# Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Purpose and Need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Public Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Bikeway Fundamentals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. EXISTING CONDITIONS</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Consistency and Coordination with Other Plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Land Use, Future Growth, Physical Barriers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Estimated Number of Bicycle Commuters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Existing Bikeway Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Existing Facilities (non-bikeway)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Bicycle Incident Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. BICYCLE MASTER PLAN</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Goals and Objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Bicycle Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Support Facility Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Specific Bikeway Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PRIORITIZATION STRATEGY</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Proposed Facility Improvements and Priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Past Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Cost Estimates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Future Funding Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Federal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Non-Traditional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Text of California Streets and Highways Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This page left intentionally blank.
A. PURPOSE AND NEED

This Bicycle Transportation Plan, 2011 (BTP) is developed by the City of Galt in an effort to encourage the enhancement of the City of Galt’s local and regional bikeways network, in order to make local and recreational bicycle travel safe and fun for all and make bicycle commuting a more viable and attractive travel option.

The intent of this Bicycle Transportation Plan is to provide the long term framework to improve and encourage bicycle transportation in the City of Galt.

The purpose of the update is to:
- Understand current bicycling conditions based upon changes in attitude, policies and bicycle demand;
- Review bikeways and bicycle programs for suitability based on current standards;
- Review / revise Goals and Objectives regarding bicycle facilities
- Meet updated requirements for funding;
- Insure that the BTP is consistent with existing relevant documents such as Galt’s General Plan Circulation and Land Use Elements, and Park and Recreation Plan, and Sacramento County’s Countywide Bicycle Transportation Plan
A Guideline - Not a Rigid Standard or Legal Ordinance

It should be noted that this plan is a Master Plan document, that, like a general plan document, provides guidance for the City as the ability to build new bike facilities become available. In accordance with the Bicycle Transportation Act (if bicycle grants or funding is requested from the State), the City is required to revisit the plan every five years in order to determine if the direction identified by the plan is still justified or needs to be revised to meet new criteria or direction.

The City is encouraged to amend the General Plan Circulation Element, and Zoning code to provide reference to this document so that City officials, City Staff, developers, and design professionals are aware of this guideline.

Implementation of this plan can take place on two levels and include:
- City sponsored / funded improvements
- Developer sponsored / funded improvements

Bicycle Transportation Act Requirements

The Bicycle Transportation Act requires that local agencies complete a Bicycle Transportation Plan in order to qualify for funds issued by the California Department of Transportation through the Bicycle Transportation Account. The Bicycle Transportation Act requires that Bicycle Transportation Plans contain at a minimum eleven key elements. The following list indicates the minimum required elements and the sections in this document where the information can be located.

1. Estimated number of existing and future bicycle commuters Section 2C.
2. Description of land use and settlement patterns Section 2B & Figure 2.
3. Description of existing and proposed bikeways Section 3, Figure 5.
4. Description of bicycle parking facilities Section 2E.
5. Description of multi-modal connections Section 2E.
6. Description of facilities for changing and storing clothes and equipment Section 2C.
7. Description of bicycle safety and education programs Section 3A, Goal 3.
8. Description of citizen and community participation Section 1C.
9. Description of consistency with transportation, air quality, and energy conservation plans Section 2A
10. Description of proposed bicycle projects & implementation priority Section 4A.

11. Description of past expenditures and future financial needs for bicycle facilities Section 4B.

B. Setting

Geographic Location
The City of Galt is located in Sacramento County, and is part of California’s Lower Sacramento Valley, midway between the cities of Sacramento and Stockton (see figure 1). According to the census bureau, the city’s population was 23,173 in 2005, and per the General Plan projection is expected to result in a 44,150 population by 2025. Galt’s growth in the past and in the future is due to its’ exceptional housing, commercial opportunities, relatively close relationship to Sacramento and Stockton, pleasant year-round climate, and its’ small town atmosphere.

The city is divided by Highway 99. The western half of the city is then further bisected by the Union Pacific Railroad tracks. A well defined business core is established on the west side of Highway 99, and there is an historic downtown area along the railroad tracks. The Northeast Area of the City was developed via a Specific Plan adopted in 1987. Galt also hosts the Galt Flea Market, attracting many citizens from Galt and surrounding communities in Sacramento and San Joaquin counties.

From a bicyclist’s perspective, Galt is an attractive place to ride. It has level terrain, a relatively mild climate, and a small town, rural atmosphere. The City is also fortunate to have a natural waterway feature along its southern boundary (Dry Creek), and a major drainage way with two distinct forks in the Northeast Area. These features provide recreational opportunities for bicyclists and pedestrians as well as providing direct linkages to major activity centers.

Transportation System
The city’s roadway system is a mix of traditional grid west of Highway 99, and a grid and curvilinear street system on the east side of Highway 99. The Northeast Area is served by two major north-south arterials, and three major east-west arterials. The west side of the city relies primarily on one major north-south corridor and five east-west arterials. (See Section 2, Figure 3 – Land Use...
FIGURE 1: REGIONAL LOCATION MAP
Highway 99 is a principal impediment to a linked, city-wide bikeway system. Limited / narrow crossing opportunities create a barrier to bikeways. Because of this barrier, the Northeast Area is often perceived as a separate entity with no direct connection to the rest of the city. However, as of this writing the City had started improvements at the Central Galt interchange that will significantly improve cross-town circulation with a new overcrossing at “A” and a widened overcrossing at “C” streets.

C. Public Participation
In preparing this document, the City solicited public input on existing bicycling conditions, potential roadways for improvements, crossing locations, and the type of support facilities or programs needed to improve bicycling in the City of Galt. The process relied on:

- Notification of the community meeting by the City via the local newspaper
- Distribution of a flyer by the City.
- Direct email from the Planning Director to persons of interest and City Staff / officials who have in the past shown interest in circulation issues
- Notification of regional bike clubs.
- Gathering input at one community meetings that invited residents of the community, bicycle club members from throughout the region, and city officials.
- Information gathered from a survey distributed to meeting attendees.
- Interviews with members of the City staff responsible for bikeway implementation.
- Public Hearings with the City Council.

The Community meeting was sparsely attended, including one resident, and one representative from the Sacramento County Air Quality Board. The one response to the survey includes the following recommendations from a resident who bikes approximately 1-6 times per week:

- Ranking of Bicycle Routes: Minimally adequate
- Purpose for bike riding: Recreation/fitness, shopping/errands. Attempt to be environmentally “benign”
The City of Galt Bicycle Transportation Plan proposes to improve bikeway conditions throughout the City.

- Choice of bike vs. auto: Avoid parking hassles, save money on gas, better for the environment, pleasure
- Issues preventing more bike riding: Poor road conditions, large intersection crossing, bike lanes not clean
- No school age children
- Recommendations for new routes: East-west route along railroad spur from SR 99 to Carillion, North side of Elm Avenue in county, Sparrow Drive
- Recommendation for improvements: Colored bike lanes, left turn signal buttons, better signage on routes, better maintenance of vegetation along routes, better bike racks at destinations, cleaner bike lanes

D. Bikeway Fundamentals
Bicycles are considered a vehicle, equivalent to automobiles, by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). However, while bicyclists share all the same rights and responsibilities of motorists, bicycle-specific facilities are often provided in an effort to enhance safety for both bicyclists and motorists. Bicyclists also need to be conscious of their skill and comfort levels when choosing their travel routes. The following sections provide a brief overview of the various classes of bikeways, and some general characteristics of the different skill levels of bicyclists.

Classes of Bikeways
There are three classes of commuter bikeways:
- Class I – off-street paved bike paths
- Class II – on-road striped and signed bicycle lanes
- Class III – on-road shared-lane signed bicycle routes
CLASS I Off-street paths are facilities on a separate right-of-way from roadways, and are usually shared by bicyclists and pedestrians. Shared paths are recreational facilities and should not be used as high-speed bikeways.

Example Class I Bike Path
**CLASS II Bicycle Lanes** are on-street facilities that use painted stripes and stencils to delineate the right of way assigned to bicyclists and motorists, and to provide for more predictable movements by each.
CLASS III Bicycle Routes are signed on-street facilities that accommodate vehicles and bicycles in the same travel lane. Bicycles are permitted on most roadways; however, for safety purposes, signed bicycle routes are often found on streets with lower speeds and traffic volumes.
Bicyclist Skill Levels
The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, or AASHTO, published the Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities in 1999. This guide provides descriptions for the three general skill levels of bicyclists, as summarized by the A, B, and C typologies below:

- **A** dvanced or experienced riders are generally using their bicycles as they would a motor vehicle. They are riding for convenience and speed and want direct access to destinations with a minimum of detour or delay, and they are typically comfortable riding with motor vehicle traffic.

- **B** asic or less confident adult riders may also be using their bicycles for transportation purposes, but prefer to avoid roads with fast and busy motor vehicle traffic unless there is ample roadway width to allow easy overtaking by faster motor vehicles.

- **C** hildren, who still require access to key destinations in their community, such as schools, convenience stores and recreational facilities. They prefer residential streets with low motor vehicle speeds, linked with shared-use paths and busier streets with well defined pavement markings between bicycles and motor vehicles, so they can avoid riding in the travel lane of major arterials.

The City’s intent is to provide opportunities to benefit all types of riders, with an emphasis on the Basic and Children skill levels.
A. CONSISTENCY AND COORDINATION WITH OTHER PLANS

Consistency and coordination are provided through the integration of Bicycle Transportation Plan (BTP) throughout the elements of the 2030 General Plan. There are discussions regarding the encouragement of non-motorized modes of transportation. These include the following annotated extractions:

From the General Plan, Chapter 5: Circulation and Transportation, Section 5.8: Bike and Pedestrian Paths:

The City adopted "The Galt Bicycle Transportation Plan (BTP)" in May 2002, to establish a safe, interconnected bicycle and pedestrian system throughout Galt. The City of Galt currently has about 9,180 lineal feet of Class I bikeway (bike paths), 10,750 lineal feet of Class II bikeway (bike lanes), and no Class III bikeway (bike routes) (see Figure 5.6). Class I bikeways exist along a portion of Dry Creek and a portion of Deadman Gulch. Full construction of these bikeways has not been completed.

Class II bike lanes exist on both sides on Lincoln Way, beginning at the southern city limits and extending north to "E" Street and then again between "A Street and Pringle Avenue. Class II bike lanes also exist on both sides of "A" Street, "C" Street, "P" Street, 6th Street, Amador Avenue and Industrial Drive. Also, in the Northeast area of the City, bike lanes exist on Carillion Boulevard, Walnut Avenue and East Stockton Boulevard.

The City currently has not officially designated Class III bike routes, although the 2,500-foot segment of "A" Street between approximately Emerald Oak Drive and the Greer Middle School is serving as an informal Class III bike route. New bikeway routes are proposed along the roadway segments listed in Table 5.5 (table not provided in this document).

AND…..

From the 2030 General Plan, Chapter 4: Land Use and Demographics, Section 4.7: Other City, County, and Regional Policies and Projects, SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (SACOG) PLANS AND POLICIES

…….. In this role, SACOG prepares the region's long-range transportation plan; prepares the Housing Needs Allocation for its member jurisdictions;
keeps a region-wide database for its own and local agency use; helps counties and cities use federal transportation funds; assists in planning for transit, bicycle networks, clean air and airport land uses; and is undertaking a new program to link transportation and land development more closely.....

And....

CITY OF GALT BICYCLE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (2002)
The City's Bicycle Transportation Plan was adopted in 2002 in an effort to improve safety for school children riding to school, encourage commuters to ride rather than drive to work, and encourage people to exercise and enjoy their community on two wheels. The City recognizes that bicycle transportation can be an important, low-cost strategy to reduce reliance on the single passenger automobile and can contribute to a reduction in air and noise pollution and traffic congestion.

The Galt Bicycle Transportation Plan was developed to implement the Galt General Plan Circulation Element. The purpose of the document was to collect in a single place all of the policies and technical information related to bicycles and bikeways, and to define a system of bike routes and support facilities that will be necessary to meet the needs of Galt through the build-out of the current (1989) General Plan. The Galt Bicycle Transportation Plan includes all of the required elements necessary to qualify for Proposition 116 funds, State Bicycle Lane Account, and other federal and state funding sources.

And..........

Parks and Recreation Master Plan 2010

5.5 Non-Vehicular Access

All new neighborhood parks should be on an existing or proposed Class I multi-use trail or Class II bike route. Neighborhoods that include parks on Class II bike lanes should have sidewalks connecting homes to the park. This standard is intended to facilitate safe pedestrian and bicycle access to parks and to make it feasible for children to visit neighborhood parks without being driven there. Improved non-vehicular access will also reduce the need for parking lots, help prevent overflow parking into neighborhoods, and reduce traffic congestion and associated air pollution.

7.3 Open Space/Trails (selected pertinent passages)

Community input to this Master Plan consistently emphasized enhanced access to natural areas and a desire for more walking and biking opportunities. The...
FIGURE 2: LANDS USE AND CIRCULATION PLAN, 2030 GENERAL PLAN
following capital improvement recommendations and planning strategies help address these concerns (Table 24).

And……

……. Class I trails and paved ADA paths should be located in recreational open space where site conditions and anticipated usage are appropriate. The City should expand the current Recreation Impact fee to specifically include assessments for acquisition and development of recreational open space at the rate of 5 acres per 1,000 people, and to provide Class I trails at the rate of one-quarter mile per 1,000 people. To meet the trail standard of one-quarter mile of Class I trail for every 1,000 population, an additional 2.34 miles of Class I trails are needed for the current population. However, if the remaining 2.79 miles of Class I trails proposed in the Bicycle Transportation Plan for the Deadman Gulch and Dry Creek corridors are built with an average corridor width of 164 feet, this will add about 55 acres of open space to meet both the recreational open space and Class I trail standard deficits. The recreation and transportation value of the Deadman Gulch Trail could be improved by addressing several connectivity issues. While an existing footbridge provides a trail connection to Canyon Creek Park, a second footbridge is needed to connect Emerald Vista Park and the Deadman Gulch Trail to the neighborhoods to the south. In areas where rail lines create barriers to a continuous Deadman Gulch Trail alignment, it is unlikely that the City will be able get approvals for at-grade crossings from the railroad operators. Given the cost of above grade crossings, it would be more practical to identify on-street Class II bike routes that will provide connections between the separated Class I trail sections. City transportation planners should also evaluate the options for improving safety at the intersection of Carillon Boulevard and the Deadman Gulch Trail. The City Parks and Transportation planning staff should also begin considering where 5 miles of new Class I trails should be located in anticipation of the potential for 20,000 new residents to move to the area by 2025. Class I trails could be located in designated open space corridors, or as part of the streetscape improvements required for new residential subdivisions. Such trails should be located to maximize access to parks and schools. This strategy will help ensure that all new neighborhood parks are accessible for pedestrians or cyclists via a Class I route. Where this is not feasible, access to neighborhood parks via a Class II route should be required. Coordination with regional trail partners, such as the Nature Conservancy, to establish regional networks and connections to
B. LAND USE, FUTURE GROWTH, PHYSICAL BARRIERS

The City of Galt Land Use patterns are illustrated on Figure 2, Land Use and Circulation Map. According to the 2030 General Plan existing conditions Report, the City of Galt is predominantly a “bedroom community,” with the majority of workers commuting outside the city to work in the metropolitan areas of Sacramento to the north and Stockton to the south. Much of the city’s growth has occurred in both the Northeast and West portions of the City. With the adoption of the Northeast Area Specific Plan in the late 1980’s, residential development in this area has been particularly active. With the proximity of both Sacramento and Stockton as metropolitan employment hubs, little growth in employment has occurred within the City. Many commercial, business/professional and industrial lands remain vacant or underutilized within the City. Therefore, the land development pattern remains skewed to residential development and being a “bedroom community”. The Galt Market remains a major regional shopping attraction each week on Tuesday and Wednesday, making Tuesday/Wednesday traffic conditions in the city significantly worse than all other days.

About two-thirds of the city is comprised of low-to medium-density residential development, generally concentrated in the southwestern and northeastern quadrants of the city. Retail Commercial and Highway Commercial opportunities are located mainly in downtown Galt, and along the SR 99 corridor. Light manufacturing uses are primarily located in the northwestern
quadrant of the city, between SR 99 and the Union Pacific Railroad tracks.

As indicated on Figure 3, the future growth patterns (per the General Plan) are likely to occur north to Twin Cities Road (SR 104), and along Simmerhorn Road and Boessow Road.

It should also be noted that Highway 99 (and the associated interchange crossings) provide a significant barrier to bike circulation routes due to narrow bridges / traffic lanes at many crossings. Two locations of railroad tracks bisect the city creating another challenge to safe bike crossings. A natural barrier to the south, Dry Creek, creates a barrier between county bikeway connections.

C. ESTIMATED NUMBER OF BICYCLE COMMUTERS

Employment Commute: It is difficult to anticipate future bicycle commuter level since there are a number of factors may affect the statistics. Included in these variables is the number of employment centers within Galt. According to census data located at www.city-data.com (circa November 2010), the 2008 population for Galt was 24,059. However, the census data also notes that 83% of workers commuted to work in a single occupied vehicle. According to the same data source 0.8% of the work force (identified as 64 people) utilized a bicycle as their means of transportation to work. This percentage of bicycle commuters is the same for the California average. As Galt continues to attract commercial and industrial facilities to the City, it is anticipated more people will chose bicycling as a mode of commuter transportation. This assumption is based on distance alone. The closer the destination of commute, the more likely people will do so via bicycle.

School Children: As a part of preparing this update, the Galt Joint Union Elementary School District, and the Galt High School were contacted to determine if records are kept regarding children bicycling to school. The elementary schools provided a visual survey of bicycles on two different days to determine general ridership as a means of getting to school. No reply was received from Galt High School. The results of the elementary survey are as follows: The results of this survey, compared to a similar survey conducted for the 2002
BTP, differ greatly and indicate that ridership has fallen greatly from an average of 5.8% to approximately 3%. Upon receiving the results of the survey additional information was collected, resulting in the following observation:

- All sites reported that during the warmer months, bike riding increases approximately 15 to 20 bikes.
- All sites reported the bike parking area is typically two-thirds full during the warmer months.
- The schools east side of the railroad tracks said it was hard to tell if ridership is down due to the boundary changes and the Lake Canyon Elementary opening. On the west side of the railroad tracks, the District stated that the boundary changes did result in less students / bike riders.

### D. EXISTING BIKEWAY FACILITIES

**Safe Routes to School:** The elementary school district has established a “Safe Routes to School” program, including a map available to parents identifying safe paths to the various schools. It is assumed that these routes would also reflect routes school children would use as bicycle paths. See Figure 4, Safe Routes to School exhibit.
FIGURE 4: SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL

Source: Galt Joint Union Elementary School District
Sacramento County Connections: The surrounding County area consists of rural farm land with limited road access to and from the City. However, the County of Sacramento has identified in their 2010 Bicycle Transportation Plan update (as of November 2010) bicycle connectivity to Galt with Class II Bike Lanes. The proposed bike lane routes are illustrated on Figure 5, Proposed Sacramento County Bikeways. It should be noted that the County of Sacramento requires a minimum 5’ paved area beyond the gutter area on Class II Bike Lanes. Figure 6, Sacramento County Bike Lane Sections, illustrates typical bike lane road sections. Coordination with Sacramento County will be needed to provide safe transitions between City and County Class II bike lanes. SACOG’s Regional Transit Plan also indicates creating a Class I Bike Path connecting the Galt area to Elk Grove and Rancho Cordova along the Central California Traction Company Railroad tracks, which run east of Galt. The City’s Bicycle Transportation Plan (2002) proposes expanding trails along Dry Creek and Deadman Gulch. Both of these trails could potentially be extended to connect with the Cosumnes River Preserve, if recreation easements or acquisitions of existing private property can be secured.

City of Galt Bike Facilities: The existing bikeway facilities in the City of Galt are comprised of Class I and Class II bike facilities on a limited number of roads / trails. Of these bike lanes, some were witnessed (during a bike ride to survey the bike way conditions) to be in need of re-striping and marking. See Figure 7 Existing Bike Facilities for existing bikeway locations. Bikeways are listed by Class I, II or III and are defined as follows:

- “Bikeway” means all facilities that primarily provide for bicycle travel.
- **Class I Bikeway (Bike Path).** Provides completely separated path for the exclusive use of bicycles and pedestrians with cross-flow minimized. See Appendix B for example.
- **Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane).** Provides a striped lane for one-way bike travel on a street or highway. See Appendix B for example.
- **Class III Bikeway (Bike Route).** Provides shared use with pedestrians or motor vehicle traffic. See Appendix B for example.
FIGURE 5: PROPOSED SACRAMENTO COUNTY CLASS II BIKE LANES

Source: 2010 Sacramento County Bicycle Transportation Plan Update-2010
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FIGURE 5: PROPOSED SACRAMENTO COUNTY CLASS II BIKE LANE
County Bike Lanes require 5-ft. paving in addition to gutter area on fully paved streets. City to County transitions may be needed to coordinate safe links between different standards.
FIGURE 7: EXISTING BIKEWAY FACILITIES
As of November 2010 The City of Galt currently has:

- 2.8 miles of existing Class I Bikeways
- 11.4 miles of existing Class II Bikeways
- Zero miles of existing Class III Bikeways

E. EXISTING FACILITIES (non-bikeway)

Changing / Storing Clothes and Equipment
Employers are encouraged to install bicycle parking facilities with lockers and shower facilities to encourage use of the bicycle as alternate transportation. Table on the next page identifies the known locations of private and public facilities that allow changing. Except for the police/public works, high schools and aquatic center, no “public” shower/changing facilities are known.

Bicycle Support and Parking Facilities
Bicycle support facilities include Class I Bike Lockers, Class II Bike Racks, Class III Bike Racks, and locker room and restroom facilities. See Figure 8 for bike parking examples. A visual survey of bike parking facilities around the city noted that bike parking at the main shopping center located on C-Street at SR99 is difficult to find and minimal in facilities. In-ground mounted Class III bike racks were noted in a visible location around the grocery store. However, two other bike racks (old style front wheel insert type) located in the northeast corner of the shopping center appear to fill an un kept landscaped area, and are not really conducive to parking bikes. Class III bike racks were located at existing parks, the centers of government, and at the aquatic center. None of the commercial activity centers provide shower facilities for bicycle riders. The showers at the Middle School and High School are only available for Physical Education classes or athletic events. Showers are available at the Aquatic Center.

As mentioned earlier, the elementary schools provide bike parking facilities and according to the school administration these facilities are generally under utilized.

Connection With Other Transportation Modes
South County Transit (SCT) provides bus transit around the City of Galt and intercity links to surrounding communities. SCT/LINK's Dial a Ride offers
## Existing Conditions

### BIKE PARKING AND RESTROOM INVENTORY (December 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING FACILITY</th>
<th>BIKE PARKING SPACES</th>
<th>RESTROOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galt High School</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty High School</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCaffery Middle School</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greer Middle School</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Oaks Elementary</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Oaks Elementary</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Canyon Elementary</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marengo Ranch Elementary</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARKS / RECREATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker Park (under contr.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Basin Park</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Park</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey Park</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.P Park</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadow View Park</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Canyon Park</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCaffery Sports Park</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galt Community Park</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald Vista Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon Creek Park</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Stone Park</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion Oaks Park</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMUD Park</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Soccer Field</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Complex</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gora Aquatic Center</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fumasi Oak Preserve</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashbrook Tot-lot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY CENTERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleton Center</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galt Market</td>
<td>23**</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabolla Center</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galt Libray</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police/Public Works</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Cities Road Park-n-Ride</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galt Place Shopping</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Way Shopping Area</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Down Town Area</td>
<td>10***</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Cities Shopping Area</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMS Industrial Park</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bike parking shared with Galt "downtown" area

**No bike racks in parking lot but possible racks inside market?**

***Bike parking shared with S.P. Park
**Existing Conditions**

**Class I Bike Lockers** allow for bikes to be securely located out of sight and out of the weather.

**Class II Bike Racks** captures the bike’s frame and at least one wheel, and provides some form of lock protection.

**Class III Bike Racks** allow the frame and one wheel to be locked to the rack. Designs are varied and provide the many stylized opportunities.

Providing a shelter (roof) over the bike parking areas may encourage more bike parking.

**FIGURE 8: BIKE PARKING EXAMPLES**
Bicycle Transportation Plan - 2011

Existing Conditions

curb to curb service throughout the City of Galt. All SCT buses provide accommodations for bikes.

SCT/LINK’s **Hwy 99 Express** provides direct intercity service connecting Galt with Lodi, Elk Grove and 65th St. in Sacramento. The Highway 99 Route runs Monday thru Friday, with hourly service all day from 5:20 am to 7:20 pm, and on Saturdays from 8:20 am to 5:25 pm. It also provides transfers to local routes in each community.

SCT/LINK offers **direct bus service from the Delta to Lodi**, with stops at Lodi Wal-Mart, Lodi Memorial Hospital and Lodi Transit Center. This route also provides direct service to Galt with connecting service via Highway 99 to Elk Grove and Sacramento. The Delta Route runs four times a day Monday thru Friday. The one existing bus stop location in the City of Galt is at City Hall.

**F. BICYCLE INCIDENT ANALYSIS**

The City of Galt Police Department provided bicycle-related accident data from April 2004 to September 2010. The total number of accidents in the 6-year span is reported to be 41 (two involving scooters), which may infer an average of almost 7 accidents per year. After further assessing the data, it was found that most traffic collisions with bicycles happen in the afternoon between noon and 6pm (see Table 1). During this time frame, 67% of all incidents are injury related. Overall, however, 76% of all 41 bicycle related accidents involve injury.

Although the locations of bicycle related traffic collisions are spread through out the city, most of the accidents appear to be concentrated in the downtown area, including two fatalities (one fatality involved a scooter). The locations of these accidents are displayed in Figure 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Day from</th>
<th>to</th>
<th>% Accidents</th>
<th>fatalities</th>
<th>injuries</th>
<th>PDO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00am</td>
<td>6:00am</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00am</td>
<td>12:00pm</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00pm</td>
<td>6:00pm</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00pm</td>
<td>12:00am</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 9: BIKE RELATED ACCIDENTS
A. Goals and Objectives

The following Goals and Objectives, and the Bicycle Master Plan exhibit (Figure 10), are intended to provide the City with specific direction for improving the Bicycle Facilities within the City limits. Unless otherwise identified, it is assumed that the Planning and Public Works Department staff’s will be responsible to establish or enforce specific implementation measures. As a part of this update, staff was asked to review the Goals and Objectives from the 2002 document to determine what objectives were acted upon between updates. The summary of these actions can be reviewed in appendix D. Based on that evaluation, the following Goals and Objectives were continued with this update. It should also be noted that the objectives identified in this document are not finite or organized in any particular order of priority. The City officials and Department heads should review the entire Bicycle Transportation Plan document periodically and direct the staff as to priority of implementation (based on feasibility to implement and available funding).

Goal 1: Assure safe and convenient bicycle access to all areas of the city.

Objectives:
1-1. Provide Class II bicycle lanes and/or Class I paths along collector and arterial streets as development occurs.

1-2. Within the financial resources of the city, retrofit existing collector and arterial streets in accordance with a prioritization schedule suggested in this document (see page 48) and / or as determined by the Public Works Department. Coordinate retrofit improvements with road pavement overlay or widening projects whenever possible.

1-3. Within the financial resources of the city, or per developer implemented improvements, provide new bicycle lanes and/or paths along both sides of all new collector / arterial streets identified on the 2030 General Plan Land Use and Circulation plan.

1-4. Identify weak links and discontinuities in the planned network, and develop a plan for prioritizing and funding solutions to the problems.

1-5. Improve bicycle access between the east and the west side of the city across
Highway 99 and include recommended improvement projects in the city's Capital Improvement Plan.

1-6. Implement requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act when planning pedestrian/bicycle facilities.

1-7. Provide bike facilities and easy access to transit services and park and ride lots to encourage the use of mass transit. Work with Vanpool services (if available) and other mass transit operators to provide bicycle storage area on the vehicle.

1-8. Provide for the safest, most direct point-to-point travel to encourage ridership.

1-9. Bikeways should be developed generally in accordance with the 2030 GP Galt Land Use and Circulation Plan depicted in figure 2, recognizing the fact that new developments will need to address bicycle circulation and connection with existing or proposed bike routes using the Circulation map as a minimal guide. Bicycle circulation within new developments should be addressed and additional bike paths included to assure convenient access if required.

1-10. New subdivisions shall be designed to permit access to bikeways from interior residential streets (e.g. access ways at the ends of cul-de-sacs). Bicycle circulation should be included as part of the development review process to assure that bikeways are included as a major component of the circulation system.

**Goal 2: Provide bike facilities at all major activity centers including, but not limited to, employer sites, shopping/office areas, schools, and recreational facilities.**

Objective
2-1. Require all projects subject to site plan review to install appropriate bike facilities as required by this plan.

**Goal 3: Educate residents about the health and air quality benefits of utilizing non-motorized transportation.**
Objectives
3-1. Develop / coordinate educational programs with the Police and School district that promote safe riding techniques.

3-2 Present the educational program on a yearly basis to every elementary and middle school.

Goal 4: Eliminate physical barriers (obstacles) and linkage problems for non-motorized transportation within and around the City.

Objectives
4-1. Plan and develop bikeways to provide a pleasant riding experience on linkages between destinations.

4-2. Develop standards and install improvements relating to street grate treatments, bike pockets at intersections, motorized traffic barriers, signal light detectors, and the like. Consider bicycle operating characteristics in the design of streets, bridges, intersections and traffic control systems.

4-3. The City shall ensure that on-street bike lanes are constructed at the time that the first vehicle lanes are built, unless the Public Works Director finds good reason to delay until a later phase.

Goal 5: Become a part of the regional trails master plan.

Objectives
5.1. Join / coordinate with other agencies in the planning and development of regional trail linkages.

Goal 6: Secure adequate funding sources to implement the bike facility improvements.

Objectives
6-1. Emphasize the use of on-street bike lanes and routes to increase cost effectiveness and secure funding associated with road improvements.

6-2. Assure that new development projects pay their fair share of bike facility improvements associated with their development.
6-3 Where appropriate, partner bike paths with flood control projects, utilities access, air quality improvements and open space/stream restoration projects.

6-4 Maximize funding opportunities through a combination of Federal, State, and regional / local source funding.

Goal 7: Reduce traffic, improve air quality, and reduce emissions that contribute to climate change by providing a viable commute alternative to the automobile.

Objectives
7-1. Promote the beneficial aspects of bicycling through Bike Month, Spare the Air and other programs.

7-2. Encourage a network of Class I Bike Path improvements in new development areas to encourage riders to use bike paths as a safe alternative to the automobile.

7-3. Partner with health organizations where appropriate to promote bicycling.

Goal 8: Ensure the long range maintenance of all bikeways and support facilities.

Objectives
8-1 All streets with Class II or III designation should be swept and vegetation trimmed at regular intervals.

8-2 Develop guidelines for routine maintenance and long-term maintenance of off-street bike paths.

8-3 Where construction operations occur adjacent to Class II or III bikeways, the developer/contractor will be responsible for maintaining clear and clean paths of travel.
8-4 Construction projects within public right-of-way should address bicycle safety and movement per Federal, State and Local standards.

8-5 Establish an on-line system for reporting, evaluating, tracking and responding to maintenance and safety concerns on bikeways. Consider using the Sacramento Association of Bicycle Advocates Hazard reporting format (http://www.sacbike.org/hazard/).

8-6. Maintain a level of service for bikeways consistent with maintenance of roadways used by motor vehicles.

**Goal 9: Enforce bicycle rules and regulations in order to reduce violations and accidents.**

Objectives
9-1. Study bicycle/auto accident records and develop a focused enforcement effort with a goal of reducing accidents by 10% in 5-years.

9-2. City shall continue its enforcement of bicycle violations, focusing on high volumes and high accident locations.

9-3. City should consider the use of police officers or community service officers on bicycles to increase the effectiveness of the enforcement program.-- Parks and Recreation personnel too.

9-4. Patrol the Central Business District, Historic Downtown and flea market area with officers on bicycles to promote bicycle use.
B. Bicycle Master Plan Exhibit
The proposed Bicycle Master Plan illustrates a network of bikeways intended to connect the City and provide improved bikeway conditions for those biking through the City. See Figure 10 for existing and proposed bikeway locations. Bikeways are listed by Class I, II or III, and are defined as follows:

- **Class I Bikeway (Bike Path)** - Provides completely separated path for the exclusive use of bicycles and pedestrians with cross-flow minimized.
- **Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane)** - Provides a striped lane for one-way bike travel on a street or highway.
- **Class III Bikeway (Bike Route)** - Provides shared use with motor vehicle traffic, is identified by Bike Route signs. These routes are intended to have a minimum amount of paving (at least 2-ft) beyond the travel lane to provide more room for bicyclists.

C. Support Facility Improvements

*Bike Parking - Private Facilities:* As noted in the visual survey of private bike parking facilities discussed earlier in this document it was noted that specific facilities that attract the general public could benefit bicyclists by providing bike parking facilities. However, except for new developments, the City has very little leverage over existing property owners to install bike racks.

*Class I Bike Path Development:* As indicated on the Bicycle Master Plan Exhibit, proposed Class I Bike Paths are intended to fill the gaps in the existing system, and in the future, create a continuous off-street trail system from the north east corner of the city to the south east corner of the city.

*(Excerpted from the 2010 Parks Master Plan):* Each new neighborhood and
community park should include paved paths within the park suitable for walking, skating, and for bicycling. Depending upon the type / size of the park the paths might only need be suitable for young children on bicycles.

While Galt residents have access to many trails at nearby regional facilities such as the Cosumnes River Preserve and the Lodi Lake Nature Area, this does not negate the need for trail access to public recreational open space areas within the City Planning Area. Therefore, the Parks Master Plan has established a trails standard to include the requirement that a system of trails be provided through public recreational open space areas.

However, the extent of such trails will be dictated by the size and configuration of the particular site, public safety considerations, and natural resource constraints. Therefore, as mentioned in the Parks Master Plan a mileage standard is not relevant for this type of facility.

Paved Class I trails should be provided at a rate of one-quarter mile for every 1,000 residents or one mile of Class I trail for every 4,000 residents in the Planning Area. This ratio reflects the fact that Galt area residents have expressed a desire for more local trails for transportation and recreation uses.

The City currently has 3.66 miles of Class I trails located in the Deadman Gulch and Dry Creek corridors. With a current population of approximately 24,000 people in the Planning Area, this means there is currently 0.15 mile of trail for every 1,000 residents. To reach the desired level of service, another 2.34 miles of trail are needed. The 2010 Bicycle Transportation Plan identifies additional Class I trail to be built in order to accomplish the desired level of service.

**Private Development Improvements:** Private development should be responsible for improving bikeway facilities associated with their development. Developers should be made aware of this document during the planning / design phase to make sure they are aware of proposed bicycle facility improvement areas.
D. Specific Bikeway Improvements

Specific new bikeway improvements are identified in Section 4: Prioritization Strategy. This section discusses specific improvements by street or path and prioritizes the improvement need based on feasibility and cost.
A. PRIORITIES

Existing Bikeways
An analysis of the existing conditions of identified / marked bike paths, lanes, and routes was conducted by riding the bikeways in the City. It was noted that certain existing bicycle facilities were in need of restriping/marking, and/or in need of proper sign identification. Specifically, the following bikeways should be considered for improvement in order to be consistent with the bikeway standards identified in this document.

- Bike Path under Carillion Blvd: Access through the culvert is restricted by frequent water extending onto bike path and vegetation growing into bike path. In the short term, direct bike traffic back to the roadway using signage to warn bikers to enter culvert at their own risk and/or warn bikers to “walk bike” through culvert. Investigate the feasibility of an at grade crossing on the street, including a pedestrian crossing signal. Also investigate the feasibility of modifying the culvert structure to achieve minimum clearance.

- C-Street from the Freeway to 7th Street: The street width does not allow for Class II standards and parking at various areas. Keep current striping, but sign for Class III Bike Route.
Prioritization Strategy

- **C-Street & 4th Street in the Old Town area:**
  There are segments that are designated as existing Class II Bike Lanes. However, the narrowness of the street, and angled parking in some areas make these streets more conducive to a Class III Bike Route. Designate as Class III and add Share the Road signs, and Sharrows.

- **Amador Avenue, from West Stockton Blvd. to Industrial Drive:**
  Auto and truck parking was observed on both sides of the street negating an opportunity for a Class II Bike Lane. Sign the for a Bike Route.

Proposed New Class II Bike Lane Improvements Criteria

For proposed new Class II Bike Lanes, a criteria was established to rank the proposed routes in order to determine some logical approach to funding new improvements. The ranking is based on a point system using (9) nine criteria - Safety, Usage, Connectivity, Ease of Implementation, Availability of Alternate Routes, Schools and Parks Served, Employment Centers, City Limit Constraints, and Developer Improvements. A weighted number system of 0 to 3 is used. The specific rating criteria are explained below:

**Safety** - Route segments that are heavily traveled by motor vehicles would be given a grade of 3 - very necessary. Segments that either have little traffic, or which currently considered safe, would be given a "1" – (bike lanes are less
necessary, bike routes may all that is needed). A “0” is used for bike paths.

*Usage* - Those segments that serve or are projected to serve the greatest number of bicyclists were given a "3". Those with few bicyclists were given a "1".

*Connectivity* - This criterion refers to how the segment fits with the surrounding regional bikeway system. A segment that fills provides a direct link would be given a "3".

*Ease of implementation* - This refers to the extent of road work that would be required to implement bikeways. Segments that are needing restriping for bike lanes or signs for bike routes were given a grade of "3". Those segments needing shoulder work were given a "2". Major road or bridge work a "1". Segments requiring land acquisition were give a “0”.

*Availability of Alternate Routes* - This criterion considered the availability of an alternate route if this particular route did not have bike lanes. Routes without reasonable alternatives were graded "3". Routes that have a good alternative were given a "1".

*Schools and Parks Served* - A score of “3” was given to routes that directly serve existing schools and parks. A score of “1” is given to routes that directly serve proposed schools and parks. A score of “0” was given for those that do not.

*Employment Centers* - A score of “3” was given to routes that are considered direct "commuter routes" for employment areas or which are located in close proximity to employment centers. Connecting routes were given lesser scores.

*City Limits Constraint* - A score of “0” is given to routes outside the current City Limits, but within the General Plan Boundary. A score of “2” is given to routes that straddle City / County boundaries. A score of “3” is given to routes inside the City Limits.

*Developer Improvements* - A score of “0” is given to routes anticipated to be a part of future developer roadway improvements. A score of “3” is given to routes requiring City resources. A score of “1” is given to routes that may include developer and city resources to complete.
FIGURE 11: PROPOSED CLASS II BIKE LANE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td></td>
<td>(See Figure 14 for #1 proposed priority improvement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvements are proposed in interchange construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Install bike lanes on all sides of road with future road widening efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Install bike lanes on north side with future road widening efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve bike lane on north side of street when new development takes place in this location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGEND
- **Proposed Class II Bike Lane**
- **C2-x** Proposed Route Number
- **#x** Improvement Priority (see page 55)
### Prioritization Strategy

#### FIGURE 12: CLASS II PRIORITIES TABLE

Figure 12, is a spreadsheet showing the individual scores of each proposed Class II Bike Lane in each of the above categories. The route number shown in the first column is not the ranking number. It is merely a route reference number associated with an individual Class II Bike Lane route map illustrated in Figure 11. See Section 4D: Future Funding Needs for specifics regarding suggested priority Bike Lane projects.
Proposed Class I Bike Paths

Proposed bike path routes were also evaluated using a less stringent criteria. Basically, priority is higher for routes that complete, or fill gaps in existing routes. The lowest rankings are for paths located outside the current city limits and are assumed to be improved (in part or in whole) via future private development plans. The proposed Class I routes are collectively illustrated on Figure 13.

Given that there are only a few select routes that the City has direct control over, only the following Routes are recommended priorities for improvement during the 5-year life of this document if funding is available:

#1: Route C1-1: Would provide a continuous trail in this area

#2: Route C1-2: Would provide a connection between existing bike path and proposed Class II at Amador Avenue.

#3: Route C1-7: Would connect to existing bike path providing opportunities to future bike paths proposed on east side of freeway. Crossing under or over freeway will be a challenge.

#4: Route C1-8: Would provide the continuation of the path to a future park site proposed just outside the city limits.

Signage should be provided at Bike Path trail heads to identify routes.
Prioritization Strategy

Proposed Class III Bike Routes

The proposed Class III Bike Routes are collectively illustrated on Figure 14. Proposed Class III Bike Routes should only require signage for improvements. The following is the suggested Class III Bike Route prioritization for improvements as funding is available:

#1: Routes C3-1, C3-2, C3-3, C3-4; in the Downtown Area: Remove any reference to Class II Bike Lanes and replace, or add, signage for Bike Routes. Add “Sharrows” on narrow streets with angled parking.

#2: Routes C3-16, C3-17, C3-18, C3-19, C3-20, C3-21, C3-22, C3-23, C3-24, C3-25; in the existing neighborhoods in the northeast area of town: Add Bike Route signage.

#3: Routes C3-5, C3-6, C3-7, C3-8, C3-9, C3-26, C3-27: Add Bike Route signage. Remove any references to Class II Bike Lanes.

#4: Routes C3-10, C-11, C3-12, C3-13, C3-14, C3-15: Add Bike Route signage. Remove any references to Class II Bike Lanes.

Example “Sharrow” Markings on Many streets in the Downtown area are not wide enough to allow bike lanes. Those streets should be signed to for Bike Routes / “Share the Road”, and marked with “Sharrows” (see Shared Roadway Bicycle Markings, page 75).
FIGURE 14: PROPOSED CLASS III BIKE ROUTES

**LEGEND**
- Proposed Class III Bike Route
- Proposed Route Number
  - C3-#x

*Improvement Priority (see page 55)*

(See Figure 11 for #2 thru #5 proposed priority improvements)
Implementation of the proposed bikeway system will require funding from local, state, and federal sources. To facilitate funding efforts, this section will present conceptual construction cost estimates for the proposed system along with a brief description of past expenditures for bikeway facilities.

**B. PAST EXPENDITURES**

Since the last update of the Bicycle Transportation Plan in 2002, The City of Galt has leveraged funding to improve some bike facilities, and they have acted on many of the objectives identified to implement the Plan. Specifically, the following facilities were improved:

- Fermoy Way along the Emerald Village Senior and Galt Village Shopping Center projects
- West Elm Avenue along the Schmidt Ranch Subdivision
- Kost Road along the Creekside 4 Subdivision
- Kost Road along the Countryside 2 Subdivision
- Marengo Road all except for the middle school property frontage and River Oaks 3 undeveloped property
- Live Oak Avenue adjacent to Consolidated Fabricators Industrial Project 1
- Carol Drive/East Stockton Boulevard (between Walnut and Amador)
- The segment of Industrial Drive south of Live Oak Avenue
- North Lincoln Way connector from Pringle Avenue to the Three Palms MHP entrance at 820 N. Lincoln Way
- East Stockton Boulevard (Walnut Avenue to Twin Cities Road)
- Twin Cities Road connector (East Stockton Boulevard to 450 feet east)
- S. Lincoln Way through the County’s unincorporated island previously had no bike lane but the City worked with the County to develop a continuous bike lane.
- The Central Galt interchange had no bike lanes across SR 99; the new two bridge design at A Street and C Street/Boessow Road will include bike lanes. The project will be under construction in 2011 and should be completed in 2012.
- The Deadman Gulch undercrossing at Carillion Boulevard is no longer viable because there is almost always water over the pathway in the culvert. Although the pathway also connects to the Carillion Boulevard sidewalk, there is no midblock crossing and no opening in the median of Carillion Boulevard. The City has recently obtained grant funding to create a mid
block crossing at this location and construction is expected in 2011.

Other Achievements
In reflecting on the existing Goals and Objectives, the City Planning Department reviewed each objective to determine if/how an objective was acted upon between 2002 and 2010. This information was used to determine if the Goal/Objectives were realistic (from an implementation point of view) and which ones should be continued. The detail of this evaluation is located in Appendix C.

C. COST ESTIMATES
The following unit cost summary is for constructing the proposed bikeway facilities shown in the Bicycle Master Plan Exhibit located in Figure 10. These cost estimates are based on costs experienced in other California communities, recent cost estimates developed as part of traffic impact fee and mitigation analysis in Sacramento County, and previous bikeway planning projects in Sacramento County. The cost estimates include engineering, permitting, right-of-way, construction, and inspection costs. These cost estimates should be used only to develop generalized construction cost estimates and project Prioritization. More detailed estimates can be developed after any feasibility analysis, preliminary engineering, and design.

GENERALIZED UNIT COSTS FOR BIKEWAY CONSTRUCTION

Class I Bike Path
(10 feet wide with 2-foot shoulders) $792,000/mile

Class I Bike Path Crossings
- Arterial Crossing $30,000
- Collector Crossing $20,000
- Canal/Creek Crossing $3,000

Class II Bike Lane
- 2-Lane Road with on-street parking ($9/LF) $48,000/mile
- 4-Lane Arterial Road with no on-street parking $310,000/mile
- 6-Lane Thoroughfare $400,000/mile

Class III Bike Route
- Signing only $5,300/mile
The unit costs identified in above have been applied to the proposed bikeway system. Additional crossing constraints may potentially be identified during preliminary engineering.

D. FUTURE FUNDING NEEDS

The future funding needs, in terms of this plan, were determined using the top four Class II routes identified in the Proposed Bike Lanes Exhibit (Figure 11) and the Bike Lane priority table (Figure 12). In addition to the Class II priorities, Class III routes in the downtown area have been identified for new signs and Sharrow markings. Other existing priorities (identified at the beginning of this section) generally involve removing or replacing signage, cleaning up areas and adding small amounts of striping. Therefore, these issues appear to fall under maintenance more than actual improvements. Given the current economic climate affecting state funding and potential private development growth, this section has only identified five Bike Lane projects for improvement based on the ranking system provided for New improvements. Subsequent estimates can be conducted as routes are completed and funding opportunities improve. This would result in more current estimates, and also trigger periodic review of the priority list.

Proposed Routes Identified for Near Future Improvement:

#1—Routes C3-1, C3-2, C3-3, C3-4 (C-Street west of 4th street to the new interchange, 4th street between A-Street and F-Street, South Lincoln Way between A-Street and F-Street) Total cost for “Sharrow” marking and “Share the Road” sign improvements approximately (6,466 LF +/-): $87,290.00

#2—Route C2-1: West “A” Street (between the railroad tracks and west to City limits): This street is wide enough to accommodate bike lanes via restriping and signing only.
- Length: approx 4,512 LF
- Pavement widening: not required
- Striping/marking/signage: 4,512 at $9/lf = $40,608.00
- Right of way acquisition: not required
- Bridge width enhancement: not required
- Railroad Crossing: not required
- Subtotal: $40,608.00
- 20% Engineering: $8,122.00
- 30% Contingency: $12,182.00
- Total (rough estimate) $60,912.00
#3—Route C2-3: Amador Avenue (between Industrial Drive and West End of existing Amador Ave.) Post “no parking” on south side of street. Stripe and sign for Bike Lanes. Existing paving is sufficient to accommodate bike lanes.

- Length: approx 1,062 LF
- Pavement widening: not required
- Striping/marking/signage: 4922LF at $9/lf = $9,558.00
- Right of way acquisition: not required
- Bridge width enhancement: not required
- Railroad Crossing: not required

Subtotal: $9,558.00

20% Engineering: $1,912.00

30% Contingency: $2,867.00

**Total (rough estimate)** $14,337.00

#4—Route C2-4 Elm Avenue (South side (city) between Industrial Drive and existing Class II)

- Length: approx 3,325 LF
- Pavement widening: not required
- Striping/marking/signage: 3,325LF at $4.5/lf = $14,963.00
- Right of way acquisition: not required
- Bridge width enhancement: not required

Subtotal: $14,963.00

20% Engineering: $2,993.00

30% Contingency: $4,489.00

**Total (rough estimate)** $22,445.00

#5—Route C2-5: A-street (From Lincoln east to interchange improvements)

- Length: approx 1,286 LF
- Pavement widening: not required
- Striping/marking/signage: 1,286LF at $9/lf = $11,574.00
- Right of way acquisition: xxxxx at $xx/sf = not required
- Bridge width enhancement: not required

Subtotal: $11,574.00

20% Engineering: $2,315.00

30% Contingency: $3,472.00

**Total (rough estimate)** $17,361.00
There are a variety of potential funding sources that can be used for bicycle projects, programs and plans from all levels of government. This section covers federal, state, regional and local sources of funding, as well as some non-traditional funding sources that may be used for bicycle projects.

A. Federal Funding Sources
Federal funding through the SAFETEA-LU (Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Effective Transportation Equity Act – Legacy for Users) could provide the bulk of non-local funding. However, Federal funding requires compliance with NEPA.

SAFETEA-LU funding is administered through the state and regional governments. Most of the funding programs are transportation versus recreation oriented, with an emphasis on (a) reducing auto trips and (b) providing inter-modal connections. Funding criteria includes completion and adoption of a Bikeway Master Plan and quantification of the costs and benefits of the system, proof of public involvement and support, CEQA compliance, and commitment of local resources. In most cases, SAFETEA-LU provides matching grants of 80 to 90 percent. Applicable SAFETEA-LU programs include:

Federal Lands Highway Funds
Federal Lands Highway Funds may be used to build bicycle and pedestrian facilities in conjunction with roads and parkways at the discretion of the department charged with administration of the funds. The projects must be transportation-related and tied to a plan adopted by the State and Metropolitan Planning Organization. Federal Lands Highway Funds may be used for planning and construction and is managed by the United States Department of Transportation.

Transportation, Community and System Preservation Program
The Transportation, Community and System Preservation Program provides federal funding for transit oriented development, traffic calming and other projects that improve the efficiency of the transportation system, reduce the impact on the environment, and provide efficient access to jobs, services and trade centers. The program is intended to provide communities with the resources to explore the integration of their transportation system with community preservation and environmental activities. The Program funds require a 20% match and can be applied to planning, design and construction and is administered through the Federal Highway Administration.
Land and Water Conservation Fund
The Land and Water Conservation Fund is a federally funded program that provides grants for planning and acquiring outdoor recreation areas and facilities. The Fund is administered by the National Parks Service and the California Department of Parks and Recreation and has been reauthorized until 2015. Cities, counties and districts authorized to acquire, develop, operate and maintain park and recreation facilities are eligible to apply. The application deadline is in May, and applicants must fund the entire project, and will be reimbursed for 50% of costs. Property acquired or developed under the program must be retained in perpetuity for public recreational use.

Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)
CMAQ Funds are directed to transportation projects and programs which contribute to the attainment or maintenance of National Ambient Air Quality Standards in non attainment or air quality maintenance areas for ozone, carbon monoxide, or particulate matter under provisions in the Federal Clean Air Act. Eligible projects include bicycle facilities.

Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)
The Highway Safety Improvement Program is managed locally by Caltrans. For a project to be eligible for HSIP funds, the project must be on any public road, publicly owned bicycle, pedestrian pathway, or trail. Projects must identify a specific safety problem that can be corrected or be improved substantially.

Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)
Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funding is distributed based on population, among the urbanized and non-urbanized areas of the State through Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs). Bicycle facilities are eligible for funding through this federally administered program.

Safe Routes to School (SRTS)
Eligible projects fall under the category of infrastructure (capital improvements), or non-infrastructure (education, encouragement, enforcement). Infrastructure projects must be located within a two mile radius of a grade school or middle school. Local Caltrans representatives serve as the administrative authority on SRTS projects.
Transportation Enhancements (TE)
Federal Transportation Enhancement funds are to be used for transportation-related capital improvement projects that enhance quality-of-life, in or around transportation facilities. Facilities that qualify for TE funds include bicycle safety, education and facility projects. Transportation Enhancements projects are managed locally by Caltrans.

B. Statewide Funding Sources
The State of California uses both federal sources and its own budget to fund bicycle projects and programs.

Bicycle Transportation Account
The Bicycle Transportation Account provides state funding for local projects that improve the safety and convenience of bicycling for transportation. Because of its focus on transportation, Bicycle Transportation Account projects must provide a demonstrable level of utility for transportation purposes. For example, all in-City on-street and paved bikeways would be good candidates for funding. Funds are available for both planning and construction. Bicycle Transportation Account funding is administered by Caltrans and cities and counties must have an adopted Bicycle Transportation Plan in order to be eligible. The maximum amount available through the Bicycle Transportation Account is $1.2 million dollars, cities and counties are eligible to apply. All projects must be designed to the standards outlined in Chapter 1000 of the Highway Design Manual. The application deadline is in December.

Community Based Transportation Planning Demonstration Grant Program
This fund, administered by Caltrans, provides funding for projects that exemplify livable community concepts including bicycle improvement projects. Eligible applicants include local governments, metropolitan planning organizations and regional transportation planning agencies. A 20% local match is required and projects must demonstrate a transportation component or objective. There is $3 million available annually statewide. The application deadline is in October.

Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program (EEM)
Bicycle projects can qualify for EEM funds if they meet the program’s requirements. Any non-profit organization can sponsor projects, which are
submitted to the State Resources Agency for evaluation in June/July of each year.

**Assembly Bill 1475 – Safe Routes to School Bill T**
This bill redefines transportation safety in California by investing $20 million per year in bike lanes, bicycle and walking trails, new sidewalks and traffic-calming projects near California schools. Several rounds of solicitation and funding have been completed. It is anticipated that this program will continue for future years. Up to 10 percent of the project’s cost can fund a non-infrastructure component that supports the infrastructure project. Only cities and counties are eligible to compete for funds.

**State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)**
All STIP projects must be capital projects (including project development costs) needed to improve transportation. Eligible projects include bicycle facility improvements and improved access to transit and are administered by Caltrans.

**Transportation Development Act**
Transportation Development Act Article 3 funds are state block grants awarded monthly to local jurisdictions for transit, bicycle and pedestrian projects in California by Caltrans. Funds for pedestrian projects originate from the Local Transportation Fund, which is derived from a ¼ cent of the general state sales tax. Local Transportation Funds are returned to each county based on sales tax revenues. Article 3 of the Transportation Development Act sets aside 2% of the Local Transportation Funds for bicycle and pedestrian projects. Eligible pedestrian and bicycle projects include: construction and engineering for capital projects; maintenance of bikeways; bicycle safety education programs (up to 5% of funds); and development of comprehensive bicycle or pedestrian facilities plans. A City or county may use these funds to update their bicycle and pedestrian plan not more than once every five years. These funds may be used to meet local match requirements for federal funding sources. Application deadlines vary within county transportation agencies.

**C. Local and Regional Funding Sources**
A variety of local sources may be available for funding bikeway and pedestrian facilities. However, their use is often dependent on political support.

**New Construction**
Future road widening and construction projects are one means of providing on-
street bikeways. To ensure that roadway construction projects provide these facilities where needed, roadway design standards need to include minimum cross-sections that have sufficient pavement for on-street bikeways and the review process for new development should include input pertaining to consistency with the proposed system.

**Impact Fees**
Another potential local source of funding is developer impact fees. There are several different impact fees which may be used for bikeway development. Traffic mitigation fees are typically tied to trip generation rates and traffic impacts produced by the proposed development, and are often used to install Class II bike lanes during road widening projects but are not used for Class I facilities. Bike trail development fees are often used in new specific plan areas as a way to finance construction of Class I trails.

**Assessment Districts**
Different types of assessment districts can be used to fund the construction and maintenance of bikeway facilities. Examples include Infrastructure Financing Districts (SB 308), Open Space Districts, or Lighting and Landscape Districts. These types of districts have specific requirements relating to their establishment and use of funds.

**Measure A**
Sacramento County voters passed the extension Measure A to allocate $.005 of sales tax for transportation projects. Measure A includes funding for roadway widening (including on-street bicycle lanes), bicycle lanes and paths, and pedestrian facilities.

**Bike Parking**
Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District is implementing a bicycle parking program with direct funding to the City of Galt, that will provide $4,300.00 toward the purchase and installation of bicycle racks (approximately 14-29 racks).

See the following Figure 15, Funding Summary Table for more specific funding information.
### FIGURE 15: FUNDING SUMMARY TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Source</th>
<th>Application Deadline</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Program Funds Available</th>
<th>Matching Requirement</th>
<th>Eligible Applicants</th>
<th>Commute</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Safety/ Education</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)</td>
<td>Varies by RTPA</td>
<td>RTPAs, Caltrans</td>
<td>$320 million</td>
<td>11.47% non-federal match</td>
<td>cities, counties, transit operators, Caltrans, and MPOs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>RSTP funds may be exchanged for local funds for non-federally certified local agencies; no match may be required if project improves safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program (CMAQ)</td>
<td>December 1, Yearly</td>
<td>RTPAs, Caltrans</td>
<td>$400 million</td>
<td>11.47% non-federal match</td>
<td>federally certified jurisdictions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Counties redesignated to attainment status for ozone may lose this source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA)</td>
<td>Varies by RTPA</td>
<td>RTPAs, Caltrans</td>
<td>$60 million</td>
<td>11.47% non-federal match</td>
<td>federally certified jurisdictions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funds are dispersed through the four shares listed below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Share</td>
<td>Varies by RTPA</td>
<td>RTPAs, Caltrans</td>
<td>$45 million</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>federal, state, or local depending or category</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding share to RTPAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Share</td>
<td>Varies by RTPA</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>$6.6 million</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding share to Caltrans. Available only if regional TEA funds are not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Transportation Enhancement Share</td>
<td>Varies by RTPA</td>
<td>State DPR</td>
<td>$20-30 million</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>federally certified jurisdictions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding share for all 12 TEA categories except conservation lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Lands Share</td>
<td>Varies by RTPA</td>
<td>Caltrans, State Resources Agency</td>
<td>$11 million</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>RTPAs, counties, cities, school districts, and non-profits</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding share for conservation lands category - acquisitions of scenic lands with high habitat conservation value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Safe Routes to School</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>$68 million over 5 years statewide</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>RTPAs, counties, cities, school districts, non-profits, Native American Tribes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Projects that improve system efficiency, reduce environmental impacts of transportation, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Trails Program (RTP)</td>
<td>October 1</td>
<td>State DPR</td>
<td>$3 million</td>
<td>20% Match</td>
<td>Jurisdiction with special districts, non profits with management responsibilities over the land</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For recreational trails to benefit bicyclists, pedestrians, and other users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Community and System Preservation Pilot Program</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>$25 million nationwide</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>state, local, MPOs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Projects that improve system efficiency, reduce environmental impacts of transportation, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land &amp; Water Conservation Fund</td>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>State DPR</td>
<td>$7.7 million</td>
<td>50% including in-kind</td>
<td>federal, state, city, county, eligible districts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federally-funded. Projects that acquire and develop outdoor recreation areas and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School (SB 10)</td>
<td>May 31</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>$18 million</td>
<td>11.5% minimum</td>
<td>city, county</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primarily construction program to enhance safety of pedestrian and bicycle facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Transportation Account</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>$7.2 million</td>
<td>minimum 10% local match on construction</td>
<td>city, county</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State-funded. Projects that improve safety and convenience of bicycle commuters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTP)</td>
<td>December 15, odd years</td>
<td>RTPA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>city, county, transit operators, Caltrans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Part of State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), the main state program for transportation project funding. For &quot;improving transportation within the region.&quot; RTPA must program funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum Violation Escrow Account (PVEA)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>State Legislature</td>
<td>$5 million</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>city, county, transit operators, Caltrans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycle and trail facilities have been funded with this program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Based Transportation Planning Demonstration Grant Program</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>$3 million</td>
<td>20% Local</td>
<td>MPO, RTPA, city, county</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Projects that exemplify livable community concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Traffic Safety Grants</td>
<td>January 31</td>
<td>Office of Traffic Safety</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>state, city, county</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycle and pedestrian projects have been funded through this program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- AQMD - Air Quality Management District
- Caltrans - California Department of Transportation
- CMAQ - Congestion Management and Air Quality
- CTC - California Transportation Commission
- FHWA - Federal Highway Administration
- RTPA - Regional Transportation Planning Agency
- State DPR - California Department of Parks and Recreation (under the State Resources Agency)
- TEA - Transportation Enhancement Activities

**Resources:**
- FHWA SAFETEA-LU Web site: [www.fhwa.dot.gov/safetealu](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/safetealu)
890. It is the intent of the Legislature, in enacting this article, to establish a bicycle transportation system. It is the further intent of the Legislature that this transportation system shall be designed and developed to achieve the functional commuting needs of the employee, student, business person, and shopper as the foremost consideration in route selection, to have the physical safety of the bicyclist and bicyclist's property as a major planning component, and to have the City or county to accommodate bicyclists of all ages and skills.

890.2. As used in this chapter, "bicycle" means a device upon which any person may ride, propelled exclusively by human power through a belt, chain, or gears, and having either two or three wheels in a tandem or tricycle arrangement.

890.3. As used in this article, "bicycle commuter" means a person making a trip by bicycle primarily for transportation purposes, including, but not limited to, travel to work, school, shopping, or other destination that is a center of activity, and does not include a trip by bicycle primarily for physical exercise or recreation without such a destination.

890.4. As used in this article, "bikeway" means all facilities that provide primarily for bicycle travel. For purposes of this article, bikeways shall be categorized as follows:

(a) Class I bikeways, such as a "bike path," which provide a completely separated right-of-way designated for the exclusive use of bicycles and pedestrians with cross flows by motorists minimized.

(b) Class II bikeways, such as a "bike lane," which provide a restricted right-of-way designated for the exclusive or semi-exclusive use of bicycles with through travel by motor vehicles or pedestrians prohibited, but with vehicle parking and cross flows by pedestrians and motorists permitted.

(c) Class III bikeways, such as an on-street or off-street "bike
route," which provide a right-of-way designated by signs or permanent markings and shared with pedestrians or motorists.

890.6. The department, in cooperation with county and City governments, shall establish minimum safety design criteria for the planning and construction of bikeways and roadways where bicycle travel is permitted. The criteria shall include, but not be limited to, the design speed of the facility, minimum widths and clearances, grade, radius of curvature, pavement surface, actuation of automatic traffic control devices, drainage, and general safety. The criteria shall be updated biennially, or more often, as needed.

890.8. The department shall establish uniform specifications and symbols for signs, markers, and traffic control devices to designate bikeways, regulate traffic, improve safety and convenience for bicyclists, and alert pedestrians and motorists of the presence of bicyclists on bikeways and on roadways where bicycle travel is permitted.

891. All City, county, regional, and other local agencies responsible for the development or operation of bikeways or roadways where bicycle travel is permitted shall utilize all minimum safety design criteria and uniform specifications and symbols for signs, markers, and traffic control devices established pursuant to Sections 890.6 and 890.8.

891.2. A City or county may prepare a bicycle transportation plan, which shall include, but not be limited to, the following elements:
   (a) The estimated number of existing bicycle commuters in the plan area and the estimated increase in the number of bicycle commuters resulting from implementation of the plan.
   (b) A map and description of existing and proposed land use and settlement patterns which shall include, but not be limited to, locations of residential neighborhoods, schools, shopping centers, public buildings, and major employment centers.
   (c) A map and description of existing and proposed bikeways.
   (d) A map and description of existing and proposed end-of-trip bicycle parking facilities. These shall include, but not be limited
to, parking at schools, shopping centers, public buildings, and major employment centers.

(e) A map and description of existing and proposed bicycle transport and parking facilities for connections with and use of other transportation modes. These shall include, but not be limited to, parking facilities at transit stops, rail and transit terminals, ferry docks and landings, park and ride lots, and provisions for transporting bicyclists and bicycles on transit or rail vehicles or ferry vessels.

(f) A map and description of existing and proposed facilities for changing and storing clothes and equipment. These shall include, but not be limited to, locker, restroom, and shower facilities near bicycle parking facilities.

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

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

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

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

(k) A description of past expenditures for bicycle facilities and future financial needs for projects that improve safety and convenience for bicycle commuters in the plan area.

891.4. (a) A City or county that has prepared a bicycle transportation plan pursuant to Section 891.2 may submit the plan to the county transportation commission or transportation planning agency for approval. The City or county may submit an approved plan to the department in connection with an application for funds for
bikeways and related facilities which will implement the plan. If the bicycle transportation plan is prepared, and the facilities are proposed to be constructed, by a local agency other than a City or county, the City or county may submit the plan for approval and apply for funds on behalf of that local agency.

(b) The department may grant funds applied for pursuant to subdivision (a) on a matching basis which provides for the applicant's furnishing of funding for 10 percent of the total cost of constructing the proposed bikeways and related facilities. The funds may be used, where feasible, to apply for and match federal grants or loans.

891.5. The Sacramento Area Council of Governments, pursuant to subdivision (d) of Section 2551, may purchase, operate, and maintain call boxes on Class I bikeways.

891.8. The governing body of a City, county, or local agency may do all of the following:

(a) Establish bikeways.

(b) Acquire, by gift, purchase, or condemnation, land, real property, easements, or rights-of-way to establish bikeways.

(c) Establish bikeways pursuant to Section 21207 of the Vehicle Code.

892. (a) Rights-of-way established for other purposes by cities, counties, or local agencies shall not be abandoned unless the governing body determines that the rights-of-way or parts thereof are not useful as a non-motorized transportation facility.

(b) No state highway right-of-way shall be abandoned until the department first consults with the local agencies having jurisdiction over the areas concerned to determine whether the right-of-way or part thereof could be developed as a non-motorized transportation facility. If an affirmative determination is made, before abandoning the right-of-way, the department shall first make the property available to local agencies for development as non-motorized transportation facilities in accordance with Sections 104.15 and 887.6 of this code and Section 14012 of the Government Code.

892.2. (a) The Bicycle Transportation Account is continued in
existence in the State Transportation Fund, and, notwithstanding Section 13340 of the Government Code, the money in the account is continuously appropriated to the department for expenditure for the purposes specified in Section 892.4. Unexpended moneys shall be retained in the account for use in subsequent fiscal years.

(b) Any reference in law or regulation to the Bicycle Lane Account is a reference to the Bicycle Transportation Account.

892.4. The department shall allocate and disburse moneys from the Bicycle Transportation Account according to the following priorities:

(a) To the department, the amounts necessary to administer this article, not to exceed 1 percent of the funds expended per year.

(b) To counties and cities, for bikeways and related facilities, planning, safety and education, in accordance with Section 891.4.

892.5. The Bikeway Account, created in the State Transportation Fund by Chapter 1235 of the Statutes of 1975, is continued in effect, and, notwithstanding Section 13340 of the Government Code, money in the account is hereby continuously appropriated to the department for expenditure for the purposes specified in this chapter. Unexpended money shall be retained in the account for use in subsequent fiscal years.

892.6. The Legislature finds and declares that the construction of bikeways pursuant to this article constitutes a highway purpose under Article XIX of the California Constitution and justifies the expenditure of highway funds therefore.

893. The department shall disburse the money from the Bicycle Transportation Account pursuant to Section 891.4 for projects that improve the safety and convenience of bicycle commuters, including, but not limited to, any of the following:

(a) New bikeways serving major transportation corridors.

(b) New bikeways removing travel barriers to potential bicycle commuters.

(c) Secure bicycle parking at employment centers, park-and-ride lots, rail and transit terminals, and ferry docks and landings.

(d) Bicycle-carrying facilities on public transit vehicles.
(e) Installation of traffic control devices to improve the safety and efficiency of bicycle travel.
(f) Elimination of hazardous conditions on existing bikeways.
(g) Planning.
(h) Improvement and maintenance of bikeways.

In recommending projects to be funded, due consideration shall be given to the relative cost effectiveness of proposed projects.

893.2. The department shall not finance projects with the money in accounts continued in existence pursuant to this article which could be financed appropriately pursuant to Article 2 (commencing with Section 887), or fully financed with federal financial assistance.

893.4. If available funds are insufficient to finance completely any project whose eligibility is established pursuant to Section 893, the project shall retain its priority for allocations in subsequent fiscal years.

893.6. The department shall make a reasonable effort to disburse funds in general proportion to population. However, no applicant shall receive more than 25 percent of the total amounts transferred to the Bicycle Transportation Account in a single fiscal year.

894. The department may enter into an agreement with any City or county concerning the handling and accounting of the money disbursed pursuant to this article, including, but not limited to, procedures to permit prompt payment for the work accomplished.

894.2. The department, in cooperation with county and City governments, shall adopt the necessary guidelines for implementing this article.
DESIGN GUIDELINES

This section provides basic bikeway planning and design guidelines for use in developing the City of Galt bikeway system and support facilities. Where noted, designs are for elements required by the State of California for compliance with Caltrans Highway Design Manual Chapter 1000 “Bikeway Planning and Design” guidelines. Otherwise, these guidelines include additional recommendations, providing information on optional design treatments. Although this information meets Caltrans requirements it is not intended to state a minimum or maximum accommodation or to replace any existing adopted roadway design guidelines. Also included in this Chapter, are experimental or nonstandard best practices with information about optional innovative bikeways and support facilities that have not been adopted by the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) or State of California for use in California and do not meet Caltrans Chapter 1000 design requirements. All facility designs are subject to Public Works engineering design review and approval.

Bikeway Facility Classifications

According to Caltrans, the term “bikeway” encompasses all facilities that provide primarily for bicycle travel. Caltrans has defined three types of bikeways in Chapter 1000 of the Highway Design Manual: Class I, Class II, and Class III. For each type of bikeway facility both “Design Requirements” and “Additional Design Recommendations” are provided. “Design Requirements” contain requirements established by Caltrans Chapter 1000 “Bikeway Planning and Design.” “Additional Design Recommendations” are provided as guidelines to assist with design and implementation of facilities and include alternate treatments approved or recommended but not required by Caltrans.

Class I Bikeway Design

Typically called a “bike path” or “shared use path,” a Class I bikeway provides bicycle travel on a paved right-of-way completely separated from any street or highway. The recommended width of a shared use path is dependent upon anticipated usage:

- 8 feet (2.4 m) is the minimum width for Class I facilities
- 8 feet (2.4 m) may be used for short neighborhood connector paths (generally less than one mile in length) due to low anticipated volumes of use
- 10 feet (3.0 m) is the recommended minimum width for a typical two-way bicycle path
• 12 feet (3.6 m) is the preferred minimum width if more than 300 users per peak hour are anticipated, and/or if there is heavy mixed bicycle and pedestrian use a minimum 2 feet (0.6 m) wide graded area must be provided adjacent to the path to provide clearance from trees, poles, walls, guardrails, etc. On facilities with expected heavy use, a yellow centerline stripe is recommended to separate travel in opposite directions.

Class I Bikeway Crossing Designs
At–Grade Intersection
When shared-use paths cross streets, proper design should be developed on the pathway as well as on the roadway to alert bicyclists and motorists of the crossing. Sometimes on larger streets, at midblock pathway crossing locations
an actuated signal is necessary. A signal allows bicyclists a clear crossing of a multi-lane roadway. If a signal is or is not needed, appropriate signage and pavement markings should be installed, including stop signs and bike crossing pavement markings.

Overcrossings
Overcrossings are also an important component of bikeway design. Barriers to bicycling often include freeways, complex interchanges, and rivers. When a route is not available to cross these barriers a bicycle overcrossing is necessary. Some design considerations for overcrossings include:

- Pathways must be a minimum 6 feet wide, with a preferred width of 8 or 10 feet wide
- Slope of any ramps must comply with ADA Guidelines
- Screens are often a necessary buffer between vehicle traffic and the bicycle overcrossing

Class II Bikeway Design
Often referred to as a “bike lane,” a Class II bikeway provides a striped and stenciled lane for one-way travel on either side of a street or highway. To provide bike lanes along corridors where insufficient space is currently available, extra room can be provided by removing a traffic lane, narrowing traffic lanes, or prohibiting parking. The width of the bike lanes vary according to parking and street conditions. Note that these dimensions are for reference only, may not meet City of Galt Standards and are subject to engineering design review.

- 4 feet (1.2 m) minimum if no gutter exists, measured from edge of pavement
- 5 feet (1.5 m) minimum with normal gutter, measured from curb face; or 3' (0.9 m) measured from the gutter pan seam
5 feet (1.5 m) minimum when parking stalls are marked
11 feet (3.3 m) minimum for a shared bike/parking lane where parking is permitted but not marked on streets without curbs; or 12 feet (3.6 m) for a shared lane adjacent to a curb face.

**Class II Intersection Design-Signalized Intersections**
Intersections represent a primary collision point for bicyclists. Small intersections with few lanes are relatively easy to manage. Large, multi-lane intersections are more difficult for bicyclists to travel through than smaller, two-lane intersections.

**Challenges and potential solutions for bicyclists’ at large signalized intersections include:**
- Signals may not be timed to allow slower-moving bicyclists to travel across the intersection. Solution: Bicycle adaptive signal timing.
Bicycle Actuated Signals & Adaptive Signal Timing
Making intersections more “friendly” to bicyclists, involves modifying how they operate. Improved signal timing, calibrating loop detectors to detect bicyclists, and camera detection makes intersections easier for bicyclists to cross intersections. Loop detectors are installed within the roadway to allow the metal of a motor vehicle to trigger a change in the traffic signal. Many standard motor vehicle loop detectors can be calibrated to detect bicycles. This allows the bicyclist to stay within the lane of travel and avoid maneuvering to the side of the road to trigger a push button. Signals can be configured so that if a bicycle is detected, an extended green time can be provided.

Signal Timing
Cities often apply signal timing techniques to enhance bicycle travel along major streets. For instance, closely-spaced signals (e.g., along one-way streets in City areas) can be timed to match bicyclists’ travel speeds. Signals timed for speeds of 12 to 16 MPH enable most bicyclists to ride comfortably with traffic. Signal timing should also take into account the necessary time needed for a bicyclist to cross a wide intersection. Activation devices can also be used on a roadway approach to prolong the green phase and extend the time needed for a bicyclist to clear the intersection. Standards suggest
intersections utilize markings to indicate the location where a bicyclist is to be positioned in order to actuate a signal. Adjacent signage is also recommended to emphasize the connection between the marking and the signal.

**Right-Turn Only Lanes**
Right-turn only lanes can present challenges for bicyclists traveling through an intersection. Bicyclists must merge to the left to position themselves in the through travel lane. Jurisdictions will sometimes stripe bike lanes on the right-side of right-turn only lanes, which places the through-cyclist in direct conflict with a right-turning vehicle. The appropriate treatment for right-turn only lanes is to either drop the bike lane entirely approaching the right-turn lane, or to place a bike lane pocket between the right-turn lane and the right-most through lane.

**Freeway Ramps**
Freeway on- and off-ramp crossings present a potential conflict zone for bicyclists and motorists, as bicycle lanes are typically dropped and bicyclists must merge across travel lanes where vehicles are accelerating or decelerating from freeway speeds. The appropriate bicyclist behavior is to merge left away so as to be positioned in the through lane well before the mouth of the on-ramp, and to remain out away from the curb until past the off-ramp. Implementation of interchange improvements requires coordination with Caltrans regarding placement of signage and striping because these areas are in Caltrans’ right-of-way. Three guidelines for these improvements are:

- The bicycle merge should begin 250 feet in advance of the freeway on-
• Appropriate signage and striping should be used to warn bicyclists and motorists of the merge.
• Bicycle improvements to freeway ramps

At-Grade Railroad Crossings
City of Galt has at-grade railroad crossings for existing and proposed bikeways. If bicyclists do not ride at a 90 degree angle over the tracks, bicyclists’ wheels can catch in the tracks and potentially lead to a collision.

Class III Bikeway Design
Generally referred to as a “bike route,” a Class III bikeway provides routes through areas not served by Class I or II facilities or to connect discontinuous segments of a bikeway. Class III facilities can be shared with either motorists on roadways or pedestrians on a sidewalk (not advisable) and is identified only by signing. There are no recommended minimum widths for Class III facilities, but when encouraging bicyclists to travel along selected routes, traffic speed and volume, parking, traffic control devices, and surface quality should be acceptable for bicycle travel.

Although it is not a requirement, a wide outside traffic lane (14 feet) is typically preferable to enable cars to safely pass bicyclists without crossing the centerline. Caltrans Chapter 1000 provides details regarding the design requirements for placement and spacing of bicycle route signage.

On-Street Regulatory & Warning Bike Signs
Signage for on-street bikeways includes standard BIKE LANE and BIKE ROUTE signage, as well as supplemental signage such as SHARE THE ROAD and warning signage for constrained bike lane conditions. Signage should be installed on existing signposts if possible, reducing visual clutter along the path or roadway.

Shared Roadway Bicycle Marking
Recently, Shared Lane Marking stencils (“Sharrows”) have been introduced for use in California as an additional treatment for Class III facilities. The stencil can serve a number of purposes, such as making motorists aware of bicycles potentially in their lane, showing bicyclists the direction of travel, and, with proper placement, reminding bicyclists to bike further from parked cars to prevent “dooring” collisions.
Bike Route Signage
In addition to wayfinding signs, bike route network signage that uses the California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CAMUTCD) standard should be used by local jurisdictions. Route numbering for these signs should be coordinated with neighboring jurisdictions where bikeways cross borders. Most commonly, they show the route number and the corresponding direction.

For bike route signs, CAMUTCD requires a green background and white lettering. The top portion of the sign is customizable for the City or region where it is located.

Multi-Use Path Signs
Local jurisdictions should work together to create a sign system for the multi-use path network. It is an expanding network that could link with many destinations countywide. Signs could show destinations as well as proper traffic control. These signs could be coordinated with other on-street bicycle route signage. This system should encourage use of trails for recreational as well as functional bicycling trip-purposes. Helping bicyclists of all ages reach destinations easily.

Wrong-Way Signs
The local jurisdictions may want to consider additional signage on bikeways with high levels of wrong-way riding. The City of Sunnyvale, places wrong way riding signs on the back of bike lane signs to help prevent bicyclists using bicycle lanes in the wrong direction, riding against traffic.

Parallel Path Warning Signage
When paths are located parallel and adjacent to roadways, vehicles turning into and out of streets and driveways must cross the path. Conflicts between bicyclists and pedestrians and turning motorists are common at these types of intersections. Turning motor vehicles do not expect to see bicyclists or pedestrians coming in the opposite direction of traffic. Starting in the early 1990’s, the City of Denver, Colorado began using experimental warning signage at its parallel paths. The signage is modified from the standard MUTCD railroad warning signage. Experimental signage, similar to the Denver parallel path warning signs, could help alert motorists to the presence of bicyclists and pedestrians on parallel paths.
Short Term Bicycle Parking

Short term bicycle parking facilities are best used to accommodate visitors, customers, messengers and others expected to depart within two hours. Bicycle racks provide support for the bicycle but do not have locking mechanisms. Racks are relatively low-cost devices that typically hold between two and eight bicycles, allow bicyclists to securely lock their frames and wheels, are secured to the ground, and should be located in highly visible areas, preferably at the
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front of a building. They are usually located at schools, commercial locations, and activity centers such as parks, libraries, retail locations, and civic centers.

**Bike Rack Guidelines**

Bicycle racks should be installed in accordance to the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals Bicycle Parking Guidelines (http://www.apbp.org/?page=Publications) with the following guidelines in mind:

- The rack element (part of the rack that supports the bike) should keep the bike upright, supporting the frame in two places and allowing one or both wheels to be secured.

- Install racks so there is enough room between adjacent parked bicycles. If it becomes too difficult for a bicyclist to easily lock their bicycle, they may park elsewhere. A row of inverted “U” racks should be installed with 15 inches minimum between racks.

- Empty racks should not pose a tripping hazard for visually impaired pedestrians. Position racks out of the walkway’s clear zone. When possible, racks should be in a covered area protected from the elements.
Long-term parking should always be protected.

• Generally, ‘U’ type racks bolted into the sidewalk are preferred and should be located intermittently or in front of key destinations.

• Bicycle racks should be installed to meet ADA standards and not block pedestrian through traffic.

The City may want to consider / encourage custom racks that can serve not only as Bicycle racks, but also public artwork.

**Long Term Bicycle Parking**

Long-term bicycle parking facilities accommodate employees, students, residents, commuters, and others that typically expect to park for more than two hours. These parking facilities should be provided in a secure, weather protected manner and location.

For long-term parking, the City may want to consider / encourage bicycle lockers. Bicyclists are usually more comfortable storing bicycles in lockers for long periods because they offer increased security and protection from natural elements. Although they may be more expensive to install, they can make the difference for commuters deciding whether or not to bicycle. The park and ride lot located on the east side of the Horseshoe Bar Road interchange and the park and ride / bus transfer lot at the rail station are excellent opportunities to locate long term bike parking facilities.

Lockers can be controlled with traditional key systems or through more elaborate subscription systems. Subscription locker programs, like e-lockers, or park-by-phone systems allow even more flexibility within locker use. Instead of restricting access for each patron to a single locker, subscribers can gain access to all lockers within a system, controlled by magnetic access cards, or caller ID. These programs typically have fewer administrative costs because they simplify or eliminate key management and locker assignment.

**Pavement Marking Guidelines**

The following exhibits are from the California MUTCD and depict typical striping, signage and marking for all bikeway facilities.
TYPICAL BIKE LANE PAVEMENT DELINEATION
(ON 2-LANE OR MULTI-LANE ROADWAYS)

SOURCES CALIFORNIA MUTCD, FIGURE BC-6

CLASS II BIKEWAY MARKING DIMENSIONS
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CLASS II BIKEWAY MARKINGS LOCATIONS
Sharrows can also be used on urban streets where narrow lanes and parking create bike / auto conflicts.

A Sharrow is an on-street marking of a bicycle and two chevrons indicating the direction of travel as depicted above. They should be no more than 250 feet apart and no less than 4 feet from the curb. Within those standards there is room for adjustment based on the roadway conditions.

In urban areas, signs typically should be placed approximately every 400 m (0.25 mi), at every turn in the route, and at all signalized intersections.
The following is an evaluation conducted by the Planning Department to determine what objectives were acted upon and which were unrealistic.

**Achievements Since 2002 Bike Transportation Plan (BTP)**

*As requested, I (Sandra Kiriu, Principal Planner) have looked at the Objectives from the 2002 BTP and note the following achievements relevant to each:*

1-1: The City has required bike lanes/paths along all collector and arterial streets as development occurs along those street frontages. The typical practice, and new General Plan policy, has been to require bike lane striping and signage for all 60’ or greater ROW’s adjacent to project construction unless there is no reasonable linkage already in place. Examples of projects that have been done since 2002 include, but are not limited to:

- Fermoy Way along the Emerald Village Senior and Galt Village Shopping Center projects
- W. Elm Avenue along the Schmidt Ranch Subdivision
- Kost Road along the Creekside 4 Subdivision
- Kost Road along the Countryside 2 Subdivision
- Marengo Road all except for the middle school property frontage and River Oaks 3 undeveloped property
- Live Oak Avenue adjacent to Consolidated Fabricators Industrial Project

1-2: The City has retrofitted several street segments to include bike lanes since 2002 such as:

- Carol Drive/East Stockton Boulevard (between Walnut and Amador)
- The segment of Industrial Drive south of Live Oak Avenue
- North Lincoln Way connector from Pringle Avenue to the Three Palms MHP entrance at 820 N. Lincoln Way
- East Stockton Boulevard (Walnut Avenue to Twin Cities Road)
- Twin Cities Road connector (East Stockton Boulevard to 450 feet east)

1-3: See response to 1-2 above.

1-4: The City has identified various weak links/discontinuities in the bicycle network and is working to correct them although there is no specific list of such
needed improvements. The following projects have been completed or are underway:

- **S. Lincoln Way** through the County’s unincorporated island previously had no bike lane but the City worked with the County to develop a continuous bike lane.
- **The Central Galt interchange** had no bike lanes across SR 99; the new two bridge design at A Street and C Street/Boessow Road will include bike lanes. The project will be under construction shortly and should be completed in 2012.
- **The Deadman Gulch undercrossing at Carillion Boulevard** is no longer viable because there is almost always water over the pathway in the culvert. Although the pathway also connects to the Carillion Boulevard sidewalk, there is no midblock crossing and no opening in the median of Carillion Boulevard. The City has recently obtained grant funding to create a mid block crossing at this location and construction is expected in 2011.

1-5: The City’s CIP includes a number of projects to improve east-west bicycle access. CIP Projects include bike lanes on the following projects, but some of the funding is beyond the current CIP 2008-1013:

- Central Galt Interchange reconstruction project (A and C Street bridges)
- Simmerhorn Overcrossing Realignment Project
- A Street widening project west of SR 99
- Twin Cities Interchange Project
- Carillion Boulevard extension project (to connect with the Central Galt Interchange)
- Walnut Avenue Interchange Project

1-6: All new pedestrian/bicycle facilities are designed to meet ADA requirements.

1-7: The City has one official park and ride lot at Twin Cities Road/East Stockton Boulevard adjacent to SR 99. Bus stops have been located in several locations in the City (IE. Civic Drive, Chabolla Avenue) and facilities continue to be planned for appropriate locations such as the Galt Place Senior Apartment complex although the City’s fixed route transit system has been discontinued because of financial infeasibility at this time.
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1-8: Bike lanes continue to be planned along designated open space corridors (Deadman’s Gulch branches and Dry Creek) and 60’ + right of way collector/arterial streets identified in the Bicycle Master Plan and where deemed appropriate. Collector streets and arterials tend to provide the most direct path of travel between activity centers.

1-9: The city has provided bikeways along most of the streets identified in Figure 3 with the exception of Amador Avenue along the Ione Spur railroad track because Amador Avenue does not connect to Carillion Boulevard as shown and existing development would prohibit that road extension. Any possible future bikeway extension could only occur if the railroad corridor was abandoned and converted to a trail system which is unlikely in the foreseeable future.

1-10: This policy has seen limited implementation and when it has occurred it has been primarily before 2002 (West A Street).

2-1: This policy has been implemented in an ongoing matter, accordance with zoning, as projects requiring Site Plan Review are constructed.

3-1: The Galt Police Department provides safety education presentations, including written materials, to each of the elementary and middle schools every other year.

3-2 through 3-12: The City has not developed a bicycle route map or similar informational materials for public distribution. The City has not advertised bicycling information or events and there are no specific incentive programs or facilities to encourage bicycling city employee commuters.

4-1: The City has been developing bikeway linkages between destinations as development occurs (Deadman’s Gulch, Dry Creek, collector/arterial streets etc.). However, most segments do not have much shading.

4-2: The city has not developed any specific design standards for bike lane improvements; the Caltrans design manual and Sacramento County improvements are the primary sources for standards. However, many of the bike lane improvements are adjacent to a parking lane, so riders do not have to contend with street grates and more current research seems to discourage the
use of motorized traffic barriers for bike lanes unless it is a very heavily traveled thoroughfare. Bicycle operating characteristics and design standards are considered and included in all new streets, bridges, and intersections.

4-3: The City requires that developers construct full half street frontage improvements including bike lanes as part of their improvement plans so improvements are in place prior to occupancy of any homes/businesses where such improvements are required.

Goal 5: No regional trail linkages have been implemented.

6-1: The City is emphasizing on-street bike lanes and routes where there is sufficient ROW to provide them. Typically, that has been on 60’ ROW or greater.

6-2: New growth areas are required to implement bicycle lanes on applicable streets and provide linkages to existing routes where feasible.

7-1: Arterial streets typically have had sufficient width and prohibit parking so as to allow for bike lanes. However, several Class II bikeways have been developed on streets with on-street parking.

7-2: The City complies with the most recent Caltrans Design Manual.

Goal 8: The City has not developed specific subdivision guidelines. For commercial/industrial projects, there are some general Site Plan Review guidelines in Chapter 18.68 of the Galt Municipal Code.

9-1: The City has adopted the County’s improvement standards, with some modifications. There are currently no crossings that are specific only to bicycles, but the combination bike/pedestrian crosswalks serve that purpose. Such crosswalks have been installed across Lincoln Way to continue the Dry Creek multipurpose pathway, and one is soon to be constructed midblock on Carillion Boulevard at the Deadman’s Gulch crossing.

Goal 10: The Deadman’s Gulch corridor has landscaping installed along developed sections and the City has been conducting periodic tree plantings to further landscape those segments that did not receive landscaping or are
currently undeveloped. The Dry Creek corridor is mostly natural riparian landscaping along one side.

11-1: The City is currently in the process of updating the BTP. The reason it has not been updated since 2002 is that the City began its General Plan Update in 2002 and it was not adopted until 2009. The updated land use/circulation plan and policies were needed to determine what updates needed to be made to the BTP.

11-2: The City will require compliance.

12-1: The Public Works Department conducts annual surveys to identify streets, including bike lanes that require re-marking/restriping. For structural pavement repair needs, Public Works crews in the field and/or citizen complaints have historically been used to identify trouble spots. However, the City is currently working on implementing a Pavement Management System that should be in place in 2011 that will help more systematically identify streets and bike lanes in need of repair/maintenance for ongoing budget discussions. Off-street bike paths are the responsibility of the Parks and Recreation Department who periodically monitor them for ongoing maintenance and budget purposes.

12-2: See response to 12-1.

12-3: See response to 12-1.

13-1: The City’s multipurpose pedestrian/bike paths along open space corridors are designed to be a minimum of 10 feet wide with adequate structural support to permit reasonable ambulance access. All such corridors also have periodic single-fronted street access so as to allow fire trucks adequate access in case of fire emergency.

Goal 14: As noted in 3-1, the Police Department conducts regular events at elementary and middle schools. In addition, the City has implemented several Safe Routes to School improvement projects, but the school districts have taken the lead on Safe Route to School public events. There are no other regular city programs related to bicycle and pedestrian safety.

15-1: See response to 3-1. Safety helmets is a key component of the Police
Department’s safety program with the schools.

15-2: The City does not have a bicycle licensing program.

15-3: This information is periodically discussed with neighborhood watch groups and discussed at school bicycle safety events, but there has been minimal written material created.

15-4: City has no knowledge of or control over content of school district programs.

16-1: To my knowledge there has not been a systematic study done of all bike/auto accident records, but the city does maintain those records. I did not see any significant patterns where there are specific locations with multiple accidents recorded. The only location that has more than one or two incidents since 2002 is C Street and Civic Drive, but that is also one of the most high traffic intersections in the City. The new Central Galt Interchange reconstruction project will be modifying that intersection and approach and hopefully reduce the incidence of accidents at this location.

16-2: The Police Department has policies and procedures which let the officers use their discretion based upon whether they believe a driver will can change his/her driving (or riding) behavior with a warning, or whether a traffic citation would be more appropriate.

16-3: The Police Department monitors all collision, both vehicle and bicycle to determine enforcement, engineering, and/or educational needs.

16-4: Ongoing enforcement.

16-5: The City has had officers patrolling the Galt Flea Market, Central Business District, and Old Town areas on bicycles on and off for the past several years. As of this writing, there are currently no officers on bikes, but the Department is looking at restarting that program in spring 2011.

16-6: See response to 16-6.
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