Date: March 19, 2008
Committee Meeting Date: April 10, 2008
Board Meeting Date: May 1, 2008

BOARD MEMORANDUM ACTION ITEM

TO: Technical Advisory Committee
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
Board of Directors

THROUGH: Michael T. Burns
General Manager

FROM: John H. Ristow
Chief CMA Officer

SUBJECT: Countywide Bicycle Plan –Adopt Plan

RECOMMENDATION:

Review and recommend that the Board of Directors adopt the 2008 Countywide Bicycle Plan for Santa Clara County.

BACKGROUND:

For the past year, VTA has been in the process of updating the 2000 Countywide Bicycle Plan (CBP). All chapters have been brought to the BPAC for discussion and comment and have included presentations on the goals and policies; the cross-county bicycle corridors; the inventory of Across Barrier Connections (ABC's); Bicycle Safety Education and Promotion programs; and the Bicycle Expenditure Program (BEP).

A CBP public workshop held March 5 was attended by 18 persons, including members of the BPAC and the general public. Written comments submitted by members of the public are presented in Attachment A. The Draft Bicycle Plan was presented to the VTA BPAC and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) in March. Written comments have been received from city and county staff over the past month.

DISCUSSION:

The Draft Bicycle Plan is included in the packet, and a revised Chapter 4 is attached which contains new tables and Appendices listing potential bicycle projects and improvements.

Policy Framework

The Goals and Policies of the 2000 CBP were reviewed, modified and updated to incorporate action steps as a measurable way to monitor progress towards the goals. The five overarching goals are the same, and the policies to implement the goals were retained with some minor changes as described below. The specific Action Steps for each policy are presented in Appendix A of the CBP:

- Goal A - Transportation Planning and Programming: Policy A3 was rewritten as follows:
  DELETE Encourage implementation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities as part of the improvement of all transportation facilities.
  ADD *Include bicycle and pedestrian facilities in applicable transportation plans programs and studies.*

- Goal B - Land Use Transportation Integration: Policy B4 was rewritten as follows:
  DELETE Discourage existing bicycle access from being negatively impacted.
  ADD *Ensure that existing bicycle facilities and access are maintained and preserved.*

- Goal D - Design and Construction: Policy D1 was rewritten as follows:
  DELETE When and where appropriate, include bicycle and pedestrian facilities when a Member Agency proposes to construct or rehabilitate a roadway.
  ADD *Ensure that Member Agency construction or rehabilitation projects incorporate best practices for bicycle and pedestrian facilities when and where appropriate.*

- Goal E – Complementary Policies that Encourage Bicycling; a new policy was added:
  Promote Public Awareness through Education & Positive Enforcement Programs. (Former Policy C3 is now an action step under this policy).

Potential Projects

The 2008 CBP plan updates and expands the Cross County Bicycle Corridor (CCBC) Network. These corridors are the basis for developing projects for the BEP. The numbering system of the CCBC's in the CBP is for planning purposes only and may or may not be the system actually used if and when VTA or the County develops a signing system for the CCBC (an action step under Policy E-2).

The CCBC network now includes all state routes and expressways due to their importance as bicycle commute routes. A total of 600 miles of roadways and 62 miles of expressways are included. Of the roadways, 120 miles are proposed new bike lanes and 90 miles are proposed for shoulder widening.

The CCBC Network also integrates the thirteen Regional and Subregional trails identified in the Santa Clara County Parks Trails Master Plan since these multi-use trails also function as bike paths. These thirteen trails include those identified by regional, state and federal agencies such as the Juan Batista de Anza National Historic Trail, the Bay Trail and the Bay Area Ridge Trail, as well as county trails such as the Guadalupe River Trail and the Los Gatos Creek Trail. The CCBC network also includes local bike paths of regional significance such as San Tomas Aquino Trail, the SR-237 bike path and the Uvas Creek Trail. To complete all of these bike path systems, over 400 miles of new bike paths would be needed.

The CBP also contains a sweeping vision for interconnectivity across the County's major circulation barriers such as freeways, railroad tracks and rivers and creeks. While many of these crossings are on the CCBC network, each segment of these barriers in the entire county was addressed. Up to 112 existing roadway crossings need either bike lanes or shoulders (see Table 4-2), and up to 123 new pedestrian/bike bridges are needed to provide connectivity between

neighborhoods, and between job centers and residential areas (see Table 4-2). Also, up to 129 freeway interchanges need either bike lane, or shoulder, and /or ramp modifications in order to reduce vehicle speeds and ameliorate merge-diverge conflicts (see Appendix D-2).

All of these potential projects will be the basis for:

- the update of the Bicycle Expenditure Plan and the VTP 2035
- development review and identifying conditions of approval
- incorporating into highway projects as part of Routine Accommodation

Comments Received
The main comments received on the Draft Plan were on the following topics:

- Correction of factual information such as city location of roadway and trail segments, existing bike lane locations; existing city programs.
- Include a more specific list of projects (we have done so in Tables 4-1 - 4-2 and Appendices D-1 and D-2).
- Addition of regionally significant trails in Gilroy to the CCBC system.
- Realignment of CCBC #18 through Gilroy.

FISCAL IMPACT:
There is no fiscal impact to the VTA annual budget or the Enterprise fund with the adoption of the Countywide Bicycle Plan.

ALTERNATIVES:
The Board may wish to make modifications to the Countywide Bicycle Plan.

Attachments
Attachment A: Public Comments
Attachment B: Revised Draft Chapter 4

Prepared by: Michelle DeRobertis, Senior Transportation Planner

ATTACHMENT A
Comments Submitted at Bike Plan Workshop
March 5, 2008

Written Comments

Goals, policies and action steps

1. Patrick Grant:
   If Sunnyvale could be persuaded to join in with Mountain View before Mountain View completes design of Reach 4 of Stevens Creek Trail, a considerable cost savings could be realized. Has to be by end of this year.

2. Anonymous- Policy A1-action step-Comply with LORS including RA (Routine Accommodation); Policy A4- action step- Should threshold for bike stations be 100 bikes not 50 to be consistent with BART?

Cross County Bicycle Corridors and or/ Bikeway Projects

3. Anne Ng (Cupertino):
   Merging issues for bikes on Lawrence (before Stevens Creek Blvd heading north after Stevens Creek Blvd heading south before Stevens Creek Blvd after 280).

4. M. Delson (San Jose):
   The map and inventory should distinguish on-ramps with a single lane from on-ramps with a double right-turn lane. The latter is much more hazardous for cyclists. (see diagram)

5. M. Delson (San Jose):
   A project should be added to study connecting the Los Gatos Creek Trail from its north end at Meridian to its restart at Lonus near Lincoln. The gap is a blemish on the countywide plan. The on-street bike lane via Willow is unsatisfactory for recreational use. I am aware of the problems with providing this connection but it is certainly deserving of study.

6. M. Delson (San Jose):
   There is a need for an east-west corridor between corridor 9 and corridor 4 (e.g. along Hamilton) to connect west San Jose to the Los Gatos Trail or to Meridian Avenue.

Other

6. M. Delson (San Jose):
   Currently, agencies designate a "bike lane" as "a striped lane for one-way bike travel on a street". But this definition includes two very different kinds of facilities: (a) bike lanes adjacent to a red-striped no parking curb, and (b) bike lanes adjacent to a lane of parked cars. These two facilities provide a very different experience for the cyclist. It is much more comfortable to ride in a lane without parked cars to your right. The maps should distinguish these facilities. More importantly, planning should distinguish these two types of bike lanes, and should aim to promote bike lanes away from parking.

BPAC Workshop Comments
March 5, 2008

CCBC #2: Homestead/Hostetter Corridor
-Show a "2" at Sand Hill/Alpine JSB terminus

CCBC #3: Old Highway 9 Corridor
-Show north end at 3 connecting to Bay Trail
-De Anza College path: show on map?

CCBC #5: Bowers/Keily Corridor
-Saratoga Ave from 280 NS to 280 SS: Currently shows as a "Na" for "In City Bike Plan". John B. says that it will be put in Bike Plan. This gap will likely be a Type 6 fix.

CCBC #8: Tasman/Alum Rock Light Rail Corridor:
-Add: connect along Bay Side of 101 to Google/SCT

General Comment:
Expressways need a CCBC number.

Verbal Comments
Patrick Grant:
Want Sunnyvale to coordinate with Mt. View on Stevens Creek Trail project. Sunnyvale Owns land from end of Remington to creek bed; 14 easement. Extremely logical to put trail here. Economies of scale to plan this trail at same time.

David Simons:
(1) This connection would access city streets
(2) Put notes on our goals and policies
-threshold for bikes for attended bike parking

Anne Brunzell:
Why isn't Pierce Mt. Eden on there? Is it because it's not for commuters?
MD response: No, we can add it if it's considered a regional bicycling route.

Chapter 4
Projects, Funding and Implementation

This chapter presents the capital projects for improving bicycling connectivity and safety in Santa Clara County. Existing and potential new projects in the VTA Bicycle Expenditure Plan (BEP) are presented along with the current BOD-approved policies. Other funding programs and policies besides the BEP for bicycle projects are described. Finally this chapter discusses the various strategies that have been or could be used to fund bicycle projects as part of other, larger non-bicycle projects.

POTENTIAL PROJECTS

First, the improvements to the existing roadway and trails system needed to complete the cross county bicycle corridor network are identified. Next, the results of the inventory of all major barriers in the county are presented as a list of the roadway crossings that do not have bike lanes or shoulders. Potential new ABC's are also suggested where there is a large gap between existing crossings. The freeway interchanges that are bicycle-unfriendly are listed. Finally safe routes to transit projects for the regional transit stations are identified.

Cross County Bicycle Corridors

Based on the CCBC alignments presented in Chapter 3 and Appendix C2, the total number of lane miles of projects was calculated for each of the eleven "gap" or "project" types. To fully implement the CCBC network, the following new bikeways and bikeway projects would be needed.

- Bike lanes on arterials or collectors 120 miles
- Bike paths as part of roadway CCBCs 5 miles
- Multiuse Trails in active planning stage 40 miles
- Multiuse Trails – future alignment unknown 380 miles
- Bike Boulevards 5 miles
- Signed Bike Routes 15 miles
- Shoulder widening- 100 miles
- Add Bike Lanes to existing roadway overcrossings 20 locations
- New bike/ped Across Barrier Connections 14 locations
- Redesign Freeway Interchanges with high-speed ramps to be more bike friendly- 20 locations
- Expressway bike improvement projects - 6 locations and systemwide bicycle timing/detection project

The project types within each City that are needed to complete each of CCBC's are presented in Appendix D1.

Across Barrier Connections

In addition to the CCBC network, potential projects have been identified that would improve access - or provide access where none exists- across all the freeways, creeks and railroad tracks in the County. The project types fall into the following 3 categories:

1. **Provide bike lanes or shoulders on existing roadway over or undercrossings with inadequate lane widths**. Of the dozen or so freeways, railroad tracks and waterways in the County, 112 were identified to have sufficient traffic volumes to consider the need for bike lanes or wide shoulders. These crossings of railroad tracks and freeways are listed below (freeway interchanges are considered separately under #2 below) while crossings of creeks are listed in Appendix D2. Some of these locations are on a CCBC while most are not.

Roadway crossings of Caltrain tracks (including at-grade crossings) that do not have bike lanes or shoulders are:

- University
- Embarcadero
- Oregon Expressway
- Mary
- Mathilda
- Sunnyvale Ave
- Lawrence Expressway
- De La Cruz(Coleman/El Camino/Lewis)
- Blossom Hill
- Palm
- Live Oak
- Tilton
- San Pedro
- Middle
- San Martin Station
- Church
- Masten
- Rucker
- Buena Vista
- Cohansey
- Las Animas
- Luchessa

Roadway crossings of UPRR tracks that do not have bike lanes or shoulders are:

- Calaveras
- Curtis
- Great Mall Drive
- Montague Expressway
- Civic Center
- Orchard City
- Kennedy
- Camden
- Hacienda
- Prospect
- Seven Springs

Roadway crossings (not interchanges) of the following freeways that do not have bike lanes or wide shoulders are listed below in Table 4-1:

Table 4-1
Freeway Arterial Crossings
with No Bike Lanes or Shoulders

I-680	SR 17	SR 237
Cropley	Moorpark	Caribbean
Jackson	Hamilton	

SR 85	I-880	US 101
De Anza	Brokaw	Ellis
Oka	Fourth	Lafayette
Bascom	Park	McKee
Camden	Pruneridge/Hedding	Alum Rock
Meridian	Forest	Coyote Road
Winfield		

SR 87	I-280
Airport Parkway	Winchester
Hedding	Macarthur
Coleman	Bascom
Julian	Leland
Almaden	Leigh
Santa Clara	Race
San Fernando	Lincoln
Park	Almaden
San Carlos	Second
Virginia	Third
Alma	Tenth
Almaden Road	
Mill Pond	
Carol	
Hillsdale	
Chynoweth	

2. **Freeway interchanges that are bicycle-unfriendly.** Freeway interchanges can be intimidating to even serious cyclists. Many moderately skilled cyclists refuse to ride through many or most interchanges in the county. The two most beneficial improvements are 1) to provide bike lanes or wide shoulders on the over/ undercrossing, and 2) to reconfigure the ramps to be at 90 degrees, which slows motor vehicle traffic and enables safer merge /weave movements between the through bicyclists and the merging/diverging motor vehicles; (see BTG Chapter 5). All freeway interchanges in the county were reviewed for their bike-friendliness. Those that need bike lanes and/or modified ramp intersections are listed in Appendix D2. Typically, these bike-friendly design elements would be incorporated into a future highway project that proposes to modify all or a portion of the interchange. Those interchanges that are currently in the VTP 2030. Highway program are indicated in Appendix D2; those interchanges that are on a CCBC are also indicated.

3. **Large gap between existing crossings of the major barriers**. Over 100 segments of freeways, railroad tracks and waterways were identified where existing crossings are spaced more than one mile apart. In the urbanized areas of the county, 113 segments were determined to warrant, either now or in the future, an intermediate crossing of the barrier. These locations are listed in Table 4-2 and are illustrated in Figure 4-1. These locations should be monitored for development or redevelopment opportunities that could construct them. Those that are needed more immediately are either: 1) already in VTP 2030, either the BEP or the Local Streets and Roads (LSR) program; 2) submitted in response to the call for projects to VTP 2035 for either the BEP or LSR; or 3) have been identified in this plan as either on the CCBC network and/or the Safe Routes to Transit projects. In the case of the LSR, the project may be a new roadway with bike lanes rather than a pedestrian/ bicycle ABC.

The following ABC's are under construction or fully funded and thus the gaps they fill are not included in the list below:

- I-280 Bicycle Bridge at extension of Mary Avenue
- US 101 and S.R.237 Bike Bridge at extension of Borregas
- I-880 roadway extension Charcot Avenue
- US 101 and S.R.237 roadway extension of Mary Avenue

Table 4-2
Locations in Santa Clara County
Needing a Potential New Across Barrier Connection

City of Campbell Potential New ABC's

Freeways		Creeks	
Name	Segment Between:	Name	Segment Between:
17	Campbell and San Tomas Expy/Camden	Los Gatos Creek	Campbell Park Bridge and Camden Ped Bridge
17	San Tomas Expy/Camden and Ped Overcrossing at Mozart (LG)	Los Gatos Creek	San Tomas Expy and Ped Bridge at Lark (LG)

City of Cupertino Potential New ABC's

Freeways		Railroad Tracks	
Name	Segment Between:	Name	Segment Between:
280	Foothill (LA) and Proposed Mary Overpass	UPRR	Rainbow and McClellan
		UPRR	Stevens Creek and Foothill

City of Gilroy Potential New ABC's

Freeways		Railroad Tracks		Creeks	
Name	Segment Between:	Name	Segment Between:	Name	Segment Between:
101	Buena Vista and Leavesley	Caltrain	Luchessa and Bolsa	Uvas Creek	Hecker Pass Hwy and Santa Teresa
101	Leavesley and Gilman			Uvas Creek	Santa Teresa and Miller

City of Los Altos Potential New ABC's

Freeways		Creeks	
Name	Segment Between:	Name	Segment Between:
280	El Monte (LAH) and Magdalena	Stevens Creek	Homestead and Stevens Creek Blvd (Cupertino)
280	Magdalena and Mora		
280	St. Joseph and Foothill		
Foothill Expy	El Monte and Springer/Magdalena		

City of Los Altos Hills Potential New ABC's

Freeways	
Name	Segment Between:
280	Robleda and El Monte

City of Los Gatos Potential New ABC's

Freeways		Creeks	
Name	Segment Between:	Name	Segment Between:
17	Lark and Blossom Hill	Los Gatos Creek	Lark and Pepper Tree Lane (Trail at Vasona Park)
85	Pollard and Winchester		

City of Milpitas Potential New ABC's

Freeways		Railroad Tracks		Creeks	
Name	Segment Between:	Name	Segment Between:	Name	Segment Between:
680	Scott Creek (Alameda County) and Jacklin	UPRR	Dixon Landing Rd and Abel (alignment splits to SC Train Station and industrial sites)	Coyote Creek	McCarthy at Dixon Landing and Ped Bridge at Alviso Milpitas
880	Fremont Blvd (Alameda County) and Dixon Landing	UPRR	Montague Expy and Oakland	Coyote Creek	Tasman and Montague Expy
880	Dixon Landing and SR 237/Calaveras	UPRR	Calaveras and Montague		
880	Tasman/Great Mall Pkwy and Montague				

City of Morgan Hill Potential New ABC's

Freeways		Creeks	
Name	Segment Between:	Name	Segment Between:
101	Cochrane and Main	Llagas Creek	Santa Teresa and Monterey
101	Dunne and Tennant		

City of Mountain View Potential New ABC's

Freeways		Railroad Tracks		Creeks	
Name	Segment Between:	Name	Segment Between:	Name	Segment Between:
101	Rengstorff/Ampitheater and Shoreline	Caltrain	Rengstorff and Shoreline	Stevens Creek	Ped Bridge at Crittenden and Moffett
101	Ellis and Proposed Mary Ave Extension (Sunnyvale)	Caltrain	Whisman and Mary (Sunnyvale)	Stevens Creek	El Camino Real and Fremont (Sunnyvale/LA)
85	Dana and El Camino Real				
Central Expy	Rengstorff and Shoreline				
Central Expy	Whisman and Mary (Sunnyvale)				

City of Palo Alto Potential New ABC's

Freeways		Railroad Tracks		Creeks	
Name	Segment Between:	Name	Segment Between:	Name	Segment Between:
101	University and Embarcadero	Caltrain	Oregon Expy and Meadow	Adobe Creek	Terman Park and Foothill Expy
101	Embarcadero and Pedestrian Overpass at Oregon Expy			San Francisquito Creek	El Camino and Sand Hill
280	Alpine and Page Mill				
Foothill Expy	Sand Hill and Page Mill				
Foothill Expy	Arastradero and Edith (LA)				

City of San Jose Potential New ABC's

Freeways		Railroad Tracks		Creeks	
Name	Segment Between:	Name	Segment Between:	Name	Segment Between:
101	North First and North Tenth	Caltrain	Ped xing at Stone and Capitol Expy	Coyote Creek	Oakland Rd and Berryessa
101	Story and Tully	Caltrain	Blossom Hill and Bernal	Coyote Creek	Mabury and Julian
101	Tully and Capitol Expy	Caltrain	Bernal and Blanchard	Coyote Creek	Story and Tully
101	Coyote Rd and Blossom Hill/Silver Creek Valley Rd	Caltrain	Blanchard and Bailey	Coyote Creek	Tully and Capitol Expy
101	Blossom Hill/Silver Creek Valley Rd and Bernal	UPRR	Hedding and El Camino/Lewis/De La Cruz/Coleman	Coyote Creek	Hellyer and Silver Creek
101	Bernal and Metcalf	UPRR	Trade Zone and Hostetter	Coyote Creek	Silver Creek and Silicon Valley Blvd
280	Lawrence Expy and Saratoga	UPRR	William and Keyes/Story	Guadalupe River	Tasman and Ped Bridge at River Oaks
280	11th and McLaughlin			Guadalupe River	Montague Expy and Trimble
680	Hostetter and Berryessa			Guadalupe River	Trimble and Airport
880	Montague and Proposed connection at Charcot			Guadalupe River	Skyport and Hedding
880	Brokaw and Old Bayshore Highway			Guadalupe River	Branham and Blossom Hill
85	Winfield and Blossom Hill			Los Alamitos	Mazzone and Graystone
237	North First and Zanker			Los Alamitos	Graystone and Harry
237	Zanker and McCarthy			Los Alamitos	Harry and Shillingsburg
237	McCarthy and Abbott			Penetencia Creek	Dorel and Alum Rock
87	Skyport and Hedding			Ross Creek	Los Gatos Almaden Rd and Blossom Hill (LG)
				Silver Creek	Greenyard and Hassler
				Silver/Thompson Creek	Yerba Buena Ave and Yerba Buena Rd

City of Santa Clara Potential New ABC's

Freeways	
Name	Segment Between:
101	San Tomas/Montague Expy and Lafayette

City of Saratoga Potential New ABC's

Creeks	
Name	Segment Between:
San Tomas Aquino Creek	Fruitvale and Highway 9

City of Sunnyvale Potential New ABC's

Freeways		Railroad Tracks		Creeks	
Name	Segment Between:	Name	Segment Between:	Name	Segment Between:
85	Homestead and Stevens Creek (Cupertino)	Caltrain	Wolfe and Lawrence Station Ped Underxing	Stevens Creek	Homestead and Stevens Creek Blvd (Cupertino)
237	Caribbean/Lawrence Expy and San Tomas Aquino Creek Trail (SC)				
Central Expy	Wolfe and Lawrence Expy				
Lawrence Expy	Elko and Tasman				

Unincorporated Cities/Communities Potential New ABC's

Freeways		Railroad Tracks		Creeks	
Name	Segment Between:	Name	Segment Between:	Name	Segment Between:
101	Tennant and Middle	Caltrain	Laguna and Palm	Llagas Creek	Llagas Rd and Edmundsen
101	Middle and San Martin	Caltrain	Palm and Live Oak	Llagas Creek	San Martin and Church
101	San Martin and Church	Caltrain	Live Oak and Tilton	Llagas Creek	Church and Masten
101	Church and Masten	Caltrain	Middle and San Martin Station	Llagas Creek	Buena Vista and Gilman
101	Masten and Buena Vista	Caltrain	San Martin Station and Church	Llagas Creek	Gilman and Leavesley
				Llagas Creek	Leavesley and Hwy 152
				Llagas Creek	Hwy 152 and Bloomfield
				Uvas Creek	Uvas Rd and Watsonville
				Uvas Creek	Watsonville and Hecker Pass Hwy

Figure 4-1 to be provided under separate cover

Safe Routes to Transit Projects

Each City in Santa Clara County was asked to identify projects that would improve bicycle access to a major transit station. The following projects, listed in Table 4-3, were submitted by local agencies.

Table 4-3
Safe Routes to Transit Potential Projects

City	Bike Improvement*	Transit Station
Gilroy	-Bike lanes on Church Street -Bike lanes on Chestnut Street -Bike Lanes on Railroad Street and Eigleberry Street	Gilroy Caltrain
Morgan Hill	-Bike lanes on Main Avenue, between Butterfield Blvd. and HWY 101, and -Bike Lanes on Diana Avenue, between Butterfield Blvd and HWY 101.	Morgan Hill Caltrain
San Jose	-Safe crossing** of tracks to eastside land uses at Blossom Hill -Safe crossing** of tracks to eastside land uses at Capitol -Five Wounds trail – Watson Park to Williams Park -Penitencia Creek Trail Coyote Creek to King Rd -Thompson Creek trail from Yerba Buena to Eastridge Transit Center -	Blossom Hill Caltrain Capitol Caltrain Alum Rock BART Berryessa BART Eastridge LRT
Santa Clara	-Spot improvements to access Ace /Amtrak station along frontage to Lafayette Rd and from other directions -Safe crossing** of tracks to east side land uses at Caltrain - Station– e.g. extension of Planned Caltrain tunnel to east side of UPRR tracks	Great America Ace /Amtrak station Santa Clara Caltrain station
Countywide/VTA	-Countywide signage program for consistency and uniformity to sign bike routes to all commuter rail stations in the county	16 Caltrain / ACE/Amtrak stations

*This table only includes cities that have a regional transit station that would be eligible to receive funds under Regional Measure 2 Safe Routes to Transit program.

** "Safe Crossing" includes overcrossings, tunnels, and signalized at-grade crossings.

PRIORITY PROJECTS

The actual scoring of the potential projects will take place with the update of the BEP described below in the next section. However over the past eight years several general project types and two specific project locations have consistently been mentioned as needing attention. These projects may be considered higher priority for future funding cycles. Note that any changes in prioritization criteria for future BEP amendments are subject to BPAC and Board approval.

1. Train stations at which passengers cannot cross the tracks
   - Blossom Hill station
   - Capitol Station
   - Santa Clara (existing BEP project; under design)

2. Large gaps where there is no adequate crossing over Caltrain tracks such as:
   - Between De La Cruz and Hedding (Santa Clara station crossing above would fill this gap)
   - Blossom Hill Road over Monterey Rd/Caltrain (under design)
   - Capital Expressway over Monterey Rd/Caltrain

3. Large gaps where there is no adequate crossing over freeways such as:
   - U.S. 101 between Mabury Rd. and Coyote Creek Trail
   - SR 87 between Mozart Ped Bridge and Los Gatos Creek Trail north of Campbell Ave
4. Bay Trail Connection between the City of Fremont and McCarthy Blvd. in Milpitas
5. Restoration of the pedestrian at-grade crossing of UPRR tracks at Fredericksburg in Saratoga serving Blue Hills School

VTA BICYCLE EXPENDITURE PROGRAM

The Bicycle Expenditure Program (BEP) was adopted by the VTA Board of Directors as the funding mechanism for countywide bicycle projects. When first adopted in 2000, there was roughly $31 million set- aside over a 10-year BEP period (FY 2001/2-2010/11). It was subsequently augmented, with the biggest change in the BEP funding being the inclusion of MTC's Regional Bicycle Pedestrian Program and the extension of the timeframe out 30 years to be consistent with the Valley Transportation Plan (VTP). The current list of 48 projects was adopted by the Board in 2005. Eighteen of these projects have been completed, which utilized $9 million from the BEP; these are listed in Appendix D-3.

Current BEP Projects and Funding

Currently, the BEP has approximately $90 million in funding, of which $33 million has been programmed as of FY 2007/08, from four funding programs:

- Measure B Bicycle Funds
- Transportation Fund for Clean Air 40% Program (TFCA 40%)
- Transportation Development Act Article 3 Pedestrian & Bicycle Program (TDA 3)
- Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Program Funds (RBPP)

Each of these fund sources is governed by a separate set of programming criteria and policies that the VTA Board of Directors amended to guarantee the availability of funds for the BEP; these are described more fully in Appendix D4. Table 4-4 shows the estimated funding available from each of these sources up till the present (2000-2008) and also projected to 2035.

Table 4-4
Available Funding for the Bicycle Expenditure Program
(2006 dollars)

Fund Source	2000 – 2008 * ($1000)	2009 – 2035 ($1000)
1996 Measure B Bike	$11,650	$350
TDA 3**	$ 3,500	$15,825
TFCA 40%**	$6,700	$16,500
RBPP	$ 2,900	$ 44,982
Other	$ 8,000	TBD
Total	**$32,750**	**$ TBD**

* Includes completed projects and projects in progress.
**The TDA 3 and TFCA funding set-aside for the BEP will fluctuate, since they are based on a percentage of projected revenue, rather than absolute dollars.
TBD = to be determined

.

The remaining 30 BEP projects and program status are shown in Appendix D5. Most of the projects will receive funds from more than one of the BEP funding sources. VTA is committed to funding the full recommended amounts in the BEP for each project. While these funding scenarios are approved by the VTA Board, VTA will maintain maximum flexibility in the actual programming of funds to each project. It may be necessary to adjust the combination of funds for Bicycle projects in the future to best leverage the funding and accommodate project schedules and delivery.

Future BEP Projects and Funding

The BEP funding allocation will be increased in conjunction with the VTP 2035 planning process and future projects will be added as funding allows. Table 4-4 presents the current assumptions for the future 25 years of funding. The process of adding new projects will be the same as for the previous BEP updates in 2002, 2004 and 2005. The bicycle projects that VTA received in response to the 2008 Call for Projects are presented in Table 4-5 along with a notation as to its relationship to the CCBC's, the ABC's and existing BEP bicycle projects.

TABLE 4-5

Proposed Bicycle Projects

Submitted In Response To Call For Projects 2008

Project Sponsor	Project Title	Related to BEP Project	on CCBC #	ABC	Total Project Cost (millions)
Campbell	Widen Los Gatos Creek Trail on East Side	SJB32	T-S4		$0.30
Campbell	San Tomas Aquino Creek Trail	SCB36	T02		$1.50
County	Foothill/Magdalena shoulder widening		X-G05		$0.40
Gilroy	Gilroy Sports Park Trail and Bridge	B12	T04		$4.80
Gilroy	Northern Uvas Creek SCWVD service road west	B13	T04		$1.90
Gilroy	Lions Creek SCWVD service road west - west of Wren Ave. to Kern Ave.				$0.90
Gilroy	Lions Creek SCWVD service road west - Kern Ave. to Day Road				$1.90
Gilroy	Lions Creek SCWVD service road west - west of Santa Teresa Blvd.				$0.60
Gilroy	SCWVD service road along western Llagas Creek				$1.70
Gilroy	Western Ronan Channel SCWVD from Leavesley Rd. to Llagas Creek				$2.70
Los Altos	Stevens Creek Link Trail	B15	T-S2		$3.00
Los Gatos	SR 9 - Los Gatos Creek Trail Connector		R3, T-S4		$2.00
Los Gatos	Blossom Hill Rd. Sidewalks and Bicycle Lanes				$0.70
Milpitas	Montague Expwy. Pedestrian Overcrossing			yes	$15.00
Morgan Hill	Madrone Recharge Channel - Conversion to Joint Use Bicycle and Pedestrian Pathway				$0.50
Morgan Hill	Bike/Ped Improvements on south side of Cochrane Rd. between DePaul Dr. & Madrone Pkwy.				$0.60
Mountain View	Permanente Creek Trail Bike/Ped crossing of US 101 and Old Middlefield Way			yes	$7.50

TABLE 4-5
Proposed Bicycle Projects
Submitted In Response To Call For Projects 2008

Project Sponsor	Project Title	Related to BEP Project	on CCBC #	ABC	Total Project Cost (millions)
Mountain View	Permanente Creek Trail Undercrossing and Extension			yes	$4.20
Mountain View	Hetch-Hetchy Trail—Middlefield Rd and Shoreline Blvd			yes	$0.80
Mountain View	Stevens Creek Trail/Middlefield Road North Side Access	B22	T-S2	yes	$0.70
Mountain View	Stevens Creek Trail/Landels School Access Point Improvements	B23	T-S2		$0.60
Palo Alto	US 101 Bike/Ped Grade Separation-make year-round			yes	$13.00
Palo Alto	South Palo Alto Caltrain Ped/Bike Grade Separation			yes	$13.00
San Jose	Thompson Creek Trail from Yerba Buena to Eastridge Transit Center				$15
San Jose	Five Wounds Trail – Watson Park to Williams St Park "Alum Rock BART Station Segment"				$4
San Jose	Penitencia Creek Trail – Coyote Creek to King Road "Berryessa BART Station Segment"				$5
San Jose	Newhall Street Bike/Ped Overcrossing over Caltrain Corridor			yes	$7
Saratoga	Bike-Pedestrian Rail Crossing between Fredericksburg Drive and Guava Court			yes	$0.25
Santa Clara	San Tomas Aquino Creek Trail Spur Trail	B36	T02		$1.00
Sunnyvale	Moffett Park Bicycle and Pedestrian Trails		T-R4		$5.86
Sunnyvale	Stevens Creek Trail Connector	B15	T-S2		$1.38
Sunnyvale	Bicycle Capital Improvement Program				$3.13
TOTAL					**$96.73**

Note: If added to the BEP, the maximum BEP amount project can receive is 80% of total project cost.

Bicycle Expenditure Program Policies

The following are some of the policies that are applicable to all projects funded through the BEP. The full text of the Board-approved BEP policy is presented in Appendix D6.

1. All projects must be funded with a 20% minimum ("local") match of non-BEP funding.
2. All BEP projects must submit an annual project status report, in addition to any reports required by the originating fund source programs
3. BEP funds that are not obligated or expended within the time limits established by the governing fund program are subject to review and reprogramming to another project that is ready to expend the funds.

IMPLEMENTATION OF A BICYCLE PROJECT- EXAMPLES AND OPTIONS

While the BEP addresses many of the most critical countywide bicycle needs, Member Agencies still have many bicycle projects and improvements that are of high priority both regionally and locally. Many funding sources outside the BEP are available for bicycle improvements; Table 4-6 presents a list the fund sources used in the recent past by Member Agencies to fund portions of their Bicycle and Pedestrian projects. The restrictions associated with some of these programs are presented in Appendix D7; most of them are very competitive since (1) they are available for projects outside Santa Clara County and/or (2) they are also used to fund non-bicycle projects.

Three of the more common strategies for implementing bicycle projects without bicycle grants are described below.

Table 4-6
Funding Sources for Bicycle Projects
Used by Cities in Santa Clara County
(bike-specific and non-bike specific)

Origin or Fund Manager	Name
Local	General Fund
Local	City Parks Fund
Local/VTA	TDA Guarantee
Local	Developer Contribution
Local	Mitigation for Project
MTC	RBPP competitive (CMAQ)
Regional	ABAG-Bay Trail
County	SCV Water District
VTA	CDT Planning
VTA	CDT capital
VTA	TFCA Competitive -60%
State of Calif.	Bicycle Transportation Account
State of Calif.	HES
State of Calif.	Safe Routes to School -State
State of Calif.	Safe Routes to School -Federal
State of Calif.	Safe Routes to Transit
State of Calif.	STIP
Federal	TEA
Federal	TLC
Federal	Federal earmark
Federal	Federal STP
Federal	Federal CMAQ

Rehabilitation: Pavement Management Programs and Local Roadway Repair/Maintenance Projects

The SAFETEA Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policy guides the programming of a two year increment of federal funding (FY 2007-08 and FY 2008-09) authorized by the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA) for pavement repair/replacement projects located between the two outside edges of curb and gutters. As part of projects such as overlays; reconstruction; curb and gutter repair; replacement of damaged loops, pavement striping, markings, reflectors, etc., Member Agencies have the opportunity to make bicycle facility and safety improvements at no or minimal cost. The more common bicycle projects are roadway re-striping to provide bike lanes or wide curb lanes.

At a minimum, pavement management and local roadway/expressway projects should not reduce the quantity or quality of local bicycle facilities, i.e. an arterial that has an

existing Class II bicycle lane that is resurfaced should have its bicycle lane re-striped at the same width, if not wider, to comply with the *Bicycle Technical Guidelines*.

Examples of opportunity-leveraging projects are:

- Convert four-lane undivided cross-sections to three lanes: two through lanes with a center two-way left-turn lane and bicycle lanes
- At intersections with right-turn only lanes, provide the extra width in the outer through lane, not the right-turn lane
- Install loop detectors that are bicycle-sensitive
- Replace grates to bicycle-safe drainage grates

Consult *Bicycle Technical Guidelines*: *A Guide for Local Agencies in Santa Clara County* for additional details.

Highway and Local Roadway Capital Projects

All highway and road projects present an opportunity to improve the bicycle (and pedestrian) infrastructure within the project limits. This is the current state of California and MTC policy as well as VTA policy. Caltrans Deputy Directive 64 states that Caltrans "fully considers the needs of nonmotorized travelers (including pedestrians, bicyclists and persons with disabilities) in all programming, planning, maintenance, construction, operations and project development activities and products". . MTC's Routine Accommodation policy states ""...bicycle facilities and walkways must be considered, where appropriate, in conjunction with all new construction and reconstruction of transportation facilities". VTA's policy is for the highway program projects to conform to VTA's BTG. Consult *Bicycle Technical Guidelines: A Guide for Local Agencies in Santa Clara County* for additional details.

Development and Redevelopment Opportunities

New development, redevelopment and the corresponding roadway reconstruction projects offer opportunities to provide safe and convenient bicycle facilities at very little marginal cost. This includes the overall right-of-way width, provision of bicycle paths or lanes and details such as gutter and drainage design. All new developments and redevelopment project areas should be connected to and consistent with the existing and proposed bicycle network. Local agencies have the authority to include bicycle facilities and improvements as conditions of approval for development projects.

Adopt-A-Highway/Adopt-A-Trail Programs

The public can also play an important role in helping maintain some of the transportation corridors in the county. The Caltrans Adopt-A-Highway Program provides individuals, businesses, and organizations an opportunity to adopt sections of the road along the California State Highway System. Adoption usually consists of maintaining a 2-mile stretch of roadside by way of removing litter and graffiti, planting and maintaining trees and flowers, and controlling the surrounding vegetation. Similarly, becoming a County Parks Volunteer is another lesser known opportunity for people to participate in maintenance and enhancement of transportation corridors. The Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation has an Adopt-A-Trail program which allows volunteers to help maintain a trail or section of trail by performing duties such as removing litter/debris, routine trail tread/drainage clearing, and reporting trail problems. Both programs acknowledge their volunteers with courtesy signage for their civic contributions.

RECENTLY FUNDED PROJECTS OUTSIDE THE BEP

Local jurisdictions have funded many projects in the recent years outside of the BEP. Most of these projects were funded through the TDA 3 and TFCA programs. Several projects have also received funding directly from the state Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) and from various federal sources. Those projects funded through BTA are listed in Appendix D8. In most cases, local jurisdictions submit applications, which are then screened and coordinated through VTA and/or MTC and/or Caltrans.