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INTRODUCTION

Purpose
The purpose of the Gilroy Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan is to encourage bicycle ridership and pedestrian activity as a viable means of transportation and recreation through the planning of local bikeways, bicycle/pedestrian trails, and bicycle parking facilities; coordination of bikeways with other modes of transportation including buses and trains; and through the encouragement of bicycle/pedestrian safety and promotion programs.

Future Plan Updates
As the first Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan prepared by the City, this plan focuses on bikeways improvements. It is anticipated that the Plan will be updated in the future to include a more comprehensive pedestrian element. See the “Future Issues” section near the end of the report.

Benefits
The Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan will facilitate a “proactive” and systematic approach in achieving an efficient environment for cyclists and pedestrians.

• Commuting and Recreation  The Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan encourages the use of bicycles and walking for commuting and recreational purposes.

• Competitive Grant Funding  Some grant sources require an approved Bicycle Transportation Plan and Bicycle Committee to qualify for funding. With a Bicycle Transportation Plan, the City will be eligible and more competitive for grant funding to implement the plan.

• Incremental Improvements  The Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan serves as a blueprint to ensure that phased improvements are consistent with an overall plan.

• Coordination with Development  Some improvements in the Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan can be linked to development conditions as development occurs. In addition, the Plan may be used as a part of the RDO “point” allocation review process for new development.

• Coordination with Roadway Improvements  Many of the proposed improvements can be implemented concurrently with proposed roadway improvements, resulting in minimal or no additional costs to the City.

• Multi-Agency Coordination  The Plan encourages coordination between many City departments (such as police, community development, and community services), Santa Clara
County, Valley Transportation Authority, Gilroy Unified School District, Santa Clara Valley Water District, and other agencies and organizations, to promote a more efficient and convenient cycling environment.

- **Safety** The Plan promotes safety through bicycle education programs.

**Community Involvement**

The Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan was developed concurrently with the City’s General Plan Update, which was guided by the 46-member General Plan Update Committee. This citizens advisory committee reviewed and commented on the proposed bikeways system that is a part of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan, and their meetings were open to the public. In addition, the Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan has been reviewed by the City’s seven-member Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Board that was formed in 2000. All meetings of the Advisory Board are publicly noticed and public comment is welcomed. The Draft Plan was approved by the Board on January 22, 2002.

**Consistency with Local and Regional Plans**

The bicycle element of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan provides a strategy for improving bicycle facilities and increasing ridership. The goals, policies, and projects are consistent with regional plans that seek to promote alternative transportation. The 1997 Congestion Management Program (Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, May 7, 1998) includes a preliminary countywide bicycle network with interconnected corridors. The area along Highway 101 in South County to Gilroy has been identified as a bike corridor, with the extension to Gilroy as a future project.

The Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan is consistent with the County of Santa Clara Trails Master Plan (1995), the Valley Transportation Authority’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines (1999), and the Santa Clara Countywide Bicycle Plan (2000). The Gilroy Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan is also consistent with the California Department of Transportation (CalTrans) Highway Design Manual that includes standards for bicycle facilities. In addition, the Plan is consistent with measures adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District to improve bicycle access and facilities, including encouraging bicycles on transit vehicles and encouraging employers and developers to provide bicycle access and facilities.

Finally, the Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan is also consistent with the City of Gilroy General Plan Update goals, policies and implementing actions (draft, Chapter 6, Transportation and Circulation).
THE BICYCLING ENVIRONMENT

Background

Bicycling is a healthy, enjoyable and environmentally sound transportation mode. With the increasing interest in bicycling, the development of quality bicycle facilities is becoming increasingly important. Overall, the number of cyclists continues rising at a tremendous rate, particularly among adults who now outnumber child cyclists. In 1990, it was estimated that 93 million Americans were bicycling. Bicycling is the fastest-growing physical fitness sport in America.

Types of Cyclists

Cycling needs can vary greatly depending on the age, experience and purpose of the cyclist.

Age  Cyclists range in age from young children to senior adults. Busy streets may be feasible routes for experienced adult riders, while grade-separated pathways or streets with low traffic volume are more appropriate for children.

Experience  Not all riders are experienced cyclists. Routes with steep grades and high traffic volumes may not be comfortable for beginning cyclists.

Purpose  Commute cyclists use their bicycles as a means of getting to and from specific locations, such as home, school, work, shopping, sporting events, etc. Experienced commute cyclists prefer the most direct route and are comfortable riding on roads with high traffic speeds and volumes. These roads typically allow for a cyclist to maintain a consistent speed and minimize conflicts with slower, less experienced cyclists and pedestrians.

Recreational cyclists use their bicycles as a means of recreation and exercise and would prefer a scenic route to the most direct route. Some recreational cyclists may prefer a steeper route for cardiovascular training. Recreational cycling includes individual or family outings, along with organized long-distance tours. For family outings, grade-separated paths are frequently preferred where slower inexperienced and young cyclists can ride safely.

The Gilroy Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan has been designed with this diversity of users in mind. For example, the most direct routes for commute cyclists may not be appropriate for recreational or beginning cyclists. Similarly, some of the paths and routes on lower volume streets may appeal more to families and recreational cyclists than to commute cyclists.
Bicyclists' Needs

To accommodate the various cycling types, route systems should be accessible and adjacent to all residential areas (it is assumed all local residential streets are bicycle friendly). They should have adequate signs and graphics to delineate locations and direction. Route systems should be visible and provide adequate travel width. In addition, it is important to keep in mind that excessive motor vehicle traffic and speed make bicycling less comfortable and less fun, especially for inexperienced and recreational cyclists.

Bikeway Design and Construction

The Bikeways Planning and Design Chapter of the Caltrans Highway Design Manual (excerpts are included in Appendix A) provides specific details on design speeds, signing, striping, lane width, and other related bikeway design issues. Caltrans identifies three types of bikeways: Class I, II, and III. Typical cross sections for each bikeway are shown in the appendix.

In addition to Caltrans standards, Bicycle Technical Guidelines have been prepared by the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA - Adopted 1999) and are an excellent design guide for nearly every bicycling condition that may be encountered. Some of the details from these Guidelines are also included in Appendix A.

**Bike Paths** (Class I Bikeways) are separated from motor vehicles. Bike paths work best in areas with few vehicle crossings (i.e. along edges, such as riverfronts). Caltrans minimum width is 8 feet (4 feet each way, with a stripe down the center), with a 2 foot graded shoulder on each side.

**Bike Lanes** (Class II Bikeways) are striped one-way lanes on roadways that are marked by signage, pavement striping, and/or stencils. Caltrans minimum recommended lane width against a curb is 5 feet. When parallel parking is present, Caltrans recommends a minimum of 12 feet from (vertical) curb to lane stripe.

**Bike Routes** (Class III Bikeways) use signs to guide bicyclists on established routes alongside roadways and are used on streets where auto traffic volume and speed do not warrant other lanes. Minimum widths are not presented in the Caltrans Design Manual, as the acceptable width is dependent on many factors, including volume and character of vehicle traffic on the road, typical speeds, vertical and horizontal alignment, sight distance, and parking conditions.

The trend for experienced commute cyclists is to "share the road." This viewpoint promotes the integration of motorists and cyclists by improving existing roadway systems to accommodate
bicycles, and educating both cyclists and drivers of how to coexist. Bicyclists share the roadway with general motor vehicle traffic.

Because bicyclists travel slower than vehicular traffic, they ride closer to the right-hand side of the road. Adequate width in the outside through lane makes both motorists and bicyclists more comfortable sharing the road and can reduce conflicts and motorist delays. Improving roads to provide this width is the equivalent of a capacity increase (Santa Clara County Transportation Agency). The amount of space available for lane sharing depends on the width of the outside lane, the presence and condition of a paved shoulder and the condition of the rightmost portion of the usable pavement. The amount of space needed for shared use depends on traffic volume, speed, grade, and the presence of parking.

**Bikeway and Road Maintenance**

In order to facilitate and encourage bicycling, bikeways must be maintained. Bicycle sensitivity to surface irregularities, such as potholes, ruts, debris and broken glass, is greater than automobiles. In addition, drainage grates with slots parallel to the direction of travel can trap a bicycle wheel, causing a violent stop and severe injuries.

Typically, there are two types of maintenance activities crucial to bicycle bikeway and road safety. They are:

1) Route maintenance such as sweeping bike lanes, restriping faded lane markings, patching potholes, and cutting overhanging vegetation.

2) Spot improvements to bring existing bikeways up to current standards.

The following table from the VTA Bicycle Technical Guidelines provides measurable standards for bikeway maintenance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respond to pavement failure reports</th>
<th>Respond to 100% of reports within 8 hours of report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain clean walkways/roadside areas</td>
<td>80% of areas maintained to a “satisfactory” level as defined by a photographic standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweep roadways</td>
<td>100% of roadways every two weeks, with 90% maintained to a “satisfactory” level as defined by a photographic standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain arterial street traffic markings</td>
<td>100% of markings annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain non-arterial street traffic markings</td>
<td>75% of markings every two years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair deteriorated non-traffic control signs</td>
<td>100% within 30 days of report/complaint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain landscaping encroachment onto roadway or that obscures sight distance</td>
<td>100% within 24 hours of report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweep during construction</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Street Sweeping**  As a standard practice, street sweeping should include the full width of the bicycle travel area, and not just the parking lane. Streets with no curb are not swept since the sweeping mechanism requires a curb to operate properly.

**Bicycle Paths**  Bicycle paths also require regular maintenance including pavement repair, striping, adjacent vegetation maintenance, and litter pick-up. Path maintenance should be incorporated into the City’s parks maintenance program and budget.

**Adopt-A-Path**  Similar to statewide “Adopt-A-Highway” programs, the City could establish an adopt-a-path program to help fund pathway maintenance. Pathway signage should be designed to recognize contributors to the program.

**Traffic Signals and Signage**

Many existing traffic signals turn green only when actuated by approaching vehicle traffic. Traffic signals should be designed, adjusted and properly identified so bicyclists can activate, or “trip” them. The standard traffic detection mechanism is an induction loop buried in the pavement to sense the proximity of bicycles with pavement markings for detecting bikes (Santa Clara County Transportation Agency, March 1954).

Signing and pavement markings are also essential to bicyclists and motorists. The Caltrans Highway Design Manual and the VTA Technical Guidelines provide standards for signing and pavement markings. (See Appendix A).
EXISTING AND PROJECTED LAND USE PATTERNS
AND COMMUTER BICYCLE USE

Population Projections


Existing and Proposed Land Use Patterns

Land uses within the City consist of a mix of residential, commercial, industrial and a variety of institutional and recreational uses. During the 1980's, the City experienced a significant amount of residential development, primarily in response to strong regional economic growth in Silicon Valley and the extremely limited and costly housing in the northern parts of Santa Clara County.

It is estimated that 70% of the City's labor force commutes to employment centers outside of Gilroy, mainly in the Silicon Valley (that ratio was 60% in the 1990 Census). Conversely, it is estimated that 70% of the City's employees commute from areas outside City limits (e.g. Salinas, Hollister). The existing primary employment centers within the City include businesses in the Downtown area: businesses along the major thoroughfares such as First Street; civic and municipal centers such as City Hall, Police and Fire Stations, and the library; Tenth Street and Chestnut Avenue; Obata Industrial Park and the growing industrial park north of Leavesley Road and west of Highway 101; a variety of regional commercial uses (e.g., The Outlets and Bonfante Gardens); and industrial uses (e.g., Gilroy Foods, Gaylord Container, Fibre Innovations and Indian Motorcycle Company). There are also many small businesses located throughout the City. Educational institutions include Gavilan College and public and private grade schools.

As part of the City's General Plan Update, approximately 1,630 acres of land could be developed for industrial park and/or campus park uses. Additionally, approximately 8,000 housing units and 440 acres of commercial land may be developed by the year 2020. The following Land Use Plan from the General Plan Update identifies existing and proposed land uses within the City limits and City planning area.
Commuter Bicycle Use

According to the Santa Clara County Bicycle Plan (March 1994), bicycle commuting in Santa Clara County accounts for at least 2.2% of commute trips, representing the highest in the Bay Area. In Gilroy, commuter bicyclists are estimated at approximately 1% - 2% of the total commuter traffic for a total of 223 cyclists in 1990 and 265 cyclists in 1998 (source, 1990 census, for ZIP Code area 95020).

There are several strategies for increasing bicycle commute use:

1) **Increase opportunities for residents to live and work in Gilroy.**
   The General Plan Update identifies possibilities for increased employment in the City, providing additional job opportunities for residents. For those not commuting out of town, the bikeways system provides a viable alternative to the automobile as a means of commuting to work.

2) **Encourage cycling as part of a multi-modal out-of-town commute.**
   Many who either live in Gilroy and commute out-of-town, or live elsewhere but work in Gilroy, use buses, trains or carpooling as a part of their commute. Cycling should be encouraged as a connection between the home/workplace and the bus/train stop/park and ride lot. This involves convenient routes between residential areas, work places and transit stops, along with secure bicycle parking facilities, and the ability to take a bicycle on the transit vehicle.

3) **Encourage cycling to school by students.**
   In addition to increasing adult bicycle commute trips, children in grades 3-6 living within one mile of school and youth in grades 7-12 living within two miles of school should be encouraged and should be able to walk or bicycle to school. This involves coordination of designated routes to school with the Gilroy Unified School District and private schools, safety and “rules of the road” education for both cyclists and automobile drivers, as well as adequate and secure bicycle parking facilities at each school.

4) **Increase number and quality of routes.**
   By implementing the recommended routes in the Transportation Plan, cycling will become more attractive as an alternative and convenient transportation mode.

Using the above strategies, an achievable goal is to increase Gilroy commute bicycle use to at least the County average of 2.2%, plus school ridership of 500-1000 students. This would result in about 1300-1800 commute/school trips per day in 2020.
BICYCLE PLAN GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

Goals
The primary goals of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan are to:

1) Improve bicycle circulation.

2) Increase use of bicycling for short- and long-range trips, and in turn reduce the use of motor vehicles.

3) Design the streets and roads to be "bicycle friendly" to equally accommodate both motorized and non-motorized modes of transportation.

4) Encourage non-motorized travel behavior by providing alternative travel methods on all land use types, when possible.

5) Improve and promote bicycle access to public transportation facilities with bikeways and storage facilities.

The emphasis of the bicycle element of the Plan is on comfortable and convenient bikeways and facilities that complement other transportation modes (e.g., bus and train, carpool, etc.) to serve areas of employment, commercial districts, schools, and parks. The plan is targeted to both recreational and commuter bicyclists.

Objectives

- Encourage bicycle travel as a major form of transportation in order to increase bicycle use and bicycle trips. Educate the bicycling public as to proper bicycling behavior.

- Develop a bikeway network maximizing the comfort and convenience of users of all levels of experience within that system. The network should be primarily for commuter travel designed to increase the potential of combining bicycle travel with other forms of transportation and also include the opportunity for recreational use.

- Coordinate the City's bikeway planning efforts with the Santa Clara County and other agencies to provide an integrated regional bikeway system and actively seek all available means of bikeway financing, including State and Federal grants.
• Reduce the conflict between bicycles and other modes of travel, and thereby decrease the number of collisions involving bicycles.

• Establish an implementation process that will support the planning and development activity requirements of the bicycle plan.

Policies
System Continuity
• Plan a bikeway network to integrate with other City and regional bicycle routes and other modes of transportation (Park and Ride lots, transit facilities, train stations etc.) in order to encourage and support the use of bicycling and reduce the use of motor vehicles.

• Priorities for developing bicycle facilities should be based upon providing a user friendly and convenient system.

• Plan bicycle paths or lanes as part of new development and new roadway construction, consistent with provisions of this Plan and based on the bikeways map.

Commuting
• Design bicycle routes to connect existing and planned residential areas with major activity centers (employment, educational, civic, etc.) by including bikeway network development as part of the Capital Improvement Program to prioritize construction or retrofits for completion of specific routes.

• Encourage bicycle use by public agency employees (including police cyclists and parking control officers) for short business-related trips.

• Encourage the provision of appropriate bicycle parking facilities at employment destinations and major public recreational areas, and where practical and economically feasible, encourage provision of showers, lockers, and other storage facilities as part of the discretionary permit review process.

Design and Construction
• Design, construct and mark bikeways and bike lanes in accordance with Caltrans and VTA standards.
• Locate bikeways as bicycle lanes adjacent to the main traveled way unless a more direct and useful separated bike path can be provided where bicycle lanes are not possible due to right-of-way restrictions, etc, or where a bicycle path is preferred as a recreational amenity.

• Where identified as a bikeway in the Master Plan, design new roads and improve existing roads to the appropriate standards to accommodate bicycle travel.

• Retain all existing bikeways along with roadway improvement projects ensuring that bike lanes are not narrowed to the point they become substandard.

• Strive to provide adequate bicycle detection at traffic signals and mark loop detectors with bicycle symbols on major arterials.

• Limit the number of driveways when planning new commercial developments in order to reduce automobile-bicycle conflicts.

• Limit on-street parking where the need for a clear bike lane exists. Stripe all arterials for bike lanes and strictly enforce parking limitations.

Bicycle Parking
• Encourage convenient, secure bicycle parking at new developments (private and public facilities and commercial districts) through the development review process.

• Encourage special event sponsors to provide bicycle access and secure bicycle parking.

• Encourage secure long-term bicycle parking with the development of new and existing transit centers and shelters and park-and-ride lots. Park-and-ride lots should include bicycle lockers.

• Encourage secure bicycle parking at major bus stops, especially along routes that serve employment and educational facilities.

Maintenance
• Require contractors and utility companies performing roadside work to maintain the road edge in the best possible condition during construction and upon project completion, return the road shoulder to pre-construction condition or better.
• Strive to ensure that bicycle facilities remain in usable condition through regular maintenance and sweeping. Keep road surfaces, including the roadway edge used by bicyclists, smooth and free of potholes with a uniform pavement edge.

**Education and Safety**

• Encourage bicycle rider training programs for all elementary school children in Gilroy. Educate motorists about sharing the road with bicyclists.

• When constructing, improving or maintaining roadways, provide improvements that comply with Caltrans design standards, and VTA guidelines. Improvements should also be consistent with the Countywide Trails Master Plan where feasible.
BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN PROJECTS

This Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan targets commuter and recreational bicyclist use, including improved access to educational facilities. There are several conditions that affect existing cyclists, including security and intermodal connectivity. The development of convenient bike paths and bike lanes is a key goal to significantly increasing bicycle use. Other projects that improve bicycle facilities and encourage riding include adequate bike lane maintenance, parking facilities, and intermodal connections, as well as increased awareness of bicycle safety. Proposed bicycle facilities are outlined below; bicycle safety and education programs are addressed in the next chapter.

Existing and Proposed Bikeways

Existing and proposed bikeways and other bicycle facility projects are identified on the attached map. Existing bicycle facilities in Gilroy consist of approximately two miles of bike paths, fifteen miles of bike lanes (including Santa Teresa Expressway), and four miles of bike routes. The only dedicated Class I bike path in Gilroy is the Uvas Creek trail, which extends for two miles from Laurel Street at its northwest end to Luchessa at its southeast end.

Future Class I Bikeways

Future/proposed Class I bike paths are summarized and prioritized below. The plan includes approximately eight regional paths and ten local paths that serve primarily as connectors between the regional trails. Some of the regional pathways are outside the City of Gilroy planning area and would be implemented through regional efforts. Priority Class I bike paths include the following (in descending order, these priorities are identified in the General Plan and may be revised in the future):

1) **Extension of the Uvas Creek Trail**  Approximately doubling in length and extending westward and south to the future Sports Park and to the main entrance of Gavilan College;

2) **Ronan Channel Trail**  Linking residential areas in the northwest area of the City with commercial and industrial areas to the east and southeast;

3) **North Santa Teresa Trail**  Linking the Ronan Channel Trail and the regional Santa Teresa trail north of Fitzgerald Avenue;

4) **Monterey Road Trail**  A Countywide route proposed to extend south from Morgan Hill to Buena Vista, which would include segments in Gilroy along the Union Pacific railroad line;
5) **South Santa Teresa Trail** Along the east side of Santa Teresa Boulevard between First Street (to the north) and the Gavilan College parking lot entrance (to the south);

6) **Day Road Trail** Along Day Road west of Santa Teresa Boulevard, then eastward across to Buena Vista Avenue and ending at New Avenue.

The Uvas Creek and Santa Teresa trails provide access to educational facilities and major recreational facilities. The Ronan, Day Road and Monterey Trail all provide commuter access. The Monterey Trail would be the most used intercity commuter trail, linking San Martin and Morgan Hill. The other trails would be more local to Gilroy with the Ronan Trail having the most potential for work commuting trips, while it, the Uvas and South Santa Teresa trails have the most potential to accommodate school commuting trips.

**Future Class II and III Bikeways**

The Class I bike paths are generally located on the outside of the developed core of the City of Gilroy. Crosstown trips would have to make an extended journey if using these paths. To complement the bike path network and allow continuous cross-town bicycle movements in semi-protected environments, several bike lanes are recommended on existing and future streets. On certain narrow sections of existing streets, bike lanes have to be replaced by bike routes, shown underlined on the list below.

The major north-south roads for proposed Class II bike lanes include:

1) **Santa Teresa Boulevard**
2) **Wren Avenue**
3) **Church Street**
4) **Murray/Chesnut Street**
5) **No Name Uno/San Ysidro/Camino Arroyo**

The major east-west roads for proposed Class II bike lanes include:

6) **Luchessa Avenue**
7) **10th Street**
8) **Mantelli Avenue**
9) **Sunrise/Cohansey Avenue**
10) **Rucker Avenue**
11) Fitzgerald/Masten Avenue

All these roads are proposed to have continuous bike lanes and routes and span across most of the City. Some of these roads have existing bike lanes in some locations. In some areas, streets may need to be re-striped or bike lane stripes removed if not consistent with the Plan.

School Access

Providing secure and easy access to the schools is one of the main goals of the Bicycle Plan. This measure would have the dual purpose of providing greater mobility to students and reducing parent car trips. School generated traffic is a major cause of congestion during the morning peak hour. These trips could be reduced if bicycle paths and lanes were available and more frequently used.

All existing and future schools (except San Ysidro School on Pacheco Pass Highway) have access to at least one bike path (Class I) or bike lane (Class II). These bikeways then connect to the four main residential areas (North, Southwest, Central and East). In some instances, Class III bike routes are used to connect residential areas and schools. They are usually established on low traffic residential streets.

Transit Center Access

The Transit Center would be accessed by Class II or III bikeways along Old Gilroy Street, Forest or Chestnut Streets, and Sixth Street.

Expressway Crossings

Bike lane crossings at expressways will occur at signalized intersections and will be striped and signed appropriately.

For the waterside bike paths (along drainage channels), there are some grade-separated crossings\(^1\) at arterials or expressways. These expressways are:

- Uvas Creek Trail at Hecker Pass Highway
- Santa Teresa
- 10th Street
- Thomas/Luchessa
- Ronan Channel Trail at Monterey
- Murray

\(^1\) Tunnel or under crossing without going directly on road.
• Leavesley
• Highway 101
• Camino Arroyo
• Highway 152

Along the Ronan Channel, if the path is located along the top of the channel, there could be at-grade crossings of the Ronan trail with Kern and Wren Avenues. For the roadside bike paths (Day Road, Santa Teresa, Monterey), crossings of expressways are at traffic signals as for bike lanes.

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

Bicycle parking facilities are an important part of the bikeways system, as cyclists need a secure place to park their bicycle when reaching their destination. Different types of facilities are recommended depending on the length of time the bicycle will be parked. For larger work places, clothes lockers and changing facilities are recommended. Showers are encouraged to maximize the opportunities and viability of bicycle commuting.

**Bicycle Parking**

**Classifications**

There are three classes of bicycle parking facilities as noted in the VTA Bicycle Technical Guidelines:

**Class I**  "A method of bicycle parking that protects the entire bicycle and its components from theft, vandalism or inclement weather. Class I bicycle parking is appropriate for long-term (two hours to all day) bicycle parking such as at employment centers, schools and transit stations. It is also important at sites where bicycles are left overnight for several days such as airports and Amtrak stations. Examples are bicycle lockers, rooms with key access for regular bicycle commuters, guarded parking areas, and valet or check-in parking. A common variation of guarded parking is at high schools and elementary schools where racks are placed within a fenced compound to provide more security. The compound is either locked during the day or unofficially guarded by the activity within the school."  Newly developed day use technology enables day use of individual bicycle lockers using smart access devices. An "E-Locker" prototype is currently being evaluated by BART staff.
This map is for planning purposes only. Many of the shared-use paths identified on the map are simply proposed and are not currently open to the public for any purpose. On-street bicycle lanes, paths, and ones shown as proposed may have current conditions that are unsafe for cyclists, and the City bears no responsibility or liability for use of such paths.

City of Gilroy
Existing Bikeways Plan
February 2002
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Bellingham Foster Steinmetz
Landmark Architecture

*Bicycle Parking - See report for reference numbers.*
This map is for planning purposes only. Many of the novel-use paths identified on the map are simply proposed and are not currently open to the public for any purpose. On-street bicycle lanes, paths, and routes shown as proposed may reoccur under conditions that are unsafe for cyclists, and the City bears no responsibility or liability for use of such paths.
**CITY OF GILROY BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

*Class II*  
“A bicycle rack to which the frame and at least one wheel can be secured with a user-provided U-lock or padlock and cable. This type of parking is appropriate for short-term parking such as at shopping areas, libraries, parks, and other places where the typical parking duration is less than two hours.”

*Class III*  
“A bicycle rack designed such that only one wheel and not the frame can be locked to the rack. While still used in such situations like schoolyards, they are not secure. They are never recommended except in guarded areas or locked rooms where they are used in Class I situations.”

The following pages illustrate acceptable (Class II) and unacceptable (Class III) types of bicycle racks. Class III racks are not suitable for new installations, and should be retained only at K-12 schools and then preferably inside fenced areas that can be locked and/or guarded between arrival and dismissal hours. Class III racks might also be suitable as part of a Class I fenced/guarded installation at some work places, such as the City Corporation Yard.

**Rack Types**

**Acceptable Types:** Require at new sites, and use to replace unacceptable types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Wave” also known as “Ribbon” rack</td>
<td>![Shape Image]</td>
<td>SUPPORT: Supports bike’s frame acceptably, but does not prevent front-wheel “flop-over”. SECURITY: Enables U-locking of frame and wheel. CAPACITY: 1 bike per upright in 2-sided sites. 1 bike per 2 uprights in 1-sided sites unless very wide spacing is specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Inverted-U</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>SUPPORT: Supports bike’s frame acceptably, but does not prevent front-wheel “flop-over”. Ideal rack for downtown sidewalk edge by car parking (orient plane of “U” parallel to curb in such sites). SECURITY: Enables U-locking of frame and wheel. CAPACITY: 2 bikes per “U” with ease, 4 if cyclists know how.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units shown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Inverted-U</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>SUPPORT: Supports bike’s frame acceptably, prevents front-wheel “flop-over” once bike is locked. SECURITY: Enables U-locking of frame and wheel. CAPACITY: 2 bikes per “U” in 2-sided sites, 1 to 1.5 bikes per “U” in 1-sided sites due to difficulty of backing in every 2 bike. Avoid versions with narrow spacings - 36” U-to-U recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Hanging Triangle”</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>SUPPORT: Bikes lean against triangles suspended from top bar. Additional 2 bikes can lean against ends. Front wheels cannot flop over once bike is locked. SECURITY: U-lock through rack triangle, bike frame, and wheel. CAPACITY: 1 bike per triangle in 2-sided sites. 1 per 2 triangles in 1-sided sites. Add 2 bikes (for ends) in both cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Pipe Lightning Bolt™</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>SUPPORT: 3-point (down tube against post, plus 2 points on wheel well). Enables use of both hands to lock bike and remove cargo without risk of bike toppling. Front baskets clear tops of posts. SECURITY: Loop on post enables U-locking of frame and front or back wheel. Posts slant back to accommodate all frame sizes. CAPACITY: 1 bike per post. OTHER: Available in 1-sided, 2-sided, and 1-sided-diagonal models for 2 to 8 bikes, all using same post-and-wheel-well module. Stanford University’s standard rack.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Unacceptable Types:
Recommend replacement at all sites unless noted below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Arc&quot; Single position shown</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>SUPPORT: One wheel, poorly. Bike can easily be pushed over by vandals. Suitable only as a display stand inside a bike shop. LOCKING: Cannot lock frame. CAPACITY: 1 bike per wheel holder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Comb&quot; also known as &quot;Dishrack&quot;, &quot;Ladder&quot;, &quot;Wheelbender&quot; One of many variations shown</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>SUPPORT: Supports only wheel except at ends. Bikes easily pushed over, &quot;pretzel&quot; wheel, hence &quot;wheelbender&quot; name. SECURITY: Must lift bike over rack to lock frame, or else may lock only the wheel (rest of bike can be stolen), except at ends. CAPACITY: 1 bike per foot in 2-sided sites, 1 per 2 feet if 1-sided. Users often lock sideways against the &quot;comb&quot;, blocking others. RECOMMENDATION: Retain at schools especially if in fenced and locked compound or in direct view of office staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;PWLoop1&quot; &quot;PWLoop2&quot;</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>SUPPORT: Supports bike acceptably by one wheel. SECURITY: Enables U-locking of frame but only if &quot;stirrup&quot; faces frame. 1-sided often set up backwards, defeating this. Rod easily cut. Wheel holders removable if nuts not immobilized. CAPACITY: 1 bike per wheel holder RECOMMENDATION: Retain at schools especially if in fenced and locked compound or in direct view of office staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rack III&quot;</td>
<td>![Rack III Image]</td>
<td>SUPPORT: Supports bike frame and captures wheels between T-bars (1 fixed, 1 movable), but many &quot;mountain bikes&quot; do not fit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-bike unit shown</td>
<td></td>
<td>SECURITY: Captures frame and both wheels. Protects padlock, but most cyclists now use U-locks. Large U-locks fit around both T-bars, but few know this. Hence not secure for typical user.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAPACITY: 1 bike per pair of T-bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rally-2&quot;</td>
<td>![Rally-2 Image]</td>
<td>SUPPORT: Bracket is intended to support the bike's down tube, but many mountain bikes are too large to fit. Scratches paint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-bike unit shown</td>
<td></td>
<td>SECURITY: Cannot U-lock bike frame.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAPACITY: 1 bike per down-tube bracket (usually seen in pairs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Side Loop-1&quot;</td>
<td>![Side Loop-1 Image]</td>
<td>SUPPORT: Supports only the end of one wheel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Side Loop-2&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>SECURITY: Cannot U-lock bike frame. Steel rod easily cut by hacksaw or bolt cutters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-sided shown; 1-sided available</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAPACITY: 1 bike per wheel holder.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inventory of Existing Bicycle Parking Facilities**

The following inventory indicates the location and quality of existing bicycle parking facilities at primary public, commercial and workplace locations. Field review of bicycle parking facilities was undertaken by members of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Board. Some locations are shown in the inventory without bicycle parking facilities. This may be due to a lack of facilities, or because some of the bicycle parking facilities at some locations were not discovered or readily visible. Additional field review is recommended when the plan is updated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number and Name</th>
<th>Bike Racks and Lockers</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Recommendations Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mt Madonna High School</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Rod Kelly School</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>PW Loop 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Pacific West Christian Academy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Luigi Aprea Fundamental</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 St. Mary School (K-8)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 El Roble School</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Glen View School</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Brownell Academy</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td>893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Gilroy High School (by pool)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>PW Loop 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Gilroy High School (by theater)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PW Loop 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Gilroy High School (by office)</td>
<td>75?</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Las Animas School</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Wheel-bender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Antonio Del Bono School</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Wheel-bender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rucker School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliot School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Ysidro School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Valley School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galvan College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odd Fellow/Rebekah Children's Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Bike Racks and Lockers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number and Name</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Recommendations Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMERCIAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Round Table Pizza</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PW Loop 1</td>
<td>Not bolted down</td>
<td>Require Class II racks for all new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Safeway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wave</td>
<td>1 sided; it is placed up against a column, so its capacity is reduced.</td>
<td>Encourage retrofit of Class III racks to Class II where feasible. Encourage lockers and showers for employees at all larger commercial establishments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Straw Hat Pizza</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Nob Hill on 1st Street</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td>Could use one by Starbucks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Kmart on 10th Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 McDonalds on 10th Street</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Orchard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 South Valley National Bank on 1st Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Single Wave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Blockbuster Video on 1st Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Single Wave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Westwood Barber</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 The Claddagh</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 AAA on 1st Street</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Against wall, holds front wheel only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Presbyterian Church on Miller Avenue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Long's Drug on 1st Street</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>PW Loop 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 PW Market on 10th Street</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>PW Loop 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 AAA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Park Rite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 St. Louise Hospital</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Wheel Bender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Community Solutions</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Dishrack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Lyons Restaurant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dishrack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSIT CENTERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Depot</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Currently keep bikes in back room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rite Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW Market</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Name</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Supply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Farm &amp; Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavilan Honda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Sanchez Mazda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. County Chrysler-Plymoth-Dodge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilroy Pontiac-Buick-GMC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilroy Toyota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Marx Chevrolet, Cad-Olds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Gilroy Dispatch</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Gilroy Fitness Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Wheel-bender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 DMV</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Waves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 South Valley Church</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 South Valley National Bank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td>2 sided</td>
<td>4 hoops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Old City Hall</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Single Mounted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRANSIT CENTERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Center</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>Lockers</th>
<th>4 bikes chained to fence-not enough capacity.</th>
<th>Add a minimum of 5 additional lockers, and more lockers added incrementally to achieve VTA guidelines.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36 Transit Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMUNITY FACILITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>Comb</th>
<th>Provide Class II racks at all neighborhood and community parks. Distribute racks at community parks at each activity area.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hall</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler Gym</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Number and Name</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Recommendations Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Rey Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 El Roble Park</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide Class II racks at all neighborhood and community parks. Distribute racks at community parks at each activity area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Christmas Hill Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Waves</td>
<td>No racks in older section of park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Hill Park-Ranch Site Addition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Hill Park-Hillsdale Addition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Animas Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Ysidro Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavilán Sports Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage Hills Park (future)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condor Park (future)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrell Avenue (future)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Arroyos Park (future)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future park and staging area at Santa Teresa &amp; Third</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunrise Park (future)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilroy Sports Park (future)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations

Schools Work with Gilroy Unified School District to increase number of racks where demand dictates, and to reorganize racks where appropriate to increase. Where possible, racks should be within the courtyard or "interior" created by school buildings. It is good for racks to be either in fenced and lockable compounds, or directly visible to administrative staff, or both. Fenced compounds should be locked or monitored except during AM or PM school commute times.

Commercial Require Class II racks for all new development. Encourage retrofit of Class III to Class II racks where feasible. Provide at least four Class II bicycle racks along Monterey Road in the Downtown area. Encourage larger commercial establishments to provide lockers and showers for their employees.

Transit Center Provide additional secure bicycle lockers at the Transit Center.

Civic Buildings Add lockers or other Class I facility for at least 6-8 bikes at Library/City Hall complex for employees. Incorporate secure bicycle parking for employees and for visitors as a part of the new police station design. Provide class I parking (possibly a rack within the fenced area) at the City’s Corporation Yard.

Parks Provide Class II racks at all neighborhood and community parks (smaller pocket parks are usually accessed by walking from immediately adjacent residential neighborhoods and do not require bicycle racks).

Workplaces Encourage Class I facilities at all workplaces based on type and size of facility (see VTA guidelines). Encourage showers and changing facilities where feasible. Showers enable active lunchtime and before/after work fitness and recreation activity. In addition to changing facilities, which can often be provided by a restroom, some bike commuters need permanently assignable clothing storage lockers. Commuter clothing lockers should be 18" deep; any shallower and hangers will not fit. For many employees, a half-height (36" high) locker is sufficient.

The following table from the VTA Guidelines provides further guidance for bicycle parking at many different types of land uses.

Bike Rack Placement

Equally important to selecting an appropriate bike rack is proper installation. The VTA Bicycle Technical Guidelines Bike Rack Details and Bike Rack Placement criteria should be observed.
BIKE PARKING RECOMMENDATIONS INSERT
BICYCLE SAFETY, EDUCATION AND PROMOTION PROGRAMS

Bicyclists need to know the vehicle laws and should develop proper cycling skills in order to co-exist more safely with motorists. Motorists must be educated about cyclists legal rights on the roadways and learn co-existence strategies. Educational programs can supply both motorists and bicyclists with valuable information and provide bicyclists with hands-on bike training. Bicycle helmets and other protective equipment must be stressed and included in safety programs. Some of the safety programs are listed below:

- **Santa Clara County Bicycle Advisory Committee**  The City of Gilroy has one citizen representative on the advisory committee of the Santa Clara County Transportation Agency. The committee provides technical reviews of proposed bicycle projects and funding applications as well as theft prevention, bicycle parking programs, education and safety, and other bicycling related issues.

- **City of Gilroy Police Education Programs**  The Police Department currently holds two Bicycle rodeos each year, one in the Spring and one in the Fall. Bicycle rodeos are oriented to teaching school age children the basics of bicycle safety and the "rules of the road."

The Police Department also makes bicycle safety presentations to schools and community groups when requested.

In addition, the department has available several bicycle safety brochures that are available on request. (See Appendix.) Working with GUSD and the Highway Patrol a special safety week is held at the beginning of each school year where bicyclists and drivers are sited for infractions of the Vehicle Code when driving or cycling to school. This effort is intended to educate both cyclists and drivers of how to safely share the road.

**Recommendations**

**Education and Safety**

1) **Education and Safety Programs**  Continue to offer and coordinate bicycle safety and education programs between the City of Gilroy Police Department, Gilroy Unified School District, and other organizations such as cycling clubs.

2) **Safety Pamphlets**  Encourage the distribution of safety pamphlets to cyclists and drivers by police officers when there is a vehicle code infraction.
3) **Recreational Rides and Organized Classes**  Consider offering bicycle safety, repair and recreational riding classes with seasoned cyclist as instructors as a part of the City’s recreational class offerings.

4) **Helmet Discount Program**  Consider a helmet discount or give-away program for limited income youth. Helmets could be “earned” as an incentive to attend a safety education program.

5) **Cycling Safety Videos**  Consider the purchase of cycling safety videos that could be made available to schools, groups, and broadcast on public access television.

**Promotion**

6) **Cycling Events**  Consider active involvement in national and statewide cycling promotion events, such as National Bike Month, Bike to Work Day, and Bike to School Day.

7) **Community Festivals with attended Bike Parking**  Work with existing bicycle advocacy groups, such as the Silicon Valley Bicycle coalition, and event promoters to provide guarded bicycle parking at City events, such as the Garlic Festival. Informational and safety pamphlets can be provided at the same time.

8) **Bicycle Route Maps**  Consider publishing a bike route map of existing bikeways, perhaps in coordination with the Chamber of Commerce, that would be available at bike shops and other locations. Production costs could be offset by the sale of ads, similar to the current Chamber roadways map.
IMPLEMENTATION AND COSTS

Several mechanisms and funding sources are available to implement the Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan. A combination of many funding sources will be needed as no single source can be expected to fund all of the recommendations in the Plan.

**Bikeways Improvements Incorporated into Larger Roadways Projects**

By far the least expensive way to build the bikeways system is to incorporate bikeways improvements as a part of larger roadway projects, such as roadway extensions or expansions, overlay projects and intersection improvements. Due to economies of scale and equipment already in place, it is easier to incorporate bikeways improvements as a part of the overall roadway design, than try to retrofit a previously completed project.

The proposed bikeways improvements should be regularly reviewed and where feasible, incorporated into regularly scheduled city maintenance cycles, such as for roadway overlays and restriping.

**Improvements Concurrent with Development**

Many improvements can be implemented concurrent with development. For example, if a development project requires roadway or intersection improvements, then bikeways improvements should be implemented at the same time. Development applications should be reviewed to ensure that improvements consistent with the Plan are included in the development package.

The City’s Residential Development Ordinance (RDO) point-allocation process and criteria should be reviewed and updated where appropriate to encourage bikeways and paths as a part of new development consistent with the goals of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan.

**Development Review Checklist**

A bicycle facilities development review checklist should be established with the participation of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Board to be used by City staff to evaluate development applications and their consistency with the Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan. The development review checklist would provide City staff with a consistent and objective evaluation tool. The checklist should include on-site improvements, such as bicycle parking facilities, and off-site improvements where appropriate, such as roadway striping, signage and intersection improvements. The development review checklist would not change the current project review and approval process.
Joint Projects

Some bikeways projects may be appropriate for joint funding with other agencies, including Santa Clara County, Santa Clara Valley Water District, and the Gilroy Unified School District.

City Funding Sources

Several funding sources are available to implement the Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan.

Redevelopment Agency  Some bikeway improvements may be appropriate for Redevelopment Agency (RDA) funding, especially if they can be tied to economic development projects, such as improving access to commercial areas. Redevelopment Agency funds cannot be used for maintenance. Currently, Gilroy does not have a Redevelopment Agency, although creation of one is under consideration. If one is created, then bikeway improvements may be eligible for RDA funding.

Development Impact Fees  Impact fees are charged for numerous infrastructure impacts of development including traffic. These fees should be reviewed to ensure that bikeways improvements are included in the impact fee schedule and that a proportional amount of impact fee revenues are allocated to bikeways projects.

Grants and Other Public Funding Sources

Numerous funding sources are available to supplement local funds including the following

Regional Sources
- Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)
- Valley Transportation Authority
- Metropolitan Transportation Commission

State Sources
- California Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Account
- Transportation Development Act Local Transportation Funds
- Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program
- Habitat Conservation Fund
- Land and Water Conservation Fund
- Safe Routes to School
Federal Sources
Transportation Enhancement Act (TEA 21). There are several different TEA 21 programs, some of which are managed by regional transportation agencies

Private Funding Sources
Private foundations are also a source of funding, especially for education and safety related programs. The “Guide to Bicycle Program Funding in California” by the Planning and Conservation League Foundation (April 1995) is a resource to research appropriate foundation funding programs.

Adopt-A-Trail Programs
As noted previously, this type of program may be a means of supporting trail maintenance.

Revenue-Producing Operations
Revenue producing operations may be considered adjacent to proposed pathways, and might include bicycle rentals, snack and juice bars, or other trail-related businesses. Lease revenues could be used to fund long-term maintenance.
Estimated Costs

The following table estimates costs for implementation of the bikeways plan. As noted above, many funding sources may be used for implementation. Unit costs are as noted below:

**Class I Bike Paths**  Includes asphalt paving on compacted base rock, striping and signage. Does not include irrigation, planting, grading, drainage, retaining walls, lighting, road crossings or other improvements. These costs can vary greatly depending on site specific conditions.

**Class II Bike Lanes**  Includes bike lane striping and signage. Does not include roadway widening, curb and gutter, drainage, lighting, signal modifications, or other improvements.

**Class III Routes**  Includes signage only. Does not include any roadway or shoulder improvements.

A more detailed inventory of existing conditions is needed to identify all costs that may be associated with proposed bikeway improvements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Summary</th>
<th>Length in Linear Feet</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I Bike Paths</td>
<td>149,119</td>
<td>$12,675,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>179,898</td>
<td>$1,475,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 3 Bike Routes</td>
<td>40,519</td>
<td>$7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$14,158,299</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Bikeways Cost Sheets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Linear Feet One Way</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLASS I - BIKE PATHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Road</td>
<td>West of Santa Teresa Blvd.</td>
<td>10637</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$904,145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buena Vista</td>
<td>Day Road</td>
<td>8743</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$743,155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Teresa Expressway</td>
<td>North of Longmeadow Dr.</td>
<td>11128</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$945,880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Teresa Expressway</td>
<td>South of First Street</td>
<td>21523</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$1,829,455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Road</td>
<td>North of Farrell Ave.</td>
<td>11450</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$973,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronan Channel/Llagas Creek from Bicycle Interchange</td>
<td>East Portion of Loop</td>
<td>12237</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$1,040,145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronan Channel/Llagas Creek</td>
<td>West Portion of Loop</td>
<td>5804</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$493,340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Park Loop</td>
<td></td>
<td>7513</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$638,605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Teresa to Sports Park Loop</td>
<td></td>
<td>3419</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$290,615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uvas Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td>10245</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$870,825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uvas Park Drive</td>
<td>Direction Watsonville</td>
<td>19215</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$1,633,275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Uvas Creek from Uvas Park Drive</td>
<td>Santa Teresa</td>
<td>4263</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$362,355</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longmeadow Drive</td>
<td>Hwy 101</td>
<td>8107</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$689,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South along Hwy 101</td>
<td>Bicycle Interchange</td>
<td>7353</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$625,005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Street</td>
<td>Bicycle Interchange</td>
<td>2304</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$195,840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohansey Ave</td>
<td>Mantelli Dr.</td>
<td>3680</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$312,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Teresa</td>
<td>Mantelli Dr.</td>
<td>1498</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$127,330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>149119</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,675,115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Linear Feet One Way</td>
<td>2 Stripes per Side - $2/Lf</td>
<td>1 Sign/Post Per 1/2 Mile + 25% - $200 ea (2 min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS II - BIKE LINES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day Road</td>
<td>Ranch Hill Dr.</td>
<td>3713</td>
<td>$29,704</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sunrise Dr/Cohansey Ave.</td>
<td>Murray Ave.</td>
<td>8281</td>
<td>$66,248</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fitzgerald Ave.</td>
<td>Masten Ave. Hwy Exit</td>
<td>7134</td>
<td>$57,072</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rucker Ave.</td>
<td>Murray Ave.</td>
<td>5458</td>
<td>$43,664</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murray Ave./Chestnut St.</td>
<td>Luchessa Ave.</td>
<td>25815</td>
<td>$206,520</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Name Uno Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4599</td>
<td>$36,792</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monterey Rd. from Farrell Ave.</td>
<td>Leavesley Rd.</td>
<td>4722</td>
<td>$37,776</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Church Ave.</td>
<td>Luchessa Ave.</td>
<td>15021</td>
<td>$120,168</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monterey Rd. South of 10th St.</td>
<td></td>
<td>9433</td>
<td>$75,464</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hanna Street from Welburn</td>
<td>10th St.</td>
<td>7370</td>
<td>$58,960</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dowdy from 3d St.</td>
<td>8th St.</td>
<td>3141</td>
<td>$25,128</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carmel from 3d St.</td>
<td>8th St.</td>
<td>3145</td>
<td>$25,160</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princeville from 6th St.</td>
<td>7th St.</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>$4,920</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wren Ave. between Welburn &amp; Mantelli Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>695</td>
<td>$5,560</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kern Ave. from Cohansey Ave.</td>
<td>First St.</td>
<td>6988</td>
<td>$55,904</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fitzgerald Ave.</td>
<td>Wren Ave.</td>
<td>10349</td>
<td>$82,792</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farrell Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$16,008</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cohansey Ave.</td>
<td>Mantelli Dr.</td>
<td>4012</td>
<td>$32,096</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mantelli Dr. East of Santa Teresa</td>
<td></td>
<td>633</td>
<td>$3,064</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mantelli Dr. West of Columbine Ct.</td>
<td></td>
<td>860</td>
<td>$6,880</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forest St.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>$14,872</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8th between Miller Ave. &amp; Orchard Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>856</td>
<td>$6,848</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maple Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>577</td>
<td>$4,616</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>528</td>
<td>$4,224</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. 7th St/Old Gilroy</td>
<td></td>
<td>2361</td>
<td>$18,888</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10th St.</td>
<td>Santa Teresa</td>
<td>3737</td>
<td>$29,896</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princevalle St. from Johnson Way</td>
<td>Luchessa Ave.</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>$15,224</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Linear Feet</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>One Way</td>
<td>2 Stripes per Side - $2/Lf</td>
<td>1 Sign/Post Per 1/2 Mile + 25% - $200 ea (2 min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASS II - BIKE LANES (continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Rd between Existing</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>$6,584</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$6,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicylce Interchange Thomas Rd./Luchessa Ave.</td>
<td>West Loop of Ronan Channel/Llagas Creek</td>
<td>9604</td>
<td>$76,832</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camino Arroyo</td>
<td></td>
<td>12836</td>
<td>$102,688</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Loop from Camino Arroyo</td>
<td>Southside Dr.</td>
<td>6535</td>
<td>$52,280</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside Dr.</td>
<td>Ronan Channel/Llagas Creek Path</td>
<td>4638</td>
<td>$37,104</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/W Connection from West Loop of Ronan Channel/Llagas Creek Path</td>
<td>Camino Arroyo</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>$16,400</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>172292</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,378,336</strong></td>
<td><strong>$34,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,413,136</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Linear Feet One Way</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS III - BIKE ROUTES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welburn Ave. from Mantelli Dr.</td>
<td>Santa Teresa Blvd</td>
<td>2497</td>
<td></td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelton Dr. from Welburn Ave.</td>
<td>Mantelli Dr.</td>
<td>1484</td>
<td></td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wren Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2359</td>
<td></td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welburn Ave. from Monterey Rd.</td>
<td>Monterey Rd.</td>
<td>3726</td>
<td></td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wren Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td>437</td>
<td></td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanna St.</td>
<td></td>
<td>7792</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st St. from Santa Teresa Blvd</td>
<td>Monterey Rd.</td>
<td>10th</td>
<td></td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Rd. from Leavesley</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>4247</td>
<td></td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Rd. From 3d</td>
<td>7th from Princeville</td>
<td>2539</td>
<td></td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th from Princeville</td>
<td>Monterey Rd.</td>
<td>2540</td>
<td></td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th from Forest</td>
<td>Maple St.</td>
<td>728</td>
<td></td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th from Forest</td>
<td>East St.</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td></td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th from Forest</td>
<td>Old Gilroy</td>
<td>2055</td>
<td></td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camino Arroyo</td>
<td></td>
<td>1198</td>
<td></td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Ysidro Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>3836</td>
<td></td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayland Ln. from 1st St.</td>
<td>Welburn Ave</td>
<td>1469</td>
<td></td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>40519</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**FUTURE ISSUES**

In order to be consistent with the General Plan Update process, this first Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan focuses on bicycle improvements. It is anticipated that future updates and revisions will be made to the plan. The following issues should be addressed when the plan is updated:

**Pedestrian Elements**

Pedestrian elements should be more thoroughly reviewed and incorporated into the plan. This may include multi-use paths, trails and sidewalk improvements. An implementation item in the City’s Parks and Recreation Master Plan is the preparation of a Citywide Trails Master Plan. Initiation of the Trails Master Plan is awaiting adoption of the General Plan Update and subsequent adoption of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan. It would be a logical step to coordinate and update the pedestrian elements of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan concurrent with the preparation of the Citywide Trails Master Plan.

**Specific Plan Areas**

Some areas of the City have been identified in the General Plan Update for future Specific Plans. These include the Hecker Pass area and the potential eastern industrial area near Llagas Creek and the Ronan Channel. Trails and bikeways should be an integral component of these Specific Plans, which should be coordinated with the Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan.

**Pacheco Pass Highway**

The Pacheco Pass Highway is currently too narrow to accommodate bicycle lanes. If the Highway is widened or realigned in the future, consideration should be given to incorporating bikeways to this important transportation corridor.

**Priorities**

As the plan is updated, priorities should also be reviewed and revised to maximize limited resources and efficiency of the transportation system.
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RDO Process

As the Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan is implemented and updated, coordination will be needed between the Plan and the RDO development review process to ensure that desired improvements are achieved with future development.

Detailed Improvement Plan and Costs

A more detailed existing conditions inventory is needed to fully understand costs associated with full implementation of the plan. This could be accomplished incrementally as a part of design development and engineering when specific sections of the plan are implemented. As more information is available, the costs for overall implementation can be updated in the plan.

Santa Teresa Expressway

Review lane and path designations on Santa Teresa from Long Meadow Dr. northward.

Bicycle Parking Facilities

The inventory of bicycle parking facilities should be updated concurrent with future plan updates.
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APPENDIX A

Excerpts From:

- Caltrans Highway Design Manual Chapter 1000 Bikeway Planning and Design
- VTA Bicycle Technical Guidelines
CHAPTER 1000
BIKEWAY PLANNING AND
DESIGN

Topic 1001 - General Information

Index 1001.1 - Definitions

"Bikeway" means all facilities that provide primarily for bicycle travel.

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

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

(3) Class III Bikeway (Bike Route). Provides for shared use with pedestrian or motor vehicle traffic.

1001.2 Streets and Highways Code References - Chapter 8 - Nonmotorized Transportation

(a) Section 887--Definition of nonmotorized facility.

(b) Section 887.6--Agreements with local agencies to construct and maintain nonmotorized facilities.

(c) Section 887.8--Payment for construction and maintenance of nonmotorized facilities approximately paralleling state highways.

(d) Section 888--Severance of existing major nonmotorized route by freeway construction.

(e) Section 888.2--Incorporation of nonmotorized facilities in the design of freeways.

(f) Section 888.4--Requires Caltrans to budget not less than $360,000 annually for nonmotorized facilities used in conjunction with the state highway system.

(g) Section 890.4--Class I, II, and III bike way definitions.

(h) Section 890.6-890.8--Caltrans and local agencies to develop design criteria and symbols for signs, markers, and traffic control devices for bikeways and roadways where bicycle travel is permitted.

(i) Section 891--Local agencies must comply with design criteria and uniform symbols.

(j) Section 892--Use of abandoned right-of-way as a nonmotorized facility.

1001.3 Vehicle Code References - Bicycle Operation

(a) Section 21200--Bicyclist's rights and responsibilities for traveling on highways.

(b) Section 21202--Bicyclist's position on roadways when traveling slower than the normal traffic speed.

(c) Section 21206--Allows local agencies to regulate operation of bicycles on pedestrian or bicycle facilities.

(d) Section 21207--Allows local agencies to establish bike lanes on non-state highways.

(e) Section 21207.5--Prohibits motorized bicycles on bike paths or bike lanes.

(f) Section 21208--Specifies permitted movements by bicyclists for bike lanes.

(g) Section 21209--Specifies permitted movements by motorists in bike lanes.

(h) Section 21209--Prohibits bicycle parking on sidewalks unless pedestrians have an adequate path.

(i) Section 21210--Prohibits impeding or obstruction of bicyclists on bike paths.

(j) Section 21212 - Requires a bicyclist under 18 years of age to wear an approved helmet.

(k) Section 21717--Requires a motorist to drive in a bike lane prior to making a turn.

(l) Section 21960--Use of freeway shoulders by bicyclists.

Topic 1002 - General Planning Criteria

1002.1 Introduction

Bicycle travel can be enhanced by improved maintenance and by upgrading existing roads used regularly by bicyclists, regardless of whether or not bikeways are designated. This effort requires increased attention to the right-hand portion of roadways where bicyclists are expected to ride. On new construction, and major
Figure 1003.2B

Typical Bicycle/Auto Movements at Intersections of Multilane Streets

LEGEND
- Bike Travel
- Motor Vehicle Travel

Ped. Crossing
Figure 1003.2C

Bike Lanes Approaching Motorist Right-turn-only Lanes

If space is available, otherwise all delineation should be dropped at this point.

Typical path of through bicyclist.

*If space is available.

Drop bike lane stripe where right turn only designated.
Figure 1003.2A

Typical Bike Lane Cross Sections
(On 2-lane or Multilane Highways)

1) STRIPED PARKING

2) PARKING PERMITTED WITHOUT PARKING STRIPE OR STALL

3) PARKING PROHIBITED

4) TYPICAL ROADWAY IN OUTLYING AREAS
   PARKING RESTRICTED
Figure 1003.1A
Two-way Bike Path on Separate Right of Way

Figure 1003.1B
Typical Cross Section of Bike Path Along Highway

*One-Way: 5' Minimum Width
Two-Way: 8' Minimum Width
Figure 1004.3
Bike Lane Signs and Markings

WHERE VEHICLE PARKING IS PROHIBITED

WHERE VEHICLE PARKING IS PERMITTED

NO STALLS

Notes:
1. The Bike Lane Pavement markings shall be placed on the far side of each intersection, and may be placed at other locations as desired.
2. The use of the bicycle symbol pavement marking to supplement the word message is optional.
3. The G93 Bike Route sign may be placed intermittently along the bike lane if desired.
4. Where motorist right turns are permitted, the solid bike lane line shall either be dropped entirely, or dashed as shown, beginning at a point between 100 and 200 feet in advance of the intersection.

STALLS

5. In areas where parking stalls are not necessary (because parking is light), it is permissible to paint a 4" solid white stripe to fully delineate the bike lane. This may be advisable where there is concern that motorist may misconstrue the bike lane to be a traffic lane.
6. The R81 Bike Sign shall be placed at the beginning of all bike lanes, on the far side of every arterial street intersection, at all major changes in direction, and at maximum half-mile intervals.
VTA BICYCLE TECHNICAL GUIDELINES

A Guide for Local Agencies in the Planning, Design and Maintenance of Bicycle Facilities

Prepared for
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

Adopted: September 2, 1999
Bike Lane Widths on Arterials/Collectors


-5' Bike Lane Optimum

Motor Vehicle Lanes

-5' Bike Lane Optimum

4' Min.*

35 mph or less

-6' Bike Lane Optimum

Motor Vehicle Lanes

-6' Bike Lane Optimum

5' Min.*

40 to 50 mph

-8' Bike Lane Optimum

Motor Vehicle Lanes

-8' Bike Lane Optimum

7' Min.*

50+ mph

Related Policies: D1.1.1; D1.1.2; D4.1

- For retrofits see text section D1.1.1.1

- Speed ranges refer to posted speeds.
- Bike lane width measured to center of bike lane stripe.
- "Optimum": The best or most favorable condition from the perspective of responsible management.

Discussion Draft (subject to change): 7/1/99
Bike Lanes at Signalized Intersections

Technical Guidelines for the Bicycle Element
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

Not To Scale

Related Policies: D1.1; D4.1; D5.2.1; D5.2.2

- If right-turn lane is present, see Figure 10.
- For blocks $\leq 400'$ or travel speeds $\leq 30$ mph, bike lane line may be dropped 100' in advance of the intersection.
- The R81 Bike Lane sign and Bike Lane pavement markings shall be placed on the far side of each intersection, and may be placed at other locations as desired.
- The use of the bicycle symbol pavement marking to supplement the work message is optional.
- The G93 Bike Route and Supplemental Arrow signs may be placed intermittently along the bike lane as desires.
- 'Optimum': The best or most favorable condition from the perspective of responsible management.
Bike Lane Widening at Intersections

SOURCE: City of Cupertino Standard Detail 39AC.

- "Optimum": The best or most favorable condition from the perspective of responsible management.

Discussion Draft (subject to change): 8/19/99
1. The bike lane line may either be dropped entirely approximately 200' in advance of the intersection, or a dashed line carried to the intersection. See Detail 39A, Caltrans Traffic Manual.

2. An optional 4 inch solid white stripe may be used in place of the cross stripes where parking stalls are unnecessary because parking is light and there is concern that a motorist may misconstrue the bike lane to be a traffic lane.

3. An optional '+' shaped marking may be used in place of the cross-stripes to encourage bicyclists to ride farther to the left away from the door-zone.

Related Policies: D1.1.1; D1.1.2; D4.1

- With posted speeds greater than 50 mph, optimum bike lane width is 8 feet.
- "Optimum": The best or most favorable condition from the perspective of responsible management.
Bike Lanes at Bus Stops

Far Side Bus Stop

Near Side Bus Stop

Begin Bike Lane Stripe at End of Bus Stop

Red Curb

Bus Stop Sign

Bench

Drop Bike Lane Stripe at Beginning of Bus Stop

Related Policies: D1.1.1; D1.1.6

*Optimum*: The best or most favorable condition from the perspective of responsible management.


Discussion Draft (subject to change): 4/26/99
Bike Lanes at Right-Turn Lanes

Technical Guidelines for the Bicycle Elements
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

- Illustration shows optimum striping at right-turn only lanes. Where there is no room for a dedicated bike lane, minimum width of through lane adjacent to right-turn lane should be 13 feet.
- 'Optimum': The best or most favorable condition from the perspective of responsible management.

Related Policies: D3.1; D4.1; D5.1.1

Discussion Draft (subject to change): 8/19/15
Type D or SA detector and 
Bicycle loop detector pavement marking SPA24C - See Figure 23B

Stripe left-turn bike lane to 
right of left-turn vehicle lane

Begin left-turn bike lane at 
beginning of left-turn vehicle lane

Drop solid bike lane line and 
begin dashed bike lane line 
200' in advance of intersection

Bike lane pavement markings - See Figure 23A

Not To Scale

Related Policies: D1.1; D4.1; D5.2.1; D5.2.2

"Optimum": The best or most favorable condition from the perspective of responsible management.

Discussion Draft (subject to change): 6/22/99
Drainage Grate Details SP-D77B

CALTRANS STD PLAN DETAIL D77B

600 mm for Type 600 grate
448 mm for Type 450 grate

100 mm Min
150 mm Max

Cross bars @ 102 mm
c.c. spacing

1.02 m
Direction of travel

603 mm for Type 600 grate
451 mm for Type 450 grate

1.02 m
Direction of travel

TYPE 450-10 & 600-13 GRATE

NOTE: Bearing bars to be 89 mm x 6.4 mm bars on 48 mm centers.

TYPE 450-8C & 600-10C GRATE

OTHER DETAILS

900 mm
Direction of travel

603 mm

900 mm
Direction of travel

603 mm

Related Policies: D4.3.1

Optimum: The best or most favorable condition from the perspective of responsible management.


Discussion Draft (subject to change): AV19/19
ROADWAY WITH BIKE LANE OR SHOULDER

Cross section of rubberized railroad crossing for rough perpendicular crossings

Cross section of rubberized railroad crossing with flangeway filler strip for low-speed skewed crossings

Related Policies: D4.3.3


- Flangeway filler strips are not acceptable for high-speed rail lines, as the filler will not compress fast enough and the train may derail.
- "Optimum": The best or most favorable condition from the perspective of responsible management.
Bikeway Regulatory Signs

Bikes
- Allowed use of full lane
  - CVC 21202
  - On bikeways with curblanes ≤ 13 feet
  - VTA SR-1

Right-turning vehicles enter bike lane when clear
- VTA SR-4

Bike lane only
- At intersections where motorists must turn right
  - VTA SR-2

Begin right turn lane
- Yield to bikes
  - MUTCD R4-4
  - Advance of right-turn lanes

Related Policies: D5.1.1

- Black lettering on white background except where noted.
- See also Traffic Manual Chapter 4.

Discussion Draft (subject to change): 7/16/99
Bikeway Warning Signs 21B

Technical Guidelines for the Bicycle E-Plan
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

VTA SW-6

CROSS TRAFFIC
DOES NOT STOP

AT TWO-WAY STOP SIGN
CONTROLLED INTERSECTION
(CALTRANS SW1)

MUTCD W16-1

AT INTERSECTIONS
WITH TRAFFIC CIRCLES
VTA SW-5

15 MPH

VTA SW-4

TRAIL CROSSING
LOOK LEFT AND
RIGHT

MUTCD W7-5

CALTRANS W79

CALTRANS W80

YIELD TO BIKES

ADVANCE OF FREE RIGHT-TURN
VTA SW-1

YIELD TO BIKES

ADVANCE OF ON-RAMP
VTA SW-2

YIELD TO BIKES

ADVANCE OF LEFT-TURN LANES
VTA SW-3

YIELD TO BIKES

ADVANCE OF SKEWED RAILROAD TRACKS
(CALTRANS SW27-1)

Related Policies: D5.1.2

Black lettering on yellow background.

Fluorescent yellow - green background is also permitted by the MUTCD for bicycle and pedestrian signs.

See also Traffic Manual, Chapter 4 for signs.


Discussion Draft (subject to change): 7/16/99
Bikeway Guide Signs

**Schematic Route Map Sign**
VTA SG-1

**Welcome to Cupertino**
**We Share the Road**
VTA SG-2

**Santa Clara County**

- **Cupertino**
  - Route sign with destination Caltrans SG-45 with supplementary placards
- **Saratoga**
  - Route sign with distance Caltrans SG-45 with supplementary placards

**Related Policies:** D5.1.3

- White lettering on green background.
- See also Traffic Manual, Chapter 4.

Discussion Draft (subject to change): 6/22/99
TRAIL WILL BE CLOSED AHEAD FOR CONSTRUCTION WORK FROM (DATE) TO (DATE) DETOUR WILL BE PROVIDED

ADVANCE NOTICE SIGN VTA SC-1

SCHEMATIC OF DETOUR ROUTE VTA SC-3

Related Policies: D3.4; D5.1

- All detour signage shall be black on orange, using reflective sheeting.
- For use when construction activity will require bicyclists to detour onto alternate routes.
- Procedure:
  1. One week prior to start of construction, install 'Advance Notice Sign'.
  2. Install 'Detour Signs' with appropriate arrows to guide bicyclists in both directions through detour.
  3. Install 'Schematic of Detour Route Sign' at beginning of detour.
  4. Inspect detour route throughout duration of construction project.

Reference Also: Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000 Bikeway Planning and Design and the Traffic Manual, Ch 4 §5.

Discussion Draft (subject to change): 6/22/99
Bicycle-Sensitive Detectors at 5-Phase Signalized Intersection

Place bicycle-sensitive loop detector and symbol in right-most left-turn lane

Type D or SA detector and pavement legend - See Figure 23B

Type A detector (optional)

Type D detector

MINOR STREET

MAJOR STREET

Related Policies: D4.1; D5.2.1; D5.2.2

- Bicycle sensitive detector and pavement marking shall be used when detection is necessary for subject approach or phase to receive green light.
- No pavement marking needed on major street with automatic recall. Applies to intersections with and without bike lanes. Type SA Detector may be used in lieu of Type D Detector. See Figure 24.
- See Figure 2 for detector type and placement on streets with bike lanes.
- "Optimum": The best or most favorable condition from the perspective of responsible management.

Discussion Draft (subject to change): 6/22/99
Related Policies: D1.1; D4.1


Discussion Draft (subject to change): 4/26/99
Loop Detector Pavement Marking

Technical Guidelines for the Bicycle Elements
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

25 mm grid
Area = 0.18 m²

Related Policies: D4.1; D5.2.2.2


Discussion Draft (subject to change): 4/26/99
Related Policies: D1.6; D4.1

SOURCE: City of Denver

• Reference Also: Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000 Bikeway Planning and Design and the Traffic Manual.

Discussion Draft (subject to change): 8/19/99
Loop Detector Details

Type D Loop Detector Configuration

1. Round corners of acute angle sawcuts to prevent damage to conductors.
2. Install 3 turns when only one Type D loop is on a sensor unit channel.
   Install 5 turns when one Type D loop is connected in series with
   3 additional 6" x 6" loops on a sensor unit channel.

Type Q Loop Detector Configuration

Type SA Loop Detector Configuration

Round corners of acute angles to prevent damage to conductors.

Termination Pullbox

Limit Line

Type SA Loop Installation

Related Policies: D5.2.2

- Source for Type D and Type Q Detectors- Caltrans Standard Plan ES-5B.
- Source for Type SA Detectors- City of Cupertino Standard Details, 5-17.

Discussion Draft (subject to change): 4/26/99
APPENDIX B

Bicycle Transportation Account: Required Elements of Bicycle Master Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Elements</th>
<th>Page Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. The estimated number of existing bicycle commuters in the plan area and the estimated increase in the number of bicycle commuters resulting from implementation of the plan.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. A map and description of existing and proposed land use and settlement patterns which shall include, but not be limited to, locations of residential neighborhoods, schools, shopping centers, public buildings and major employment centers.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. A map and description of existing and proposed bikeways by class number (I, II, III).</td>
<td>15–24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. A map and description of existing and proposed end of trip bicycle parking facilities. These shall include, but not be limited to, parking at schools, shopping centers, public buildings, and major employment centers.</td>
<td>15–34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. A map and description of existing and proposed bicycle transport and parking facilities for connections with and use of other transportation modes. These shall include, but not be limited to, parking facilities at transit stops, rail and transit terminals, ferry docks and landings, park-and-ride lots, and provisions for transporting bicyclists and bicycles on transit or rail vehicles or ferry vessels.</td>
<td>15–34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. A map and description of existing and proposed facilities for changing and storing clothes and equipment. These shall include, but not be limited to, locker, restroom, and shower facilities near bicycle parking facilities.</td>
<td>15–34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Required Elements

G. A description of bicycle safety and education programs conducted in the area included within the plan, efforts by the law enforcement agency having primary traffic law enforcement responsibility in the area to enforce provisions of the Vehicle Code pertaining to bicycle operation, and the resulting effect on accidents involving bicyclist.

H. A description of the extent of citizen and community involvement in development of the plan, including, but not limited to, letters of support.

I. A description of how the bicycle transportation plan has been coordinated and is consistent with other local or regional transportation, air quality, or energy conservation plans, including, but not limited to, programs that provide incentives for bicycle commuting.

J. A description of the projects proposed in the plan and a listing of their priorities for implementation.

K. A description of past expenditures for bicycle facilities and future financial needs for projects that improve safety and convenience for bicycle commuters in the plan area.
direct staff to work with the applicant for revisions to the tentative map as proposed, for review on January 21, 2003.

At 9:55 the Mayor called for a recess, after which he recalled the meeting to order.

The Mayor deviated from the agenda to accommodate interested persons in the audience.

Carriage Hills & Los Arroyos Parks Master Plans
The Mayor noted a review of the Carriage Hills and Los Arroyos Parks Master Plans.

The staff report was noted and further explained by Operations Services Manager Ruigh

Lee Steinmetz reviewed the plans for the parks.

Motion was made by Councilman Pinheiro, seconded by Councilman Morales and carried to approve the Carriage Hills Park Master Plan.

Motion was made by Councilman Pinheiro, seconded by Councilman Morales and carried to approve the Los Arroyos Park Master Plan.

Bicycle/Ped. Trans.Plan
The Mayor noted a review and approval of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan.

The staff report was noted and further explained by Operations Services Manager Ruigh.

Motion was made by Councilman Pinheiro, seconded by Councilman Arellano and carried to approve the Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan, with two changes to include on page 16 number 4), second line should read “which would potentially include...”, and on page 45 under Specific Plan Areas, the third line would end with “component of these any Specific Plans.”

The Mayor returned to the regular order of the agenda.

Pub. Hearing CUP 02-08
The Mayor stated it was the time and place scheduled for a Public Hearing on a Conditional Use Permit request to operate an Alzheimer’s and assisted living facility within the Village Green Development, on property zoned R3/PUD (Medium Density/Planned Unit Development), located at the southwest corner of Santa Teresa Boulevard and Hecker Pass Highway. Coastal Rim Properties, applicant, CUP 02-08.