# Table of Contents

Acknowledgements i

Executive Summary iii

1. Introduction 1
   - Purpose and Vision 1
   - Benefits of Trails 1
   - Goals 7
   - Process 7

2. Background and Regional Context 9
   - City Documents 9
   - County Documents 12
   - State Documents 15

3. Gilroy Trails Master Plan Map 17
   - Map Legend 17
   - Long-Term Crossings 17
   - Bridge and Road Improvement Projects 18
   - Trail Corridors 19
   - Trail Types 20

4. Trails Standards 25
   - Referenced Sources 25
   - Accessibility 25
   - Trails Along Creeks and Drainage Channels 27
   - Standards Matrix 28

5. Implementation 31
   - Relationship to the General Plan 31
   - Residential Development Ordinance 31
   - Trails Acquisition 34
   - Permitting/Environmental Review 35

CITY OF GILROY TRAILS MASTER PLAN
May 2, 2005
# Table of Contents

- **Trails Development**
  - 35
- **Trail Priorities**
  - 37
- **Maintenance**
  - 38
- **Trails Master Plan Review**
  - 40
- **Follow-Up Action Items**
  - 41

6. **Capital Costs**
  - 45

7. **Maintenance Costs**
  - 63

8. **Potential Funding Sources**
  - 69

- **Bibliography**
  - 75
- **Appendix 1**
  - 77
- **Appendix 2**
  - 103
- **Appendix 3**
  - 105
- **Appendix 4**
  - 107

**Figures**

- **Portion of Santa Clara County Trails Master Plan Update Map**
  - 14
- **Map 1—Trails Master Plan**
  - 21
- **Map 2—Trail Use Designation**
  - 23
- **Map 3—Pedestrian/Bicycle Transportation Plan Updates**
  - 43
- **Map 4—Trails Master Plan Key Map**
  - 47
- **Map 5—Trails Master Plan—Sector 1**
  - 49
- **Map 6—Trails Master Plan—Sector 2**
  - 51
- **Map 7—Trails Master Plan—Sector 3**
  - 53
- **Map 8—Trails Master Plan—Sector 4**
  - 55
Acknowledgements

GILROY TRAILS MASTER PLAN TASK FORCE
Sherri Stuart
Norm Thompson
Doug Meier
Steve Nelson
Edith Edde
John Donahoe
Pedro Pornelas
John Hewitt
Pam Gimenez
Ty Ashford
Charles Van Meter
Brian Mendenhall
Carol Frederickson
Gretchen Yoder-Schrock
Art Kerr
Thomas Muniz
Bob Elgroth
Community Member
Planning Commission
Gavilan Joggers & Striders
Bay Area Ridge Trail
Gilroy Historical Society
RJA
MACSA
Greenbelt Alliance
Gilroy Visitors Bureau
Gilroy Youth Commission
GUSD
SCVWD
SCVWD
Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Board
Gavilan College
Community Member
Cycling Advocate

GILROY TRAILS MASTER PLAN TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meredith Kaplan
Cheryl Bolin
Cydney Casper
Dan Castaneda
Chris Weske
Bill Headley
Mark Frederick
NPS, Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail (Retired 12/04)
Recreation Superintendent
Planner II
Unit Supervisor, Gilroy Police Department
Community Services Department
Facilities and Park Development Manager
Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation Department

CITY COUNCIL
Al Pinheiro, Mayor
Robert Dillon
Paul Correa
Craig Gartman
Charles S. Morales
Russ Valiquette
Roland Velasco

PLANNING COMMISSION
Dion Bracco, Chair
Tim Day, Vice-Chair
Thomas D. Boe
Joan M. Lewis
Ermelindo Puente
Norman Thompson
Cat Tucker

CITY OF GILROY TRAILS MASTER PLAN
May 2, 2005
Acknowledgements

**Parks and Recreation Commission**
Denise Jungling, Chair
Sam Bozzo
Barbara DeLorenzo
Curt Goris
Alfred Navaroli
Joan Spencer
Bruce Williams

**Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Board**
Allen D. Beale
Thomas A. Muniz
Humberto “Bert” Rangel
Anthony Rosso
Bruce Williams
Gretchen Yoder-Schrock

**City Staff**
Jay Baksa
Michael Dorn
Wendie Rooney
William Faus
Gregory Giusiana
Joe Kline
Chris Orr
Carla Rugh
Richard Smelser

**City Administrator**
**Community Services Director (Interim)**
**Community Development Director**
**Planning Division Manager**
**Police Chief**
**Public Information Officer**
**Parks & Landscape Supervisor**
**Operations Services Manager**
**City Engineer**

**Bellinger Foster Steinmetz Landscape Architecture**
Lee Steinmetz
Elke Lucking
Joy Long
Michelle Parravano

**Principal**
**Associate, Project Manager**
**Graphics**
**Report Publishing**

---

City of Gilroy Trails Master Plan
May 2, 2005
-ii-
Executive Summary

The Executive Summary highlights the key points of each chapter in the Trails Master Plan. For more detail, refer to the complete Trails Master Plan report.

INTRODUCTION

Purpose
The purpose of the Gilroy Trails Master Plan is to provide a long-range blueprint for a comprehensive citywide trails system. The Trails Master Plan is one of the implementation items identified in the Gilroy General Plan.

Vision
The Trails Master Plan vision is to plan, design and implement a network of trails that, together with the City of Gilroy's on-street bikeways and pedestrian sidewalks, will connect the community, its park and open space system, schools, employment centers and other community destinations. The Gilroy trails system will be an integral part of, and provide links to, the existing and proposed regional trail system. The Gilroy trails system will benefit transportation, recreation, safety and personal health.

Process
Development of the Trails Master Plan was guided by an advisory Task Force of community members with diverse trails interests, and a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The Task Force and TAC met jointly about once each month from December 2003, through January 2005. The Task Force and TAC reviewed proposed trail alignments, standards and policies. A community meeting was held on November 9, 2004, to review the proposed trails plan. Meeting notices were mailed to owners of property adjacent to proposed trail alignments.

BACKGROUND AND REGIONAL CONTEXT
Chapter 2 of the Trails Master Plan reviews City, County and State documents that are relevant to trails planning in Gilroy. The City's General Plan provides the framework for trails policies. The Countywide Trails Master Plan Update indicates trail corridors of regional significance that cross
Executive Summary

through or near Gilroy. These include regional trails that extend beyond Santa Clara County, including the Bay Area Ridge Trail, the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail, and the Benito Clara Trail.

GILROY TRAILS MASTER PLAN MAP
The Trails Master Plan map indicates trails of regional significance (local segments of trails shown in the Countywide Trails Plan) and local trails (trails that are important for local connectivity but are not part of the Countywide Trails Plan). Trails are also differentiated by trail type: Class 1 Bicycle/Pedestrian Trails, Pedestrian Only Trails, and Bicycle/Pedestrian/Equestrian Multi-Use Trails. In some cases, short-term interim trails are shown along with long-term trails alignments. The long-term alignments require grade-separated crossings of roadways and/or railroads that due to high cost, may not be feasible in the foreseeable future. The trails master plan is coordinated with the on-street bikeways proposed in the Gilroy Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan to show a complete bicycle transportation system. The Trails Master Plan includes a total of 43.2 miles of trails.

TRAILS STANDARDS
Trails standards have been compiled from a variety of sources. A number of references are applicable to the design of trails, including the CalTrans Highway Design Manual, Valley Transportation Authority’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines, Santa Clara County’s Countywide Trails Master Plan, and the Uniform Interjurisdictional Trail Design, Use and Management Guidelines. Standards for accessibility are also included, as well as standards for trails along creeks and drainage channels, consistent with the policies of the Santa Clara Valley Water District.

IMPLEMENTATION
Several recommendations are provided to assist in moving from conceptual trails on a map to built trails on the ground. Perhaps most significantly, as an approved Master Plan and implementation item of the General Plan, the City will now have a tool to review and condition
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development projects where trails are shown on the Trails Master Plan. In addition, suggested changes to the Residential Development Ordinance (RDO) Rating Scale may further encourage developers to fund trails development. Priority criteria for trails development are also included, as well as guidelines for trail operations and maintenance.

CAPITAL COSTS

Capital costs for trail segments have been estimated. Costs are based on different types of trails: Pedestrian Only; Class I Bicycle/Pedestrian Trails; and Bicycle/Pedestrian/Equestrian Trails. The Class I Trails have been divided into trails with high costs and trails with average costs, depending on the anticipated complexity of constructing the trail. Unit trails costs have been estimated as follows:

- Pedestrian Only Trail: $20 per lineal foot or $105,600 per mile.
- Average Cost Class I Trail: $120 per lineal foot or $633,600 per mile.
- High Cost Class I Trail: $200 per lineal foot or $1,056,000 per mile.
- Pedestrian/Bike/Equestrian Trail: $120 per lineal foot or $633,600 per mile.

In addition to these unit costs, acquisition costs have been estimated at $411,000 per acre with a 20 foot trail acquisition width. Very few trails are assumed to be acquired through purchase. Most trail rights-of-way are assumed to be acquired at no cost through dedication or easement. Above grade street/railroad crossings have been estimated at $5,000,000 each. Staging areas are estimated at $200,000 each.

Total capital cost for complete buildout of the Trails Master Plan is estimated at $51,715,580. This includes $20,000,000 for long-term completion of grade-separated crossings as shown on the Master Plan map.
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MAINTENANCE COSTS
Annual maintenance costs are estimated at $3,500 per mile for Class 1 bicycle/pedestrian trails. Periodic (every 5 years) trail resurfacing and re-striping is estimated at $11,500 per mile. At build-out, maintenance of all trails is estimated at $498,564 annually.

POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES
The City’s existing revenue sources are not sufficient to fund build-out of the Trails Master Plan. A matrix of grant funding sources is included, and the City is encouraged to actively pursue leveraging limited local funds with other funding sources.

CONCLUSION
The Trails Master Plan is a long-term vision for the future that may take generations to achieve. Adoption of the Trails Master Plan will be a significant step in this process. Without a Trails Master Plan, opportunities for trails will be lost as development occurs. Implementation of the plan over time will require advocacy, leadership, and cooperation. The Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Board is tasked with establishing annual trail priorities and annually reviewing progress toward completion of the plan. City staff and commissions will need to carefully review development projects and establish conditions that assure trail development can occur. City staff will also need to actively seek grant funding for trails. Community members will need to show their support for trails as a highly valued community resource. Developers can add value to their projects and to the community at large by supporting trails. The City Council will need to play a leadership role in securing funding for trails development and long-term maintenance as a part of the City’s overall budgeting process. The Trails Master Plan sets the framework for the City, developers and community members to work together to achieve its goals over time.

“A society grows great when old men plant trees whose shade they know they shall never sit in.” — Greek proverb
Introduction

PURPOSE

The purpose of the Gilroy Trails Master Plan is to provide a long-range blueprint for a comprehensive citywide trails system. The Trails Master Plan is one of the implementation items identified in the Gilroy General Plan. Policy 16.05 of the General Plan states: “Develop a Trails Master Plan to guide the planning, design and implementation of a citywide trails network.”

The Trails Master Plan will enable City staff, property owners, developers, interested community members, and associated agencies to proactively review, plan for and incorporate trail alignments with development. The Trails Master Plan is coordinated with the on-street bicycle and sidewalk network delineated in the City’s Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan, and with the Santa Clara County Trails Master Plan Update.

Vision

The Trails Master Plan vision is to plan, design and implement a network of trails that, together with the City of Gilroy’s on-street bikeways and pedestrian sidewalks, will connect the community, its park and open space system, schools, employment centers and other community destinations. The Gilroy trails system will be an integral part of, and provide links to, the existing and proposed regional trail system. The Gilroy trails system will benefit transportation, recreation, safety and personal health.

BENEFITS OF TRAILS

As noted in the Vision Statement for the Trails Master Plan, the benefits of a comprehensive trails system for communities are multi-faceted.

Health

Exercise is key to improving personal health and reducing stress. Current news articles frequently highlight increasing health care costs, rising heart disease, and the growing health issues related to obesity. Trails provide opportunities for regular cardiovascular exercise, including running, walking and bicycling.
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According to the National Parks Service Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance Economic Impacts of Protecting Rivers, Trails and Greenways (1995):

For every mile a person walks or runs, they will save society 24 cents per mile in medical and other costs. These figures are the results of a theoretical model developed by the Rand Corporation (Men’s Fitness Magazine, 1992)

Recreation activities involving exercise reduce health care costs. People who exercise regularly have 14 percent lower claims against their medical insurance, spend 30 percent fewer days in the hospital, and have 41 percent fewer claims greater than $5,000.

Transportation
A system of well-connected trails and on-street bikeways supports alternative low-cost and environmentally sound transportation. Trail use for transportation results in fewer automobile trips. This reduces the need for costly roadway widenings, improves air quality, and reduces oil consumption.
Introduction

According to Bicycle Blueprint, *a Plan to Bring Bicycling into the Mainstream in New York City* (1998):

Nationwide, bicyclists forgoing auto travel save between 120 and 680 million gallons of gasoline per year, equivalent to 0.1%-0.6% of fuel consumed by passenger vehicles. This translates into significant savings of vehicle emissions: as much as 0.5% of NOx, 0.9% of hydrocarbons, and a 1.2% savings of CO.

The *Valley Transportation Plan 2020* (December 2000) states:

Quality of life deteriorates as more time is spent in the car, and as options for when to go places or how to get there diminish. Delays...aggravate drivers and passengers, and make it harder to fulfill family, work and community commitments... With a peak period that can last up to five hours, many area residents feel pushed to their limits...

In 1997, work trips represented the largest category of all daily trips made in the county. However, many trips (40 percent) are not work-related; in fact 53 percent of the county’s 2000 population—over 928,000 people—do not work, and thus don’t
make work trips. The biggest categories of non-work trips are from home to shopping (25 percent) or to visiting and recreation (12 percent).

Travel alternatives are fundamental to a high quality of life and full participation in community, especially for people who are not ‘auto-mobile’ because of age, ability, or economic circumstance. The right services and facilities can allow non-drivers to get around and drivers to drive less. The most effective and well-used travel options are suited for their surroundings: public transit focused in the most urban areas of the region, bicycle ways that serve schools and parks, sidewalks and crossable streets that make trips possible by foot.

As the county’s diverse communities continue to evolve and change, so too do their transportation needs. With age, changes occur in abilities, needs and preferences that make transit and walking much more likely alternatives.

As noted above, trails are an integral element of a comprehensive and efficient transportation system.

**Recreation**

Trails provide recreational opportunity for people of all ages and abilities. According to the *Public Opinions and Attitudes on Outdoor Recreation in California* (1997), walking, followed by jogging or running, are the two most popular recreational activities in the State. Bicycling ranks number four on a list of 43 recreational activities. In addition to being the most popular recreational activity, recreational walking has the highest unmet demand for additional public facilities. Clearly, there is strong public support for trails to meet recreational needs.

**Safety**

Trails reduce conflicts between automobiles and bicyclists and automobiles and pedestrians. Trails provide a safe environment for beginning cyclists who are not yet ready to ride on streets. Trails are also important components of "safer routes to schools" for students. In addition, trail
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use provides "eyes" to sensitive environmental areas such as creeks and drainage areas that are frequent targets of vandalism and illicit activity due to lack of visibility and use. Trails also provide alternative routes of ingress and egress in the event of major accidents or disasters.

Education

Trails provide outdoor education opportunities for all ages by improving access to natural areas such as creeks. In addition, Gilroy has an opportunity for historic interpretation along the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail.
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Economic

The Economic Impacts of Protecting Rivers, Trails and Greenways states:

Proximity to greenways, rivers and trails can increase sales price, increase the marketability of adjacent properties, and promote faster sales...Along the suburban Lafayette/Moraga Trail in California, the majority of the owners felt that the trail would make their properties sell more easily and at increased values...a study of property values near greenbelts in Boulder, Colorado, found that housing prices declined an average of $4.20 for each foot of distance from a greenbelt up to 3,200 feet. The same study determined that, other variables being equal, the average value of property adjacent to the greenbelt would be 32 percent higher than those 3,200 feet away...In a survey of adjacent landowners along the Luce Line rail-trail in Minnesota...61 percent of the suburban residential owners noted an increase in their property value as a result of the trail...

In addition to a well-documented increase in property values associated with trails, other benefits include the potential to increase trails-related business, such as sales of walking/jogging shoes, exercise gear and bicycles. Some businesses, such as restaurants and cafes, may find an advantage in locating close to trails. Businesses may have an interest in locating in cities with trail access as a community amenity for their employees. The improved business climate associated with trails can result in increased employment and tax revenues, of obvious benefit to the city. Well-planned and managed trails are a sound community investment.
GOALS

With this context of the importance of trails for Gilroy, the following goals have been established for the Gilroy Trails Master Plan:

1. Improve and expand the existing trails system to meet the current and future needs of Gilroy residents.
2. Increase the use of the trail system and in turn reduce the use of motor vehicles, promoting personal health, safety and recreational enjoyment.
3. Plan, design and implement trails locally to become part of the county-wide, regional and national trails network.
4. Develop a trails route map within General Plan build-out limits, identifying specific trail alignments and opportunities, and identifying public and private property with trails potential.
5. Cooperate with other public agencies, organizations and the private sector. Incorporate public participation into the trails planning, design, and implementation process where feasible.
6. Develop trail acquisition strategies and design standards.
7. Identify incentives for trail dedication and development. Encourage incentive points for on-site trails dedication and contributions to off-site trails acquisition and development as part of the Residential Development Ordinance (RDO) process.
8. Use existing corridors, such as levees, maintenance roads, etc. where feasible.
9. Provide access to the fullest range of trails for all community residents.
10. Improve and promote bicycle access to public transportation facilities with trails, bikeways and storage facilities.

PROCESS

Development of the Trails Master Plan was guided by a 17-member advisory Task Force consisting of Gilroy citizens with diverse trails interests, as well as representatives of the Santa Clara Valley Water District, Gilroy Unified School District, and Gavilan College. The Task Force
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was supported by a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) representing City staff, the Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation Department, and the National Park Service (Jaun Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail). The Task Force and TAC met jointly about once each month from December, 2003 through January 2004. The Task Force and TAC reviewed proposed trail alignments, standards and policies.

In addition to the Task Force/TAC meetings, a community meeting was held on November 9, 2004, to review the proposed trails plan. Meeting notices were mailed to owners of property adjacent to proposed trail alignments. The Trails Master Plan has also been reviewed in public meetings before the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee and the Parks and Recreation Commission. The Gilroy City Council has final review and approval authority for the Trails Master Plan.
Background and Regional Context

Gilroy's Trails Master Plan is supported by numerous City and regional documents. These documents provide policies that encourage trails, establish regional trail corridors, and recommend standards for trail design. This chapter reviews the context for trails established in these documents.

CITY DOCUMENTS

Gilroy General Plan
Perhaps the most significant City document is the Gilroy General Plan, adopted in 2002. The General Plan "describes the type of community we want to be in the future; and sets forth goals, policies and implementing actions...to help us achieve our aims...In total, the Gilroy General Plan articulates our vision of the future and how we intend to realize it." (Gilroy General Plan, Page 1-1)

The Trails Master Plan is an implementation item identified in the General Plan. In addition, several General Plan policies influence the Trails Master Plan as noted below.

Chapter Six - Transportation and Circulation

Policy 14.01 Non-Auto Modes of Travel: Emphasize non-auto travel modes of transportation as a key strategy for achieving air quality goals. For example, encourage bicycle riding to school from an early age by providing safer bikeways between residential areas and schools...

Policy 14.02 Land Use Planning to Promote Walking and Biking: Promote compact, mixed use development patterns that encourage pedestrian and bicycle travel and transit use.

Policy 14.03 Bicycle and Pedestrian Paths and Facilities: Correct deficiencies, expand existing facilities, and provide for the design of safer, convenient and attractive bicycle and pedestrian facilities whenever possible. ...Greenbelts, linear parks, public easements and drainages reserved in public open space will be planned to
Background and Regional Context

accommodate bike and pedestrian traffic if they are so designated in the Bicycle Transportation Plan.

Policy 14.05 Private Development of Bike and Pedestrian Facilities: Involve private development in providing bikeways, pedestrian pathways, and support facilities when such facilities pass through or about a development site.

Policy 14.06 Traffic Impact Fee for Bikeway Improvements: Use the comprehensive traffic impact fee to finance General Plan bikeway improvements in conjunction with roadway improvements.

Action 14.A Trail and Pathway Implementation: Work with the County in implementing trails and bike paths planned locally as part of the Countywide network in the County Trails and Pathways Master Plan. New development along designated trail or bikeway corridors should be required to dedicate land and construct the designated facility.

Action 14.I Bike Paths for Emergency Access: Design bike paths to be wide enough for emergency vehicles where other emergency routes do not exist, located and designed to enhance the personal safety of bicyclists. Use removable bollards or other devices to prevent vehicles other than emergency and maintenance vehicles from using the bike paths.

Action 14.J Bikeway Planning and Design Criteria: Follow the criteria for bikeways outlined in the California Department of Transportation’s publication Planning and Design Criteria for Bikeways in California.

Chapter Seven - Public Facilities and Services

Policy 16.05 Trails Master Plan: Develop a Trails Master Plan to guide the planning, design and implementation of a citywide trail network. The Plan should indicate
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specific trail alignments and opportunities, identify private and public property with trails potential, and set forth acquisition/easement priorities. To support implementation of the Trails Master Plan, encourage incentive points for on-site trails dedication or contribution to off-site trails as part of the RDO process.

Action 16.B Trails Master Plan: Establish specific trail alignments and acquisition targets based on a Gilroy Trails Master Plan and the Bicycle Transportation Plan.

Chapter Eight - Community Resources and Potential Hazards

Policy 25.21 Multiple Use of Flood Control Projects: Design flood control measures and drainage channel improvements as part of an overall community improvement program with provision for multiple use, including recreational open space, trails, bikeways, groundwater recharge, protection and restoration of riparian vegetation and wildlife habitats, and enhancement of scenic qualities.

Action 20.B Habitat and Urban Streams/Creek Protection: Require development along creeks to be set back from the entire floodway of the creek...Setbacks required should allow adequate room for trails and access on both sides of the creek.

Parks And Recreation System Master Plan

The development of trails is an integral component of the City's parks and recreation system. The City's Parks and Recreation System Master Plan includes a Conceptual Trails Master Plan map. This map became the starting point for establishing trail alignments and has been refined as a part of the Trails Master Plan process.

Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan

The City's Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan focuses primarily on on-street bicycle facilities, such as bicycle lanes and routes. The Trails Master Plan, which focuses on off-street trails and bicycle paths, is integrated with the Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan to provide a cohesive non-automobile transportation system.
Background and Regional Context

Residential Development Ordinance Rating Scale
The Residential Development Ordinance (RDO) Rating Scale is the City of Gilroy’s established method of evaluating and ranking development proposals as part of a unit allocation program within the City, and is one means of encouraging trails as a part of development. Recommendations for the RDO rating scale are included in Chapter 6 of the Trails Master Plan.

COUNTY DOCUMENTS

Countywide Trails Master Plan Update
The Countywide Trails Master Plan Update establishes trails corridors of regional, countywide, local and even national significance within Santa Clara County. The Trails Master Plan Update serves as an advisory document for local agencies within the County to plan for and design local trail alignments that connect to and assist in completing the Countywide trails system. Some of the trails noted in the Countywide Trails Master Plan that are significant to Gilroy include the following (quotes are from the Countywide Trails Master Plan Update, pages 40-46):

Regional Trails
“Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail: [Part of the National Trails System, this trail] commemorates the route taken by Anza in 1775-76 when he led a group of colonists from what is now Horcasitas, Sonora, Mexico to San Francisco Bay where they established a presidio and mission for New Spain...Anza’s expedition crossed what is now Santa Clara County three times...As called for by the National Park Service...a series of ‘recreation retracement trails’ would be developed. These are shared-use trails that generally follow the journey of the Anza expedition, though the trail route...would not necessarily be coincidental with the actual Anza route. Like Anza’s expedition, there are three branches to the trail...”
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"Benito-Clara Trail: [This is] a loop trail linking recreational resources in northern San Benito County with those in southern Santa Clara County and with the Cities of Morgan Hill, Gilroy, Hollister and San Juan Bautista.”

Bay Area Ridge Trail: a trail system that follows the ridges and mountains that circle the San Francisco Bay and connects...nine Bay Area counties... The Bay Area Ridge Trail is proposed to cross the Santa Clara Valley through or near Gilroy.”

Sub-Regional Trails

“Coyote Creek/Llagas Creek Trail: from the Alameda County Line and the Bay Trail to the San Benito County Line and the Monterey-Yosemite Trail.

West Valley Trail: from Almaden Lake Park to the southern county link of the Bay Area Ridge Trail.”

Connector Trail Routes

“Buena Vista - Day Trail: connecting...Watsonville Road and the West Valley Trail with Day Road and the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail.

West Branch Llagas Creek Trail: connecting...Santa Teresa/Day Road area with the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail, the Benito-Clara Trail, and the Coyote Creek/Llagas Creek Trail.”
Background and Regional Context

*Portion of Santa Clara County Trails Master Plan Update Map*
Background and Regional Context

Uniform Interjurisdictional Trail Design, Use, and Management Guidelines

As a follow-up to the Countywide Trails Master Plan, these guidelines and standards were developed for use by local agencies in implementing local trails plans. Many of these standards have been incorporated into Chapter 5, Trails Standards, of the Gilroy Trails Master Plan.

Valley Transportation Plan 2020

The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) completed this plan in 2000. It includes a prioritization of bicycle projects within the County, with funding for the highest priority projects. "Tier 1" (highest priority projects) are included in VTA's 10-year Bicycle Expenditure Plan. (The Uvas Creek Trail connection to Gilroy Sports Park is currently included in the 10-year Expenditure Plan.) Priority projects are re-evaluated every two years. Completion of the Trails Master Plan, and coordination with the City's Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan, will assist the City to participate in this competitive process.

Bicycle Technical Guidelines

Also prepared by VTA, while these guidelines are primarily oriented for on-street bicycle lanes and routes, some of the standards also apply to trails, such as signage and railroad crossing recommendations. These guidelines supplement CalTrans bicycle design guidelines.

STATE DOCUMENTS

Caltrans Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000, Bikeway Planning and Design

This Chapter of the Highway Design Manual establishes design standards for both on-street and separated bicycle facilities. CalTrans establishes standards for three classes of bikeway: Class I bikeways are bike paths, which are grade-separated from roadways. "Bike paths should offer opportunities not provided by the road system. They can either provide a recreational opportunity, or in some instances, can serve as direct high-speed commute routes if cross flow by motor vehicles can be minimized..." Class II bikeways are bike lanes. "Bike lanes are established along streets in corridors where there is significant bicycle demand, and where there are distinct
Background and Regional Context

needs that can be served by them. The purpose should be to improve conditions for bicyclists in the corridors...” Class III bikeways are bicycle routes, without a designated bike lane. “Bike routes are shared facilities which serve either to: (a) provide continuity to other bicycle facilities (usually Class II bikeways); or (b) designate preferred routes through high demand corridors.” (Highway Design Manual, page 1000-3.)

Most of the trails shown in the Trails Master Plan are Class I bikeways, although some of the connecting trails are shown as Class II bikeways where rights-of-way are not sufficient for Class I trails. In addition, some of the trail alignments are proposed as pedestrian-only trails, and some are designated as multi-use to include bicycles, pedestrians, and equestrians. Class II and III bikeways are found primarily in the Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan. Chapter 5, Trails Standards, provides more detail on the various types of trails included in the Trails Master Plan.
Gilroy Trails Master Plan Map

Map 1 illustrates Gilroy's proposed trails system and its relationship to bikeways that are further described in the City's Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan. Together, the trails and bikeways provide for recreation and non-motorized transportation throughout the City and provide connections between Gilroy and other cities and Santa Clara County destinations.

MAP LEGEND

The Map Legend differentiates types of trails. The Bay Area Ridge Trail, given its regional significance, and its location primarily outside of the City's jurisdiction, is shown differently than other trails.

"Other Regional, Sub-Regional and Connector Trails" are trail corridors that are identified in the Countywide Trails Master Plan. These are also shown by reference letter and number, as noted in the County Plan. For example, R1-A is the Northern Recreation Retracement Route of the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail. R3 is the Benito Clara Trail.

The City would be responsible for implementation of these trails within the City limits. Some of these trails are shown beyond the City's jurisdiction for context only, but would not be implemented by the City.

"Local Trails" are trails not identified in the Countywide Trails Master Plan, but are considered important to the City's overall trail system. "Long-Term Crossing Options" identifies locations where future, grade-separated crossings of major roadways are desired.

"Long Term Crossing Options" identifies locations where future, grade-separated crossings of major roadways are desired.

LONG-TERM CROSSINGS

Long-Term Crossing Options are identified at the intersection of Monterey Road and Lions Creek/Ronan Channel; Day Road and Santa Teresa Boulevard; and Sixth Street at the Highway
101 over-crossing. Given the cost of pedestrian/bicycle grade-separated crossings, these are seen as long-term future implementation items that should be considered for grant funding and other funding sources.

The portion of trail connecting Lions Creek west of Monterey Highway to Ronan Channel at Murray Avenue is shown as "long-term Class 1 Alignment." This trail segment should only be constructed when there is a safe crossing at the railroad and at Monterey Highway. A short-term alternative alignment is shown along Las Animas Street. This alignment is easier to achieve in the short-term as there is already a traffic signal at Monterey St. and an at-grade crossing of the railroad.

BRIDGE AND ROAD IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

The ‘Camino Arroyo Bridge Project’ is a new roadway from the intersection of Gilman Avenue and Camino Arroyo (North) to Camino Arroyo (South) connecting to State Route 152. The bridge will span the West Branch Llagas Creek and connect the trails proposed along the north and south sides of the creek. In addition this project will include a Class I trail bridge to be extended out from the south side of the existing 6th street Highway 101 bridge crossing. The trail bridge across Highway 101 will connect the trail along the north edge of the West Branch Llagas Creek with the trail along the Ronan Channel, both of which are regionally significant.

The ‘Farrell Avenue Bridge Widening’ consists of widening the bridge and re-striping the adjacent intersection of Farrell Avenue and Church Street. The bridge widening will facilitate an 8 foot wide Class I trail at sidewalk level on the north side of the bridge and a 5’ wide Class II bicycle lane on the south side. Across Farrell Avenue at Church Street the class I trail across the bridge will immediately connect to the trail proposed along the east side of the West Branch Llagas Creek creating a safer route to school for neighborhood children.

The ‘Hollister to Gilroy 25 and 101 Widening Project’ is a Caltrans project that consists of a Highway 101 realignment and widening in the area of Route 25 and a realignment and widening
of Route 25 with a Highway 101 bridge crossing. Starting at Gavilan College the realigned Route 25 will interface with Santa Teresa Boulevard. It is the intent to align the Bay Area Ridge Trail through Gavilan College with the new Santa Teresa/Route 25 connection providing a safe Highway 101 crossing until it veers north at Bolsa Road.

TRAIL CORRIDORS

Generally, the Trails Master Plan provides a series of trails that circle the City along its rural edges, following creeks and drainage channels along the south and east, and crossing the ridgeline to the west. Creeks and drainage channels with trails include Uvas Creek, Llagas Creek, Lions Creek, Ronan Channel and Morey Channel. Trails connect a variety of destinations, including existing and proposed schools, Gavilan College, Gilroy Sports Park, and commercial and employment centers east of Highway 101. A pedestrian trail is proposed to cross the City’s western ridgeline and provide a connection between Uvas Creek to the south and Lions Creek to the north. A pedestrian connection trail is also proposed between the Bay Area Ridge Trail and Uvas Creek. Some local trails connect the existing and future commercial development east of Highway 101. Other local trails are shown in the Glen Loma Ranch area and reflect the Glen Loma specific plan. Through town, due to built-out conditions and lack of right-of-way, many of the connections are provided by on-street bikeways.

Alternative trail alignments are also shown for a pedestrian connection through the Eagle Ridge Open Space to the proposed Bay Area Ridge Trail. One or more of these alternative alignments could be developed through the open space, which has an irrevocable offer of dedication. Since the area is currently private property, it is difficult to evaluate which alignment(s) would be best. Criteria to determine this in the future should include:

1. Potential environmental impact of trail construction and access, taking into account sensitive environmental conditions, such as Salamander habitat.
2. Ease of construction and maintenance.
3. Safe connections to staging areas
TRAIL TYPES

Map 2 indicates recommended types of trails. Most of the trails are Class I multi-use trails for pedestrian and bicycle use. The proposed trail alignment along Llagas Creek/Holsclaw Road is recommended to be multi-use for cyclists, pedestrians and equestrians, in compliance with guidelines for the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail. Other trails are recommended to be for pedestrian use only, based on steep topography. The next chapter, Trails Standards, includes design guidelines for each type of trail.
Trails Standards

REFERENCED SOURCES

Applicable trails standards exist from a variety of sources, and are included as a part of the Trails Master Plan. A significant source of details is the *Uniform Interjurisdictional Trail Design, Use and Management Guidelines* developed in 1999 by the Santa Clara County Parks Department as a follow-up to the *Countywide Trails Master Plan*. The guidelines were developed to assist local agencies when implementing local segments of countywide and regional trails, and to assure consistency in trail design and signage throughout the County. The Master Plan recommends adoption of these guidelines, with minor modifications to reflect City of Gilroy standards.

For bikeways, an important reference is Chapter 1000 of the California Department of Transportation (CalTrans) Highway Design Manual. This chapter provides basic design standards for bikeways in California. The Class 1 bikeways proposed in the Gilroy Trails Master Plan shall be designed to these standards, which are consistent with the County standards referenced above.

Another important reference is the Valley Transportation Authority’s (VTA’s) *Bicycle Technical Guidelines*. These guidelines are primarily for the design of on-street bikeways. While the County’s *Uniform Interjurisdictional Trail Design, Use and Management Guidelines* are the primary source for Class I Bike Path Design Standards, the *Bicycle Technical Guidelines* do address interface design issues between Class I Bikeways and Streets.

ACCESSIBILITY

There are several references for accessibility standards in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). However, most outdoor accessibility standards deal with developed areas such as parks, parking areas and outdoor spaces associated with buildings. While it is desirable to strive to achieve the same standards for trails, this is not always feasible given natural topography and adjacent natural conditions. Therefore, the Regulatory Negotiation Committee on Accessibility Guidelines for Outdoor Developed Areas, a national committee, was formed to
review and propose trails guidelines consistent with the ADA. This Committee has recommended the following minimum standards for trail accessibility.

"Under the proposed guidelines, an accessible trail would meet these minimum technical provisions:

1. Clear tread width: 36" minimum
2. Tread Obstacles: 2" high maximum (up to 3" high where running and cross slopes are 5% or less)
3. Cross Slope: 5% max.
4. Running slope (trail grade) meets one or more of the following:
   a. 5% or less for any distance.
   b. up to 8.33% for 200' max. Resting intervals no more than 200' apart.
   c. up to 10% for 30' max. Resting intervals 30'.
   d. up to 12.5% for 10' max. Resting intervals 10'.
   e. No more than 30% of the total trail length may exceed a running slope of 8.33%.
   f. Passing Space: provided at least every 1000' where trail width is less than 60''
   g. Signs: shall be provided indicating the length of the accessible trail segment.

While the proposed accessibility guidelines address the special circumstances where designers and operators may not be able to achieve accessibility, they are encouraged to always provide access to the greatest extent possible. Departures from specific accessibility guidelines are permitted for any portion of the trail where compliance would:

1. cause substantial harm to cultural, historic, religious, or significant natural features or characteristics;
2. substantially alter the nature of the setting or the purpose;
3. require construction methods or materials that are prohibited by Federal, State, or local regulations or statutes;
4. not be feasible due to terrain or the prevailing construction practices."
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Source: “Questions and Answers on proposed ADA trail guidelines”, by Stuart MacDonald, Chair, National Association of State Trail Administrators

While these guidelines have not been officially adopted at the Federal level, they are recommended as an accessibility standard for Gilroy’s trails system.

TRAILS ALONG CREEKS AND DRAINAGE CHANNELS

Most of the proposed trails along Gilroy’s creeks and drainage channels are under the jurisdiction of the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD). The Water District is a willing partner in trails development, and the City has an excellent opportunity to significantly expand its trail system through development of trails along existing SCVWD maintenance roads. This will require joint use agreements between the City and the Water District. Along with user safety, primary concerns of the Water District include: unimpeached access to channels for regular and emergency maintenance; discouraging unauthorized vehicular access and illegal dumping; protecting environmental resources, and protecting flood control functions. The following guidelines are recommended for trails design along creeks and drainage channels to address water district concerns:

1. The City shall work with the Santa Clara Valley Water District and the California Department of Fish and Game so that trail alignments are coordinated with current setback requirements.
2. Where feasible, provide turnout areas along trails for parking of maintenance vehicles.
3. Where feasible, in addition to public staging areas, provide separate maintenance staging areas.
4. For long trail reaches adjacent to public roadways or other access points, consider mid-block gates for maintenance access.
5. Trails adjacent to agricultural areas should be fenced.
6. Where vehicular access is possible along trails, use fencing, boulders or other means to restrict access, minimize unauthorized vehicular use of trails, and discourage illegal dumping.
7. Where maintenance roads exist on both sides of a channel, consider paving one side for the trail and leaving the other side unpaved for maintenance access.
9. Planting areas should be located on the outbound (non-channel) side of trails. Plant materials shall be drought tolerant and non-invasive.
10. Irrigation of planting areas shall be designed to minimize erosion of trail surfaces, levee roads and channel banks.
11. Provide directional signage indicating cross streets and distance markers as shown in the countywide trails sign standards.

STANDARDS MATRIX

The following standards matrix identifies various trails standards and the source for each standard (see Appendix I):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>City of Gilroy Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class One Trail Sections</td>
<td>Urban Shared-Use Trail Sections, T-1, T-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Adjacent to Creek, Park or Open Space</td>
<td>T-5A, T-5B, T-18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tree spacing and location shall be site and species specific. Trees shall be selected and spaced based on mature tree size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Trail</td>
<td>Natural Tread for Hikers G-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use Bicycle/Pedestrian/Equestrian Shared Use Trail</td>
<td>Shared Use Trails G-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CITY OF GILROY TRAILS MASTER PLAN
May 2, 2005
-28-
## Trails Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trail Intersections</td>
<td>T-8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Ending at Cul-de-Sac</td>
<td>T-9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Barriers</td>
<td>T-10</td>
<td>1 Use City of Gilroy standard collapsible bollard. Space adequately for safe passages of bicycle trailers such as Burleys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Intersections</td>
<td>T-12A-T13B</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail on Levee</td>
<td>T-15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levee Undercrossing</td>
<td>T-16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creek Crossings</td>
<td>T-17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Markings</td>
<td>T-14, T-19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Signage</td>
<td>S-1-S-11</td>
<td>1 Use City of Gilroy standard park identification signs at major trail entrances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
<td>T-7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Gate</td>
<td>T-11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Trail Fencing</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Fencing adjacent to drainage channels</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Street bikeway connections</td>
<td>Standards included in the Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant List</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:**
1. Uniform Interjurisdictional Trail Design, Use and Management Guidelines
   Santa Clara County Interjurisdictional Trails Committee, April 15, 1999
2. Countywide Trails Master Plan
   Santa Clara County, November 14, 1995
3. Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan
   City of Gilroy, February, 2002
4. Bicycle Technical Guidelines
   Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, September 2, 1999
5. Gilroy Trails Master Plan
Trails Standards
Implementation

In addition to the recommendations for trail corridors shown on the Master Plan Map and standards for trails construction, methods of implementation are needed to move from conceptual trails on a map to built trails on the ground. This chapter discusses processes and means to acquire and develop trails.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE GENERAL PLAN

Once adopted by the City Council, the Trails Master Plan becomes an implementation tool of the General Plan, similar to other City Master Plans for water, emergency services, circulation, and park facilities. The City can then condition development proposals to provide for trails where shown on the approved Trails Master Plan map as part of the development review and approval process. Trails can then occur incrementally with development. Once adopted, the Trails Master Plan map supercedes the "Gilroy Trails Conceptual Master Plan" that is found in both the Gilroy General Plan and the Parks and Recreation System Master Plan.

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE

The City's Residential Development Ordinance (RDO) limits the number of residential units that can be built in the City each year, and provides a process to evaluate which proposed residential projects best meet the City's overall needs. The City periodically holds an RDO competition (typically every two to three years) when allocations are available for distribution. The RDO rating scale is used to evaluate and rank competing projects each year. Using these rankings, "the City Council may select projects to be assigned a build-out allocation and development schedule. Under this process, the Planning Commission has the responsibility to prepare project ranking, following a recommendation from City staff" (RDO Rating Scale, August 6, 2001).

Projects that best meet the City's overall goals as established in the General Plan receive the highest ranking, and are thus more likely to be approved. (The City Council however, is not obligated toward allocation based solely on the point totals.) With this in mind, the RDO rating scale can be used as an incentive for developers to incorporate trails into their projects, consistent with the Trails Master Plan. There are 200 points possible in the RDO rating scale. With some
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minor modifications, categories where trails are addressed account for 60 of the 200 points. (This does not imply that a project with trails would receive 60 points.) The following are recommended text changes to the RDO Rating Scale, as well as categories where projects with trails could receive points:

---

Recommended Text Changes to the RDO Rating Scale:
- Proposed deletions are shown as **strike-through** text.
- Proposed additions are shown as **underlined italic** text.

---

III. DESIGN

B. Circulation (0-10 points)

Completing General Plan circulation element improvements, *including voluntary contributions to completion of City-identified segments*. Efficient design of the proposed circulation to link existing and planned transportation systems including streets, bike routes, walkways, and trails.

Note: This recommended text change could allow developers to receive points for contributions to trails (or other circulation element improvements) beyond their project. For example, a project that does not have trails identified in the Trails Master Plan could receive points by contributing to trails elsewhere in the City. The City could direct these contributions to priority trails so that the trails system is built systematically.

E. Transit Oriented Design (0-14 points)

Proximity of the project in relationship to the downtown train depot. Only projects within 1/3 mile (1,760 feet) of this transit facility will be considered under this category. Projects located in some measure within the distance requirement will be given partial credit. *Projects that provide non-motorized connections to transit centers will also be considered.*
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G. Project Open Space (0-12 points)
Projects providing active open space areas that are designed and intended to be used by all individuals within a development are evaluated. Active open space areas providing a full range of open space amenities may be given the maximum points (i.e. benches, bar-be-cue, play structures, pool, sand lots, picnic tables, trails, etc.)

IV. COMMUNITY BENEFIT FACTORS
A. Cultural and Recreational Benefits (0-2 points)
Provision of new facilities, such as golf courses, trails, theaters, cultural centers, parks shown on the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, trails shown on the Trails Master Plan, and community recreation centers, or other improvements for cultural and community benefit.

B. Capital Improvements Benefits (0-8 points)
Development of public works or capital improvements beyond what is normally required. Typically, this would be infrastructure benefiting an area outside the project boundary (i.e.; developed public parks, waterways, trails, bikeways, bridges, public access roads, etc, as identified in City-approved Master Plans.)

Note: Adding the text “as identified in City approved Master Plans” assures that points are received only for trails that are part of an approved master plan and contribute to City-wide connectivity. For example, a developer may wish to provide other trails within a project, but unless the trails are of broader community benefit, they would not receive points in the RDO process.

Other RDO categories with potential points for trails, where no text changes are recommended:
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III. DESIGN

C. Resource Conservation (0-6 points)
Incorporation of site and architectural design features which will maximize the potential for resource conservation (e.g.; conserving water, preserving water recharge areas, energy conservation, protecting prime agricultural lands, etc.).

D. Site Design Coordination (0-8 points)
Coordination of the proposed project, circulation elements, and other amenities and facilities with adjacent properties and development projects. Projects that complement adjacent development with regard to the density, design and neighborhood features are looked at.

In order to encourage trails development concurrent with development, approval of the above RDO Rating Scale modifications is a recommended action item of the Trails Master Plan.

TRAILS ACQUISITION

Dedication
Acquisition of land for trails can take many forms and does not always require fee purchase by the City. With adoption of the Trails Master Plan as an implementation item of the General Plan, the City will be in a strong position to acquire land for trails through dedication as a condition of development. Many of the trails shown on the Trails Master Plan may be acquired through dedication. Dedication is a common tool used by public agencies to acquire land for many public facilities, including schools, roads and parks.

Easements
Not all trail lands need to be owned by the City. Easements allow the City to use property owned by others for public trails. Most of the trails shown adjacent to drainage channels where maintenance roads exist can be developed through easement and joint use agreements with the
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Santa Clara Valley Water District and third-party owners where applicable. Easements may not be appropriate in all situations. Both the property owner and City must fully understand the long-term liability and maintenance implications of easement agreements.

Fee Purchase

Some trails may need to be acquired through purchase. When looking at the overall Trails Master Plan map, only a small portion of the trails will require purchase.

Trail segments that are anticipated to be acquired through dedication, easement or purchase are identified in the next chapter.

PERMITTING/ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Trails permitting and environmental review can involve many agencies depending on the location of the trail and extent of proposed improvements. Attached is a list of potential permitting agencies that may be involved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Permit/Review Description</th>
<th>Where applicable/comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)</td>
<td>Review of all projects for potential environmental impacts. Depending on project and CEQA Initial Study, outcomes may be: Notice of Categorical Exemption, Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>Any project requiring grading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Projects with significant structures, such as retaining walls.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Permit/Review Description</th>
<th>Where applicable/comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>Fire Marshal’s Office</td>
<td>Review emergency vehicle access requirements; review potential fire hazards, weed management and potential smoking restrictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Department of Roads and Airports</td>
<td>Encroachment or Construction</td>
<td>Connections to, under or over County roadways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
<td>NPDES Permits</td>
<td>Permits for stormwater discharge and approval of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMFS NOAA–Fisheries</td>
<td>Potential Review Authority</td>
<td>Development adjacent to creeks, rivers, or wetlands with sensitive or endangered species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Fish and Game</td>
<td>1601 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement</td>
<td>Development adjacent to creeks, rivers, or wetlands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>Section 404 Section 10</td>
<td>Development within or that affects the waterways under its jurisdiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Water District</td>
<td>Encroachment or Construction</td>
<td>Development adjacent to creeks and drainage channels under its jurisdiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalTrans</td>
<td>Encroachment or Construction</td>
<td>Connections to, under, or over State roads and highways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>Encroachment or Construction</td>
<td>Railroad Crossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>Section 404</td>
<td>Impact on threatened or endangered species, including habitat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TRAILES DEVELOPMENT

Trails design and development will be guided by the trails standards found in the previous chapter. In addition to the design standards, funding sources are needed for the capital improvements required to develop trails.

Several funding sources exist for trails development. Since trails are a component of the Parks and Recreation System Master Plan, the City's parks development fund may be used for trails acquisition and development. Development impact fees, paid in part to fund parks and recreation facilities as the City grows, are the source of revenue for this fund. Trails are only one type of facility that are funded, along with neighborhood and community parks, and special use facilities. Each year, through the City's Capital Improvement Budget (CIB) process, the City establishes and updates priorities for use of these funds. Trails development needs to be balanced with other recreational facility needs and demands through the CIB process. Since the Trails Master Plan was not yet completed and the extent of trails not yet known, the amount of funding in the City's current CIB for trails is very limited. As currently calculated, the City's impact fee for parks development will only fund a small portion of the total trails currently envisioned.

As noted previously in this chapter, the RDO process may lead to additional funding for trails if developers provide additional trails funding as a part of the application and review process, beyond what is required for trails dedication and development impact fees.

Grants are another source of funding for trails acquisition and development. CIB funding can be used to leverage additional funding through grants. Potential grant sources are identified in Chapter 8.

TRAIL PRIORITY CRITERIA

Rather than selecting specific trail alignments to be highest priority, the following criteria are recommended to evaluate potential trail funding through the annual CIB process. This allows the City to be flexible in determining the best way to implement the Trails Master Plan, taking into
3. Within the trail clearing limit, understory grasses and herbaceous annuals shall be inspected annually during the early summer months and prior to the fire season and, where appropriate, mowed, per Fire Marshal weed management recommendations.

4. Corrective work for drainage or erosion problems shall be performed within a reasonable period of time. Where necessary, barriers to prevent further erosion shall be erected until problems are corrected. Missing or damaged signs shall be replaced as soon as possible. Damaged structures shall be repaired as soon as possible. Damaged gates, fences and barriers shall be replaced as soon as possible. Trails shall be closed if corrective work cannot be accomplished within a reasonable time frame. If monitoring reveals that undesirable soil compaction is occurring in sensitive habitats adjacent to trails, erection of barriers or other appropriate measures (such as trail rerouting), will be employed as needed to discourage off-trail use.

5. Where trails are paved, they should be swept periodically to keep them free of loose gravel, debris, broken glass or other litter. Damaged pavement should be replaced as soon as possible. Unpaved Shared-use Trails should be regraded as necessary to maintain smooth surfaces.

6. Brush should be used to cover bootleg trails, abandoned trails or shortcuts to discourage use until natural vegetation returns.

7. Periodic monitoring of known sensitive habitats near trails will be conducted to determine if unacceptable soil compaction is occurring. Sensitive habitats include Riparian; Wetlands; Serpentine; and Oak Woodland.

8. A trails map suitable for public distribution should be developed and regularly updated. The map will be developed and reviewed annually by the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Board.

9. All City trails shall be patrolled to assure that they are safe and usable. A level-of-service approach shall be used by the City, such that trails receive attention commensurate with that provided to public parks. Objectives of trail inspections shall be trail safety and security, adjacent private property security, code enforcement, visitor information and education, litter control, and minor maintenance.
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account unknown future funding opportunities. Trail segments that best meet these criteria should receive highest priority:

1. Trail segments that support “Safer Routes” (to schools, parks and community facilities).
2. Trail segments that complement systematic and incremental development.
3. Opportunity to leverage funding with grant or other funding sources.
4. Trail segments that extend or enhance recreational opportunities, based on existing and projected use.
5. Trail segments that assist to complete regional trails as identified in the Countywide Trails Master Plan and/or the Valley Transportation Authority’s Countywide Bicycle Plan.
6. Trail segments that support trip reduction by providing connections to destinations such as shopping and work places.

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

Trails require regular maintenance to promote safe use, reduce potential hazards, and enhance environmental conditions. The following maintenance guidelines are selected from the Countywide Trails Master Plan and slightly modified for local use.

Trail Monitoring and Maintenance Guidelines

1. A yearly inventory of all trail maintenance, including drainage, vegetation clearing, signing, surfacing, need for graffiti removal, and repair of structures, gates, fences and barriers shall be done in early spring, prior to the heavy summer use period. Based on maintenance reports, trails shall be subject to closure or repair as warranted.

2. Vegetation growth shall be cleared and obstacles shall be removed where necessary. Good pruning practices along trails shall be followed. Ground cover plants and low shrubs shall not be cleared except from the actual trail tread. Noxious plants (e.g. Yellow Star Thistle) shall be controlled along the trail in a timely manner.
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10. To the extent feasible, certain aspects of trail supervision, such as trail safety and security, litter control, and information and education may be accomplished by volunteers. In any event, City staff shall inspect the trails as outlined above.

11. Prior to developing and opening a City trail to public use, a trail management plan that identifies the level of personnel needed to operate and maintain the trail relative to the above guidelines shall be prepared by City staff. Criteria to be included in the trail management plan include, but are not limited to:
   a. anticipated types and levels of use
   b. availability of police and fire protection
   c. trail patrols
   d. annual maintenance requirements
   e. emergency management allotments
   f. management agreements with other agencies
   g. anticipated use of volunteers or contract services

12. Prior to opening for public use, funding for a trail’s maintenance in terms of staffing and equipment will be identified and obtained for the first fiscal year of a new trail’s operations.

13. Emergency Response—Clear actions and personnel responsibilities shall be assigned for monitoring and responding to seasonal and emergency conditions including (but not limited to):
   a. trail closures during seasonal flooding, including gate closures, signage, etc.
   b. trail management during disasters, such as fire, earthquake, etc.
   c. trail failure or major repairs

14. Liability—Trail liability issues and responsibilities should be clearly understood and included as a part of any joint use agreements.

15. Consider an “Adopt-a-Trail” program to assist with long term maintenance similar the Caltrans “Adopt-a-Highway” program.

While funding sources outside of the City’s General Fund exist for trails development (CIB funding and grants for example), there are limited funding opportunities for long-term trails
maintenance. Chapter 7 identifies anticipated trails maintenance costs. As noted in the maintenance guidelines above, funding sources for maintenance need to be identified prior to opening new trails.

TRAILS MASTER PLAN REVIEW

The Trails Master Plan is intended to provide long-term recommendations for development of a comprehensive and coordinated trails system for Gilroy. Flexibility is also needed so that the plan can be adapted to unforeseen future circumstances. Therefore, the following reviews are recommended to ensure that the Trails Master Plan best meets community needs in the future.

As noted in the following table, the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Board (BPAB) is tasked to review and approve specific trail segment priorities each year, based on the criteria established in the Master Plan, recommendations of City staff, and potential funding. A sample trail priority evaluation matrix is included in Appendix 2 and can be used by City staff and the BPAB. The BPAB's recommended trail priorities should be considered by City Council as a part of its annual CIB process. As part of its process of reviewing priorities, the BPAB may periodically survey existing use patterns, either through field observation, web-based surveys, surveys of known user groups, or a combination of methods. In addition, the BPAB should review progress toward implementation of the Master Plan annually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Prepared by</th>
<th>Review/Approval by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review potential trails funding and trail segment priorities</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>City Staff</td>
<td>BPAB, prior to Council CIB review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review progress in implementing the Trails Master Plan</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>BPAB, with report to Parks and Recreation Commission (PRC) and City Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Prepared by</th>
<th>Review/Approval by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review of Trails Funding &amp; Coordination with Potential Grant Funding/Other Funding Sources</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>City Staff</td>
<td>City Council, as part of annual CIB process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update of Trails Master Plan including Trails Master Plan map, standards, maintenance guidelines and costs</td>
<td>Every 5 Years</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td>BPAB; PRC; Planning Commission; City Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOLLOW-UP ACTION ITEMS

The following action items have been identified to coordinate the Trails Master Plan recommendations with other documents.

Residential Development Ordinance

Amend the RDO Rating Scale as recommended in this Chapter.

City of Gilroy Bicycle Pedestrian Transportation Plan

Update the Bicycle Pedestrian Transportation Plan to be consistent with the Trails Master Plan (see Map 3).

Recommendations for the Countywide Trails Master Plan

Recommend the following updates to the Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation Department for the Countywide Trails Master Plan:

1. Relocate Anza Trail (R1-A bike), currently shown along Santa Teresa Boulevard, to follow West Valley Trail (S6) through Uvas Debell Park Preserve.
2. Change Buena Vista/Day Trail (C31) along Buena Vista Avenue and Day Road to be “On-street Bicycle Route within Road Right-of-Way.”
3. Add as a “Connector Trail Route” the local trail outside of current City Limits between Lions Creek (C31) and Uvas-Carnadero Creek (S6).
Implementation

CIIB/Impact Fee Update
Concurrent with Capital Improvement Budget review and possibly with future updates of the Parks and Recreation System Master Plan, consider revising development impact fees to generate more funding for trails development.

TRAILS ADVOCACY
Successful implementation of the Trails Master Plan will require advocacy at all levels. Community members will need to promote trails as a valued community resource. City staff and officials will need to carefully review and condition development projects to assure consistency with the Trails Master Plan. Developers can add value to their projects and the entire community by supporting trails projects. The City can leverage limited funding for trails by actively pursuing grants. Achieving the Trails Master Plan will take a concerted community effort.
Capital Costs

The following chart highlights capital costs for various trail segments. The trail segments have been divided into four quadrants for easier reference. Capital costs include acquisition costs as well as costs to develop the trails, which may include demolition, grading, drainage, paving, fencing, signage, irrigation, and planting. Obviously, different trail segments will cost different amounts per mile depending on the extent and complexity of required construction. Due to its conceptual nature, average costs are used for various types of trails in the master plan. Trail types that have been identified include the following:

1. Pedestrian-only Trails
2. "Class I" Bicycle/Pedestrian Trails
3. Bicycle/Pedestrian/Equestrian Trails

Most of the trails proposed in the Trails Master Plan are Class I bicycle/pedestrian trails. For costing purposes, the Class I bicycle trails have been divided into two categories: trails with high costs and trails with average costs. Trails with high costs are near sensitive environments that may require additional protection or restoration measures; have extensive fencing requirements; involve multiple street crossings; or have other features that will increase the cost per mile.

In addition to the trails costs, fixed features such as bridges and grade-separated crossings have also been included.

Cost data comes from a variety of sources: recent trail construction costs from the City of Gilroy, trail construction cost estimates from the Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation Department, and cost data from the Valley Transportation Authority. Actual costs may vary greatly from these estimates. As trail segments are selected for implementation, more detailed cost projections will be needed as a part of the design process.
Capital Costs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail Segment #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Trail Type</th>
<th>Linear Feet</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
<th>Channel/Creek Crossing</th>
<th>Above Grade Street/Track Crossing</th>
<th>Staging Area</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Creek: Fitzgerald Ave to Rucker Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>3607</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$432,840</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$432,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Creek: Rucker Ave to Buena Vista Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>4156</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$499,220</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$499,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Creek: Buena Vista Ave to Cohansy Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>2917</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$350,040</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$350,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Drainage Channel: Cohansy Ave to Farrell Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$162,720</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$162,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Drainage Channel: Farrell Ave to Church Street</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$165,960</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$165,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Drainage Channel: Church St to Monterey St</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$96,720</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$96,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lions Creek: Lions Creek Bridge to Wren</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$101,400</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$132,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$233,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lions Creek: Wren to Kern Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$162,720</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$162,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>S. Morey Channel: Existing Bridge to St Teresa Blvd</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>2502</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$307,440</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$307,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lions Creek: Kern Ave to Lions Creek Bridge</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$106,440</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$166,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>N. Morey Channel: Lions Creek Bridge to St Teresa Blvd</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$154,800</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$154,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Lions Creek: Lions Creek Bridge to E. Day Rd</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>2715</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$325,800</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$325,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>E. Day Road: to St Teresa Blvd *</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>1751</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$210,120</td>
<td>$330,423</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$540,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>St Teresa Blvd: N. of Longmeadows Dr to E. Day Rd</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>3128</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$375,360</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$375,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>St Teresa Blvd: E. Day Rd to Fitzgerald Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>6313</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$757,560</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$757,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Future High School: Along St Teresa Blvd</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$85,440</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$5,285,440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Lions Creek: St Teresa Blvd to General Plan Boundary (GPB)</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>2688</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$322,560</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$382,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>End of Rancho Hills Dr to GPB</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$5,060</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$5,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Creek: Rancho Hills Dr to GPB</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>2693</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$311,160</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$311,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Creek: Rancho Hills Dr to Carriage Hills Park</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$129,360</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$129,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Future Golf Course: End of Mantell Dr to GPB</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>2408</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$288,960</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$288,960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Assumed Acquisition Cost Per Acre: $411,000
- Assumed Trail Width: 20'

**Sector 1 Total:**
- $5,352,380
- $330,423
- $252,000
- $10,008,000
- $200,000
- $16,134,803
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail Segment #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Trail Type</th>
<th>Linear Feet</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
<th>Channel/Creek Crossing</th>
<th>Above Grade Street/Track Crossing</th>
<th>Staging Area</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Monterey St: Masten Ave to Buena Vista Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>5863</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$1,172,600</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$1,172,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Monterey St: Buena Vista Ave to Farrell Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>3822</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$764,400</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$764,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Las Animas: Monterey St to Murray Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$205,080</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$5,205,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ronan Channel: Leavesley Rd to Murray Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>3029</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$363,480</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$363,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ronan Channel: Monterey St to Murray Ave *</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>2173</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$260,760</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$280,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Leavesley Rd: Anloy Circle to Hollis Lane Rd</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>5722</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$685,040</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$685,040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sector 2 Total: | $3,461,360 | $0 | $0 | $5,000,000 | $0 | $5,461,360 |

* Notes:  
Long Term Class I Alignment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail Segment #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Trail Type</th>
<th>Linear Feet</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
<th>Channel/Creek Bridge Crossing</th>
<th>Aligned Grade/Street Crossing</th>
<th>Staging Area</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Not Used</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>4131</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$495,720</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$495,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Not Used</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>5750</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$690,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$690,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Harker Pass: Hwy 152 to South Valley Community School</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>2905</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$348,600</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$348,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Harker Pass: Trail 31 to South Valley Community School</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>10467</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$1,258,440</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$1,258,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Uvas-Camadero Creek: GPB at Golf Course to St Teresa Blvd</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>7390</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$886,800</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$886,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>St Teresa Blvd: Hwy 152 to 3rd St</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>3175</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$381,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$381,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>St Teresa Blvd: 3rd St to Miller Rd</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>4510</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$541,200</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$541,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>St Teresa Blvd: Miller Rd to Thomas Rd</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>4510</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$486,400</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$486,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>St Teresa Blvd: Thomas Rd to Mesa Rd</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>4510</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$541,200</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$541,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>St Teresa Blvd: Mesa Rd to Route 25 Project</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>4510</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$541,200</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$541,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Mesa Rd: St Teresa Blvd to Sports Park</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>3825</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$459,000</td>
<td>$721,798</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$1,180,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>S. Uvas-Camadero Creek: Sports Park to Luchessa Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>5617</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$674,040</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$674,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>S. Uvas-Camadero Creek: Luchessa Ave to 10th St</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>3561</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$427,320</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$427,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>S. Uvas-Camadero Creek: 10th St to Miller Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$222,840</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$222,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>S. Uvas-Camadero Creek: Miller Ave to St Teresa Blvd</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>4511</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$577,320</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$577,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>N. Uvas-Camadero Creek: Sports Park</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>6157</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$738,480</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$813,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>N. Uvas-Camadero Creek: Sports Park to Luchessa Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$198,360</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$198,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Ridge Trail Access: Miller Staging Area to GPB</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>5045</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$100,900</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$100,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Ridge Trail Access: Alt 1 to GPB</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>6170</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$123,400</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$123,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>S. Uvas-Camadero Creek: Sports Park to GPB</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>4263</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$852,000</td>
<td>$904,450</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$1,732,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Thomas Rd: Monterey St to N. Uvas-Camadero Creek Trail</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>2214</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$265,680</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$265,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>St Teresa Blvd (@ Ballybunion Rd) to Uvas-Camadero Creek Trail</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>2911</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$351,720</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$351,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Segment #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Trail Type</td>
<td>Linear Feet</td>
<td>Unit Cost</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>Channel/Creek Crossing</td>
<td>Above Grade Street Crossing</td>
<td>Stopping Area</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>ST Teresa Blvd (5 Miller Ave) to Uvas-Carradero Creek trail</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>3652</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$438,240</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$438,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>ST Teresa Blvd (5 Miller Ave) to Uvas-Carradero Creek trail @ Glen Loma School</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>3492</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$419,040</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$419,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Along Glen Loma School</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$119,040</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$119,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Mesa Rd. Regional Trail to Hwy 101 *</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>3082</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$369,840</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$369,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54A</td>
<td>Old Hwy 101 Alignment: Uvas-Carradero Creek to Bay Area Ridge Trail **</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>3430</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$34,300</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$34,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sector 3 Total: $12,477,800 $2,446,563 $184,500 $0 $200,000 $15,308,963

* Notes:
  Assumed Acquisition Cost Per Acre: $411,000
  Assumed Trail Width: 20'

** Assumed Trail Faving is Existing
### Gilroy Trails Master Plan Cost Data
#### Sector 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail Segment #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Trail Type</th>
<th>Linear Feet</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
<th>Channel/Creek Crossing</th>
<th>Above Grade Street Crossing</th>
<th>Staging Area</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Ronan Channel: Leavesley Rd to 6th St</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>4971</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$596,520</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$5,966,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>N.West Branch Llajas Creek: Sweeney Court to Holclaw Rd</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>6080</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$729,600</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$729,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>S.West Branch Llajas Creek: Hwy 101 to Holclaw Rd</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>4532</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$543,840</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$543,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Llajas Creek: Leavesley Rd to Gilman Rd</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian/Equestrian</td>
<td>5812</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$697,440</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$697,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Llajas Creek: Gilman Rd to West Branch Llajas Creek</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian/Equestrian</td>
<td>4209</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$505,089</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$655,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Llajas Creek: West Branch Llajas Creek to future ext Luchessa Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian/Equestrian</td>
<td>3067</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$368,049</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$368,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Llajas Creek: Future extension of Luchessa Ave to Lower Miller Slough Inter</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian/Equestrian</td>
<td>3295</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$395,400</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$395,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Llajas Creek: Lower Miller Slough to GPB</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian/Equestrian</td>
<td>8164</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$979,680</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$979,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>N. Uvas-Camadero Creek: Hwy 101 to GPB *</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>2931</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$351,720</td>
<td>$553,095</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$904,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Luchessa Ave: Monterey St to Hwy 152</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>9850</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$1,186,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$1,186,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sector 4 Total:**

- Total Linear Feet: 6,325,320
- Total Subtotal: $553,095
- Total Acquisition: $150,000
- Total Channel/Creek Crossing: $5,000,000
- Total Above Grade Street Crossing: $200,000
- Total Staging Area: $200,000
- Total: $12,228,415

*Notes:
- Assumed Acquisition Cost Per Acre: $411,000
- Assumed Trail Width: 20’

### Cost Data Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector 1 Total</th>
<th>$5,352,360</th>
<th>$330,423</th>
<th>$252,000</th>
<th>$10,000,000</th>
<th>$200,000</th>
<th>$16,134,803</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sector 2 Total</td>
<td>$3,461,360</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,461,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector 3 Total</td>
<td>$12,477,900</td>
<td>$2,446,503</td>
<td>$164,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$15,306,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector 4 Total</td>
<td>$6,325,320</td>
<td>$553,095</td>
<td>$150,300</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$12,228,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>$27,616,960</td>
<td>$3,330,081</td>
<td>$586,500</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$52,133,541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maintenance Costs

The following chart estimates maintenance costs for the various trail segments. Estimated maintenance costs have been derived from past experience of the City of Gilroy along with trails maintenance costs established by the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy. Trails maintenance includes not only the trail itself but also the adjacent right-of-way, which typically includes existing or introduced planting.

For typical Class 1 trails, annual maintenance costs are estimated at $3,500 per mile, and include mowing, herbicide applications, pruning, garbage and litter pick-up, graffiti removal, repair of damaged furnishings, such as benches and signs, and minor trail surfacing repair. In addition to regular annual maintenance, more comprehensive trail resurfacing (re-coating with a slurry seal) and re-striping is estimated to occur every five years, at a cost of approximately $11,500 per mile. These periodic costs have been pro-rated to an annual cost in the attached charts. Costs have been itemized by trail segment. Pedestrian/Equestrian/Bicycle Trails are estimated at a 10% higher cost per mile. Pedestrian only trails are estimated at a 50% lower cost per mile. As noted in Chapter 5, more detailed maintenance projections should be established for each trail segment prior to trail construction and opening.
# Gilroy Trails Master Plan Operations and Maintenance Cost Data
## Sector 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail Segment #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Trail Type</th>
<th>Linear Feet</th>
<th>Trail Maintenance</th>
<th>Recoating Slurry Seal</th>
<th>Re-Striping</th>
<th>Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Creek: Fitzgerald Ave to Rucker Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>3807</td>
<td>2,391</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$7,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Creek: Rucker Ave to Buena Vista Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>4166</td>
<td>2,762</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>$206</td>
<td>$8,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Creek: Buena Vista Ave to Cohanyezy Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>2917</td>
<td>1,934</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>$146</td>
<td>$6,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Drainage Channel: Cohaneyzy Ave to Farrel Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>$68</td>
<td>$2,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Drainage Channel: Farrel Ave to Church St</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>1383</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>$69</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Drainage Channel: Church St to Monterey St</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$1,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lions Creek: Lions Creek Bridge to Wren</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>$42</td>
<td>$1,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lions Creek: Wren to Kern Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>$68</td>
<td>$2,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>S. Morey Channel: Existing Bridge to St Teresa Blvd</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>2562</td>
<td>1,698</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>$128</td>
<td>$5,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lions Creek: Kern Ave to Lions Creek Bridge</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>$44</td>
<td>$1,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>N. Morey Channel: Lions Creek Bridge to St Teresa Blvd</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$2,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Lions Creek: Lions Creek Bridge to E. Day Rd</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>2715</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>$136</td>
<td>$5,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>E. Day Road: to S. Teresa Blvd</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>1751</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>$88</td>
<td>$3,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>St Teresa Blvd: N. of Longmeadows Dr to E. Day Rd</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>3128</td>
<td>2,073</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>$156</td>
<td>$6,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>St Teresa Blvd: E. Day Rd to Fitzgerald Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>6313</td>
<td>4,185</td>
<td>2,424</td>
<td>$39,141</td>
<td>$52,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Future High School: Along St Teresa Blvd</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>$36</td>
<td>$1,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Lions Creek: St Teresa Blvd to General Plan Boundary (GPB)</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>2688</td>
<td>1,782</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>$134</td>
<td>$5,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>End of Rancho Hills Dr to GPB</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Creek: Rancho Hills Dr to GPB</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>2593</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Creek: Rancho Hills Dr to Carriage Hills Park</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>1076</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>$2,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Future Golf Course: End of Mantelli Dr to GPB</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>2408</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sector 1 Total:**

|                        |                                |                  | 44814        | $27,965           | $15,191               | $40,803     | $128,773   |

**Notes:**
- Assumed Maintenance Cost Per Mile of Bicycle/Pedestrian Trail: $3,500
- Assumed Maintenance Cost Per Mile of Pedestrian Trail: $1,750
- Assumed Slurry Recoating Every 5 Years at $.16 Per Foot. Cost for 12' Wide Trail Per Linear Foot: $1.92
- Assumed Restriping Cost Every 5 Years Per Linear Foot: $0.25
## Gilroy Trails Master Plan Operations and Maintenance Cost Data
### Sector 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail Segment #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Trail Type</th>
<th>Lineal Feet</th>
<th>Trail Maintenance</th>
<th>Recoating Slurry Seal</th>
<th>Re-Striping</th>
<th>Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Monterey St: Masten Ave to Buena Vista Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>5863</td>
<td>3,866</td>
<td>2,251</td>
<td>$293</td>
<td>$12,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Monterey St: Buena Vista Ave to Farrell Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>3822</td>
<td>2,534</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>$191</td>
<td>$8,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Las Animas: Monterey St to Murray Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$3,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ronan Channel: Leaveeley Rd to Murray Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>3029</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>1,163</td>
<td>$151</td>
<td>$6,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ronan Channel: Monterey St to Murray Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>2173</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>$109</td>
<td>$4,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Leaesley Rd: Arroyo Circle to Holsclaw Rd</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>5792</td>
<td>3,839</td>
<td>2,224</td>
<td>$290</td>
<td>$12,145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sector 2 Total: |                                    |                  | 22388       | $14,841           | $8,597             | $1,119      | $46,945       |

**Notes:**
- Assumed Maintenance Cost Per Mile of Trail: $3,500
- Assumed Slurry Recoating Every 5 Years at $.16 Per Square Foot. Cost for 12’ Wide Trail Per Linear Foot: $1.92
- Assumed Restriping Cost Every 5 Years Per Linear Foot: $0.25
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail Segment #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Trail Type</th>
<th>Linear Feet</th>
<th>Trail Maintenance</th>
<th>Recreating Slurry Seal</th>
<th>Re-Striping</th>
<th>Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Future Golf Course: Burchell Creek to Mantelli Dr</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>4131</td>
<td>2,738</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>$207</td>
<td>$8,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Not Used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Not Used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Hecker Pass: Hwy 152 to South Valley Community School</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>5750</td>
<td>3,812</td>
<td>2,208</td>
<td>$288</td>
<td>$12,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Hecker Pass: Trail 31 to South Valley Community School</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>2905</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>$145</td>
<td>$6,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Uvas-Camadero Creek: GPB at Golf Course to St Teresa Blvd</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>10487</td>
<td>6,952</td>
<td>4,027</td>
<td>$524</td>
<td>$21,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>St Teresa Blvd: Hwy 152 to 3d St</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>$118</td>
<td>$4,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>St Teresa Blvd: 3d St to Miller Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>7390</td>
<td>4,899</td>
<td>2,838</td>
<td>$370</td>
<td>$15,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>St Teresa Blvd: Miller Ave to Thomas Rd</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>4510</td>
<td>2,990</td>
<td>1,732</td>
<td>$226</td>
<td>$9,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>St Teresa Blvd: Thomas Rd to Mesa Rd</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>3175</td>
<td>2,105</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>$159</td>
<td>$6,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37A</td>
<td>St Teresa Blvd: Mesa Rd. to Route 25 Project</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>2448</td>
<td>1,621</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>$122</td>
<td>$5,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Mesa Rd: St Teresa Blvd to Sports Park</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>3825</td>
<td>2,536</td>
<td>1,469</td>
<td>$191</td>
<td>$8,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>S. Uvas-Camadero Creek: Sports Park to Luchessa Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>5617</td>
<td>3,723</td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td>$281</td>
<td>$11,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>S. Uvas-Camadero Creek: Luchessa Ave to 10th St</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>2561</td>
<td>1,698</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>$128</td>
<td>$5,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>S. Uvas-Camadero Creek: 10th St to Miller Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>1,231</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>$93</td>
<td>$3,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>S. Uvas-Camadero Creek: Miller Ave to St Teresa Blvd</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>4811</td>
<td>3,189</td>
<td>1,847</td>
<td>$241</td>
<td>$10,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>N. Uvas-Camadero Creek: Sports Park</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>6157</td>
<td>4,081</td>
<td>2,364</td>
<td>$308</td>
<td>$12,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>N. Uvas-Camadero Creek: Sports Park to Luchessa Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>$83</td>
<td>$3,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Ridge Trail Access: Miller Staging Area to GPB</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>5045</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Ridge Trail Access: Alt 1 to GPB</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>4619</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Ridge Trail Access: Alt 2 to GPB</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>5170</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>S. Uvas-Camadero Creek: Sports Park to GPB</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>4877</td>
<td>3,233</td>
<td>1,873</td>
<td>$244</td>
<td>$10,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48A</td>
<td>N. Uvas-Camadero Creek: Sports Park to GPB</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>4263</td>
<td>2,826</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>$213</td>
<td>$9,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Thomas Rd: Monterey St to N. Uvas-Camadero Creek</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>2214</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>$111</td>
<td>$4,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>St Teresa Blvd (@ Ballyunion Rd) to Uvas-Camadero Creek trail</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>2931</td>
<td>1,943</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>$147</td>
<td>$6,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>St Teresa Blvd (@ Miller Ave) to Uvas-Camadero Creek trail</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>3652</td>
<td>2,421</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>$183</td>
<td>$7,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>St Teresa Blvd (@ Miller Ave) to Uvas-Camadero Creek trail @ Glen Loma School</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>3492</td>
<td>2,315</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$7,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Along Glen Loma School</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$2,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Mesa Rd: Regional Trail to Hwy 101</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>3082</td>
<td>2,043</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>$154</td>
<td>$6,463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Gilroy Trails Master Plan Operations and Maintenance Cost Data

## Sector 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail Segment #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Trail Type</th>
<th>Linear Feet</th>
<th>Trail Maintenance</th>
<th>Recoating Slurry Seal</th>
<th>Re-Striping</th>
<th>Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54A</td>
<td>Old Hwy 101 Alignment: Uvas-Camadero Creek to Bay Area Ridge Trail</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td>3430</td>
<td>2,274</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>$172</td>
<td>$7,192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sector 3 Total:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linear Feet</th>
<th>Trail Maintenance</th>
<th>Recoating Slurry Seal</th>
<th>Re-Striping</th>
<th>Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>113395</td>
<td>$70,251</td>
<td>$37,847</td>
<td>$4,928</td>
<td>$226,421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- Assumed Maintenance Cost Per Mile of Bicycle/Pedestrian Trail: $3,500
- Assumed Maintenance Cost Per Mile of Pedestrian Trail: $1,750
- Assumed Slurry Recoating Every 5 Years at $.16 Per Square Foot. Cost for 12' Wide Trail Per Linear Foot: $1.92
- Assumed Restriping Cost Every 5 Years Per Linear Foot: $0.25
## Gilroy Trails Master Plan Operations and Maintenance Cost Data

### Sector 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail Segment #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Trail Type</th>
<th>Linear Feet</th>
<th>Trail Maintenance</th>
<th>Recaoting Slurry Seal</th>
<th>Re-Stripping</th>
<th>Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Ronan Channel: Leavesley Rd to 6th St</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>4971</td>
<td>3,295</td>
<td>1,909</td>
<td>$249</td>
<td>$10,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>N.West Branch Llagas Creek: Hwy 101 to Holscaw Rd</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>6080</td>
<td>4,030</td>
<td>2,336</td>
<td>$304</td>
<td>$12,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>S.West Branch Llagas Creek: Hwy 101 to Holscas Rd</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>4532</td>
<td>3,004</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>$227</td>
<td>$9,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Llagas Creek: Leavesley Rd to Gilman Rd</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian/Equestrian</td>
<td>5812</td>
<td>4,238</td>
<td>2,232</td>
<td>$291</td>
<td>$12,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Llagas Creek: Gilman Rd to West Branch Llagas Creek</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian/Equestrian</td>
<td>4209</td>
<td>3,069</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>$210</td>
<td>$9,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Llagas Creek: West Branch Llagas Creek to future extension of Luchessa Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian/Equestrian</td>
<td>3067</td>
<td>2,236</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>$153</td>
<td>$6,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Llagas Creek: Future extension of Luchessa Ave to Lower Miller Slough intersection</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian/Equestrian</td>
<td>3295</td>
<td>2,403</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>$165</td>
<td>$7,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Llagas Creek: Lower Miller Slough to GPB</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian/Equestrian</td>
<td>8164</td>
<td>5,953</td>
<td>3,135</td>
<td>$408</td>
<td>$17,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>N. Uvas-Camadero Creek: Hwy 101 to GPB &quot;2&quot;</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>2931</td>
<td>1,943</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>$147</td>
<td>$6,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Luchessa Ave: Monterey St to Hwy 152</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>9650</td>
<td>6,397</td>
<td>3,708</td>
<td>$483</td>
<td>$20,235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sector 4 Total:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linear Feet</th>
<th>Trail Maintenance</th>
<th>Recaoting Slurry Seal</th>
<th>Re-Stripping</th>
<th>Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52711</td>
<td>$36,568</td>
<td>$20,241</td>
<td>$2,636</td>
<td>$112,156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- Assumed Maintenance Cost Per Mile of Bicycle/Pedestrian Trail: $3,500
- Assumed Maintenance Cost Per Mile of Bicycle/Pedestrian/Equestrian Trail: $3,650
- Assumed Slurry Recaoting Every 5 Years at $.16 Per Square Foot. Cost for 12' Wide Trail Per Linear Foot: $1.92
- Assumed Re-Stripping Cost Every 5 Years Per Linear Foot: $0.25

### Operations and Maintenance Cost Data Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector 1 Total</th>
<th>44814</th>
<th>$27,965</th>
<th>$15,191</th>
<th>$40,803</th>
<th>$128,773</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sector 2 Total</td>
<td>22388</td>
<td>$14,841</td>
<td>$8,597</td>
<td>$1,119</td>
<td>$46,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector 3 Total</td>
<td>113395</td>
<td>$70,251</td>
<td>$37,847</td>
<td>$4,928</td>
<td>$226,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector 4 Total</td>
<td>52711</td>
<td>$36,568</td>
<td>$20,241</td>
<td>$2,636</td>
<td>$112,156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linear Feet</th>
<th>Trail Maintenance</th>
<th>Recaoting Slurry Seal</th>
<th>Re-Stripping</th>
<th>Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>233308</td>
<td>$149,624</td>
<td>$81,876</td>
<td>$49,486</td>
<td>$514,295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Funding Sources

The City's existing revenue sources (General Fund and Park Development Fund) are not sufficient to fund all of the trails improvements recommended in the Trails Master Plan. Clearly, other revenue services will be needed. As noted in the Implementation Chapter, developer contributions to trails should be encouraged through the RDO process. In addition, the City should actively pursue grants to maximize use of limited local funds. The following chart lists numerous grant-funding sources that should be actively pursued.
## Potential Trail Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Grant Source</strong></th>
<th><strong>Grant Description / Purpose</strong></th>
<th><strong>Contact Info</strong></th>
<th><strong>Due Date</strong></th>
<th><strong>Grant Amount</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal &amp; State Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Trails Program (RTP), with Motorized and Non-motorized divisions</td>
<td>Provides funds to develop and maintain recreational trails for motorized and non-motorized recreational trails users.</td>
<td>California State Parks, Office of Grants &amp; Local Services; P.O.Box 942896, Sacramento, CA 94296-0001 Ph: 916-653-7423</td>
<td>3-Oct-05</td>
<td>$2.2 million per year available for 80% of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Transportation Account (Caltrans Bicycle Facilities Unit)</td>
<td>Grant funds for new bike paths, bike lanes, and bike routes, etc. Cities or counties may apply.</td>
<td>Pam McGuire, Caltrans Bicycle Facilities Unit, CDOT, 1120 N Street; M.S. #1; Sacramento, CA 95814. Ph: 916-653-0036 <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/">www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/</a></td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>$7 Million per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Conservation Corps (CCC)</td>
<td>Source of volunteer labor for public projects that must provide a natural resource or other public benefit, and provide corps members with education &amp; training</td>
<td>Walt Auburn, Margaret Behan, or Kurt Shwank, Supervisor; 1719 24th St. Sacramento, CA 95816 Ph: 916-341-3155 or Fax: 916-445-1007 <a href="http://www.ccc.ca.gov">www.ccc.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Program (RBPP)</td>
<td>Funds for bicycle and pedestrian projects in the San Francisco Area</td>
<td>Doug Johnson at (510) 464-7846 or via e-mail <a href="mailto:djohnson@mtc.ca.gov">djohnson@mtc.ca.gov</a> 101 Eighth Street Oakland, CA 94607 Fax 510.464.7848</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>25% regional matching funds with 75% county. $6 million available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Conservancy Non-Profit Grants Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>Access Program Manager, Coastal Conservancy 1330 Broadway, Suite 1100; Oakland, CA 94612</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Up to $500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Resources Grant Program (Firestone Grants)</td>
<td>Provides grants to coastal counties and cities impacted by the effect of offshore energy development. Grants cover enhancement/restoration efforts, planning, acquisition, and the Coastal Trail.</td>
<td>Chris Potter, California Resources Agency; 1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1311; Sacramento, CA 95814. Ph: 916-653-5656. Fax: 916-653-8102</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Part A – $500 K, for offshore energy development. Part B – $100 K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Block Grants (by HUD)</td>
<td>Fund neighborhood revitalization, economic development, and provision of improved community facilities and services</td>
<td>Robert Ilumin, 450 Golden Gate Ave; San Francisco, CA 94102; 415-436-6490 or <a href="mailto:robert_g_ilumin@hud.gov">robert_g_ilumin@hud.gov</a></td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Source</td>
<td>Grant Description / Purpose</td>
<td>Contact Info</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
<td>Grant Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEMP (Environmental Enhancement &amp; Mitigation Program)</td>
<td>Grants for supplemental mitigation of the environmental impacts of modified or new public transportation facilities. Must add onto other mitigation projects. Not stand-alone grants. May have a direct or indirect connection to the environmental impacts of a transportation project.</td>
<td>Carolyn Dudley, State Resources Agency; 1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1311, Sacramento, CA 95814 Ph. 916-653-5656. Fax: 916-653-8102 <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/eem/eemframe.htm">www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/eem/eemframe.htm</a></td>
<td>November every year</td>
<td>Grants range to $250,000, with $2 million available total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Education Grant Program (EPA)</td>
<td>Provides funding for implementation of site facilities, networking, inter-disciplinary planning and implementation. Public organizations and non-profits may apply.</td>
<td>Bill Andrews; Environmental Education Grant Program, Policy and Program Coordination Unit A; 721 Capitol Mall; Sacramento, CA 95814 916-657-5378</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>$3 K to $10 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Education Grants (EPA)</td>
<td>Ideal for funding interpretive elements for your trail. Provide support for projects which design, demonstrate, or disseminate environmental education practices, methods, or techniques.</td>
<td>Stacey Benfer; US EPA-REGION 9; 75 Hawthorne St.; San Francisco, CA 94105; Ph. 415-744-1161 or Fax: 415-744-1072 <a href="mailto:benfer.stacey@epamail.epa">benfer.stacey@epamail.epa</a></td>
<td>November 15, 2005</td>
<td>$5K to $25 K per project. 75% matching funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Conservation Fund Program (HCF)</td>
<td>Provides matching funds for the acquisition, enhancement, and restoration of wildlife areas, and for programs that bring urban residents into park and wildlife areas. Local units of governments may apply.</td>
<td>Mr. Odel King, Manager, Grants Administration, State Dept. of Parks &amp; Recreation, Local Services Section, 1416 9th St. Room 1449-1, P.O. Box 942896, Sacramento, CA 94296-0001 Ph. 916-653-8758 <a href="http://www.parks.ca.gov/grants/hcf/hcf.htm">www.parks.ca.gov/grants/hcf/hcf.htm</a></td>
<td>October every year</td>
<td>$2 million available each year until 2020 — 50% state matching funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Coastal Wetland Conservation Grants</td>
<td>Grants for the acquisition, restoration, or enhancement, and management of interests in coastal lands or waters. State agencies may apply.</td>
<td>Chris McKay; U.S. Fish &amp; Wildlife Service, 911 NE 11th Ave; Portland, OR 97232-4181 Ph. 503-231-6128 Email: <a href="mailto:Chris_McKay@mail.fws.gov">Chris_McKay@mail.fws.gov</a> or Steve Horn 510-286-4158</td>
<td>Early June each year</td>
<td>$10-$12 million total funds; 50% matching funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Source</td>
<td>Grant Description / Purpose</td>
<td>Contact Info</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
<td>Grant Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Endowment for the Arts</td>
<td>Promotes excellence in design by funding activities which include urban design, historic preservation, planning, architecture, and landscape architecture. Grants may be used for initiating design projects, though funding is not available for capital improvement and construction.</td>
<td>Peter Holly; National Endowment for the Arts; 1100 Pennsylvania Ave., Washington, D.C. 20506. Ph: 202-682-5437</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park Service: Rivers, Trails, &amp; Conservation Assistance Program</td>
<td>Provides staff assistance for river, trail, and conservation projects.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nps.gov/pwro/rtca">www.nps.gov/pwro/rtca</a></td>
<td>Aug. 1 every year</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Access Program (Department of Fish &amp; Game)</td>
<td>Funds for the acquisition or improvements which preserve wildlife habitat or provide recreational access for hunting, fishing, or other wildlife oriented recreation. Not grants, but state projects developed in cooperation with local governments.</td>
<td>Georgia Lipphardt; Wildlife Conservation Board; CA Dept. of Fish &amp; Game, 1416 Ninth St. Sacramento, CA 95814 Ph. 916-445-8448</td>
<td>Quarterly; Feb, May, Aug., Nov.</td>
<td>Up to $250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land &amp; Water Conservation Fund (LWCF)</td>
<td>Grants may be used for statewide recreational planning and for acquiring and developing recreational parks and facilities, especially in urban areas. Federal &amp; state agencies, cities, counties, and park districts may apply.</td>
<td>Mr. Odel King, Manager, Grants Administration, State Dept. of Parks &amp; Recreation, Local Services Section, 1416 9th St. Room 1449-1, P.O. Box 942896, Sacramento, CA 94296-0001 Ph. 916-653-8758 <a href="http://www.parks.ca.gov/grants/lwcf/lwcf.htm">www.parks.ca.gov/grants/lwcf/lwcf.htm</a></td>
<td>May each year</td>
<td>$10,000 to $200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)</td>
<td>Grants for roads, bridges, transit capital and bicycle &amp; pedestrian projects including bike parking facilities at terminals, bike racks on buses, bike-activated traffic lights and preservation of abandoned railway corridors for trails.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/cmagrstp.htm">www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/cmagrstp.htm</a></td>
<td>Depends on the MPO (Metropolitan Planning Org.). Some annual, some less frequent</td>
<td>$320 million annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Source</td>
<td>Grant Description / Purpose</td>
<td>Contact Info</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
<td>Grant Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Based Transportation Planning and Demonstration Grant Program</td>
<td>Supports demonstration planning projects that provide an example of livable community concepts</td>
<td>Caltrans Community Planning Branch, D.O.T., 120 N. St., MS-621, Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
<td>November every year</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum Violation Escrow Account (PVEA)</td>
<td>Funds projects that conserve energy and that benefit, directly or indirectly, consumers of petroleum products within the state. Funded by legislation each year</td>
<td><a href="http://www.energy.ca.gov/commission/budget/">www.energy.ca.gov/commission/budget/</a></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School Program (SR2S)</td>
<td>Funds projects that improve the safety of pedestrian and bicycle routes to/from schools.</td>
<td>Randy Rosping (<a href="mailto:Randy.Rosping@dot.ca.gov">Randy.Rosping@dot.ca.gov</a>)</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)</td>
<td>State funding for a variety of transportation projects, such as carpool lanes, transit stations, and other facilities.</td>
<td>Santa Clara County Congestion Management Agency, 101 Main St., Suite 240, San Jose, CA 95110, Ph: 408-454-4030, <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/trace/">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/trace/</a></td>
<td>Biannual process</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazard Elimination Safety (HES) Program</td>
<td>Purpose is to improve safety on all public roads and highways, including bicycle, pedestrian and traffic calming measures. Funds originate from a 10% STP set aside. City and county agencies may apply.</td>
<td>Caltrans Local Assistance Office, 111 Grand Ave., P.O. Box 23680, Oakland, CA 94623-0680, 510-286-5226, <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/lalocalPrograms">www.dot.ca.gov/hq/lalocalPrograms</a></td>
<td>July - project solicitation, Nov. - submit projects</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Potential Trail Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Source</th>
<th>Grant Description / Purpose</th>
<th>Contact Info</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local &amp; Regional Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Water District</td>
<td>Funds are allocated for the development of trails, parks, and open space, to increase public access to, and enjoyment of, public areas for increased recreational opportunities. Cities, counties, park districts or non-profits may apply.</td>
<td>Bryan Mendenhall, Watershed Planning Unit, Santa Clara Valley Water District, 5750 Almaden Expressway, San Jose, CA 95118 Ph. 408-265-2607, ext. 3093 <a href="mailto:bmendenhall@valleywater.org">bmendenhall@valleywater.org</a></td>
<td>March 30, 2005 Biennial Program</td>
<td>Total of $900,000 is available each cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Bicycle Expenditure Program</td>
<td>To provide a countywide bicycle network</td>
<td>Valley Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Every two years</td>
<td>Varies by project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foundation &amp; Corporate Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikes Belong Coalitions, Ltd.</td>
<td>Goal: to encourage more people to ride bicycles more often throughout the US.</td>
<td>Tim Baldwin (<a href="mailto:tim@bikesbelong.org">tim@bikesbelong.org</a>), Grants Program Administrator, Bikes Belong Coalition, Ltd. 1368 Beacon Street, Suite 102, Brookline, MA 02446-2800 Ph. 617-734-2111 <a href="http://www.bikesbelong.org">www.bikesbelong.org</a></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Equipment, Inc. (REI) Corporation Contribution Program</td>
<td>Provides grants to nonprofit organizations to help them encourage participation and safety in muscle-powered activities. Also to promote increased access to recreational opportunities.</td>
<td>Marianne Jones, REI, Public Affairs Department, P.O. Box 1938, Sumner, WA 98390-0800 Ph. 206-395-5928 <a href="http://www.rei.org">www.rei.org</a></td>
<td>Ongoing – evaluation takes 8-12 weeks</td>
<td>$250 - $2500 per grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF)</td>
<td>Goal: to promote healthy communities and lifestyles. Does not fund on-going operating expenses, existing deficits, endowment or capital costs, etc.</td>
<td>Richard J. Toth, Director, Office of Proposal Management (OPM), The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Route 1 and College Road, P.O. Box 2316, Princeton, NJ, 08543-2316 Ph. 609-452-8701 <a href="http://www.rwjf.org">www.rwjf.org</a></td>
<td>Ongoing – national programs have specific deadlines</td>
<td>Grants range from $2000 to $14 million. Most about $275,000.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Appendix 1

## Trails Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>City of Gilroy Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class One Trail Sections</td>
<td>Urban Shared-Use Trail Sections, T-1, T-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Adjacent to Creek, Park or Open Space</td>
<td>T-5A, T-5B, T-18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tree spacing and location shall be site and species specific. Trees shall be selected and spaced based on mature tree size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Trail</td>
<td>Natural Tread for Hikers G-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use</td>
<td>Shared Use Trails G-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian/Equestrian Shared Use Trail</td>
<td>T-8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Intersections</td>
<td>T-9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Ending at Cul-de-Sac</td>
<td>T-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Use City of Gilroy standard collapsible bollard. Space adequately for safe passages of bicycle trailers such as Burleys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Intersections</td>
<td>T-12A-T13B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail on Levee</td>
<td>T-15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levee Undercrossing</td>
<td>T-16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creek Crossings</td>
<td>T-17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Markings</td>
<td>T-14, T-19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Signage</td>
<td>S-1-S-11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Use City of Gilroy standard park identification signs at major trail entrances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
<td>T-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Gate</td>
<td>T-11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Trail Fencing</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant List</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-Street bikeway connections</td>
<td>Standards included in the <em>Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Fencing adjacent to drainage channels</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:**

1. *Uniform Interjurisdictional Trail Design, Use and Management Guidelines*  
   *Santa Clara County Interjurisdictional Trails Committee, April 15, 1999*
2. *Countywide Trails Master Plan*  
   *Santa Clara County, November 14, 1995*
3. *Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan*  
   *City of Gilroy, February, 2002*
4. *Bicycle Technical Guidelines*  
   *Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, September 2, 1999*
5. *Gilroy Trails Master Plan*
Urban Shared-Use Trail Sections T-1

Uniform Interjurisdictional Trail Design, Use, and Management Guidelines
Santa Clara County Interjurisdictional Trails Committee

Centerline Stripe: 4" (100 mm) yellow centerline stripe, continuous on curves.

Note: See Figure T-3 for landscape guidelines.

Optimum 2% cross slope for drainage.

2'-0" (0.6 m) graded shoulder.

12'-0" (3.7 m) optimum.

Paved Trail
(See Figure T-2, A and B)

Section A

Paved Trail in Turf Area
(See Figure T-2, C)

Section B

Centerline Stripe: 4" (100 mm) yellow centerline stripe, continuous on curves.

Optimum 2% cross slope for drainage.

2'-0" (0.6 m) graded shoulder.

12'-0" (3.7 m) optimum.

Combination Paved Trail and Unpaved Jogging Trail
(See Figure T-2, A and B)

Section C

Related Policies: UD-2.2.2; UD-3.5.4; UD-4.11.1; UM-3.4

Notes:
- For natural-surfaced trail cross-sections and urban Shared-Use Trails that include an equestrian shoulder, refer to the 1995 Countywide Trails Master Plan, Figures G-2 and G-3.
- Trail shoulders: 2' (0.6 m) graded shoulder; 2" (0.6 m) minimum vegetation clearance; prune all brush over 12" (0.3 m) in height and 1/2" (12 mm) dia. that extends into trailway.
- Centerline stripes should be used along trails. Solid centerline stripes should be used where there is heavy use, on curves greater than 100 feet long (30.5 m) with restricted sight distances, and where the path is unlit or nighttime riding is expected. Dashed stripes should be used where there is heavy use but only where sight distances permit.
- "Optimum": The best or most favorable condition for a particular trail situation from the perspective of responsible management.
- Reference Also: Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000 Bikeway Planning and Design; Topic 1003 - Design Criteria; and Topic 1004 - Uniform Signa. California State Department of Transportation.

Final: April 15, 1999
T-2  Trail Edge Details

Uniform Intergovernmental Trail Design, Use, and Management Guidelines
Santa Clara County Intergovernmental Trails Committee

2'-0" (0.6 m) compacted shoulder; material type may vary; flush with top of trail surface;

Asphalt paving; 1/2" (12 mm) maximum aggregate size

Note: On levees, near streams, or in areas with sensitive resource constraints as determined by the local agency, trail surface could be composed of compacted Class II aggregate base course.

2'-0" (0.6 m) shoulder; decomposed granite; flush with top of trail surface; 95% compaction

Class II aggregate base course; compacted to 95%

2'-0" (0.6 m) compacted shoulder for turf; flush with top of concrete curb

Reinforced concrete curb; ease top edges; broom finish; expansion joints at 20' on center

Related Policies:

Notes:
- As soil conditions vary through Santa Clara County, soil tests should be made on a case-by-case basis prior to trail design.
- The cross-section design of any trail located on a flood-control levee should be developed to a standard to accommodate Santa Clara Valley Water District vehicle access requirements.

- "Optimum": The best or most favorable condition for a particular trail situation from the perspective of responsible management;
- Reference Also: Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000 Bikeway Planning and Design; Topic 1003 - Design Criteria; and Topic 1004 - Uniform Signs. California State Department of Transportation.

Final: April 15, 1999
Trail Adjacent to Creek, Park, or Open Space

Uniform Interjurisdictional Trail Design, Use, and Management Guidelines
Santa Clara County Interjurisdictional Trails Committee

See Also Figure T-5B

Center Line Stripes: 4" (100 mm) yellow centerline stripe, continuous on curve
Asphalt Trail
(see Figures T-1B and T-2C)

2' (0.6 m) graded shoulder
2% slope

2 (0.6 m) graded shoulder

3'-6" (1.2 m) minimum
for tree, sign, or other obstruction

8'-0" (2.4 m) optimum

Related Policies: UD-1.1; UD-1.1.4; UD-2.2.2; UD-3.5.6; UD-4.11.1; UM-3.4

Notes:
- Maximum grade of 5% is optimum; 8.33% maximum for short sections.
- Trail shoulders: 2' (0.6 m) graded shoulder / 2' (0.6 m) minimum vegetation clearance; prune all brush over 12' (3.7 m) in height and 12' (3.7 m) dia. that extends into trailway.
- Centerline stripes should be used along trails. Solid centerline stripes should be used where there is heavy use, on curves greater than 100 feet long (30.5 m) with restricted sight distances, and where the path is unlighted and nighttime riding is expected. Dashed stripes should be used where there is heavy use but only where sight distances permit.
- "Optimum": The best or most favorable condition for a particular trail situation from the perspective of responsible management
- Reference Also: Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000 Bikeway Planning and Design, Topic 1003 - Design Criteria; and Topic 1004 - Uniform Signs, California State Department of Transportation.

Final: April 15, 1999
Plan: Trail Adjacent to Creek, Park, or Open Space

Uniform Interjurisdictional Trail Design, Use, and Management Guidelines
Santa Clara County Interjurisdictional Trails Committee

See Also Figure T-5A

3'-6" (1.2 m) minimum for tree, sign, or other obstruction

12'-0" (3.7 m) optimum

14'-6" (4.5 m) optimum

NOTE: Motorized vehicle ingress/egress to parking areas or building service areas should be altered not to cross trail whenever feasible

Building

Landcape Easement

50' (15.2 m) minimum transition radius typ.

10'-0" (3.1 m) optimum

12'-0" (3.7 m) optimum

8'-0" (2.4 m) optimum

30' (9.1 m) or Greater Optimum Easement / Right-of-way

If trail meanders, width of easement / right-of-way may vary accordingly

Property line, edge of park or open space area, fence, or top of bank

Shade trees @ 25' (7.6 m) o.c. staggered (optional)

Structure or feature (e.g. utility box or fire hydrant) requiring trail to change alignment

Related Policies: UD-1.1.1; UD-1.1.4; UD 2.2.2; UD-4.11.1

* "Optimum": The best or most favorable condition for a particular trail situation from the perspective of responsible management

* Reference Also: Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000 Bikeway Planning and Design; Topic 1003 - Design Criteria; and Topic 1004 - Uniform Signs, California State Department of Transportation.

Final: April 15, 1999
"Inverted U" Style Bicycle Rack

- 3'-0" (1.0 m)
- 1'-0" (0.3 m)

Profile View

Profile View

Side View

2'-0" (0.6 m) clear space from any wall, fence or other obstruction

3'-0" (0.9 m) optimum clear space
- "from trail for access and circulation
- 7'-0" (2.1 m) from edge of rack

Plan View

Source: Wilbur Smith Associates

Related Policies:

- "Optimum": The best or most favorable condition for a particular trail situation from the perspective of responsible management.
- Reference Also: Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000 Bikeway Planning and Design; Topic 10C3 - Design Criteria; and Topic 10C4 - Uniform Signs, California State Department of Transportation.

Final: April 15, 1999
Trail Intersections T-8

Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Direction of Sign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trail Post</td>
<td>Direction of Markings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Safety Sign
"Caution Congested Area"
(See Figure S-9)

Trail Entrance Bollard and Use Signs
(See Figure S-5)

15'-0" (4.6 m) radius typ.

Regulatory Sign
"Reduce Speed Ahead / End of Trail"
(See Figure S-8)

Trail Entrance Bollard and Use Signs
(See Figure S-5)

Trail Mileage Marker and Direction Sign
(See Figure S-6)

Trail

Trail Mileage Marker and Direction Sign
(See Figure S-6)

Trail Entrance Bollard and Use Signs
(See Figure S-5)

Safety Sign
"Caution Congested Area"
(See Figure S-9)

Plan

Related Policies: UD-1.1.6.1

* "Optimum": The best or most favorable condition for a particular trail situation from the perspective of responsible management

+ Reference Also: Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000 Bikeway Planning and Design; Topic 1003 - Design Criteria; and Topic 1004 - Uniform Signs, California State Department of Transportation.

Final: April 15, 1999
T-9 Trail Ending At Parking Area or Cul-de-Sac

Uniform Interjurisdictional Trail Design, Use, and Management Guidelines
Santa Clara County Interjurisdictional Trails Committee

Legend

Sign
Direction of Sign

Trail Post
Direction of Markings

Regulatory Sign
"Reduce Speed Ahead / End of Trail"
(See Figure S-2)

Trail Mileage Marker and Direction Sign (See Figure S-6)

Trail Entrance Sign
(See Figure S-4)

15'-0" (4.6 m) radius typ.

Turf or low plantings: Use turf blocks for fire access if required.

Regulatory Sign
"Stop"
(See Figure S-8)

Trail Bollards (See Figure T-10)

Trail Entrance Bollard and Use Signs (See Figure S-5)

Red curb (no parking)

4" (100 mm) Red Curb (no parking) for emergency access

6" (150 mm) Curb and Gutter

Curb cut for trail

Cul-de-Sac or Staging Area

Related Policies: UD-4.2.1

* "Optimum": The best or most favorable condition for a particular trail situation from the perspective of responsible management
* Reference Also: Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000 Bikeway Planning and Design; Topic 1003 - Design Criteria; and Topic 1004 - Uniform Signs. California State Department of Transportation.

Final: April 15, 1991
Typical Trail Barrier Posts T-10

Uniform Interjurisdictional Trail Design, Use, and Management Guidelines
Santa Clara County Interjurisdictional Trails Committee

Plan

Stripe: Yellow; 4" (100 mm) wide

Collapsible Bollard

Bollard: 4" diameter (100 mm) steel pipe w/ smoothed top edge (brown)

Yellow Reflecter Tape: 2' x 10" (50 mm x 250mm) stripes; two sides

Elevation

Related Policies: UD-4.2.1; UD-4.11.1

* "Optimum": The best or most favorable condition for a particular trail situation from the perspective of responsible management
* Reference Also: Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000 Bikeway Planning and Design; Topic 1003 - Design Criteria; and Topic 1004 - Uniform Signs, California State Department of Transportation.

Final: April 15, 1999
T-11 Trail Maintenance Gate

Related Policies: UD-4.2.1; UD-4.2.3

- "Optimum": The best or most favorable condition for a particular trail situation from the perspective of responsible management
- Reference: AASHTO Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000 Bikeway Planning and Design; Topic 1003 - Design Criteria; and Topic 1004 - Uniform Signs. California State Department of Transportation.

Final: April 15, 1981
Major Street / Signalized Street Intersection

Legend

- Sign
  - Direction of Sign
- Trail Post
  - Direction of Markings

**SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION**

- Trail Crossing; white stripes on blue background
- Trail Safety Sign
  - "Caution - Vehicular Cross Traffic" (see Figure S-9)
- Bicycle Stop Bar / Limit Line
- Regulatory Sign
  - "Stop" (see Figure S-8)
- Bicycle loop activators for traffic signal
  - (See Figure T-14A)
- Trail Safety Sign
  - "Upcoming Stop Sign" (see Figure S-9)
- Note: if necessary, shield sign so it will not be seen by motorists on street

- Pedestrian Crosswalk
- Push-button (to meet ADA requirements) activator for traffic signal.

- Roadway Regulatory Sign
  - "No Right Turn On Red" and Roadway Caution Sign
  - "Yield to Bikes" (see Figure S-10)

- Trail Entrance Bollard and Use Signs
  - (See Figure S-10)

- Caution Sign
  - "Trail Crossing Head - Look Right" (see Figure S-10)

- Related Policies: UD-1.15; UD-4.16; UD-4.17

- 2'-6" (0.8 m)
- 1'-6" (0.5 m)

- Trail Crossing: white stripes on blue background

- Trail Safety Sign
  - "Caution - Vehicular Cross Traffic" (see Figure S-9)

- Bicycle Stop Bar / Limit Line

- Regulatory Sign
  - "Stop" (see Figure S-8)

- Bicycle loop activators for traffic signal
  - (See Figure T-14A)

- Trail Safety Sign
  - "Upcoming Stop Sign" (see Figure S-9)

- Note: if necessary, shield sign so it will not be seen by motorists on street

- "Optimum": The best or most favorable condition for a particular trail situation from the perspective of responsible management
- Reference also: Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000 Bikeway Planning and Design; Topic 1002 - Design Criteria; and Topic 1004 - Uniform Signs. California State Department of Transportation.

Finals: April 15, 1999
T-12B Major Street / Signalized Street Intersection

* "Optimum": The best or most favorable condition for a particular trail situation from the perspective of responsible management

* Reference Also: Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000 Bikeway Planning and Design; Topic 1003 - Design Criteria; and Topic 1004 - Uniform Signs, California State Department of Transportation.

Final: April 15, 1999
Trail / Major Street Intersection - Signalized T-13A

Legend

- Sign
- Direction of Sign
- Trail Post
- Direction of Markings
- Regulatory Sign "Stop Ahead for Traffic" (See Figure 5-8)
- Trail Mileage Marker and Direction Sign (See Figure 5-6)
- 100' (30.4 m) to intersection
- Island: Paved; 6" (150 mm) rolled curb
- Trail Entrance Sign (See Figure 5-4)
- Trail Entrance Bollard and Use Signs (See Figure 5-5)
- Roadway Caution Sign "Trail Crossing - Look Left and Right" Locate prior to trail crossing (See Figure 5-10)
- Push-button (to meet ADA requirements) and bicycle loop activators for traffic signal (See Figure T-14)
- Curb Cut (to meet ADA requirements)
- Stop Bar / Limit Line 10'-0" (3.0 m) from Trail Crossing
- Traffic Signal
- Traffic Signal for Trail
- Regulatory Sign "Stop Ahead for Traffic" (See Figure 5-8)
- Major Street (4-lane; high volume)

Related Policies: UD-1.1.5; UD-1.1.6.2; UD-4.16; UD-4.17

- "Optimum": The best or most favorable condition for a particular trail situation from the perspective of responsible management
- Reference: Also: Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000 Bikeway Planning and Design; Topic 1003 - Design Criteria; and Topic 1004 - Uniform Signs. California State Department of Transportation.

Final: April 15, 1999
T-13B Trail / Minor Street Intersection - Not Signalized

Legend

- Sign - Direction of Sign
- Trail Post - Direction of Markings

- Regulatory Sign "Stop Ahead for Traffic" (See Figure 5-8)
- Trail Mileage Marker and Direction Sign (See Figure 5-8)

100' (30.4 m) to intersection

- Island: Paved; 6" (150 mm) rolled curb
- Trail Entrance Sign (See Figure 5-4)

Roadway Sign "Stop" (See Figure 5-8)

- Trail Entrance Bollard and Use Signs (See Figure 5-5)

- Stop Bar / Limit Line 10'-0" (3 m) from Trail Crossing

- Sidewalk

- Trail Crossing (white stripes on blue background)

- Sidewalk

- Regulatory Sign "Stop" (See Figure 5-8)

- Roadway Sign "Caution - Trail Crossing Look Left and Right" Locate prior to trail crossing (See Figure 5-10)

Note: on streets where trail has right-of-way, install a 3" to 4" (75 mm to 100 mm) rise in pavement height for entire width of trail crossing.

Related Policies: UD-1.1.5; UD-1.1.6.2; UD 4.1.6; UD-4.17

- "Optimum": The best or most favorable condition for a particular trail situation from the perspective of responsible management

Final: April 15, 1991
Bicycle Loop Detector

1" (25 mm) grid

0'-2"
(50 mm)

0'-10"
250 mm

Stop

1" (25 mm) grid

0'-2"
(50 mm)

1'-4"
(0.4 m)

Related Policies: UD-4.11.3; UD-4.17

* "Optimum": The best or most favorable condition for a particular trail situation from the perspective of responsible management
* Reference Also: Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000 Bikeway Planning and Design; Topic 1003 - Design Criteria; and Topic 1004 - Uniform Signs, California State Department of Transportation.

Final: April 15, 1999
Plan: Trail on Levee

Uniform Interjurisdictional Trail Design, Use, and Management Guidelines
Santa Clara County Interjurisdictional Trails Committee

Related Policies: UD-1.3.2.3

"Optimum": The best or most favorable condition for a particular trail situation from the perspective of reasonable management.

Reference Also: Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000 Bikeway Planning and Design; Topic 1003 - Design Criteria; and Topic 1004 - Uniform Signs. California State Department of Transportation.

Final: April 15, 1999
Related Policies: UD-2.6; UD 4.1.5

Notes
- Trail connections will likely occur on both sides of road bridge

- "Optimum": The best or most favorable condition for a particular trail situation from the perspective of responsible management

- Reference Also: Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000 Bikeway Planning and Design; Topic 1003 - Design Criteria; and Topic 1004 - Uniform Signs, California State Department of Transportation.

Final: April 15, 1991
Locate bridge footings outside of top of bank.

Bridge major streams and drainages

Reinforce downstream spillway with rocks or native vegetation.

Culvert crossings of small streams and drainages

Relate: Policies: UD-1.3.3.14

- "Optimum": The best or most favorable condition for a particular trail situation from the perspective of responsible management
- Reference Also: Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000 Bikeway Planning and Design; Topic 1003 - Design Criteria; and Topic 1004 - Uniform Signs. California State Department of Transportation.

Final: April 15, 1999
Trail Placement Adjacent to Streams

Uniform Interjurisdictional Trail Design, Use, and Management Guidelines
Santa Clara County Interjurisdictional Trails Committee

Relationship to property lines, environmentally sensitive areas & residences

Grade trail to drain away from natural creek or sensitive resources

Install signs, barriers, and / or fences to limit access to hazards, sensitive habitats or private property. See also: UD-1.1.4

For shared-use trails, provide 150' (45.7 m) setback buffer, where possible, from the top of bank (where the stream is predominantly in its natural state) or 100' (30.4 m) from the outside edge of the riparian zone where there are no opportunities for shared use of levees or existing roadways. See also: Design Guideline UD 1.3.3.1.

Provide buffers such as streets, sidewalks and plantings between trails and residential property

Where possible locate trails adjacent to the front yards, streets and public open spaces, rather than adjacent to private backyards, storage areas, or utility areas.

See also: Design Guideline UD 2.1, Tables UD-1 and UD-2

Grade trail to drain away from natural creek or sensitive resources

Where feasible provide trails for shared use of levees or other linear open spaces. See also: Figures T-15 and T-16.

Related Policies: UD-1.1.1; UD-1.3.3.14; UD 1.1.4

- "Optimum": The best or most favorable condition for a particular trail situation from the perspective of responsible management
- Reference Also: Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000 Bikeway Planning and Design; Topic 1003 - Design Criteria; and Topic 1004 - Uniform Signs. California State Department of Transportation.

Final: April 15, 1999
T-19  Pavement Striping Adjacent to Walls and Barriers

Uniform Interjurisdictional Trail Design, Use, and Management Guidelines
Santa Clara County Interjurisdictional Trails Committee

---

Barrier (fence, retaining wall, building facade)

Centerline Stripe: Yellow; 4" (100 mm) wide; solid

Safety Edge Stripe: White; 4" (100 mm) wide; 1'-0" (0.3 m) from base of barrier

Hazard Condition Sign
(see Figure 5-9)

Centerline Stripe: Yellow; 4" (100 mm) wide, dashed

---

Related Policies: UD-1.1.4; UD-4.11

* "Optimum": The best or most favorable condition for a particular trail situation from the perspective of responsible management
* Reference Also: Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000 Bikeway Planning and Design; Topic 1003 - Design Criteria; and Topic 1004 - Uniform Signs, California State Department of Transportation.

Final: April 15, 1999
Shared-use Trails
Natural Tread - Double Track Trail
Equestrians, Hikers & Bicycles

Shared-use Trail Route: a trail route designed, developed, and managed for all types of users. Use would be accommodated either on one Shared-use Trail, or a combination of parallel Limited-use (see Figure G-4) and/or Single-purpuse Trails (see Figure G-5).

Native material or Base rock

2'-0" minimum vegetation clearance on each side of trail. Prune all brush over 3'-0" in height & 1'-0" in diameter that extends into trailway.

Optimum width varies

Optimum 2% Cross-slope for Drainage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Designation</th>
<th>Typ. Maximum Trail Grade</th>
<th>Average Terrain Slope</th>
<th>Optimum Trail Tread Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valley Floor Areas</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>0-15%</td>
<td>12'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-30%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;30%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill Areas</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0-15%</td>
<td>12'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-30%</td>
<td>10'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;30%</td>
<td>8'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Areas</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0-15%</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-30%</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;30%</td>
<td>4'-0&quot; to 6'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

- For trails typically outside of Urban Service Areas as shown on the County General Plan Land Use Map.
- "Optimum," the best or most favorable condition for a particular trail situation from the perspective of responsible management.
- ** Should a situation be encountered where the optimum width indicated cannot be achieved or a staged development approach is used where narrower trails precede the optimum buildout width, mitigation measures should be used to provide for trail user safety. Such measures could include, but are not limited to: brush removal and clearing to augment lines-of-sight, trail pullout at regular intervals, one-way trail management, signage, or dismounting requirements.

Santa Clara County Trails Master Plan Update: Design Guidelines
November, 1995

Figure G-3
Shared-use Trails

Paved Tread - Double Track Trail
Equestrians, Hikers & Bicycles

Shared-use Trail Route: a trail route designed, developed, and managed for all types of users. Use would be accommodated either on one Shared-use Trail, or a combination of parallel Limited-use (see Figure G-4) and/or Single-purpose Trails (see Figure G-5).

Notes:
- “Optimum” the best or most favorable condition for a particular trail situation from the perspective of responsible management.
- Should a situation be encountered where the optimum width indicated cannot be achieved or a staged development approach is used where narrower trails precede the optimum buildout width, mitigation measures should be used to provide for trail user safety. Such measures could include, but are not limited to: brush removal and clearing to augment lines-of-sight, trail pullout at regular intervals, one-way trail management, signage, or dismounting requirements.
Natural For Tread Hikers

Native material or Base rock

2'-0" minimum vegetation clearance on each side of trail. Prune all brush over 12" in height & 1/2" in diameter that extends into trailway.

Optimum

2% Cross-slope for Drainage

6'-0" vertical clearance

Optimum

Width Varies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Designation</th>
<th>Typ. Maximum Trail Grade</th>
<th>Optimum Trail Tread Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valley Floor Areas</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>5'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill Areas</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Areas</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>4'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Santa Clara County Trails Master Plan Update: Design Guidelines

Figure G-5

November, 1995
5" SQUARE PRECAST WOODCRETE POST AT 8' O.C.

2 1/8"X5 1/2" PRECAST WOODCRETE RAIL

TOP OF FOOTING SHALL SLOPE TO DRAIN

INTEGRAL COLOR: DARK BROWN

GILROY TRAILS MASTER PLAN
TYPICAL TRAIL FENCING
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Sample Bicycle Pedestrian Authority Board (BPAB)
Trail Priority Evaluation Form
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail Segment #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Trail Type</th>
<th>Supports &quot;Safer Routes&quot;</th>
<th>Complements Systematic and Incremental Development</th>
<th>Supports Grant or Other Funding Source Opportunity</th>
<th>Schedule Enhance Recreational Opportunities</th>
<th>Assists to Complete Regional Trails</th>
<th>Supports Trip Recreation</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Creek: Fitzgerald Ave to Rucker Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Creek: Rucker Ave to Buena Vista Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Creek: Buena Vista Ave to Cohansy Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Drainage Channel: Cohansy Ave to Fair Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Drainage Channel: Fair Ave to Church Street</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Drainage Channel: Church St to Monterey St</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lions Creek: Lions Creek Bridge to Wren</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lions Creek: Wren to Kern Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>S. Morey Channel: Existing Bridge to St Teresa Blvd</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lions Creek: Kern Ave to Lions Creek Bridge</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>N. Morey Channel: Lions Creek Bridge to St Teresa Blvd</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Lions Creek: Lions Creek Bridge to E. Day Rd</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>E. Day Road: to St Teresa Blvd</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>St Teresa Blvd: N. of Longmeadows Dr to E. Day Rd</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>St Teresa Blvd: E. Day Rd to Fitzgerald Ave</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Future High School: Along St Teresa Blvd</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Lions Creek: St Teresa Blvd to General Plan Boundary (GPB)</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>End of Rancho Hills Dr to GPB</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Creek: Rancho Hills Dr to GPB</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Creek: Rancho Hills Dr to Carriage Hills Park</td>
<td>Bicycle /Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Future Golf Course: End of Mantelli Dr to GPB</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Point System:

1 Point = Low Value
2 Points = Medium Value
3 Points = High Value
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Trails Organizations

Rails to Trails Conservancy
1100 12th Street, 10th Floor NW
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 331-9696
www.railstrails.org

American Trails
P.O. Box 491797
Redding, CA 96049-1797
(530) 547-2060
www.americantrails.org

Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail
Amigos de Anza
Nancy Du Pont, Northern California Chair
1350 Castle Rock Road
Walnut Creek, CA 94598
(510) 937-7661
email: htrails@earthlink.net

National Park Service
Pacific West Regional Office
1111 Jackson Street, #700
Oakland, CA 94607
(510) 817-1438
www.nps.gov/juba

Bay Area Ridge Trail Council
Bob Power, South and East Bay Trail Director
1007 General Kennedy Avenue, Suite 3
San Francisco, CA 94129-1405
(415) 561 2595
www.ridgetrail.org
Appendix 4

Downtown Trail Along Railway Corridor

The following information was provided from the California Public Utilities Commission, which oversees rail safety. It suggests a pathway along the railway corridor in the Downtown area to provide safe connections to the train station. This information is being forwarded to the Downtown Task Force for consideration as a part of the Downtown Specific Plan.
May 17, 2005

Don Dey
City Engineer
City of Gilroy
7351 Rosanna Street
Gilroy, CA 95020-6197

RE: Recommended Rail Safety Improvements for Gilroy

Dear Mr. Day:

Passenger train service into the heart of downtown Gilroy provides an opportunity for “transit village” type development. A key aspect of this type of development is to provide safety mitigations for the increased density and traffic as a result of the rail service.

The potential exists for pedestrians to use the rail corridor as a pathway. This can be avoided by providing an alternate path parallel to the tracks, separated by a vandal-resistant (aesthetically pleasing) fence, with adequate lighting.

The following recommendations are a follow up to our February 24, 2005 meeting to discuss potential rail safety improvements for Gilroy.

Path specifics:
- Start the path at IOOF Avenue, on the east side of the tracks. This segment of the path would be on the former cannery property, currently proposed for redevelopment, and this path could link into another path proposed on the property. Linking the educational facilities on IOOF with the rail station with a safe, convenient path will discourage use of the railroad right-of-way as a pathway.
- The path should continue along the cannery property to the existing pedestrian crossing along Lewis Street to the west side of the railroad tracks. The path should then follow the existing alley adjacent to the tracks to the station.
- The alley could be improved either piecemeal as properties adjacent to the alley are improved, or as one project. A very similar project in San Mateo used TLC money for the improvements.
- Close the crossing at Martin Street to vehicular traffic and retain as a pedestrian crossing to the proposed plaza.
Other Recommendations:

The City should consider making fencing the railroad right-of-way a requirement for every project adjacent to the tracks.

On our site visit, numerous pedestrians were observed using the pedestrian crossing at Casey Street. Improving this crossing with active pedestrian gates, and fencing to channelize the pedestrians to the crossing should be implemented.

If you have any questions in this matter, please call me at (415) 703-2795.

Very truly yours,

Kevin Boles
Utilities Engineer
Rail Crossings Engineering Section

cc: Bill Headly, City of Gilroy
    Lee Steinmetz, Bellinger, Foster & Steinmetz Landscape Architects