MEETING NOTICE
AND AGENDA

BAYSHORE BIKEWAY WORKING GROUP
The Bayshore Bikeway Working Group may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Friday, April 7, 2006
2:00 p.m.
SANDAG, Conference Room 8A
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Staff Contact: Stephan Vance
(619) 699-1924
sva@sandag.org

AGENDA HIGHLIGHT
• BAYSHORE BIKEWAY PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.
Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>INTRODUCTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>PUBLIC COMMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3.</td>
<td>MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 14, 2005 MEETING APPROVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>WESTERN SALT PROJECT UPDATE DISCUSSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Endangered species restrictions have precipitated a revision to the previously published project schedule. Staff from the City of San Diego and consultants will provide a status report on this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5.</td>
<td>BAYSHORE BIKEWAY PLAN IMPLEMENTATION DISCUSSION/APPROVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The SANDAG Transportation Committee has approved the Bayshore Bikeway Plan update. This item suggests a strategy for moving forward with implementation. The Working Group will be asked to provide policy direction, and may take action on specific implementation items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>ADJOURN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ next to an item indicates an attachment
MEETING MINUTES FOR THE OCTOBER 14, 2005, MEETING

Agenda

1. Introductions

See attached list of attendees.

2. Public Comments and Communication

None.

3. Approval of February 25, 2005 Meeting Minutes

The minutes of the April 13, 2005, were approved as written (Motion Monroe, second McLean).

4. Western Salt Project Report

Frank Gaines from the City of San Diego updated the committee on the status of this project. Because the San Diego City Council did not make the required findings to support their override of the Coronado Belt Line historic designation, the project consultant team will be preparing an EIR on the historic resource. Marie Lia, who is providing legal assistance on the historic resource issue has said it will take four weeks to update the historical properties report. This time was not included in the current project schedule, but the consultants felt they could recover from this delay.

A key issue becomes how to develop mitigation measures for historic resources. The Working Group discussed the importance of meeting early with historic resource experts to provide appropriate mitigation in the EIR. Supervisor Cox and Councilmember Monroe offered to meet with the Save Our Heritage Organization to discuss mitigation alternatives.

Supervisor Cox reported that his office is developing a planning grant application to the State Coastal Conservancy to look at developing the 17 acre parcel that contains the Western Salt processing plant as an historic resource. It could serve as a staging area for the bikeway, interpretive center for the wildlife refuge and railroad, among other things. He has discussed with SANDAG the question of who should be the recipient of this grant, and has suggested that it would make sense for SANDAG to manage the grant.
Kathy Keehan questioned whether the schedule could be maintained if the plan is to release the EIR for comment in April, and the second screen check will not happen until November. Dennis Landaal responded that they currently are about four weeks behind, but he felt they could make that up by the time they need to go out to bid in July, 2006. He felt they might need help from the working group to ensure they obtain their permits in a timely manner.

5. Bayshore Bikeway Plan Update

Staff reported that the draft final plan for the Bayshore Bikeway has been completed and distributed to Working Group members and stakeholders, primarily at local jurisdictions, for comment. Brett Hondorp of Alta Planning + Design gave an overview of the final document. The main body of the report had been presented to the Working Group previously. The draft final report includes those sections, modified to reflect comments received from the working group, stakeholders, and the community. In addition, it contains detailed planning-level cost estimates, design guidelines, and a discussion of management, maintenance, and security. Staff requested comments from the Working Group.

The most significant comments related to the cost estimate, identifying funding, and establishing priorities. Several members suggested that the 25 percent contingency included in the cost estimate was too low. Councilmember Monroe suggested it could be as high as 50 percent. Gordy Shields asked what the priorities would be for project development. Staff responded that the plan does not prioritize projects because some parts of the plan depend on work to be done by others (e.g. Seaport Village redevelopment and SDG&E transmission line undergrounding), and we will want to take advantage of opportunities as they arrive. Staff also offered to bring the issue of project priorities back to the next meeting for further discussion. Kathy Keehan suggested that a cost for engineering and permits be added to the estimate. A factor for these costs will be added to the final estimate.

Members of the Working Group identified minor technical details they felt should be changed, but overall expressed satisfaction with the plan. Motion (Monroe, McCann) to make the changes discussed and forward the plan to the Transportation Committee for adoption in December. Councilmember Monroe commented that he thought the plan should go to the full SANDAG Board as well.

Supervisor Cox reported that he had met with Dick Vortman, President of National Steel and Shipbuilding Co. (NASSCO) to discuss the bikeway plan, how it might impact parking in the area, and how it might benefit the area by providing more transportation choices. He said there will be some significant challenges to building the bike path through the parking area, but he felt NASSCO was open to discussing how this might be accomplished.

Supervisor Cox also reported that he and Councilmember Monroe met with in-coming Rear Admiral Leendert Hering regarding the Navy’s participation in future Bayshore Bikeway improvements along the Harbor Drive frontage of Naval Station San Diego. Adm. Hering was less enthusiastic about the project than his predecessor, Rear Admiral Jose Betancourt, Ret., but Supervisor Cox felt there was still room to discuss the project with him.
Supervisor Cox reminded the group that Adm. Betancourt was an enthusiastic supporter of bikeway improvements by the naval station. He asked if we could invite Adm. Betancourt to sit as a citizen member of the Bayshore Bikeway Working Group. Staff agreed to look into what it would take to add a member to the group. Supervisor Cox also asked that a staff person from the Center City Development Corporation be added to the Working Group’s mail list.

The Working Group discussed possible sources of funding to implement the plan. Suggestions included asking state and federal legislators to earmark funds for the project, or getting the project included in a future state transportation bond measure. Supervisor Cox suggested that we contact Senator Ducheny’s office.

Finally, the Working Group asked if there were projects that could be implemented in the near term. Staff suggested that a grant request could be submitted to SANDAG for additional bikeway signs. A request will be made to the City of San Diego for such a claim.

Other Matters

The Working Group discussed items to discuss at the next meeting. Preliminary agenda items will include:

- Update on the Western Salt Project EIR.
- Identifying funding sources for projects in the plan.
- Developing project development priorities.
- Funding for a comprehensive signing program. (The FY 2007 TDA/TransNet bicycle and pedestrian should include a request to undertake this.)

6. Adjourn
**BAYSHORE BIKEWAY WORKING GROUP ATTENDANCE**

**Date:** April 13, 2005

<table>
<thead>
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<th>NAME</th>
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</thead>
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<td><strong>Members</strong></td>
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</tr>
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<td>Supervisor Greg Cox</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Gordy Shields</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilmember Phil Monroe</td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilmember Fred McLean</td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilmember John McCann</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff and Others</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>SANDAG</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
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Introduction

On March 17, 2006, the SANDAG Transportation Committee unanimously adopted the Bayshore Bikeway Plan update. This action authorizes SANDAG to transmit the plan to local agencies as a guide for including the bikeway into developments along the San Diego bayfront. Copies of the plan will be available at the meeting.

For the Bayshore Bikeway Working Group, the task now becomes developing an implementation strategy for the plan. Key decisions and action items for implementation will include establishing project implementation priorities, continued community outreach to build support for the plan, establishing local agency commitments to implement their portions of the improvements, identifying funding sources and building support to fund projects.

Recommendation

The Working Group will discuss implementation strategies and may adopt project implementation priorities based on the criteria discussed below.

Discussion

Route Segments

The plan breaks the bikeway into 10 segments as shown in Attachment 1. They can be summarized as follows:

Segment 1: Ferry Landing to Seaport Village is within Port tidelands subject to the redevelopment plans of the Port District.

Segment 2: Convention Center Way to 28th Street within tidelands, and within the City of San Diego between Harbor Drive on the east side and the trolley right-of-way, bridging the railroad tracks at the 10th Avenue Marine Terminal.

Segment 3: Between 29th Street to 32nd Street the path continues on the east side of Harbor Drive and likely will involve improvements to the parking areas that serve National Steel and Shipbuilding (NASSCO) employees.
Segment 4: 32nd Street to Civic Center Drive transitions from the City of San Diego to National City. This segment includes alternate routes along either side of Harbor Drive between 32nd Street and the Naval Station Gate 7.

Segment 5: Civic Center Drive to the existing bike path at 32nd Street in National City includes improvements that may involve Burlington Northern and Santa Fe (BNSF), and changes to west side of Tidelands Avenue.

Segment 6: From the bike path beginning at 32nd Street, across the Gordy Shields Bridge to E Street in Chula Vista, no major improvements are recommended for this section.

Segment 7: E Street to J Street in Chula Vista is primarily through the bayfront redevelopment area being planned by the Port and Chula Vista. The recommended alignment is within the San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E) right-of-way where transmission line towers are scheduled to be undergrounded.

Segment 8: J Street to Main Street where the proposed alignment is in the SDG&E right-of-way and in the Metropolitan Transit System’s (MTS) Coronado Belt Line right-of-way.

Segment 9: Main Street in Chula Vista to the City of Imperial Beach where the City of San Diego currently is developing the project through the salt works, and to the west where Imperial Beach would like to develop a bike path spur connecting to their beachfront.

Segment 10: The existing bike path and route in Coronado connecting to the ferry landing does not require major improvements.

Each segment represents a portion of the route that has some independent utility because it connects to an exiting bike path or it serves significant land uses. Some segments will be easier to implement than others due to cost and right-of-way constraints. Consequently, the Working Group should develop implementation priorities to facilitate a logical development of the planned improvements.

**Project Implementation Priorities**

The two most significant factors that will affect plan implementation are cost and right-of-way. The total estimated cost in the plan is $9,958,000, but the individual segments range in cost from $6,000 to $2,896,000. Much of the proposed alignment is in public right-of-way, but implementing the plan will depend on the cooperation of such entities as the U.S. Navy, MTS, SDG&E, and BNSF. The following table summarizes the cost and right-of-way issues for each segment. It is important to remember that there are no right-of-way costs in these estimates. The numbers in parentheses refer to subdivisions of segments that are referenced in the plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Responsible Agency</th>
<th>Other Significant Stakeholders</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Port District</td>
<td>City of San Diego/CCDC</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>Assumes implementation of full improvements with redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(1A)</td>
<td>Port District</td>
<td>City of San Diego/CCDC</td>
<td>$201,000</td>
<td>Convention Center Way to 8th Ave. Dependent on hotel site development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Participating parties</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(2A-2B)</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>MTS, NASSCO, Port District</td>
<td>$2,692,000</td>
<td>Bridge over freight rail yard is main cost factor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>NASSCO, U.S. Navy</td>
<td>$2,199,000</td>
<td>Potential impacts to parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>City of San Diego, National City</td>
<td>U.S. Navy, BNSF</td>
<td>$2,751,000</td>
<td>Cooperation of Navy, utility undergrounding required. Alternative alignment could require railroad right-of-way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Port District</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>Redevelopment would provide an alternative, more attractive alignment. May require some BNSF right-of-way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Port District, SDG&amp;E, MTS</td>
<td>$1,938,000</td>
<td>May be broken into segments. Segment 7 implementation tied to bayfront redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>City of San Diego, Imperial Beach</td>
<td>U.S. Fish &amp; Wildlife, Save Our Heritage Organization</td>
<td>Not included in plan estimate</td>
<td>San Diego portion under development. Potential future spur developed by Imperial Beach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No improvements recommended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Segments 1, 2(1A), and 7, are dependent upon or closely related to ongoing redevelopment efforts. Segment 1 must wait until the Port District moves forward with their Historic Waterfront redevelopment, and the plan assumes that the bikeway improvements will be included as a part of that project. Segment 2(1A) is partially dependent upon hotel development south of the Convention Center. Developing the recommended bike path along Convention Center Way probably is not warranted without the promenade to the south that will be built along with the hotel. The recommended alignment in Segment 7 depends on the undergrounding of SDG&E’s transmission lines, but is also closely tied to Chula Vista bayfront redevelopment. The timing of these two projects will determine when Segment 7 can be implemented.

Segments 2(2A-2B) through 6 and Segment 8 are all stand-alone projects that will require local agency initiative, and the identification of funding for implementation. For the sake of continuity, these segments should be built from south to north starting at 8th Street and Harbor Drive, and/or from north to south beginning at the salt works, and from the end of the bike path at 32nd Street and Marina Way in National City. Working from north to south would mean tackling the most expensive segment first with perhaps the most significant engineering challenge, the bridge over the freight tracks at the 10th Avenue Marine Terminal. Depending on the timing of the improvements on Port tidelands to the north, it could result in a disconnected segment of bike path. On the other hand, it would begin the improvements in the area of the bikeway that is the least bicycle-friendly.

Starting from Segment 8 in Chula Vista would provide an extension to the Western Salt project currently being developed by the City of San Diego. The timing might also be right to connect up with improvements being made by the Chula Vista Bayfront redevelopment and the undergrounding of the SDG&E transmission towers. Segment 8 is also a segment that appears to have fewer right-of-way and environmental issues.
A third logical starting point for improvements is at 32nd Street and Harrison Avenue in National City, tying into the existing bike path and bridge. The plan suggests two alignment alternatives through National City, one on the west side of Tidelands Avenue, and a more direct route along Harrison Avenue. Because it would better serve the historic train depot and railway museum, and avoid the truck traffic at the marine terminal, the Harrison Avenue alignment might be considered the better of the two alignments. However, it is dependent on significant changes in existing land uses on the Harrison Avenue alignment and acquisition of right-of-way. At the north end, this alignment also requires access to BNSF right-of-way and, until the path could be extended north along the west side of Harbor Drive, a way for northbound cyclists to cross Harbor Drive.

Based on these opportunities and constraints, Segment 8 seems to be the more logical place to focus resources for the next bike path extension. At the same time, it would be prudent to begin doing additional the technical studies necessary to develop projects in National City and San Diego.

**Funding Alternatives**

There are five main sources of revenue that typically have been available to fund bikeway projects like the Bayshore Bikeway: federal, state, regional, local, and private.

**Federal Funds.** Previous Bayshore Bikeway improvements relied heavily on funding from the federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) and Transportation Enhancement (TE) programs. Recently, however, SANDAG policy has revised the priorities for the use of these funds. Eighty-five percent of SANDAG discretionary federal and state funds are now dedicated to the TransNet Early Action projects. This means the bulk of the available CMAQ funds are going to the managed lane projects on the region’s freeways. At the same time, the federal TE funds authorized through 2009 have been programmed for the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP). This leaves very little discretionary federal funding available for projects like the Bayshore Bikeway. In the case of the CMAQ program, the bikeway would be competing against other regional bikeway projects and public transit for these limited funds.

Another source of federal funds is federal transportation program earmarks. Earmarks are obtained by working directly with the state’s senators, and with local congressional representatives. For the Bayshore Bikeway, key representatives would be Susan Davis and Bob Filner.

**State Funds.** As with the federal funds, State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds that SANDAG programs are primarily going toward the Early Action projects. The state’s Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA), on the other hand, is a statewide competitive grant program administered by Caltrans. It currently is funded at $5 million per year but the Governor’s budget proposal for FY 2007 recommends a one-time increase to $9.2 million. Typical awards under this program are $500,000 or less. To be eligible to apply, a city or county must have a current adopted bicycle transportation plan. San Diego and Chula Vista have current plans, National City has been funded by SANDAG to complete a plan, and Coronado has applied to SANDAG for funds to update their plan. Another potential source of state funding is the state Coastal Conservancy through their effort to complete the California Coastal Trail.
**Regional Funds.** The TransNet Bicycle Program and Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 funds currently provide about $4 million per year for bicycle and pedestrian projects through a regional competitive grant program administered by SANDAG. For the coming fiscal year, SANDAG received applications exceeding $10 million dollars. Beginning in FY 2009 when the TransNet Extension ordinance takes effect, the TransNet portion of these funds will increase from $1 million per year to 2 percent of the annual receipts, or an estimated $6 million in FY 2009.

**Local Funds.** Local agencies have contributed to bikeway projects in several ways. Many jurisdictions routinely construct collector and arterial streets with bike lanes out of their capital improvement budgets, but few if any have constructed bike paths with gas tax or other local discretionary funds. Cities have dedicated revenues from assessments on new development to bikeway improvements. The City of San Diego, for instance, has committed $1.75 million from facilities benefit assessments for grade separations and other bikeway improvements along the SR 56 bike path.

**Private Funds.** Numerous studies have shown that trails and bikeways, when properly developed, become a community asset that is reflected in the real estate market. Both new construction and resale homes have used access to regional bikeways and trails as a selling point. Commercial development too benefits from the presence of regional bikeway. Bicycle traffic brings customers for food and beverage services, bike rentals and repairs, and other goods and services. Tourists are drawn to sites that offer the recreational opportunities of a bikeway. These benefits justify local jurisdictions requiring private developers to provide for the planned bikeway improvements as part of their project, much the way the Otay Ranch development is being built with a system of trails constructed by the developer.

Future developments of the Bayshore Bikeway will require funding from all these and other funding sources. Members of the Working Group

**Community Support for Plan Implementation**

Though relatively modest in scale and cost compared to most transportation improvements, projects like the Bayshore Bikeway still require a significant commitment of financial and human resources to accomplish. Garnering these resources will require popular and political support that extends beyond the members of the Bayshore Bikeway Working Group. For that reason, the Working Group may wish develop an on-going public outreach effort to educate other elected officials, community groups, property and business owners, and other stakeholders about the vision for the Bayshore Bikeway. Staff recommends that Working Group members schedule presentations on the plan to their Boards, planning commissions, councils or council committees and community groups as appropriate. SANDAG staff can customize the presentation of the plan given to the Transportation Committee to suite different audiences around the bay.
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FIGURE 5-1

Key to Bayshore Bikeway Study Segments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIGURE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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