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

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• REGIONAL BIKE PLAN EARLY ACTION PROGRAM
• CONNECTING THE BAYSHORE BIKEWAY TO THE BORDER
• CITY OF SAN DIEGO BIKESHARE PROGRAM

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.
Phone 511 or see www.511sd.com for route information.
Secure bicycle parking is available in the building garage off Fourth Avenue.

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.
## BAYSHORE BIKEWAY WORKING GROUP

**Wednesday, July 24, 2013**

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Bayshore Bikeway Working Group on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Working Group that is not on this agenda. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. Working Group members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

+3. **APRIL 12, 2013, MEETING SUMMARY**

The Bayshore Bikeway Working Group should review and approve the meeting summary from its April 12, 2013, meeting.

### REPORTS

+4. **REGIONAL BIKE PLAN EARLY ACTION PROGRAM**

The SANDAG Transportation Committee received a report on the Regional Bike Plan Early Action Program at its July meeting. Staff will report on the program, its implications for the Bayshore Bikeway, and the response from the Transportation Committee.

+5. **CONNECTING THE BAYSHORE BIKEWAY TO THE BORDER**

Bikeway connections between the Bayshore Bikeway and the community of San Ysidro are limited and inconsistent. The Regional Bike Plan has identified this connection among the high priority corridors for the region. Staff will provide a report on what is planned for the corridor in the Regional Bike Plan Early Action Program.

6. **CITY OF SAN DIEGO BIKESHARE PROGRAM**

Bikeshare programs are proliferating across the country. Ed Clancy, Program Manager for the City of San Diego’s bicycle initiatives will provide a presentation on plans to implement a bikeshare program in San Diego.

+7. **MARINA WAY/32ND STREET TO HARBOR DRIVE AND 32ND STREET (SEGMENTS 4 AND 5)**

A status report on this segment will be provided to the working group. Key issues continue to be the need to find an alternative alignment in National City south of Bay Marina Drive, and obtaining approvals from the Public Utilities Commission and BNSF for the railroad crossings.
8. MAIN STREET TO PALOMAR STREET (SEGMENT 8B)

Progress has been made in identifying the issues that will need to be address in order to select a preferred alignment for this segment of the bikeway. SANDAG staff will provide an update.

9. CORONADO CAYS INTERSECTION STUDY

The City of Coronado has been studying alternatives to improve the safety and operation of the bikeway at the entrance to the Coronado Cays. The working group will receive an update on the status of that work.

10. ANNOUNCEMENTS

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
APRIL 12, 2013, MEETING SUMMARY

1. Introductions
Supervisor Cox called the meeting to order. Self-introductions were conducted.

2. Public Comments and Communications
None.

3. Approval of November 15, 2012, Meeting Summary
Approval of the November 15, 2012, meeting summary was deferred for lack of a quorum at the beginning of the meeting.

Approved: Motion by Councilmember Woiwode, with a second by Gordy Shields.

4. Marina Way/West 32nd Street to Harbor Drive and 32nd Street (Segments 4 and 5)
Dean Hiatt of SANDAG staff provided an update on the status of this project. The issue controlling the schedule for completing this project remains obtaining approval from the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) for railroad crossings at 8th Street and 19th Street in the City of National City. In addition, following the CPUC approval, SANDAG will need to hear from the railroad, BNSF, about the changes they will require to the crossing, primarily related to the signals and gates. In the process of keeping key stakeholders apprised of changes proposed for the crossing at 8th Street, SANDAG received comments from the Navy expressing concern about potential traffic impacts from removing the right turn slip lane from westbound 8th Street to northbound Harbor Drive. The concern arose because of a significant planned shift of Navy personnel from the East Coast to the West Coast. SANDAG staff is working with the Navy and the City of National City to ensure the plan reflects future motor vehicle traffic needs at the intersection while preserving the access and safety of Bikeway users. The time needed for the rail crossing permits and related design work will push the start of construction back into 2014.

SANDAG staff will work with Port District staff to determine if the Port needs to sign off on the CPUC permit.

Presentations on these segments of the bikeway will be made to the city council in National City on May 1, and to the Board of Port Commissioners on May 7.
5. Main Street to Palomar Street (Segment 8B)

Emilio Rodriguez from SANDAG provided briefing on the progress being made to identify feasible alignments for the Bikeway in this section. An alternative using Frontage Road next to Interstate 5 has been eliminated due to environmental and right of way constraints, and cost. The remaining alternatives are over a box culvert in the drainage ditch next to Bay Boulevard, or in the Coronado Belt line rail right of way immediately to the west. The constraint for the drainage ditch alignment is that this area has been determined to be wetlands, and under the National Environmental Policy Act, the project must avoid wetland impacts if possible. The constraint for the railroad alignment is that the rail has been designated an historic resource by the City of San Diego. This alignment also would have to deal with poor drainage, poor soil conditions, and a likely need to move power poles.

Staff had discussed the railroad alignment with Bruce Coons of the Save Our Heritage Organization. His comment was that the historic resource was significant, but that we would be able to move the rails as long as they were replaced in a condition that would accommodate future rail service. This is likely to require right of way from the salt works operations.

Staff also discussed the alternatives with the Army Corp of Engineers, which would be responsible for the Section 404 wetlands permit. As a result of that meeting, SANDAG and its consultants will provide a detailed summary of the constraints on the other alignment. An informal response on the potential for obtaining that permit will be provided within the next month.

The Working Group discussed options and alternatives, including alignments that minimized the impacts but impacted both resources. Supervisor Cox asked if the project could be split so that a portion could be built now and the northern 750 feet where the wetland impacts would occur could be built later. Commissioner Nelson asked if the City of San Diego could remove the historic resource designation from the railroad. Councilmember Aguilar offered to pursue a resolution from the City of Chula Vista to support that action.

Staff responded that they thought the alignment in the drainage ditch is probably the most viable. With proper documentation of the significant constraints, a Section 404 permit could be obtained, and mitigation is available in the SANDAG environmental mitigation land bank at no cost to the project. Staff recommended differing judgment on the alignment until there is a response from the Army Corps of Engineers. There will be time to make that judgment once funding has been identified for preliminary engineering.

6. H Street to E Street in Chula Vista

Frank Rivera from the City of Chula Vista discussed work the city is doing to identify an alignment for a class 1 bike path along the west side of Bay Boulevard between H Street and E Street. This project is being pursued because there is a good chance it could be implemented before the proposed Bayshore Bikeway past the marina is realized as part of the Chula Vista bayfront redevelopment. Mr. Rivera described three alternatives: one along the rail right of way that would pass through the secured area for the United Technologies Corporation operations, one that would follow be along the west side of Bay Boulevard to G Street then turn west to the rail right of way before continuing north to E Street, and one that would stay on the west side of Bay Boulevard all the way to F Street/Lagoon Drive before entering the rail right of way to E Street. Mr. Rivera suggested that the third alternative seems the most viable and least expensive.
On a motion from Gordy Shields and second from Councilmember Aguilar, the Working Group unanimously recommended pursuing the third alternative. Commissioner Nelson stated that H Street will provide critical access to Port Tidelands when redevelopment occurs, and could not support a project that had a negative impact on tidelands. He asked that the project development consider all Port District plans for the area.

7. San Diego-Coronado Bay Bridge Bike and Pedestrian Facility

Lewis Dominy of Dominus Studio Architecture presented a proposal for constructing a bikeway connection across San Diego Bay by hanging a bike path under the arches in the piers on the San Diego Coronado Bay Bridge. Mr. Dominy described the concept as an opportunity to create a signature facility for San Diego. He also identified the issues that will have to be addressed. They include: ensuring enough clearance under the bikeway for the tallest Navy ships to pass under the bridge at high tide, how to connect the bikeway on each side, and cost. The working estimate for the bikeway is about $60 million. He suggested that the opportunity could be so attractive it might be able to attract financial support.

8. Barrio Logan (Segments 2 and 3)

Stephan Vance of SANDAG reported that progress on this segment still awaits funding, which will become available when SANDAG adopts a Regional Bike Plan Early Action Program. That could happen sometime in the summer of 2013. In the meantime, SANDAG continues to get correspondence about this segment that encourages SANDAG to consider the alignment and design concept developed by General Dynamic/NASSCO. Mr. Vance assured the Working Group that all options will be considered in the preliminary engineering phase of this project once it begins.

9. Updates on Projects Related to the Bayshore Bikeway

Ed Walton, City Engineer for the City of Coronado provided information on effort to improve the safety of the Bayshore Bikeway crossing at the entrance to The Cays in Coronado. He stated there have been a number of collisions and near collisions at that location. The configuration of the intersection is complex; walls block the cyclists from the view of drivers coming out of the Cays. Several design options are under consideration that will improve sight lines, slow vehicle traffic entering and exiting State Route 75 (SR-75), or move the bikeway crossing closer to traffic signal on SR 75.

10. Announcements

Josie Calderon spoke in favor of a Barrio to Barrio bikeway that would connect Barrio Logan to San Ysidro and the border. 95 percent of 5th graders surveyed in San Ysidro said they own bikes but only one percent said they ride. She suggested the problem is that currently there not a good connection between the border and the Bayshore Bikeway. She asked if this issue could be brought back the Bayshore Bikeway Working Group at a future meeting. Supervisor Cox asked that it be put on the agenda for the next meeting.

11. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 4 p.m. Next meeting scheduled for July 24, 2013.

Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, stephan.vance@sandag.org
# BAYSHORE BIKEWAY WORKING GROUP ATTENDANCE

Date: July 19, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
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Riding to 2050: San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan (Bike Plan) was approved by the Board of Directors on May 28, 2010. The Bike Plan was developed to support implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), both of which call for more transportation options and a balanced regional transportation system that supports smart growth and a more sustainable region.

On October 28, 2011, the Board of Directors made a major commitment to Active Transportation with the adoption of the 2050 RTP/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). The final action by the Board calls for beginning work on an Early Action Program (EAP) for the projects included in the Board-approved Bike Plan within six months of the 2050 RTP/SCS adoption, as well as planning for a broader Active Transportation program, including safe routes to school and safe routes to transit, within two years of the 2050 RTP/SCS adoption. The Transportation Committee accepted the goals for the Bike Plan EAP framework on April 6, 2012. This action also included funding to initiate preliminary engineering and detailed cost estimates for the Bike EAP network.

This report will present four Bike Plan EAP funding options, a summary of the funding assumptions, and description of the overall programmatic approach for implementation of the Bike EAP network. Each option varies in the amount of funding set aside for the local grant program.

Discussion

EAP Framework Goals

The accepted framework goals used to develop the Bike Plan EAP and funding strategy are as follows:

- The overall goal is to implement the Regional Bicycle Network High Priority Projects within 10 years
- Execute Regional Bicycle Programs to support the Regional Bicycle Network as outlined in the Bike Plan
- Continue to fund local bicycle and pedestrian plans, programs, and projects through a competitive grant program

In accordance with the framework goals, the projects proposed for the Regional Bike Plan EAP listed in Attachment 1 were prioritized using the criteria as shown in Attachment 2.
**Preliminary Engineering and Cost Estimates**

The cost estimates were developed by SANDAG engineering and planning staff with the assistance of two engineering consulting teams. The summary project costs shown in Attachment 1 are the estimated costs to complete the projects. Project costs include planning, environmental approval, preliminary engineering, design, right-of-way acquisition, review and permitting, construction, construction management and administrative costs including communications and legal. As is standard practice for projects in all stages of development, a contingency is included and varies based on project phase and in some cases the unique circumstances involved in a given project. Similar to the way Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures are a part of regional major corridor projects, regional bikeway projects also will include programmatic elements such as targeted marketing efforts and community-based travel planning that will support the capital investments for construction of the Regional Bicycle Network in order to maximize usage and safety.

**Implementation Options**

One of the EAP framework goals is to continue funding the local grant program. This goal is a very influential factor in determining the funding capacity of the Bike EAP program and was used to develop the proposed scenarios. Four preliminary financial scenarios were evaluated as shown in Table 1. In each scenario, assumptions for the investment levels for the Bike EAP and the grant program varied. Four scenarios were run as shown in Table 1 below. The analysis shows that positive fund balances and adequate debt service coverage are maintained for the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>EAP Amount</th>
<th>Annual Grant Amount</th>
<th>Grant Starting Year</th>
<th>Maintains positive fund balance and adequate debt service coverage?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 1</td>
<td>$200M</td>
<td>$1M</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2</td>
<td>$170M</td>
<td>$2M</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 3</td>
<td>$210M</td>
<td>$1M</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 4</td>
<td>$220M</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis shows the impacts of having varying investment levels for the Bike EAP ($170 million to $220 million), different annual grant amounts ($1 million, $2 million, or none at all) and different annual grant program starting years (2014 vs. 2024).

Attachments 1 and 3 show the proposed project priority list and a regional map showing all of the projects with the Scenario 1 funding cut-off shown for illustration purposes. The other scenario funding cut-offs and corresponding project lists can be found by using the rolling total cost column in Attachment 1.

The scenarios illustrate how increasing the size of the annual grant program from $1 million (Scenario 1) to $2 million (Scenario 2) would reduce the size of the Bike EAP by approximately $30 million. Deferring the start of a grant program from 2014 (Scenario 1) to 2024 (Scenario 3) adds approximately $10 million to the potential size of the EAP, from about $200 million to $210 million. Lastly, not having an annual grant program (Scenario 4) would allow the Bike EAP to be approximately $220 million. All four scenarios are similar in terms of the Debt Service Coverage Ratio, which would be close to 1.0x by 2031, near the end of the 20-year analysis period.
It is proposed to initially use the existing SANDAG commercial paper program as the means for financing the projects as the overall program ramps up. This strategy allows for only borrowing what is needed on an ongoing basis until the program is fully up and running. The potential to transfer the financing to long-term bonds can be evaluated each time the TransNet Major Corridors program contemplates a new bond issuance as part of the regular updates of the TransNet Program Plan of Finance.

Revenue Assumptions and Other Funding Opportunities

The assumptions for the revenues include the 2 percent TransNet Bicycle, Pedestrian and Neighborhood Safety (BPNS) program, and the Transportation Development Act (TDA) non-motorized program.

The Bike EAP is modeled after the Board’s current TransNet EAP, which has advanced TransNet Major Corridor projects around the region. The EAP concept has enabled the construction of a number of major transportation projects, and has allowed others to move forward to construction readiness, which helps position the region well if additional funds become available. To maximize funding opportunities from other sources, the Bike EAP implementation would be timed to have different projects in every stage of development. All projects would be moving toward the construction phase on a rolling timeline so at any given time there would be projects that are close to being “shovel ready” for construction. Partnerships and coordination with other regional and local projects are other opportunities that would be actively pursued by the project development team.

Potential funding opportunities could include the Transportation Alternatives (TA) program that was included in the federal surface transportation authorization, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) and for which specific state legislation is pending to determine the project selection and distribution processes. This program in part replaces the long-standing Transportation Enhancements (TE) federal funding program under which the region has historically been successful in competing for past regional bicycle projects.

Other opportunities could include future state and federal funds, including infrastructure bond measures and grant funds from environmental conservancies. In the event that the region is successful in securing additional funds, they would be incorporated into the annual TransNet Plan of Finance (POF) update to identify potential additional opportunities to defer debt financing or advance additional bike projects. Changes to assumptions in project costs and schedules, and to revenues, would be included in the annual TransNet POF update that is generally brought to the Board each year in the fall.

Other Issues

Supporting Programs

With the implementation of the projects as part of the draft Bike Plan EAP, it is proposed to integrate and coordinate other supporting programs within the individual project budgets, with the goal of increasing the number of people riding bikes for transportation. For example, targeted marketing efforts and community-based travel planning could be employed in a particular corridor to encourage greater usage of a new bike facility.
Data Collection, Evaluation, and Modeling

Proper planning for active transportation requires up-to-date and accurate data and model information on bicyclists, pedestrians, and the facilities they use. Development of the Regional Bike Plan EAP would be coordinated closely with ongoing data collection, evaluation, and monitoring efforts. Funding for this program was approved as part of the initial implementation efforts so that baseline data could be collected, and a bicycle/pedestrian model could be developed in time for incorporation into the Activity-Based Model that will be used to develop San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. The Activity-Based Model under development relies on data to improve analyses of bicycle/pedestrian usage. Funding for this program is allowing SANDAG to collect pertinent data, establish evaluation criteria, and a framework to monitor the impact of investments in active transportation.

Next Steps

Based on discussion and input today, the implementation scenarios will be refined and brought back to the Transportation Committee in September for recommendation to the Board of Directors for final action.

CHARLES "MUGGS" STOLL
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. Regional Bike Plan EAP – Proposed Project Priority
              2. Regional Bike Plan EAP – Prioritization for Proposed Phasing
              3. Regional Bike Plan EAP – Map

Key Staff Contact: Chris Kluth, (619) 699-1952, chris.kluth@sandag.org
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>FY Start</th>
<th>Existing Project Phase</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>22,466,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>2,579,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>5,727,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>5,771,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>2,688,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>6,615,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Class B Bikeway</td>
<td>7A</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>12,390,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Class B Bikeway</td>
<td>8B</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>2,380,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Class B Bikeway</td>
<td>9B</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>100,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Class B Bikeway</td>
<td>10A</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>1,000,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Class B Bikeway</td>
<td>11B</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>3,000,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Class B Bikeway</td>
<td>12B</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>1,000,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Class B Bikeway</td>
<td>13A</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>400,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Class B Bikeway</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>1,000,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Class B Bikeway</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>1,000,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Class B Bikeway</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>1,000,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Class B Bikeway</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>1,000,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>2,462,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>767,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>1,045,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>2,821,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>1,728,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>1,741,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>3,703,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>4,762,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>769,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>3,108,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>7,648,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>1,327,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>1,994,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>1,030,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>12,216,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>128,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>5,468,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>35, 35A, 35B</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>13,519,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>29,189,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>8,329,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>5,045,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>288,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>3,568,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>3,571,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>431,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>862,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>4,958,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>10,156,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>9,508,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>21,813,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>4,383,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>10,315,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>9,054,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Class B Bikeway</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>410,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Class B Bikeway</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>13,000,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Class B Bikeway</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>2,883,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Class B Bikeway</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>16,788,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Class B Bikeway</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>4,814,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Class B Bikeway</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>7,684,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>6,900,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>High Priority Urban Bikeway</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>4,775,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Class B Bikeway</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>114,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Class B Bikeway</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>3,688,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Class B Bikeway</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>473,000 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Class B Bikeway</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Design, Const.</td>
<td>2,817,000 $</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: Urban projects and Class I projects prioritized separately

**Urban Projects**

1. Continue working on and finish projects started in the Initial Implementation phase

2. Base prioritization on existing results/criteria adopted by Transportation Committee when Initial Implementation was presented
   a. Demand Base Criteria
      i. Gravity model based on Smart Growth Opportunity Areas (SGOAs)
      ii. Higher land use intensities and shorter distances between SGOAs lead to greater estimated demand
   b. Facility Based Criteria
      i. Network gaps
      ii. Bicycle crashes
      iii. Public comments

3. Group similarly prioritized projects together geographically

**Class I Projects** Finish projects started in the Initial Implementation phase and continue working on projects SANDAG is lead implementation agency

1. Project readiness

2. Group geographically with other Urban Projects where feasible/efficient

3. Capitalize on other regional project implementation efforts
Projects within $200M Capacity
- Urban Route
- Class I Route
Projects above $200M Capacity
- Urban Route
- Class I Route

Regional Bike Network
- Future
- Existing
- Project Done by Others

Major Roads and Highways

Projects 48B, 31B, 50, 8, 9, and 10 funded through ROW.
CONNECTION THE BAYSHORE BIKEWAY TO THE BORDER

Introduction

On several occasions, a member of the community of San Ysidro has come to the Bayshore Bikeway Working Group to raise awareness of the need for a better bikeway connection between the border and the Bikeway. In combination with existing and planned improvements on the Bayshore Bikeway, this would create a “barrio to barrio” connection between San Ysidro and Barrio Logan.

The Regional Bike Plan identifies regional corridors in the South Bay that would make this connection. The Regional Bike Early Action Program (EAP), currently under discussion with the Transportation Committee, it is now possible to outline the opportunities for developing these connections.

Discussion

Planned Regional Corridors

The Regional Bike Plan identifies 40 regional bike corridors across the region that connect major activity centers, smart growth areas, and regional transit services (see Attachment 1). Among those is the Border Access Corridor that will run from the international border to the Bayshore Bikeway. The specific alignment for this corridor has yet to be determined, but for planning purposes, the Regional Bike Plan assumed the corridor would likely follow San Ysidro Boulevard, Beyer Boulevard, Coronado Avenue and Saturn Boulevard. The corridor would connect with the Bayshore Bikeway along an existing spur from the bikeway that extends from the northern end of Saturn Boulevard to the Bayshore Bikeway entrance at Main Street in Chula Vista.

Also connecting to the Border Access Corridor is the regional corridor known as the Imperial Beach Connector. The initial planned alignment for this corridor is on Donax Avenue, beginning at Saturn Boulevard, 13th Street, and Palm Avenue west to the Seacoast Drive. This corridor would provide another connection to the Bayshore Bikeway via the bike lanes that the City of Imperial Beach plans to have installed in conjunction with the Bikeway Village on 13th Street north of Palm Avenue.

For both of these corridors, the Regional Bike Plan assumed on-street bikeway facilities that would include sections of enhanced bike route (Class III), bicycle boulevard, and bike lanes (Class II). Attachment 2 provides examples of the different facility types.
**Corridor Implementation**

When the SANDAG Transportation Committee first addressed implementation of the Regional Bike Plan, they recommended priority implementation of the four major Class I corridors already under development: the Bayshore Bikeway, Coastal Rail Trail, Inland Rail Trail and San Diego River Trail. They also identified 30 high priority urban corridors for early implementation. Among those priority corridors is a combination of the Border Access Corridor and the Imperial Beach Connector.

The Transportation Committee also endorsed the development of a financing strategy called the draft EAP. Several options for how the EAP could be financed were discussed by the Transportation Committee at their July 19, 2013, meeting. A decision on which approach to take will not be made until late summer or fall, but the initial options presented assumed the preliminary engineering for the Border Access Corridor could begin in Fiscal Year (FY) 2015, and that construction could begin as early as FY 2019. Many factors will determine the timeframe needed to develop the project, and the availability of funding is only the first one. However, the draft EAP suggests a general timeline for when work could begin to connect the Bayshore Bikeway to San Ysidro. The draft EAP also proposes an FY 2019 date for construction of the Barrio Logan segment of the Bayshore Bikeway.

Attachments: 1. Regional Bicycle Corridors  
2. Regional Corridor Bicycle Facility Types

Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, stephan.vance@sandag.org
REGIONAL BICYCLE CORRIDORS
1 - Bayshore Bikeway
2 - Bay to Ranch Bikeway
3 - Border Access Corridor
4 - Camp Pendleton Trail
5 - Carlsbad-San Marcos Corridor
6 - Central Coast Corridor
7 - Centre City-La Mesa Corridor
8 - Chula Vista Greenbelt
9 - City Heights-Old Town Corridor
10 - Clairemont-Centre City Corridor
11 - Coastal Rail Trail
12 - East County Northern Loop
13 - East County Southern Loop
14 - El Camino Real
15 - Encinitas-San Marcos Corridor
16 - Escondido Creek Bikeway
17 - Gilman Connector
18 - Hillcrest-El Cajon Corridor
19 - Imperial Beach Connector
20 - Inland Rail Trail
21 - Kearny Mesa-Beaches Corridor
22 - Kensington-Balboa Park Corridor
23 - North Park-Centre City Corridor
24 - Mid-County Bikeway
25 - Mira Mesa Corridor
26 - Mission Valley-Chula Vista Corridor
27 - Park Boulevard Connector
28 - Poway Loop
29 - San Diego River Bikeway
30 - San Luis Rey River Trail
31 - Santee-El Cajon Corridor
32 - Sweetwater River Bikeway
33 - Vista Way Connector
34 - I-8 Corridor
35 - I-15 Bikeway
36 - SR-52 Bikeway
37 - SR-56 Bikeway
38 - SR-125 Corridor
39 - I-805 Connector
40 - SR-905 Corridor

NOTE:
Colors do not represent facility type.
The color variations are intended to differentiate start and end of all corridors.
### Regional Corridor Bicycle Facility Types

#### Class I - Bike Path
Bike paths are bikeways that are physically separated from vehicular traffic. Also termed shared-use paths, bike paths accommodate bicycle, pedestrian, and other non-motorized travel. Paths can be constructed in roadway right-of-way or independent right-of-way. Bike paths provide critical connections in the region where roadways are absent or are not conducive to bicycle travel.

#### Class II - Bike Lanes
Bike lanes are defined by pavement markings and signage used to allocate a portion of a roadway for exclusive or preferential bicycle travel. Within the regional corridor system, bike lanes should be enhanced with treatments that improve safety and connectivity by addressing site-specific issues. Such treatments include innovative signage, intersection treatments, and bicycle loop detectors.
**Class III - Bike Routes**
Bike routes are located on shared roadways that accommodate vehicles and bicycles in the same travel lane. Established by signs, bike routes provide continuity to other bike facilities or designate preferred routes through corridors with high demand. Within the regional corridor system, bike routes should be enhanced with treatments that improve safety and connectivity by addressing site-specific issues.

**Cycle Tracks**
A cycle track is a hybrid type bicycle facility that combines the experience of a separated path with the on-street infrastructure of a conventional bike lane. Cycle tracks are bikeways located in roadway right-of-way but separated from vehicle lanes by physical barriers or buffers. Cycle tracks provide for one-way bicycle travel in each direction adjacent to vehicular travel lanes and are exclusively for bicycle use. **Cycle tracks are not recognized by the Caltrans Highway Design Manual as a bikeway facility.** Development of cycle track on segments of the regional corridor system is proposed through experimental, pilot projects.
**Bicycle Boulevards**

Bicycle boulevards are local roads or residential streets that have been enhanced with traffic calming and other treatments to facilitate safe and convenient bicycle travel. Bicycle boulevards accommodate bicyclists and motorists in the same travel lanes, typically without specific vehicle or bicycle lane delineation. These roadway designations prioritize bicycle travel above vehicular travel. The treatments applied to create a bike boulevard heighten motorists’ awareness of bicyclists and slow vehicle traffic, making the boulevard more conducive to safe bicycle and pedestrian activity. Bicycle boulevard treatments include signage, pavement markings, intersection treatments, traffic calming measures, and can include traffic diversions. **Bicycle boulevards are not defined as bikeways by the Caltrans Highway Design Manual; however, the basic design features of bicycle boulevards comply with Caltrans standards.**
MARINA WAY/32ND STREET TO HARBOR DRIVE AND 32ND STREET (SEGMENTS 4 AND 5)

Introduction

Segments 4 and 5 of the Bayshore Bikeway were originally planned to extend the existing path, which ends near the National City marina, north of the 32nd Street entrance to Naval Base San Diego. While the project was in the final design phase, proposed plans to redevelop the Port marine terminal and some adjacent land in National City resulted in potential conflicts between these two projects. Along with a need to reduce the cost of the bikeway project, this led SANDAG to truncate the southern end of the project at Tidelands Avenue and Bay Marina Drive.

This report provides an update on the status of this project.

Discussion

Project Budget

This project currently has an approved budget of $5.35 million that includes the following revenues.

- California Coastal Conservancy grant: $2,500,000
- Federal Transportation Enhancement funds: $938,000
- TransNet program: $1,790,000
- State Transportation Improvement Program: $122,000
- Total: $5,350,000

This amount includes $1.06 million for the environmental and design phases, and $4.29 million for construction and construction management. The critical deadline for the expenditure funds is associated with the Transportation Enhancement funds, which require a construction contract to be awarded by August 2014, and expended by August 2016.

Project Issues

Railroad Crossings

The critical path items for this project remain approval from the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) for the two railroad crossings at 19th Street and Tidelands Avenue, and 8th Street and Harbor Drive. The CPUC permit for these crossings is dependent on an agreement with the railroad, BNSF, about the improvements they will require at these crossings. Resolving the
matter of these crossings also has potential budget impacts, because BNSF has the authority to determine what improvements will be needed and what the cost of those improvements will be.

Completing negotiations with BNSF has been a major challenge for the project. However, recent feedback from them about the 19th Street and Tidelands Avenue crossing has been positive in terms of the kind and cost of the improvements that will be required. Staff continues to explore opportunities to resolve the 8th Street and Harbor Drive crossing design. This is the critical path item for the project schedule. Once resolved, it will take 60 days to complete the final design, and five months to advertise and award a construction contract. Under any likely scenario, that would not mean construction would begin until after the end of this calendar year, most likely in the spring.

8th Street and Harbor Drive Intersection

SANDAG also is working with the City of National City and the Navy to finalize the design for the 8th Street and Harbor Drive intersection. Current plans called for the removal of a right turn slip lane from 8th Street to northbound Harbor Drive to improve safety for bikeway users. The Navy has raised concerns about the impact this would have on vehicle traffic in light of planned increases in the naval forces at Naval Base San Diego. SANDAG and its consultant team will be meeting with the City of National City and the Navy to discuss the traffic analysis in the coming week. We believe the traffic analysis supports the removal of the right turn lane. The design of this intersection will affect the railroad crossing as well, so the issue must be resolved before negotiations can begin with BNSF regarding the railroad agreement.

Bikeway Gap in National City

Truncating the project on the south end at Bay Marina Drive leaves a gap in the otherwise continuous Class 1 bikeway. SANDAG and the Port District are prepared to work together to identify a new alignment for the bike path here, but that will not be possible until we know what changes will occur in the street network and land uses in the area. Among the ideas being discussed is the closure of Tidelands Avenue south of Bay Marina Drive, which was where the bike path was originally planned to be built. If that occurs, it is likely that the bike path will have to be aligned along Bay Marina Drive and Marina Way, but until a feasibility study is conducted we will not know what that would entail. The public right of way currently is constrained along Bay Marina Drive by on-street parking, and by railroad tracks and the Paradise marsh refuge along Marina Way. Currently there is no funding identified to conduct the feasibility study that will be necessary to identify a new preferred alignment.

Key Staff Contact: Dean Hiatt, (620) 699-6978, dean.hiatt@sandag.org
MAIN STREET TO PALOMAR STREET (SEGMENT 8B)  

Introduction

Segment 8B of the Bayshore Bikeway is a planned 0.7-mile section of the bikeway from Main Street in the City of Chula Vista to Palomar Street. This portion of the bikeway was excluded from the project that constructed Segments 7 and 8A (Palomar Street to H Street) in 2012, due to right of way constraints. Beginning at Palomar Street, the Bayshore Bikeway Plan adopted in 2006 assumed an alignment through this section immediately west of Bay Boulevard, then transitioning to what currently is a salt works access road on the eastern edge of the salt works. The new path would be connected to the existing bike path where it ends at Main Street. The original project concept was to construct the bike path on top of a box culvert in an open drainage ditch for about 700 feet south of Palomar Street. The main reason this section was not constructed as part of the Segments 7 and 8A project is that this ditch is designated as potential wetlands. In addition, the old Coronado Belt Line railroad that runs parallel to the drainage ditch has been designated an historic resource by the City of San Diego, making an alignment to the west of the ditch problematic as well.

The feasibility study currently underway has been exploring alignment alternatives for Segment 8B. This report discusses the progress made to identify a feasible alignment, the additional steps necessary to complete the project, and the project schedule.

Discussion

Project Budget

The current budget for Segment 8B funds the current alignment studies, preparation of the environmental documents, and preliminary design with the following revenue sources:

- Federal Transportation Enhancement: $336,000
- State Transportation Improvement Program: 44,000
- TransNet Active Transportation Program: 540,000
- County of San Diego: 71,000

Total: $991,000

The Regional Bike Program Early Action Program that is scheduled for adopting later this summer recommends an additional $2,959,200 for final design and construction, with the funding becoming available as early as this fiscal year.
**Project Issues**

Because the project budget includes federal funds, the project is subject to National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is responsible for administering these funds in California, and also certifies the NEPA document. Caltrans staff has advised SANDAG that under NEPA, the project must try to identify an alignment that avoids wetland impacts. To meet that requirement, several different alignments have been studied as shown in Attachment 1. Insufficient right of way is available for an alignment along Frontage Road. Areas of designated wetlands also exist on the east side of Bay Boulevard. With the rail line being designated an historic resource; total avoidance of any natural or cultural resources in the project area is proving infeasible.

To determine the feasibility of building the bike path on top of a box culvert in the drainage ditch, SANDAG held informal pre-application meetings with the Army Corp and the Regional Water Quality Board (RWQB). SANDAG has coordinated with these regulatory agencies to receive input on the project and aid in SANDAG’s selection of a preferred alignment. As a result of these meetings, SANDAG staff has a better idea of what will be required to build the bike path on the box culvert. Mitigation for wetland impacts is available in the TransNet Environmental Mitigation Bank. Storm water quality features will have to be included in the project.

**Project Schedule**

Now that SANDAG has met with the Army Corps of Engineers, and the RWQB, the next step is to meet with Caltrans, the City of San Diego, and stakeholders on the preferred alignment; the project schedule will be updated after receiving input from these stakeholders. SANDAG staff expects to move forward with preliminary engineering and environmental compliance for a preferred alignment beginning in fall 2013.

Attachments: 1. Segment 8B Alignment Alternatives

Key Staff Contact: Emilio Rodriguez, (619)-699-6984, emilio.rodriguez@sandag.org