be attributed to the presence of the area’s two colleges, Cuesta Community College and Cal Poly State University. According to a 2006 Outdoors Foundation survey, individuals of younger ages (specifically under the age of 44) are more likely to participate in bicycling activities. These factors make the City of San Luis Obispo the perfect community for both transportation and recreational bicycling.
Bicycle Transportation Plan History

In April 1985, the City of San Luis Obispo adopted its first bicycle transportation plan. The Bicycle Facilities Plan identified a network of on-street bikeways extending throughout the community – mostly along arterial streets and collector roads.

In 1991, the San Luis Obispo City Council created a Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) and asked it to prepare a bicycle transportation plan that met State law requirements in place at that time. This work was completed and a Bicycle Transportation Plan (BTP) was adopted on October 27, 1993. The second-generation document expanded the scope of bicycle transportation planning in San Luis Obispo by calling for a more complete network of both on and off-street bikeways, and by establishing policies for bicycle parking.

Since 1993, State codes that establish the required content of bicycle transportation plans have changed. Therefore, the 2002 plan update focused on developing and including new information as required by Section 891.2 of the California Streets and Highways Code. This update process involved City staff, members of the BAC and its subcommittee, and citizen volunteers. On May 7, 2002, the San Luis Obispo City Council adopted the plan, which was submitted to the Caltrans Bicycle Facility Unit and subsequently certified as meeting the requirements of the California Streets and Highways Code.

The next update of the BTP was adopted by the City Council on May 15, 2007. This BTP update focused on updating and expanding policies, as well as creating a comprehensive ranking system for projects listed in the Plan. Again the update process involved City staff, members of the BAC, and input from citizens. Also in 2007, the City was named as a Bicycle Friendly Community by the League of American Bicyclists (LAB). In 2008, the Central Coast Section of the American Planning Association presented the City with an Award of Excellence for its 2007 Bicycle Transportation Plan.

The 2013 plan builds on the past plans by adding new projects and by refining policies to reflect successful experiences of other bicycle friendly communities. It adds best practices to the policy section, has been reformatted for clarity, and includes more detailed cost estimates of proposed facilities. A summary of the changes can be found in Appendix G, page G-5. The Community Development Director reviewed the Plan for its environmental impact in August 2013, and recommended that a mitigated negative declaration be granted.

The San Luis Obispo Public Works Department and the Bicycle Advisory Committee prepared this fifth generation plan. For more information, contact the Public Works Department at (805) 781-7210. This Plan can also be viewed on the Public Works page of the City’s website (www.slocity.org).

Public Input

In 2008, San Luis Obispo's Public Work's Department distributed a Transportation Survey to obtain data on usage and modes of transportation, including bicycling. Over one thousand survey respondents offered information on their primary destination by bicycle, how often they commute by bicycle, and what measures would need to be implemented to increase their bicycle usage.

The San Luis Obispo Bicycle Advisory Committee consists of seven members of the public, appointed by the City Council. The purpose of the BAC is to provide oversight and policy direction on matters related to bicycle transportation in San Luis Obispo and its relationship to bicycling outside the City.

The Bicycle Advisory Committee spent 12 public meetings updating the Bicycle Transportation Plan over a 2-year period. The Committee's
Major City Goals:
Represent the City’s priorities for the two-year financial plan. In January 2013 the City Council included bicycling and support of the Bicycle Transportation Plan as one of the City’s major goals for the 2013-15 Financial Plan. The goal states: “Expand bicycle and pedestrian paths to improve connectivity and safety, including continued progress on Rail Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Trail and Bob Jones Trail, and pursuit of other options contained in the Bicycle Transportation Plan.” A full listing of the “Major City Goals” can be found on the City web site at: www.slocity.org

Land Use Settlement Patterns

Existing Development Pattern

The community of San Luis Obispo began in 1772 with the founding of Mission San Luis Obispo de Tolosa. During its first century, a retail and financial district and government center formed around the old mission. At the close of the 19th century, the Southern Pacific Railroad (now the Union Pacific Railroad) pushed through the eastern side of San Luis Obispo, forming a circulation barrier for community residents but providing a vital link to interstate destinations. In the mid-1950s, Highway 101, a four-lane freeway, was constructed along the town's western edge, dividing some older neighborhoods and again limiting cross-town access.

Following a traditional expansion pattern, offices and residential neighborhoods now surround the Downtown Area, extend outward and are served by arterial streets, some of which are also State highways. Outward expansion along these arterial streets has provided new shopping and employment centers, now located near the town’s periphery. (See Map 3: Land Use Settlement Patterns, pg. 9.)

San Luis Obispo is the County seat and includes offices for City, County, State, and Federal agencies. Major employment centers include California Polytechnic State University (Cal Poly), the downtown core, shopping plazas adjacent to Highway 101 along Madonna and Los Osos Valley Roads, and light industrial and office development along Broad and South Higuera Streets.

Proposed Settlement Pattern

To the north and east, outward growth of San Luis Obispo is limited by topography (e.g., Santa Lucia Foothills and Bishop Peak) and by State-owned land (Cal Poly University). To the west, productive agricultural lands and a flood plain surrounding Laguna Lake border Los Osos Valley Road and Foothill Boulevard. These areas are part of a “green belt” proposed for preservation as open space.

Most urban growth is slated for areas along the southern edge of the City, most of which can be seen as in-fill based on the current boundary shape of the City. The extent of future growth is shown in Map 4: Planning Areas (pg. 20). It includes two new residential neighborhoods (the Margarita and Orcutt Areas), further expansion of retail commercial uses along Madonna Road and Los Osos Valley Road, and substantial industrial development north of the County Airport in the Airport Area. Specific Plans have been prepared for these “expansion areas” that incorporate a network of Class I and II bikeways connected to the existing system.

Full development of land, as envisioned by San Luis Obispo’s General Plan, will result in the City occupying about 14 square miles, with a total resident population of 57,000 people living in 24,700 dwellings by the year 2029.
**Major City Attractions and Destinations**

**Downtown San Luis Obispo**

The compact downtown core of San Luis Obispo attracts both residents and visitors with its quaint, locally-owned restaurants, boutique style shopping, art venues, and entertainment. The downtown area is home to attractions such as Old Mission San Luis Obispo and Bubblegum Alley, and is the host of entertainment from the year-round Thursday evening Farmer's Market to the Concerts in the Plaza featuring local singers and music groups during the summer months. Both the Farmer's Market and Concerts in the Plaza have been known to offer a bike valet to attendees traveling by bicycle.

**California Polytechnic State University and Cuesta Junior College**

Cal Poly, a nationally ranked university and one of the finest technical universities in the west, is located north of and adjacent to San Luis Obispo. Cuesta, the local junior college regarded for its excellent educational programs, services, and staff, is located a few miles north of the City limits. With faculty, students and staff totaling over thirty thousand, it is important that these campuses have bicycle facilities available for both the on and off campus populations. Bicycling is an efficient and affordable way to get to, from, and around campus.

**Inland Parks and Open Spaces**

San Luis Obispo is the backdrop to spectacular views of the Santa Lucia Mountains and prominent morros (Spanish for a rounded hill or promontory), including Cerro San Luis and Bishop Peak. Open spaces and natural reserves not only surround the City, but provide corridors of parks within the City’s neighborhoods, business districts, and even the downtown core. These open spaces provide opportunity for future trails and Class I bike paths through the City offering recreational access to its natural beauty.
Data Collection and Future Trends

According to the 2008-2010 American Community Survey (ACS) conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau, over sixty percent of the City of San Luis Obispo residents have a short commute to work (less than 15 minutes) regardless of transportation mode. The ACS also shows, however, that over seventy percent of commuters primarily drive alone to work by motor vehicle. This closely matches the national statistic that half of all trips are three miles or less, yet seventy-two percent are made by car (Summary of Travel Trends, 2009). By identifying the barriers to bicycle commuting, future planning and project implementation can be geared towards providing programs and facilities that will encourage motorists to shift to bicycling. Studies have shown that implementation of a comprehensive range of infrastructure, programs, and policy efforts such as those identified in this Plan create growth in bicycle commuting (Pucher, 2011).

The main sources of bicycle use data for the City of San Luis Obispo are citywide bicycle counts, the U.S. Census, and a SLO City transportation survey. The bicycle counts indicate the specific areas of the City that are most popular for bicycling, while the Census data and local transportation survey indicate how many residents are commuting by bicycle, along with the type of destination.

The City’s bicycle count collects bicycle use volume data for specific locations throughout the City. These counts, combined with bicycle collision data presented in the annual Traffic Safety Report, are used to evaluate bicycle travel patterns, as well as develop and prioritize projects in this Plan. (Data from the bike counts are included in the “Notes” sections of this Plan’s projects: Appendix A.) The 2008 City of San Luis Obispo Bicycle Count Data report concluded that there is an upward trend for average bicycle volumes since 1996. The report also indicated that bicycle volumes at Cal Poly are consistently greater than volumes seen at other locations within the City. Additionally, the report noted a direct correlation between the rise in gas prices and an increase in bicycle count volumes (City of San Luis Obispo, Bicycle Count Data 2008, figures 2 and 5). Currently, this data collection methodology does not account for the commute patterns of children in grades k-12.

The Census data from 2000 through 2010 shows an upward trend in bicycle use for transportation to work. In 2000, the data reported that 3.6 percent of the City’s population commuted to work by bicycle. By 2010, it showed an increase to 5.2 percent of the City’s population. This data is derived from the question, “How did the person usually get to work last week?” It does not account for those who use a bicycle to commute to work occasionally, or commuters using multimodal transportation, such as transit combined with bicycle. Even more significantly, the Census data does not account for commutes to destinations other than work, or for children or students who ride their bikes for transportation. Therefore we can expect that the City of San Luis Obispo actually has a higher percentage of bicycle commuters than is reported in the Census data.

The definition for a bicycle commuter used in this Plan does not place limits on the age of the rider or the destination type, only on the trip intent (not including trips primarily for physical exercise or recreation). This definition is consistent with the definition given in the California Streets and Highways Code, Section 890.3.

Data collected in the 2008 City of SLO Transportation Survey show a significantly higher bicycle commuter rate in the City of San Luis Obispo than was captured in the Census data. According to this survey, eleven percent of City adult residents use a bicycle as their primary mode of transportation to and from work or school. Further, thirteen percent identified themselves as a bicycle commuter at least 3-4 days a week as an alternative to driving. (Table Intro.1: Primary Usage of Bicycles in San Luis Obispo on the following page, shows the breakdown for how bicycles are used, including recreation, along with common commute destinations by type.) The survey also revealed that sixty-four percent...
of respondents would ride more with inducements (bike paths, lanes, etc.) related specifically to policies and projects contained in this Plan. This sixty-four percent makes up the potential for adult bicycle commuting growth within the City — as many as 28,000 additional adult bicycle commuters!

Table Intro.1: Primary Usage of Bicycles in San Luis Obispo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work / School</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Errands / Appointments</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping / Entertainment</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Friends</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Requirement</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2008 City of San Luis Obispo Transportation Survey

Benefits of Bicycling

The City of San Luis Obispo continues to benefit from being a bicycle friendly community for the health and well-being of the community, the environment, and the City’s economy. Being bicycle friendly has allowed the City of San Luis Obispo the opportunity to continue promoting and planning for bicycle facilities and programs. As a League of American Bicyclists’ designated Bicycle Friendly Community, the City of San Luis Obispo is “in a better place to receive grant funding for bicycle-related projects” (Tucker, 2011). The nation-wide recognition of San Luis Obispo as a bicycle-friendly community attracts tourism, providing an opportunity to boost the economic activity within the City.

Economic Development

There are economic benefits to investing in bicycling facilities, from traffic congestion relief to increased real estate values, both individuals and communities are impacted. “Bicycling generates more than $100 billion a year to the U.S. economy. It supports nearly 1.1 million jobs and generates nearly $20 billion in federal, state, and local tax revenues, as well as billions spent on meals, transportation, lodging, gifts and entertainment during bike trips and tours” (Flusche, 2009). Employers of **head of household** jobs can have an easier time attracting skilled workers to locations which have a high quality of life, generally equated with bicycle friendly communities. The presence of quality bicycle facilities in neighborhoods is also often an indicator of higher real estate values. Further, street infrastructure designs that prioritize bicyclists and pedestrians (traffic calming, bicycle paths, lanes, and parking) have shown to be economically beneficial to area businesses (Drennan, 2003, Meisel, 2010, The Clean Air Partnership, 2009).

Outdoor activities such as bicycling are some of the most popular activities for people while on vacation. Bicycling facilities can provide the incentive to increase tourist expenditures on lodging, food, entertainment, and other items. Organized bicycling events also have an economic benefit to the City. For example, the Lighthouse

The physical activity of commuting by bicycle can decrease a person’s risk of being obese and having abnormal blood pressure (Gordon-Larsen, 2009). Additionally, it is excellent exercise that can increase muscle strength, build stamina, and improve cardio-vascular fitness and heart health (Travers, 2009).

As a bicycle-friendly community, the City of San Luis Obispo is leaving a positive footprint on the environment by encouraging commuters to shift from motor vehicles to bicycles, reducing the number of vehicle trips and miles traveled in the community, reducing traffic congestion and improving air quality.

Outdoor activities such as bicycling are some of the most popular activities for people while on vacation. Bicycling facilities can provide the incentive to increase tourist expenditures on lodging, food, entertainment, and other items. Organized bicycling events also have an economic benefit to the City. For example, the Lighthouse...
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Introduction

Bicycling events such as the Tour of California attract both residents and tourists. (Here, fans watch on the outdoor screen next to Mission Plaza while waiting for the arrival of the 2006 Tour.)

and Wildflower Century Rides organized by the SLO Bicycle Club showcase over 2,600 riders annually with two-thirds of the riders visiting from out of town and usually staying at least two nights in local hotels. Other large organized rides that come through the region annually include the AIDS/LifeCycle (in 2011 featured 2,362 riders), the Best Buddies Challenge featuring event chair Maria Shriver, the SLO Grand Fondo, the Tri-California Wildflower Triathlon, and the SLO City Triathlon. San Luis Obispo is also a popular stop for touring bicyclists along California’s popular Pacific Coast Bike Route (established by the California legislature in 1976), which runs from the Oregon state line to the border with Mexico.

For most households, ownership of a motor vehicle is typically the highest expense after housing. Bicycling provides more mobility options to those who cannot afford a motor vehicle or choose to make other economic investments. It also allows some households to reduce the number of motor vehicles they own and replace some motor vehicle trips with bicycle trips. According to the Texas Transportation Institute, congestion costs the individual commuter in small areas like San Luis Obispo $363 in delay time and wasted fuel annually (TTI, 2011). In 2010, small area commuters were delayed in congested traffic for an average of 18 hours, wasting 4 gallons of gasoline (TTI, 2011). Congestion is expected to worsen as the national economy recovers from recession.

The report, “Bike Plan Benefit-Cost Analysis” (Appendix K), analyzed the costs and benefits of installing the complete Railroad Safety Trail and Bob Jones City to Sea Trail, approximately 25% of the total length of proposed Class I bikeway projects in this Plan, and found a benefit to cost ratio of nearly ten to one (see Appendix A for project details). Costs analyzed in the report include both current construction and on-going maintenance costs. Benefits quantified in this analysis include benefits to individuals, such as health and recreation, along with benefits to the community, such as congestion reduction and reduced health care costs.

This Plan includes information required by Section 891.2 of the California Streets and Highways Code (See Table of Contents for a guide to finding this information). This Plan has been submitted to the California Department of Transportation’s Bicycle Unit and has been certified as being in compliance with applicable codes.

This plan supports AB 1358, The Complete Streets Act of 2008. This Act requires that complete streets policies be included in Caltrans studies and the circulation element of city and county general plans when they are updated. The City of San Luis Obispo 2013 Bicycle Transportation Plan incorporates the bicycling component of Complete Streets policies in specific plan projects, and within the policies of the plan. Where funding is provided, projects will comply with appropriate current Complete Streets policies.

This plan supports both AB 32: Global Warming Solutions Act, and SB 375: Sustainable Communities Strategy. Bikeway policies included in this Plan comply with or exceed those in Chapter 1000 of the Highway Design Manual (Sixth Edition) published by the California Department of Transportation.

This Plan was prepared and adopted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and its guidelines. Copies of its Mitigated Negative Declaration are available from the Public Works Department upon request.

This Plan recognizes the 2009 County Grand Jury report titled, “Great Paths but Galling Gaps”; in which the Grand Jury provided the following recommendations regarding the City’s bicycle network:

• “The City should continue to aggressively pursue grants and other funding to build bike paths and other bicycle friendly facilities;”
• “Completion of the Railway Safety Trail should be the City’s top bike

Complete Streets:
(Also known as livable streets) are roadways designed and operated to enable safe access and travel for all users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and public transportation users of all ages and abilities.
**Related County Plans**

This Plan is consistent with County plans adopted by the County Board of Supervisors, such as the Clean Air Plan (2001), Parks and Recreation Element (2006) and the County Bikeways Plan (2010).

Existing City segments that connect to existing or proposed County bikeways include the Class I Railroad Safety Trail into Cal Poly and the Class II bike lanes on Broad Street, Foothill Boulevard, Grand Avenue, Highland Drive, Los Osos Valley Road, Monterey Street, Orcutt Road, Pehufino Canyon Road, Santa Rosa Street, and South Higuera Street. Proposed City segments that meet with existing or proposed County bikeways include the Bob Jones Trail, Laguna Lake Bikeways, and Cuesta Park/Loomis St. southbound Hwy. 101 exit. See Appendix L for a detailed listing of both existing and proposed connections between City and County bikeways.

This Plan is consistent with the 2010 San Luis Obispo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) which includes provisions for non-motorized transportation, adopted by the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG). This Plan supports the following non-motorized transportation goals in the RTP:

- **NM 1.** Promote development of a coordinated and connected regional bikeway system with emphasis on linking gaps of the regional system where appropriate bikeways do not exist.
- **NM 2.** Promote livable community cores and a well connected bike and pedestrian system that promote walking and bicycling.
- **NM 11.** Assure that efforts are made to reduce barriers to cycling and walking (SLOCOG, 2010).

SLOCOG's 2010 RTP focuses on regional segments of the California Coastal Trail and Juan Bautista de Anza trails corridors. The City's Railroad Safety Trail follows the Juan Bautista de Anza trail corridor.

**Related City Plans**

This Plan is consistent with the City of San Luis Obispo's General Plan, specifically the the Parks and Recreation Element (2001), Conservation and Open Space Element (2006), and the Circulation Element (1994) which calls for a bicycle "Modal Split Objective" of 10% of "City Resident Trips". This Plan is also consistent with the City's adopted Climate Action Plan (August, 2012), specifically its Transportation and Land Use Policy TLU 3.1, "Modify Bicycle Transportation Plan to achieve a 20% bicycle mode share by 2020" and the “Complete Streets” section (4.0) to "Modify the General Plan Policies in the SLO2035 update to support a balanced, multimodal transportation network". This Plan also supports the City's plan, "A Conceptual Physical Plan for the City's Center" (1997), which states that the City should "provide more facilities that encourage and enhance the use of bicycles". The Plan supports provisions within the City’s Zoning Regulations (2010), and the guidelines in the City’s Community Design Guidelines (2010).

**City Planning Areas**

The City of San Luis Obispo has adopted a variety of planning documents for residential neighborhoods, commercial districts, open space and parks. These prescribe the arrangement of land uses, establish design standards for new development, and identify alignments for transportation corridors, including Class I and II bikeways. Where these plans include bikeway facilities, they may also include funding.
mechanisms for facilities within their boundaries. Precise alignment of bikeways is established by these plans and are supported by this Plan. Should the bikeways prescribed by these related plans be modified, this Plan will be amended to achieve consistency. Map 1: Bicycle Transportation Network shows the type and general alignment of bikeways throughout San Luis Obispo. This Plan is designed to be consistent with the following listed plans.

**Airport Area Specific Plan.** Establishes the design of service commercial and industrial districts between South Higuera and Broad Streets, generally north of the County Airport. The plan shows Class I bikeways extending along two area creeks and Tank Farm Road, and Class II bikeways along all area arterial and collector streets.

**Bob Jones City-to-Sea Bike Trail Route Plan.** This plan describes Class I bikeways on the east side of Highway 101 between Marsh Street and South Higuera at the Octagon Barn, as well as sections on the west side of Highway 101 between Dalidio Drive and Calle Joaquin. It includes preliminary and alternate alignments for the trail, and was approved by the City Council in 2002. See Appendix A for a description of the overall route and details on the component segments.

**Edna-Islay Specific Plan.** This plan encompasses residential properties between Orcutt Road and Broad Street and is bisected by Tank Farm Road. Class I bikeways are prescribed along the railroad and area creeks while Class II bikeways are shown on bordering and bisecting arterial streets.

**Laguna Lake Park Master Plan.** Establishes the design of an active park and nature preserve which includes Laguna Lake and is generally bordered by Madonna Road and the City Limit. The plan includes an existing paved path as a bikeway, as well as land acquisition and pathway easement plans to connect to both Los Osos Valley Road and Foothill Boulevard.

**Margarita Area Specific Plan.** Establishes the design of a new residential neighborhood east of the current end of Margarita Avenue, north of Prado Road. The plan shows both Class I and Class II bikeways along either side of Prado Road, connections to Broad Street bikeways, various Class I bikeways in the South Hills Area, and Class II bikeways along principal neighborhood streets.

**Mid-Higuera Enhancement Plan.** This plan encompasses properties along Higuera Street from Marsh Street to a point just south of Madonna Road. The plan shows the configuration of Class I bikeways along San Luis Obispo Creek and Class II bikeways along Higuera and South Streets and Madonna Road.

**Orcutt Area Specific Plan.** Establishes the design of a new residential neighborhood east of the railroad bordering Orcutt Road. Class I bikeways are planned adjoining the railroad and along creek areas and Class II bikeways along bordering arterials streets and collector streets within the neighborhood. A bicycle and pedestrian bridge over the railroad tracks is planned near Industrial Way.

**The Railroad District Plan.** This plan includes the Union Pacific Railroad and adjoining streets from Johnson Avenue to Orcutt Road. The plan shows the general configuration of Class I bikeways on both sides of the railroad and connections to neighborhood streets.

**Railroad Safety Trail.** This plan describes Class I bikeways along the railroad corridor between Highland Drive and Tank Farm Road. It includes preliminary and alternate alignments for the trail, and was approved by the City Council in 2002. See Appendix A for a description of the overall route and details on the component segments.

**Sinsheimer Park Master Plan.** Establishes a phased completion plan for the park that is located east of the railroad tracks and generally between the ends of Boulevard del Campo, Helena Street and Southwood Drive. The plan shows a paved bikeway leading from the Railroad Safety Trail and going between the two ball fields, as well as a network of additional trails.

**South Hills Natural Reserve Conservation Plan.** Establishes a conservation area bordered by the Woodbridge and Stoneridge developments on the north, and the planned Margarita Area development to the south. A bicycle trial is planned on the southwest side and ties into existing fire roads.
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Introduction

The bicycling network within the City of San Luis Obispo continues to grow with sixty miles of existing bikeways, and more than fifty miles of planned routes (See Appendix A). Planning for the bikeway network is focused on providing safe, reliable, and efficient connections to all major destinations throughout the City, for both transportation and recreational purposes.

The projects and policies contained in this plan detail the support and planned expansion of our bicycling network. Included in the network are Class I (bike paths), Class II (bike lanes), Class III (designated routes), as well as alternative or enhanced facilities (such as bicycle boulevards and bicycle-only signals).

Providing this network is the City’s key to promoting increased use of bicycles as a transportation choice and encouraging bicycling for health, economic, community, environmental, or other personal reasons.

Table 1.1 Existing and Proposed Bicycle Transportation Network Mileage (as of December 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Existing Mileage</th>
<th>Proposed Mileage</th>
<th>Total Mileage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I: Bike Paths</td>
<td>7.2 (22%)</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II: Bike Lanes</td>
<td>29.7 (62%)</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III: Routes</td>
<td>20.6 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharrows</td>
<td>0.5 (8%)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulevards</td>
<td>2.9 (58%)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>24.0 (75%)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60.9 (54%)</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>112.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bicycling Network Objectives

Objective 1: Improve bicycle circulation by identifying and addressing barriers to bicycling.

Objective 2: By 2017, complete the network of Class II and III bikeways and related improvements identified in this Plan.

Objective 3: By 2020, increase bicycle use for transportation to a 20% mode share.

Objective 4: By 2032, complete the network of Class I bikeways identified in this Plan that do not have established timelines or phasing approved by another City plan.

Objective 5: Cooperate with the County, State, San Luis Obispo Council of Governments, and Cal Poly in the planning and design of bicycle facilities such as the Bob Jones City to Sea Bike Trail and the Railroad Safety Trail.

Existing and Proposed Bikeways

Bikeways shall be established at locations shown on Map 1: Bicycle Transportation Network. Policies 1.8, 1.8a and 1.8b offer further guidance for bikeways located within an adopted City planning area and for approval of changes. (See Map 4: Planning Areas, for affected areas).
**Class I Bike Path**

Currently there are over seven miles of paved bike paths in the City of San Luis Obispo (see Map 1). While some existing paved paths do not conform to established CalTrans design standards for **Class I Bikeways**, this plan documents them as functional transportation and recreational facilities. All new bike paths are proposed to be built to Class I bikeway standards. There are twenty-six additional miles proposed in this Plan (See Appendix A). Because of their separation from motor vehicle traffic, Class I paths commonly attract users less comfortable riding on roadways with traffic, such as families, young children, and new and renewed cyclists. The preferred location for Class I facilities are corridors not served by existing streets, away from the influence of parallel streets, and with a minimum number of crossings or intersections. Class I bike paths should offer opportunities not provided by the road system. Class I bike paths can be an effective tool in providing transportation connections within neighborhoods, to recreational facilities such as parks and open spaces, or as high speed bicycle commuter routes.

As ranked by the City’s Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC), the top two Class I projects in this Plan are the “Railroad Safety Trail” (RRST) and the “Hwy. 101, North Broad to Marsh St.” bikeways. The Bob Jones City to Sea Trail (BJT) came in a close third. (See the “Implementation and Funding” chapter, for a description of the ranking process. See Appendix A for further project details.) While the RRST and BJT are ranked with an overall score, individual segments that fill gaps between completed segments and connections are priority projects. The priority focus on gaps supports the 2009 Grand Jury report, “Great Galling Gaps” recommendations. Direction for completion of RRST and BJT projects is also contained in the City’s 2013-15 Financial Plan. (See “Major City Goals”, pg. 6.)

The “Railroad Safety Trail”, a planned 4.5 mile long bike path along the Union Pacific Railroad that bisects San Luis Obispo, has long been one of the City’s high priority bike path goals (see map on pg. A37, Appendix A). Construction began in 1995 with various segments being constructed since. A total of 2.25 miles of this corridor have been completed as of December, 2012. When totally complete, the path will provide a north-south bicycling thoroughfare connecting Cal Poly on one end, to the southern City limits at the other end. Along the way the bike path connects neighborhoods previously cut off by the railroad, provides access to other City recreational amenities (baseball fields, City pool, tennis courts), along with schools, the City’s downtown and other shopping destinations.

The “Hwy. 101, North Broad to Marsh St.” Class I path is seen as a gap in the originally planned path spanning from North Broad Street to Madonna Road. It will complete the envisioned bikeway by connecting to the Madonna Inn bike path, that was constructed in 2011. The complete bike path will link neighborhoods in the north section of town to shopping and neighborhoods on the City’s west side, and greatly improve non-motorized access to the City’s only middle school.

The City’s portion of the Bob Jones City-to-Sea Trail will include over four miles of Class I bike path, linking the west end of downtown San Luis Obispo, with the southwest corner of the City limits and the County path beyond. The total envisioned bikeway will connect San Luis Obispo (City) to Avila Beach (Sea). Planning for the path began in 2000, with completion of the first City section (just over a mile) between Prado Road and north of Los Osos Valley Road (LOVR), in February 2008. Until the current gap between the path end and LOVR is connected (anticipated by Dec. 2013), the path is only useful as a recreational facility. (See map on pg. A72, Appendix A.)

An additional notable path is the Prado Road Class I bike path. It is planned for installation during development of the roadway and will link the City’s east and west sides, as well as providing a bicycling connection between the Railroad Safety Trail and the Bob Jones Trail.

**Class II Bike Lanes**

In San Luis Obispo, there are approximately thirty miles of **Class II bike lanes** located along major streets. It is the City’s long-term goal to establish and maintain Class II bike lanes along all arterial streets and highways (except Highway 101) since these corridors provide the

---

**Class I Bikeway (Bike Path):**
Provides a completely separated right-of-way for the exclusive use of bicycles and pedestrians with crossflow by motorists minimized.

A young user enjoying the car-free Class I experience on the Madonna Inn Bike Path.
most direct access to important destinations and are frequently used by commuting bicyclists. This Plan proposes an additional eighteen miles of Class II lanes. (See projects in Appendix A.)

As ranked by the City’s Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC), the top two Class II projects in this Plan address bike lane channelization. The top ranked projects target the intersection of South Street at Broad, and the more complex intersection of South Street, Higuera Street, and Madonna Road. While Class II bike lanes are typically dropped prior to intersections that do not have dedicated right hand turn only lanes, channelization provides specific roadway space for bicyclists where turn lanes exist, and also help to provide predictability for all traffic movements.

San Luis Obispo’s bike lanes are designed to comply with at least the minimum standards presented in Chapter 1000 of the Highway Design Manual, published by Caltrans. The City’s bike lane width standards are based on the roadway design and motor vehicle speeds and volumes. Appendix C of this Plan provides a table providing guidance for increased Class II bike lane width that is based on allowed parking, motor vehicle speed, motor vehicle volume, and roadway grade. This table is used along with the input of the Traffic Operations Manager, to determine Class II bike lane width whenever new striping occurs.

San Luis Obispo’s bike lanes are located at the edge of the roadway adjoining raised concrete curbs or along the outside of parking bays where parallel vehicle parking is provided. In this latter situation, the City stripes both sides of the bike lane to provide greater guidance to motorists for efficiently parking their vehicles outside the bike lane.

Some arterial streets within the City’s Urban Reserve (the area around the City where urban development might occur, as described in the City’s General Plan) are under the jurisdiction of San Luis Obispo County or the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Portions of Broad, Orcutt and Tank Farm Roads are examples of County roads, while portions of Santa Rosa Street is a State highway (State Route 1) under Caltrans control.

## Channelization:
The use of pavement markings, raised islands, or other suitable means, to regulate and separate intersection turning movements from through movements, for the safe and orderly conduct of motor vehicles, bicycles, movements, for the safe and orderly conduct of motor vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians.

Channelization:
The use of pavement markings, raised islands, or other suitable means, to regulate and separate intersection turning movements from through movements, for the safe and orderly conduct of motor vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians.

Class II channelization on east bound Foothill Blvd. at Santa Rosa Street (Highway 1).

## Bicycle Boulevards:
A shared roadway (bicycles and motor vehicles share the space without marked bike lanes) where the through movement of bicyclists are given priority over motor vehicle travel on a local street. Bicycle Boulevards are designated on low speed, low volume local streets that parallel higher traffic arterial streets, and may use treatments to address cut through vehicle traffic and vehicle speed.

### Bicycle Boulevards:
A shared roadway (bicycles and motor vehicles share the space without marked bike lanes) where the through movement of bicyclists are given priority over motor vehicle travel on a local street. Bicycle Boulevards are designated on low speed, low volume local streets that parallel higher traffic arterial streets, and may use treatments to address cut through vehicle traffic and vehicle speed.

Bicycle Boulevards: the “Broad Street Bicycle Boulevard crossing Hwy. 101” and the “Cerro Romualdo Bicycle Boulevard”. Bicycle boulevards are shared roadway facilities that create an attractive, convenient, and comfortable bicycling environment that is welcoming to cyclists of all ages and skill levels. The low speed, low traffic environment created by bicycle boulevards are not only attractive to bicyclists, but also to pedestrians. Although the cost of construction will vary depending on the specific treatments, bicycle boulevards can be relatively inexpensive compared to other bicycle facility improvements. (Walker, et al, 2009).

San Luis Obispo’s first bicycle boulevard, the Bill Roalman Bicycle Boulevard on Morro Street, was completed in October 2009 and extends one half mile from Marsh Street to Santa Barbara Avenue. It includes the closure of Morro Street to motor vehicle traffic at its south end, installation of a traffic signal at the Morro-Upham-Santa Barbara intersection that includes a bicycle-only phase, and installation of two traffic diverters along the Boulevard’s length which limit motor vehicle access, but allow bicycling access. This Plan includes projects which will create nearly six more miles of bicycle boulevards (See Appendix A).

### Shared Lane Marking Legends (Sharrows)
On streets where bike lanes are not provided and where curb lanes are

### Class III Bike Routes:
This Plan identifies streets in residential and commercial districts that are used by cyclists to connect sections of the Class I and Class II bikeway network. Currently there are over twenty miles of Class III bike routes in the City of San Luis Obispo (See Map 1, pg. viii). Also included as Class III route designation, are Bicycle Boulevards and routes utilizing the Shared Lane Marking legend. These facilities have enhancements as described below.

#### Bicycle Boulevards:
As ranked by the City’s Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC), the top two Class III projects in this Plan are both bicycle boulevards. They are the “Broad Street Bicycle Boulevard crossing Hwy. 101” and the “Cerro Romualdo Bicycle Boulevard”. Bicycle boulevards are shared roadway facilities that create an attractive, convenient, and comfortable bicycling environment that is welcoming to cyclists of all ages and skill levels. The low speed, low traffic environment created by bicycle boulevards are not only attractive to bicyclists, but also to pedestrians. Although the cost of construction will vary depending on the specific treatments, bicycle boulevards can be relatively inexpensive compared to other bicycle facility improvements. (Walker, et al, 2009).

San Luis Obispo’s first bicycle boulevard, the Bill Roalman Bicycle Boulevard on Morro Street, was completed in October 2009 and extends one half mile from Marsh Street to Santa Barbara Avenue. It includes the closure of Morro Street to motor vehicle traffic at its south end, installation of a traffic signal at the Morro-Upham-Santa Barbara intersection that includes a bicycle-only phase, and installation of two traffic diverters along the Boulevard’s length which limit motor vehicle access, but allow bicycling access. This Plan includes projects which will create nearly six more miles of bicycle boulevards (See Appendix A).

### Shared Lane Marking Legends (Sharrows)
On streets where bike lanes are not provided and where curb lanes are
too narrow for motorists and cyclists to safely travel side by side within the lane, the City, with input from the Traffic Operations Manager and Bicycle Advisory Committee, may install Shared Lane Marking Legends (also known as “Sharrows”) to improve the positioning of bicyclists on roadways with regular bicycle use. Sharrows are carefully placed within the travel lane to guide bicyclists to ride in a predictable location that avoids car doors and/or roadway gutters, and to remind drivers to share the road with bicyclists. Unlike bicycle lanes, sharrows do not designate a particular part of the street for the exclusive use of bicyclists. All narrow travel lanes should be considered a shared space. These lane markings are meant to guide bicyclists and remind motorists to expect to see and share the lane with bicyclists.

There are currently almost three miles of existing Sharrows installed in the City. They are located on Monterey Street, Broad Street, Capitolio Way, and Industrial Way. Additional Sharrows may be installed in conjunction with projects and according to policy where needs arise.

**Bikeway Connections**

This Plan identifies existing bikeway connections that provide access to or between other bicycling facilities or the City’s roadway network. Projects in this Plan support related City Plans that maintain or create unpaved bicycle trails as bikeway connections. These “trails” may or may not be rideable by all users and may be subject to closure for seasonal conditions. Existing bikeway connections are noted on Map 1: Bicycle Transportation Network and listed in Appendix J.

**Intersections and Grade Separated Crossings**

Intersections can be significant barriers for bicyclists, depending on the bicyclist skill level and the complexity and volume of the intersection traffic. The California Highway Design Manual states that use of a grade separated crossing is desirable to eliminate intersection conflicts where Class I bikeways intersect high motor vehicle volume roadways. While most projects in this Plan categorized as Class I, II, or III address intersections (and grade separated crossings) within their scope, there are some projects that specifically focus on an intersection only.

According to the California Public Utilities Commission, any new crossings of the railroad must be grade separated. A key piece of our installed Railroad Safety trail is the Jennifer Street bridge, a 51-meter-long pedestrian and bicycle bridge over the railroad at Jennifer Street, linking eastern neighborhoods to San Luis Obispo’s Downtown Core.

As ranked by the City’s Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC), the top two projects in this Plan that involve just an intersection or grade separated crossing are the “North Chorro Intersection Enhancement” and “Santa Rosa at Boysen, Grade Separated Crossing” projects (See Appendix A).
Policies and Implementation Actions

Overall Network:

1.1 All bikeways shall meet or exceed minimum standards set forth in the current version of the California Highway Design Manual.

Implementation Action 1.1.1: It is recommended that the City’s Subdivision Regulations and Engineering Standards be revised to include cross-sections for streets that include Class II bike lanes.

1.2 Neighborhood traffic management projects (traffic calming) shall be designed to safely accommodate bicyclists.

1.3 Traffic Calming: On streets where vehicle volume, speed, or collisions are impacting bicycle travel, the City shall consider possible remedies such as signage, striping, or other traffic calming devices.

1.4 The City shall include small scale projects, such as signing and striping in upcoming City paving projects when appropriate.

1.5 With the exception of Highway 101, all highways and City streets in San Luis Obispo are considered streets that bicyclists will use. Accordingly, all highways (except Highway 101) and public streets shall be designed and maintained to accommodate bicyclists.

1.6 All developments/subdivisions shall be designed with bicycle use as an equal and viable option for transportation to, from, and within a development.

1.7 Developments shall adhere to all policies in this Plan, include all bikeways described in this Plan, and include approved bicycle parking as referenced in the Plan’s bicycle parking policies.

1.8 Development shall provide bicycle facilities, in accordance with City plans and standards pursuant to State and local legal requirements.

1.8a Where a bikeway is located within an adopted City planning area (Specific Plan, Park Plan, Area Plan, etc.), its location shall be as established by that plan.

1.8b After receiving input from the Bicycle Advisory Committee, the Public Works Director may approve adjustments in the location and/or designation of bikeways to reduce environmental impacts, better serve the needs of bicyclists, or provide a bikeway connection through a new development consistent with the intent of the Plan.

1.9 Signs and pavement markings shall be installed along City bikeways, consistent with Caltrans and City standards and those contained in adopted Specific Plans.

1.10 The City shall maintain and make available a bicycling map of the City.

Implementation Action 1.10.1: Update and publish a City bicycling map at least every ten years, or as needed.

Ensuring Connectivity within the Bicycle Transportation Network:

1.11 Along collector or arterial streets where there are gaps in the Class II bikeway network, share the road signs should be installed using existing sign or streetlight poles wherever possible.

1.12 Where cul-de-sacs are used in subdivisions, pedestrian/bikeway connections shall be provided to through streets. Where perimeter walls are employed, breaks shall be provided at safe locations to enable pedestrian and bicycle circulation to adjoining areas or public streets.

Bicycle Facilities:
Any physical feature that serves the needs of bicyclists, including bike lanes and paths, bicycle racks and lockers, signs, pavement markings and symbols, places to post information, lighting, and traffic controls.

“Share The Road” signage on Monterey St.
Central Area Projects Implementation
Western Area Projects
Eastern Area Projects

A bicyclist waits in the Bike Box on Monterey Street.

Colored Pavement:
Color is applied to bicycle facility pavement to alert motorists to the presence of bicyclists in known high conflict zones.

1.13 In complex traffic corridors where competing demands for the use of the right-of-way present unique challenges that traditional facilities may not wholly meet (e.g., areas with right-of-way constraints or potential conflicts between multiple user groups), the City may consider utilizing alternative design facilities such as, but not limited to:

a. Colored Pavement: To enhance the conspicuity of a bicycle lane or a bicycle lane extension in locations with high bicycle and motor vehicle use, such as through intersections and other traffic conflict areas.

b. Bike Box: To facilitate bicyclist left turn positioning, help prevent right-turn conflicts, increase bicyclist visibility, or to group bicyclists together to clear intersections quickly, the City may install bike boxes at intersections.

c. Buffered Bicycle Lanes: Using striping to create a buffer between a bike lane and the adjacent travel lane, and/or the “door zone” of the parking lane.

The design treatment that is approved for use by the City’s Traffic Operations Manager will depend on a variety of factors, such as the specific desired outcome, impact to all transportation modes within the corridor, future development plans, success rates of similar facilities in other locales, local supporting data, cost, etc.

Addressing Bicyclists at Intersections:

1.14 Intersections shall be designed to allow motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists to see one another approaching and encourage legal movements, per the California Vehicle Code.

1.15 Intersections of Class I bike paths and roadways should align at 90 degrees, either at crossings where motorists can be expected to stop, or a location completely out of the influence of any other intersection. Design of intersections not able to align at 90 degrees should consider assignment of right of way via traffic control devices.

1.16 Directional signs should be installed where bikeways intersect, turn, terminate, or at bikeway connections. (See Operation and Maintenance Implementation Action 1.57.1.)

1.17 Roundabouts or Traffic Circles: Designs shall provide bicyclists the choice of proceeding through the roundabout as either a vehicle or a pedestrian. These facilities should be designed to minimize the speed differential between bicyclists and motorists. In all cases, Class II bike lanes shall be terminated in advance of the roundabout to encourage cyclists to mix with vehicle traffic, and be restored downstream of the roundabout or traffic circle.

1.18 At signalized intersections, bicycle traffic shall be considered during the development of the traffic signal timing. The total intersection clearance interval (yellow change interval plus red clearance interval) should allow bicyclists time to traverse the intersection in compliance with AASHTO guidelines.

1.19 New or modified traffic signals along designated Class II or III bikeways shall include detection for bicycles. Video detection is the preferred system. If in-pavement loop detection is used, pavement legends shall be applied to the road surface and maintained to identify the optimum location for bicyclists to position their bikes to trigger a signal change.

Implementation Action 1.19.1: Maintain an inventory of locations where signal actuation pavement legends are refreshed/repainted as part of regular maintenance operations (see Policy 1.57).

1.20 Channelization should be provided at signalized intersections along streets that have Class II bikeways and where dedicated turn lanes are provided. The City will evaluate existing intersections, consider constraints to achieving this policy, and program improvements as appropriate. The City shall encourage Caltrans and the County to do the same.
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1.21 Unpaved trails and paved walkways identified in this Plan provide bikeway connections and therefore shall be retained and remain open for use by the general public (see Appendix J for listing.)

Class I Bike Paths:

1.22 The use of bollards on any facility where bicycling is not expressly prohibited should be avoided. For Class I bike paths, a divided path (two narrower one-way paths just prior to the roadway intersection of the path) should be considered in lieu of the installation of bollards to reduce the potential for collisions. When bollards are used, they should comply with City standards.

Implementation Action 1.22.1: Revise City Engineering Standards to include current best practices for bollard use, including but not limited to: minimum five feet clear space between bollards, minimum five foot setback of bollards from structures or path access points, number of posts used, and diversion striping.

Implementation Action 1.22.2: Maintain an inventory of bollards, review for compliance with City Engineering Standards, and upgrade if necessary during regular maintenance and/or as funds are available.

Adjoining Creeks:

1.23 Class I bikeways shall be located outside of creek setbacks except where otherwise allowed or as provided for in the City’s Conservation & Open Space Element. (See Appendix D.)

1.24 Where setback encroachments cannot be avoided, their extent shall be minimized and existing riparian vegetation shall be reinforced with native plants to create landscaped buffers between the bikeway and the riparian canopy. (See Appendix D.)

1.25 Bikeway encroachments into the creek setback shall be subject to the exception process of the Creek Setback Regulations contained in the Municipal Code.

1.26 The number of bicycle-pedestrian bridges over creeks shall be minimized. Bridges shall:
   a. Be of a “clear span” design.
   b. To the greatest extent possible, be located to avoid removal of native trees and streamside habitat or impacts to important aquatic habitat areas.
   c. Minimize grading of creek banks or changes to the channel alignment.
   d. Include a smooth riding surface to minimize noise.

On Agricultural Land:

1.27 Bikeways that cross or border agricultural land shall:
   a. Use existing service roads where shared use is compatible with agricultural and bicycling operations.
   b. Be fenced and signed to discourage trespassing onto adjoining areas.
   c. Avoid dividing properties in a way that unduly complicates agricultural operations.

Near Laguna Lake:

1.28 Bikeways located near Laguna Lake, should:
   a. Be located beyond and adequately buffered from wetland habitat.
   b. Not alter the hydrological dynamics of the wetland.
   c. Be closed when flood hazards exist.
   d. Ensure construction is preceded by a census of bird life in adjoining areas. Bird populations should be periodically monitored, and remedial action taken, as needed.
Bicycle Transportation Network

1.29 Where an existing creek channel is widened to establish a new top of bank, Class I bikeways shall be located as prescribed by Policy 1.23.

1.30 Where parallel flood control channels are constructed, Class I bikeways may be located within the riparian canopy established by the new flood control channel, parallel to the channel side that is farthest from the parent creek. (See Appendix D.)

1.31 When existing creeks are widened or when new flood control channels are constructed, Class I bikeways should be installed at the same time or, at a minimum, their rights-of-way shall be reserved and maintained as clear space to enable their eventual installation.

1.32 Along parallel flood control channels, Class I bikeways and service roads may share the same alignment. The structural design of these facilities shall be sufficient to support maintenance vehicles.

Near Railroad:

1.33 Reconstruction of “at-grade” railroad crossings by the Union Pacific Railroad or others should be at right angles and shall include the installation of bicycle friendly panels on the approaches and between the tracks.

1.34 New bicycle and pedestrian bridges along the Railroad Safety Trail should generally be separate from existing railroad bridges.

1.35 Class I bikeways along the railroad should include appropriate setbacks and fencing to ensure safe and compatible operations with active rail lines. (See Appendix D.)

Lighting:

1.36 Vandal resistant lighting shall be provided for all Class I bikeways and shall be consistent with City plans, located overhead (including in under crossings), generally not more than 16 ft. (5 m) high, direct light downward, have bulbs well recessed to avoid direct glare, and comply with City regulations.

1.37 Lighting for Class I bikeways along creeks shall be designed to shine away from the creek corridor or not installed at locations where potential environmental impacts cannot be mitigated.

Class II Bike Lanes:

1.38 In the long-term, all arterial streets and State Highways (except Route 101) should include Class II bikeways.

1.39 “Bikeway Width Design Standards” (Appendix C), shall be used in determining bike lane width based on traffic speed, traffic volume, percent grade, and motor vehicle parking.

1.40 The preferred location of Class II bikeways is at the edge of the road, adjacent to a curb. Bike lanes shall run parallel to the motor vehicle lane, not the curb. Where on-street motor vehicle parking is allowed, bike lanes shall be located along the outside of parking bays next to the travel way.

1.41 When a street with Class II bikeways is repaved, smooth surfaced material shall be used. The pavement within a bike lane shall be installed without seams or creases.
1.42 Before a street with Class II bikeways is slurry sealed, pavement deficiencies such as severe cracking and potholes shall be repaired. Existing surface elevation differences between the edge of asphalt and the concrete gutter shall be made flush. Streets with bikeways shall only receive a Type I or Type II slurry seal. Chip seals are not to be used on streets with bikeways. (See Operation and Maintenance Implementation Action 1.57.1 and 1.57.2.)

1.43 Class II bikeways shall be kept clear of all vegetation, including overhead (a minimum of 8 feet of vertical clearance).

1.44 When installing new drainage inlets along Class II bikeways, undercurb inlets shall be used to eliminate grates from the bikeway. When resurfacing roadways or performing other construction maintenance, inspection and assessment for replacement or repair of drain grates shall be performed and corrective measures pursued. (See Operation and Maintenance Implementation Action 1.57.1 and 1.57.2.)

Class III Bike Routes:

1.45 Class III bikeways should be located along streets that meet the following criteria:
   a. Motor vehicle traffic is less than 10,000 vehicles per day.
   b. The 85th percentile speed of traffic is less than 35 mph.
   c. The route provides a connection between Class II bikeways, or is a low-volume motor vehicle route, parallel to a Class II bikeway.

1.46 Along Class III bikeways traffic lanes may be narrowed to 10 ft. and edge stripes installed to channelize vehicles.

1.47 "Bike Route" signage along Class III bikeways shall be considered when the route provides a connection between other bikeway facilities (Class I, Class II, etc.), when traffic conditions (speed, volume, etc.) have indicated a need to raise awareness of the route, or when the route is an identified City, State, or Federal bicycle route (e.g. Bill Roalman Bicycle Boulevard, Pacific Coast Bicycle Route).

Bicycle Boulevards:

1.48 Bicycle Boulevards shall:
   a. Be located along local or collector streets that provide for through bike connections.
   b. Be optimized for through bicycle traffic with a minimum of stops, without creating cut through opportunities for motorists.
   c. Be established only after residents or businesses have been provided sufficient opportunity to participate in the development and review of the design.
   d. Be considered and coordinated with any proposal to adopt a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan.
   e. Where appropriate, include traffic calming devices that reduce the differential between motor vehicle and bicycle speeds.
   f. Avoid diverting a significant amount of motor vehicle traffic to other residential streets, consistent with adopted Neighborhood Traffic Management Guidelines.

1.49 Prior to installation, the Architectural Review Commission shall review and approve the design of bicycle boulevards with input from the Bicycle Advisory Committee. (Map 1: Bicycle Transportation Network identifies approved and proposed bicycle boulevards.)

1.50 The "Bike Boulevard Report Card" (Appendix E) should be used for both planning of future and the review of past bicycle boulevard installations.
Shared Lane Marking Legends (Sharrows):

1.51 On streets where bike lanes are not provided and where lanes are too narrow for motorists and cyclists to travel side by side within the lane, the City, with input from the Traffic Operations Manager and the Bicycle Advisory Committee, may install shared lane markings (also known as “Sharrows”) to improve the lateral positioning of bicyclists on roadways with regular bicycle use. Sharrows will most commonly be used on roadways that serve as connections between other bicycling facilities. Criteria for consideration of Sharrow locations may include the following:

   a. On-street parking
   b. Travel lane width
   c. Posted speed limit
   d. Measured traffic speeds
   e. Traffic volume
   f. Traffic composition (presence of buses and large trucks)
   g. Bicycle traffic volume
   h. Number of incidents of wrong-way bicycling, or sidewalk bicycling
   i. Corridors where there is a high potential to increase trips by bicycle

**Implementation Action 1.51.1:** For cost efficiency, installation of the legends and associated signage should be implemented in conjunction with other striping/signage projects.

Operation and Maintenance:

1.52 Annexation, planning and development activities, street reconstruction or reconfiguration projects, and street maintenance shall provide for bikeways and bicyclists as prescribed by this Plan.
1.57 Bikeways and bikeway connections shall be inspected on a routine basis to identify maintenance issues, including but not limited to:

a. Potholes.
b. “Alligator” cracks.
c. Longitudinal and transverse cracks.
d. Steps in the pavement surface.
e. Hazardous drainage grates.
f. Sunken or raised utility trenches or covers.
g. Encroaching vegetation.
h. Faded or missing bike lane striping, pavement symbols or signs.
i. Poor street repairs (uneven surfaces).
j. Signal actuation, bicycle placement/positioning stencil.

**Implementation Action 1.57.1:** Inspect bikeways biennially and prepare a report identifying the problems, recommended action, priority, and time frame for correction. The report should include recommendations for bikeway signage.

**Implementation Action 1.57.2:** Maintain a reporting button on the City’s web site to aid the public in reporting problems.

1.58 Traffic control plans prepared for work within the street right-of-way shall address bicyclists during construction. Signage should warn both bicyclists and motorists in advance of any location where the bicycle lane is closed. If space is available, a coned-off four (4) foot wide area for bicycle travel shall be provided between the construction zone and the vehicle travel lane.

**Implementation Action 1.58.1:** Provide bicycling specific information on the “Commuter Update” web page of the City’s web site when any City bikeways are included in the construction area.
**Introduction**

Secure and conveniently located parking is as critical to bicyclists as it is for motorists. Providing well designed bicycle parking racks located at popular destination points, both commercial and recreational, promotes and encourages bicycling as a transportation choice. Additionally, the provision of bicycle racks help prevent parking or locking of bikes to unacceptable fixtures such as trees, benches, poles, or railings that might interfere with pedestrian travel. To promote bicycling for transportation trips over a few miles, it is important that public transit have bicycle carrying capacity, as well as secure convenient bicycle parking at transit hubs. Finally, to encourage and attract transportation bicyclists from further destinations, there is a need for changing and/or shower facilities at destination points.

**Bicycle Parking and Support Facilities Objectives**

**Objective 6:** Require new development to provide bikeways and bicycle parking consistent with adopted City plans and standards.

**Objective 7:** Sponsor partnership programs that provide bicycle parking for land uses that lack needed facilities.

**Existing and Proposed Bicycle Parking and Support Facilities**

Until 1993, San Luis Obispo did not have bicycle parking standards. Current standards are now stipulated within various City documents as well as this Plan. The General Plan Circulation Element specifies new development’s responsibility in providing secure bicycle storage and the Zoning Regulations establish the minimum number of bicycle parking spaces being required. The Community Design Guidelines contains standards and criteria for bicycle rack design, location, and installation specifications. Further promotion of increased bicycle parking capacity is included in the Zoning Regulations which stipulate that development projects which provide more bicycle spaces than required may reduce the required car spaces. Additionally, the City promotes its “Racks with Plaques” bicycle rack donation program, which began in 2005. This program provides bicycle parking in the downtown and at public facilities while giving permanent recognition to its donors. By 2013, over 37 racks had been donated, providing parking for 142 bicycles. Through promotion of these standards and policies, bicycle parking availability has been steadily increasing in San Luis Obispo. In the downtown area alone there are currently over 130 publicly owned bicycle racks, with capacity to park almost 400 bikes.

For information on the location of bicycle parking policies and standards see Appendix F. The guidance in this Plan complies with the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals’ (APBP) 2010 Bicycle Parking Guidelines.

**End of Trip Bicycle Parking**

The Downtown Core contains the highest concentration of bicycle racks. Use of these racks for short-term bicycle parking is identified by site surveys conducted each month by the San Luis Obispo County Bicycle Coalition. Data from these inspections is used to identify abandoned bicycles and to prioritize the location of future rack installations. The City inspects the condition of these racks annually, replacing or repairing those that are in poor condition. While the majority of bicycle parking racks outside of the downtown are provided by development, the City does install and maintain bicycle parking racks at City parks and open space trail heads. The Racks with Plaques bike rack donation program maintains a “wish list” for bike rack parking needs within the City.

**Short-Term Bicycle Parking:**

Parked provided to accommodate visitors and customers, who are generally parking for less than four hours. Bicycle rack designs meeting City standards satisfy this need.
Bicycle Parking at Transportation Hubs

The use of multi-modal transportation is increasing within the City of San Luis Obispo. San Luis Obispo Transit (SLO Transit) operates a daily fixed route transit service within San Luis Obispo’s urban reserve, serving major employment centers and all residential neighborhoods. SLO Transit’s Downtown Transit Center located at 990 Palm Street provides bicycle parking and each bus includes a rack that can carry three bicycles. SLO Transit gathers data on bus bike rack use. Over 20,000 transit rider trips with a bicycle have been recorded each fiscal year since tracking began in 2009, with the highest being 26,000 in 2012. Data is also captured noting when racks are at capacity and when and where demand exceeds capacity. This data will help determine bicycle rack needs at bus stop locations.

The San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority (SLORTA) operates a seven-route regional transit system that serves all urban quadrants of San Luis Obispo County, with its major hub in the Downtown Core of San Luis Obispo. SLORTA’s transit center is located adjacent to the Downtown Transit Center and also includes bicycle parking for its patrons. SLORTA buses can accommodate up to six bicycles per bus.

San Luis Obispo is served by Amtrak passenger rail service: the Coast Starlight and the Pacific Surfliner. Bicycles can be accommodated on the Coast Starlight when they are properly packed in boxes provided by Amtrak. They must be checked as baggage and there is a box and handling fee. For the Pacific Surfliner, bicycles can be directly loaded onto the passenger cars; at least one train per day features bike racks on passenger cars. The Amtrak station located at Santa Rosa Street and Railroad Avenue includes short term bicycle parking.

The following table indicates existing and proposed bicycle parking facilities at transportation hubs within the City of San Luis Obispo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (Responsible Agency)</th>
<th>Existing Type of Rack</th>
<th>Existing Capacity (Bicycles)</th>
<th>Proposed Type of Rack</th>
<th>Proposed Total Capacity (Bicycles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amtrak Station (Amtrak)</td>
<td>Inverted “U” Rack</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Retain Existing</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTA Bus Transfer Station (RTA)</td>
<td>“Wave” Bike Rack</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>City Approved Design</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Transit Center (City of SLO)</td>
<td>Inverted “U” Rack</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Retain Existing</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO County Airport (City of San Luis Obispo)</td>
<td>Single wheel support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>City Approved Design</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of San Luis Obispo Data

### Changing and Shower Facilities

In-town employee work commute trips are generally less than four miles in length and 20 minutes in duration. Therefore, showers may not be necessary. In contrast, inbound work commute trips from surrounding communities generally are in excess of twelve miles. Showers are warranted for these commuters.

San Luis Obispo has facilities that are specifically designed to provide long-term bicycle parking, changing rooms with storage for clothes and equipment, and showers at the same location. Larger employers such as Caltrans, County and City agencies, and Cal Poly provide these facilities for employees who commute to work by bicycle, or public transit combined with bicycling. Smaller employers provide bicycle lockers and restrooms that enable changing for their employees.

The City maintains parks and public plazas scattered throughout San Luis Obispo that include public restrooms, accessible during daylight.
Policies and Implementation Actions

Bicycle Parking Provisions:

2.1 The City shall maintain bicycle parking requirements as part of the Zoning Chapter of its Municipal Code (reference MC 17.16.060).

2.2 As stipulated by the Zoning Regulations, short and long-term bicycle parking shall be provided whenever a new structure is erected or enlarged or whenever a new use is established which requires a total of 10 or more vehicle parking spaces.

Implementation Action 2.2.1: Review and provide recommendations on proposed amendments to the City’s Zoning Regulations affecting bicycle parking a minimum of every five years.

Engineering and Design of Bicycle Parking:

2.3 Development plans submitted for consideration by the Architectural Review Commission, Planning Commission, or Community Development Director shall include dimensioned drawings that clearly describe and depict the location, orientation, number, type, and storage capacity of long and short-term bicycle parking facilities.

2.4 The City shall encourage existing development to upgrade their bicycle parking facilities to meet current City standards (e.g. type of rack, number of bicycles accommodated).

2.5 The City’s Community Design Guidelines shall contain illustrations of how bicycle parking should be installed and oriented as part of new development projects.
2.6 Bicycle racks and lockers shall be installed pursuant to City requirements and the manufacturer’s specifications for placement and clearance from obstructions.

2.7 The City shall maintain bicycle parking standards in its Engineering Standards.

**Implementation Action 2.7.1:** Review and provide recommendations on proposed amendments to the Community Design Guidelines and the Engineering Standards a minimum of every 5 years.

2.8 In the Commercial Core, bicycle racks shall be colored forest green consistent with City Council Resolution # 9278 (2002 Series).

2.9 In street bicycle parking may be considered on a case by case basis. Bicycle racks should be mounted off the street, to allow for street sweeping and to minimize the encroachment into the parking lane. Preferred locations shall include:

   a. Low traffic speed and volume streets
   b. Just prior to mid-block pedestrian crosswalks
   c. Prior to driveway/street intersections outside of normal turning radii and where turning volumes are low
   d. High visibility areas
   e. High pedestrian volume
   f. Known high bicycle parking demand areas

2.10 Bicycle parking shall be provided where direct connections between surface modes of transportation are made (e.g. train stations, bus terminals, and park-and-ride facilities), and at public parks, plazas or other recreation facilities.

2.11 City and regional transit vehicles shall continue to provide racks for the transport of bicycles and increase capacity as demand increases and rack design improves.

2.12 Should grant funds become available, the City shall offer racks or lockers to businesses at high bicycle parking demand locations if they agree to install and maintain them.

2.13 The City shall promote and support enhanced bicycle parking services, such as Bike Valet, at community events such as Thursday night’s Farmer’s Market, or Concerts in the Plaza, when over 100 attendees are expected.

2.14 As funding becomes available, the City should institute a program of working cooperatively with property owners to install bike parking on sites that lack sufficient bike parking, consistent with the following priorities:

   - **First Priority:** Retail shopping areas, major office complexes, entertainment centers, and locations requested by the general public, Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC), and staff, where bicycle parking needs have been identified but no bicycle parking is currently available.
   - **Second Priority:** Manufacturing and service commercial businesses with 50 or more employees where no bicycle parking is currently available.
   - **Third Priority:** Retail shopping areas, major office complexes, and entertainment centers, where bicycle parking is insufficient and it is poorly designed or located.
   - **Fourth Priority:** Multi-family housing complexes that lack sufficient bicycle parking.

2.15 Bicycle rack siting and design:

   - **Siting:**
     a. Install at highly visible locations that are as close to the main entrance of the destination as possible, at least as convenient as the most convenient automobile parking space available to the general public.

Inverted “U” racks are one of the City approved designs used to provide short-term bicycle parking.

**Bike Valet:**
A bicycle parking service, usually set up for special events, offering convenient and secure bicycle parking at locations where a large number of bicyclists are expected.
Long-term Bicycle Parking:

2.18 Bicycle lockers, lockable rooms reserved for bicycle storage, and Bicycle Centrals (Stations) shall be used to satisfy the need for long-term bike parking.

2.19 The City shall encourage the development of bicycle centrals at employment centers and locations where people gather.

2.20 Bicycle lockers shall:

a. Be located at least as conveniently as the most convenient automobile parking space and installed at highly visible locations that are as close to the main employee entrance as possible.

b. In the commercial core, be provided in parking structures, surface parking lots, or incorporated into new buildings and managed to enable safe and convenient access by downtown employees and residents.

c. To the greatest extent possible, be integrated into a project’s overall architecture and site design themes.

d. Be constructed of durable materials and be waterproof. Fiberboard or high-density foam walls or dividers shall be avoided as construction materials.

e. Be installed on, and securely attached to a pad with a cross slope between one and two percent. Concrete is the preferred pad material.

f. Employ secure locking mechanisms that make it easy for the intended users to access them.

2.21 When interior locked rooms are used to provide long-term bicycle storage, these rooms shall:

a. Have a minimum dimension of 11 feet (unless bicycles are stored vertically) to accommodate a 6-foot-long bike plus 5 feet of aisle space outside of the doorway area.

b. Include a means to organize bike storage with at least one wheel touching the ground.

c. Be located near or at the employee street level entry and arranged in a way that enables convenient ingress and egress for people with bicycles.

d. Exclude other routine indoor activities and be reserved for bicycle storage.

Design and Installation:

a. Stand a minimum of 30 inches from ground level and support bikes in a stable position by providing at least two vertical contact points for the bicycle’s frame.

b. Be coated with, or constructed of, a durable material that prevents rust or corrosion.

2.16 The City shall continue to promote and manage its Racks with Plaques bicycle rack donation program which provides short-term public bicycle parking at public facilities and throughout the downtown area.

2.17 Inverted “U” racks, Peak Racks (www.peakracks.com), or other City approved design shall be used to meet the City’s short-term parking requirement. Wave, comb, and toast style racks are examples of racks not permitted by the above guidelines.

Implementation Action 2.17.1: Biennially inspect and repair City owned bicycle racks. Defects that warrant repair include racks that have been damaged, are missing anchor bolts or are missing protective surface covering.
Long-term Bicycle Parking Support Facilities:

2.22 The City shall explore the feasibility of establishing an employer-supported program where commuting or touring bicyclists can shower, change and possibly store their bicycles at athletic and fitness clubs and gymnasiums in the San Luis Obispo area.

2.23 Showers and changing facilities at public recreation buildings (such as the Ludwick Community Center on Santa Rosa Street) should be available for use by commuting or touring bicyclists.

2.24 Work sites that are not required to provide showers and clothing lockers should be strongly encouraged to do so.

2.25 The City may require a particular land use to provide more than the minimum number of showers or locker facilities, as established by the City Zoning Regulations, when it determines that the land use will generate higher demand for these facilities.

2.26 Full-length and well-ventilated clothing lockers shall be the preferred type of facility for storing personal gear and bicycling equipment.

2.27 The City shall establish requirements for the provision of shower and locker facilities at work places and their upkeep for original intended use.

(City of San Luis Obispo 2006 General Plan Circulation Element Policy 4.1.5, page 16; City of San Luis Obispo August 2005 Airport Area Specific Plan, Bicycle Facilities Guidelines - E, page 6-26.)

Implementation Action 2.27.1: Include shower facility requirements in the next round of Zoning Regulations amendments to be considered by the City Council.
Introduction

Education plays a significant role in the safety and confidence of bicyclists. Law enforcement and bicycling educators are key to providing education of the laws pertaining to bicyclists, as well as proven best-practices for safe bicycle riding. Education is relatively cheap when compared to most bikeway facilities projects, yet it is labor intensive and has to be repeated year after year to have a long term impact. A particular challenge for the City is outreach to a large number of in-coming Cal Poly and Cuesta students each year, who may or may not have been exposed to similar educational opportunities prior to moving to San Luis Obispo.

Promotion of bicycling related activities in order to encourage residents to use bicycling as a sustainable option for transportation is another key component of this Plan. Bicycling promotion and bicycling advocacy efforts within the City are in part due to its relationship with regional and national organizations such as the SLO County Bicycle Coalition, SLO Regional Rideshare, and the League of American Bicyclists.

Bicycling Education and Promotion Objectives

**Objective 8:** Contribute to bicycling safety, promotion and education activities and cooperate with others that share a common vision and purpose.

**Objective 9:** Support and encourage Safe Routes to Schools programs to improve safety and encourage more children to bicycle and walk to school.
League of American Bicyclists

The League of American Bicyclists (LAB) is a nation-wide non-profit organization with a mission to “promote bicycling for fun, fitness and transportation and work through advocacy and education for a bicycle-friendly America”. The League’s Bike-Ed program uses trained League Cycling Instructors (LCIs) to teach bicyclists, as well as motorists, about the rights and responsibilities of cyclists, and how bicyclists can ride legally and safely with traffic. Another notable program is the Bicycle Friendly America (BFA) program which designates communities throughout the United States as Bicycle Friendly Communities (BFC) at a Diamond, Platinum, Gold, Silver, or Bronze level. This ranking is based on engineering, education, encouragement, enforcement, and evaluation in regards to bicycling. San Luis Obispo has been ranked a Silver level BFC since October 2007. To learn more about the League and its programs, visit bikeleague.org (League, 2013).

Education and Safety Programs

Annual Bicycling Safety Rodeo

Since 1998, the City has sponsored an annual bicycling safety rodeo during the fall. The purpose of the rodeo is to teach safe riding practices and vehicle code compliance to elementary and secondary school aged children. The rodeo is typically held in a large parking lot or playground and includes a skills course, demonstrations of safe riding practices, distribution of literature, and helmet fitting. The City provides helmets for participants who do not have one, or replaces inadequate helmets. Participants are invited from throughout San Luis Obispo County. The event is broadly advertised, and each year attracts approximately 200 children. In 2011, the Rodeo was expanded to include a Kidical Mass style bicycle ride on City streets. This event gives children experience riding on City streets, while in the safety of a supervised and controlled group.

Safety Assemblies

The City partners with the SLO County Bicycle Coalition to provide bicycling safety presentations at local elementary schools. Students are provided basic information about safe riding techniques and vehicle code requirements. The training is done in collaboration with the local Safe Routes to School program (coordinated through Rideshare). In 2012, eight (8) safety assemblies were presented to area youth. The City Police Department also conducts safety presentations at the elementary schools the week of the annual Bicycle Rodeo.

Adult Bicycling Education Workshops

The City partners with the SLO County Bicycle Coalition to provide a variety of bicycling education workshops from lunch seminars to half-day courses, covering a rider’s rights and responsibilities, traffic laws, how to ride confidently in traffic, emergency riding skills, and route planning strategies. The classes are based on the League of American Bicyclists curriculum, and are taught by local League Cycling Instructors (LCIs). In 2012, ninety four (94) adults participated in these workshops.

Similar to the above offerings, the City offers a lunch session covering bicyclist rights and responsibilities, applicable traffic laws, and riding in a visible and predictable manner. This session also includes an overview of State of CA facility design points from the Highway Design Manual and the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), and their relationship to the California Vehicle Codes that govern bicycle riding.

Diversion Program

Bicyclists that are ticketed for a traffic offense in SLO County may...
choose to participate in a diversion program taught by the Cal Poly University Police Department. The class includes a presentation of the laws and regulations regarding bicycling and skateboards. It focuses on the proper methods to safely commute while riding bicycles.

Transit Driver Awareness Training

City contracted transit drivers are required to attend annual bicyclist awareness training, provided by the City of San Luis Obispo. This training includes information on sharing the road with cyclists, bicyclist’s rights and responsibilities, and how to identify and therefore avoid bicyclists that are exhibiting behavior that is common in the highest bicyclist/motorist collision patterns.

Programs Promoting Bicycling

Bike Month

The City sponsors Bike Month, an annual countywide effort encouraging residents to commute by bike and participate in a variety of bicycling related events scheduled during the month of May. Events that encourage bicycle commuting include bike breakfasts, Shop by Bike, and a Commuter Bike Challenge. Other more social related activities include scavenger hunts by bike and "Bike-In" movies. Safe riding practices are promoted in conjunction with all the events through literature distribution, web site posted information, and verbal instruction.

Public Service/Mass Marketing Campaign

An electronic and print media campaign for the promotion of safe bicycling has been created, and is published periodically when funding or a partnership is available.
Policies and Implementation Actions

3.1 Consider hiring a full time bicycle coordinator to help manage bicycle transportation capital projects, prepare grant applications, review development projects to ensure consistency with bicycle facility policies, and coordinate City-sponsored bicycle transportation promotion and education activities.

**Implementation Action 3.1.1:** Maintain the current 50% Principal Transportation Planner position and 25% Transportation Programs Assistant staff position, and propose funding to increase staffing as the City's fiscal health improves.

3.2 Continue to provide funding for bicycling promotion and bicycling education.

**Implementation Action 3.2.1:** Maintain City-funded bicycle transportation promotion and educational activities that benefit San Luis Obispo's residents, workforce, and visitors through the use of consultant service contracts.

Citywide Partnerships:

3.3 The City shall continue to work with the San Luis Obispo Coastal Unified School District to create and support "Safe Routes to School Plans" and programs for schools in San Luis Obispo.

3.4 The City shall work with the San Luis Obispo's Middle and Senior High Schools to encourage the use of bicycles.

3.5 The City should consider providing incentives for employees to commute to work by bicycle and encourage local business to do the same.

Educational Outreach:

3.6 The City shall continue to promote and sponsor programs and events designed to teach children and adults safe riding methods and the benefits of bicycling.

**Implementation Action 3.6.1:** Partner with SLO Regional Rideshare, the SLO County Bicycle Coalition, the League of American Bicyclists and others to support bicycling promotion and education activities such as Bike Month, Bike Rodeos, bicycling education classes, after-school programs, and bike helmet giveaway programs.

**Implementation Action 3.6.2:** Continue to assist the City’s Police and Parks and Recreation Departments in their efforts to organize the City’s annual Bike Rodeo.

3.7 Continue to offer information to the public about the purpose of new bicycle facility treatments (e.g., bicycle boulevards, shared lane markings, etc.) and safe behaviors for all users operating on these facilities.

**Implementation Action 3.7.1:** Continue to prepare a biennial report highlighting bicycle facility and program improvements within the previous two years.

**Implementation Action 3.7.2:** Continue to provide annual bicycling behavior training to City transit drivers, preferably just prior to the start of the Fall school term.

**Implementation Action 3.7.3:** Continue to participate in Cal Poly's Week of Welcome (WOW) as an opportunity to promote bicycling and bicycle-on-transit use.

**Implementation Action 3.7.4:** Pursue other opportunities such as presentations and online materials to inform residents and businesses of typical bicycling behaviors, common collision patterns and bicycle facility treatments within the City.
Promotional Outreach:

3.8 Support and promote the development of efforts to inform traveling bicyclists of the City's bicycle routes, support facilities (including lodging and transportation hubs), and popular destinations.

   Implementation Action 3.8.1: As funding is available, design, create, erect and maintain signage for routes/facilities/destinations identified as routes supporting the promotion of bicycling as a transportation mode, especially in conjunction with tourism and through-town linkages. (See also, policy 1.47).

   Implementation Action 3.8.2: Promote and support multi-modal transportation (e.g. bikes on transit).

3.9 Post and/or make available bicycle route network maps in high-visibility public locations such as City offices, transit centers, libraries, college campuses and tourist destinations.

   Implementation Action 3.9.1: Provide new, updated, and/or replacement bicycle transportation network materials as needed to the informational kiosk located at the Amtrak station.

3.10 Maintain and improve the current award designation level in the League of American Bicyclists “Bicycle Friendly Community” (BFC) program.

   Implementation Action 3.10.1: Support efforts by local organizations or individuals to nominate and maintain the City's League of American Bicyclists (LAB) Bicycle Friendly Community (BFC) award status by providing City data.

3.11 The City shall promote bicycling related events (e.g. Tour of California) that are likely to result in an increase in local bicycle use and/or bicycling education.

Enforcement:

3.12 Traffic laws regarding bicyclists rights and responsibilities shall be strictly enforced.

   Implementation Action 3.12.1: Annually review bicycling collision reports for opportunities to address collision patterns.

3.13 The City shall promote and support the use of a bicycle “traffic school” option for persons involved in bicycle-related traffic violations.

   Implementation Action 3.13.1: Staff shall seek Traffic Court approval for use of a City sponsored bicycle traffic school for persons involved in bicycle-related traffic violations within the City Limits.
Chapter Four: Implementation and Funding

Introduction

Bikeways in San Luis Obispo may be funded from the full range of financial resources available to the City, (local, State, and Federal). Unless otherwise noted, it is assumed that the City will seek grant funding to pay for some or all of the project costs. Specific funding sources can impact the selection of projects undertaken.

Listed in this section are descriptions of the Plan’s project priority establishment process, a description of project cost estimation process, past expenditures, future financial needs, possible funding sources, as well as implementation related Plan policies.

Implementation and Funding Objectives

Objective 10: Provide guidelines and technical assistance for designing and locating bicycle facilities.

Objective 11: Secure and earmark sufficient funds to implement this Plan.
Implementation of Projects

This Plan contains 61 proposed projects with over 150 project segments which have been developed and prioritized by the BAC (detailed in Appendix A). As it was in the 2007 City of San Luis Obispo Bicycle Transportation Plan, the Railroad Safety Trail is the top priority project of this Plan. Project execution order is in part guided by the project’s prioritization (described below) and the following considerations:

- Bikeway projects are accomplished from a variety of funding sources and combinations of funding sources. Each bikeway project does not compete for funding with all other bikeway projects.

- Many bikeway projects are undertaken concurrent with a larger project such as a street reconstruction or widening. The priority of the larger project often determines when a bikeway project will be accomplished.

- Bikeway projects can be closely linked to, or a result of, development. Therefore, the funding and construction of such projects is dependent upon the funding and construction timing of the new development. It is difficult to predict the timing for these projects due to the many uncertainties inherent to development.

- Occasionally, the identification and subsequent accomplishment of a project occurs so quickly (i.e. due to safety concerns or funding grants), that the project may not be listed or given a high priority.

Project Priority Criteria

A priority ranking system has been established to ensure understanding and relevance of the various bicycle transportation projects. The end result is a general classification of the project as a 1st, 2nd, or 3rd priority. To arrive at this classification, the set of defined criteria shown in Table 4.1 is used as a means to compare the projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Segment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking and Support Facilities</td>
<td>Enhanced bicycle parking facilities and support facilities for riders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling Education and Promotion</td>
<td>Enhances education and promotion of bicycling among the public.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Project Priority Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commuting</td>
<td>Will the project be used for, be an aid to, or increase bicycle commuting?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Does the project enhance overall safety in the transportation network considering bicycles, motor vehicles, and pedestrians?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>Will the project enhance or contribute to an increased use of recreational cycling?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Flow</td>
<td>Does the project improve traffic flow considering all users: bicycle, motor vehicle, and pedestrian?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Does the project educate all travelers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement</td>
<td>Does the project provide specific advantages to using a bicycle as the transportation choice (e.g. parking advantage or travel time to destination)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Is it feasible to expect implementation within 1-3 years based on known available funding or other variables?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links</td>
<td>Will the project improve continuity with existing or other proposed bike routes? Does the project fill a void such as a lane designation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Does the project directly contribute to a safer bike route to school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Does the project provide or improve continuity with existing bike routes that connect to major destination areas outside of San Luis Obispo? (e.g. Cuesta College, Avila Beach)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranking System

The Bicycle Advisory Committee members individually evaluated Plan projects by ranking them on each of the above criteria using a 0 - 5 scale where, 0 = no relevance, 1 = very low relevance, 2 = medium relevance, 3 = moderately high relevance, 4 = high relevance, 5 = very high relevance. The average total of assigned points established each project’s priority in the Plan as follows:

1st priority = 31 - 50,  2nd priority = 16 - 30,  3rd priority = 0 - 15

Individual project rankings are available for review by request from the Public Works Department.
## Funding Opportunities

Funding resources include the General Fund, Transportation Impact Fees (TIF), mitigation fees, and cost participation by other entities. Every two years, the City Council adopts a Financial Plan. An integral part of the Financial Plan is the **Capital Improvement Program (CIP)**. The CIP identifies major equipment or facility needs for the next five years. In addition, bikeway projects may be eligible for Regional, State or Federal program funding or grants when a bikeway project meets the appropriate criteria. Identifying funding sources is an important action within this Plan. Awareness of grant programs and funding opportunities can allow development and implementation of these projects at little or no cost to the City.

### Table 4.2 Funding Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School Program (SRTS)</td>
<td>Federal SRTS funds can be used on infrastructure or non-infrastructure projects at schools serving grades K-8. Infrastructure projects need to be within 2 miles of a school. Funding for this grant program is dependent upon reauthorization of the Federal Surface Transportation Act. <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/saferoutes/saferoutes.htm">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/saferoutes/saferoutes.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)</td>
<td>Project must be located on a public road or publically owned bicycle/pedestrian pathway or trail. Additionally, the project must identify a safety problem that will be corrected or improved upon due to the implementation of the project <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/hsiprogram.htm">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/hsiprogram.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Block Grants</td>
<td>CBGB funds are available for activities that benefit low and moderate-income persons, prevention or elimination of slums or blight, or address community development needs having a particular urgency because existing conditions pose a serious and immediate threat to the health or welfare of the community for which other funding is not available. <a href="http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/comm_planning/communitydevelopment/programs">http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/comm_planning/communitydevelopment/programs</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School Program (SRTS)</td>
<td>Project must be located on any state highway or local road, and must correct an identified safety hazard or problem occurring on a route that students utilize to and from school. Available for schools serving grades K-12. <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/saferoutes/saferoutes.htm">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/saferoutes/saferoutes.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program - Enhancements Activities (STIP-TE)</td>
<td>Similar to ITIP - TE, but awarded on a competitive basis by the Regional Transportation Agency. Project must have regional significance and meet Federal Transportation Enhancement eligibility as noted at website: <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/TransEnhAct/TransEnact.htm">www.dot.ca.gov/hq/TransEnhAct/TransEnact.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Development Act Funds</td>
<td>Funding for transit and non-transit purposes that comply with Regional Transportation Plans. Funds available for a wide variety of transportation programs, from planning to capital construction. <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/State-TDA.html">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/State-TDA.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Y</td>
<td>City projects linked to traffic congestion relief. <a href="http://www.slocity.org/finance/salestaxincr.asp">http://www.slocity.org/finance/salestaxincr.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Funded</td>
<td>Project specific features, conditions, or mitigations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>City Council approved Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table continued...

---

The Madonna Inn Bike Path was completed in 2011, providing a multi-use path from the Madonna Inn entrance to Marsh Street near downtown. This bikeway was developer funded as an air pollution control mitigation measure.
Future Financial Needs

Every two years the City prepares a Financial Plan projecting expenditures for the next five years. The Financial Plan identifies bicycle transportation projects that are anticipated to receive funding within the next five years. Appendix B of the 2011-13 Financial Plan, Capital Improvement Plan, identifies the following future financial needs for bicycle transportation between July 2011 and June 2016.

Railroad Safety Trail: Hathway to Taft. The Railroad Safety Trail has an existing segment from Cal Poly along the east side of the railroad ending at Hathway Street. The proposed segment will extend the trail further south to Taft Street. The 2011-13 Capital Improvement Plan budgets $300,000 for this project, funded by Federal and State Grants.

Railroad Safety Trail: Taft to Pepper. This segment will extend the Railroad Safety Trail from Taft Street to Pepper Street and includes a bicycle/pedestrian bridge over the Union Pacific railroad tracks. The 2011-13 Capital Improvement Plan estimates this project will cost $1,284,000 and funding will be provided by Federal and State Grants.

Bob Jones Trail: Los Osos Valley Road to Octagon Barn. This project extends the Bob Jones City-to-Sea trail from Los Osos Valley Road to the Octagon Barn beyond the southern city limits. The 2011-13 Capital Improvement Plan estimates this project will cost $550,000 and will be funded by grants.

Bicycle Facility Improvements. This Plan includes small-scale, miscellaneous bicycle facility improvements such as channelization, signage, striping, drain grate replacements, bicycle boulevards and maintenance. The 2011-13 Capital Improvement Plan allocated $25,000 annually, funded by City Transportation Impact Fees. The 2013-15 Capital Improvement Plan allocates $100,000 annually, funded by the City’s General Fund.

Table 4.3 Future Financial Plan (2011-2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Estimated Cost*</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Safety Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hathway to Taft</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Federal and State grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Safety Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taft to Pepper</td>
<td>$1,280,000</td>
<td>Existing and future grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Jones Trail Connection</td>
<td>$870,000</td>
<td>State and Federal grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Jones Trail LOVR to Octagon Barn</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>Existing and future grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Facility Improvements</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>City Traffic Impact Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,125,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table reflects applicable cost for land acquisition, design, construction and construction management.

* Only 2011-2013 costs have been budgeted. Funding for 2013-15 has not been included.

Past Expenditures

Table 4.4 lists the costs of bicycle related projects within the City from 2008 to December 31, 2012. For consistency within this document, the costs reflected in this table are construction costs only. Depending on the overall project scope, design cost may add significantly to the project.

Street maintenance and repair also contributes to the quality of facilities for all users, including bicyclists. The City has annual Capital Improvement Projects for street reconstruction, resurfacing, and microsurfacing totaling millions of dollars every year. While these...
projects are not listed below because they do not breakdown the cost of bicycle facility maintenance and repair, they account for a significant amount of money being used to improve existing bicycle facilities every year.

### Table 4.4 Past Expenditures for Major Bicycle Facilities 2008-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type of Facility</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orcutt Road: Sacramento to Bullock</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcutt Road: Sacramento to Railroad</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morro Street: Marsh to Santa Barbara</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Bill Roalman Bicycle Boulevard</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>$776,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel and Orcutt</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Bike Signal</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Street</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Sharrows</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh Street/Highway 101 undercrossing</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Multi-use path</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Safety Trail: Foothill to Hathaway</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>$469,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Drive</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial and Capitolio</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sharrows</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Safety Trail: Foothill to Campus</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>$674,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madonna Inn Bike Path</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madonna Road Bike Box</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Jones Trail: Prado Road to north of Los Osos Valley Road</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$742,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pismo Street Bike Lane, Johnson to Santa Rosa</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>$5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Street Green Bike Lanes</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Osos Valley Road Multi Use Pathway</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>$474,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Street</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Sharrows</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>$5,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** 7.4 \( \$3,209,800 \)

* Costs are unknown because project was administered by private development or another public agency.
Δ Funding sources include State and Federal funds, Traffic Impact Fees, and City General Fund.
Policies and Implementation Actions

4.1 All bikeway projects shall be prioritized by the Bicycle Advisory Committee as described in Table 4.1 Project Priority Criteria.

4.2 The City may accelerate the implementation of lower priority projects when opportunities to establish funding partnerships, participation by property owners, or other special circumstances are present.

4.3 Focus implementation of this Plan’s policies and projects utilizing feedback from the League of American Bicyclists (LAB) Bicycle Friendly Community (BFC) process, “key measures” and reviewer recommendations.

   Implementation Action 4.3.1: The BAC shall consider BFC review feedback when recommending projects during the City’s goal setting process and during the update process of this Plan.

Funding and Financial Support:

4.4 The City shall update its Bicycle Transportation Plan as required by the State, to maintain eligibility for State Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) grants.

   Implementation Action 4.4.1: The BAC shall update the Bicycle Transportation Plan at least every 5 years, or as required to maintain eligibility for BTA grants, and consider amendments when circumstances arise.

4.5 Require that development contribute its share toward the costs of bicycling facilities and programs.

4.6 New bikeways shall be considered a priority for installation in advance of, or during the first phases of development.

4.7 Continue to prioritize funding towards transportation congestion relief projects including high priority bicycling projects.

4.8 Work with local organizations to pursue additional funding for bicycling safety education programs. By providing support to grants and other funding applications, the City can help organizations that conduct education to increase their resources and reach more City bikeway users.

4.9 Consider employing other financial strategies such as debt-financing on projects that are likely to be funded by regional, state or federal grant programs, or from the City’s Capital Improvement Plan.

4.10 Utilize grant funding to the maximum extent feasible to pay for bicycling projects and programs. Candidate grant programs include, but are not limited to grant sources listed earlier in this chapter.

4.11 Make an effort to develop financial partnerships with others to complete the Railroad Safety Trail.

4.12 The City should secure and earmark sufficient funds to implement...
Implementation Action 4.12.1: Integrate Bicycle Transportation Plan projects in to the City’s five year Capital Improvement program budget and Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) programs.

Implementation Action 4.12.2: As part of the City’s two-year financial planning process, the Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) shall:

a. Provide the City Council with a request for annual funding of miscellaneous bicycling facilities that include bicycle racks, lockers, and minor intersection or segment improvements such as striping.

b. Submit a list of prioritized projects the Committee recommends for City funding during the two-year budget cycle. This funding shall be used for the design and construction of bicycling facilities that improve bicycle transportation.

Implementation Action 4.12.3: Reserve a minimum of two percent (2%) of its Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds for bicycling projects and programs. Candidate activities for use of these funds include, but are not limited to:

a) Support cost of bicycling safety education and training.

b) Minor capital projects such as bicycle parking, facility signage, and drain grate upgrades.

c) Planning, engineering, and environmental studies for bicycle transportation capital projects.

d) Bicycling promotional activities and materials.

Evaluation:

4.13 The City will continue to gather bicycling related data for City facility evaluation purposes.

Implementation Action 4.13.1: Conduct bike counts at key intersections throughout the City at least every two years to obtain comparable data regarding bicycle usage within the City.

Implementation Action 4.13.2: Present citywide bicycling count data to the Bicycle Advisory Committee for their consideration and input.

Implementation Action 4.13.3: Present bicycling related statistics from the City’s Annual Traffic Safety Report to the Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) for their consideration and input.

Implementation Action 4.13.4: The Bicycle Advisory Committee shall review the Implementation Matrix in Appendix B at least every two years to evaluate progress on the actions described in this Plan.
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Glossary

Terms contained in this glossary are also shown in the sidebar on the page where they are first used.

Arterial Streets: Are designed to provide a high capacity of mobility and generally serve longer vehicle trips
to, from, and within urban areas.

Bicycle Advisory Committee: Provides oversight and policy direction on matters related to bicycle
transportation in San Luis Obispo and its relationship to bicycling outside the City.

Bicycle Boulevards: A shared roadway (bicycles and motor vehicles share the space without marked bike
lanes) where the through movement of bicyclists are given priority over motor vehicle travel on a local street.
Bicycle Boulevards are designated on low speed, low volume local streets that parallel higher traffic arterial
streets, and may use treatments to address cut through vehicle traffic and vehicle speed.

Bicycle Central (or Station): Is a consolidated sheltered storage area for employee bicycles, integrated into
the design of job sites, and may be combined with showers and bicycle repair and support facilities.

Bicycle Commuter: Is a person making a trip by bicycle, primarily for transportation purposes, and does not
include a trip primarily for physical exercise or recreation.

Bicycle Facilities: Are any physical feature that serves the needs of bicyclists, including bike lanes and paths,
bicycle racks and lockers, signs, pavement markings and symbols, places to post information, lighting, and
traffic controls.

Bicycle Friendly Community: A community that provides accommodation for cycling with policies and
practices which encourage people to bike for transportation and recreation.

Bicycle-only Signal: A traffic signal head for regulating bicycle movement at intersections, providing a phase
where only bicycles may proceed

Bike Box: A designated area at the front of a traffic lane at a signalized intersection that places the bicyclist
ahead of queuing motor vehicle traffic during the red signal phase.

Bike Kitchen: A do-it-yourself bicycle maintenance and repair facility, usually run by volunteers of a non-
profit organization. Facilities often offer classes in maintenance, supply tools, and may sell or trade used parts.

Bike Valet: A bicycle parking service, usually set up for special events, offering convenient and secure bicycle
parking at locations where a large number of bicyclists are expected.

Bikeways: A general term that includes bike lanes, paths, and designated streets or routes that provide for
bicycle travel.
**Glossary (continued)**

**Bikeway Connection:** An existing or planned unpaved trail or paved walkway providing connections to bikeways.

**Buffered Bike Lane:** A buffered bike lane is an on-street bike lane that has a painted buffer either between the bike lane and parked cars, between the bike lane and the standard motor vehicle lane, or both. Typically the buffer will be striped with diagonal lines and serves to keep bicyclists from riding in the “door zone” and/or to add separation between bicyclists and motor vehicle traffic.

**Channelization:** The use of pavement markings, raised islands, or other suitable means, to regulate and separate intersection turning movements from through movements, for the safe and orderly conduct of motor vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians.

**Class I Bikeway (Bike Path):** Provides a completely separated right-of-way for the exclusive use of bicycles and pedestrians with crossflow by motorists minimized.

**Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane):** Provides a striped lane for one-way bicycle travel on a street or highway.

**Class III Bikeway (Bike Route):** A Class III bike route provides connectivity within the overall bicycle transportation system, by filling in gaps between other identified bicycling facilities. Class III routes are generally designated on lower volume streets where motorists and bicyclists share the lane. Class III bike routes that have high bicycling demand may be signed to indicate the route.

**Collector Roads:** Are designed to connect traffic from small local roads to arterial streets, while providing a balance between mobility and land access within residential, commercial, and industrial areas.

**Colored Pavement:** Color is applied to bicycle facility pavement to alert motorists to the presence of bicyclists in known high conflict zones.

**Complete Streets:** (Also known as livable streets) are roadways designed and operated to enable safe access and travel for all users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and public transportation users of all ages and abilities.

**Commercial Core:** Includes the Downtown Commercial Zoning District (CD) in downtown San Luis Obispo. (See "Downtown Area").

**Door Zone:** The lateral space next to on-street parallel parked cars within which car doors may open into the roadway.

**Downtown Area:** The City of San Luis Obispo’s “General Plan, Land Use Element” defines an area that includes the commercial core and surrounding neighborhoods, as the “Downtown Planning Area”. (See Figure 4 of that plan.)

---

**Grade Separated Crossing:** Provides continuity of a facility over or under a roadway or railroad.

**Elementary School Zone:** Influence area (defined by the San Luis Obispo Coastal Unified School District) for each elementary school within the City Limits.

**Head of Household:** Responsible for paying more than half the cost of keeping up a home, along with having at least one financial dependent.

**Intersection:** An area where two or more pathways or roadways join together.

**Kidical Mass:** A fun bike ride for kids and families stressing legal and safe riding habits, with a dual educational goal of not only teaching kids how to ride safely but to let the overall community know that “kids are traffic too”.

**Long-Term Bike Parking:** Bicycle parking meant to accommodate employees, students, residents, commuters, and others expected to park on a regular basis for more than four hours. This parking is to be provided in a secure, weather-protected manner and location. Long-term parking type will be a bicycle locker, a locked room with standard racks and access limited to bicyclists only, or standard racks in a monitored location.

**Loop Detector:** A type of vehicle detection system for triggering traffic signals that uses an induction “loop” buried in the street pavement.

**Major City Goals:** Represent the City’s priorities for the two-year financial plan.

**Multi-Tenant Work Sites:** Consist of a structure, or group of structures, on one worksite where more than one employer conducts business.

**Pavement Management Zone:** The City is divided in to nine “Zones” for scheduling regular pavement maintenance and rehabilitation.

**Planning Areas:** Lands surrounding or within San Luis Obispo where the City has adopted, or intends to adopt, a specific plan, district plan, enhancement plan, area plan, route plan, or alignment plan to guide its use.

**Shared-Lane Markings:** (Also known as Sharrows.) Pavement legends used to assist bicyclists with lateral positioning in narrow lanes or lanes with on-street parking, to remind motorists to expect to share the roadway with bicyclists, to encourage safe passing of bicyclists, to help guide bicyclist to ride outside the parked car “door zone” and to reduce the incidence of wrong-way bicycling.

**Short-Term Bike Parking:** Is parking provided to accommodate visitors and customers, who are parking for less than four hours. Bicycle racks meeting City standards satisfy this need.

**Showers:** Are bathing stalls accompanied by clothing lockers and changing areas reserved for each gender at a work site.
Appendix A: Implementation Projects

Projects detailed on the following pages include a description of their location and overall priority, along with an intent statement to clarify the basis of the project. For evaluation purposes, each project lists the type of facility, elementary school zone, city pavement management zone, estimated cost, and project length. Further relevant information unique to the project is listed in the notes section. For easy geographical reference, projects are grouped by the areas shown on the Project Areas map (at left). This appendix is divided into these logical sections, with each containing an area map and an index of projects located within the area. Within each area, projects are listed north to south and east to west.

Note that where bikeways are included within specific planning areas or where the City Council has adopted route plans for a particular bikeway, these adopted plans shall guide the bikeway’s more precise placement (Plan Policy 1.8a). This plan presents their location in conceptual form to support those other plans.

Elementary School Zone:
As defined by the San Luis Coastal Unified School District, these are the areas of influence for each elementary school within the City Limits. A map of these zones is included in Appendix I.

Pavement Management Zone:
The City is divided into nine “Zones” for scheduling regular pavement maintenance and rehabilitation. It can be cost effective to implement bicycling projects in conjunction with this schedule. A map of these zones is included in Appendix I.
The Central Area is generally bounded by the following: Hwy. 101, the Union Pacific railroad tracks, and High Street. See surrounding project areas for adjoining projects.

**Projects contained in the Central Area are:**

- Casa to Toro Bicycle Boulevard, Crossing Hwy 101:
  - Grade separated crossing of Hwy. 101, Lemon St. to Toro St.
  - Lemon St. Bicycle Boulevard (Hwy. 101 to Santa Rosa Park)
  - Casa St. Bicycle Boulevard (Santa Rosa Park to Murray St.)

- Toro Street Bicycle Boulevard

- Broad Street Bicycle Boulevard, crossing Hwy. 101:
  - Grade separated crossing of Hwy. 101

- Ramona to Hwy. 101 & Hwy. 101 to Monterey Beach/King Bicycle Boulevard:
  - Marsh St. to High St.
  - High St. to Meadow Park
  - Hwy. 101/Marsh Street Under-crossing

- Islay Street Bicycle Boulevard

- Jennifer St. bridge, access to Morro St. Bicycle Boulevard

- Class III Signage Projects in the Central Area
**Casa to Toro Bicycle Boulevard, Crossing Hwy 101:**

**Priority:**
First

**School Zone:**
Bishop Peak

**Class:**
Bicycle Boulevard

**Project Length (feet):**
1,515

**Estimated Cost:**
$4,020,000

**Project Description:** The overall project creates a Bicycle Blvd. from the north end of the proposed Toro St. Bicycle Blvd, over Hwy 101, to Murray via Lemon St., Santa Rosa park and Casa St.

**Notes:** Has a relationship with the proposed Toro St. Bicycle Blvd. Overall, the pedestrian grade separated crossing is key to this project. Path through Santa Rosa park necessary to connect Lemon St. with Casa. This project with its related links of Lemon and Casa becomes more important if the proposed Broad St. bicycle boulevard is not able to be completed. City of SLO Bicycle Count Data taken in 2008 show the intersection of Santa Rosa and Mill use as thirteenth highest out of 28 locations surveyed, with a total count of 98 (data included here as this project may impact use at the mentioned intersection).

**Intent:** To provide a low traffic impact north/south through route for bicyclists that serves Cal Poly and downtown bike route connectors west of the railroad tracks.

**Casa to Toro Bicycle Boulevard**

Segment -
Grade Separated Crossing of Hwy. 101, Lemon to Toro

**Section Length (feet):**
405

**Section Description:** This segment creates a Grade Separated Crossing from Toro St. to Lemon St. across Hwy 101.

**Notes:** Relationship with other “Casa to Toro Bicycle Blvd.” segments (Lemon Street bicycle boulevard and Casa Street bicycle boulevard) Also has a relationship with the proposed Toro St. Bicycle Blvd. Overall, the grade separated crossing is key to this project. Path through Santa Rosa park necessary to connect Lemon St. with Casa St. This project with its related links of the GSX between Lemon and Toro and the Casa St. bicycle boulevard segment, becomes more important if the proposed Broad St. bicycle boulevard is not able to be completed.
**Segment - Lemon Street Bicycle Boulevard**

**Intent:** To provide a low traffic impact connection between the proposed Grade Separated Crossing of Hwy. 101 and the proposed Casa Street bicycle boulevard.

**Project Length (feet):** 640

**Estimated Cost:** see overall project estimate

**Notes:** Relationship with other “Casa to Toro Bicycle Blvd.” segments (Grade separated crossing at Hwy. 101 connecting Lemon and Toro and Casa Street Bicycle Boulevard.) Also has a relationship with the proposed Toro St. Bicycle Blvd. Overall, the grade separated crossing is key to this project. Path through Santa Rosa Park necessary to connect Lemon St. with Casa St. This project with its related links of the GSX between Lemon and Toro and the Casa St. bicycle boulevard segment, becomes more important if the proposed Broad St. bicycle boulevard is not able to be completed.

**Section Description:** This segment creates a Bicycle Blvd. along Lemon, from Hwy 101 to Santa Rosa Park.

**Segment - Casa Street Bicycle Boulevard**

**Intent:** To provide a low traffic impact connection between the proposed Lemon Street bicycle boulevard and Foothill Blvd. Class II lanes.

**Project Length (feet):** 875

**Estimated Cost:** see overall project estimate

**Notes:** Relationship with other “Casa to Toro Bicycle Blvd.” segments. (Grade separated crossing at Hwy. 101 connecting Lemon and Toro and Lemon Street bicycle boulevard.) Also has a relationship with the proposed Toro St. Bicycle Blvd. Overall, the grade separated crossing is key to this project. Path through Santa Rosa Park necessary to connect Lemon St. with Casa St. This project with its related links of the GSX between Lemon and Toro and the Casa St. bicycle boulevard segment, becomes more important if the proposed Broad St. bicycle boulevard is not able to be completed. To achieve the project “intent” of connection to Foothill Blvd. Class II lanes, some treatment may be necessary on the Class III section of Casa (Murray to Foothill).
### Toro Street Bicycle Boulevard

**Priority:** Second  
**School Zone:** Hawthorne  
**Class:** Bicycle Boulevard  

**Project Description:** Create a Bike Blvd. along Toro St, from Islay St. to Hwy. 101.  

**Notes:** Connects with proposed Islay St. Bicycle Blvd. Related to the proposed Casa to Toro St. Bicycle Blvd. and proposed grade separated crossing of Hwy. 101 at Toro and Lemon. Overall, the grade separated crossing of the Casa to Toro Bicycle Blvd. (section "A") is key to this project. The Casa to Toro Bicycle Blvd. (A, B and C) becomes more important if the proposed Broad St. BB is not able to be completed. The intersections of Santa Rosa and Walnut and Santa Rosa and Olive are both ranked 2nd highest for bicycle/motor vehicle collisions within the 5 year trend of 2005-2010, each having a total of 6 collisions. The intersection of Santa Rosa and Marsh is ranked 5th highest for bicycle/motor vehicle collisions within the 5 year trend of 2005-2010, having a total of 3 collisions. The Toro Bicycle Blvd. will serve as an alternate route to Santa Rosa St. for bicycle travelers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Length (feet):</th>
<th>3,980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Cost:</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pave. Mgt. Zone:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Broad Street Bicycle Boulevard, crossing Hwy. 101:

**Priority:** First  
**School Zone:** Hawthorne Bishop Peak  
**Class:** Bicycle Boulevard  

**Project Description:** Create a Bike Blvd. along Broad, from Monterey St. to Ramona.  

**Notes:** The overall project consists of two component segments: “Broad St. Bike Blvd. Ramona to 101 & 101 to Monterey”, and “Broad Street Bicycle Blvd. 101 GSX” which connects the north and south segments of “Broad St. Bike Blvd. Ramona to 101 & 101 to Monterey”. The project may require traffic calming. City of SLO Bicycle Count Data taken in 2008 show the intersection of Chorro and Lincoln as 9th highest out of 27 locations surveyed, and the intersection of Santa Rosa and Mill use as thirteenth highest, with total counts of 147 and 98 respectively (implementation of this project may impact use at the mentioned intersections). Implementation of component pieces of the project may proceed separately. Specifically, if the grade separated crossing portion is not ready for implementation, bicyclists would still benefit from implementation on North Broad Street. Implementation of the grade separated crossing portion of the project will follow the removal of Highway 101 on and off ramps at Broad.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Length (feet):</th>
<th>5,345</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Cost:</td>
<td>$5,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pave. Mgt. Zone:</td>
<td>4, 7, 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Broad Street Bicycle Boulevard**

**Segment:**
*Grade separated crossing of Hwy. 101*

**Intent:** Provide a lower traffic volume route north/south from Foothill Blvd. by-passing Downtown core congestion.

**Project Description:** Pedestrian/Bicycle grade separated crossing of Hwy. 101 connecting north and south segments of Broad street.

**Notes:** This project was formerly known as Mis 14 in the Bicycle Transportation Plan dated May 7, 2002 and described as an underpass from the north side of 101 at Broad, to Brizzolara st.

**Project Length (feet):** 510

**Estimated Cost:** see overall project estimate

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 4, 7**

---

**Broad Street Bicycle Boulevard**

**Segment:**
*Ramona to Hwy. 101 & Hwy. 101 to Monterey St.*

**Intent:** To provide the primary low traffic impact north/south through route for bicyclists and pedestrians serving the downtown core, for neighborhoods north of downtown core.

**Project Description:** Create a Bike Blvd. along Broad, from Monterey St. to Ramona.

**Project Length (feet):** 4,835

**Estimated Cost:** see overall project estimate

**Notes:**

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 4, 7, 9**
Beach/King Bicycle Boulevard:

**Priority:** First

**School Zone:** Hawthorne

**Class:** Bicycle Boulevard

**Project Length (feet):** 3,595

**Estimated Cost:** $50,000

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 4**

**Intent:** To provide a low traffic impact north/south through route for bicyclists that serves the downtown core for neighborhoods south of the downtown core and west of Broad St.

**Project Description:** The overall project creates a Bicycle Blvd. from Meadow Park to Marsh Street.

**Notes:** Connects with proposed Islay St. Bicycle Blvd. A bicycle/pedestrian signal or other device to facilitate crossing of South will be required on South St. Note: One pedestrian death in 2005 at King/South intersection.

Segment: Marsh to High

**Project Length (feet):** 1,970

**Estimated Cost:** see overall project estimate

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 4**

**Intent:** To provide a low traffic impact North/South through route for bicyclists that serves the downtown core, for the neighborhoods west of Broad and South of the downtown core.

**Project Description:** This section creates a Bike Blvd. along Beach, from Marsh St. to High St.

**Notes:** May require traffic control on High St. at the King/Beach intersection. Connects with proposed Beach/King segment “High St. to Meadow Park” which also has a relationship to the proposed Islay St. Bicycle Blvd.
Beach/King Bicycle Boulevard

Segment: High St. to Meadow Park

Intent: To provide a low traffic impact North/South through route for bicyclists that serves the downtown core for neighborhoods South of the downtown core and West of Broad St.

Project Description: This section creates a Bike Blvd. along King, from High St. to Meadow Park.

Notes: Connects with proposed King/Beach segment “Marsh to High” and proposed Islay St. Bicycle Blvd. A bicycle/pedestrian signal or other device to facilitate crossing of South will be required on South St. Note: One pedestrian death in 2005 at King/South intersection.

Priority: First

School Zone: Hawthorne

Class: II

Project Length (feet): 1,625

Estimated Cost: see overall project estimate

Hwy 101/Marsh Street Under-crossing

Intent: Provide bicycle facility connectivity between Class II lanes downtown on Higuera and Marsh Streets, with City Open Space and proposed Cerro San Luis Class I path (the existing Madonna Inn Bike Path and proposed path to the north).

Project Description: Install bike lanes on both sides of Marsh from Fernandez Lane, under interchange to Marsh and including bicycle channelization for eastbound on Marsh at Higuera. May require modifications to ramp shoulders and landscaping. Project would provide connection to Cerro San Luis trailhead. Will likely require Caltrans approval.

Notes: In 2009, Caltrans constructed a multi-use path along the north side of the underpass. This project recognizes and retains the need for Class II lanes as well. In 2010, the Madonna/Marsh portion of the “Cerro San Luis Class I path” was installed (now known as the Madonna Bike Path). A project relationship exists with “Hwy 101 Class I-North Broad to 101 at Marsh St.” project (this is the remaining portion of the “Cerro San Luis Class I path”). If/when the Marsh/Broad section is installed, this project will have to be re-evaluated and ranked. This project was previously known as Mis-19 in the 2002 Plan. Installation must likely occur with Caltrans’ replacement of the Hwy. 101 bridge in this location.
Islay Street Bicycle Boulevard

**Priority:** Second

**School Zone:** Hawthorne

**Class:** Bicycle Boulevard

**Project Description:** Create a Bicycle Blvd. along Islay St., from Beach to Toro streets.

**Notes:**
- Connects with proposed Beach/King Bicycle Blvd. and proposed Casa to Toro St. Bicycle Blvd.
- A signal, or other device, may be needed at Broad and at Osos streets.
- A traffic control device should also be considered for Chorro St. Along with the previously noted intersections, traffic calming and/or bicycle priority treatments may be necessary along the route to match the definition/intent of a Bicycle Boulevard.

City of SLO Bicycle Count Data taken Oct. 7, 2008 show the intersection of Osos and Leff use as fifteenth highest out of 28 locations surveyed, with a total count of 95. Counts for the intersection of Morro and Leff were nineteenth out of 28 locations, with a total of 73.

The May 2007 Bicycle Transportation Plan listed this project as the Leff St. Bicycle Boulevard. For this plan the entire project has been shifted one block to avoid the more abrupt grade changes on Leff St.

**Project Length (feet):** 3,580

**Estimated Cost:** $30,000

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 1, 4**

---

Jennifer St. Bridge, access to Morro St. Bike Blvd.

**Priority:** Second

**School Zone:** Hawthorne

**Class:** other

**Project Description:** Create a non-motor vehicle connection between the west side of the Jennifer St. bridge and the Amtrak parking lot entrance/exit at Upham/Santa Barbara/Morro Sts.

**Notes:**
- A ramp extending from the lowest tier of the bridge towards Morro Street. This option has been included in grant applications (unfunded), but is not supported by the Railroad Museum board.
- Widening/lengthening of the railroad platform under the bridge and extending along the existing pedestrian walkway to the south of the bridge ramp. This option may require Union Pacific approval.

City of SLO Bicycle Count Data taken in Oct. 7, 2008 show the Jennifer St. bridge bike use as tied for sixteenth highest out of 28 locations surveyed, with a total count of 81. Counts for the intersection of Morro and Leff were nineteenth out of 28 locations, with a total of 73. A subsequent special bike count on Morro St. saw a rise to 78 in Oct. 2009.

**Project Length (feet):** 390

**Estimated Cost:** $120,000

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 2, 4**
### Class III Signage Projects: Central Area

**Intent:** Provide signed bike routes, as shown on the Bicycle Transportation Network Map, connecting other bicycling related facilities within the Northern Area of town (City of San Luis Obispo Pavement Management Zones 9, and portions of 1 and 4).

**Project Description:** Install signage indicating location of a Bike Route at the following locations:

- Mill St. from railroad tracks to Chorro (2,850 ft.)
- Peach St. from Chorro to Nipomo (1,200 ft.)
- Chorro St. from Mill to Pismo (2,000 ft.)
- Monterey St. from railroad tracks to Chorro (2,850 ft.)
- Higuera St. from Johnson to Nipomo (3,350 ft.)
- Pismo St. from Santa Rosa to Broad (1,850 ft.)
- Nipomo St. from Peach to High (3,750 ft.)
- Broad St. from Higuera to High (3,000 ft.)
- High St. from eastern terminus to Nipomo (1,400 ft.)
- Railroad Ave from north end of Amtrak parking lot to Jennifer St. Bridge (500 ft.)

**Notes:** Per MUTCD, signage should be placed every quarter mile (1312 ft.) and at signalized intersections. Total cost for each sign, including labor and installation, is $500. Existing signage may reduce costs for some listed segments.

---

**School Zone:** C. L. Smith

**Class:** III

**Project Length (feet):** 22,750

**Estimated Cost:** see notes

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 1, 4, 9**
The Northern Area is bounded by the following: Hwy. 101 and the City limit north and west of High Street. See surrounding project areas for adjoining projects. Note that for presentation purposes the entire Railroad Safety Trail is presented with the Eastern Area projects, even though it contains segments in the Northern and Southern sections of the City as well.

Projects contained in the Northern Area are:

- Highland/Chorro Class I
- Highland/Santa Rosa Bypass
- Highland Class II
- Cerro Romauldo Bicycle Blvd.
- Cerro Romauldo Class I
- Boysen Ave. Connection
- Santa Rosa at Boysen, Grade Separated Crossing
- Patricia/Foothill/La Entrada Intersection
- Foothill/Ferrini Crossing
- Tassajara Sharrows
- North Chorro Intersection Enhancement
- California Bridge Widening
- Cuesta Park Under-crossing
- Cuesta Park/Loomis St. S. Bound Hwy. 101 Exit
- Hwy. 101 Class I, North Broad to 101 at Marsh St.

Class III Signage Projects in the Northern Area

- A22
- A23
- A24
- A25
- A26
- A27
- A28
- A29
- A30
- A31
- A32
- A33
- A34
- A35
- A36
- A37
Highland/Chorro Class I

**Priority:** First

**School Zone:** Bishop Peak

**Class:** I

**Project Description:** Construct a bike slot on Highland turning south on to Chorro St. The primary goal is the bike slot, but a secondary alternative would be to construct a Class I path from Highland to Chorro streets on the South side of Highland.

**Intent:** To facilitate better circulation for westbound Highland traffic turning south on to Chorro. The connection is necessary to provide an alternative north/south corridor into and out of the downtown area for bicyclists to avoid Santa Rosa.

**Project Length (feet):**
- 15 feet for slot,
- up to 200 feet for path:

**Estimated Cost:**
- $10,000 slot
- $100,000 path

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 8**

Highland/Santa Rosa Bypass

**Priority:** Second

**School Zone:** Hawthorne

**Class:** I

**Project Description:** Class I - From entrance at apartments (200 N. Santa Rosa), through parking lots and across existing creek bridge and along the edge of the agriculture field, connecting to Highland Dr.

**Notes:** This route involves both private property and Cal Poly State University property. City of SLO Bicycle Count Data taken in 2008 show the intersection of Santa Rosa and Highland use as third highest out of 28 locations surveyed, with a total count of 202.

**Project Length (feet):**
- 2,700

**Estimated Cost:**
- $300,000
Appendix A: Implementation Projects - Northern Area

### Highland Class II

**Priority:** Second  
**School Zone:** Bishop Peak  
**Class:** II  
**Project Length (feet):** 2,300  
**Estimated Cost:** $20,000  

**Intent:** To provide travel lanes for bicyclists. The project will also provide connectivity to the proposed Class III lanes on Cuesta and in turn, to the proposed Cerro Romauldo Bike Blvd.

**Project Description:** Install Class II bike lanes in each direction on Highland from SR1 to Cuesta St.

**Notes:** This project may require removal of parking. If space limitations only provide for one bike lane, it should be installed in the East bound direction to accommodate slower moving uphill bike traffic. This project was formerly known as Mis 10 in the Bicycle Transportation Plan dated May 7, 2002. In that plan the project was for only a Class II on the North side of Highland with a length of 575 feet and a “negligible” cost. Note that the project now calls for a Class II lane on each side with the total length at 1150 feet. Costs responsibilities were listed as Developer = 100%. “Cal Poly install as part of H-8 site development”. City of SLO Bicycle Count Data taken in 2008 show the intersection of Santa Rosa and Highland use as third highest out of 28 locations surveyed, with a total count of 202.

### Cerro Romauldo Bicycle Blvd.

**Priority:** First  
**School Zone:** Bishop Peak  
**Class:** Bicycle Boulevard  
**Project Length (feet):** 2,890  
**Estimated Cost:** $30,000  

**Intent:** To provide an alternate route to Foothill for E/W travel, directly serving two elementary schools and connecting neighborhoods to shopping.

**Project Description:** Create a Bike Blvd. from Patricia to Ferrini along Cerro Romauldo. Right-of-way shall be considered at Tassajara to allow for continuous bicycle flow. Traffic calming may be required to manage motor vehicle speeds along the route.

**Notes:** Relationship to other projects: Foothill/Ferrini traffic signal, Cerro Romauldo Class 1 connection from Ferrini to Chorro, Tassajara lane enhancements, and Class III routes on Jeffrey Dr. City of SLO Bicycle Count Data taken in 2008 show the intersection of Foothill and Tassajara use as sixteenth highest out of 28 locations surveyed, with a total count of 81.
### Cerro Romauldo Class I

**Priority:** First  
**School Zone:** Bishop Peak  
**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 615  
**Estimated Cost:** $200,000  
**Pave. Mgt. Zone:** 7

**Intent:** To connect the proposed Cerro Romauldo Bike Blvd. to N. Chorro for further bikeway network connections and access to the Chorro/Foothill signalized intersection.

**Project Description:** Create a Class I path to extend Cerro Romauldo from Ferrini to N. Chorro.

**Notes:** The specific route for this path has not been determined as the City does not have control of the property necessary to complete it. The route is dependent on which properties the City can acquire. This project has a direct relationship to the project to install a traffic signal on Foothill at Ferrini and the Cerro Romauldo Bike Blvd. The installation of either of these projects may impact the priority of this project. Other project relationships exist with the creation of the Boysen Ave. Connection project, and the Santa Rosa/Boysen Grade Separated Crossing project. City of SLO Bicycle Count Data taken in 2008 show that the intersection of Foothill and Tassajara use as sixteenth highest out of 28 locations surveyed, with a total count of 81.

### Boysen Ave. Connection

**Priority:** First  
**School Zone:** Bishop Peak  
**Class:** other

**Project Length (feet):** 1,235  
**Estimated Cost:** $10,000  
**Pave. Mgt. Zone:** 7

**Intent:** Create the most direct route possible from the Boysen Ave. intersection of Santa Rosa St. to N. Chorro St., to connect with other proposed bikeway network facilities.

**Project Description:** Create a connection from the Boysen Ave. intersection of Santa Rosa St. to N. Chorro St. via existing shopping center parking lot.

**Notes:** Has a relationship with the following proposed projects:  
- Cerro Romauldo Bike Blvd.  
- Cerro Romauldo Class I  
- Santa Rosa/Boysen Ave. Grade Separated Crossing  
- Highland/Santa Rosa Bypass  

Bike counts taken in 2008 show that the intersections of Santa Rosa/Foothill and Santa Rosa/Highland were the second and third highest with counts of 314 and 202 respectively.
### Santa Rosa at Boysen, Grade Separated Crossing

**Priority:** First  
**School Zone:** Bishop Peak  
**Class:** I  

**Project Length (feet):** 170  
**Estimated Cost:** $1,500,000  
**Pave. Mgt. Zone:** 7

**Intent:** Address an existing bicycle and pedestrian circulation pattern and provide a legal crossing of Santa Rosa (Hwy 1) that does not conflict with vehicle traffic.

**Project Description:** Create a grade separated crossing between Boysen Ave. and the north bound side of Santa Rosa St. (Hwy. 1)  

**Notes:** Supports the State Route 1 Major Investment Study. Has a relationship with the following proposed projects:  
- Cerro Romauldo Bike Blvd.  
- Cerro Romauldo Class I  
- Boysen Ave. Connection  
- Highland/Santa Rosa Bypass  

Bike counts taken in 2008 show that the intersections of Santa Rosa/ Foothill and Santa Rosa/Highland were the second and third highest with counts of 314 and 202 respectively.

### Patricia/Foothill/La Entrada Intersection

**Priority:** Second  
**School Zone:** Bishop Peak  
**Class:** other

**Project Length (feet):** not applicable  
**Estimated Cost:** $50,000  
**Pave. Mgt. Zone:** 7

**Intent:** Provide for easier crossing of this intersection, particularly for elementary school children.

**Project Description:** Re-engineer intersection to more easily allow bicyclist crossings of Foothill at Patricia/La Entrada in all directions.

**Notes:** The crossing of Foothill Blvd. is a significant barrier for many traveling to/from Bishop Peak/Teach Elementary school. Currently, children on bikes are directed to become pedestrians and cross Foothill in the crosswalk (only on the west side of Patricia). When traveling North this means they must also cross Patricia if they are to legally continue riding from this point. Proposed solutions to the intersection need to be identified. City of SLO Bicycle Count Data taken in 2008 show the intersection of Foothill and Tassajara use as sixteenth highest out of 28 locations surveyed, with a total count of 81.
Foothill/Ferrini Crossing

Priority: First
School Zone: Bishop Peak
Class: other

Project Length (feet): not applicable
Estimated Cost: $200,000

Project Description: Provide a protected crossing of Foothill Blvd. at Ferrini Rd.

Notes: Possible solutions could include a traffic signal that includes video detection for bicyclists, a bicycle/pedestrian only signal, lane configuration changes on Foothill, or a grade separated crossing. This project has a direct relationship to the creation of an extension of Cerro Romauldo as a Class I path from Ferrini to N. Chorro. If the Class I extension is in place or is funded, then this proposed project may not be as necessary for a BB link, and therefore would impact its ranking. There is also a relationship to the proposed creation of Cerro Romauldo as a Bike Blvd. City of SLO Bicycle Count Data taken in 2008 show the intersection of Foothill and Tassajara use as sixteenth highest out of 28 locations surveyed, with a total count of 81.

Tassajara Sharrows

Priority: First
School Zone: Bishop Peak
Class: other

Project Length (feet): 1,640
Estimated Cost: $10,000

Project Description: Provide a bikeway network connection from Ramona, across Foothill at the Tassajara signal, to Cerro Romauldo.

Notes: This was listed as a Class II connection project in the 2007 Bike Plan, and would have required on-street parking removal. This option shall still be considered if traffic volumes warrant. The project has relationships with the proposed Cerro Romauldo Bike Blvd. City of SLO Bicycle Count Data taken in 2008 show the intersection of Foothill and Tassajara use as sixteenth highest out of 28 locations surveyed, with a total count of 81.
**North Chorro Intersection Enhancement**

**Priority:** First

**School Zone:** Bishop Peak

**Class:** other

**Project Length (feet):** 200

**Estimated Cost:** $10,000

*Pave. Mgt. Zone 7*

**Intent:** To address conflict potential in the common direction movement (north on Chorro to west on Foothill) from the right hand lane that allows both left turning and straight through traffic movement.

**Project Description:** For northbound Chorro bicycle traffic at Foothill Blvd. Modify the intersection/provide facilities, to reduce conflict possibility between left (west) turning bike traffic, and straight through motor vehicle traffic.

**Notes:** Possible solutions could include a Bike Box, a bicycle specific signal phase, or lane movement configuration changes. Bike counts taken in 2008 show that the intersections of Santa Rosa/Foothill was the second highest with a count of 314.

---

**California Bridge Widening**

**Priority:** Second

**School Zone:** Hathorne

**Class:** II

**Project Length (feet):** 90

**Estimated Cost:** $200,000*

*Pave. Mgt. Zone 1*

**Intent:** Improve bike travel through the intersections (at California and Marsh and California and San Luis Drive). Reduce conflicts with vehicles.

**Project Description:** When the vehicle bridge on California Blvd. from San Luis Dr. to Marsh St. is replaced, it should be widened to accommodate Class II bicycle lanes to San Luis Drive.

**Notes:** Known as Mis-11b from 2002 Bike Plan. *Estimated cost reflects 10% of total bridge cost; actual cost may vary. To be included in re-development costs for vehicle bridge.
Appendix A: Implementation Projects - Northern Area

Cuesta Park Under-crossing

**Priority:** Second

**School Zone:** Hawthorne

**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 821

**Estimated Cost:** $410,000

**Pave. Mgmt. Zone:** 1, 8

**Intent:** To allow bicyclist to exit South bound Hwy. 101 and allow bicyclist and pedestrian access under the freeway between San Luis Dr. and Loomis Street at Cuesta Park.

**Project Description:** Southbound Hwy. 101 Exit and path under US 101 from San Luis Drive to Cuesta Park.

**Notes:** Will require Caltrans, Fish and Game and Corps of Engineers approval. The South bound Hwy. 101 exit was added in the 2013 BTP update to replace the closing of Miossi to bicyclists. The 2013 plan also presents the project, “Cuesta Park / Loomis South bound Hwy 101 Exit”, a stand alone project to create a new exit from Hwy. 101 South for bicyclists only. While the projects are not mutually exclusive, the implementation of one will impact the ranking of the other. This project was formerly known as Mios 23 in the Bicycle Transportation Plan dated May 7, 2002. In it the cost associated with this project are noted as 50% City, 50% Recreation grant.

Cuesta Park/Loomis St. S. Bound Hwy. 101 Exit

**Priority:** Second

**School Zone:** Hawthorne

**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 350

**Estimated Cost:** $140,000

**Pave. Mgmt. Zone:** 1

**Intent:** Provide an exit from Hwy. 101 southbound for bicycles only that allows bicyclists to exit prior to roadway curves preceding the Monterey St. exit that limit sight visibility. The project will also provide access to Loomis Street.

**Project Description:** Hwy 101 South bound bicycle exit at Cuesta Park/Loomis St.

**Notes:** In this plan the project, “Cuesta Park Under-crossing”, was modified to include a south bound exit from Hwy. 101. While the projects are not mutually exclusive, the implementation of one will impact the ranking of the other.
### Class III Signage Projects: Northern Area

**School Zone:** Bishop Peak

**Class:** III

**Project Description:** Install signage indicating location of a Bicycle Routes at the following locations:

- Highland Dr. from Cuesta to Patricia (1,900 ft.)
- Patricia Dr. from Highland Dr. to Foothill Blvd. (1,450 ft.)
- Ramona Dr. from N. Broad to Tassajara Dr. (1,850 ft.)
- N. Broad from Ramona Dr. to Foothill Blvd. (450 ft.)
- Chorro St. from Highland Dr. to Lincoln St. (5,350 ft.)
- Murray St. from Broad to Santa Rosa (1,600 ft.)
- Casa St. from Foothill to Murray (1,250 ft.)
- West St. from Chorro St. to Lincoln (700 ft.)
- Lincoln St. from West St. to N. Broad (2,150 ft.)
- Cuesta Dr. from Cerro Romualdo to Highland (1,000 ft.)
- Tassajara from Ramona to Cerro Romualdo (800 ft.)
- Hathaway from Cal Poly Campus to California Blvd. (2,300 ft.)
- Loomis Rd. from City Limit to Grand (3,150 ft.)

**Project Length (feet):** 23,950

**Estimated Cost:** see notes

**Notes:** Per MUTCD, signage should be placed every quarter mile (1312 ft.) and at signalized intersections. Total cost for each sign, including labor and installation, is $500. Existing signage may reduce costs for some listed segments.

---

### Hwy 101 Class I, North Broad to 101 at Marsh St.

**Priority:** First

**School Zone:** Bishop Peak Hawthorne

**Class:** I

**Project Description:** Create a Class I bikeway on the west side of 101 from the N. Broad St./101 area, to connect to the existing Class I bikeway that links Marsh St. at Hwy 101, and Madonna Rd.

**Project Length (feet):** 3,320

**Estimated Cost:** $2,000,000

**Notes:** The current map shows the connection being made at the N. Broad/101 intersection. This is only a suggestion. Hill St. may be more desirable. Property ownership, Caltrans control/approval and terrain are all issues which may impact the final route of the path. Has a relationship with the Broad Street Bike Blvd., and Hwy. 101 Marsh St. Under-crossing projects. This project was known as the “Cerro San Luis Class I path” in the 2007 Bike plan. In 2010, a portion of the project was built from Marsh St. to Madonna and is known as the Madonna Bike path.

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 6, 7**
The Eastern Area is generally bounded by the following: Hwy. 101, the Railroad tracks, and the eastern City limit. See surrounding project areas for adjoining projects. Note that for presentation purposes the entire Railroad Safety Trail is presented with the Eastern Area projects, even though it contains segments in the Northern and Southern sections of the City as well.

Projects contained in the Eastern Area:

- Railroad Safety Trail:
  - Highland Drive to Mustang Stadium
  - Foothill Blvd. to Murray St.
  - Hathaway to Taft
  - Taft to Phillips
  - Phillips to Marsh
  - Marsh to Amtrak Station (using Union Pacific right-of-way)
- Grade Separated Crossing of Railroad at Penny Lane
- French Hospital Connection Bikeway
- Jennifer to Henry
- High to Roundhouse
- Roundhouse to McMillian
- Grade Separated Crossing of Railroad near Sinsheimer Park
- Sinsheimer Park Connections
- Sacramento/Duncan to Laurel Class I, RRST Connection
- Orcutt Area Specific Plan Sections
- Grade Separated Crossing of Railroad near Industrial Way
- Bridge Over Tank Farm Road
- Buena Vista Bridge Widening
- Monterey Street Class II
- Fixlini/Flora Bicycle Boulevard:
  - Fixlini/Flora Bicycle Boulevard
  - Fixlini/Flora Class I
- Flora Bicycle Boulevard
- Sequoia Bicycle Boulevard
- Ella Street Neighborhood Bicycle Boulevard (Option A)
- Ella Street Neighborhood Bicycle Boulevard (Option B)
- Boulevard del Campo Improvements
- Southwood Sharrows
- Orcutt Area Bikeways
- Spanish Oaks Underpass Ramp
- Class III Signage Projects in the Eastern Area
Railroad Safety Trail (RRST): Overall Project

**Priority:** First

**School Zones:**
- Bishop Peak
- Hawthorne
- Sinsheimer
- Los Ranchos

**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 26,773

**Estimated Cost: see individual segments**

**Intent:** The intent of this project is to create the major north/south bicycle thoroughfare for the City serving downtown neighborhoods and businesses, Cal Poly, elementary schools, and all the Broad Street corridor neighborhoods and businesses.

**School Zones:**

**Bishop Peak**

**Priority:** First

**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 1,290

**Estimated Cost:** $516,000

**Notes:**
- The segment is currently outside the City limits. It was known in previous plans as RBP8. In those plans the project extended to the campus entrance at Campus Way. The section from Campus Way to the Stadium was completed by Cal Poly in 2009.
- A 2011 bicycle circulation study done for Cal Poly indicated that this project may require the realignment of California Blvd., due to space limitations concerning the railroad right-of-way.

**Project Description:**
- Support segment - Class I path on east side of RR from the sports complex north of Highland Drive, to the stadium. Extend path in back of palm trees to cross Highland Dr. on an 82 ft. bridge with deck approaches and extend to sports complex entrance.

**Notes:**
- The 2009 Grand Jury report, “Great Paths but Galling Gaps: Bicycle Riding in SLO County” included the following recommendation: “Completion of the Railway Safety Trail should be the City's top bike priority, because once finished, it will provide safe and efficient commuting.”
### Railroad Safety Trail

#### Segment: Foothill Blvd. to Murray St.

**School Zones:**
- Bishop Peak
- Hawthorne

**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 1,700

**Estimated Cost:** $510,000

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 8**

**Project Description:** Support segment - Class I path on west side of RR from Murray St. to Foothill Blvd.

**Notes:** Need wrought iron fencing for access issues. This project segment was known as RBP 10 in previous plans.

**Intent:** Provides a more direct path to Cal Poly from the Murray Street Neighborhood.

### Railroad Safety Trail

#### Segment: Hathway to Taft

**School Zones:**
- Hawthorne

**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 630

**Estimated Cost:** $300,000

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 8**

**Project Description:** Primary segment - Class I path from Hathway Ave. to Taft St. on the east side of the railroad tracks.

**Notes:** This project segment is a piece of the trail alignment that was known in previous City of SLO Bike plans as RBP6. The RBP6 alignment ran at grade adjacent to the tracks from Hathway Ave. to Marsh St. This was also represented as a portion of "Phase 4" of RRM Design Group 2001 Railroad Safety Trail project description. See Appendix H for past naming references. *Cost Estimate from the 2011-13 Capital Improvement Plan.*
Railroad Safety Trail

Segment: Taft to Phillips

School Zones: Hawthorne, Bishop Peak

Class: I

Project Length (feet): 1,450
Estimated Cost: $1,280,000

Project Description: Primary segment - Class I path from Taft to Phillips. Includes a 250 ft. (approx.) bridge spanning the railroad tracks from behind the Highway Patrol property, to Phillips St. Notes: This project segment is a piece of the trail alignment that was known in previous City of SLO Bike plans as RBP6. The RBP6 alignment ran at grade adjacent to the tracks from Hathway Ave. to Marsh St. This was also represented as a portion of “Phase 4” of RRM Design Group 2001 Railroad Safety Trail Project description. See Appendix H for naming references. *Cost Estimate from the 2011-13 Capital Improvement Plan.

Railroad Safety Trail

Segment: Phillips to Marsh

School Zones: Hawthorne, Bishop Peak

Class: III

Project Length (feet): 1,750
Estimated Cost: $3,000,000

Project Description: Primary segment - Route along Pepper St., from Phillips St. to Marsh St. The route will utilize existing surface streets as either Class III facilities or Bicycle Boulevards limiting motor vehicle access. A bridge spanning Monterey St. will be constructed to minimize the route gradient changes.

Notes: This project segment is a piece of the trail alignment that was known in previous City of SLO Bike plans as RBP6. The RBP6 alignment ran at grade adjacent to the tracks from Hathway Ave. to Marsh St. This was also represented as a portion of “Phase 4” of RRM Design Group 2001 Railroad Safety Trail Project description.
### Railroad Safety Trail

#### Segment: Marsh to Amtrak Station (using City right-of-way)

**School Zones:** Hawthorne  
**Class:** II & III  

**Project Length (feet):** 2,830  
**Estimated Cost:** $25,000  

*Project Description: Primary segment* - Route utilizing existing City streets.  
*Notes:* Provides on-street connection if Union Pacific RR property cannot be utilized. A combination of bike lanes and bike boulevards are envisioned to complete this segment. Project segment known in previous plans as RBP1.

#### Railroad Safety Trail

#### Segment: Marsh to Amtrak Station (using Union Pacific right-of-way)

**School Zones:** Hawthorne  
**Class:** I  

**Project Length (feet):** 2,830  
**Estimated Cost:** $4,000,000  

*Project Description: Support segment* - Path along west side of RR from Marsh to the north end of Amtrak Station parking lot. Includes a 165 ft. bridge over San Luis Creek and a 195 ft. bridge over Johnson Ave. Project would include local access from local streets.  
*Notes:* Requires use of Union Pacific property, which at the time of the writing of this plan is not supported by the railroad. Project segment known in previous plans as RBP1.
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Appendix A: Implementation Projects - Eastern Area

Railroad Safety Trail

Segment: Grade Separated Crossing of Railroad at Penny Lane

School Zones: Hawthorne

Class: I

Project Length (feet): 148

Estimated Cost: $2,000,000

Pave. Mgt. Zone 1

Project Description: Support segment - Class I bridge over the railroad between Penny Lane and Fairview St.

Notes: Utilizes location where a roadway bridge used to exist. Provides direct connection to French Hospital campus and neighborhoods. This project segment was known as RBP 14 in previous plans.

Railroad Safety Trail

Segment: French Hospital Connection Bikeway

School Zones: Hawthorne

Class: I

Project Description: Support segment - Create a Class I path connection between the east end of Iris St. and Fairview St., with access to the intersection of Lizzie St. at Johnson Ave.

Notes: Relationships to existing Jennifer St. Bridge, existing Johnson Ave. class II bike lanes, the proposed Flora/Fixlini Bicycle Blvd., the proposed Ella St. Neighborhood Bicycle Blvd., and the Railroad Safety Trail. If this project segment is created prior to the Ella St. Neighborhood Bicycle Blvd., it may impact the rank of that project, and/or the routing of that project.

City of SLO Bicycle Count Data taken in Oct 2008 show bicycle use at the intersection of Johnson and San Luis Drive as twentieth highest out of 28 locations surveyed, with a total count of 70.

In the previous BTP, the RRST alignment for this segment was included in RBP19, which spanned from the Penny Lane GSX to the Jennifer St. bridge. The cost breakdown responsibility listed is 25% Developer, 25% City, 50% grant. Assumes French Hospital contributes to construction.

Project Length (feet): 1,480

Estimated Cost: $400,000

Pave. Mgt. Zone 1, 2
### Railroad Safety Trail

#### Segment: Jennifer to Henry

**School Zones:**
- Hawthorne
- Sinsheimer

**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 550

**Estimated Cost:** $220,000

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 1, 2, 4**

**Project Description:** Support segment - Path along east side of RR from the Jennifer Street Bridge to Henry St.

**Notes:**
- As a stand alone project, it has relationships to the existing Johnson Ave. class II bike lanes, the proposed Flora/Fixlini Bicycle Blvd., and the proposed Ella St. Neighborhood Bicycle Blvd. If this project segment is created prior to the Ella St. Neighborhood Bicycle Blvd., it may impact the rank of that project, and/or the routing of that project.
- City of SLO Bicycle Count Data taken in Oct. 2008 show bicycle use at the intersection of Johnson and San Luis Drive as twentieth highest out of 28 locations surveyed, with a total count of 70.
- In the previous BTP, the RRST alignment for this segment was included in RBP19, which spanned from the Penny Lane grade separated crossing to the Jennifer St. bridge. The notes for that plan indicated a requirement of bridging the creek at the northeast end of the French Hospital property. This is now covered in the project segment “French Hospital Connection Bikeway”.

---

### Railroad Safety Trail

#### Segment: High to Roundhouse

**School Zones:**
- Hawthorne
- Sinsheimer

**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 775

**Estimated Cost:** $250,000

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 2, 4**

**Project Description:** Support segment - Path from east end of High St. to the East end of Roundhouse.

**Notes:**
- The principal route for this project segment is over the Union Pacific Railroad right of way. The City owned Emily Street Right-of-Way shall be preserved for this project as a secondary option. This project was known as RBP 15 in previous plans.
### Railroad Safety Trail

**Segment: Roundhouse to McMillian**

**School Zones:**
- Hawthorne
- Sinsheimer

**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 2,725

**Estimated Cost:** $820,000

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 2, 3, 4**

**Project Description:** Support segment - Path along west side of RR from Roundhouse to McMillian. Path will connect with bridge near Sinsheimer Park.

**Notes:** May require extensive soil remediation in roundhouse area depending on location. This project segment was known as RBP 16 in previous plans.

---

### Railroad Safety Trail

**Segment: Grade Separated Crossing of Railroad near Sinsheimer Park**

**School Zones:**
- Hawthorne
- Sinsheimer

**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 620

**Estimated Cost:** $3,000,000

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 2, 3**

**Project Description:** Primary segment - Bridge, ramping, and Class I connection to existing bikeways or pedestrian paths at Sinsheimer Park on the east side of the tracks, and connection to roadways on the west side.

**Notes:** Cost estimate based on connection between Francis St. and hillside adjacent to Blvd. del Campo which features 250 bridge span, 254 feet of ramping, 25 vertical clearance of trucks; 10 foot wide bridge and ramps and embankments assumed where space allows. This project segment was known as RBP 13 in previous plans.
### Railroad Safety Trail

#### Segment: Sinsheimer Park Connections

**School Zones:**
- **Sinsheimer**

**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 880

**Estimated Cost:** $270,000

**Pave. Mgmt. Zone 2, 3**

**Project Description:** Support segment - Provide paved path and unpaved trail connections from the RRST through Sinsheimer Park to Southwood Drive as is consistent with the Sinsheimer Park Master Plan, including but not limited to a paved connection between the ball fields and a paved or unpaved trail along the north side of Sydney creek.

**Notes:**
- Length and cost estimates are for the paved Class I path through the Sinsheimer Park ball fields, as shown in the park's master plan. Improvement of the trail along Sydney creek may occupy part of the School District's Property and may require relocation of fencing. Eligible for Safe Routes to School grant. A portion of this project section was known as RBP4 in previous plans. It has been expanded to reflect consistency with the park master plan. The existing trail along Sydney creek is listed in Appendix J (Bikeway Connections). The dirt path on the north side of the park between Boulevard del Campo and Helena has a relationship to this Plan project: Boulevard del Campo Improvements.

---

### Railroad Safety Trail

#### Segment: Sacramento/Duncan to Laurel Class I, Railroad Safety Trail Connection

**School Zones:**
- **Hawthorne**
- **Sinsheimer**

**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 730

**Estimated Cost:** $146,000

**Pave. Mgmt. Zone 2, 3**

**Project Description:** Primary segment - Off street two-way path on the north side of Orcutt Rd., between the intersections of Sacramento/Duncan and Laurel, creating connection with the Railroad Safety Trail (RRST) and the two closest intersections.

**Notes:**
- This project segment could be developed in two parts: 1: RRST to Laurel, 2: RRST to Sacramento/Duncan.
- Consideration by the Traffic Engineer for crossing treatment of Orcutt at Sacramento/Duncan may need to be made based on traffic speed and volume counts when the project is implemented. Associated with the Railroad Safety Trail (RRST) projects. In the 2007 Bicycle Transportation Plan this project was listed as the Railroad Bicycle Trail segment, "RBP 3". In that version the project extended only east along Orcutt from the RRST terminus, to the Laurel/Orcutt intersection.
Railroad Safety Trail

**Segment: Orcutt Area Specific Plan Sections**

**School Zones:**
Hawthorne
Sinsheimer

**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):**
5,410

**Estimated Cost:**
see notes

**Project Description:** Primary segment - Path along east side of RR from Laurel Ln. to Tank Farm Road. Includes a 82 ft. bridge over small creek in the Orcutt Area. Part of alignment may use Bullock Lane right-of-way.

**Notes:** Funding = 100% developer per Orcutt Area Specific Plan. Has a relationship with RRST: Bridge over Tank Farm Road. Project segment known in previous plans as RBP 5.

School Zones:
Hawthorne
Sinsheimer

Class: I

**Project Length (feet):**
145

**Estimated Cost:**
see notes

**Project Description:** Primary segment - A grade separated crossing from the end of Industrial Way on the east side of the tracks, to the Railroad Safety Trail on the west side of the tracks.

**Notes:** Developer funded per Orcutt Area Specific Plan. Relationship exists with the existing Sacramento Class II lanes, and the further citywide connectivity through the planned Prado Rd. corridor. This project segment was known as RBP 11 in previous plans.
**Railroad Safety Trail**

**Segment: Bridge over Tank Farm Road**

- **School Zones:** Hawthorne, Sinsheimer
- **Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 830

**Estimated Cost:** see notes

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 3**

**Project Description:** Primary segment - Bridge over Tank Farm Road along east side of RR. Includes a 197 ft. bridge over Tank Farm Road and 591 ft. of elevated decking on the approaches. Project also includes Class I connections south of Tank Farm Road to existing bikeways or streets.

**Notes:** Funding per Orcutt Area Specific Plan. This project segment was known in previous plans as RBP 9.

---

**Buena Vista Bridge Widening**

**Priority:** Second

**School Zone:** Hawthorne

**Class:** II

**Project Length (feet):** 150

**Estimated Cost:** $300,000

**Project Description:** Widen Buena Vista from Loomis St. to Monterey St. to include class II bike lanes on both sides.

**Notes:** This includes the widening of the bridge over 101 which will require Caltrans approval. Relationship to the Monterey Street Class II project (formerly Mis-28 in 2007 plan). *Cost estimate reflects 10% of the overall cost for a new bridge. Actual cost may vary; cost would be included in re-development costs for a vehicle bridge.*
Monterey Street Class II

**Priority:** Second

**School Zone:** Hawthorne

**Class:** II

**Project Length (feet):** 9,770

**Estimated Cost:** $55,000

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 1**

**Intent:** To provide room for bicycles and motor vehicles to use the lanes at the same time.

**Project Description:** Install Class II bike lanes on Monterey Street from Santa Rosa to U.S. 101.

**Notes:** This could be provided by removal of curb parking on one side of the street. Class II lanes on both sides are preferred. If only one side is possible then it should be on the uphill north bound side with “shared lane” marking south bound. An interim solution of “shared lane” markers for both directions have been installed. Additional note, project has a relationship to BV101X (Buena Vista / 101 crossing widening project.) 2008 City of SLO Bicycle Count Data show the intersection of California and Monterey use as 6th out of 28 locations surveyed for highest volume, with a total count of 174. This project was formerly known as Mis 28 in the Bicycle Transportation Plan dated May 7, 2002.

Fixlini/Flora Bicycle Boulevard:

**Priority:** Second

**School Zone:** Hawthorne

**Class:** Bicycle Boulevard

**Project Length (feet):** 8,471

**Estimated Cost:** $341,000

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 1, 2**

**Intent:** To provide a low traffic impact north/south through route for bicyclists that serves the Johnson Ave. neighborhoods through to San Luis High and upper Monterey Street area.

**Project Description:** Create a Bike Blvd. along Fixlini from Lizzie, through County property to connect with Flora, along the length of Flora, and further connecting to the County via Sequoia.

**Notes:** Connects to proposed Ella St. Neighborhood Bicycle Blvd. Cut through traffic to the High School must be addressed before the Bicycle Blvd. can be put in place. Includes a section listed in the 2002 Bike Plan as “Mis 9” 2008 City of SLO Bicycle Count Data show the intersection of Johnson and San Luis Drive use as 21st out of 28 locations surveyed for highest volume, with a total count of 70. (Data reference included here as this project may impact use at the mentioned intersections).
### Fixlini/Flora Bicycle Boulevard

#### Segment: Fixlini Bicycle Boulevard

**Intent:** To provide a low traffic impact North/South through route for bicyclists that serves the Johnson Ave. neighborhoods through to San Luis High and upper Monterey Street area.

**Project Description:** Create a Bicycle Boulevard along Fixlini, from Lizzie to southern end.

**Notes:** Connects to proposed Bicycle Boulevards. This route connects with a closed back entrance to the High School. High School cut through traffic must be addressed before the Bicycle Boulevard can be put in place. Connects to Fixlini/Flora Class I segment of the overall Bicycle Boulevard.

**Project Length (feet):** 1,285

**Estimated Cost:** see overall project

---

#### Fixlini/Flora Bicycle Boulevard

#### Segment: Fixlini/Flora Class I

**Intent:** Create a link between the neighborhoods south of Bishop and east of Johnson serving the Adult School, High School, and neighborhoods of San Luis Drive and East of Johnson without having to take the more heavily trafficked Johnson Ave.

**Project Description:** Create a Class I bikeway from north end of Flora, across County and church property to Fixlini.

**Notes:** This segment is pivotal to the Flora/Fixlini Bicycle Boulevard. This project will require County approval; a pedestrian easement from County property to Fixlini had been granted. A bridge may be needed to span a small creek. This project was formerly known as Mis 9 in the Bicycle Transportation Plan dated May 7, 2002.

**Project Length (feet):** 1,010

**Estimated Cost:** see overall project

---

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 1**

---

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 1, 2**
Fixlini/Flora Bicycle Boulevard

**Segment: Flora Bicycle Boulevard**

**Intent:** To provide a low traffic impact North/South through route for bicyclists that serves the neighborhoods North of Johnson Ave., through to both the proposed Ella St. Bicycle Boulevard East/West downtown and San Luis High/upper Monterey Street areas.

**Project Description:** Create a Bike Blvd. along Flora, from Bishop to Southwood.

**Notes:** May require traffic calming to reduce vehicle speeds. Connects with proposed Fixlini/Flora Class I (Mis 9 from bike plan dated May 7, 2002) and proposed Ella/Ruth/George Bicycle Blvd. Also has a relationship to proposed Sequoia Bicycle Boulevard.

**Project Length (feet):** 5,290

**Estimated Cost:** see overall project

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 2**

---

Fixlini/Flora Bicycle Boulevard

**Segment: Sequoia Bicycle Boulevard**

**Intent:** To provide a low traffic impact North/South through route for bicyclists that serves the neighborhoods North of Johnson Ave., connecting via the proposed Flora St. Bicycle Boulevard, through to both the proposed Ella St. Neighborhood Bicycle Boulevard East/West downtown and San Luis High/upper Monterey Street areas.

**Project Description:** Create a Bicycle Boulevard along Sequoia, from Southwood to the southern City limits.

**Notes:** Connects with the proposed Flora St. Bicycle Boulevard, the proposed Fixlini/Flora Class I (Mis 9 from bike plan dated May 7, 2002) and proposed Ella St. Neighborhood Bicycle Blvd. An easement exists for the continuation of Tiburon Road (currently County jurisdiction) which opens up further neighborhoods for connecting this route, and links to regional bicycling routes on Orcutt Road and future connections to ‘Orcutt Area Bikeways’ (see project in this plan).

**Project Length (feet):** 886

**Estimated Cost:** see overall project

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 2**
**Ella Street Neighborhood Bicycle Boulevard (Option A)**

**Priority:**
Second

**School Zone:**
Sinsheimer
Hawthorne

**Class:**
Bicycle Boulevard

**Project Length (feet):**
2,705

**Estimated Cost:**
$15,000

**Intent:** To provide a low traffic impact East/West through route for bicyclists that serves the downtown core, downtown neighborhoods and Johnson Ave. neighborhoods.

**Project Description:** Create a Bicycle Boulevard from the Jennifer St. bridge to the proposed Flora/Fixlini Bicycle Blvd., utilizing the most gradual grade available. “Option A” extends the Railroad Safety Trail from the current east side exit/entrance of Jennifer St. bridge to Henry (See RRST segment “Jennifer to Henry”). A Bicycle Boulevard is then created from Henry, along Iris, to Ruth, to Ella, across Johnson, and to Fixlini.

**Notes:** There are two route options proposed for this project. “Option A” is dependent on being able to extend the Railroad Safety Trail north to Henry St. Option A offers the most gradual grade route.

Relationships to existing Jennifer St. Bridge, existing Johnson Ave. class II bike lanes, the proposed Fixlini/Flora Bicycle Blvd., and the proposed French Hospital Connection Bikeway. Some sections may require traffic calming to reduce vehicle speeds. This project was known as the Ella/Ruth/George Bicycle Blvd. in the 2007 Bicycle Transportation Plan. The name was changed with the introduction of “Option A” in the 2013 plan. If the French Hospital Connection Bikeway is created prior to this project, it may impact the rank of this project, and/or the routing of this project.

City of SLO Bicycle Count Data taken in Oct. 2008 show bicycle use at the intersection of Johnson and San Luis Drive as twentieth highest out of 28 locations surveyed, with a total count of 70.

**Ella Street Neighborhood Bicycle Boulevard (Option B)**

**Priority:**
Second

**School Zone:**
Sinsheimer
Hawthorne

**Class:**
Bicycle Boulevard

**Project Length (feet):**
2,550

**Estimated Cost:**
$15,000

**Intent:** To provide a low traffic impact East/West through route for bicyclists that serves the downtown core, downtown neighborhoods and Johnson Ave. neighborhoods.

**Project Description:** Create a Bicycle Boulevard from the Jennifer St. bridge to the proposed Flora/Fixlini Bicycle Blvd., utilizing the most gradual grade available. “Option B” creates a Bike Blvd. from the east side exit/entrance of Jennifer St. bridge, along George, to Ruth, to Ella, across Johnson, and to Fixlini.

**Notes:** There are two route options proposed for this project. “Option B” follows the route outlined in the 2007 Bicycle Transportation Plan. Relationships to existing Jennifer St. Bridge, existing Johnson Ave. class II bike lanes, the proposed Fixlini/Flora Bicycle Blvd., and the proposed French Hospital Connection bikeway. Some sections may require traffic calming to reduce existing vehicle speeds. This project was known as the Ella/Ruth/George Bicycle Blvd. in the 2007 Bicycle Transportation Plan. The name was changed with the introduction of “Option A” in the 2013 plan. If the French Hospital Connection bikeway is created prior to this project, it may impact the rank of this project, and/or the routing of this project.

City of SLO Bicycle Count Data taken in Oct. 2008 show bicycle use at the intersection of Johnson and San Luis Drive as twentieth highest out of 28 locations surveyed, with a total count of 70.
**Boulevard Del Campo Improvements**

**Priority:** Second  
**School Zone:** Sinsheimer  
**Class:** other

**Project Length (feet):** 40  
**Estimated Cost:** $10,000

**Project Description:** Install curb ramps on Blvd. del Campo and Helena for park path access.

**Notes:** Should be developed as part of sidewalk improvement projects.

**Intent:** To provide better access to the unpaved path.

**Existing dirt path**

---

**Southwood Sharrows**

**Priority:** Second  
**School Zone:** Sinsheimer  
**Class:** other

**Project Length (feet):** 2,940  
**Estimated Cost:** less than $10,000

**Project Description:** Provide Shared Roadway Marking legends in both directions on Southwood Dr., from Laurel Lane to Johnson Ave.

**Notes:** Relationship to existing bicycling facilities: Johnson Ave. class II lanes, Laurel Ln. class II lanes, Southwood Dr. class II lanes, along with Sinsheimer Park and its connection to the Railroad Safety Trail.

---

**Boulevard Del Campo Improvements**

**Existing dirt path**
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Orcutt Area Bikeways

School Zone:
Sinsheimer

Class: I and II

Project Length (feet):
6,455

Estimated Cost:
see notes

Pave. Mgt. Zone 2

Intent: To implement bicycling facilities in the adopted Specific Plan.

Project Description: Orcutt Area Bikeways. Install Class I and II bike ways in the Orcutt Area, consistent with its adopted specific plan, when subdivisions are processed.

Notes: Project has not been ranked or a cost estimate developed since it is a construction/development driven project. This applies to the internal bicycle facilities, not the regional facilities (i.e. Railroad Safety Trail).

This project was formerly known as Mis 25 in the Bicycle Transportation Plan dated May 7, 2002. In it, the cost associated with this project are noted as 100% developer.

Spanish Oaks Underpass Ramp

Priority: Second

School Zone:
Los Ranchos

Class: I

Project Length (feet):
250

Estimated Cost:
$120,000

Pave. Mgt. Zone 3

Intent: Provide rideable access to the underpass.

Project Description: Provide access ramps from both Spanish Oaks Drive and Poinsettia, to the existing railroad underpass of the Islay Hill area bikeways.

Notes: Costs associated with this project include ADA compliance which staff believes must be met. Property not under City ownership. This project only provides seasonal access. Historically, this project has been listed in the “Unmet Bikeway Needs” compilation from the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG).
## Class III Signage Projects: Eastern Area

### School Zone:
#### Sinsheimer
#### Hawthorne

### Class: III

**Intent:** Provide signed bike routes, as shown on the Bicycle Transportation Network Map, connecting other bicycling related facilities within the Northern Area of town (City of San Luis Obispo Pavement Management Zones 2, and a portion of 1 and 3).

**Project Description:** Install signage indicating location of a Bike Route at the following locations:

- Mill St. from Grand Ave. to the railroad tracks (1,600 ft.)
- Monterey and Buena Vista Streets, from Loomis to the railroad tracks (3,250 ft.)
- San Luis Drive from northern terminus to California (3,900 ft.)
- Fairview St. (400 ft.)
- Lizzie St. from Johnson Ave. to Fixlini St. (350 ft.)
- Bishop St. from Flora to Johnson (600 ft.)
- Jennifer St. Bridge to south end of Bushnell (2,350 ft.)
- Boulevard del Campo, Sinsheimer Park trail to the Railroad Safety Trail entrance/exit (400 ft.)
- Augusta St. from Bishop to Laurel (3,500 ft.)
- Laurel Ln. from Flora to Johnson (350 ft.)
- Southwood from Laurel to Sequoia (2,700 ft.)

**Project Length (feet):** 19,400

**Estimated Cost:** see notes

**Notes:** Per MUTCD, signage should be placed every quarter mile (1312 ft.) and at signalized intersections. Total cost for each sign, including labor and installation, is $500. Existing signage may reduce costs for some listed segments.

**Pave. Mgt. Zone:** 1, 3
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The Southern Area is generally bounded by the following: Hwy. 101, High Street, the Railroad tracks, and the southern City limit. See surrounding project areas for adjoining projects. Note the following:

- For presentation purposes, the entire Railroad Safety Trail is presented with the Eastern Area projects, even though it contains segments in the Northern and Southern sections of the City as well.
- For presentation purposes, the entire Bob Jones City to Sea Trail is presented with the Southern Area projects, even though it contains segments in the Western section of the City as well.

Projects contained in the Southern Area are:

Bob Jones Trail: Overall Project
- Marsh to Bianchi
- Bianchi Class I
- Bianchi to South
- South to Brook Class III
- Brook to Madonna
- Madonna Grade Separated Crossing
- Madonna to Elks
- Bridge Over Creek at Elks
- Elks to Prado
- Class II Connection to Prado
- Bridge over SLO Creek at Prado
- Prado to Los Osos Valley Road
- Grade Separated Crossing of Los Osos Valley Road
- LOVR to Octagon Barn
- Prado to Calle Joaquin

Continued
Southern Area projects continued:

A93  South Street Channelization at Broad Street
A94  Madonna/Higuera/South Channelization
A95  Roundhouse Ave. Class II
A96  South Hills / Margarita Area Connection
A97  MASP (Margarita Area Specific Plan) Magarita Area Bikeways
A98  MASP Prado East extension to Broad
      MASP AASP (Airport Area Specific Plan) Acacia Creek Bikeway:
      Overall Project
      A100  MASP Broad St. Crossing
      A101  MASP Rockview to Sports Field
      A102  AASP Sports Field to Tank Farm
      A103  AASP Santa Fe
      A104  AASP Santa Fe to Buckley
      A105  Industrial and Capitoliio Class II
      A106  Industrial to Bougainvillea
      A107  Industrial/Tank Farm Class I Bypass
      A108  AASP Tank Farm Road Class I Lanes
      A109  El Capitan/Poinsettia Class I Connection
      A110  MASP AASP Unocal Collector Bikeway
      A111  AASP Tank Farm Creek Class I
      A112  Buckley Road Bikeway Network: Overall Project
      A113  Vachell Lane Class II
      A114  Buckley Class II
      A115  Buckley Extension Class I and Class II
      A116  Buckley Class I path
      A117  Buckley Area, East Fork Bikeway
      A118  Class III Signage Projects in the Southern Area

Bob Jones City to Sea Trail:

Priority: First

School Zone: Hawthorne

C. L. Smith

Bishop Peak

Class: I

Project Length (feet): 18,138

Estimated Cost: see individual segments

Pave. Mgt. Zone 4, 5, 6

Intent: The intent of this project is to join the proposed SLO County Bob Jones City-to-Sea Trail with the downtown core and the Laguna Lake area businesses and neighborhoods.

Project Description: A bikeway facility connecting both: The Laguna Lake Park area and the west end of Marsh St. to the southern City Limit at South Higuera St. near the Octagon Barn area.

Notes: As does this plan, the Bicycle Transportation Plan updated May 2007, listed this as a large project with component segments. In that plan the naming convention was brought forward from the plan dated May 7th 2002, which listed the pieces as individual projects “BJT 1 - 12”. For this plan, each project segment has been renamed by logical location identifiers. The overall project consists of fourteen component segments. Breaking the project in to component segments allows them to be treated (funded and implemented) separately. Cost estimates shown here were updated from the Bob Jones City-to-Sea Trail cost estimate (see reference in “Related City Plans” section of this Plan. Only the overall project, listed here, has been ranked. Cross referencing of naming is supplied in Appendix H. See also, “Mid Higuera Street Enhancement Plan.”
### Bob Jones City to Sea Trail

#### Segment: Marsh to Bianchi

**School Zones:** Hawthorne  
**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 870  
**Estimated Cost:** $174,000  
**Pave. Mgt. Zone 4**

**Project Description:** East side of SLO Creek from Marsh St. to Bianchi Lane.  
**Notes:** Will require easements and possibly clearance of some older industrial structures to complete this segment. Assumes land dedication as part of property redevelopment. This project was previously known in previous Bicycle Transportation Plans as "BJT6".

### Bob Jones City to Sea Trail

#### Segment: Bianchi Class I

**School Zones:** Hawthorne  
**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 100  
**Estimated Cost:** $250,000  
**Pave. Mgt. Zone 4**

**Project Description:** Path crossing San Luis Creek.  
**Notes:** A Class I path is preferred. Providing bike and pedestrian access across the bridge is a high priority.
### Bob Jones City to Sea Trail

**Segment: Bianchi to South**

**School Zones:** Hawthorne

**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 1,340

**Estimated Cost:** $228,000

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 4**

**Project Description:** West side of SLO Creek from Bianchi Lane to South St. Includes a 197 ft. bridge over the creek at south end of segment to connect with west end of South Street, using only City property.

**Notes:** This project was previously known in the 2007 Bicycle Transportation Plan as “BJT7.” The project involves a significant bridge structure near South St.

### Bob Jones City to Sea Trail

**Segment: South to Brook Class III**

**School Zones:** Hawthorne

**Class:** III

**Project Length (feet):** 250

**Estimated Cost:** less than $10,000

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 4**

**Project Description:** At minimum, establish Class III routes along South and Brook streets to provide a complete bikeway.

**Notes:** Project may include traffic calming or be upgraded from Class III if traffic conditions warrant.
Bob Jones City to Sea Trail

**Segment: Brook to Madonna**

**School Zones:** Hawthorne

**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 810

**Estimated Cost:** $162,200

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 4, 5**

**Project Description:** East side of SLO Creek from south end of Brook to Madonna.

**Notes:** Assumes that Caltrans maintenance yard has been purchased as a public park and accommodates BJT. Assumes easement through property at end of Brook St. to access Caltrans property. This project was previously known as "BJT8".

---

**Segment: Madonna, Grade Separated Crossing**

**School Zones:** Hawthorne

**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 150

**Estimated Cost:** $44,000

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 4, 5**

**Project Description:** Grade separated crossing of Madonna Road, connecting to segments of the bikeway on the north and south sides of the road.

**Notes:** An under-crossing is the preferred type and would be installed on east side of SLO Creek. It will likely require reconfiguration of bank under bridge to create a clear passage area. This project was previously known as "BJT9".
Bob Jones
City to Sea Trail

**Segment: Madonna to Elks**

*School Zones: Hawthorne*

*Class: I*

**Project Length (feet):** 2,400

**Estimated Cost:** $850,000

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 5, 6**

*Project Description:* East side of SLO Creek, Madonna Road to Elks Lane. Includes a 66 ft. bridge over South Street Creek, just south of Caltrans property.

*Notes:* Construct as part of redevelopment of Caltrans site. Secure easements or real property and incorporate as part of property redevelopment and/or flood project. This project was previously known as "BJT5".

---

Bob Jones
City to Sea Trail

**Segment: Bridge Over Creek at Elks**

*School Zones: Hawthorne*

*Class: I*

**Project Length (feet):** 115

**Estimated Cost:** $200,000

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 5**

*Project Description:* Parallel bridge over SLO Creek at Elks Lane.

*Notes:* Secure easements or real property and incorporate as part of property redevelopment and/or flood project. This project was previously known as "BJT12".
**Bob Jones City to Sea Trail**

### Segment: Elks to Prado

**School Zones:** Hawthorne

**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 870

**Estimated Cost:** $422,000

**Pave. Mgt. Zone:** 5

**Project Description:** West side of SLO Creek from Elks to Prado.

**Notes:** There may be a variety of optional alignments available to address interim conditions. Secure easements or real property and incorporate as part of property redevelopment and/or flood project. If the “Class II Connection to Prado” is to be included, a Class I exit/entrance shall be included as part of this project. This project was previously known as “BJT4”.

---

**Bob Jones City to Sea Trail**

### Segment: Class II Connection to Prado

**School Zones:** Hawthorne

**Class:** II

**Project Length (feet):** 1000

**Estimated Cost:** less than $10,000

**Pave. Mgt. Zone:** 5

**Project Description:** If a roadway is constructed as shown in the Bob Jones City-to-Sea Trail Preliminary Alignment plans (segment 3 - sheet 3), Class II lanes shall be provided to connect with the Class I path along the creek alignment.

**Notes:** An exit/entrance to the Class I path shall be included for connection to these Class II lanes as part of the “Elks to Prado” section of the overall project.
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Bob Jones City to Sea Trail

Segment: Bridge over SLO Creek at Prado

School Zones: Hawthorne

Class: I

Project Length (feet): 148

Estimated Cost: $300,000

Pave. Mgt. Zone 5

Project Description: 148 feet parallel bridge over SLO Creek at Prado Rd. on north side of existing bridge.

Notes: South side Class I path included in expansion of road bridge. Build as part of replacement of bridge. This project was previously known as "BJT3".

Bob Jones City to Sea Trail

Segment: Prado to Los Osos Valley Road

School Zones: Hawthorne

Class: I

Completed!

4/7/2014

Project Length (feet): 300

Estimated Cost: $310,000

Pave. Mgt. Zone 5

Project Description: West side of SLO Creek from Prado to LOVR. Includes a bridge over Prefumo Creek at south end of Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Notes: Bikeway from Prado Road to bridge location has been constructed. Bridge and construction to LOVR still needed. This project was previously known in the 2007 Bicycle Transportation Plan as "BJT1".

The 2009 Grand Jury report, "Great Paths but Galling Gaps: Bicycle Riding in SLO County" included the following recommendation, "The City, working with Caltrans, should promptly connect that segment of the Bob Jones Trail that starts at Prado Road but ends just north of Los Osos Valley Road with LOVR."
**Bob Jones City to Sea Trail**

**Segment: Grade Separated Crossing of Los Osos Valley Road**

**School Zones:** Hawthorne

**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 640

**Estimated Cost:** $320,000

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 5**

**Project Description:** Provide a Class I grade separated crossing of Los Osos Valley Road, connecting the north and south segments of the path.

**Notes:** At grade connections to LOVR for entering and exiting the Bob Jones Trail on both the east and west side shall be included at this point.

Cost estimates included here reflect the cost of an under-crossing of LOVR.

The 2009 Grand Jury report, “Great Paths but Galling Gaps: Bicycle Riding in SLO County” included the following recommendation: “When the LOVR overpass at Highway 101 is improved, the Bob Jones Trail should pass under that heavily traveled street.”

---

**Bob Jones City to Sea Trail**

**Segment: LOVR to Octagon Barn**

**Priority:** See Main Project

**School Zones:** Hawthorne

**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 2,885

**Estimated Cost **: $550,000

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 5**

**Project Description:** East side of SLO Creek from LOVR to Octagon Barn

**Notes:** Segment is under County jurisdiction and would need to be integrated with agricultural operations. This project was previously known as “BJT11”. *Cost Estimate is from the 2011-13 Capital Improvement Plan.*
Bob Jones
City to Sea Trail

School Zones:
C.L. Smith

Class: I

Project Length (feet): 6,260
Estimated Cost: $1,878,000

Pave. Mgt. Zone 5

Segment: Prado to Calle Joaquin

Project Description: Provide Class I Path from Prado Rd., east side of drainage swale, south to Prefumo Creek and east to Calle Joaquin. Includes a grade separated crossing of Prefumo Creek to provide connections to Froom Ranch Way and Oceanaire Drive.

Notes: Various configurations can be considered depending on development pattern. This project was previously known as “BJT10”. Project cost responsibility = 100% developer.

South Street Channelization at Broad Street

Priority: First

School Zone: Hawthorne

Class: II

Project Length (feet): 100
Estimated Cost: unknown

Pave. Mgt. Zone 4, 9

Project Description: Install channelization on South at Broad (227) in both East and West bound directions.

Notes: Relation to the South Broad Street Corridor Plan. Project could be funded through the Corridor Plan. The project may require right-of-way (ROW) acquisition. This project was formerly Mis-7 in 2002 Bike Plan.
Appendix A: Implementation Projects - Southern Area

Madonna/Higuera/South Channelization

**Priority:** First

**School Zone:** Hawthorne

**Class:** II

**Project Description:** Install bike channelization through intersections for South Street and S. Higuera, Madonna and S. Higuera. This should incorporate all directions.

**Notes:** Right-of-way acquisition may be required impacting cost. The current layout of this multi-intersection presents three distinct challenge areas for bicyclists: 1) South bound on S. Higuera street forces bicyclists to the right of a two lane wide right-hand-turn. 2) North bound on S. Higuera needs additional right of way as Class II bike lane is dropped forcing bicyclists into vehicle lane. 3) North bound on Madonna has a difficult diverge lane transition prior to the intersection. Prior to relinquishing the intersection to the City, Caltrans installed a "Bike Box" at this leg/direction of the intersection in 2010 to assist with visibility issues related to left turning cyclists and straight through motorists. This facility is being evaluated for effectiveness. City of SLO Bicycle Count Data taken in 2008 show this intersection's use as seventh highest out of 27 locations surveyed, with a total count of 154. (This project was formerly Mis-8 in 2002 Bike Plan.)

**Intent:** Improve bike travel through the intersection. Reduce conflicts with vehicles.

**Priority:** Second

**School Zone:** Hawthorne

**Class:** II

**Project Description:** If/when Bishop Street is extended to Roundhouse, construct Class II lanes on Roundhouse Ave between Johnson and Santa Barbara Avenues including a grade separated crossing of railroad tracks.

**Notes:** Project is dependent upon a motor-vehicle grade separated crossing of railroad tracks. Estimated costs reflects 10% of cost for a Vehicle Grade Separated Crossing; Actual cost may vary to be included into cost of Vehicle Grade Separated Crossing.

**Project Length (feet):** 7,090

**Estimated Cost :** $800,000

---

Roundhouse Ave. Class II

**Priority:** Second

**School Zone:** Hawthorne

**Class:** II

**Project Description:** If/when Bishop Street is extended to Roundhouse, construct Class II lanes on Roundhouse Ave between Johnson and Santa Barbara Avenues including a grade separated crossing of railroad tracks.

**Notes:** Project is dependent upon a motor-vehicle grade separated crossing of railroad tracks. Actual cost may vary to be included into cost of Vehicle Grade Separated Crossing.

**Project Length (feet):** Roundhouse Ave. Class II

**Estimated Cost :** $800,000

---

Pave. Mgt. Zone 2
South Hills/Margarita Area Connection

**Priority:** First

**School Zone:** Hawthorne

**Class:** Other

**Project Length (feet):** 3,290

**Estimated Cost:** $800,000

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 3**

**Intent:** Provide a paved/unpaved bikeway from Exposition Drive and Blue Rock Road to Calle Jazmin as shown in the South Hills Natural Reserve Conservation Plan.

**Project Description:** Paved and Unpaved bikeway connection over South Hills from Exposition Drive to Margarita specific plan area.

**Notes:** Although a portion of the bikeway is unpaved, the project is included in the BTP because it is a component of an integrated circulation system. This project was formerly known as Mis 24 in the Bicycle Transportation Plan dated May 7, 2002. In it the cost associated with this project are noted as 70% City, 30% “TE” (Transportation Enhancement) grant. (Refer to Mis-24 from 2007 bike Plan).

Margarita Area Specific Plan, Margarita Area Bikeways

**School Zone:** Hawthorne

**Class:** I and II

**Project Length (feet):** see Specific Plan for details

**Estimated Cost:** see notes

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 3**

**Intent:** To implement bicycling facilities in the adopted Specific Plan.

**Project Description:** Margarita Area Bikeways. Install Class I and II bikeways in the Margarita Area, consistent with its adopted specific plan, when subdivisions are processed.

**Notes:** Project is not ranked and no cost estimate is provided since it is a construction/development driven project. This applies to the internal bicycle facilities, not the regional facilities (Prado Road).

This project was formerly known as Mis 26 in the Bicycle Transportation Plan dated May 7, 2002. In it the cost associated with this project are noted as 100% developer.
Margarita Area Specific Plan, Prado East extension to Broad

Priority: First

School Zone: Hawthorne

Class: I and II

Project Length (feet): 17,500

Estimated Cost: see notes

Pave. Mgt. Zone 3

Intent: Provide cross-town connectivity from the existing eastern terminus of Prado Road to Broad Street.

Project Description: Class I and II bike lanes on both sides, from the east end of Prado continuing to Broad street.

Notes: A project ranking has been included as this roadway provides regional connectivity. No project cost estimate is provided because it is a construction/development driven project.

See Figure 12, “Circulation Plan” of the Margarita Area Specific Plan, in the Community Development pages of the City of San Luis Obispo web site: www.slocity.org.

Acacia Creek Bikeway:

Priority: Second

School Zone: Hawthorne

Class: I & II

Project Length (feet): 12,480

Estimated Cost: see notes

Pave. Mgt. Zone 3

Intent: The intent is to create an off roadway route, connecting existing S. Broad St. neighborhoods north of Acacia creek with the Sports Field, proposed Prado, Tank Farm and Buckley Road Bikeways.

Project Description: Creates a series of Class I paths and Class II bike lanes within the Specific Plan Area.

Notes: The overall project consists of five component pieces. The Bicycle Transportation Plan, dated May 7th 2002, listed these as individual projects “Act 1 - 5”. The bikeway system bridges across both the Margarita Area and Airport Area Specific Plan areas. It also has a relationship to the Tank Farm Road area class I’s and the existing Class I that joins Broad St. to Sacramento Dr. The overall project is development driven, therefore no cost estimate has been provided.
### Acacia Creek Bikeway

**Segment: Broad St. Crossing**

- **School Zone:** Hawthorne
- **Class:** I

- **Project Description:** Grade separated crossing at Broad Street between existing path accessing Sacramento Drive and Rockview.

- **Notes:** Will require feasibility analysis and approval from the California Department of Fish and Game and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Location links to the Eastern border of the Margarita Area Specific Plan.

- **Project Length (feet):** 280

- **Estimated Cost:** see overall project notes

- **Pave. Mgt. Zone 3**

---

### Acacia Creek Bikeway

**Segment: Rockview to Sports Field**

- **School Zone:** Hawthorne
- **Class:** I

- **Project Description:** Class I path; Rockview to south end of sports field complex. Passes along west side of creek, under the extension of Prado Road and will be integral to the Sports Field Complex.

- **Project Length (feet):** 3,835

- **Estimated Cost:** see overall project notes

- **Notes:** Project section located within the Margarita Area Specific Plan.

- **Pave. Mgt. Zone 3**
Acacia Creek Bikeway

**Segment: Sports Field to Tank Farm**

**School Zone:** Hawthorne  
**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 1,550  
**Estimated Cost:** see overall project notes

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 3**

**Project Description:** Class I path: West side of creek from sports field complex to Tank Farm Rd. shifting west to intersect with Santa Fe Road at its proposed intersection with Tank Farm.

**Notes:** Project section located within the Airport Area Specific Plan.

---

Acacia Creek Bikeway

**Segment: Santa Fe**

**School Zone:** Hawthorne  
**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 1,025  
**Estimated Cost:** see overall project notes

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 3**

**Project Description:** Class I path: From Tank Farm Road south and parallel to Santa Fe to south side of creek.

**Notes:** Project section located within the Airport Area Specific Plan. Sante Fe Road extension would include separated bikeway adjoining new creek bridge. The cost breakdown responsibility is Developer - 100%. Part of AASP funded flood control project and area impact fees.
Acacia Creek Bikeway

**Segment: Santa Fe to Buckley**

School Zone: Hawthorne

Class: I & II

**Project Length (feet):** 5,790

**Estimated Cost:** see overall project notes

Pave. Mgt. Zone 3

**Project Description:** Class I path located on east side of creek corridor from Santa Fe until it parallels the southern boundary of Union Oil Property; then it will bridge the creek (40m clear span structure) and cross to the west side and extend to north end of Esperanza. Install Class II facilities along Esperanza Lane to Buckley Road.

**Notes:** Project section located within the Airport Area Specific Plan.

The cost breakdown responsibility is Developer - 100%. Part of AASP funded flood control project and area impact fees.

---

**Industrial & Capitolio Class II**

**Priority:** Second

**School Zone:** Hawthorne

**Class:** II

**Project Length (feet):** 5,680

**Estimated Cost:** $30,000

Pave. Mgt. Zone 3

**Project Description:** Construct Class II lanes on Industrial Way from Broad St. to the eastern end near the RR tracks; and Capitolio Way from Broad St to Sacramento Dr.

**Notes:** This project was part of the 2007 bicycle transportation plan and included Sacramento Drive at that time. Class II lanes were created on Sacramento during a regular pavement management update while that version of the plan was in place. "Sharrows" were installed on both Industrial and Capitolio as an interim solution, balancing local area business parking needs and current bicycling rates. This Class II lane project is being kept in place to allow future need study. Overall travel rates are anticipated to increase with the expansion of the surrounding areas. The installation of the planned RR crossing at Industrial may also have an impact.
### Industrial to Bougainvillla

**Priority:** Second  
**School Zone:** Los Ranchos  
**Class:** I  
**Project Length (feet):** not applicable  
**Estimated Cost:** less than $10,000  

**Project Description:** Provide a Class I bikeway connection from Industrial Way to Bougainvillla St., utilizing the existing homeowner association (HOA) linear parkway.  

**Notes:** The connection existed previously until the gate was welded shut by the HOA. The project has a relationship to the "Industrial to Tank Farm Class I" project, as well as the Railroad Safety Trail extension between Orcutt and Tank Farm, and the GSX of the railroad at Industrial.

### Industrial/Tank Farm Class I Bypass

**Priority:** Second  
**School Zone:** Los Ranchos  
**Class:** I  
**Project Length (feet):** 1,000  
**Estimated Cost:** $300,000  

**Project Description:** Create a paved path along the drainage at the backside of the Marigold Center.  

**Notes:** Concern has been expressed about bicyclists using the parking lot as a bypass and way to stay off Broad Street, denoting the need for the proposed facility. Implementation of this project needs to address traffic concerns at the entrance/exits, especially on the Tank Farm Road side. This project has a relationship to the proposed "Industrial to Bougainvillla Connection" project, as well as the Railroad Safety Trail extension from Orcutt to Tank Farm Road, and the grade separated crossing of the railroad at Industrial. Prior implementation of these other projects may impact the priority of this project.
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### Airport Area Specific Plan
#### Tank Farm Road Class I Lanes

**Priority:** Second  
**School Zone:** Los Ranchos  
**Class:** I  

**Project Length (feet):** 9,200  
**Estimated Cost:** see notes  

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 3**

**Project Description:** Construct Class I lanes on both sides of Tank Farm Road between Santa Fe Rd. and the planned road known as the “Unocal Collector” in the Airport Area Specific Plan.

**Notes:** This project supports the Airport Area Specific Plan (AASP). Relationships exist with all other AASP bikeways, along with Margarita Area Specific Plan bikeways, including the proposed Tank Farm Creek Class I Bikeway, Buckley Class I and Class II projects, the Acacia Creek Bikeway System and the East Fork of San Luis Creek Class I project. The overall project is development driven, therefore no cost estimate has been provided.

**Intent:** Provide Class I connectivity between the Tank Farm Creek and Acacia Creek Class I bikeways, per the Airport Area Specific Plan.

### El Capitan/Poinsettia Class I Connection

**Priority:** Second  
**School Zone:** Los Ranchos  
**Class:** I  

**Project Length (feet):** 175  
**Estimated Cost:** $25,000  

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 3**

**Project Description:** Construct a Class I connection between El Capitan and Poinsettia.

**Intent:** Provide a safe, all season, connection to the existing Class I where use had indicated the need.
### Margarita Area Specific Plan & Airport Area Specific Plan, Unocal Collector Bikeway

**Priority:** First

**School Zone:** Los Ranchos, Hawthorne

**Class:** II or I

**Project Length (feet):** 2,800

**Estimated Cost:** see notes

**Pave. Mgt. Zone:** 3

**Intent:** Create a bikeway connection between the proposed eastern extension of Prado Road and Tank Farm Road, along the western segment of these roadways.

**Project Description:** Create a Class II bike lane on the roadway known as the "Unocal Collector" in the Airport Area and Margarita Area Specific Plans. If the roadway is not created this plan calls for the creation of a Class I facility along this general alignment instead.

**Notes:** The Class II project is part of both the Airport Area Specific Plan (see figure 6-2 of that plan) and Margarita Area Specific Plan (see Figure 12 of that plan). Relationships exist with the "Prado East Connection to Broad" project, as well as all AASP bikeways including the proposed Tank Farm Road Class I Bikeways, Buckley Class I and Class II projects, the Acacia Creek Trail System and the East Fork of San Luis Creek Class I project. This project will be funded 100% by the developer. The project is development driven, therefore no cost estimate has been provided.

### Airport Area Specific Plan, Tank Farm Creek Class I

**Priority:** Second

**School Zone:** Los Ranchos, Hawthorne

**Project Length (feet):** 6,745

**Estimated Cost:** see notes

**Pave. Mgt. Zone:** 5

**Intent:** Create an off-roadway connection between the mid section of Tank Farm Rd. and Buckley.

**Project Description:** Class I facility from Tank Farm Rd. to Buckley Rd. extending along the western edge of the tank farm property south of Tank Farm Road, cross the small drainage swale and extend along the creek’s western edge through the Avila Ranch property to Buckley Rd.

**Notes:** Part of Airport Area Development. Project is within the Airport Area Specific Plan. Relationships exist with all other AASP bikeways including the proposed Tank Farm Road Class I Bikeways, Buckley Class I and Class II projects, the Acacia Creek Bikeway System and the East Fork of San Luis Creek Class I project. The project is development driven, therefore no cost estimate has been provided.
### Buckley Road Bikeway Network

**Priority:** Second  

**School Zone:** Los Ranchos  

**Class:** I and II  

**Project Length (feet):**  
- Class I = 15,665  
- Class II = 36,210  

**Estimated Cost:** see notes  

**Project Description:** Class I paths and Class II lanes providing bicycle facility connectivity between Broad and S. Higuera St. along with connecting to the proposed Acacia Creek and Tank Farm Creek paths.  

**Notes:** Projects are within the Airport Area Specific Plan. Relationships exist with proposed Tank Farm Creek Bike path, Acacia Creek Bikeway system and the East Fork of San Luis Creek Class I project. If Buckley Road is extended to S. Higuera, Class II lanes would be installed as part of construction. The portions of the overall project which are contained within the Airport Area Specific Plan are development driven, therefore no cost estimate has been provided for these segments.

### Segment: Vachell Lane Class II

**School Zone:** Los Ranchos  

**Class:** II  

**Project Length (feet):** 5,010  

**Estimated Cost:** see overall project notes  

**Project Description:** Class II bike lanes on both sides of Vachell Lane, S. Higuera to Buckley.  

**Notes:** Will require widening of shoulders on Vachell Lane and may be completed in segments as properties develop under City/County jurisdiction. For developed properties, will require removal of curb parking. Avila Ranch development installs with frontage improvements. The cost breakdown responsibility is: Developer = 100%. Project is within the Airport Area Specific Plan. Relationships exist with proposed Buckley Class II, Buckley Extension Class II, Buckley Class I Paths, Tank Farm Creek Bike path, the Acacia Creek Bikeway System and the East Fork of San Luis Creek Class I project.
### Segment: Buckley Class II

**Intent:** To provide space for both bicyclists and motorists.

**Project Description:** Class II bike lanes on both sides of Buckley from Vachell to Broad.

**Notes:** Will require shoulder widening across agricultural parcels and bridges and culverts extended. May be completed in segments as properties develop under City/County jurisdiction. The cost breakdown responsibility is: Developer = 100%. Project is within the Airport Area Specific Plan. Relationships exist with proposed Vachell Class II, Buckley Extension Class II, Buckley Class I Paths, Tank Farm Creek Bike path, the Acacia Creek Bikeway System and the East Fork of San Luis Creek Class I project. Although this project section only includes Buckley Road from Broad to Vachell, when Buckley Road is extended to S. Higuera, Class II lanes would be installed with roadway. Buckley Road extension is funded by Airport Area Specific Plan fees.

**Project Length (feet):**
- **Class II** = 28,400

**Estimated Cost:**
- **Class II** = $10,000

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 5**

### Segment: Buckley Extension Class I and Class II

**Intent:** To provide space for bicyclists and motorists, and connectivity to bicycling facilities proposed for Buckley Rd.

**School Zone:** Los Ranchos

**Class:** I and II

**Project Description:** Class I bike lane on the north side of Buckley, and Class II bike lanes on both sides of Buckley, from S. Higuera to Vachell.

**Notes:** Project is adjacent to the Airport Area Specific Plan but provides connectivity with the planning area’s other bicycling projects. Relationships exist with proposed Vachell Class II, Buckley Class I, Buckley Class I Paths projects, Tank Farm Creek Bike path, the Acacia Creek Bikeway System and the East Fork of San Luis Creek Class I project.

**Project Length (feet):**
- **Class I** = 1,400
- **Class II** = 2,800

**Estimated Cost:**
- **Class I** = $420,000
- **Class II** = $10,000

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 5**
Buckley Road Bikeway Network

Segment: Buckley Class I Path

Intent: To provide bicyclists an off street facility to navigate along Buckley Rd.

Project Description: Class I bike path along the north side of Buckley from Vachell St. to Broad

Notes: Project is within the Airport Area Specific Plan. The cost breakdown responsibility is: Airport Area Specific Plan fees = 100%. Relationships exist with proposed Vachell Class II, Buckley Class II, Buckley Extension Class II projects, Tank Farm Creek Bike path, the Acacia Creek Bikeway System and the East Fork of San Luis Creek Class I project.

School Zone: Los Ranchos

Class: I

Project Length (feet): 14,265

Estimated Cost: see overall project notes

Pave. Mgt. Zone 5

Buckley Area, East Fork Bikeway

Priority: Second

School Zone: Los Ranchos

Class: I

Project Length (feet): 6,785

Estimated Cost: see notes

Pave. Mgt. Zone

Intent: Create an off-roadway network of bike paths.

Project Description: Class I path on the south side of Buckley Rd following the east fork of San Luis Creek, from Vachell Lane to the point where Esperanza would extend straight to the creek.

Notes: Has a relationship with Buckley Road Bikeway Network, as well as the Tank Farm Creek Class I. Supports the Airport Area Specific Plan. Projects which are contained within the Airport Area Specific Plan are development driven, therefore no cost estimate has been provided.
Class III Signage Projects:
Southern Area

School Zone: Hawthorne Los Ranchos

**Intent:** Provide signed bike routes, as shown on the Bicycle Transportation Network Map, connecting other bicycling related facilities within the Southern Area of town (portions of the City of San Luis Obispo Pavement Management Zones 3, 4, and 5).

**Project Description:** Install signage indicating location of a Bike Route at the following locations:
- Emily St. from High St. to south end of Emily (750 ft.)
- Victoria Ave. from Broad St. to Francis Ave. (1,000 ft.)
- Francis Ave. from Victoria Ave. to east end of Francis (350 ft.)
- Lawrence Drive from Broad St. to Garibaldi Ave. (850 ft.)
- McMillan Ave from north end of McMillan to Orcutt Rd. (1,300 ft.)
- Morrison St. from McMillan to east end of Morrison St. (250 ft.)
- Woodbridge and Exposition between Broad and South (4,350 ft.)
- Beebee from South St. to Bridge St. (600 ft.)
- Bridge St. between Meadow Park and Higuera (1,450 ft.)
- South St. between Higuera and western end of South St. (500 ft.)
- Brook St. from South St. to south end of Brook (200 ft.)
- Elks Lane from Higuera St. to Prado Road (2,700 ft.)
- Margarita Ave. and Calle Jazmin (2,500 ft.)
- Industrial from Broad St. to Damon Garcia Park entrance (350 ft.)
- Poinsettia from Tank Farm to Fuller (1,700 ft.)
- Fuller from Poinsettia to Broad St. (1,300 ft.)

**Notes:** The intersection of McMillan Ave and Orcutt is ranked 5th highest for bicycle/motor vehicle collisions within the 5 year trend of 2005-2010, having a total of 3 collisions. The intersection of Broad and Woodbridge is also ranked 5th highest for bicycle/motor vehicle collisions within the 5 year trend of 2005-2010, having a total of 3 collisions. These projects all have relationship to Railroad Bike Plan. Per MUTCD, signage should be placed every quarter mile (1312 ft.) and at signalized intersections. Total cost for each sign, including labor and installation, is $500. Existing signage may reduce costs for some listed segments.

**Project Length (feet):** 20,150

**Estimated Cost:** see notes

Pave. Mgmt. Zone 3, 4, 5
Map 10: Western Area

The Western Area is generally bounded by the following: The Western City Limit north and west of High Street, and Hwy. 101. See surrounding project areas for adjoining projects. Note the following:

- The entire Bob Jones City to Sea Trail is presented with the Southern Area projects, even though it contains segments in the Western section of the City as well.

Projects contained in the Western Area are:

- Laguna Lake Bikeways - A
- Laguna Lake Bikeways - B
- Laguna Lake Bikeways - C
- Bridge to Laguna Middle School
- Madonna to Laguna Lake Traverse, Class I Path
- Laguna Lake Park to Oceanaire Path
- Prado West Connection
- Los Osos Valley Road Channelization
- Class III Signage Projects: Western Area
Appendix A: Implementation Projects - Western Area

### Laguna Lake Bikeways - A

**Priority:** First  
**School Zone:** C. L. Smith  
**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 10,000  
**Estimated Cost:** $5,000,000  
**Pave. Mgt. Zone:** 6

**Intent:** Create a link between Madonna Road and Foothill Blvd. which does not require using LOVR, providing direct access to O’Connor Way. Overall, the Laguna Lake Bikeways A, B, C should create off roadway links between northern and western City neighborhoods, City parks, and Laguna Middle School.

**Project Description:** Create a Class I bikeway from the north end of Laguna Lake Park to lower Foothill area at O’Connor.

**Notes:** Requires approval of Madonna ranch owners; path is in flood zone, may need elevated sections. Note relationship to Laguna Lake Bikeways B and Laguna Lake Bikeways C, Class I paths connecting to the Laguna Middle School neighborhood at Diablo Drive, and upper Foothill neighborhood area. Portions of the overall project (parts A, B and C) were formerly known as MIS 18 in the Bicycle Transportation Plan dated May 7, 2002. Cost associated with this project are noted as 30% from “TE/BTA” grant (Transportation Enhancement/Bicycle Transportation Act) in the 2002 plan. Supports Laguna Lake Park Master Plan.

### Laguna Lake Bikeways - B

**Priority:** First  
**School Zone:** C. L. Smith  
**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 3,690  
**Estimated Cost:** $1,800,000  
**Pave. Mgt. Zone:** 6

**Intent:** Create a bike path connection to the Laguna Middle School neighborhood. Overall the Laguna Lake Bikeways A, B, C should create off roadways links between northern and western City neighborhoods, City parks, and Laguna Middle School.

**Project Description:** Create a Class I bikeway connecting the proposed Laguna Lake Bikeways A, a Class I bikeway from the north end of Laguna Lake Park to lower Foothill area at O’Connor Way, to the Laguna Middle School neighborhood at Diablo Drive.

**Notes:** Two conceptual route options have been identified. The bridge option may require amendments to the Laguna Lake Parks Master Plan and agency approvals. The optional route around Laguna Lake may require reconfiguration of Los Osos Valley Road right-of-way between Diablo Way and the City Limit. Has a relationship to Laguna Lake Bikeways A, Laguna Lake Bikeway C and the Laguna Lake Park Master Plan. Portions of the overall project (parts A, B and C) were formerly known as MIS 18 in the Bicycle Transportation Plan dated May 7, 2002. Transportation Act in the 2002 plan.
**Laguna Lake Bikeways - C**

**Intent:** Create a bike path connection to the Laguna Middle School neighborhood. Overall the Laguna Lake Bikeways A, B, C should create off-roadways links between northern and western City neighborhoods, City parks, and Laguna Middle School.

**Priority:** First

**School Zone:** C. L. Smith

**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 9,970

**Estimated Cost:** $6,000,000

**Project Description:** Create a Class I bikeway connecting the proposed Laguna Lake Bikeways A, a Class I bikeway from the north end of Laguna Lake Park to lower Foothill area at O’Connor Way, to upper Foothill Blvd. neighborhood area.

**Notes:** Requires approval of Madonna ranch owners, and may require acquisition of property in Foothill neighborhood. Path is in flood zone, may need elevated sections. Has a relationship to Laguna Lake Bikeways A, Laguna Lake Bikeways B and the Laguna Lake Park Master Plan. Portions of the overall project (parts A, B and C) were formerly known as MIS 18 in the Bicycle Transportation Plan dated May 7, 2002.

---

**Bridge to Laguna Middle School**

**Intent:** Provide an off-street connection between neighborhoods (Laguna Ln. and Oceanaire Dr.) and improved bicycle and pedestrian access to C.L. Smith Elementary School and Laguna Middle School. Project allows users to travel between neighborhoods without having to utilize the Los Osos Valley Road corridor.

**Priority:** First

**School Zone:** C.L. Smith

**Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 500

**Estimated Cost:** $500,000

**Project Description:** Install a bicycle/pedestrian bridge over Prefumo Creek and a pathway connection between Vista del Lago and Oceanaire Dr.

**Notes:** This project was the desired route for a 2007 BTP project that received Safe Routes to School funding. The City did not own land or easements needed on the south side of the creek. Unable to obtain an easement, the City developed a Class I facility running parallel to LOVR between Oceanaire and Laguna Lane. If easements can be obtained in the future, this project should be pursued.
**Madonna to Laguna Lake Traverse, Class I Path**

- **Priority:** First
- **School Zone:** C.L. Smith
- **Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 1,650
**Estimated Cost:** $825,000

**Project Description:** Create a Class I path from the Madonna Inn to Laguna Lake Park, behind and above businesses along the north side of Madonna Rd.

**Notes:** Has a relationship to the existing Class I path that terminates at the corner of Madonna Rd. and the Madonna Inn entrance, the proposed "Oceanaire to Existing East end of Prado Class I", and the proposed "Laguna Lake Bikeways". Bike counts taken in 2008 show that the intersection of Higuera/Madonna was the seventh highest with a count of 154.

---

**Laguna Lake Park to Oceanaire, Path**

- **Priority:** First
- **School Zone:** C. L. Smith
- **Class:** I

**Project Length (feet):** 1,120
**Estimated Cost:** $224,000

**Project Description:** Class I path on west side of Madonna Road from Dalidio Dr. to Oceanaire Dr.

**Notes:** Can utilize existing Laguna Lake Park paved path for a portion of the bikeway. May require bridge structure over Laguna Lake outlet.

Note the following project relationships: “Prado West Connection”, “Laguna Lake Bikeways A, B, C”, “Madonna to Laguna Lake Traverse, Class I Path”.
Prado West Connection

**Priority:** First

**School Zone:** C. L. Smith

**Class:** I and II

**Project Length (feet):**
- 15,040 Class I
- 15,040 Class II
- 340 Bridge

**Estimated Cost:** $9,881,000

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 5**

**Intent:** Provide connectivity from the planned "Prado East extension to Broad" project, as a main east/west connector across town to shopping and, most notably, the City’s single middle school.

**Project Description:** Class I bike paths and Class II lanes on Prado Road from the western boundary of the Margarita Area Specific Plan, continuing on to a grade separated crossing of US 101, and then continuing on Dalidio Rd. to Laguna Lake Park.

**Notes:**
- There is a need for a Class I crossing of Hwy 101 between LOVR and Madonna roads. Either a bicycle/ped only crossing, or a motor vehicle crossing with both Class I and Class II facilities will suffice.
- The need for Class II lanes along this project length should be evaluated as developments are proposed along the corridor.
- Note the following project relationships: "Prado East extension to Broad", "Prado to Calle Joaquin" of the Bob Jones Trail project, "Laguna Lake Park to Oceanaire Path".
- The "Estimate Cost" shown here reflects the bicycle related costs if a bicycle/pedestrian bridge were to be constructed in lieu of a motor vehicle crossing. If a motor vehicle crossing is constructed, the actual bicycle-related costs would be lessened by being partially absorbed into the cost of a motor vehicle bridge.

Los Osos Valley Road Channelization

**Priority:** First

**School Zone:** C. L. Smith

**Class:** II

**Project Length (feet):** 50

**Estimated Cost:** less than $10,000

**Pave. Mgt. Zone 5**

**Intent:** To make it easier for cyclists to navigate the intersection and proceed over the freeway. The execution of this project needs to allow motorists a long visual chance to see bicyclists moving into the straight through bike channel as the right-hand-lane changes into a right-turn only lane.

**Project Description:** Redefine and reinforce channelization on SB LOVR at Calle Joaquin.

**Notes:** Three major factors should be considered when designing this bicycle channelization: 1) traffic volume and speed; 2) slight bend in LOVR and roadside shrubs impair both motorists ability to see bikes traveling ahead of them when approaching this intersection traveling south, and bicyclists ability to see the motorists approaching from behind; and 3) traffic entering from eastern side of Calle Joaquin with the intent to get into the RHT lane of LOVR to enter Hwy. 101 - i.e., crossing all lanes of traffic. Project will be completed as part of LOVR interchange project which is proposed to be funded by grants, traffic impact fees, and City funds.
Class III Signage Projects: Western Area

Intent: Provide bike routes, as shown on the Bicycle Transportation Network Map, connecting other bicycling related facilities within the Western Area of town (City of San Luis Obispo Pavement Management Area 6, and a portion of 5).

Project Description: Install signage indicating location of a Bike Route at the following locations:

- Laguna Lake Park roadways (3,000 ft.)
- Oceanaire Ct. from Galleon Way to Los Osos Valley Rd. (750 ft.)
- Galleon Way from Atascadero St. to Oceanaire Ct. (1,600 ft.)
- Atascadero St. from Oceanaire Ct. to Galleon Way (1,400 ft.)
- Oceanaire Ct. from Madonna to Atascadero St. (250 ft.)
- Oceanaire from Madonna to Cayucos Dr. (1,800 ft.)
- Calle Joaquin from Los Osos Valley Road to existing Class II on Calle Joaquin (1,150 ft.)

Notes: Per MUTCD, signage should be placed every quarter mile (1312 ft.) and at signalized intersections. Total cost for each sign, including labor and installation, is $500. Existing signage may reduce costs for some listed segments.

School Zone: C. L. Smith

Class: III

Project Length (feet): 9,950

Estimated Cost: see notes

Pave. Mgt. Zone 5, 6
## Appendix B: Implementation Actions

### Implementation Actions Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo Department of Community Development</td>
<td>Subdivision regulations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10.1</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo Department of Public Works: Transportation Division</td>
<td>Update and publish a City bike map</td>
<td>Every 10 Years</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.19.1</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo Public Works Department: Transportation Staff</td>
<td>Maintain an inventory of locations where signal actuation pavement legends are installed</td>
<td>Annual Paving Schedule</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.22.1</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo Public Works Department: Transportation Staff</td>
<td>Revise City Engineering Standards to include current best practices for bollard use</td>
<td>Engineering Standards are updated biennially</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.22.2</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo Department of Public Works: Transportation Division</td>
<td>Maintain an inventory of bollards, review for compliance with City Engineering Standards, and upgrade when necessary during regular maintenance</td>
<td>Annual Paving Schedule</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51.1</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo Department of Public Works: Transportation Division</td>
<td>For efficiency, installation of the legends and associated signage should be implemented as part of the City's Pavement Management Program.</td>
<td>Annual Paving Schedule</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.53.1</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo Department of Public Works: Transportation Division</td>
<td>Develop a volunteer program for organizations, businesses, and private citizens to contribute towards maintenance efforts by adopting a bicycle facility. The program shall also generate publicity for the group's service.</td>
<td>Upon adoption of BTP 2013</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.57.1</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo Department of Public Works: Transportation Division</td>
<td>Inspect bikeways biennially and prepare a report identifying the problems, recommended action, priority, and timeframe for correction.</td>
<td>Every 2 Years</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.57.2</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo Department of Public Works: Administration</td>
<td>Maintain a reporting button on the City's website to aid the public in reporting problems.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.58.1</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo Department of Public Works: Administration</td>
<td>Provide bicycling specific information on the City's &quot;Construction Update&quot; web page when any City bikeways are included in the construction area.</td>
<td>Jan-13</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Date of Completion</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td></td>
<td>The BAC shall consider BFC review feedback when recommending projects during the City's goal setting process and during the update process of this Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td></td>
<td>The BAC shall update the Bicycle Transportation Plan at least every 5 years, or as required to maintain eligibility for BTA grants, and consider amendments when circumstances arise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrate Bicycle Transportation Plan projects into the City's five-year Capital Improvement program budget and Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td></td>
<td>As part of the City's two-year financial planning process, the Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) shall: Provide the City Council with a request for annual funding of miscellaneous bicycling facilities that include bicycle racks, lockers, and minor intersection or segment improvements such as striping.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reserve a minimum of two percent (2%) of its Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds for bicycling projects and programs. Candidate activities for use of these funds include, but are not limited to: Support cost of bicycling safety education and training; Minor capital projects such as bicycle parking, facility signage, and drain grate upgrades; Planning, engineering, and environmental studies for bicycle transportation capital projects; and, Bicycling promotional activities and materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct bike counts at key intersections throughout the City at least every two years to obtain comparable data regarding bicycle usage within the City.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Present citywide bicycle count data to the Bicycle Advisory Committee for their consideration and input.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Present bicycling related statistics from the City's Annual Traffic Safety Report to the Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) for their consideration and input.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Bicycle Advisory Committee shall review this Implementation Actions Matrix in Appendix B at least every two years to evaluate progress on the actions described in this Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix C: Bikeway Width Design Standards**

These standards shall establish bike facility widths within the City of San Luis Obispo. These standards shall meet or exceed the minimum standards described in the California Highway Design Manual (HDM), and the California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).

Existing bikeways that do not meet the standards shown, are accepted as part of the City's bikeway network and may be upgraded if funding is available and significant environmental impacts can be avoided.

Construction of short segments of Class II Bike lanes should generally be consistent with the design of adjoining bikeway segments, unless fully meeting these standards will provide significant improvement to the comfort or safety of bicyclists.

### Bikeway Facility Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Minimum Width</th>
<th>Notes and Additional Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I, or Multi Use Path</td>
<td>12 ft.</td>
<td>2' shoulders shall also be included on either side of all Class I facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bikeway Facility Widths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Minimum Width</th>
<th>Notes and Additional Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class II Channelization</td>
<td>5 ft.</td>
<td>Where channelization adjoins a right turn lane used as a designated bus or truck route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>5 ft.</td>
<td>Additional guidance provided in Section 5-93-2 of the City Traffic Code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>6.5 ft.</td>
<td>Additional guidance provided in Section 5-93-2 of the City Traffic Code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>8 ft.</td>
<td>Additional guidance provided in Section 5-93-2 of the City Traffic Code.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Guidance

- 2' shoulders shall also be included on either side of all Class I facilities.
- University approves the City Traffic Code.
- Minimum Width:
  - 12 ft.
  - 5 ft.
  - 6.5 ft.
  - 8 ft.

### Bikeway Facility Widths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Minimum Width</th>
<th>Notes and Additional Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I, or Multi Use Path</td>
<td>12 ft.</td>
<td>2' shoulders shall also be included on either side of all Class I facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bikeway Design Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class I, or Multi Use Path</th>
<th>Minimum Width</th>
<th>Notes and Additional Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I, or Multi Use Path</td>
<td>12 ft.</td>
<td>2' shoulders shall also be included on either side of all Class I facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bikeway Facility Widths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Minimum Width</th>
<th>Notes and Additional Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I, or Multi Use Path</td>
<td>12 ft.</td>
<td>2' shoulders shall also be included on either side of all Class I facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bikeway Design Standards

- Additional guidance provided in Section 5-93-2 of the City Traffic Code.
Appendix D: Bikeway Sections

Class I Bike Path

Class I Bike Path in Creek setback

- 20 ft Creek setback
- Fencing to protect creek habitat

Appendix D: Bikeway Sections
Class I Bike Path near Railroad

Class I Bike Path near Creek

Potential for native plants in full width of buffer

Fencing to protect creek habitat

12 ft

2 ft 20 ft

native planting buffer
Appendix E:
Bicycle Boulevard Report Card

The Bicycle Boulevard Report Card was developed by City Staff (with input from the Bicycle Advisory Committee) to evaluate the effectiveness of each bicycle boulevard. This tool is to be used for both planning considerations and a point in time snapshot of a facility. When planning/installing a new facility, be aware that implementation timing is a factor in both neighborhood impact perception, and user perception of the facility. Because of this, it is critical that implementation be done in a timely and cohesive manner. It is important in that it may skew public perception for development of further Bicycle Boulevard facilities, but it will not have a lasting impact on the ranking of an individual facility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motorist Speed:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% before = _____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% after = _____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorist Volume:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume before = _____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume after = _____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Volume:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume before = _____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume after = _____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stops:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Judge, relative to adjacent route)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge Intersections:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Judge, relative to adjacent route or prior facility)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Impact:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Perception)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- 85% speed shall be calculated using same criteria (day, time, length and formula)
- Motorist Volume should be judged with relative area trends considered.
- A “challenge intersection” is one that an inexperienced cyclist would avoid.
- Neighborhood impact includes: parking, lighting, streetscape, secondary impact.

Average =
Appendix F:
Bicycle Parking Design and Installation Information

Guidance for bicycle parking is provided in the following documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bicycle Transportation Plan</th>
<th>Community Design Guidelines</th>
<th>Zoning Regulations</th>
<th>&quot;Racks with Plaques&quot; Donation Program</th>
<th>General Plan Circulation Element</th>
<th>City Engineering Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Policy Direction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Spaces Required</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Requirements</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Between 2007 and 2012, the City of San Luis Obispo made significant progress implementing the City’s Bicycle Transportation Plan (BTP). The table “2007 Bicycle Transportation Plan Accomplishments” lists both installed Plan projects, and actions or installations resulting from Plan policies. The table “Summary of Changes for the 2013 BTP” allows for comparison of changes from the 2007 BTP to the 2013 BTP.

### 2007 Bicycle Transportation Plan Accomplishments (as of 12/31/12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Policy Reference</th>
<th>Description of Accomplishment</th>
<th>2007 Project</th>
<th>2007 Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Safety Trail</td>
<td>A half mile section of the trail was completed as described in the three projects listed below, connecting the Cal Poly campus and extending south to Hathway St. This corridor has had the highest bicycle traffic counts since 1996.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RBP2)</td>
<td>2009, 2011 - Trail parallel to California Blvd., between Foothill Blvd. and Hathway St., including a bicycle phase signalized crossing of CA, was completed.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RBP8)</td>
<td>2009 - Trail parallel to California Blvd., between Campus Way and the north side of the stadium.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RBP7)</td>
<td>2010 - Trail parallel to California Blvd., between Foothill Blvd. and Campus Way.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Jones Orcutt Road Class I Connection</td>
<td>2008 - A one mile section of the trail was built from Prado Road to just north of Los Osos Valley Road.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(BUT1)</td>
<td>2011 - Bridge installed crossing creek and connecting the completed section of the trail with the intersection of Prado Rd./S. Higuera</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Jones City to Sea Trail</td>
<td>2012 - Class I path along Los Osos Valley Road between Laguna Lane and Oceanaire, connecting the Laguna Middle School and C.L. Smith Elementary School neighborhoods.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcutt Road Class I Connection</td>
<td>2009 - Trail on the south side of Orcutt, connecting Sacramento Drive Class II bike lanes with future Railroad Safety Trail segment.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 101/Marsh St. Undercrossing (Mis 19)</td>
<td>2009 - Caltrans installed a trail on Marsh St. under the Hwy. 101 overpass, supporting the project “intent”.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 101 Class I trail, North Broad to Madonna (Madonna Inn Bike Trail)</td>
<td>2011 - Trail from Marsh Street to Madonna Road completed (Madonna Inn Bike Path). This is a portion of the overall listed project. (Done as Air Quality Mitigation project.)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All new developments ...designed with bicycle use ...for transportation...</td>
<td>2011 - Target Center path connection to Oceanaire Drive.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Middle School Connection</td>
<td>2012 - Class I path along Los Osos Valley Road between Laguna Lane and Oceanaire, connecting the Laguna Middle School and C.L. Smith Elementary School neighborhoods.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2013 Bicycle Transportation Plan

### G-2 Appendix: 2007 - 2013 Accomplishments and Updates

#### Channelization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foothill/California Channel (Mis 6)</td>
<td>2007 - Installed on Foothill at the California intersection for east bound straight through bicyclists.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channelization should be provided at signalized intersections...</td>
<td>2008 - Installed on Foothill at the Santa Rosa intersection for east bound straight through bicyclists.</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California/Marsh Bike Channelization (Mis 11a)</td>
<td>2008 - Installed on Marsh St. at the California intersection for both left and right turning bicyclists.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channelization should be provided at signalized intersections...</td>
<td>2010 - Installed on Los Osos Valley Road at South Higuera.</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Higuera through Striping (Mis 20)</td>
<td>2011 - Installed on S. Higuera for straight through bicycle travel.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channelization should be provided at signalized intersections...</td>
<td>2012 - Installed on Los Osos Valley Road west bound at Laguna Lane.</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Class II bike lanes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orcutt Widening (Mis 4)</td>
<td>2008 - Road widened between McMillian and Laurel and bike lanes added.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial streets should include Class II Bikeways</td>
<td>2008 - As part of the street rehabilitation, Santa Barbara Ave. bike lanes were improved between Upham and Broad St.</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial streets should include Class II...</td>
<td>2009 - With the extension of Sacramento Dr. through to Orcutt Rd., bike lanes were installed on Sacramento Dr. from Industrial Way to Orcutt Rd.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikeway Design Standards</td>
<td>2009 - Class II lanes widened on South St. as part of &quot;Road Diet&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All arterials streets should include Class II Bike lanes</td>
<td>2011 - Class II lanes installed on Johnson Ave. between Buchon and San Luis Drive.</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood traffic mgmt. projects shall accommodate bicyclists</td>
<td>2011 - Road &quot;island&quot; conflict eliminated on south bound Johnson at Buchon intersection.</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood traffic mgmt. projects shall accommodate bicyclists</td>
<td>2011 - Installed a Class II lane on Pismo St., between Johnson and Santa Rosa.</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All arterials streets should include Class II Bike lanes</td>
<td>2012 - The Class II lane on Tank Farm Rd. east bound was lengthened between Santa Fe and Broad Streets during the intersection re-build.</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Misc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Roalman Bicycle Boulevard (Mis 1)</td>
<td>2009 - Final phase completed: Diverters installed at Buchon and at Leff St., and signagae completed.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall projects and policies</td>
<td>2009 - Received praise for accomplishments in a 2009 Grand Jury report on bicycling in San Luis Obispo County.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance, Monitoring, &amp; Construction</td>
<td>2009 - Bicycle, signal-actuation pavement symbols installed in multiple locations</td>
<td>1.27, 1.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey St. Class II (Mis 28), Special Design Provision and Other Support Facilities</td>
<td>2009 - Share the Road signs and pavement legends (Sharrows) were installed on Monterey St. between Buena Vista and Santa Rosa.</td>
<td>1.43, 3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcutt Widening (Mis 4)</td>
<td>2009 - Bicycle phase signal installed at Orcutt/Laurel intersection.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento/Industrial/ Capitolio Class II</td>
<td>2010 - Sharrows were installed on Industrial and Capitolio as an interim solution.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Education and Promotion</td>
<td>Provided reflective leg bands to the bicycling public.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South/Higuera/Madonna Channelization (Mis 8), partial project install</td>
<td>2010 - A &quot;Bike Box&quot; was installed on Madonna at Higuera St. by Caltrans.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Information Kiosk (OBP 1)</td>
<td>2011 - Utilizing a Transit kiosk, Bike Route information posted.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colored Pavement</td>
<td>2012 - Green Class II lanes were installed on California Blvd. at the Monterey St. intersection to enhance awareness by all users as an effort to reduce bike/car turning movement collisions.</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix:

- 2013 Bicycle Transportation Plan
- Grants / Funding
- Railroad Bike Path (RBP 6) 2007 - The City was awarded a $495,000 Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) grant for the construction of a bridge over US Hwy. 101: ✓
- Laguna Middle School Connection Options 2007 - The City was awarded a $798,600 Safe Routes to School grant to design and build a Class I trail connection between the Oceanaire Dr. and Laguna Ln. neighborhoods: ✓
- Railroad Bike Path (RBP 1) 2008 - The City was awarded an $890,000 Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) grant for the construction of the trail between Marsh St. and the Amtrak Station: ✓
- Funding Bicycle Programs 2011 - Received a $76,230 Community Based Transportation Planning Grant for the Bob Jones Trail, Octagon Barn to LOVR connection: 5.4
- Funding Bicycle Programs 2009 - Installed a Class II lane on Pismo St., between Johnson and Buchon intersection: ✓
- Funding Bicycle Programs 2010 - Road "island" conflict eliminated on south bound Johnson at Buchon: ✓
- Funding Bicycle Programs 2011 - Installed on S. Higuera for straight through bicycle travel: ✓
- Funding Bicycle Programs 2012 - Installed on Los Osos Valley Road west bound at Laguna Lane: ✓

### Policy

- Bike Box installation on Madonna at Higuera St. by Caltrans: ✓
- Share the Road signs and pavement legends (Sharrows) were installed on Monterey St. between Buena Vista and Santa Rosa: ✓
- Diverters installed at Buchon and at Leff St.: ✓
- Bike Route information posted: ✓
- Transit kiosk, Bike Route information posted: ✓
- Green Class II lanes were installed on California Blvd. at the Monterey St. intersection to enhance awareness by all users as an effort to reduce bike/car turning movement collisions: 1.44

### Miscellaneous

- Reflective leg bands provided to bicyclists: 4.5
- Bike Box installed on Madonna at Higuera St. by Caltrans: ✓
- Bike Route information posted: ✓
- Green Class II lanes were installed on California Blvd. at the Monterey St. intersection to enhance awareness by all users as an effort to reduce bike/car turning movement collisions: 1.44
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2007 - 2012, approximately 2,810 adults and children have been reached through the San Luis Obispo County Bicycle Coalition’s Bike Ed program. This includes assemblies, lunch meetings, and half-day seminars.

The Community Profile section identifies San Luis Obispo’s existing demographics and town size.

This section identifies City attractions such as shopping areas, recreational areas, tourist attractions, and education facilities within San Luis Obispo. Access to these destinations is accommodated in this Bike Plan.

This section contains statistics on bicycle use in the City and identifies the increasing demand for bicycle transportation facilities.

This section identifies the economic benefits of investing in bicycle facilities and includes a summary of a benefits-cost analysis done for the Railroad Safety Trail and Bob Jones City to Sea trail. (The study is included in Appendix K.)

Consolidates information contained in the 2007 body and appendix B in one to section. An expanded summary of related County plans has been included and expanded in Appendix L. Adds compliance with three laws enacted after 2007, including AB 1358, Complete Streets Act, AB 32, and SB 375 Sustainable Community Strategies.

Objectives are grouped by chapter topic for relationship to policies and implementation actions that will be used to achieve the objectives. See below for additions/modifications and number changes. (in the 2007 Plan Program Objectives were located in a group on pp. 10.)

Combines and expands and clarifies information from the 2007 Plan appendix C and the Policy section.

Combines and expands and clarifies information from the 2007 Plan appendices D, E and F and the Policy section.

Adds information concerning monthly site surveys of downtown short term bike parking, notes that the majority of bicycle parking outside of downtown are provided by development, and that the City does install and maintain racks at City parks and Open Space trail heads.

Adds data on the number of bicycles transported on City transit.

Combines, expands and clarifies information from the 2007 Plan Appendix G and the Policy section.

Summary of changes for 2013 BPT Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter: Section, ...Page</th>
<th>Plan Format:</th>
<th>Description of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction: Community Profile, ...3</td>
<td>The Community Profile section identifies San Luis Obispo’s existing demographics and town size.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction: Major City Attractions and Destinations, ...7</td>
<td>This section identifies City attractions such as shopping areas, recreational areas, tourist attractions, and education facilities within San Luis Obispo. Access to these destinations is accommodated in this Bike Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction: Data Collection and Future Trends, ...10</td>
<td>This section contains statistics on bicycle use in the City and identifies the increasing demand for bicycle transportation facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction: Benefits of Bicycling, ...13</td>
<td>This section identifies the economic benefits of investing in bicycle facilities and includes a summary of a benefits-cost analysis done for the Railroad Safety Trail and Bob Jones City to Sea trail. (The study is included in Appendix K.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction: Economic Development, ...13</td>
<td>This section identifies the economic benefits of investing in bicycle facilities and includes a summary of a benefits-cost analysis done for the Railroad Safety Trail and Bob Jones City to Sea trail. (The study is included in Appendix K.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction: Relationship to Other Documents and Plans, ...15</td>
<td>Combines and expands and clarifies information from the 2007 Plan appendix B in one to section. An expanded summary of related County plans has been included and expanded in Appendix L. Adds compliance with three laws enacted after 2007, including AB 1358, Complete Streets Act, AB 32, and SB 375 Sustainable Community Strategies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1, 2, 3, 4 - Objectives: ...23, 44, 56, 67</td>
<td>Objectives are grouped by chapter topic for relationship to policies and implementation actions that will be used to achieve the objectives. See below for additions/modifications and number changes. (in the 2007 Plan Program Objectives were located in a group on pp. 10.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1 - Bicycle Transportation Network: Overall, ...21</td>
<td>Combines and expands and clarifies information from the 2007 Plan appendix C and the Policy section.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2 - Bicycle Parking and Support Facilities: Overall, ...43</td>
<td>Combines and expands and clarifies information from the 2007 Plan appendices D, E and F and the Policy section.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2 - Bicycle Parking and Support Facilities: End of Trip Bicycle Parking, ...45</td>
<td>Adds information concerning monthly site surveys of downtown short term bike parking, notes that the majority of bicycle parking outside of downtown are provided by development, and that the City does install and maintain racks at City parks and Open Space trail heads.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2 - Bicycle Parking and Support Facilities: Bicycle Parking at Transportation Hubs, ...46</td>
<td>Adds data on the number of bicycles transported on City transit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3 - Bicycling Education and Promotion: Overall, ...55</td>
<td>Combines, expands and clarifies information from the 2007 Plan Appendix G and the Policy section.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Plan Format: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Section, ...</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3 - Bicycling Education and Promotion: Partnerships Supporting Bicycle Programs, ...</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>This section identifies City partnerships with other organizations and groups. It includes a description of the agency/group, and contact/web addresses for each. (Combines and expands on information from the 2007 Plan Appendix G and the Policy section.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3 - Bicycling Education and Promotion: Enforcement and Engineering, ...</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>This section describes the relationship between engineering and enforcement efforts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4 - Implementation and Funding: Overall, ...</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Combines, expands and clarifies information from the 2007 Plan Appendix K and the Policy section.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4 - Implementation and Funding: Funding Opportunities, ...</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>This section identifies potential funding sources for implementing this Plan. This section acts as an action plan for the City to apply for funding of projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4 - Implementation and Funding:</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Table shows expenditures from 2008-2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4 - Implementation and Funding: Evaluation and Measurement, ...</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>This section describes how “Implementation Actions” are used as a tool to evaluate and measure how the proposed projects and programs of this Plan are being implemented. (see below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1, 2, 3, 4 - Policies and Implementation Actions: Evaluation and Measurement, ...</td>
<td>30, 48, 61, 74</td>
<td>Policies are grouped by chapter topic. “Implementation Actions” have been added (see above) and follow related Policies. (See pggs. G8-G18 for listing of Policy and Implementation Action changes.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossary: B2 - B4 (also throughout the Plan)</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Appeared near the front of the 2007 Plan (pg. 8). The glossary has been expanded for the 2013 Plan and not only appears at the end, but term definitions are included in the sidebar of each page where they are first used.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix - A</td>
<td>Was Appendix J in the 2007 Plan. Describes 61 projects (some with multiple segments or options such as the Railroad Safety Trail, bringing the projects segments contained in the appendix above 150). Included are the development of 5.9 miles of bicycle boulevards in eight projects, 26 miles of Class I paths, and 18 miles of Class II paths. Emphasizes closing gaps on existing Class I paths and overall bikeway connectivity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix - A</td>
<td>The “Pavement Maintenance Areas Plan” included in the 2007 Plan Appendix J, is presented in the 2013 Plan Appendix I: Support (“Pavement Management Zones”).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix - C</td>
<td>&quot;Bikeway Width Design Standards&quot; is an updated version of Appendix M from the 2007 plan. Updated for clarity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix - G</td>
<td>“2007-12 Updates and Significant Accomplishments” is an updated version of 2007 “Preface” information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Plan, Appendix - N: Standard Mitigation for Class I Bikeways Adjoining Creeks</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Appendix removed. See Class I Paths, Adjoining Creeks Policies, Pg. 34 of the 2013 Plan, along with specific environmental policies in other City documents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Vision / Goals / Objectives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location in 2007 Plan</th>
<th>Location in 2013 Plan</th>
<th>Description of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction (A SLO Vision of the Future)</td>
<td>SLO Vision pg. vii</td>
<td>Changed wording to include all bicyclists, children, adults, SLO residents and visitors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Goal 1, pg. 10</td>
<td>Goal 1, page vii</td>
<td>Added: Significantly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Goal 2, pg. 10</td>
<td>Goal 2, page vii</td>
<td>Added: ...with an emphasis on travel to employment centers, commercial districts, schools and recreational destinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Goal 3, pg. 10</td>
<td>Goal 3, page vii</td>
<td>Added: ...addressing climate change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objectives (definition) pg. 8**

- Purpose, Page 2
  - In 2007 read: are specific endeavors that support the achievement of goals. In 2013 read: Expected outcomes to implementation of this Plan’s projects, policies, and actions.

**Actions (definition) pg. 8**

- Purpose, Page 2
  - In 2007 read: are specific steps needed to implement this Plan. In 2013 read: Implementation steps associated with specific Plan policies.

**Program Objective 1, pg. 10**

- Objective 2, Page 23
  - In 2007 read: “...a network related improvements within the City limits.”
  - In 2013 read: “...the network...related improvements in this Plan.”

**Program Objective 2, pg. 10**

- Objective 4, Page 23
  - In 2007 read: “By 2027, complete a network of Class I Bikeways that are located outside of specific planning areas. Construct Class I Bikeways within Specific Planning Areas consistent with the phasing called for by each plan.”
  - In 2013 reads: “By 2032, complete the network of Class I bikeways identified in this Plan that do not have established timelines or phasing approved by another City plan.”

**Program Objective 7, pg. 10**

- Program Objective 5, Page 23
  - Objective number is the only change.

**Program Objective 4, pg. 10**

- Program Objective 6, Page 44
  - Objective number is the only change.

**Program Objective 3, pg. 10**

- Program Objective 7, Page 44
  - Objective number is the only change.

**Program Objective 5, pg. 10**

- Program Objective 8, Page 56
  - In 2007 read: “...promotion and education activities in cooperation with other organizations.”
  - In 2013 reads: “...promotion and education activities and cooperate with others...”

**Program Objective 6, pg. 10**

- Program Objective 10, Page 67
  - Objective number changed. Deleted: “to agencies, property owners, designers and developers”

**Program Objective 8, pg. 10**

- Program Objective 11, Page 67
  - Objective number is the only change.
### Policy / Implementation Action:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location in 2007 Plan</th>
<th>Location in 2013 Plan</th>
<th>Description of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Implementation Action 1.1.1, Page 30</td>
<td>New Action: “It is recommended that the City’s Subdivision Regulations and Engineering Standards be revised to include cross-sections for streets that include Class II bike lanes.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Policy 1.3, Page 30</td>
<td>New Policy: Traffic Calming: On streets where vehicle volume, speed, or collisions are impacting bicycle travel, the City shall consider possible remedies such as signage, striping, or other traffic calming devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.1, Page 10</td>
<td>Policy 1.5, Page 30</td>
<td>In 2007 read: All public streets shall be designed and maintained to accommodate bicyclists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.5, Page 11</td>
<td>Policy 1.6 and 1.7, Page 30</td>
<td>In 2013, Policy 1.6: This policy is the same as the first sentence from the 2007 policy first sentence. In 2007 read: (second sentence) - Access shall include bicycle routes to schools serving the community, Class II bike lanes (or Class I bike paths), and approved bicycle parking as referenced in the Plan’s short-term bike parking standards. In 2013 Policy 1.7 reads: Developments shall adhere to all Policies in this Plan, include all bikeways described in this Plan, and include approved bicycle parking as referenced in the Plan’s bike parking policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Policy 1.8, Page 31</td>
<td>New Policy: Development shall provide bicycle facilities, in accordance with City plans and standards pursuant to State and local legal requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.2, Page 10</td>
<td>Policy 1.8a and 1.8b, Page 31</td>
<td>In 2013: Policy split in to two policies. &quot;...may approve changes...&quot; modified to &quot;...may approve adjustments...&quot;. Adds, &quot;consistent with the intent of the Plan&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.2, Page 19</td>
<td>Policy 1.9, Page 31</td>
<td>In 2007 read: The City shall install signs and pavement marking along Class I and II Bikeways, consistent with Caltrans standards or those contained in adopted Specific Plans (see Appendix J). In 2013 reads: Signs and pavement markings shall be installed along City Bikeways, consistent with Caltrans standards and those contained in adopted Specific Plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Policy 3.1), Page 19</td>
<td>Implementation Action 1.10.1, Page 31 (supports Policy 1.10, Page 31)</td>
<td>New Action: Update and publish a City bike map at least every ten years, or as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Policy 1.13, Page 32</td>
<td>New Policy: Calmings: On streets where vehicle volume, speed, or collisions are impacting bicycle travel, the City shall consider possible remedies such as signage, striping, or other traffic calming devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.44, Page 16</td>
<td>Policy 1.14, Page 32</td>
<td>New Policy: Intersections shall be designed to allow motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists to see one another approaching and encourage legal movements, per the California Vehicle Code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Policy 1.15, Page 32</td>
<td>New Policy: Intersections of Class I bike paths and roadways should align at 90 degrees, either at crossings where motorists can be expected to stop, or a location completely out of the influence of any other intersection. Design of intersections not to align at 90 degrees should consider alignment of right of way via traffic control devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Policy 1.17, Page 33</td>
<td>New Policy: Roundabouts or Traffic Circles: Designs shall provide bicyclists the choice of proceeding through the roundabout as either a vehicle or a pedestrian. These facilities should be designed to minimize the speed differential between bicyclists and motorists. In all cases, Class II bike lanes shall be terminated in advance of the roundabout to encourage cyclists to mix with vehicle traffic, and be restored downstream of the roundabout or traffic circle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Policy / Implementation Action: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location in 2007 Plan</th>
<th>Location in 2013 Plan</th>
<th>Description of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Policy 1.18, Page 33</td>
<td>New Policy: At signalized intersections, bicycle traffic shall be considered during the development of the traffic signal timing. The total intersection clearance interval (yellow change interval plus red clearance interval) should allow bicyclists time to traverse the intersection in compliance with AASHTO guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.27, Page 14</td>
<td>1.19, Page 33</td>
<td>In 2007 read: (2nd sentence) &quot;If in pavement detection is used, stencil markings shall...&quot; Changed in 2013 reads: (2nd sentence) &quot;If in pavement loop detection is used, pavement legends shall...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Implementation Action 1.19.1, Page 33</td>
<td>New Action: Maintain an inventory of locations where signal actuation pavement legends are refreshed/repaired part of regular maintenance operations (see Policy 3.57).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.19, Page 13</td>
<td>Policy 1.20, Page 33</td>
<td>Added: &quot;The City shall encourage Caltrans and the County to do the same.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Policy 1.21, Page 34</td>
<td>New Policy: &quot;Unpaved trails and paved walkways identified in this Plan provide bikeway connections and therefore shall be retained and remain open for use by the general public. (see Appendix J for listing).&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Policy 1.22, Page 34</td>
<td>New Policy: The use of bollards on any facility where bicycling is not expressly prohibited shall be avoided. For Class I Bike paths, a divided path (two narrower one-way paths just prior to the roadway intersection of the path) should be considered in lieu of the installation of bollards to reduce the potential for collisions. When bollards are used, they should comply with City Standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Implementation Action 1.22.1, Page 34</td>
<td>New Action: Revise City Engineering Standards to include current best practices for bollard use, including but not limited to: minimum five foot clear space between bollards, minimum five foot setback of bollard from structures or path access points, number of posts used, and diversion striping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Implementation Action 1.22.2, Page 34</td>
<td>New Action: Maintain an inventory of bollards, review for compliance with City Engineering Standards, and upgrade if necessary during regular maintenance and/or as funds are available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.7, Page 11</td>
<td>Policy 1.23, Page 34</td>
<td>Added: &quot;City to &quot;Conservation &amp; Open Space Element&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.8, Page 11</td>
<td>Policy 1.24, Page 34</td>
<td>Deleted: &quot;Other mitigation measures are described in Appendix M&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.9, Page 14</td>
<td>Policy 1.33, Page 36</td>
<td>Added: &quot;should be at right angles&quot; and changed &quot;concrete&quot; to &quot;bicycle friendly&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.45, Page 16</td>
<td>Policy 1.34, Page 36</td>
<td>Added: &quot;railroad&quot; to &quot;existing railroad bridges&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.56, Page 20</td>
<td>Policy 1.36, Page 37</td>
<td>Added: &quot;Vandal resistant shall...&quot;, &quot;all Class I bikeways...including in under crossings...&quot; Deleted: Reference to Class II lane illumination since roadway lighting requirements cover Class II lanes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Policy / Implementation Action: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location in 2007 Plan</th>
<th>Location in 2013 Plan</th>
<th>Description of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Policy 1.39, Page 37</td>
<td>New Policy: &quot;Bikeway Width Design Standards&quot; (Appendix C), shall be used in determining bike lane width based on traffic speed, traffic volume, percent grade, and motor vehicle parking. (The 2007 Plan included the standards as an Appendix, but no policy.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.18, Page 13</td>
<td>Policy 1.40, Page 37</td>
<td>In 2007 read: The preferred location of Class II Bikeways is at the edge of the road, adjacent to a curb. Bike lanes shall run parallel to the motor vehicle lane, not the curb. However, in the Downtown Planning Area where more than 50% of the curb area is used by motor vehicle parking during the day or night (and off-street parking is not available) bike lanes should be located along the outside of parking bays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.37, Page 15</td>
<td>Policy 1.41, Page 37</td>
<td>Modified: &quot;asphalt&quot; to &quot;material&quot;, and &quot;must&quot; to &quot;shall&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.39, Page 15</td>
<td>Policy 1.42, Page 38</td>
<td>Modified: &quot;slurry&quot; to &quot;micro&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.40, Page 14</td>
<td>Policy 1.43, Page 38</td>
<td>Added: &quot;soil&quot; to &quot;material&quot;, and &quot;shall&quot; to &quot;must&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.53, Page 14</td>
<td>Policy 1.44, Page 38</td>
<td>Deleted: &quot;asphalt&quot; to &quot;material&quot;, and &quot;shall&quot; to &quot;must&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.20, Page 13</td>
<td>Policy 1.45, Page 38</td>
<td>In 2013: Eliminated provision, &quot;Travel lanes are a minimum of 12 ft. wide.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.22, Page 13</td>
<td>Policy 1.46, Page 38</td>
<td>2007 read: When installing new drainage inlets or replacing old ones, grate should be kept out of Class II Bikeways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.23, Page 13</td>
<td>Policy 1.47, Page 38</td>
<td>In 2013: When installing new drainage inlets along Class II bikeways, under-curb inlets shall be used to eliminate grates from the bikeway. When resurfacing roadways or performing other construction maintenance, inspection and assessment for replacement/repair of drain grates shall be performed and corrective measures pursued. (Implementation Actions 1.57.1 and 1.57.2 are referenced.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.24, Page 14</td>
<td>Policy 1.48, Page 39</td>
<td>In 2013 reads: &quot;Bike Route&quot; signage along Class III bikeways shall be considered when the route provides a connection between other bikeway facilities (Class I, Class II, etc.) when traffic conditions (speed, volume, etc.) have indicated a need to raise awareness of the route, or when the route is an identified City, State, or federal bicycle route. (e.g. Bill Rosland Bike Blvd., Pacific Coast Bicycle Route).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.25, Page 13</td>
<td>Policy 1.49, Page 39</td>
<td>Deleted: a) &quot;to important destinations.&quot; Added: b) &quot;be optimized for through bicycle traffic with a minimum of stops, without creating cut through opportunities for motorists. Modified: c) &quot;necessary&quot; to &quot;appropriate&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.26, Page 13</td>
<td>Policy 1.50, Page 39</td>
<td>Modified: &quot;must&quot; to &quot;shall&quot;, and changed the Bicycle Advisory Committee's responsibility from approval to giving input.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**2013 Bicycle Transportation Plan**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location in 2007 Plan</th>
<th>Location in 2013 Plan</th>
<th>Description of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Policy 1.50, Page 39</td>
<td>New Policy: The &quot;Bicycle Boulevard Report Card&quot; (appendix E) should be used for both planning of future and the review of past bicycle boulevard installations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.43, Page 15</td>
<td>Policy 1.51, Page 40</td>
<td>Deleted: &quot;curb&quot; and &quot;safely&quot; Added: ...Sharrows will most commonly be used on roadways that serve as connections between other bicycling facilities. Criteria for consideration of Sharrow locations may include the following: • On-Street parking. • Travel lane width. • Posted speed limit. • Measured traffic speeds. • Traffic volume. • Traffic composition (presence of buses and large trucks). • Bicycle traffic volume. • Number of incidents of wrong-way bicycling, or sidewalk bicycling. • Corridors where there is a high potential to increase bicycle trips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Implementation Action 1.51.1, Page 40</td>
<td>New Action: For cost efficiency, installation of the legends and associated signage should be implemented in conjunction with other striping/signage projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.4, Page 11</td>
<td>Policy 1.52, Page 40</td>
<td>Added: &quot;...small street maintenance...&quot;, and &quot;...and bicyclists...&quot;, &quot;...large street maintenance...&quot;, &quot;...and bicyclists...&quot;, &quot;...small street maintenance...&quot;, and &quot;...and bicyclists...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Policy 1.53, Page 41</td>
<td>New Policy: Class I bikeways should be kept clear of debris and litter which service may in part be performed by volunteer organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Implementation Action 1.53.1, Page 41</td>
<td>New Action: Develop a volunteer program for organizations, businesses, and private citizens to contribute towards maintenance efforts by adopting a bicycle facility. The program should be designed to also generate publicity for the group’s service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.55, Page 41</td>
<td>New Policy: Site maintenance during construction shall include bicycling facilities outside of the designated work site, to the degree that traffic, work site machinery, and/or environment (wind, water, etc.) may have migrated construction related roadway hazards to them (gravel, sand, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.5, Appendix L, p. 174</td>
<td>Policy 1.56, Page 41</td>
<td>Modified: Reference location to table that now directly follows the policy and includes updated text from the CA Highway Design Manual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.57, Page 42</td>
<td>In 2007 reads: &quot;Transportation staff will inspect bikeways annually. As problems are discovered, they will be prioritized for repair by City crews. Candidate problems including, but not limited to...&quot; In 2013 reads: &quot;Bikeways and bikeway connections shall be inspected on a routine basis to identify maintenance issues, including but not limited to...&quot; Added: &quot;...Signal actuation, bicycle placement stencil&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location in 2007 Plan</th>
<th>Location in 2013 Plan</th>
<th>Description of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Implementation Action 1.57.1, Page 42</td>
<td>New Action: Inspect bikeways biennially and prepare a report identifying the problems, recommended action, priority, and timeframe for correction. The report should include recommendations for bikeway signage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Implementation Action 1.57.2, Page 42</td>
<td>New Action: Maintain a reporting button on the City's web site to aid the public in reporting problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.38, Page 15</td>
<td>Policy 1.58, Page 42</td>
<td>Added: Signage should warn both bicyclists and motorists in advance of any location where the bicycle lane is closed. If space is available, a coned-off four (4) foot wide area for bicycle travel shall be provided between the construction zone and the vehicle travel lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Policy 2.4), Page 16</td>
<td>Implementation Action 2.2.1, Page 49</td>
<td>Policy changed to an &quot;Action&quot;: Added: &quot;...a minimum of five every five years.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Policy 2.4, Page 49</td>
<td>New Policy: The City shall encourage existing development to upgrade their bicycle parking facilities to meet current City standards (type of rack, number of bicycles accommodated).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Policy 2.6, Page 50</td>
<td>New Policy: Bicycle racks and lockers shall be installed pursuant to City requirements and the manufacturer’s specifications for placement and clearance from obstructions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Policy 2.7, Page 50</td>
<td>New Policy: The City shall maintain bicycle parking standards in its Engineering Standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Implementation Action 2.7.1, Page 50</td>
<td>New Action: Review and provide recommendations on proposed amendments to the Community Design Guidelines and the Engineering Standards a minimum of every 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 2.9, Page 50</td>
<td>New Policy: In street bicycle parking may be considered on a case by case basis. Bicycle racks should be mounted off the street, to allow for street sweeping and to minimize the encroachment into the parking lane. Preferred locations shall include: • low traffic speed and volume streets • just prior to mid-block pedestrian crossings • prior to driveway/street intersections outside of normal turning radii and where turning volumes are low • high visibility areas • high pedestrian volume • known high bicycle parking demand areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 2.6, Page 16</td>
<td>Policy 2.12, Page 51</td>
<td>Added: &quot;...at high bicycle parking demand locations...&quot; Deleted: &quot;...outside the downtown core...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 2.15, Page 18</td>
<td>Policy 2.13, Page 51</td>
<td>Added: &quot;...or Concerts in the Plaza...&quot;, and Removed: &quot;and the Tour of California.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy / Implementation Action: (continued)</td>
<td>Location in 2007 Plan</td>
<td>Location in 2013 Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 2.19, Page 19</strong> to 2013</td>
<td>Policy 2.14 Page 51</td>
<td>In 2007 read: &quot;...the City shall institute an ongoing program of working cooperatively with property owners to install bike parking on legally nonconforming sites...&quot; In 2013 reads: &quot;...the City should institute a program of working cooperatively with property owners to install bike parking on sites that lack sufficient bike parking...&quot; Modified: Each &quot;Priority&quot; section detailed to include, &quot;no bike cycling parking currently available&quot;, is insufficient, or poorly designed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 2.7, Page 16</strong> to 2013</td>
<td>Policy 2.15, Page 51</td>
<td>Reordered and organized for &quot;String&quot; and &quot;Design and Installation&quot;. Added: &quot;Provide for both front-in and back-in parking, allowing...&quot;, &quot;Install at highly visible locations...&quot;, &quot;Parked bicycles should neither be in jeopardy of damage...&quot;, &quot;Avoid locations that require bicycles to travel over stairs&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 2.16, Page 19</strong> to 2013</td>
<td>Policy 2.16 Page 52</td>
<td>Deleted: &quot;...at no cost to the City.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 2.8, Page 17</strong> to 2013</td>
<td>Policy 2.17, Page 52</td>
<td>Added: &quot;...or other City approved design.&quot;, and &quot;Wave, comb, and tooth style racks are examples of racks not permitted by the above guidelines.&quot; Removed: &quot;Racks shall be installed pursuant to the City's Community Design Guidelines and the manufacturer's specifications for placement and clearance from obstructions&quot;. New Policy 2.6 now supports removed text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 2.11, Page 18</strong> to 2013</td>
<td>Policy 2.21, Page 53</td>
<td>Added: (to 2.21b)...&quot;with at least one wheel touching the ground.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 3.8, Page 20</strong> to 2013</td>
<td>Policy 2.22, Page 54</td>
<td>Removed: &quot;will&quot;, and Added: &quot;shall&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 3.9, Page 20</strong> to 2013</td>
<td>Policy 2.23, Page 54</td>
<td>Modified: Reference to &quot;Recreation Center&quot;, to &quot;Ludwig Community Center&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 3.10, Page 19</strong> to 2013</td>
<td>Policy 2.24, Page 54</td>
<td>(note changes have relationship to new policy 2.3 as well)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 3.11, Page 20</strong> to 2013</td>
<td>Policy 2.26, Page 54</td>
<td>Added: &quot;$\ldots$ shall be...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supports Circ. Element Policy 4.1.5 pg. 16 (not in 2007 BTP) Also related to changes made to old BTP policy 3.1</strong></td>
<td>Policy 2.27, Page 54</td>
<td>New Policy (modified Circulation Element Policy language - reflects updates to the Zoning Regulations approved since the adoption of the 1994 Circ. Element). The City shall establish requirements for the provision of shower facilities at work places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n/a</strong> to 2013</td>
<td>Implementation Action 2.27, Page 54</td>
<td>New Action: Include shower facility requirements in the next round of Zoning Regulations amendments to be considered by the City Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n/a</strong> to 2013</td>
<td>Policy 3.1, Page 62</td>
<td>Added: &quot;...full time.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n/a</strong> to 2013</td>
<td>Implementation Action 3.1.1, Page 62</td>
<td>New Action: Maintain the current 50% Principal Transportation Planner position and 25% Transportation Programs Assistant staff position, and propose funding to increase staffing as the City's fiscal health improves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 4.2, Page 20</strong></td>
<td>Policy 3.2, Page 62</td>
<td>In 2007 read: &quot;Prepare and distribute Request for Proposal to organizations that can establish and sustain City-funded bicycle promotion and educational activities that benefit San Luis Obispo's residents, workforce, and visitors.&quot; In 2013 reads: &quot;Continue to provide funding for bicycling promotion and bicycling education.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 4.2, Page 20</strong></td>
<td>Implementation Action 3.2.1, Page 62</td>
<td>Policy changed to an &quot;Action&quot;. In 2007 read: Prepare and distribute Request for Proposals to organizations that can establish and sustain City-funded bicycle promotion and educational activities that benefit San Luis Obispo's residents, workforce, and visitors. In 2013 reads: Maintain City-funded bicycle promotion and educational activities that benefit San Luis Obispo's residents, workforce, and visitors through the use of consultant service contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 4.3, Page 21</strong></td>
<td>Policy 3.3, Page 62</td>
<td>Added: &quot;well&quot;, and Added: &quot;shall&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 4.3, Page 21</strong></td>
<td>Policy 3.4, Page 62</td>
<td>Modified: &quot;Junior&quot;, to &quot;Middle&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 4.6, Page 21</strong></td>
<td>Policy 3.5, Page 62</td>
<td>Removed: &quot;Continue to provide...&quot;, Added: &quot;Consider providing...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 4.5, Page 21</strong></td>
<td>Policy 3.6, Page 63</td>
<td>Policy changed to an &quot;Action&quot;. Removed: &quot;Continue to...&quot;, &quot;$\ldots$ bike...&quot; and Added: &quot;Partner with...&quot;, &quot;$\ldots$ bicycling...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 4.4, Page 21</strong></td>
<td>Policy 3.7, Page 63</td>
<td>New Policy: Continue to offer information to the public about the purpose of new bicycle facility treatments (e.g., bicycle boulevards, shared lane markings, etc.) and safe behaviors for all users operating on these facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n/a</strong> to 2013</td>
<td>Implementation Action 3.6.1, Page 63</td>
<td>New Action: Continue to offer information to the public about the purpose of new bicycle facility treatments (e.g., bicycle boulevards, shared lane markings, etc.) and safe behaviors for all users operating on these facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n/a</strong> to 2013</td>
<td>Implementation Action 3.6.2, Page 63</td>
<td>New Action: Continue to offer information to the public about the purpose of new bicycle facility treatments (e.g., bicycle boulevards, shared lane markings, etc.) and safe behaviors for all users operating on these facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n/a</strong> to 2013</td>
<td>Implementation Action 3.7.1, Page 63</td>
<td>New Action: Continue to prepare a biennial report highlighting bicycle facility and program improvements within the previous two years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n/a</strong> to 2013</td>
<td>Implementation Action 3.7.2, Page 63</td>
<td>New Action: Continue to provide annual bicycling behavior training to City transit drivers, preferably just prior to the start of the Fall school term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n/a</strong> to 2013</td>
<td>Implementation Action 3.7.3, Page 63</td>
<td>New Action: Continue to participate in Cal Poly's Week of Welcome (WOW) as an opportunity to promote bicycling and bicycle-on-transit use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n/a</strong> to 2013</td>
<td>Implementation Action 3.7.4, Page 63</td>
<td>New Action: Pursue other opportunities such as presentations and online materials to inform residents and businesses of typical bicycling behaviors, common collision patterns and bicycle facility treatments within the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n/a</strong> to 2013</td>
<td>Policy 3.8, Page 64</td>
<td>New Policy: Support and promote the development of efforts to inform traveling bicyclists of the City's bicycle routes, support facilities (including lodging and transportation hubs), and popular destinations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Policy / Implementation Action: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location in 2007 Plan</th>
<th>Location in 2013 Plan</th>
<th>Description of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Implementation Action 3.8.1, Page 64</td>
<td>New Action: As funding is available, design, create, erect and maintain signage for routes/facilities/destinations identified as routes supporting the promotion of bicycling as a transportation mode, especially in conjunction with tourism and through-town linkages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Implementation Action 3.8.2, Page 64</td>
<td>New Action: Promote and support multi-modal transportation (e.g. bikes on transit).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Policy 3.9, Page 64</td>
<td>New Policy: Post and/or make available bicycle route network maps in high-visibility public locations such as City offices, transit stops, libraries, college campuses and tourist destinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Implementation Action 3.9.1, Page 64</td>
<td>New Action: Provide new, updated, and/or replacement bicycle transportation network materials as needed to the informational kiosk located at the Amtrak station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Policy 3.10, Page 64</td>
<td>New Policy: Maintain and improve the current award designation level in the League of American Bicyclists “Bicycle Friendly Community” (BFC) program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Implementation Action 3.10.1, Page 64</td>
<td>New Action: Support efforts by local organizations or individuals to nominate and maintain the City’s League of American Bicyclists (LAB) Bicycle Friendly Community (BFC) award status by providing City data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Policy 3.11, Page 64</td>
<td>New Policy: The City shall promote bicycling related events (e.g.: Tour of California) that are likely to result in an increase in local bicycle use and/or bicycling education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.32, Page 15</td>
<td>Policy 3.12, Page 65</td>
<td>In 2007 read: Laws against motorists illegally occupying Class II Bikeways shall be strictly enforced. In 2013 read: Traffic laws regarding bicyclists rights and responsibilities shall be strictly enforced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Policy 1.40), Page 15</td>
<td>Implementation Action 3.12.1, Page 65</td>
<td>Policy changed to an “Action”: In 2007 read: “As part of the City’s Annual Traffic Safety Report, the City Traffic Engineer will take remedial action when the condition or design of the bikeway is judged to be a contributing factor.” In 2013 read: “Annually review bicycling collision reports for opportunities to address collision patterns.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 4.7, Page 21</td>
<td>Policy 3.13, Page 65</td>
<td>In 2007 read: Promote and support the use of a “traffic school” option for persons involved in bicycle-related traffic violations. In 2013 read: “The City shall promote and support the use of a bicycle “traffic school” option for persons involved in bicycle-related traffic violations.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Implementation Action 3.13.1, Page 65</td>
<td>New Action: City Staff shall seek Traffic Court approval for use of a bicycle traffic school for persons involved in bicycle-related traffic violations within the City Limits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Policy 4.3, Page 76</td>
<td>New Policy: Focus implementation of this plan’s policies and projects utilizing feedback from the BFC process “key measures” and reviewer recommendations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2013 Bicycle Transportation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location in 2007 Plan</th>
<th>Location in 2013 Plan</th>
<th>Description of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Implementation Action 4.3.1, Page 76</td>
<td>New Action: The BAC shall consider BFC review feedback when recommending projects during the City’s goal setting process and during the update process of this Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 6.1, Page 22</td>
<td>Policy 4.4, Page 76</td>
<td>In 2007 read: The City shall update its Bicycle Transportation Plan every four (4) years, to maintain eligibility for State Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) grants. and shall undertake a more comprehensive review every eight (8) years. In 2013 read: The City shall update its Bicycle Transportation Plan as required by the State, to maintain eligibility for State Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) grants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Implementation Action 4.4.1, Page 76</td>
<td>New Action: The BAC shall update the Bicycle Transportation Plan at least every 5 years, or as required to maintain eligibility for BTA grants, and consider amendments when circumstances arise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 5.3, Page 21</td>
<td>Policy 4.5, Page 76</td>
<td>In 2007 read: Require that new development contribute its fair share to support the costs of bicycle facilities and programs. In 2013 read: Require that development contribute its share toward the costs of bicycling facilities and programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Policy 4.6, Page 77</td>
<td>New Policy: New bikeways shall be considered a priority for installation in advance of, or during the first phases of development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Policy 4.7, Page 77</td>
<td>New Policy: Continue to prioritize “Measure Y” funding (City 1/2 cent sales tax) towards transportation congestion relief projects including high priority bicycling projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Policy 4.8, Page 77</td>
<td>New Policy: Work with local organizations to pursue additional funding for bicycling safety education programs. By providing support to projects and other funding applications, the City can help local organizations that conduct education to increase their resources and reach more City bicyclists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 5.6, Page 21</td>
<td>Policy 4.9, Page 77</td>
<td>In 2007 read: “Employ debt-financing strategies for large bikeway projects, where their costs are out of scale with potential funding from regional, state or federal grant programs or from the City’s Capital Improvement Fund.” In 2013 reads: “Consider employing other financial strategies such as debt-financing on projects that are likely to be funded by regional, state or federal grant programs, or from the City’s Capital Improvement Fund.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 5.4, Page 21</td>
<td>Policy 4.10, Page 77</td>
<td>Added: “Utilize… to the maximum extent feasible…” and Removed: “…regional, state and federal grants…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 5.5, Page 21</td>
<td>Policy 4.11, Page 77</td>
<td>In 2007 read: “…establish a financial partnership with Cal Poly…” In 2013 reads: “…develop financial partnerships with others…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Policy 4.12, Page 78</td>
<td>New Policy: The City should secure and earmark sufficient funds to implement this Plan by 2032 as called for in the Program Objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Policy / Implementation Action: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location in 2007 Plan</th>
<th>Location in 2013 Plan</th>
<th>Description of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (Policy 5.2), Page 21 | Implementation Action 4.12.1, Page 78 | Policy changed to an "Action" -  
In 2007 read: "Continue to include major bicycle capital projects, including the Railroad Safety Trail, in the City’s Capitol Improvement and Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) programs."  
In 2013 reads: "Integrate Bicycle Transportation Plan projects in to the City’s five year Capital Improvement program budget and Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) programs." |
| (Policy 5.8), Page 22 | Implementation Action 4.12.2, Page 78 | Policy changed to an "Action" -  
Removed: "proposai", and Added: "request" |
| (Policy 5.1), Page 21 | Implementation Action 4.12.3, Page 78 | Policy changed to an "Action" -  
Added: a) "...and training", and b) "...facility signage, and drain grate upgrades."  
Supports Circ. Element Policy 7.6 pg. 24 (not in 2007 BTP) |
| n/a | Policy 4.13, Page 79 | New Policy: The City will continue to gather bicycling related data for City facility evaluation purposes. |
| n/a | Implementation Action 4.13.1, Page 79 | New Action: Conduct bike counts at key intersections throughout the City at least every two years to obtain comparable data regarding bicycle usage within the City. |
| n/a | Implementation Action 4.13.2, Page 79 | New Action: Present citywide bicycling count data to the Bicycle Advisory Committee for their consideration and input. |
| n/a | Implementation Action 4.13.4, Page 79 | New Action: The Bicycle Advisory Committee shall review the Implementation Matrix in Appendix B at least every two years to evaluate progress on the actions described in this plan. |

### Projects listed in the table below as “completed” have been previously listed in the “2007 Bicycle Transportation Plan Accomplishments” table at the beginning of this appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Type of Project</th>
<th>Description of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Bike Path 2 (RBP2) / Class I</td>
<td>1,128 ft. - Completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Bike Path 7 (RBP7) / Class I</td>
<td>325 ft. - Completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Bike Path B (RBP8) / Class I</td>
<td>1,060 ft. - Completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 101 Class I North Broad to Madonna / Class I</td>
<td>3,775 ft. - Completed connection from Marsh Street to Madonna. (See revised project: Highway 101 Class I North Broad to Marsh Street.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcutt Road Class I Connection / Class I</td>
<td>630 ft. - Completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Jones, City to Sea Trail 1 (BT1) / Class I</td>
<td>5,935 ft. - Completed. (See New Project: BIT Prado to LOVR Connection.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Jones, City to Sea Trail 2 (BT2) / Class I</td>
<td>Eliminated - Because the planned facility would not connect with other Class I facilities on the west end of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad/Sacramento Link / Class I</td>
<td>Eliminated - Redundant Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Middle School Connection / Class I</td>
<td>390 ft. - Completed. (See new related project, &quot;Bridge to Laguna Middle School&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California/Marsh Bike Channelization (Mis11a)/Class II</td>
<td>20 ft. - Completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcutt Widening (Mis-4) / Class II</td>
<td>4,700 ft. - Completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Class II / Class III</td>
<td>7,800 ft. - Completed. Class II lanes constructed along Sacramento. (See New Project: Industrial/Capitolio Class II.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footsteps/California Channelization (Mis 6)/Class II</td>
<td>50 ft. - Completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Piqueras Through Striping (Mis 20)/Class II</td>
<td>100 ft. - Completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Drive / Highway 101 access (Mis 21)</td>
<td>Eliminated - Project was to maintain access. The new plan creates a policy for maintaining access at existing bikeway connection points and maintains a listing of them in Appendix J instead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Eastbound / Class II</td>
<td>Eliminated - Traffic lane reconfiguration eliminated the need for this project at this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Realmann Bicycle Boulevard / Bicycle Boulevard</td>
<td>Completed - Final phase (traffic diverts) installed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Street Bicycle Boulevard / Bicycle Boulevard</td>
<td>Eliminated - Re-routed. (See New Project: Islay Bicycle Boulevard.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella/Ruth/George Bicycle Boulevard / Bicycle Boulevard</td>
<td>Re-routed. (See New Project: Ella Street Neighborhood Bicycle Boulevard.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Information Kiosk (OBP-1) / Other</td>
<td>Completed. (See new &quot;Recommended Action&quot; to update materials annually or as needed.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Center Line Striping / Other</td>
<td>Project removed as it is a Traffic Operations issue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Modified/New Projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Type of project</th>
<th>Location in 2013 Plan</th>
<th>Description of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Safety Trail/Class I</td>
<td>Appendix A, pages A39 - A57</td>
<td>Modified: All trail segments have been named by location for the 2013 BTP (2007 BTP used &quot;BTP&quot; prefix and a number). Of significant note is the designation of project segments as &quot;Primary&quot; or &quot;Support&quot;: &quot;Primary&quot; segments are those whose completion will create a single continuous north to south trail, and which are currently seen as the most attainable routes due to known right-of-way or funding issues. &quot;Support&quot; segments are those that add further connections to the Primary route and should be pursued if they can be achieved. Modified 2007 &quot;BTP&quot; project: Now called the Sacramento/Duncan to Laurel Class I, Railroad Safety Trail Connection (pg. A54). 730 ft. trail extension to Duncan Lane on north side of Orcutt Rd. 2007 project only connected Laurel/Orcutt Intersection. This is a &quot;primary segment&quot;. Modified 2007 &quot;RBPS&quot; project: Now called &quot;Sinheimer Park Connections&quot;. Made it consistent with the Sinheimer Park Master Plan. Modified 2007 &quot;RBPS&quot; project: Now called &quot;French Hospital Connection Bikeway&quot; (pg. A48). 1,480 ft. trail connecting Iris, Lizzie, and Fairview Streets, further defining the trail location along the east side of the railroad. This is a &quot;support segment&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Jones, City to Sea Trail / Class I</td>
<td>Appendix A, pages A75 - A92</td>
<td>Modified: All trail segments have been named by location for the 2013 BTP (2007 BTP used &quot;BTP&quot; prefix and a number). New: A project segment has been added to provide a grade separated crossing of Los Osos Valley Road, connecting the north and south segments of the trail. Note: A project has been included to add Class II lanes to a possible road creation running north from Prado between Hwy. 101 and S. Higuera. It was shown on the 2007 plan map but did not have a written project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix H: BTP, Project Naming History

All projects in this Plan are named by location. Where more than one location describes a project area, the names are presented in a north to south or east to west orientation. The following table is presented to identify current Plan project names, compared to names used in past Bicycle Transportation Plans and/or other City documents that may not have employed the same naming nomenclature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013 BTP</th>
<th>2007 BTP</th>
<th>2002 BTP</th>
<th>Notes/additional naming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broad Street Bicycle Blvd. crossing Hwy. 101</td>
<td>Broad St. Bike Blvd. 101 GSX</td>
<td>Mis - 14</td>
<td>Project lengthened from 2002 version.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islay Street Bicycle Blvd.</td>
<td>Leff St. Bicycle Blvd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Location change (same intent / length).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach/King Bicycle Blvd.</td>
<td>King / Beach Bike Blvd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia/Foothill/La Entrada Intersection</td>
<td>Foothill/Patricia/La Entrada Intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tassajara Sharrows</td>
<td>Tassajara Class Il Lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Facility type change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Blvd. Bridge Widening</td>
<td>California Ave Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Mis - 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy. 101 Class I, North Broad to 101 at Marsh St.</td>
<td>Cerro San Luis, Class I path</td>
<td></td>
<td>2007 project partially completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixlini / Flora Bicycle Blvd.</td>
<td>Flora Fixlini Bicycle Blvd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella Street Neighborhood Bicycle Boulevard</td>
<td>Ella/Ruth/George Bicycle Boulevard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madonna/Higuera/South Channelization</td>
<td>South/Higuera/Madonna Channelization</td>
<td>Mis - 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acacia Creek Class I segments:</td>
<td>Acacia Creek Class I Trail system</td>
<td></td>
<td>Both the Margarita Area Specific Plan and the Airport Area Specific Plan describe bikeways along this route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acacia Creek Class I Trail system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockview to Sports Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Field to Tank Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe to Buckley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial &amp; Capitolio Class II</td>
<td>Sacramento/Industrial/Capitolio Class II</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sacramento bike lanes installed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


## Appendix H: Bicycle Transportation Plan, Project Naming History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013 BTP</th>
<th>2007 BTP</th>
<th>2002 BTP</th>
<th>Notes/additional naming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Safety Trail</td>
<td>Railroad Bicycle Path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Dr. to Mustang Stadium</td>
<td>RBP - 8</td>
<td>RBP - 8</td>
<td>&quot;Phase 4a&quot;, (2008 CIP) - Rotary Project, or “Missing Link” - Rotary Conner-Cletsoway Link of the Railroad Safety Trail Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustang Stadium to City Limit (south of Campus Way)</td>
<td>RBP - 8</td>
<td>RBP - 8</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Limit (south of Campus Way) to Foothill Blvd.</td>
<td>RBP - 7</td>
<td>RBP - 7</td>
<td>&quot;Phase 4&quot;, (CIP) - &quot;Segment 2&quot; (Project description plan dated 6/2001) Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill Blvd to Hathway</td>
<td>RBP - 2</td>
<td>RBP - 2</td>
<td>&quot;Phase 4&quot;, (CIP) - &quot;Segment 2&quot; (Project description plan dated 6/2001) Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill Blvd. to Murray</td>
<td>RBP - 10</td>
<td>RBP - 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hathway to Taft</td>
<td>RBP - 6</td>
<td>RBP - 6</td>
<td>&quot;Phase 4&quot;, (CIP) - Segment 2 (Project description plan dated 6/2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taft to Phillips</td>
<td>RBP - 6</td>
<td>RBP - 6</td>
<td>&quot;Phase 2&quot; (Project description plan dated 6/2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips to Marsh</td>
<td>RBP - 6</td>
<td>RBP - 6</td>
<td>&quot;Phase 2&quot; (Project description plan dated 6/2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh to Amtrak</td>
<td>RBP - 1</td>
<td>RBP - 1</td>
<td>&quot;Phase 3&quot; (CIP plan date 5/2009) - &quot;Segment 1&quot; (Project description plan dated 6/2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Separated Crossing at Penny Lane</td>
<td>RBP - 14</td>
<td>RBP - 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Hospital Connection Trail</td>
<td>RBP - 19</td>
<td>RBP - 19</td>
<td>2013 re-alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer to Henry</td>
<td>RBP - 19</td>
<td>RBP - 19</td>
<td>2013 portion of re-alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High to Roundhouse</td>
<td>RBP - 15</td>
<td>RBP - 15</td>
<td>Included in the Railroad District Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundhouse to McMillan</td>
<td>RBP - 16</td>
<td>RBP - 16</td>
<td>Included in the Railroad District Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Separated Crossing near Sinsheimer Park</td>
<td>RBP - 13</td>
<td>RBP - 13</td>
<td>Included in the Railroad District Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinsheimer Park Trails</td>
<td>RBP - 4</td>
<td>RBP - 4</td>
<td>2013 includes all Sinsheimer Park Master Plan trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento/Duncan to Laurel Class I</td>
<td>RBP - 3</td>
<td>RBP - 3</td>
<td>2013 expanded to include recent road improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcutt Area Specific Plan</td>
<td>RBP - 5</td>
<td>RBP - 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Separated Crossing of RR at Industrial</td>
<td>RBP - 11</td>
<td>RBP - 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge over Tank Farm Road</td>
<td>RBP - 9</td>
<td>RBP - 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2013 BTP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013 BTP</th>
<th>2007 BTP</th>
<th>2002 BTP</th>
<th>Notes/additional naming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob Jones City-to-Sea Trail</td>
<td>Bob Jones City-to-Sea Trail</td>
<td>BJT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh to Bianchi</td>
<td>BJT - 6</td>
<td>BJT - 6</td>
<td>Included in the Mid-Higuera Enhancement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bianchi Class I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bianchi to South</td>
<td>BJT - 7</td>
<td>BJT - 7</td>
<td>Included in the Mid-Higuera Enhancement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South to Brook Class III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook to Madonna</td>
<td>BJT - 8</td>
<td>BJT - 8</td>
<td>Included in the Mid-Higuera Enhancement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madonna Grade Separated Crossing</td>
<td>BJT - 9</td>
<td>BJT - 9</td>
<td>&quot;Segment 1&quot; (Project description, 6/2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madonna to Elks</td>
<td>BJT - 5</td>
<td>BJT - 5</td>
<td>&quot;Segment 1&quot; (Project description, 6/2001) partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Over Creek at Elks</td>
<td>BJT - 12</td>
<td>BJT - 12</td>
<td>&quot;Segment 2&quot; (Project description, 6/2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elks to Prado</td>
<td>BJT - 4</td>
<td>BJT - 4</td>
<td>&quot;Segment 2&quot; (Project description, 6/2001) partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Over SLO Creek at Prado</td>
<td>BJT - 3</td>
<td>BJT - 3</td>
<td>&quot;Segment 3&quot; (Project description, 6/2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prado to Los Osos Valley Road</td>
<td>BJT - 1</td>
<td>BJT - 1</td>
<td>&quot;Segment 3&quot; (Project description, 6/2001 and CAR 7/17/2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Separated Crossing of Los Osos Valley Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOVR to Octagon Barn</td>
<td>BJT - 11</td>
<td>BJT - 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prado to Calle Joaquin</td>
<td>BJT - 10</td>
<td>BJT - 10</td>
<td>&quot;Segment 4&quot; (Project description, 6/2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 BTP</td>
<td>2007 BTP</td>
<td>2002 BTP</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASP Tank Farm Creek Class I</td>
<td>Tank Farm Creek Class I</td>
<td>TFC - 1</td>
<td>The Airport Area Specific Plan describes this bikeway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckley Road Bikeway</td>
<td>Buckley Road Class II</td>
<td>BRB</td>
<td>The Airport Area Specific Plan describes bike-ways in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network segments:</td>
<td>Bike Lane System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vachell Lane Class II</td>
<td>BRB - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckley Road Class II</td>
<td>BRB - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckley Extension Class I, II</td>
<td>BRB - 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckley Class I Path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge to Laguna Middle School</td>
<td>Laguna Middle School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanaire to Existing East end</td>
<td>Existing East end of Prado to</td>
<td>BJT - 13</td>
<td>2002 plan included a bridge over Madonna Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Prado Class I, Option A</td>
<td>Oceanaire Class I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanaire to Existing East end</td>
<td>Prado Grade Separated Crossing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Prado Class I, Option B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I: Support Maps

The Map below shows the City’s “Pavement Management Zones”. The zones are used to segment the City for regular street surface upgrades and rehabilitation.
Appendix I: Support Maps

The map below shows the public elementary school neighborhood boundaries. All of the Bicycle Transportation Plan projects (Appendix A) identify in which elementary school zone they lie.
Appendix J: Existing Bikeway Connections

A "Bikeway Connection" is defined as an existing or planned unpaved trail or paved walkway providing connections to bikeways. The following is a current listing of existing bikeway connections as of January 31, 2013. These locations are also shown on Map 1: Bicycle Transportation Network.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Begin (North/West)</th>
<th>End (South/East)</th>
<th>Length(ft)</th>
<th>City Area</th>
<th>Paved</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toro</td>
<td>*1321 Johnson Ave.</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>*Albertson's Market parking lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nipomo Street</td>
<td>Mill Street</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Drive</td>
<td>Los Cerros</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Drive</td>
<td>Highway 101</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Street</td>
<td>Andrews Street</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Monday Club to San Luis Dr. across creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Safety Trail</td>
<td>Southwood Drive</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sinsheimer Park Master Plan, southern edge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marigold Center</td>
<td>Poinsettia Street</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3580 Broad</td>
<td>3591 Sacramento</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Broad St. mixed use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista Collados</td>
<td>Vista Lago</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanaire</td>
<td>Prefumo Creek Commons</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Village Shopping Center</td>
<td>West Newport</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quail Drive</td>
<td>Eto Circle</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh Court</td>
<td>Farrier Court</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreman Court</td>
<td>Singletree Court</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devaul Ranch Way</td>
<td>Irish Hills Plaza</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K:
Bike Plan Benefit-Cost Analysis

MEMORANDUM

Date: January 31, 2013

To: Peggy Mandeville
Principal Transportation Planner, City of San Luis Obispo

From: Joe Fernandez, PE, AICP

Subject: Bike Plan Benefit-Cost Analysis

This memorandum summarizes the benefit-cost analysis conducted for the Railroad Safety Trail (RRST) and Bob Jones Bike Trail (BJBT) within the City of San Luis Obispo. JBG Consulting prepared the analysis shown in the Appendix, which is used as the basis for this summary. This document first discusses the cost estimates, followed by bicycle demand estimates, then presents the benefit calculations, and finally presents the benefit-cost ratio.

SUMMARY

NCHRP Report 552: Guidelines for Analysis of Investments in Bicycle Facilities presents an approach for quantifying potential value and benefits of bicycle facilities. These include benefits to individuals, such as health and recreational benefits, and benefits to the community, such as congestion reduction and reduced health care costs. The RRST and BJBT within the City limits were analyzed to determine their benefit. The present value of construction and on-going maintenance costs is near $23 million. The present value of benefits is nearly $240 million, yielding a benefit-cost ratio near 10.

COST ESTIMATES

The cost estimates to construct and maintain the RRST and BJBT within the City limits were obtained from the Draft Bicycle Transportation Plan, 2012. Annual maintenance costs were assumed to be $25,000 per mile per year, construction was assumed to be completed within four years, and the projects were assumed to have a 30-year useful life. Future expenditures, including future construction costs and maintenance costs, were converted to present value costs using 3% and 7% discount rates to provide a range of possible present values. This memo presents the results of the 7% discount rate, as it results in a more conservative benefit-cost ratio. Table 1 summarizes the project costs and their net present values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Maintenance Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Safety Trail</td>
<td>5.1 miles</td>
<td>$14,993,384</td>
<td>$1,759,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Jones Bike Trail</td>
<td>3.25 miles</td>
<td>$5,310,310</td>
<td>$1,121,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.35 miles</td>
<td>$20,303,693</td>
<td>$2,880,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Present Value of Total Project Costs: $23,184,443

1. Net present value of costs using a 7% discount rate, assuming construction in 4 years and maintenance for 30 years. See tables 2A and 2B in the Appendix for detailed calculations.
BICYCLE DEMAND ESTIMATES

Predicting bicycle demand typically takes one of two forms: predictive models using demographic, policy, and facility variables to estimate bicycle travel; or sketch planning models that build on measured mode shares, typically Census data. NCHRP 552 uses the latter approach because (1) it accounts for the significant variability in bicycle use between different geographic areas by starting with local data, and (2) it is simple to apply with readily available data.

Sketch Planning Method

The sketch planning method estimates bicycling demand in two steps. The first step uses the commute share near the proposed facility to estimate the average number of adult bicyclists in the area on a given day. Surveys from 15 US metropolitan areas provide the basis to estimate the number of daily bicyclists as a function of commuter bicyclists with a high degree of confidence.

The second step extrapolates the number of new bicycle users based on the mode share of existing commuters. Research shows that people are more likely to ride a bicycle if they live within one mile of a bicycle facility than if they live outside of that distance. The likelihood increases for residents within ½ mile and ¼ mile of a bicycle facility. The population within ¼ mile, ½ mile, and one mile of the proposed facilities was estimated using a GIS network of the planned bicycle facilities and 2010 Census Block Group Data.

A range of possible demand levels is presented, and the most likely estimate is selected based on local knowledge and judgment of other more qualitative factors such as proximity to universities or links to other major destinations.

Demand Estimates

Table 2 summarizes the estimated bicycle demand for the proposed facilities using the approach described above. The bicycle demand in the area would more than double with the construction of the BJBT and RRST.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Bicycle Demand Estimates1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commuters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Cyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Cyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This table summarizes the best estimate of demand associated with the projects. Detailed calculations showing the range of estimates are presented in Tables 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the Appendix.

BENEFITS ASSOCIATED WITH BICYCLE FACILITIES

NCHRP 552 quantifies the benefits associated with bicycle facilities, including benefits realized by facility users and the community at large. Four types of benefits are quantified:

- **Mobility benefits** are based on stated preference surveys indicating the value people place on riding on certain facilities compared to others. For off-street bicycle trails like the BJBT and RRST, commuters indicate a willingness to spend about 20 minutes extra to use the off-street trail instead of riding on a street with parked cars.

- **Health benefits** reflect the correlation between increased physical activity and reduced health care costs, both on an individual and community level. NCHRP 552 uses the median value ($128) of ten studies quantifying the annual per capita cost savings of increase physical activity. It then multiplies $128 by the new cyclists resulting from the new facilities.

- **Recreation benefits** are calculated based on the number of new non-commuter cyclists, where a typical daily benefit of recreational cycling is valued at $10. This valuation is based on a review of a wide variety of studies of outdoor activities.

- **Reduced auto use benefits** are applied only to commuter and other non-recreational travel that serve as an alternative to auto use. These benefits include reduced congestion, reduced air pollution, and user cost savings.

The estimated value of these benefits is summarized in Table 3. The recreation benefits constitute 2/3 of the total benefit value, followed by the mobility benefits which constitute more than ½ of the total.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Benefit Estimates1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Auto Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Annual Value</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This table summarizes the best estimate of benefits associated with the projects for 2010 population estimates. Detailed calculations showing the range of estimates are presented in Tables 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 of the Appendix.

BENEFIT-COST RATIO

The annual value of benefits shown in Table 3 is converted to a net present value to provide a consistent baseline for calculating the benefit-cost ratio. Table 4 summarizes the benefit-cost ratio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Benefit-Cost Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present Value of Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$243,989,323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This table summarizes the net present value of benefits and costs using a 7% discount rate and assuming a 30-year useful facility life. Detailed calculations showing the range of estimates are presented in Tables 13 and 14 of the Appendix.

The calculated benefit-cost ratio is 10.52. There is a large range of ratios depending on the input assumptions and assumed usage of the new facilities. This range is presented in Table 14 of the Appendix. While no ‘rule of thumb’ exists for evaluating the benefit/cost ratio, a ratio of over 10 is higher than many other infrastructure projects.
APPLICATIONS AND POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS

This analysis can be used in the Future Financial Needs section of the Bicycle Transportation Plan to accompany the Plan’s project cost estimates. The bicycle demand estimates show the effectiveness of these major Class I projects towards achieving the City’s mode split goals.

The analysis could be improved by using finer-grained population data, allowing for more accurate estimates of the population near the proposed facilities. This data would also help identify areas that are currently underserved by bicycle facilities, as these areas would see the most benefit from new facilities.

Local survey data could be used to further refine the analysis and increase the level of confidence in the results. For example, locally valid estimates of bicycle commute mode share and recreational bicycling rates would improve the analysis.

This analysis approach can be used on a larger scale to evaluate regional trails (like the Salinas River Trail and BBJT outside of San Luis Obispo).

Finally, the analysis could be conducted for the RRST and BBJT individually to determine which project offers the higher benefit-cost ratio, for use in project prioritization.

BENEFIT-COST ANALYSIS - APPENDIX:

Bicycle demand is calculated using the methods and standard values given in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Element</th>
<th>Trail Segment Length (Miles)</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Annual Maintenance Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rail Road Safety Trail</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>$16,966,500</td>
<td>$127,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Jones Trail</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$81,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,966,500</td>
<td>$208,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Present Value Calculations: 7% Real Discount Rate

Net Present Value of Annual Maintenance Costs$1 $2,880,750

Net Present Value Calculations: 3% Real Discount Rate

Net Present Value of Annual Maintenance Costs$2 $4,091,500

1 The present value coefficient for a project useful lifetime of 30 years and a discount rate of 7% is 13.80; that is, the net present value of each dollar of annual maintenance costs is $13.80.

2 The present value coefficient for a project useful lifetime of 30 years and a discount rate of 3% is 19.60; that is, the net present value of each dollar of annual maintenance costs is $19.60.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Project Cost Expenditure</th>
<th>Discounted Present Value of Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7% Discount Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,159,484</td>
<td>$1,159,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,194,026</td>
<td>$1,173,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,167,707</td>
<td>$1,126,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,330,528</td>
<td>$1,259,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,611,120</td>
<td>$1,498,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,616,513</td>
<td>$1,476,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,054,012</td>
<td>$1,841,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$2,444,396</td>
<td>$2,152,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$2,005,922</td>
<td>$1,734,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,172,974</td>
<td>$1,845,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,616,156</td>
<td>$1,347,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,726,267</td>
<td>$1,413,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,533,277</td>
<td>$1,322,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$766,956</td>
<td>$605,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$500,132</td>
<td>$434,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,966,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Present Value of Annual Maintenance Costs $2,880,750 $4,091,500

Net Present Value of Total Project Costs $23,184,443 $25,884,866
### Table 3: Bicycle Commuters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>City of San Luis Obispo</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>45,119</td>
<td>45,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Adults</td>
<td>89.30%</td>
<td>89.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Commuters</td>
<td>20,006</td>
<td>20,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Commuters (%)</td>
<td>44.34%</td>
<td>44.34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Bicycle Commuters: % of Commuters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>High Estimate</th>
<th>Low Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Estimate</td>
<td>10.28%</td>
<td>10.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Estimate</td>
<td>7.75%</td>
<td>7.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Estimate</td>
<td>5.30%</td>
<td>5.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Bicycle Commuters: % of Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>High Estimate</th>
<th>Low Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Estimate</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Estimate</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Estimate</td>
<td>2.35%</td>
<td>2.35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. High and low estimates for number of bicycle commuters are the 2009 - 2011 American Community Survey estimates plus or minus the stated statistical uncertainties. Uncertainties in total population and total commuters are less than 1% and are not considered in the present analysis.

### Table 4: Populations Within Various Distances of Project Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of San Luis Obispo Bicycle Master Plan Proposed Locations</th>
<th>Population within 400 Meters</th>
<th>Population within 800 Meters</th>
<th>Population within 1600 Meters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rail Road Safety Trail</td>
<td>11,775</td>
<td>19,877</td>
<td>28,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Jones Trail</td>
<td>5,519</td>
<td>7,092</td>
<td>16,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Estimates from 2010 Census Block Data and GIS Mapping</td>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>17,284</td>
<td>25,964</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 5: Commuting Cyclists and Total Daily Adult Cyclists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance to Project:</th>
<th>400 Meters</th>
<th>800 Meters</th>
<th>1600 Meters</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>17,266</td>
<td>8,698</td>
<td>18,966</td>
<td>44,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Commuters</td>
<td>44.34%</td>
<td>44.34%</td>
<td>44.34%</td>
<td>44.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Adults</td>
<td>89.30%</td>
<td>89.30%</td>
<td>89.30%</td>
<td>89.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commuting Cyclists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Estimate</th>
<th>787</th>
<th>396</th>
<th>865</th>
<th>2,048</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best Estimate</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>1,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Estimate</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>1,056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Daily Adult Cycling Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Estimate</th>
<th>31.43%</th>
<th>31.43%</th>
<th>31.43%</th>
<th>31.43%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best Estimate</td>
<td>9.75%</td>
<td>9.75%</td>
<td>9.75%</td>
<td>9.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Estimate</td>
<td>5.30%</td>
<td>5.30%</td>
<td>5.30%</td>
<td>5.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Daily Adult Cyclists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Estimate</th>
<th>4,846</th>
<th>2,441</th>
<th>5,329</th>
<th>12,616</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best Estimate</td>
<td>1,563</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>1,652</td>
<td>3,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Estimate</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>2,127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Calculated as the product of population and the commuting cyclist’s percentage of population in Table 3.

### Table 6: NEW Daily Bicycle Commuters and Daily Adult Cyclists: Attributed to the Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance to Project:</th>
<th>400 Meters</th>
<th>800 Meters</th>
<th>1600 Meters</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Bicycle Commuters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Estimate</td>
<td>1,518</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>2,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Estimate</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Estimate</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1,184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### New Daily Adult Cyclists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Estimate</th>
<th>9,353</th>
<th>4,712</th>
<th>10,285</th>
<th>24,352</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best Estimate</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td>4,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Estimate</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Per the NCHRP Report 522, Page 39, the numbers of new bicycle commuters and new daily adult cyclists are estimated to be 1.93, 1.11 and 0.39 times the current values (See Table 5 above) for distances of 400 meters, 800 meters, and 1600 meters, respectively. These values are in addition to the new bicycle commuters.
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Table 7: Annual Mobility Benefits for Bicycle Commuters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bicycle Commuters</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Annual Mobility Benefit¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Bicycle Commuters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Estimate</td>
<td>2,048</td>
<td>$4,176,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Estimate</td>
<td>1,552</td>
<td>$3,166,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Estimate</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>$2,154,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bicycle Commuters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Estimate</td>
<td>2,296</td>
<td>$4,683,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Estimate</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>$3,549,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Estimate</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>$2,414,671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Per the NCHRP Report 552, page 39, the mobility benefit for riding on off-street bicycle trail, compared to riding on a street with parked cars is $4.08/trip, with 2 trips per day 5 days per week 50 weeks per year.

Numbers of existing and new bicycle commuters are from Tables 5 and 6 above.

Table 8: Annual Health Benefits for Total New Adult Cyclists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Adult Cyclists</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Annual Health Benefit¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Estimate</td>
<td>26,646</td>
<td>$3,410,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Estimate</td>
<td>6,082</td>
<td>$776,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Estimate</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$128,319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Per the NCHRP Report 552, page 39, the annual health benefit per new cyclist is $128.

The total estimated numbers of new adult cyclists are shown above in Table 6.

Table 9: Annual Recreation Benefits for New Adult Cyclists (Excluding New Bicycle Commuters)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Adult Cyclists (Excluding New Bicycle Commuters)</th>
<th>Number²</th>
<th>Annual Recreation Benefits¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Estimate</td>
<td>24,350</td>
<td>$88,876,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Estimate</td>
<td>4,342</td>
<td>$15,848,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Estimate</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>$3,027,501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Per the NCHRP Report 552, page 39, the annual recreation benefit for new adult cyclists, excluding new bicycle commuters, is calculated at $10/day times 365 days.

² Number of new adult cyclists from Table 6 above.

Table 10: Reduced Auto Use Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Bicycle Commuters</th>
<th>Number¹</th>
<th>Annual Recreation Benefits²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Estimate</td>
<td>2,296</td>
<td>$447,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Estimate</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>$339,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Estimate</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>$230,814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ From Table 6 Above.
² Based on an average 6 mile roundtrip commute distance and $0.13 per mile - the NCHRP Report 552 value for urban areas.

Table 11: Total Annual Benefits 2008 Population Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>High Estimate</th>
<th>Best Estimate</th>
<th>Low Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Benefits</td>
<td>$8,662,081</td>
<td>$6,715,526</td>
<td>$4,968,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Benefits</td>
<td>$3,410,629</td>
<td>$776,472</td>
<td>$128,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Benefits</td>
<td>$88,876,324</td>
<td>$15,848,479</td>
<td>$3,027,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Auto Use Benefits</td>
<td>$447,692</td>
<td>$339,253</td>
<td>$230,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Annual Benefits</td>
<td>$101,596,726</td>
<td>$23,681,730</td>
<td>$7,955,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 6 Above.
Table 13: Detailed Calculation of Net Present Value of Benefits
Best Data Estimates for 7% and 3% Discount Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Annual Benefits</th>
<th>Years in Future</th>
<th>7% Discount Factor</th>
<th>3% Discount Factor</th>
<th>Net Present Value 7% Discount Rate</th>
<th>Net Present Value 3% Discount Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9330</td>
<td>0.9700</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$6,056,577</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8664</td>
<td>0.9409</td>
<td>$5,238,333</td>
<td>$5,698,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$12,182,199</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8044</td>
<td>0.9127</td>
<td>$9,798,833</td>
<td>$11,118,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$18,377,456</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7481</td>
<td>0.8853</td>
<td>$13,747,293</td>
<td>$16,269,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$24,642,944</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6957</td>
<td>0.8587</td>
<td>$17,143,609</td>
<td>$21,161,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$24,783,408</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6470</td>
<td>0.8330</td>
<td>$16,034,622</td>
<td>$20,643,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$24,924,674</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.6017</td>
<td>0.8080</td>
<td>$14,967,198</td>
<td>$20,138,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$25,066,744</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.5596</td>
<td>0.7837</td>
<td>$14,026,894</td>
<td>$19,645,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$25,209,625</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.5204</td>
<td>0.7602</td>
<td>$13,119,368</td>
<td>$19,165,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$25,353,320</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.4840</td>
<td>0.7374</td>
<td>$12,270,558</td>
<td>$18,696,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$25,497,834</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.4501</td>
<td>0.7153</td>
<td>$11,476,661</td>
<td>$18,238,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>$25,643,171</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.4186</td>
<td>0.6938</td>
<td>$10,734,137</td>
<td>$17,792,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>$25,789,337</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.3893</td>
<td>0.6730</td>
<td>$10,039,649</td>
<td>$17,356,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>$25,936,337</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.3620</td>
<td>0.6528</td>
<td>$9,390,093</td>
<td>$16,932,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>$26,084,174</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.3367</td>
<td>0.6333</td>
<td>$8,782,564</td>
<td>$16,517,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>$26,232,854</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.3131</td>
<td>0.6143</td>
<td>$8,214,241</td>
<td>$16,113,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>$26,382,381</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.2912</td>
<td>0.5958</td>
<td>$7,682,881</td>
<td>$15,719,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>$26,532,760</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.2703</td>
<td>0.5780</td>
<td>$7,185,801</td>
<td>$15,334,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>$26,683,997</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.2519</td>
<td>0.5606</td>
<td>$6,720,892</td>
<td>$14,959,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>$26,836,096</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.2342</td>
<td>0.5438</td>
<td>$6,286,057</td>
<td>$14,593,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>$26,989,062</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.2178</td>
<td>0.5275</td>
<td>$5,879,355</td>
<td>$14,236,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034</td>
<td>$27,142,899</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.2028</td>
<td>0.5117</td>
<td>$5,498,967</td>
<td>$13,887,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>$27,297,614</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.1884</td>
<td>0.4963</td>
<td>$5,143,189</td>
<td>$13,547,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>$27,453,210</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.1752</td>
<td>0.4814</td>
<td>$4,810,430</td>
<td>$13,216,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037</td>
<td>$27,609,693</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.1630</td>
<td>0.4670</td>
<td>$4,499,200</td>
<td>$12,893,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038</td>
<td>$27,767,089</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.1516</td>
<td>0.4530</td>
<td>$4,198,104</td>
<td>$12,577,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2039</td>
<td>$27,925,341</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.1409</td>
<td>0.4394</td>
<td>$3,935,846</td>
<td>$12,269,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>$28,084,515</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.1311</td>
<td>0.4262</td>
<td>$3,681,201</td>
<td>$11,969,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2041</td>
<td>$28,244,587</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.1219</td>
<td>0.4134</td>
<td>$3,443,031</td>
<td>$11,676,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$543,869,323</td>
<td>$412,370,935</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Benefit-Cost Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit-Cost Analysis</th>
<th>Net Present Value of Benefits</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Benefit-Cost Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits with 7% Discount Rate</td>
<td>$871,020,415</td>
<td>$23,184,443</td>
<td>37.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Estimate</td>
<td>$243,989,323</td>
<td>$23,184,443</td>
<td>10.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Estimate</td>
<td>$85,700,981</td>
<td>$23,184,443</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits with 3% Discount Rate</td>
<td>$1,543,526,189</td>
<td>$25,684,866</td>
<td>59.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Estimate</td>
<td>$432,370,935</td>
<td>$25,684,866</td>
<td>16.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Estimate</td>
<td>$151,869,815</td>
<td>$25,684,866</td>
<td>5.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix L: Consistency to related SLO County Plans

Consistency of this Plan to related plans in San Luis Obispo County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Highways</th>
<th>County FM Corridors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Highway A</td>
<td>County FM A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Highway B</td>
<td>County FM B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Highway C</td>
<td>County FM C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Highway D</td>
<td>County FM D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of San Luis Obispo

2013 Bicycle Transportation Plan

Appendix L: Consistency to related SLO County Plans
Appendix L: Consistency of this Plan to related plans in San Luis Obispo County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Consistent with County Plan</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Consistent with City Plan</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consistency of this Plan to related plans in San Luis Obispo County
RESOLUTION NO. 10471 (2013 Series)

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO ADOPTING THE 2013 BICYCLE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (GPIER 71-13)

WHEREAS, the City Council established the Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) and charged it with, among other responsibilities, maintaining and updating the Bicycle Transportation Plan; and

WHEREAS, the 2007 Bicycle Transportation Plan approved by Resolution No. 9899 needs to be updated and certified by the State in 2013 to comply with the Streets and Highways Code in order for the City to continue to be eligible to apply for State Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) grant funding; and

WHEREAS, the Bicycle Advisory Committee developed a comprehensive update to the 2007 Plan over a two year period based on input received from the Bicycle Advisory Committee and members of the public; and

WHEREAS, in May 2013, a public hearing draft of the 2013 Bicycle Transportation Plan was published and placed on the City's website for public review; and

WHEREAS, the potential environmental impacts of the 2013 Bicycle Transportation Plan have been evaluated in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to an initial environmental study (ER 71-13) and the Community Development Department Director recommends adopting a Negative Declaration of environmental impact; and

WHEREAS, on September 11, 2013, the Planning Commission reviewed the 2013 Bicycle Transportation Plan and Negative Declaration at a public hearing and has recommended that the City Council approve the Plan and its Negative Declaration as forwarded by the Bicycle Advisory Committee and revising the Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, the City Council conducted a public hearing on November 5, 2013 and has considered the testimony of interested parties, the Planning Commission hearing and action, the Negative Declaration prepared by staff and recommended by the Planning Commission, and the evaluation and recommendation of staff.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of San Luis Obispo as follows:

SECTION 1. The City Council finds and determines that the Plan’s Negative Declaration adequately addresses the potential significant environmental impacts of the project and reflects the independent judgment of the Council. The Council hereby approves said Negative Declaration.
SECTION 2. Findings. This Council, after consideration of the 2013 Bicycle Transportation Plan as recommended by the Bicycle Advisory Committee and Planning Commission, staff recommendations, public testimony, and reports thereof, makes the following findings:

1. The proposed 2013 Bicycle Transportation Plan will promote the public health, safety and welfare of persons working or living in the City by providing a network of convenient bikeways, bicycling safety, and bicycling education.

2. The proposed 2013 Bicycle Transportation Plan will further General Plan goals to reduce people's use of their cars by supporting and promoting alternatives such as walking, riding buses and bicycles, and using car pools.

3. The proposed 2013 Bicycle Transportation Plan will provide new and improved bicycling facilities which further existing General Plan policies and objectives to complete a network of safe and convenient bikeways that connect neighborhoods with major activity centers and the county bike routes.

SECTION 3. Approval. The 2013 Bicycle Transportation Plan is hereby approved by the City Council with minor changes made at the meeting and Resolution Number 9899 (2007 Series) approving the 2007 Bicycle Transportation Plan is hereby superseded and the 2013 Bicycle Transportation Plan shall hereafter be the official Plan of the City of San Luis Obispo.

Upon motion of Council Member Christianson, seconded by Council Member Ashbaugh, and on the following roll call vote:

AYES: Council Members Ashbaugh, Carpenter and Christianson, and Vice Mayor Smith
NOES: None
ABSENT: Mayor Marx

The foregoing resolution was adopted this 5th day of November 2013.

[Signature]
Vice Mayor Kathy Smith

ATTEST:

[Signature]
Anthony J. Mejia, CMC
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

[Signature]
J. Christine Dietrick
City Attorney
December 30, 2013
Peggy Mandeville
919 Palm Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

RE: Comments on the Draft Bicycle and Trails Master Plan

Dear Ms. Mandeville,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on City of San Luis Obispo’s 2013 Bicycle Transportation Plan. As the state-designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for San Luis Obispo County, SLOCOG is charged with the responsibility of approving Bicycle Transportation Plans within the region for compliance with California Streets and Highway Code Section 891.2 and with the current 2010 Regional Transportation Plan-Preliminary Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP-PSCS). SLOCOG acknowledges The City’s Plan meets the eligibility requirements set forth by the State of California.

SLOCOG acknowledges the City’s history and ability in producing exceptional bicycle plans for future bikeways and bicycle-related projects. The 2013 Bicycle Transportation Plan prepared by the City is comprehensive, well written and was developed with a great deal of input from local citizens. The plan’s updated policies strengthen existing policies that promote bicycle infrastructure, safety, and education and provides the framework necessary to continually build upon the foundation currently in place.

A major goal of SLOCOG is to help assure the development of an efficient, coordinated, integrated, and balanced transportation system to meet the mobility needs of the San Luis Obispo region utilizing all modes of transportation. The City’s commitment to ensure continued progress in meeting this goal is reflected in its 2013 Bicycle Transportation Plan. SLOCOG is proud to continue to partner with the City of San Luis Obispo in planning and implementing future bicycle-related improvements.

Sincerely,

Richard Murphy
Director Programming & Project Delivery
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments

Appendix M: Plan Adoption Documents