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Executive Summary

Bicycling and walking are low-cost, quiet, non-polluting, and healthy forms of transportation ideal for many trips. In 1997, the City of San Leandro adopted a Bicycle Master Plan to set forth a blueprint for completing a system of bikeways, support facilities (such as bicycle parking) and education programs. This document was updated in 2004 to reflect changes in the bicycling environment and to add a pedestrian component—the plan was re-titled as the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

This document comprises the 2010 update to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. This Plan is the official policy document guiding the development of facilities to enhance bicycling and walking as an additional and appropriate transportation choice for San Leandro residents. Specifically, the City’s vision is for:

*A city where walking and bicycling are fully integrated into daily life, providing environmentally-friendly transportation alternatives that are both safe and convenient for people of all ages and abilities.*

Bicycles

Existing bicycle facilities in San Leandro fall into the following three types which range from off-street paths, often shared with pedestrians (Class I), on-street striped bike lanes (Class II) and on-street signed bike routes (class III). These facilities are illustrated in Figure A-1.

**Figure A-1: Bicycle Facility Designations**

![Class I: Off-Street Multi-Use Path](image)

![Class II: On-Street Bicycle Lane](image)

![Class III: On-Street Bicycle Route](image)
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The City has approximately 25 miles of existing bikeway facilities consisting of:

- 4.2 miles of Class I bike paths
- 17.7 miles of Class II bike lanes
- 3.1 miles of Class III bike routes

San Leandro has many qualities favorable to bicycle riding, including a temperate climate, flat terrain, and scenic recreational resources along the Bay and in the hills. Based upon field review and input from City staff and the BPAC, several issues were identified in this Update which currently deter bicycling in San Leandro by residents and visitors. These include:

- **Heavy Traffic:** High traffic volumes and speeds and significant truck traffic are not conducive to a comfortable bicycling environment.

- **Narrow Streets:** Limited roadway width make it a challenge for automobiles and cyclists to share the road.

- **Barriers:** Railroad corridors and freeways limit the roadway network connectivity and present unsafe conditions at crossings.

- **Pavement Conditions:** Bicyclists are especially susceptible to poor roadway and pavement conditions.

- **Right Turn Lanes:** Bicycle facilities are positioned near the curb lane. The presence of right turn lanes intrude on the bike facilities, creating a conflict zone and unsafe conditions for bicyclists.

- **Providing Facilities for All Types of Bicyclists:** A variety of facilities must be provided to meet the various cyclist skill levels and willingness to ride in traffic

- **Connectivity to Destinations and Surrounding Facilities:** Connections to employment, shopping, recreation, and school destinations need to be considered as well as links to facilities in adjacent communities.

- **Bicycle Parking:** Additional short-term bicycle racks for utilitarian trips and long-term parking options for employees is needed throughout the City

Improvements identified to meet these needs were organized into bikeway network improvements, spot improvements and bicycle parking improvements. In total, an additional 38.8 miles of bikeways are proposed, which would more than double the current total. Included in this recommendation are 8.4 miles of Class I bike paths, 10 miles of Class II bike lanes, and 20.4 miles of Class III bike routes. Table A-1 shows a breakdown of these proposed facilities. The Plan identifies 18 spot improvements that include minor, low cost improvements to the existing facilities to better define the bikeway network and its effectiveness. Recommendations for a city bicycle rack program and updates to the City’s bicycle parking ordinance are also included to increase the supply of bicycle storage citywide.
Table A-1: Length (Miles) of System by Bikeway Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bikeway Classification</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Totala</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>63.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Discrepancy in total of Class III bikeways and total network miles is due to conversion of segments of Class III bikeway on MacArthur Blvd and Lewelling Blvd from existing Class III to proposed Class II.

Pedestrians

The City of San Leandro has over 200 miles of roadway, which constitutes an enormous adjacent pedestrian network. The state of the pedestrian network varies greatly throughout the City. Much of the City is a very walkable and pedestrian friendly environment, composed of small blocks, complete sidewalks, street trees and accessibility features. However, there are areas of the City that are inhospitable to pedestrians because of lack of sidewalks, lack of street trees, long blocks, and lack of accessibility features. Additionally, there are some major barriers within the City that inhibit the connectivity of the pedestrian network.

This Plan evaluates and presents the existing pedestrian network and future improvement strategies at three different levels: Citywide, Pedestrian Improvement Areas, and Pedestrian Key Locations.

Citywide improvements include:

- ADA Transition Plan
- Sidewalk surface assessment and repair
- Curb ramp upgrades to meet ADA standards
- Signal upgrades to meet Accessible Pedestrian Signal Guidelines
- Updated push buttons on pedestrian activated signals
- Implement, maintain and enforce parking restrictions at intersections and crosswalks
- Implement streetscape enhancements
A series of ten Pedestrian Improvements Areas are presented in the Plan. These areas were chosen for their proximity to important destinations, need for connectivity improvements, or potential for future development. Seven of these areas were previously identified in the 2004 Plan and three are new to this update. They include:

1. San Leandro Marina
2. Westgate Center
3. Kaiser Development Area
4. Manor Boulevard / Washington Avenue
5. Downtown San Leandro BART Station
6. East 14th Street Corridor
7. Bancroft Avenue / Dutton Avenue
8. Bay Fair BART Station
9. MacArthur Boulevard
10. Estudillo Avenue – I-580 Underpass to Anthony Chabot Park

Key Pedestrian Locations identify specific areas where improvements are suggested. These areas should be further analyzed and studied to determine a feasible and acceptable design. Twenty locations were identified, including the following:

1. Garfield Elementary School
2. Davis Street/I-880
3. Cherry Grove Park
4. Woodrow Wilson Elementary School/ John Muir Middle School
5. Wicks Boulevard at the Marina Community Center
6. Bonaire Park
7. Pacific Community Recreation Complex
8. Washington Elementary School
9. Corvallis Elementary School
10. Floresta Boulevard/ Monterey Boulevard/ Monroe Elementary School
11. San Leandro Boulevard/ Washington Avenue Intersection
12. McKinley Elementary School
13. Bancroft Middle School
14. East 14th Street/San Leandro Boulevard Intersection
15. 136th Avenue/Bancroft Avenue
16. Washington Avenue/Lewelling Boulevard Intersection
17. Grand Avenue/Joaquin Avenue Intersection
18. Jefferson Elementary School
19. 150th Avenue/Hesperian Boulevard/Bancroft Avenue/ East 14th Street Intersection
20. Hesperian Boulevard/Lewelling Boulevard intersection
Implementation

The Implementation Plan for bicycle and pedestrian improvements used a series of criteria to prioritize the projects and identified potential funding sources for each improvement. Bicycle and pedestrian projects were rated independently and assigned to an appropriate phasing scenario based on their performance in the evaluation process. Cost estimates, potential funding sources, coordinating agencies and future actions were identified for these projects.

In addition to the development of these independent lists, a high priority project list was developed which combines the highest rated bicycle and pedestrian improvements and identifies those projects which have mutual benefits to the bicycle and pedestrian networks. These projects also have the potential for being implemented in the short-term based on implementation status and available funding. These high priority projects, listed in Table A-2 on the following page, represent the 5-year expenditure plan based upon expected revenue to the City for these types of projects and potential funding through competitive grant programs.
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Table A-2: High Priority Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects – 5-Year Expenditure Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Limits/Location</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bike-to-Work Day</td>
<td>citywide program</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>CW-2</td>
<td>City Bike Rack Program</td>
<td>citywide program</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian accessible and safety equipment</td>
<td>citywide program</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped</td>
<td>B-5.b</td>
<td>San Leandro Blvd BART Pedestrian Interface Plan (matching funds)</td>
<td>at Downtown San Leandro BART Station and surroundings</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped</td>
<td>B-5.a</td>
<td>West Juana Ave redesign (matching funds)</td>
<td>at Downtown San Leandro BART Station and surroundings</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Measure B Pass-Through Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both B-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike CW-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike 34-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike 60-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike 60-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike 58-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped B-7.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped B-4.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped B-7.c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped C-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped C-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped C-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped C-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competitive Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both B-7.b/25-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike 30-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike 33-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike 70-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike 30-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped C-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped C-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped B-10.a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Costs estimated over a five year period for on-going programs
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Bicycling and walking are low-cost, quiet, non-polluting, and healthy forms of transportation ideal for many trips. In 1997, the City of San Leandro adopted a Bicycle Master Plan to set forth a blueprint for completing a system of bikeways, support facilities (such as bicycle parking) and education programs. This document was updated in 2004 to reflect changes in the bicycling environment since the previous document and, also, to add a pedestrian component.

This document comprises the 2010 update to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (Plan) is the official policy document guiding the development of facilities to enhance bicycling and walking as an additional and appropriate transportation choice for San Leandro residents. It is divided into six chapters that address existing bicycling and walking conditions, goals and policies, the recommended bicycle network and pedestrian improvement areas, safety, education, enforcement, and a plan to guide implementation.

Relationship to Other Plans

A number of current documents were reviewed and summarized to identify policies related to bicycling and walking in San Leandro. These documents included a mix of local, state, regional and federal sources as listed below. Appendix A contains a description of each of these sources.

In summary, these documents support bicycling and walking in the City of San Leandro, neighboring communities, and the region; bicycling and walking are recognized as ways to reduce congestion, oil consumption, air pollution, noise pollution, and impacts on climate change as well as to improve mobility options and provide opportunities for healthy exercise. The goals of these planning documents are consistent with the goals, policies and recommendations outlined in the 2010 Update of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan focused on providing a balanced transportation system for the City that meets the needs of all road users.

Local

- City of San Leandro General Plan (2002)
- City of San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (2004)
- City of San Leandro Climate Action Plan (2009)
- San Leandro Trails and Bikeways Map (2004)
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- San Leandro Safety Brochures
- East 14th Street South Area Development Strategy (2004)
- Central San Leandro BART Revitalization Strategy (2005)
- MacArthur Boulevard Streetscape Master Plan (2001)
- West Estudillo Historic Downtown Improvement Project (2003)
- Bay Fair BART Station Area Improvement Plan (2009)
- Project summaries for current San Leandro street reconfiguration projects

Regional

- Regional Bike Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area (2009)
- Bay Trail Plan (1989)
- Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan (2006)
- Alameda County Bicycle Master Plan for Unincorporated Areas (2007)
- Alameda Countywide Strategic Pedestrian Plan (2006)
- Alameda County Pedestrian Plan for Unincorporated Areas (2006)
- East Bay Regional Park District Master Plan (1997)
- MTC Pedestrian Districts Study (2006)
- East Bay Greenway Study (2008)
- UPRR Oakland Subdivision Corridor Improvement Study (2009)
- City of Oakland Bicycle Master Plan (2007)
- Oakland Pedestrian Master Plan (2002)

State

- California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD 2010)
- Accommodating Non-Motorized Travel Directive (DD 64 2001)
- Caltrans Context Sensitive Solutions (2001+)
- Main Streets: Flexibility in Design and Operations (2005)
- California Vehicle Code
Federal

- SAFETEA-LU (2005)
- Americans with Disabilities Act (1990)

Conformance with Funding Requirements

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan is in conformance with the California Bicycle Transportation Act (BTA), the Transportation Development Act (TDA), and Measure B requirements to put the City in a good position to compete for funding from these sources. The requirements of BTA funding are generally considered the most challenging; satisfying the BTA will also improve the City’s competitiveness in pursuing other Federal and state funding sources. Appendix E lists the 11 elements required by the BTA and identifies where they are addressed in the Plan. Measure B and TDA require that the Plan contain a list of prioritized projects approved by a committee. The prioritization methodologies and resulting list of prioritized projects may be found in Chapter 6.

Community Involvement in Development of the Plan

A Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) was formed to advise City staff and the consultant team in development of the Plan. The BPAC included 13 members and three alternates. Six public meetings were held with the BPAC between January and August 2010 including a field trip in March 2010 to look at walking and bicycling conditions throughout the City. The Plan was recommended for approval by the BPAC in September 2010.

Project Setting

The City of San Leandro is located in the East Bay of the San Francisco Bay Area between the City of Oakland (to the north) and the unincorporated communities of Alameda County to the south (San Lorenzo) and east (Castro Valley). To the west, San Leandro has more than three miles of shoreline on the San Francisco Bay. The City covers approximately 15 square miles and is home to more than 80,000 residents. In addition to its local recreation, school, shopping, entertainment and employment destinations, the City has a number of regional attractors including the Oyster Bay Regional Shoreline, San Leandro Marina, segments of the Bay Trail, Anthony Chabot Regional Park, and Bayfair Center. More about what can be found in and around San Leandro is described below.
Major Activity Centers

Major activity centers have the potential to attract the greatest number of trips, including those made by bicycling and walking. The location of these key destinations are used as a guide in predicting the important or needed routes of travel for bicyclists and pedestrians and, thereby, used in prioritizing where bicycle and pedestrian improvements can serve the most users. The major activity centers in San Leandro are shown on Figure 1. The following discussion of the major activity centers includes:

- Schools
- Community and Senior Centers
- Public Libraries
- Parks
- City Government Services
- Retail Destinations
- Major Employment Centers

Schools

Students in the City of San Leandro are served by both the San Leandro Unified School District and the San Lorenzo Unified School District. Following standard practice, the elementary schools are located within the neighborhoods allowing for short trips to school. The elementary schools feed into the middle schools which then feed into the high schools. The middle schools and high schools serve a progressively larger geographic area. Improving the safety, accessibility and maintenance of roadways and sidewalks around schools is an important method to encouraging walking and bicycling as transportation to and from school.

In total there are ten elementary schools, three middle schools and one high school located within the City’s boundaries. The high school is currently expanding to accommodate more students with the addition of the new 9th Grade Campus. Additionally there is one continuation high school, Lincoln High and an Adult School Community Education Center, both of which are centrally located in the City.

There are also two high schools (Arroyo High School and San Lorenzo High School) within San Lorenzo Unified School District that are located within close proximity to the City of San Leandro and attended by students living in San Leandro.

Community and Senior Centers

The City of San Leandro Senior Services offers a wide range of services to the San Leandro senior community. Senior programs and activities are provided at the Marina Community Center located in the southwest portion of the City on Wicks Boulevard. A new Senior Center is under construction on East 14th Street at 138th Avenue; the timeframe for the opening of the Senior Center is undetermined because of current budgetary issues.
In addition to offering senior services, the Marina Community Center provides space for a number of public and private community events. To complement this facility, the San Leandro Boys & Girls Club, located on Marina Boulevard at San Leandro Boulevard, provides a venue for all boys and girls of San Leandro to come together as a community to realize their full potential as productive, responsible and caring citizens.

**Public Libraries**

There are four branches of the San Leandro Public Library distributed around the City. The Main Branch, located on Estudillo Avenue east of downtown San Leandro, is the largest library in the system and has been recently upgraded. The newly renovated building includes a large parking area, a nicely landscaped open space, and new in-roadway crossing warning lights and a pedestrian actuated flashing beacon on Estudillo Boulevard. The Manor Branch is located on Manor Boulevard within the Washington Manor Neighborhood retail district. This branch is the most recently renovated facility including sidewalk improvements and a new in-roadway crossing warning lights installation with a pedestrian actuated flashing beacon on Manor Boulevard. The Mulford-Marina Branch of the public library is located at the intersections of Fairway and Aurora Drives. The South Branch of the public library is located at the intersections of East 14th Street and 148th Street.

**Parks**

The San Leandro Park system includes 23 parks and recreation facilities including community and neighborhood parks, swimming pools and sports fields. Small neighborhood parks are located throughout the City. Additionally, a number of small parks are located adjacent to elementary schools and contain play structures. There are four larger parks within the City that provide a variety of sports fields. Marina Park, located adjacent to the San Francisco Bay, is the largest city park and provides a wide variety of recreational facilities including paths for walking and bicycling. Many of the paths are part of the San Francisco Bay Trail network.

**City Government Services**

Major city government services in San Leandro that would attract pedestrians and bicyclists include the San Leandro City Hall and the San Leandro Police Department. Both of these services are located on East 14th Street at the north end of Downtown San Leandro.

**Retail Destinations**

There are numerous retail destinations scattered throughout San Leandro. Improving pedestrian and bicycle access to/from retail destinations is important to encouraging walking and biking as a form of transportation.

**Downtown San Leandro:** Downtown San Leandro is a major retail destination and includes a number of independent restaurants and retail businesses as well as branches of major retail chain stores such as a Safeway supermarket. The San
San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan

Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION

Leandro Plaza has recently undergone significant upgrades that include a number of pedestrian improvements. The Pelton Center is another shopping plaza located in downtown San Leandro that includes a number of smaller independent retail businesses and restaurants.

**Bayfair Center:** Bayfair Center is a regional shopping mall and major retail destination, located adjacent to the Bay Fair BART Station. Bayfair Center includes key anchor stores such as Macy’s, Kohl’s, and Target as well as restaurants, a movie theater and weekly farmer’s market. Bayfair Center has recently improved pedestrian access, but improvements to create better bicycle and pedestrian connections between the center, surrounding roadways, and the BART station remain to be implemented.

**Westgate Center:** Westgate Center is a large retail, office, and light industrial complex located on Davis Street adjacent to I-880. The shopping center contains a number of major anchor stores including Wal-Mart, The Home Depot and Office Depot. Costco is located across Davis Street. Westgate Parkway was extended in 2006 between Timothy Drive north of the Wal-Mart driveway and Williams Street, providing new vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle access.

**Greenhouse Marketplace Shopping Center:** Greenhouse Marketplace is a local shopping destination located adjacent to the I-580 and I-238 interchange. Greenhouse Marketplace includes a Safeway, Longs Drugs and a number of smaller chain businesses.

**Marina Square Center:** Marina Square is a large shopping center located east of I-580 at the Marina Boulevard exit. Marina Square has a number of large-scale retail outlets, including Nordstrom Rack, Gap and Old Navy.

**Major Employment Centers**

The City of San Leandro has a very strong employment base. Traditionally the City has had a number of food service and manufacturing businesses. Recently, because of its convenient location to freeways, major roadways, and transit, the City has attracted more office/high-tech businesses. There are two large manufacturing and industry areas, West San Leandro and Marina Avenue and South of Marina Avenue, which house a number of large-scale businesses. These areas typically have not been priority areas for pedestrian or bicycle improvements and have the need for improvement. Creekside Plaza is multiple-building complex with over 234,000 square feet of office space located at the corner of Davis Street and San Leandro Boulevard. This complex was strategically located adjacent to the Downtown San Leandro BART Station to encourage transit ridership.

Hospitals are a significant source of employment to any community. San Leandro has the San Leandro Hospital campus of Eden Medical Center located on East 14th Street at 138th Avenue; a new Kaiser Hospital is under development on Merced Street between Marina Boulevard and Fairway Drive.
Multimodal Connections
San Leandro is centrally located in the East Bay and is well served by bus and BART transit. Transit connection opportunities are discussed below.

BART
Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) operates rapid rail transit service throughout the San Francisco Bay Area. Three BART lines—Richmond-Fremont, Fremont-Daly City, and Daly City-Dublin/Pleasanton—provide service to the two stations in San Leandro: Downtown San Leandro and Bay Fair stations. Both stations are well-used, and provide parking for commuters.

**Downtown San Leandro BART Station:** The Downtown San Leandro BART Station is located at 1401 San Leandro Boulevard between Davis and Thornton Streets less than a half a mile from Downtown San Leandro. New transit-oriented development (TOD) is slated for development in the vicinity around the station and is planned to be the southern terminus for AC transit’s proposed Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Line. As a result of the BRT and future development, the station is being studied for redesign that will possibly include a reconfiguration of the bus terminal and improved pedestrian and bicycle access.

The station includes outdoor bicycle racks with storage for approximately 92 bicycles. 12 key-operated and 20 electronically operated rental lockers provide additional secure, covered bicycle storage. The key-operated lockers are available only for long-term rentals and require users to complete an application/rental agreement. The electronic lockers, which are operated with a pre-purchased smart card, offer short-term storage and are available on a first-come, first-served basis.

The Downtown San Leandro BART Station is presently accessible from the City bikeway network via bike lanes on San Leandro Boulevard, Alvarado Street, and Williams Street. The bike lanes on Williams Street extend approximately two miles to the west of the BART station while the bike lanes on San Leandro Boulevard extend approximately ½ mile to the north and south of the station. The bike lanes on Alvarado Street exist only in the immediate vicinity of the station. A number of additional bikeways are proposed to serve the station including extensions to these existing facilities, which would greatly bolster the station’s bicycle accessibility. These proposed routes include the East Bay Greenway trail along the Union Pacific Railroad/BART right-of-way, an eastward extension of bike lanes along Williams Street, a new bikeway along Juana Avenue, and additional bike lanes on Davis Street.

**Bay Fair BART Station:** The Bay Fair BART Station is located at 15242 Hesperian Boulevard immediately south of the Bayfair Center shopping mall. The Bayfair Center has long-range TOD plans, and the recent Station Area Plan outlines short-term solutions to improving pedestrian and bicycle access to the station. The Bay Fair Station has outdoor bicycle racks with capacity for approximately 42 bicycles. The station also has 16 key-operated bicycle storage lockers, which
operate under the same terms and conditions as those at the Downtown San Leandro BART Station.

The station is presently accessible from the City bikeway network along Hesperian Boulevard. Additionally, a bicycle/pedestrian connection exists between the Bay Fair BART Station and Bayfair Center. Bicycle access from the unincorporated areas east of the station and internal bicycle circulation between the two sides of the station are less clearly demarcated. Current Alameda County plans would improve bicycle access from the east by designating bike routes along 159th Avenue/Coehlo Drive and Elgin Street. These bikeways would provide important connections to East 14th Street and adjacent neighborhoods. The aforementioned East Bay Greenway trail would create an additional opportunity for bicycle and pedestrian access to the station.

**Bicycle Access on BART:** Given space constraints in BART trains and stations during peak travel periods, bicycles are not allowed on all BART trains at all times. During the morning peak period, approximately 7:05 a.m. – 8:50 a.m., bicycles are not allowed on trains traveling from the East Bay to San Francisco. In the evening peak period, approximately 4:25 p.m. – 6:45 p.m., bicycles are not allowed onboard trains traveling from San Francisco to the East Bay; additionally, cyclists traveling from the East Bay to San Francisco during this period must exit at Embarcadero Station. Bicycles are allowed on all BART trains during non-commute hours (8:50 a.m. – 4:25 p.m. and 6:45 p.m. – closing) and all day on weekends and holidays. In addition to these time restrictions, cyclists are never permitted to ride in crowded cars or in the first car of a BART train. Bicycles are, however, always allowed on trains on the Richmond-Fremont line.

**AC Transit Bus Service**

Alameda-Contra Costa Transit (AC Transit) operates local bus service throughout Alameda and western Contra Costa Counties as well as transbay bus service into San Francisco and San Mateo Counties. 15 AC Transit routes serve San Leandro, with many of these routes stopping at the San Leandro and/or Bay Fair BART Stations which function as major bus-bus and bus-BART transfer points. Routes 1, 1R, 40, and the All-Nighter 801 provide service to San Leandro from the north terminating at the Bay Fair BART Station. Routes 75 and 89 provide local connections within San Leandro with stops at both BART stations. Routes 32, 48, 93, 97, and 99 only operate as far north as Bay Fair BART Station providing service to communities to the south and east of San Leandro. Route 85 also provides service to the south through San Leandro from the Downtown San Leandro BART Station. Routes NX3, NX4, and S provide transbay service to San Francisco.

Route 1R is unique in that it provides limited stop rapid bus service along East 14th Street. This core AC Transit route is planned for eventual conversion to full bus rapid transit (BRT)—which includes stations and off-board fare collection—between Downtown Berkeley and the Downtown San Leandro BART Station. As BRT is implemented, and potentially extended further south to the Bay Fair
BART Station, effective bicycle connections to BRT stations will become increasingly important. The initial BRT stations in San Leandro would include upgraded 1R stops at Dutton Avenue/East 14th Street and Davis Street/East 14th Street as well as the Downtown San Leandro BART Station. Generally, these stations would be well served by existing and planned bikeways along Peralta Avenue, Davis Street, Estudillo Avenue, and in the vicinity of the Downtown San Leandro BART Station.

All AC Transit buses have front-mounted racks with a capacity of two bicycles. AC Transit commuter coaches, which are used on select transbay routes, have the capacity for an additional two bicycles in the below-seat cargo bays when front racks are full. Certain commuter coaches on transbay routes operating to San Mateo County can hold up to four bicycles in cargo bays. Provided that they do not block seats or aisles, folding bicycles are allowed onboard AC Transit buses at any time.
Figure 1: Major Activity Centers
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Chapter 2: Goals and Policies

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan contains goals and policies for developing and implementing a bikeway system and pedestrian improvements that can meet the City’s vision for:

*A city where walking and bicycling are fully integrated into daily life, providing environmentally-friendly transportation alternatives that are both safe and convenient for people of all ages and abilities.*

These goals and policies are outlined below.

**Goal 1:** Support bicycling and walking and the development of a comprehensive bicycle and pedestrian transportation system as a viable alternative to the automobile.

**Policies:**

1.1 Work to ensure that all streets in San Leandro are pedestrian and bicycle-friendly.

1.2 Update the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, part of the City’s General Plan, every five years to identify existing and future needs and provide specific recommendations for facility and program improvements and phasing.

1.3 Include updates to the Bicycle and Pedestrian project lists as part of the larger annual Capital Improvement Project (CIP) update that the City undertakes for all projects.

1.4 Ensure that the Plan is consistent with all existing city, county, regional, state, and federal policy documents.

**Goal 2:** Implement bicycle and pedestrian improvements maximizing the amount of funding for which San Leandro is eligible.

**Policies:**

2.1 Identify current local, county, regional, state, and federal programs that would fund bicycle and pedestrian capital improvements and programs, along with specific funding requirements and deadlines.

2.2 Identify non-governmental funding sources for bicycle and pedestrian capital improvements and programs such as non-profit or foundation grants, public-private partnerships, and community organizations.

2.3 Pursue multi jurisdictional funding applications with Alameda County, neighboring cities and other potential partners such as BART and the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD).
2.4 Develop a prioritized list of bicycle and pedestrian improvements along with detailed cost estimates, and identify appropriate funding sources for high priority projects.

2.5 Encourage the formation of reliable local, regional, and state funding sources that can be used to leverage federal funds.

2.6 Estimate and measure the benefits related to an increased mode share of bicycling and walking, such as reduced energy consumption, congestion and parking demand and improved air quality and opportunities for healthful exercise, to make the City competitive in applying for grants.

Goal 3: Develop a bicycle system that meets the needs of utilitarian and recreation users, helps reduce vehicle trips, and links residential neighborhoods with local and regional destinations.

Policies:

3.1 Develop a bikeway system that connects residential neighborhoods to employment and shopping areas, multi-modal terminals, schools, recreational facilities and other destinations.

3.2 Build upon the existing bikeway system to provide a comprehensive city-wide network that provides connections to facilities designated by Alameda County, East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD), regional agencies, and adjacent communities.

3.3 For the bikeway system, balance user convenience with safety concerns. Where needed, develop a dual system that serves both the experienced and inexperienced bicyclist utilizing low-volume streets and off street multi-use trails.

3.4 Encourage the use of existing natural and man-made corridors such as creeks, shorelines, railroad corridors, and other open space corridors for future multi-use trail alignments.

3.5 Address barriers to bicycling, such as lack of secure bicycle parking, signals which do not detect bicycles, difficulty of carrying significant baggage by bicycle, and bicycle prohibitions on transit.

3.6 Conduct bicycle and pedestrian counts and surveys to gauge the effectiveness of various improvements and programs.

Goal 4: Create a well-connected pedestrian environment by improving the walkability of all streets in San Leandro through the planning, implementing, and maintaining of pedestrian supportive infrastructure that meets the needs of all users.

Policies:

4.1 Improve connections in the pedestrian network, and provide a high level of service to pedestrians on all streets.
4.2 Ensure safe pedestrian connections between important community destinations, such as residential areas, transit locations, schools, senior centers and other community facilities.

4.3 Increase connectivity and access across barriers to walking such as incomplete or uneven sidewalks, sidewalk obstructions including cars parked on sidewalks, trail gaps, wide intersections, and poor connections to transit stops.

4.4 Develop a citywide pedestrian wayfinding (directional signage) system.

4.5 Ensure that sidewalks and other pedestrian facilities meet the principles of universal design and meet legally mandated and best practices requirements for accessibility.

4.6 Provide adequate street furniture and accessible public restrooms to foster an inviting pedestrian environment, where appropriate.

4.7 Ensure adequate light levels for highly traveled pedestrian environments.

4.8 Encourage the vibrancy of pedestrian environments by maximizing opportunities for landscaping, and street trees.

4.9 Provide intersections with minimal crossing distances (compact intersections), pathways, and frequent crossing opportunities that are safe, accessible, functional, and useful.

4.10 Utilize best practices guidelines for marking pedestrian crossings at controlled and uncontrolled locations.

4.11 Install and maintain accessible pedestrian signals adhering to ADA installation guidelines and the latest best practices at all major multi-lane intersections that serve schools, transit hubs, and major commercial centers.

Goal 5: Maximize bicycle and pedestrian access to transit.

Policies:

5.1 Ensure that the bicycle and pedestrian systems serve all multi modal stations.

5.2 Provide pedestrian amenities and safety measures such as bus shelters and wider sidewalks at major transit stops.

5.3 Work with local and regional transit agencies to install bike racks and lockers (or expand existing installations) at major transit stops and terminals and to expand opportunities to carry bicycles on buses and BART trains. Bicycle parking facilities should meet current best practices standards.

5.4 Improve bicycle and pedestrian connections between the Downtown San Leandro and Bay Fair BART stations and the
surrounding neighborhoods, with special attention to the at-grade railroad crossings and connections through the parking lots.

**Goal 6: Improve bicycle and pedestrian safety.**

**Policies:**

6.1 Continue to monitor bicycle and pedestrian-related collisions every three to six months and target a reduction rate of 50 percent over five years.

6.2 Identify existing bicycle and pedestrian education programs and target future expansions in these programs. Programs should educate pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists of their rights and responsibilities for sharing the road and address potential conflicts between motor vehicles, bicyclists and pedestrians as well as potential conflicts between pedestrians and bicyclists.

6.3 Implement a pedestrian and bicycle safety education program (“Safe Moves”) that is taught every three to five years to all school children (kindergarten to 12th grade) and senior adults. Include bicycle rodeos where children are given actual riding lessons in school.

6.4 Continue and expand the system for reporting and responding to maintenance problems on the existing bikeways and sidewalks.

6.5 Develop a Plan that identifies a schedule for maintenance and cleaning of bicycle facilities.

6.6 Continue to prepare Suggested Routes to Schools maps and construct improvements at schools throughout the City to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety.

**Goal 7: Develop detailed and ranked bicycle and pedestrian improvements.**

**Policies:**

7.1 Develop criteria for ranking pedestrian and bicycle projects and a project description for top priority projects to be included in the City’s next CIP. Projects would include capital improvements such as bikeway and bicycle parking installations and sidewalk and crosswalk improvements as well as education programs and public awareness campaigns.

7.2 Identify improvements to be completed in the short term based on objective criteria, including number of activity centers served, closure of critical gaps, elimination of safety hazards, level of existing use, and input from the public.

7.3 Develop detailed implementation information on each recommended project, including classification, length, adjacent
traffic volumes and speeds, environmental impacts, activity centers served, cost, overall feasibility, and agency(s) responsible for implementation.

7.4 Update design guidelines and standards for the design of pedestrian and bicycle facilities that meet state and federal (including American Disability Act) standards and best practices.

Goal 8: **Raise awareness of the benefits of walking and biking by developing a coordinated public outreach strategy to encourage bicycling and walking.**

**Policies:**

8.1 Continue the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) as a forum for ongoing discussions concerning bicycle and pedestrian issues. The BPAC should be involved in the monitoring, implementation, funding, and updating of bicycle and pedestrian facilities as well as reviewing other projects that might affect bicycle and pedestrian access.

8.2 Maximize public involvement through workshops and other means such as the City’s website.

8.3 Update the San Leandro Trails and Bikeways Map, as needed, for public distribution showing bicycle and trail facilities, key destinations, connections to adjoining jurisdictions, and bicycling safety information.

8.4 Sponsor annual events such as “Bike to Work Day”, “Walk to School Day”, and offer walking and bicycling safety courses for adults, families and children.

8.5 Develop an incentive program for City employees and to serve as a model to other city employers to encourage walking and bicycling to work.

8.6 Develop a program to recognize employers, organizations or individuals that encourage walking and bicycling as an alternative to driving for trips to work, school or other activities.

8.7 Provide information and an approach to publicize the advantages and opportunities afforded by walking and bicycling as viable alternatives to the automobile to reduce noise, carbon emissions, and fuel consumption and improve air quality while providing opportunities for healthful exercise.

8.8 Develop strategies that encourage people to bicycle or walk to work/school, for errands and to connect to transit.

8.9 Coordinate efforts with the City agencies, the Cherry City Cyclists, the East Bay Bicycle Coalition, and other relevant advocacy associations.
Goal 9: Develop land use policies and development standards that promote bicycling and walking for utilitarian and recreation trips.

Policies

9.1 Develop procedures for review of new development and redevelopment projects by City staff, with support from the BPAC as needed, to ensure that they meet the goals and guidelines of this plan.

9.2 Utilize zoning to encourage development that incorporates a mixture of uses, including residential and local-serving-retail/employment, to promote walking and bicycling.

9.3 New development should be accessible to bicyclists and pedestrians with wide sidewalks, compact intersections, integrated pedestrian circulation, bikeway facilities and bicycle parking following legally mandated and best practices requirements for accessibility. New development should include secure bicycle parking for residents and employees.

9.4 Provide pedestrian and bicycle connections between new developments and surrounding commercial and residential areas to accommodate both residents and visitors following design guidelines presented in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines.

9.5 Provide pedestrian and bicycle connections to schools when designing circulation systems in future development.

9.6 When reasonable, keep new block lengths 500 feet or shorter with frequent controlled intersections.

9.7 In new developments, maintain easements for bicycle and pedestrian access where cul-de-sacs or limited points of vehicle access are part of the development design.

9.8 New development should provide an internal pedestrian circulation plan that includes a connection to the public sidewalk. New commercial development should have at least one major entrance on a public sidewalk.

9.9 Encourage businesses and new development to make streetscape improvements that promote the use of the street by pedestrians and bicyclists. Support the use of street spaces for outdoor seating, and merchant displays, while maintaining adequate pedestrian access.
Chapter 3: Bicycle Network

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan sets forth a blueprint for completing the system of bikeways and support facilities within the City of San Leandro. When the Bicycle Master Plan was first adopted in 1997, the City had just 7.4 miles of bicycle lanes on City streets. Since then, the Plan was updated in 2004 and some of the City’s bikeway network described in these previous plans has been implemented. The existing network now includes 17.7 miles of bicycle lanes, 4.2 miles of bicycle paths and 3.1 miles of signed bicycle routes, for a total existing network of approximately 25 miles. This latest update builds upon the existing bicycle facilities and the proposed networks outlined in previous plans with a focus on accommodating bicycle travel throughout the City and providing access to key employment, school, recreation, shopping and transit destinations.

Bicycle Facilities

Bicycle facilities include bikeway treatments, bicycle parking, and signage. These elements are described below with additional design detail included in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines. This discussion includes what is currently in use in San Leandro and other options that may be utilized during implementation of the Plan.

Bikeway Treatments

Bikeway planning and design in California typically relies on the guidelines and design standards established by Caltrans as documented in “Chapter 1000: Bikeway Planning and Design” of the Highway Design Manual (2009) and Part 9 of the Manual of Uniform Control Devices (CA MUTCD 2010). These documents follow standards developed by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and identify specific design standards for various conditions and bikeway-to-roadway relationships.

Bicycle facilities in San Leandro fall into the following three types which are illustrated below in Figure 2.

1. **Class I bike paths**, also known as multi-use paths, are separated completely from motor vehicle traffic but may be shared with pedestrians. Bicycle paths in San Leandro are found along the waterfront and in the shoreline parks. Most of these pathways are also part of the San Francisco Bay Trail network.

2. **Class II bike lanes** are striped in the roadway for the exclusive use of bicycles. Vehicle parking and vehicle/pedestrian cross-flow are permitted. The striping is supported by pavement markings and signage (CA MUTCD R81). San Leandro has installed “Bikes Wrong Way” signs to the back of many of the bike lane signs to encourage correct bicycling behavior. In San
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Leandro, many of the lanes are located along the curb where on-street parking is not permitted. The lanes adjacent to a parking lane are usually striped on both sides. Bike lanes generally range from 5 – 6 feet in width.

3. **Class III bike routes** are located on the roadway shared with motor vehicles. Bike routes are designated by signage (CA MUTCD D11-1) or shared roadway bicycle markings (sharrows). To date, sharrows have not been used in San Leandro.

![Figure 2: Bike Facility Designations](image)

**Other Bikeway Treatments Not Currently in Use in San Leandro**

**Shared Roadway Bicycle Marking (Sharrows):** The shared roadway bicycle marking or sharrow may be used to assist bicyclists with positioning on a shared roadway (specifically outside the ‘door zone’) and to alert other road users of the location a bicyclist may occupy within the traveled way. See **Figure 3.**

According to the CA MUTCD, sharrows are intended to be used only on a roadway with a Class III bike route designation or roadway with no bikeway designation and only where there is on-street parking. However, common practice in the Bay Area has been to use sharrows on roadways without on-street parking where high volumes of bicycle traffic are expected and other options are not available (such as Market Street in San Francisco) or where additional guidance is needed to get bicyclists through a transition between bike lanes or through a complex intersection with right-turn only lanes.

![Figure 3: Sharrow](image)

**Bicycle Boulevards:** A bicycle boulevard is a shared roadway which has been optimized for bicycle traffic. Bicycle boulevards differ from other shared roadway treatments such as bike routes in that they are designed to give priority to through bicycle traffic while allowing local motor vehicle traffic. Traffic calming treatments, such as speed humps and diverters are often employed to discourage non-local motor vehicle through traffic and lower motor vehicle traffic speeds and volumes. Bicycle boulevards are generally provided as an alternative to a busy arterial street. Therefore the bicycle boulevard should parallel the arterial and be located within one or two blocks of the arterial. Signage and pavement markings reinforce the idea that the
roadway is a bicycle priority street. The Hillegass-Bowditch Bicycle Boulevard in Berkeley, CA is shown in Figure 4.

Figure 4: Bicycle Boulevard in Berkeley, CA

Colored Bike Lanes: Colored bike lanes are considered a way to guide bicyclists through complex intersections as well as to make motorists aware that they are crossing a bike lane. Studies of colored bike lane applications in Portland, Oregon¹ have shown that the colored bike lanes have a positive effect in the number of motorists yielding to bicyclists and bicyclists following the path marked by the colored bike lanes. On the downside, it was also reported that bicyclists were less vigilant while traveling along the colored bike lanes, perhaps signifying an increased ‘false’ sense of security. Colored bike lanes are being used by many jurisdictions but have not, as yet, been officially endorsed by a national design manual or standards (such as the MUTCD). An example installation is shown in Figure 5.

Figure 5: Colored bike lane, Cambridge, MA

¹ Portland’s Blue Bike Lanes, City of Portland, Office of Transportation, 1999
http://www.portlandonline.com/transportation/index.cfm?a=58842&c=34772
Bicycle Parking

Secure bike parking is a necessity for promoting bicycle use especially for utilitarian trips. People will not cycle to shop, to work, or to school without a safe place to store their bicycle. Bicycle parking, in the form of bicycle racks, is available at the public schools, parks and many other trip attractors. The type of bicycle parking provided at a destination should reflect the type of parking demand expected at the location, i.e. whether facilities are needed for short-term or long-term parking. For example, a shopping mall will need short-term parking for shoppers as well as long-term parking for employees. Bicycle parking categories are defined below and shown in Figure 6.

Class I Bicycle Parking: This is parking that protects the entire bicycle and its components from theft, vandalism and the weather. Class I parking is suitable for a few hours use up to a full day and is usually found at employment or transit centers. Some Class I installations can also be appropriate for overnight parking, if needed. Examples are bike lockers, bike cages or rooms (locked areas with key access for regular users generally for use by employees), guarded parking areas (such as bike racks near a parking garage attendant), and valet parking (such as a bike station). Class I parking is found at the Downtown San Leandro and Bay Fair BART stations.

Class II Bicycle Parking: This is defined as a bicycle rack to which the frame and at least one wheel can be secured with a user-provided U-lock or padlock and cable. This type of parking is appropriate for short-term parking such as at shopping areas, libraries, and other places where the typical parking duration is about two hours. Examples of racks popular with bicyclists are the inverted U-rack and the wave or ribbon rack. Bike racks should be placed in a highly visible location, especially to pedestrians, and in close proximity to the intended destination. In addition, bicycle racks (and the bicycles parked to the racks) should be located outside the typical pedestrian travel path and not conflict with parked cars or passengers entering/exiting parked vehicles.

Figure 6: Bicycle Parking Types – Class I (left) and Class II (right)
Bicycle Signage/Wayfinding

Signage is an important support element for bicycle facilities to provide guidance to bicyclists and to alert motorists to the potential for bicyclists on the roadway. Some examples are shown in Figure 7. Guidelines for the type and location of signage to be used can be found in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines. Bikeway signage for Class II and Class III facilities mandated by the CA MUTCD includes ‘Bike lane’ signs (R81) and ‘Bike route’ signs (D11-1). A version of the “Bikes Wrong Way“ (R5-1b) has been used in many locations in San Leandro placed on the back of the R81 ‘Bike lane’ sign to inform bicyclists that they are traveling in the wrong direction in the bike lane. An additional option for bikeway guidance is the guide sign (SG-45) which is used in conjunction with a city or regional logo and route number.

Wayfinding is another important function of bikeway signage, allowing bicyclists to find the appropriate route to their destination. Mileage to that destination is also helpful. An example of wayfinding combined with the bike route sign that has been recently installed in the City of Oakland is shown below.

Figure 7: Bikeway Signage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R81 Bike Lane sign</th>
<th>Version of R5-1b used in San Leandro</th>
<th>SG-45 Bikeway Guide sign used in San Francisco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D11-1 Bike Route sign with wayfinding used in Oakland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing Conditions

Existing and Future Bicycle Commuter Population

Based on journey to work data from the 1990 and 2000 US Census and the 2006-2008 American Community Survey (Table 1), it is estimated that less than 1 percent of San Leandro resident commuters use a bicycle as their primary means of transportation to work. Using the commuter data from the 2006-2008 American Community Survey, this represents an estimated 350 work based daily bicycle trips. It should be noted that this data does not account for commuters with multiple modes of travel to and from work, such as commuters that ride a bicycle to a BART station before transferring to transit for the remainder of their trip. In these surveys, such trips would be counted as a transit trip. In addition, the census data fails to capture people who commute by bicycle only one or two days per week. Consequently, it is felt that the number of actual commuter bicycle trips is higher than what is represented here.

This commuter population represents only a percentage of the total cyclists within the City. Cycle trips made for school, shopping, and recreation purposes often represent a large percentage of total bicycle trips but are not captured within the Census based surveys.

The future bicycle commuter population will depend on a number of factors such as the availability of well-connected facilities (bikeway and bicycle parking), population density, and type of future land development. With the current emphasis in San Leandro on transit-oriented development and use of alternative transportation modes for environmental and personal health reasons, it would be expected that the popularity of bicycling would increase at an even greater rate than what has occurred historically. For these reasons, it is estimated that with implementation of the bicycle network, the commuter mode split would reach an estimated 3 percent of the mode share representing approximately 1,200 work-based daily bicycle trips.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode (Home-based work trips)</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2006-2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Means</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work at Home</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1990 and 2000 U.S. Census; American Community Survey 2006-2008
Existing Bicycle Network

An inventory of existing bikeways in San Leandro was conducted to 1) update the existing network described in the 2004 Plan and 2) assess the condition and facilities in the designated existing network.

The City has approximately 25 miles of bikeway facilities consisting of:

- 4.2 miles of Class I bike paths
- 17.7 miles of Class II bike lanes
- 3.1 miles of Class III bike routes

The existing bikeway network is illustrated in Figure 8 with a full inventory and description of the Bikeway Network (existing and proposed) contained in Appendix B. In summary, the existing on-street bikeway network includes:

- Adams Avenue – Class II bike lanes from Bigge Street to Doolittle Drive.
- Aladdin Avenue – Class II bike lanes from Alvarado Street to Teagarden Street.
- Alvarado Street - Class II bike lanes from W Studillo Avenue to Thornton Street and from Marina Boulevard to Aladdin Avenue and Class III bike route from Teagarden Street to Fremont Avenue.
- Bancroft Avenue - Class II bike lanes and Class III bike route from Durant Avenue (Oakland city limits) to East 14th Street/Hesperian Boulevard.
- Bay Trail – Class I bike path through Oyster Bay Regional Shoreline and from Estudillo Canal to southern city limits.
- Davis Street - Class II bike lanes from Alvarado Street to Frederick Road/Gilmore Drive.
- Doolittle Drive - Class II bike lanes from Oakland city limits to Davis Street and from Fairway Drive to Farallon Drive.
- Estudillo Avenue - Class II bike lanes from MacArthur Boulevard to East 14th Street.
- Fairway Drive - Class II bike lanes and Class III bike route from Teagarden Street to Monarch Bay Drive.
- Farallon Drive - Class II bike lanes from Doolittle Drive to Wicks Boulevard.
- Floresta Boulevard - Class II bike lanes from Washington Avenue to Fremont Avenue.
- Fremont Street - Class II bike lanes from Alvarado Street to Floresta Avenue.
- Halcyon Drive - Class II bike lanes from Hesperian Boulevard to BART tracks/future East Bay Greenway.
• Hesperian Boulevard - Class II bike lanes from East 14th Street to Springlake Drive.

• Lewelling Boulevard - Class II bike lanes and Class III bike route from Washington Avenue to Bayfront Drive.

• MacArthur Boulevard – Class III bike route from Durant Avenue (Oakland city limits) to Estudillo Avenue.

• Monarch Bay Drive - Class II bike lanes from Fairway Drive to south terminus.

• Neptune Drive (Bay Trail) – Class III bike route from Oyster Bay Regional Park entrance to Marina Boulevard.

• Park Street - Class II bike lanes from San Leandro Street to San Leandro Boulevard.

• San Leandro Boulevard - Class II bike lanes from San Leandro Creek to Washington Avenue.

• Springlake Drive - Class II bike lanes from Hesperian Boulevard to Washington Avenue.

• Teagarden Street - Class II bike lanes from Fairway Drive/Aladdin Street to Alvarado Street.

• Washington Avenue - Class II bike lanes from Caliente Drive to Anza Way.

• Westgate Pkwy - Class II bike lanes from South Walmart driveway to Williams Street.

• Wicks Boulevard - Class II bike lanes from Burroughs Avenue to Lewelling Boulevard.

• Williams Street - Class II bike lanes from San Leandro Boulevard to Neptune Drive.
Connections to Regional Bikeways and Adjacent Jurisdictions

While bicycle connectivity within the City of San Leandro is the main focus of this plan, connections to the regional bicycle networks and adjacent communities are also important. After all, bicycle trips do not always end at the city limits.

Regional Bikeway Networks in San Leandro

There are several routes on the San Leandro bikeway network that have been designated as routes of county or regional significance (Figure 9). The following bikeways are included on both the Alameda Countywide and San Francisco Regional bikeway networks.

- Bancroft Avenue-Hesperian Boulevard-Fairmont Drive (generally north to south with section on Fairmont Drive running east to west).
- Doolittle Drive-Farallon Drive-Wicks Boulevard-Lewelling Boulevard (generally north to south with section on Lewelling Boulevard running east to west).
- Lake Chabot Road-Estudillo Avenue-Davis Street (east to west).

San Leandro bikeways that are included on the Alameda Countywide network include:

- Hesperian Boulevard from Fairmont Drive to Springlake Drive.
- San Leandro Boulevard from San Leandro Creek to Washington Avenue.
- East Bay Greenway from Oakland city limits to eastern city limits (Hesperian Boulevard).

San Francisco Bay Trail in San Leandro

San Leandro contains segments of the San Francisco Bay Trail along the San Leandro waterfront between Oakland to the north and San Lorenzo to the south. The Bay Trail facilities are also included on the Alameda Countywide and Regional Bikeway networks. Most of the Bay Trail consists of Class I bike paths with the exception of a short segment of Class III bike route on Neptune Drive between the Oyster Bay Regional Shoreline and Marina Boulevard. Included in the Bay Trail network are path loops around Oyster Bay Regional Shoreline, Mulford Point, and the Small Boat Lagoon in Marina Park. Much of this alignment has paved or unimproved pathways but most do not meet the standards for Class I bike paths. The recently completed San Leandro Bay Trail Slough Bridge provides a much needed connection for the Bay Trail between San Leandro and Oakland.

Connections to Adjacent Jurisdictions

The San Leandro bikeway network was designed, in part, to provide connection to facilities in adjacent communities. Figure 9 shows the locations of these connecting facilities.
To the north, from west to east, connections include:

- From the recently completed bicycle/pedestrian bridge across Oyster Bay, the San Francisco Bay Trail extends north to Oakland on an existing Class I bike path to Airport Drive.
- The existing Class II bike lanes on Doolittle Drive connect to existing Class II bike lanes in Oakland.
- The proposed Class I bike path on the East Bay Greenway will connect to the proposed Class I bike path in Oakland.
- The proposed Class II bike lanes on San Leandro Boulevard will connect with proposed Class II bike lanes in Oakland. This segment also connects to a proposed Oakland bicycle boulevard on Apricot Street.
- The proposed Class III bike route on East 14th Street will connect with proposed Class II bike lanes on International Boulevard in Oakland.
- The existing Class II bike lanes on Bancroft Avenue connect with existing Class II bike lanes in Oakland.
- The existing Class III bike route (proposed Class II bike lanes) on MacArthur Boulevard connects to proposed Class II bike lanes in Oakland.
- The proposed Class II bike lanes on Foothill Boulevard will connect with proposed Class II bike lanes in Oakland.

To the south and east of San Leandro, Alameda County has jurisdiction in San Lorenzo, Castro Valley, and other unincorporated areas. Bicycle planning for these areas is set forth in the *Alameda County Bicycle Master Plan for Unincorporated Areas*. Although Hayward is not discussed in this section because it does not share a common border with San Leandro, some primary bicycle routes, such as the Bay Trail and Hesperian Boulevard, continue south through San Lorenzo into Hayward. Specific connections from San Leandro going west to east include:

- Existing segments of the Bay Trail continue south along the shoreline through San Lorenzo.
- The proposed Class II bike lanes on Washington Avenue will connect with proposed Class II bike lanes in San Lorenzo.
- The proposed Class II bike lanes on Hesperian Boulevard will connect to the existing Class III bike route in San Lorenzo. This route is also included on the Alameda Countywide bicycle network.
- The proposed Class III bike route on Lewelling Boulevard will connect to the east with proposed Class II bike lanes. This route is also part of the Regional and Alameda Countywide bicycle networks.
• The proposed East Bay Greenway (Class I bike path) will continue southeast from San Leandro to connect with the proposed facility through Ashland. This facility is designated on the Alameda Countywide bicycle network.

• The proposed Class III bike route on East 14th Street will connect with existing Class III bike route in Ashland.

• The proposed Class II bike lanes on Fairmont Drive will connect to the proposed facility in Castro Valley. This route is designated on the Regional and Alameda Countywide bicycle networks.

• The proposed Class III bike route on Lake Chabot Road will connect to the proposed Class III bike route to the east. This route is designated on the Regional and Alameda Countywide bicycle networks.

End of Trip Facilities

Bicycle travel requires a network of supporting amenities in order to be convenient and appealing as an everyday means of transport. Safe and convenient bicycle parking is a necessity of popular destinations. Showers and/or changing rooms are practical for long commute rides or changing between cycling and business clothing. And bicycle shops dispersed throughout the community play an integral role in all aspects of cycling from fixing a quick flat to keeping one’s bicycle in proper riding condition.

End of trip facilities in San Leandro are shown in Figure 10. Bicycle racks are the main type of bicycle parking available for public use in San Leandro. Although not shown on the map, bicycle racks are provided at each of the public schools. Racks are also located at the major retail centers, libraries, government buildings, and recreational destinations. The two BART stations have both bicycle racks and bicycle lockers.
Figure 9: Regional and Adjacent Communities Bikeways
Figure 10: End of Trip Facilities
Needs Analysis

San Leandro has many qualities favorable to bicycle riding, including a temperate climate, flat terrain, and scenic recreational resources along the Bay and in the hills. Based upon field review and input from City staff and the BPAC, several issues were identified that currently deter bicycling in San Leandro by residents and visitors. These include:

**Heavy Traffic:** Major east-west connectors such as Davis Street, Marina Boulevard, Lewelling Boulevard, and Estudillo Avenue; and north-south connectors such as Doolittle Drive, San Leandro Boulevard, East 14th Street, Hesperian Boulevard, and Washington Avenue all contain many major intersections and carry high traffic volumes, including significant truck traffic, which are not conducive to a comfortable bicycling environment.

**Narrow Streets:** While many of the major arterials are wide enough for multiple travel lanes, there is often not enough width to accommodate the heavy traffic and parking demands while providing separate lanes for bicycle travel. In addition, many of the collector streets, such as Bancroft Avenue and Williams Street which would be considered as good bicycling alternatives to the busy arterials are very narrow for the high volumes of traffic that they already carry.

**Barriers:** San Leandro has many barriers that disrupt the typical grid system. Because of these barriers (three railroad corridors, Interstates 237, 580 and 880), there are limited crossings east-west across the city. Bicyclists are forced to share these access routes with heavy volumes of automobile and truck traffic. While lower volume collectors or residential collectors would be more favorable for bicycle traffic, these streets often do not provide the needed connections across the rail and freeway barriers. Crossings over or under the highways and railroad corridors are generally narrow; many of the freeway interchanges pose additional hazards for bicyclists when navigating traffic at freeway on and off-ramps.

**Pavement Condition:** Maintenance of streets designated for bicycle facilities is particularly important as bicyclists are especially susceptible to potholes and road debris. While most of the roadways in San Leandro are in good shape, poor pavement condition was noted on some streets, particularly Davis Street, Doolittle Drive, Merced Street, and Williams Street.

**Right Turn Lanes:** There are many free right and right turn only lanes at intersections in San Leandro. While these lanes may be needed to accommodate traffic volumes at the intersection, they pose a hazard to through cyclists on these roadways. The recommended treatment for a bike lane through an intersection with a right turn only lane would be to provide a through bike lane to the left of the right turn only lane. This configuration has
been done at many locations in the City (for example, Williams Street at Doolittle Drive, Westgate Parkway, and Merced Street).

Facilities for All Types of Bicyclists: There are many types of bicyclists in San Leandro. They vary in skill and in their willingness to ride in traffic, ranging from experienced adult cyclists who will ride on any street, to casual adult or novice cyclists who are intimidated by high traffic volumes and speeds, to child cyclists who often do not have the motor skills and experience to safely navigate the busier streets. The proposed network should consider the needs of all types of bicyclists providing a combination of arterial routes, bike lanes, local streets, and bike paths.

Connectivity to Destinations and Surrounding Facilities: In order to serve all attractors, a fairly fine-grained bikeway network is needed. It must geographically cover the entire city and include a route within each major neighborhood. Recognizing that some cyclists prefer the most direct route, accommodation is needed on the major arterials and collectors in addition to facilities on collectors and residential streets that may be more attractive to less experienced cyclists. Connections to employment, shopping, recreation, and school destinations need to be considered as well as links to facilities in adjacent communities.

Bicycle Parking: Secure and convenient bicycle parking is imperative to encourage cycling trips. Some bicycle parking, primarily short-term bicycle racks, is available in San Leandro at schools, parks, government offices, and some retail establishments. More short-term bicycle racks for utilitarian trips and long-term parking for employees is needed throughout the City.

Proposed Bicycle Improvements

Improvements to the bicycle environment as presented in this Plan fall into the following categories:

- Bikeway network
- Spot improvements
- Bicycle parking

These are discussed below. Support programs, such as education, promotion and enforcement are discussed in Chapter 5.

The Bikeway Network

The recommended bikeway network is a backbone of primary routes; it is not meant to accommodate every bicycle trip in the City. Once completed, this network would furnish safer and more direct routes for the majority of those
bicycling within San Leandro. It considers the range of age and skill level (adults, novice and children) of those that chose to travel by bicycle.

The bikeway network is a tool that allows the City to focus and prioritize implementation efforts where they will provide the greatest community benefit. Streets or corridors selected for inclusion in the network should be targeted for specific improvements, such as the installation of bicycle lanes or wide curb lanes and should receive regular maintenance, such as sweeping and pavement repair, to keep these roadways in good bicycling condition.

However, it is important to recognize that, by law, bicyclists are allowed on all streets and roads regardless of whether or not they are a part of the bikeway network. Consequently, all streets should be improved for safer bicycle travel when opportunities arise following the guidelines provided in the *San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines*, MTC’s Complete Streets Checklist, and best practices for bicycle accommodation.

**Bikeway Selection Criteria**

The proposed system was developed according to the following planning criteria:

**Coverage:** The system should provide equitable, reasonable access from all residential neighborhoods to both commute and recreation routes. In essence, the system should provide a bicycle facility within one-half mile of any residential street.

**System Rationale:** Each link in the system should serve one or a combination of these purposes: recreation, connection, and commuting. Bikeway links should be continuous with a minimal number of arterial crossings and uncontrolled intersections.

**Avoidance of Arterials:** Assigning bikeways on arterials with high traffic volumes, high travel speeds, or narrow right-of-ways should be avoided if at all possible.

**Connection of Employment Centers:** Downtown, business parks, major retail, and other employment centers should be accessible from all neighborhoods by a reasonably direct system.

**Connection of Schools, Libraries and Parks:** Schools, libraries, and parks should be connected to surrounding residential neighborhoods by bikeways. While not serving every residential street, the bikeway system should serve as feeder routes where special safety features can be provided at busy intersections.

**Connection to Regional Bikeways:** The bikeway system should allow continuous access to potential regional bikeway routes and routes in adjacent communities.
Suitability of Bikeway Type: The characteristics of a roadway determine whether that roadway is suitable for inclusion in the network and, if so, what type of facility should be prescribed. Roadway width is a key factor in determining what bicycling improvements can be made. Roadways should also be assessed by traffic speed, volume of car and truck traffic, and roadway hazards. The ages and skill levels of expected bicyclists should be considered. Recommended bikeway cross-sections are illustrated in the San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines.

Proposed Network

The proposed bikeway network is illustrated on Figure 11. The proposed system includes a total of almost 39 miles of new bikeway facilities in addition to the 25 miles currently in place. Specific improvements will be defined during the design phase for each project following the standards set forth in the San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines. Table 2 shows the number of existing and proposed miles for each bikeway classification. In addition to the bicycle network, spot location improvements and bicycle parking improvements are recommended and discussed below.

Table 2: Length (Miles) of System by Bikeway Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bikeway Classification</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Total(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>63.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Discrepancy in total of Class III bikeways and total network miles is due to conversion of segments of Class III bikeway on MacArthur Blvd and Lewelling Blvd from existing Class III to proposed Class II.

To manage the planning and implementation of the network, each facility was assigned a bikeway number following the conventions of the federal highway system and as utilized in the Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan. (North-south bikeways assigned odd numbers from west to east and east-west bikeways given an even number from north to south.) For consistency, the San Leandro bikeways were assigned the same number where they overlapped the Alameda County routes. At completion, the network would include 31 bikeways as shown in Table 3.

Each bikeway was further divided into segments, as needed, to describe the different roadway characteristics and recommended improvements. The proposed improvements by segment are presented in Table 5 found in Chapter 6. The complete network, including both existing and proposed segments, is described in more detail in Appendix B.
### Table 3: San Leandro Bikeway Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bikeway Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bay Trail-Neptune Dr-Bay Trail</td>
<td>San Leandro Slough</td>
<td>southern city limits</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Monarch Bay Dr</td>
<td>Marina Blvd</td>
<td>south terminus</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Doolittle Dr-Farallon Dr</td>
<td>Oakland city limits</td>
<td>Wicks Blvd</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Timothy Dr-Westgate Pkwy-Merced St-Wicks Blvd</td>
<td>Davis St</td>
<td>Lewelling Blvd</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Teagarden St-Fremont St</td>
<td>Fairway Dr/Aladdin St</td>
<td>Floresta Ave</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Alvarado St-Portola Dr-Monterey Blvd</td>
<td>San Leandro Creek</td>
<td>Washington Ave</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Adams Ave</td>
<td>Bigge St</td>
<td>Doolittle Dr</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Norton St-Andover St</td>
<td>Washington Manor Park</td>
<td>Lewelling Blvd</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Dowling Blvd-Maple Ct</td>
<td>MacArthur Blvd</td>
<td>Oakes Blvd</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>San Leandro Blvd-136th Ave</td>
<td>Broadmoor Blvd (Oakland city limits)</td>
<td>School St</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Oakes Blvd-Peralta Ave</td>
<td>Superior Ave</td>
<td>future East Bay Greenway</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>East Bay Greenway</td>
<td>Oakland city limits</td>
<td>eastern city limits</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Park St</td>
<td>San Leandro St</td>
<td>San Leandro Blvd</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Lake Chabot Rd-Estudillo Ave-Davis St</td>
<td>eastern city limits</td>
<td>western terminus</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Washington Ave</td>
<td>Juana St</td>
<td>San Lorenzo Creek (southern city limits)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>East 14th St</td>
<td>Oakland city limits</td>
<td>eastern city limits</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Juana Ave</td>
<td>Grand Ave</td>
<td>San Leandro Blvd</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Bancroft Ave-Hesperian Blvd</td>
<td>Durant Ave (Oakland city limits)</td>
<td>San Lorenzo Creek (southern city limits)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Sybil Ave-Castro St-Williams St</td>
<td>Grand Ave</td>
<td>Neptune Dr</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikeway Number</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Length (miles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>MacArthur Blvd-Superior Ave-Grand Ave-Evergreen Ave-School St-Russ Ave-Wake Ave-Halsey Ave-Lark St</td>
<td>Durant Ave (Oakland city limits)</td>
<td>150th Ave</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>143rd Ave</td>
<td>East 14th St</td>
<td>Washington Ave</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Foothill Blvd</td>
<td>Durant Ave</td>
<td>MacArthur Blvd</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Aladdin Ave-Fairway Dr</td>
<td>Alvarado St</td>
<td>Monarch Bay Dr</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>150th Ave</td>
<td>Freedom Ave (eastern city limits)</td>
<td>Hesperian Blvd</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Manor Blvd</td>
<td>Norton St</td>
<td>Wicks Blvd</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Fairmont Dr-Halcyon Dr-Floresta Blvd-Farnsworth St</td>
<td>East 14th St (eastern city limits)</td>
<td>Vining Dr</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Springlake Dr</td>
<td>Hesperian Blvd</td>
<td>Washington Ave</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Fargo Ave</td>
<td>Washington Ave</td>
<td>Farnsworth St</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Estudillo Canal Trail</td>
<td>Farnsworth St</td>
<td>Bay (Bay Trail)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Burkhart Ave</td>
<td>Norton St</td>
<td>Wicks Blvd</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Lewelling Blvd/Bayfront Dr</td>
<td>Hesperian Blvd (eastern city limits)</td>
<td>Harbor Wy</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spot Improvements

Several of the existing facilities need minor, low cost improvements to meet the design standards for these facilities as well as to better define the bikeway network and improve its effectiveness. These spot improvements are described below in Table 4. The spot improvements were combined as a single project for prioritization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bikeway</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Recommended Spot Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Neptune Dr (Bay Trail) from Oyster Bay Regional Park entrance to Marina Blvd</td>
<td>Add bicycle route and Bay Trail signage. Reconfigure the median and channelization at the Neptune Drive/Monarch Bay Dr/ Marina Boulevard intersection for better bicycle access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Monarch Bay Dr from Fairway Dr to south terminus</td>
<td>Add bicycle lane signs and pavement markings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Wicks Blvd from Burkhart Ave to Lewelling Blvd</td>
<td>Add sharrows to through-right travel lane and terminate bicycle lane striping prior to intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Alvarado St from Marina Blvd to Aladdin Ave/W 137th Ave</td>
<td>Extend bike lanes to/from the southern approach to Marina Boulevard as far as possible to the intersection, adding sharrows to continue the facility. Stripe bike lanes through the missing segment over Montague Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Adams Ave from Bigge St to Doolittle Dr</td>
<td>Add bike lane signs. Extend dashed bike lane stripe to Doolittle Drive and/or add sharrows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>San Leandro Blvd from San Leandro Creek to Washington Ave</td>
<td>Consider removing free right turns from Washington Avenue or stripe bike lane past traffic islands, dashed through free right turns. Add sharrows on eastbound approach to Washington Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Estudillo Ave from MacArthur Blvd to East 14th St</td>
<td>Add sharrows to through travel at Bancroft Avenue and East 14th Street intersections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Davis St from Alvarado St to Frederick Rd/Gilmore Dr</td>
<td>Repaint bike lane striping and pavement markings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Bancroft Ave from Durant Ave (Oakland city limits) to Blossom Way</td>
<td>Remove diagonal parking spaces at southbound approach to Dutton Avenue and continue bike lane striping. At Dowling, consider removing free right turn or stripe bike lane on inside to painted traffic island.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4: Recommended Spot Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bikeway</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Recommended Spot Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Bancroft Ave from 136th Ave to 138th Ave</td>
<td>Replace bike lane striping partially removed for construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Hesperian Blvd from East 14th St to Springlake Dr</td>
<td>Add through bike lanes or sharrows to both approaches to Fairmont Drive. Extend bike lanes on the northbound approach to/from Springlake Drive or add sharrows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Williams St from San Leandro Blvd to Neptune Dr</td>
<td>Add sharrows to I-880 overpass. Remove bike lanes and pavement markings from Alvarado Street for 300 feet west and replace with sharrows to (eastbound) and from (westbound) the intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>MacArthur Blvd from Durant Ave (Oakland city limits) to Superior Ave</td>
<td>Add more bike route signage until bike lanes are implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>MacArthur Blvd from Dowling Blvd to Joaquin Ave/Grand Ave</td>
<td>Add more bike route signage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Fairway Dr from Teagarden St to Miller St</td>
<td>Add sharrows and ‘share the road’ or ‘watch for bikes’ signage to overpass. Add ‘yield to bikes and pedestrians’ signage for westbound traffic merging onto Fairway Drive on west side of overpass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Springlake Dr from Hesperian Blvd to Loch Ln/Creekside Dr</td>
<td>Add sharrows on eastbound approach to Hesperian Boulevard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Springlake Dr from Loch Ln/Creekside Dr to Washington Ave</td>
<td>Remove westbound bike lane at least 50 feet before right turn lane starts. Add sharrows for left/through bike traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Lewelling Blvd from Wicks Blvd to west of RR tracks/Bayfront Dr</td>
<td>Add bike lane signage and pavement markings to striped bike lanes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bicycle Parking

Bicycle parking is an integral part of the bikeway network. Without secure and convenient bicycle parking, many cyclists will not choose to use their bicycle for trips where stops are made. Currently, bicycle racks are provided by the City, other public agencies, and by private landowners. More bicycle parking is needed within the City, particularly at retail centers, employment centers, parks, transit stops, and other locations that attract bicycle trips. To meet this need, the following two programs are recommended.

City Bicycle Rack Program: This program is recommended to provide the City with the means and procedures for installing bicycle racks where they are needed. With this program, the City would install a bicycle rack(s) within the public right-of-way at the request of a community member. This could be a landowner, business owner, resident, or employee. Once the request has been received, City staff would visit the requested location to determine if a bike rack can fit, contact adjacent property owners to inform them of the intent to install a bicycle rack, and, finally, install the bicycle rack. The program could also provide technical support for property owners wishing to install bicycle racks on private property as well as serve as a clearinghouse for bicycle parking information.

Bicycle Parking Ordinance: The City currently has a section in the Zoning Ordinance regarding bicycle parking that specifies that bicycle parking be provided at the rate of 5 percent of the requirement for automobile parking spaces with commercial uses. It is recommended that this requirement be revised as a standalone Bicycle Parking Ordinance and expanded to include other land uses (i.e. residential) and to provide more specific recommendation as to type of bicycle parking to be provided (i.e. short-term or long-term) by land use. More detailed discussion of the specifics for a revised bicycle parking ordinance can be found in the San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines including a sample bicycle parking ordinance.
Chapter 4: Pedestrian Network

The most memorable and sought after pedestrian environments are places where people have the opportunity to slow down, enjoy their surroundings, and observe or interact with other members of their community. To achieve this status, pedestrian facilities need to be designed to meet or exceed the minimal requirements, and include amenities that encourage and promote walking. Walkability is a qualitative measure of the degree to which a pedestrian network encourages walking. Walkability is influenced by all aspects of the built environment; the availability and maintenance of aspects of the pedestrian network, such as sidewalks, crosswalks, curb ramps, and street trees, and the availability of pedestrian amenities such as benches and wayfinding signage.

Throughout this document the term “pedestrian” will be used to include all persons who utilize the sidewalks and crosswalks regardless of their level of mobility. The goal of pedestrian oriented design is to meet the needs of all users, regardless of their age, their destination, or if they walk or roll in a wheelchair.

Introduction

The City of San Leandro has over 200 miles of roadway, which constitutes an enormous adjacent pedestrian network. The state of the pedestrian network varies greatly throughout the City. Much of the City is a very walkable and pedestrian friendly environment, composed of small blocks, complete sidewalks, street trees and accessibility features. However, there are areas of the City that are inhospitable to pedestrians because of lack of sidewalks, lack of street trees, long blocks, and lack of accessibility features. Additionally, there are some major barriers within the City that inhibit the connectivity of the pedestrian network. These barriers include railroad tracks and freeways (I-237, I-580, and I-880), which run throughout San Leandro and limit the east to west pedestrian connectivity within the city and create accessibility and safety limitations.

The City of San Leandro is constantly working to improve the pedestrian environment. A number of major improvements have been made under the 2004 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. These improvements, in part, include the downtown beautification project, the San Leandro History Walk on West Estudillo Avenue, and improvements on MacArthur Boulevard; these and other improvements are discussed in greater detail in Appendix C. This update is designed to identify additional future pedestrian improvement needs and to prioritize their implementation.
Pedestrian Improvement Areas

The City of San Leandro and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) have identified Pedestrian Improvement Areas as areas where walkability is critical and should be improved. This Plan focuses on these Pedestrian Improvement Areas; they were chosen for a number of reasons including proximity to important destinations, need for connectivity improvements, or potential for future development. A total of ten Pedestrian Improvement Areas are identified as part of this Plan, seven of which were previously identified in the 2004 Plan, and three that are new to this update. Figure 12 illustrates the Pedestrian Improvement Areas.

1. **San Leandro Marina Pedestrian Improvement Area** includes the area along Monarch Bay Drive adjacent to the Marina as well as the neighborhood around Marina Boulevard and Doolittle Drive.

2. **Westgate Center Pedestrian Improvement Area** includes the Westgate Shopping Center, the intersection of Timothy Drive and Davis Street, and the area along West Gate Parkway.

3. **Kaiser Development Area Pedestrian Improvement Area** encompasses the location of the future Kaiser Permanente San Leandro Medical Center/Mixed-Use Retail Development Project. The area is bounded by Marina Boulevard to the north, Merced Street to the west, Fairway Drive to the south, and I-880 to the east.

4. **Manor Boulevard/Washington Avenue Pedestrian Improvement Area** includes the Manor Boulevard corridor from Juniper Street to Washington Avenue and the Washington Avenue corridor from San Leandro Boulevard to Lewelling Boulevard. This Pedestrian Improvement Area contains an active neighborhood commercial district and a high volume roadway.

5. **Downtown San Leandro BART Station Pedestrian Improvement Area** is bounded by Davis Street to the north, Alvarado Street and the railroad to the west, Marina Boulevards and Estabrook Street to the south, and East 14th Street to the east. The Area expands at its eastern boundary to include the San Leandro Main Library between Estudillo Avenue and Callan Avenue. This Pedestrian Improvement Area includes much of Downtown San Leandro, the Downtown San Leandro BART Station, a number of employment locations, and areas of future development.

6. **East 14th Street Corridor Pedestrian Improvement Area** encompasses the nearly three miles of East 14th Street within the City limits. This Pedestrian Improvement Area serves as a primary local vehicle and transit route, providing access to employment centers, as well as, pedestrian generators such as schools, libraries, and parks.

7. **Bancroft Avenue/Dutton Avenue Pedestrian Improvement Area** encompasses Dutton Avenue from Breed Avenue to Chetland Road, and Bancroft Avenue from Dowling Boulevard to 138th Avenue. The area includes a small commercial district and is a major north-south connector.
within the City; land uses include retail, residential, and a number of schools.

8. **Bayfair BART Station Pedestrian Improvement Area** encompasses the BART station, Bayfair Center, and adjacent areas on Hesperian Boulevard and Fairmount Drive.

9. **MacArthur Boulevard Pedestrian Improvement Area** extends along MacArthur Boulevard from Durant Avenue to Estudillo Avenue. The area incorporates two retail corridor districts and access to and from I-580.

10. **Estudillo Avenue from the I-580 Underpass to Anthony Chabot Park Pedestrian Improvement Area** encompasses Estudillo Avenue from the I-580 underpass to Anthony Chabot Regional Park. These parks are a major destination for residents of the City of San Leandro. Currently pedestrian access to the park is limited and unsafe.

**Key Pedestrian Locations**

Key Pedestrian Locations are identified as discrete locations that warrant special considerations for pedestrians because they pose potential challenges to pedestrians or are located near significant pedestrian destinations and thus deserve special safety precautions. The following are Key Pedestrian Locations that need significant pedestrian and safety improvements. Key pedestrian Locations are also illustrated in Figure 12.

1. Garfield Elementary School
2. Davis Street/I-880
3. Cherry Grove Park
4. Woodrow Wilson Elementary School/ John Muir Middle School
5. Wicks Boulevard at the Marina Community Center
6. Bonaire Park
7. Pacific Community Recreation Complex
8. Washington Elementary School
9. Corvallis Elementary School
10. Floresta Boulevard/ Monterey Boulevard/ Monroe Elementary School
11. San Leandro Boulevard/ Washington Avenue Intersection
12. McKinley Elementary School
13. Bancroft Middle School
14. East 14th Street/San Leandro Boulevard Intersection
15. 136th Avenue/Bancroft Avenue
16. Washington Avenue/Lewelling Boulevard Intersection
17. Grand Avenue/Joaquin Avenue Intersection
18. Jefferson Elementary School
19. 150th Avenue/Hesperian Boulevard/Bancroft Avenue/ East 14th Street Intersection
20. Hesperian Boulevard/Lewelling Boulevard intersection
Figure 12: Pedestrian Improvement Areas and Key Pedestrian Locations
Needs Assessment

The City of San Leandro has an extensive pedestrian network requiring constant maintenance and rehabilitation in order to meet the growing needs of its pedestrians. The City contains many roads that were built to primarily serve the automobile, and thus do not provide a high level of pedestrian infrastructure. As a result, there are many locations throughout the City that provide sidewalks without any added features that would encourage walking or help to create a comfortable pedestrian environment. Many of the Pedestrian Improvement Areas contain neighborhood commercial centers or other destinations such as schools and parks that are visited on a daily basis. Such areas need pedestrian amenities and upgrades to encourage walking and the creation of a safe and inviting environment.

Throughout the City, many sidewalks, crosswalks, and curb ramps need to be upgraded to meet current ADA standards. ADA standards have evolved since many of the original accessibility improvements were implemented, and the City is working to make these upgrades to meet current standards. In many cases meeting ADA standards is a complex task because of the limited spatial resources. An in-depth discussion of the needs for each Pedestrian Improvement Area and Key Pedestrian Location is included in Appendix C.

Recommended Improvements

Recommended city-wide improvements and recommendations for the Pedestrian Improvement Areas and Key Pedestrian Locations are presented below. These suggested improvements are based upon a pedestrian audit performed for each area and on information provided by City staff and members of the BPAC. Further detail about specific design criteria for these recommendations can be found in the San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines.

A. City-Wide Improvements

The following are improvements that should be considered and implemented throughout the City or within future city-wide planning projects.

A-1 ADA Transition Plan

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), which provides civil rights protections to persons with disabilities, was enacted on July 26, 1990. Title II of the ADA mandates that a public entity and the services, programs or activities that they provide are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities. The act requires any public entity that employs 50 or more people to prepare a self-evaluation to assess whether any of their programs and services are discriminatory, and to evaluate physical barriers to accessibility. As an outcome,
public entities were required to develop a Transition Plan (by January 1992). The goals of the plan are to identify physical obstacles in the public entity's facilities that limit the accessibility of its programs or activities to individuals with disabilities; describe in detail the methods that will be used to make the facilities accessible; specify the schedule for taking the steps necessary to achieve compliance; and indicate the official responsible for implementation of the plan.

The City of San Leandro developed an ADA Transition Plan in 1995 and is currently undergoing a plan update. As part of the update, the City needs to perform a city-wide survey of its existing facilities to identify barriers for accessibility. Additionally the Transition Plan should:

- Identify existing facilities that limit access for persons with disabilities.
- Describe in detail the methods to be used to make facilities accessible.
- Specify a schedule for improving facilities by prioritizing the needs of persons with disabilities in existing facilities.
- Indicate the official responsible for implementation of the plan.
- Develop a procedure for installation of accessible facilities.
- Monitor the Transition Plan via milestones.
- Provide an avenue for citizens to request curb ramps, Accessible Pedestrian Signals, and sidewalk repair.
- Coordinate with the San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

**A-2 Assess and Repair Sidewalk Surface**

Safe and accessible sidewalk connections are the backbone of creating a pedestrian-friendly city. The City of San Leandro has a very extensive sidewalk network. However, in order to build off of this existing network and promote connectivity and accessibility, the City needs to ensure that all sidewalk surfaces meet ADA standards. Meeting or exceeding ADA standards will contribute to a better pedestrian environment for all users.

ADA standards require a minimum of 4 feet of unobstructed sidewalk. Some exceptions may be made to a minimum of 3 feet because of right-or-way restrictions, natural barriers, or other existing conditions. If a sidewalk is less than 5 feet wide, a passing space, which measures 5 feet wide by 5 feet long, is required every 200 feet. Sidewalks should have a continuous surface that is not interrupted by steps or abrupt changes in level and have a slip resistant surface.

There are instances within the City of San Leandro where the sidewalks are not up to standard for a number of reasons. In many cases, sidewalks are old and their age has caused the surface to crack and cause abrupt level changes.
Additionally, sidewalks are frequently obstructed by signs, poles, benches, or other streetscape amenities, which encroach on the minimum 4 foot sidewalk. There are also areas within the City where there may be a gap in the existing sidewalk network. As part of the ADA Transition Plan, the City should conduct an audit of the sidewalks and identify locations that need to be updated to meet the minimum ADA requirements. These areas should be prioritized by the City based upon their proximity to major destinations.

**A-3 Ensure that All Curb Ramps Meet ADA Standards**

Curb ramps allow people with mobility impairments to gain access to the sidewalks and to pass through median islands in streets. Without curb ramps, these individuals would be forced to travel in streets and roadways, where they are in potential conflict with vehicles and/or are prevented from reaching their destination.

Curb ramps are required at every intersection where a pedestrian way crosses a curb. The preferred orientation is for two curb ramps per corner that align with the direction of the crosswalks. Sometimes the limited width of a sidewalk makes it necessary to locate one curb ramp in the center of the curb return. However, in locations where space is limited curb extensions should be considered as a method to widen the sidewalk and provide adequate room for curb ramps.

As part of the ADA Transition Plan, a survey of the intersections throughout the City should be performed to evaluate the status of curb ramps based upon the ADA Accessibility Guidelines. Currently, the City requires all new development to meet ADA standards, and has an annual budget of $50,000 to bring existing ramps up to ADA standards; these are prioritized on a request basis or when roads are rehabilitated or improved by 25%.

**A-4 Update Signals within City to meet Accessible Pedestrian Signal Guidelines**

Accessible Pedestrian Signals are pedestrian activated signals that communicate information about pedestrian timing in a non-visual format and are spatially designed to be utilized by pedestrians with mobility and visual limitations. Accessible pedestrian signals help pedestrians with vision impairments to navigate an intersection by audibly indicating the WALK interval of the signal phase, and by guiding a pedestrian across the street with a constant audible destination message. The City has installed a number of accessible pedestrian signals at various locations throughout the City.

Currently, the CA MUTCD does not require accessible pedestrian signals at all signalized locations. They recommend that the installation of pedestrian accessible signals should be based upon an engineering study that takes into account potential demand, citizen’s requests for accessible pedestrian signals, traffic volumes, and the complexity of intersection geometry and traffic signal phasing. The CA MUTCD also recommend that local organizations, providing...
support services to pedestrians who have visual and/or hearing disabilities, can offer valuable input on the need for accessible pedestrian signals. \(^2\)

The San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines outline design guidelines for the use of accessible pedestrian signals. Currently, the majority of the signals within the City do not fully meet these accessibility guidelines. Standard City policy is that all new signals designed and built within the City will meet these guidelines. Retrofitting existing signals to meet accessible pedestrian signal guidelines will require significant construction and engineering in many locations. The location of new accessible pedestrian upgrades to existing signals is currently based upon citizen request with the services of an Orientation and Mobility Specialist to evaluate subject intersections and recommend improvements. To make the most use of available resources and to target the locations in most need of retrofit, the City should continue to address citizen needs but should also work to create a prioritized list of signals for upgrades based upon the following criteria:

- Major intersections with medium to high volumes of traffic.
- Intersections with turning lanes particularly if the signal pole and push button are located on a central median island.
- Intersections that are not at 90 degrees.
- Intersections that are located near schools, parks, youth and senior centers, shopping districts, and transit facilities.

**A-5 Update the Push Buttons on Pedestrian Activated Signals**

The type and location of the pedestrian signal push button are important aspects of a pedestrian signal that greatly influences their use and accessibility. Throughout the City of San Leandro there are a number of pedestrian signal push buttons that are not universally accessible. These push buttons are outdated and often contain small push buttons that demand a lot of force to activate. The City has begun to replace these outdated push buttons with modern push buttons that can be easily operated by persons with limited hand strength or dexterity, that require a limited amount of force to activate, and that respond to activation with a noise or vibration to alert the pedestrian that the button has been activated.

Updating the signal push buttons is one opportunity to improve the accessibility of pedestrian signals that can be accomplished with minor engineering and cost. The City should prioritize the updating of the push buttons in the short-term working with the BPAC and other community members to identify priority locations that need push button updates, and to ensure that all new signals include pedestrian activated push buttons that meet these criteria.

---

A-6 Implement, Maintain and Enforce Parking Restrictions at Intersections and Crosswalks

Vehicles parked in parking lanes adjacent to the curb can limit the visibility of pedestrians at intersections and crosswalks. Implementing parking restrictions adjacent to intersections and crosswalks is a relatively easy method of improving pedestrian visibility.

Based upon MUTCD recommendations, the City should ensure that parking is restricted for a minimum of 1.5-car lengths (30 feet) on the nearside of signalized intersection and for 1-car length (20 feet) on the far side of a signalized intersection. Similarly, a parking restriction of 1-car length (20 feet) should be installed adjacent to both sides of all marked crosswalks. Red “no parking zones” should be regularly maintained to enforce these recommendations.

The City of San Leandro Municipal Code (6-1-500) states that it is unlawful for the driver of a vehicle to stop or park their vehicle within an intersection, in a crosswalk, on a sidewalk, or on any portion of the area extended from the edge of the curb (or from the highest point of a rolled curb) to the sidewalk. To create a culture of compliance for these existing and newly proposed rules, the City needs to consistently enforce these rules through warnings and ticketing.

A-7 Implement Streetscape Enhancements

Streetscape enhancements are pedestrian improvements beyond the minimum standard that help to create an enhanced pedestrian experience and contribute to the overall livability of the City. Streetscape enhancements include pedestrian scaled lighting, street trees and landscaping, street furniture, colored or decorative paving, and decorative crosswalks. In addition, traffic calming measures are often employed to reduce crossing distances and traffic speeds and increase visibility of pedestrians crossing the street.

Streetscape enhancements should be prioritized for locations adjacent to major destinations identified in Figure 1 in Chapter 1. Streetscape enhancements should be of a similar palette to the improvements that have been recently installed in Downtown San Leandro and in the MacArthur Boulevard Pedestrian Improvement Area.

B. Pedestrian Improvement Areas

The following is a list specific improvements that should be implemented within each of Pedestrian Improvement Areas. These recommendations will need further analysis and design per accepted local, State and national standards and to ensure that they are feasible and appropriate. In addition, a detailed cost analysis will be needed as a next step towards implementing any of the following recommendations. Further detail about specific design criteria for

---

these recommendations can be found in the *San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines*.

**B-1 San Leandro Marina**

a. **Improve Monarch Bay Drive Sidewalks and Crosswalks**: Continuous pedestrian pathways should be created on both sides of Monarch Bay Drive in the Marina, to facilitate a safe pedestrian environment to this major destination. Additionally, crosswalks, a minimum of 250 to 350 feet apart, should be installed along Monarch Bay Drive to encourage pedestrians to cross at safe locations. Further analysis of Monarch Bay Drive will need to be performed to determine potential crosswalk locations.

b. **Create a Pedestrian Crossing at the Intersection of Monarch Bay Drive and Neptune Drive**: This intersection is an important link between the Marina and adjacent neighborhood. The intersection has been designed with a median that prevents cars from turning left onto Neptune Drive from Monarch Bay Drive. Unfortunately, this median limits bicycle and pedestrian access to the neighborhood as well. This intersection should be redesigned to include a safe pedestrian crosswalk and bicycle entry.

c. **Improve the Sidewalks and Curb Ramps within the Residential Neighborhood**: The City should analyze the existing sidewalks to identify locations where the sidewalks and the curb ramps need to be replaced. Ideally the sidewalks would be a minimum of 5-feet in width and include an adjacent 3 to 4 foot landscaped buffer.

**B-2 Westgate Center**

a. **Implement Safety and Circulation Improvements in the Westgate Center Parking Lot**: The parking lot should be redesigned to provide dedicated pedestrian pathways to identify the pedestrian route of travel through the parking lots and minimize potential conflict with vehicles. New landscaping to provide shade should be incorporated into the pedestrian connection design. The pedestrian pathways that have been recently implemented at Bayfair Center should be used as a model for these recommendations.

b. **Improve the Pedestrian Crossing at the Intersection of Timothy Drive and Davis Street**: There is an existing center median at this location that should be redesigned to provide a protected pedestrian refuge island for pedestrians. Additionally, curb extensions could help to reduce the wide pedestrian crossing.

At the southeast corner of the intersection, there is a large turning radius from Timothy Drive onto Davis Street. A narrower turning radius has been painted on the street to channelize and slow the speed of right turns. This corner should be redesigned to replicate the painted turning radius, which would reduce the crossing distance across Timothy Street.
B-3 Kaiser Development Area

a. **Improve Sidewalks**: As the site is developed, the City should ensure that the development plans include wider sidewalks with a landscaped buffer to separate the sidewalk from the street.

b. **Kaiser Hospital Site Design Recommendations**: As Kaiser Hospital moves forward in the development process, the City should work closely to ensure that the site design includes accessible pedestrian routes, pedestrian amenities, adequate signage and wayfinding, bicycle parking and lockers, provisions for transit connections and public open spaces.

B-4 Manor Boulevard/Washington Avenue

a. **Replace the Rolled Curbs along Manor Boulevard**: The rolled curbs along Manor Street should be replaced with traditional vertical curbs to inhibit the practice of parking on the sidewalk. When replacing the rolled curbs, the sidewalks should be widened to create more room for pedestrians and provide space for landscaping, if possible. Ideally, the sidewalks would be a minimum of 5-feet with a 3- to 4-foot landscaped buffer between the sidewalk and the street.

b. **Create More Pedestrian Crosswalks on Manor Boulevard**: In this residential neighborhood, crosswalks should be provided every 250-350 feet. Further analysis of Manor Boulevard will need to be performed to determine potential crosswalk locations.

c. **Implement Pedestrian Streetscape Improvements along Washington Avenue**: Because the roadway width along Washington Avenue, there is the opportunity to widen the sidewalks and provide a landscaped buffer along the sidewalk. New crosswalks should be implemented, and curb extensions can be added at corners to reduce the width of the pedestrian crossing. Similar to East 14th Street, adequate roadway width exists to incorporate a landscaped median in the center of the street that would improve the aesthetics of the street and contribute to calming traffic. Landscaped medians should be extended to provide pedestrian refuges at intersections to improve the safety of the pedestrian environment.

d. **Create More Pedestrian Crosswalks along Washington Avenue**: New crosswalks should be implemented to minimize the distance between crosswalks and increase connectivity. Further analysis of Washington Avenue will need to be performed to determine potential crosswalk locations. Curb extensions should be added at corners to reduce the width of the pedestrian crossing. Similarly, adequate roadway width exists to incorporate pedestrian refuge islands at major pedestrian crossings to improve pedestrian safety.

e. **Create Safe Pedestrian Crosswalks at the Intersections of Washington Avenue and Halcyon Drive and Lewelling Boulevard**: The City should analyze the potential to remove the channelized right turns with pork-chop islands to improve safety for pedestrians and bicyclists.
f. **Create a Pedestrian Connection at the Washington Avenue Tunnel under the Railroad Tracks:** The City should work to gain an easement across the railroad tracks to establish an at-grade pedestrian crossing of the railroad tracks. The City should also work with Urban Ecology to further the development of the East Bay Greenway, which is proposed to run under the BART tracks from Oakland to Hayward. The East Bay Greenway would provide an at grade multimodal path above the tunnel, which would improve connectivity at this location.

g. **Improve the I-880 Pedestrian Overpass:** The pedestrian crossing should be improved to create a more comfortable pedestrian environment by adding a buffer between the sidewalk and the adjacent fast moving traffic.

### B-5 Downtown San Leandro BART Station

a. **Redesign West Juana Avenue:** The incorporation of widened sidewalks, curb extensions, and a new bicycle lane into the redesign of West Juana Avenue will strengthen the roadway as a key pedestrian and bicycle connection between the BART station and Downtown. A good example of the type of improvements that should be implemented in this location are the recent streetscape improvements along West Estudillo Avenue.

b. **Implement the San Leandro Boulevard BART Pedestrian Interface Plan:** As part of the San Leandro Boulevard BART Pedestrian Interface Plan, San Leandro Boulevard is currently undergoing planning to improve the access and connectivity to the BART station. Planning efforts should include improved and widened sidewalks, updated crosswalks and curb ramps along San Leandro Boulevard, a new sidewalk in front of the BART station’s bus terminal, new landscaping, and wayfinding signage.

c. **Improve the Sidewalks and Curb Ramps in the Residential Neighborhoods:** The sidewalks in the residential neighborhoods of this Pedestrian Improvement Area are old and should be repaired and replaced to ensure that they provide a smooth and accessible surface for pedestrians. The landscape strip should be made consistent and planted with street trees to provide a buffer from the street and improve the aesthetics of the pedestrian environment. Curb ramps in the neighborhood should be analyzed to identify locations that need upgrades.

d. **Incorporate Streetscape Improvements and Public Space Additions into Future TOD Developments:** As part of the City of San Leandro’s Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) strategy, the BART parking lot to the east of the station and the vacant area to the west of the station as well as Martinez Street are slated to be mixed-use TOD developments. These developments will provide new affordable and market rate housing in the Downtown.

The TOD projects will contain a mixture of residential housing, retail and office uses, and the design of the streetscape and open spaces associated with the projects will be critical to enlivening the surrounding neighborhood. New sidewalks should be extra wide to accommodate...
commuters, provide pedestrian amenities, such as benches, for commuters who might be waiting in the area, and provide space for outdoor retail or restaurant use.

e. **Safety and Accessibility Improvements at the Railroad Crossings:** Within this Pedestrian Improvement Area, the railroad tracks cross both Davis Street and Williams Street. Railroad crossings pose potential safety and accessibility issues due to the following factors: inadequate warning and signage, crossings in poor condition leading to tripping hazards, large gaps in the crossing surface and flangeway causing bicycle tires and wheels to get stuck, and lack of education and understanding of railroad crossing operations.

For both locations, detectable warning devices such as truncated domes, flashing signals, signs and audible sounds should be installed to warn pedestrians of the potential hazard and the potential for oncoming trains. The crossing surface adjacent to the railroad tracks needs to be maintained as a smooth and flat surface to prevent wheels and other objects from potentially getting stuck in the gaps. It is especially important to ensure that the placement of the railroad crossing pole still allows for a minimum of a 4-foot accessible sidewalk clearance.

**B-6 East 14th Street Corridor**

a. **Consolidate and Redesign Driveway Ramps to Improve Safety and Accessibility:** As the parcels along East 14th Street continue to be developed, the City should encourage new businesses to reduce the amount of on-site parking in front of the business and consolidate the number of driveway ramps to the street. In the interim, the City can assess East 14th Street to identify driveway ramps that are hazardous and should be redesigned, and the ramps that are no longer in use and can be removed.

b. **Improve Crosswalks at Uncontrolled Intersections:** There are a number of crosswalks located at unsignalized intersections that should be improved by restriping the crosswalks as high visibility ladder crosswalks to increase their visibility. The street is wide enough to consider implementing curb extensions or pedestrian refuge islands at crosswalks to reduce the crossing distance and increase pedestrian safety.

New crosswalks at unsignalized intersections and intersections can improve the connectivity and safety of the pedestrian environment. Further analysis of East 14th Street and coordination with Caltrans will need to be performed to determine potential crosswalk locations. Many of the existing crosswalks are located at unsignalized intersections, and safety for pedestrians should be improved by restriping them as high visibility ladder crosswalks or adding pedestrian actuated signals.

c. **Reconfigure Median between Broadmoor Boulevard and Durant Avenue to Include Pedestrian Refuge:** The center landscaped median at the north end of the City is not well coordinated with crosswalks and does not help to improve pedestrian safety or connectivity. There is an opportunity to
redesign the median at this location to provide pedestrian refuge areas, improved crosswalks, and provide additional connectivity.

d. **Implement the Streetscape Improvements Recommended in the East 14th Street South Area Development Strategy:** The *East 14th Street South Area Development Strategy* identifies extensive recommendations for changes to East 14th Street in San Leandro south of Maud Avenue/Thornton Street, including lane reconfiguration, new crosswalk locations, design guidelines for new development, and streetscape improvements. The recommendations in the Strategy have been vetted by City staff and brought to the attention of Caltrans and should be pursued for implementation. Specifically, the Strategy calls for a new center median that will narrow the street, slow traffic and provide locations for pedestrian refuge islands. The Strategy also outlines locations for new crosswalks along East 14th Street that should be the basis for the installation of new crosswalks.

**B-7 Bancroft Avenue/Dutton Avenue**

a. **Redesign the Dutton Avenue/Bancroft Avenue Intersection:** This intersection would benefit from curb extensions and widened sidewalks at the intersection to improve the safety of pedestrians in this area, and provide extended sidewalk areas for sidewalk seating and pedestrian amenities. The pedestrian amenities, such as tables, chairs and landscaping will contribute positively to the retail environment by creating outdoor space for people to gather and enjoy the neighborhood. The curb extensions will also provide space for updated curb ramps.

b. **Improve the Safety of Bancroft Avenue and 136th Avenue Intersection for Students:** The new 9th Grade Campus will result in an increased number of students traveling between this school and San Leandro High School during the day; consequently, the intersection of Bancroft Avenue and 136th Avenue is a key intersection for pedestrian safety improvements. The City is considering a new signal with a pedestrian scramble at this intersection, potentially funded through a recent Safe Routes to School grant application. A pedestrian scramble is a system that stops all vehicular traffic and allows pedestrians to cross an intersection in every direction, including diagonally, at the same time. If the City decides to forgo pursuing a pedestrian scramble at this intersection, the intersection should be redesigned with curb extensions and yellow high visibility crosswalks on all legs of the intersection.

c. **Create more crosswalks along Bancroft Avenue between Dutton Avenue and Callan Avenue:** On Bancroft Avenue, the distance between crosswalks at Dutton Avenue and Callan Avenue is over 2,000 feet. This section of roadway should be studied to determine a potential location for one or more crosswalks to link the adjacent residential neighborhoods. Haas Avenue is one potential location that should be considered because of the existing bus stops at this intersection.
B-8 Bayfair BART Station

a. Improve the Streetscape along Hesperian Boulevard: The sidewalks should be widened to provide space for a landscape buffer between the sidewalk and the street. Additionally, curb extensions or pedestrian refuge islands should be added to the crosswalks to reduce the crossing distance. Hesperian Avenue has a paved center median. The median could be planted with trees and landscaping to improve the aesthetics of the street and contribute to the reduction of vehicle speeds.

b. Implement the Bay Fair BART Station Area Improvement Plan: The City of San Leandro should continue to work with BART to pursue funding to implement the remaining recommendations in the Plan, which includes improved pedestrian paths through the BART parking lots, new pedestrian lighting, and new wayfinding.

c. Hesperian Boulevard/Bayfair Drive and Hesperian Boulevard/Fairmount Drive Intersections: Redesign of these intersections should include curb extensions and/or pedestrian refuge islands to reduce pedestrian crossing distances and improve pedestrian safety.

B-9 MacArthur Boulevard

a. Implement Sidewalk and Curb Ramp Improvements on MacArthur Boulevard between Lewis Avenue and Dutton Avenue: The curb ramps and sidewalks in this area should be improved to provide accessible connections between the two adjacent retail districts.

b. Implement Traffic Calming at the Freeway On- and Off-ramps: Traffic calming and better signage to the on- and off-ramps of I-580 will help to traffic speeds. Potential traffic calming measures include reducing the width of the travel lanes, speed feedback signs, or gateway elements. The City is also considering implementing a roundabout at the intersection of MacArthur Boulevard, I-580, and Superior Avenue as part of Phase II MacArthur Boulevard Improvements.

c. Continue upgrading the sidewalks between Lewis Avenue and Durant Avenue: The sidewalks should be reviewed for uneven or failing concrete to ensure ADA accessibility. Additionally, there are a number of driveway ramps along the corridor that disrupt the continuity of the sidewalk. These discontinuities should be retrofitted and the number of driveway crossings minimized as this area continues to develop.

B-10 Estudillo Avenue - I-580 Underpass to Anthony Chabot Park

a. Create a Safe Pedestrian Connection from The City of San Leandro to Anthony Chabot Park: The northern shoulder of Estudillo Avenue should be widened to create room for a formal sidewalk, a minimum of 5-feet in width. The City of San Leandro will need to work with property owners along Estudillo Avenue, as the implementation will require the removal of parking on the shoulder and may encroach on adjacent parcels. This
northern sidewalk may need to include a pedestrian crossing along Estudillo Avenue.

b. **Improve Wayfinding to the Entrance of Anthony Chabot Park:** New wayfinding signage for pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists should be provided along Estudillo Avenue to guide users to the park.

### C. Key Pedestrian Locations

The following are specific improvements that should be made at each of the Key Pedestrian Locations. These recommendations will need further analysis and design per accepted local, State and national standards to ensure that they are feasible and appropriate. In addition, a detailed cost analysis will be needed as a next step towards implementing any of the following recommendations. Further detail about specific design criteria for these recommendations can be found in the *San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines*.

1. **Garfield Elementary School:** There is a yellow high-visibility crosswalk on Marina Boulevard, which should be repainted to maintain its visibility. School Warning signage should be placed in advance of the crosswalk and School Crosswalk Warning signs should be placed adjacent to the crosswalk to warn drivers of the potential of children crossing at this intersection. Curb extensions should be considered at this intersection to increase the visibility of students crossing at this location and decrease the crossing distance.

2. **Davis Street/I-880:** There are pedestrian sidewalks on both the north and south side of the overpass, but there are no crosswalks or pedestrian signals for pedestrians at the on- and off-ramp crossings. A new pedestrian bridge was studied for this location; however, a survey of the adjacent neighborhood residents indicated little desire for the project. As an alternative, crosswalks and pedestrian signage should be added wherever the pedestrian way crosses the roadway.

3. **Cherry Grove Park:** A new sidewalk should be added along the east side of Leonard Drive on the north portion of the park to connect to the existing crosswalk and parking area on the south side of the park. An in-pavement lighted crosswalk with pedestrian actuated flashing beacons should be considered for installation at the intersection of Williams Street and Leonard Drive, at the entrance to the park.

4. **Woodrow Wilson Elementary School/John Muir Middle School:** The intersection of Williams Street and Joyce Avenue has a yellow high visibility crosswalk at the entrance to the middle school with pedestrian activated in-pavement flashing lights. School Warning signage should be placed in advance of the crosswalk and School Crosswalk Warning signs should be placed adjacent to the crosswalk.
There is a high visibility mid-block crossing on Williams Street between Campbell Avenue and Dolly Avenue. School Warning signage should be placed in advance of the crosswalk.

5. **Wicks Boulevard at the Marina Community Center**: Two new high visibility crosswalks have been installed on Wicks Boulevard connecting the Community Center to Stenzel Park. The southern crosswalk still needs to be improved by creating curb ramps on the western sidewalk and creating a new sidewalk to the east, where presently there is no sidewalk.

6. **Bonaire Park**: The entrance to Bonaire Park is difficult to see because it is adjacent to the entrance to the Madison Elementary School parking lot and residential housing. New crossings should be considered on Juniper Street at the intersections of Sagewood Avenue and Manzanita Avenue.

7. **Pacific Community Recreation Complex**: Curb extensions should be considered for the intersection of Teagarden Street and Aladdin Avenue to reduce the crossing distance and improve pedestrian visibility. A new in-pavement lighted crosswalk and pedestrian actuated flashing beacon should be considered for implementation at the intersection of Teagarden Drive and Montague Avenue.

8. **Washington Elementary School**: A yellow high visibility crosswalk has been installed in front of Washington Elementary School across Dutton Avenue with roadway mounted pedestrian signage, and pedestrian actuated flashing beacons with an in-pavement lighted crosswalk. This crosswalk extends to cross a channelized right turn from Dowling Boulevard onto Dutton Avenue. The City should analyze the feasibility of removing the channelized right turn and squaring off the corner to improve the pedestrian safety at this location.

9. **Corvallis Elementary School**: At the intersection of Oberline Avenue and Corvallis Street there is a new yellow striped crosswalk with roadway and sidewalk mounted pedestrian crossing signs. This crosswalk should be restriped as a yellow high visibility crosswalk and School Warning signage should be placed in advance of the crosswalk.

   The intersection of Farnsworth Street and Corvallis Street has a channelized right turn with a pork-chop island. The City should analyze the feasibility of removing the channelized right turn and squaring off the corner to improve the pedestrian safety at this location. Additionally, the crosswalks should be restriped as yellow high visibility crosswalks, and School Warning signage should be placed in advance of the crosswalk and School Crosswalk Warning signs should be placed adjacent to the crosswalk.

10. **Floresta Boulevard/Monterey Boulevard**: The City should evaluate the channelized right turn with a pork-chop island to determine if it is feasible for removal and the feasibility of re-configuring Floresta Boulevard to accommodate Class II bike lanes. The City is seeking a Safe Routes to School Grant to implement a proposed traffic signal project at this intersection.
11. **San Leandro Boulevard/Washington Avenue Intersection**: New Accessible Pedestrian Signals have been recently installed at this intersection to improve accessibility of the crossing. To further improve safety at this intersection, the City should analyze the feasibility of removing the channelized right turn and installing new curb extensions and pedestrian refuge islands.

12. **McKinley Elementary School**: A traffic signal with pedestrian activation is located at the intersection of East 14th Street and Estabrook Street in front of the McKinley Elementary School. School Warning signage should be placed in advance of the crosswalk and School Crosswalk Warning signs should be placed adjacent to the crosswalk.

   The City recently installed an in-pavement lighted crosswalk at the Bancroft Avenue/Blossom Way intersection. To further improve safety to McKinley Elementary School, a yellow high visibility pedestrian crossing with School Warning signage in advance of the crosswalk and School Crosswalk Warning signs adjacent to the crosswalk should be implemented at the intersection of Bancroft Avenue and Warren Avenue.

13. **Bancroft Middle School**: The intersections adjacent to Bancroft Middle School have recently been updated. It is recommended that these intersections receive increased enforcement to ensure that motorists are abiding by the rules and respecting the school environment.

14. **East 14th Street/San Leandro Boulevard Intersection**: Pedestrian refuge islands should be installed in association with the existing central medians on East 14th Street. Curb extensions with new curb ramp improvements should be implemented at all corners of the intersection dependent upon the available space. The City should analyze the feasibility of removing the channelized right turn onto San Leandro Boulevard from East 14th Street and replace it with a widened sidewalk and a standard corner treatment.

15. **136th Avenue/Bancroft Avenue**: This location will become an extremely important crossing because this is a key location for students traveling between San Leandro High School and the new 9th Grade Campus. The City is considering a dedicated pedestrian scramble signal phase as part of a new traffic signal project to be funding through a Safe Routes to School Grant.

16. **Washington Avenue/Lewelling Boulevard Intersection**: This intersection is very wide and contains two channelized right turns with pork-chop islands. The City should analyze whether the feasibility of removing the channelized right turns and redesigning the intersection with curb extensions and pedestrian refuge islands to minimize the pedestrian crossing distance.

17. **Grand Avenue/Joaquin Avenue Intersection**: A pedestrian refuge island has been added across Joaquin Avenue at the intersection of Grand Avenue. The intersection should be further improved with crosswalk striping.

18. **Jefferson Elementary School**: A new high visibility yellow crosswalk has been installed as a mid-block crossing on Bancroft Avenue. The crosswalk has roadway and sidewalk mounted pedestrian crossing signs. Pedestrian
actuated flashing beacons and an in-pavement lighted crosswalk should be considered for additional safety at this location.

19. **150th Avenue/Hesperian Boulevard/Bancroft Avenue/East 14th Street Intersection**: This wide intersection has not had recent pedestrian improvements. Curb extensions, curb ramp improvements, and pedestrian refuge islands will make this intersection safer for pedestrians.

20. **Hesperian Boulevard/Lewelling Boulevard Intersection**: There has been a lot of recent development near the Hesperian Boulevard and Lewelling Boulevard intersection. Where space exists, the City should analyze if it is possible to widen the existing central medians to provide pedestrian refuge islands for pedestrians who are crossing this wide intersection.
Chapter 5: Safety, Education and Enforcement

This chapter discusses existing safety conditions for bicycling and walking in San Leandro including an evaluation of recent collision activity and current safety and education programs available to San Leandro residents. Additional education and enforcement programs are recommended to improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians. It should be noted that while improving safety is extremely important and a high priority in San Leandro, riding a bicycle and walking involves an inherent risk that no improvements can completely eliminate. It is the responsibility of all road users to follow the rules of the road and to treat each other with respect to increase road safety.

Collision Analysis

Pedestrian and bicycle-related collision data was obtained from the City of San Leandro for the years 2006 through 2009. This data was analyzed to identify patterns in these incidents which might point to specific improvements needed in the San Leandro pedestrian and bicycle program. Figure 13 shows this data spatially within the City of San Leandro.

In addition, current collision data was compared against available data from the previous plans to determine if trends in the cause or location of pedestrian and bicycle collisions could help to identify the need for physical improvements or the issues of most concern for education and safety programs. The locations identified below warrant further study. It is recommended that continued analysis of collision diagrams, on-site observations, and further monitoring of collision activity and enforcement be conducted. It is important to determine if collision causes can be traced to behavior or roadway design issues. Commonalities between incidents can aid in determining what improvements would be effective in reducing collisions.
Bicycle Collisions

During the 4-year period of this analysis, there were 79 reported collisions in San Leandro involving bicycles with a total of 59 reported injuries. No fatalities occurred during this period. This reflects an average of approximately 20 bicycle collisions annually. This number indicates a drop in the average of 23 annual collisions reported in the 2004 Plan and the average of 32 annual collisions reported in the 1997 Plan. Wrong-way riding and right-of-way violations by either the cyclist or motorist continue to be the most common cause of motor vehicle-bicycle collisions.

Almost two-thirds of all the collisions occurred at or within close proximity of an intersection. The intersection of Estudillo Avenue/MacArthur Boulevard was reported as the intersection with the highest number at three bicycle collisions. Other intersections that experienced two bicycle collisions included:

- East 14th Street/Davis Street
- East 14th Street/Lorraine Boulevard-Begier Drive
- East 14th Street/Joaquin Avenue
- East 14th Street/Estabrook Street
- Estudillo Avenue/San Jose Street.
- Marina Boulevard/Doolittle Drive
- Monterey Boulevard/Floresta Boulevard
- San Leandro Boulevard/Davis Street

The roadway with the greatest number of bicycle collisions along its length was East 14th Street as reported in the 1997 Plan; the 2004 Plan pointed to Washington Street as the location with the greatest number of collisions. The current data again identifies East 14th Street as the roadway with the greatest number of bicycle collisions.
Figure 13: Pedestrian and Bicycle Collisions 2006 – 2009
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Pedestrian Collisions

During the 4-year period of this analysis, there were 109 reported collisions in San Leandro involving pedestrians with a total of 86 reported injuries. No fatalities occurred during this period. This reflects an average of approximately 27 pedestrian-involved collisions annually. This number indicates a drop in the average 33 annual collisions reported in the 2004 Plan. Motorists were at fault the majority of the time, and the most common collision factor was the motorist violating pedestrian right-of-way.

East 14th Street experienced the largest number of pedestrian-involved collisions for the 4-year period as was also reported in the 2004 Plan although the total current number was slightly less (39 compared to 45 in the 2004 Plan). Pedestrian collisions along East 14th Street were generally in the vicinity of Downtown or Bayfair Center. Bancroft Avenue and Davis Street experienced the next highest pedestrian collision rates with 10 collisions and 9 collisions, respectively.

Similar to the 2004 Plan, more of the incidents (66 percent) occurred at intersections rather than at midblock locations. Most of the intersections with the highest rates (three collisions) were located on East 14th Street. They are:

- East 14th Street/Bayfair Drive
- East 14th Street/Dutton Avenue
- East 14th Street/Estudillo Avenue
- East 14th Street/Juana Avenue
- Davis Street/Alvarado Street

Intersections with two collisions during the 4-year analysis period are:

- East 14th Street/Chumalia Street
- East 14th Street/Farimont Drive
- East 14th Street/Joaquin Avenue
- Bancroft Avenue/Dutton Avenue
- Hesperian Blvd/Springlake Drive
- Lewelling Blvd/Washington Ave

Education Programs

The safe interaction between pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists hinges on a shared understanding of the basic rules and responsibilities for travel on public roads. Cities can play a lead role in promoting this understanding through educational programs and initiatives that encourage safe, responsible behavior by all road users. The following sections document existing bicycle and pedestrian education and safety programs currently in place in San Leandro. The sections also pose suggestions for increasing the robustness of existing programs or implementing new, cost-effective programs with proven successes.
Bicycle Programs to teach current and potential bicyclists of all ages about the fundamentals of bicycle riding are an important educational tool; they help establish good riding skills and promote safe interactions between pedestrians, motorists, and other cyclists. The following programs and initiatives are currently in place in San Leandro:

**Community education programs:** Beginning in 2003, the City contracted with Safe Moves to provide school workshops and traffic rodeos, community-based traffic rodeos and senior citizen traffic safety presentations for the continuation of the Pedestrian Safety Program.

- This program included 225 classroom workshops for elementary, middle and high school students, with each workshop geared toward each grade level. 25 school-based traffic safety rodeos were conducted for each grade level in the elementary schools during school hours. Six community-based traffic safety rodeos were available to the general public and, as possible, were scheduled with other community events. Lastly, 20 traffic safety workshops were held to target the senior community. These workshops were held at senior citizen centers and other community sites including housing facilities.

- In addition to the Safe Moves workshops and rodeos, many elementary schools hold yearly safety assemblies. Bancroft Middle School is unique in that it also has a BMX trick rider club that makes annual presentations to the physical education classes including bicycle safety tips.

- The City submitted an application in early 2010 to the California Office of Traffic Safety for funding to continue educational programs with Safe Moves. Although this application was denied, the City continues to look for funding to continue the education programs provided by Safe Moves.

- The City submitted three applications in July 2010 for Safe Routes to School funding for signal improvements and education programs at San Leandro High School, Lincoln High School, and James Monroe Elementary School.

- The City will be participating in Safe Routes to School walking audits during the upcoming school year at 2-3 schools in San Leandro led by Transform.

**East Bay Bicycle Coalition (EBBC) Workshops:** The EBBC holds periodic free cycling workshops throughout Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. Programs are designed to appeal to a variety of audiences and skill levels and include bicycle safety and traffic skills classes, family cycling workshops, and children’s bike rodeos.

**San Leandro Bicycle Map:** The City provides a detailed bikeways and trails map that also includes safe cycling tips, cycling information specific to San Leandro, and city and regional contacts for additional information.
Bike to Work Day (BTWD): Each Bike to Work Day, the San Leandro Engineering and Transportation Department hosts a bicycle energizer station at the main entrance to the Downtown San Leandro BART Station. Food, drink and BTWD tote bags containing giveaways and outreach materials are provided. The San Leandro energizer station has experienced significant growth in participation over the years from 67 bicyclists in 2007 to more than 150 participants in 2009.

Bike SL Event: The first annual Bike SL event, sponsored by the San Leandro Downtown Association, was held on May 2, 2010. This event promotes cycling in the city and included a 5-mile family bicycle ride and a 13-mile more challenging mountain bike ride followed by a barbeque with live music. ([www.bikesl.org](http://www.bikesl.org))

In addition to continuing the above programs, the City might consider enacting the following supplemental programs:

Bicycle Helmet Program: The City should partner with existing statewide helmet programs to provide low-cost or free helmets to schoolchildren. In California, minors are required to wear a bicycle helmet while bicycling.

In-class Bicycle Education Programs: Bicycle safety information could be added to the curricula of elementary and middle school physical education classes, and might be implemented in conjunction with interested school staff, Safe Moves, the East Bay Bicycle Coalition, or Cycles of Change, an East Bay nonprofit which promotes cycling as a component of healthy lifestyles. Depending on availability of bicycles, staff interest, and liability considerations, off-campus bicycle rides might also be included as a part of physical education classes or as afterschool events.

Adult Bicycle Education Program: Expanding on existing Safe Moves and EBBC workshops, an adult bicycle education program could be established through the San Leandro Adult School, Recreation and Human Services Department, or by contracting with the East Bay Bicycle Coalition or League of American Bicyclists, which provides a variety of bicycle safety courses. This program would train adults to ride defensively in traffic and provide instructions for effective bicycle commuting.

Traffic School and Youth “Diversion” Programs: Bicycle safety should be an integral part of traffic school curricula for motorists; however, cyclists hold an equal obligation to adhere to traffic rules. Accordingly, the City should consider instating a traffic school for cyclists. Such a program would parallel conventional motorist traffic schools and would allow cyclists cited with a moving violation to take a class to lessen or eliminate their financial penalty. A similar, albeit less formal program might also be required of youths who are stopped for illegal cycling maneuvers. In this “diversion” program, youths who ride illegally must attend a one-day remedial cycling skills course, which is typically held on a weekend and conducted by the police department.
Partnership with Local Bicycle Shops: Bicycle shops are a natural community outlet for the distribution of safe cycling pamphlets, maps, and other informational materials. Bicycle shops are also ideal locations to post notices about bicycle safety workshops and events. Additionally, bicycle shops may also offer knowledgeable personnel and/or sponsorship for future cycling events and workshops.

Earn-Your-Bike Program: Based on similar programs in neighboring cities, San Leandro might consider establishing an earn-your-bike program, in which youths participate in a certain number of safe cycling skills and basic bicycle repair courses to receive a youth cycling certification. The program could be operated by the San Leandro Recreation and Human Services Department, but might exist in partnership with Cycles of Change and local bicycle shops. If enough financial support is available, underprivileged youth might also be awarded bicycles for completion of this program.

Public education campaigns: These campaigns are designed to promote bicycling and walking focusing on the benefits of non-motorized modes.

- As funding or other opportunities become available, consider using volunteers or City staff to create public service announcements for display on television, the internet, and/or outdoor billboards.
- Partner with AC Transit to display posters promoting safe interactions between road users on transit vehicles and at bus stops.
- Partner with other cities to share and obtain traffic safety information and best practices. The City of San Jose’s Street Smarts program (http://www.getstreetsmarts.org/) offers a well respected safety education module that is easily adaptable to other communities.
- Utilize home mailings and utility bills to distribute brochures, newsletters, and other safety and education materials. Consider providing different materials depending on the target audience, which might vary by location or age.
- Position warning signs at strategic locations advising cyclists and motorists to share the roadway.

Pedestrian

Pedestrian safety education targeted at all road users is an important means for promoting safe interactions between pedestrians, motorists, and cyclists. The following programs and initiatives are currently in place in San Leandro:

Community education programs: Community education programs relating to pedestrians and bicyclists are discussed in the Bicycle section above.

Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program: The City of San Leandro has instituted a Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program for the use of engineering devices (such as speed humps), traffic enforcement, and traffic safety education to
reduce vehicle speeds and encourage motorists to use appropriate routes, rather than cut through residential areas. Local residential streets and residential collectors are eligible for the program. Inclusion of a street in the traffic calming program is initiated by a citizen and follows a defined set of criteria for improvement design, prioritization and public input. More information on the program can be found at: http://www.sanleandro.org/depts/transit/landuse/transp.asp

The Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program includes a traffic safety education program with the following elements:

- Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program Handbook.
- Neighborhood Pace Car Program where residents pledge to drive within the speed limit and abide by existing traffic laws. Participants are given decals to display on their cars to remind others to slow down.
- Safety brochures for adult and child bicycle safety, pedestrian safety, and motorist best practices.

**Pedestrian safety assessment:** In March 2010, the University of California Transportation Center (UCTC) completed a pedestrian safety assessment of San Leandro, which included interviews with city staff and a walking assessment of the city’s pedestrian network. The pedestrian safety assessment ranked the City’s treatment of pedestrian issues based on 35 criteria and provided recommendations for potential improvements. The UCTC team identified San Leandro as exceeding national best practices in 19 of the 35 criteria.

In addition to the above programs and events, the City might consider enacting the following supplemental pedestrian programs:

**Walking audits:** The City should consider holding periodic walking audits at locations with high incidence of pedestrian collisions. These events would bring together City transportation staff, police officers, bicycle and pedestrian advocates, and community members to strategize ways of improving walking conditions and general safety at these locations.

**Local walking promotions:** Walk-your-child-to-school day, monthly community walking days, employer lunchtime walks, and organized walk-to-transit campaigns are all examples of simple initiatives that can conveniently and seamlessly integrate walking into a variety of lifestyles.

**Pedestrian map:** As a companion piece to the existing San Leandro Bicycle Map, the City should consider publishing a citywide pedestrian guide complete with safe walking tips, key pedestrian zones, annual or recurring events such as festivals and farmers markets, and contacts for additional walking information.

**Public education campaigns:** Education campaigns presented in the Bicycle section above are also applicable to pedestrian safety initiatives.
Safe Routes to School

Safe Routes to School (SR2S) is a shorthand name for a broad array of programs designed to encourage walking and cycling to school. These programs focus on improving traffic safety around schools and promoting the health benefits of increased walking and biking. At the same time, SR2S programs benefit non-participating motorists and transit users with reductions in traffic congestion around schools. SR2S programs typically involve partnerships among municipalities, school districts, community volunteers, and law enforcement. Safe Routes to School programs encompass a four-pronged strategy known as the “Four E’s:"

- **Education**: For Safe Routes to School programs, students are taught bicycle, pedestrian and traffic safety skills, and educational campaigns aimed at drivers are developed.

- **Encouragement**: Events and contests such as walkathons are used to encourage walking, bicycling, or carpooling. These events are especially effective when they include participation by parents in an effort to change their travel behaviors as well.

- **Enforcement**: Law enforcement agencies use a variety of specialized enforcement tactics, such as pedestrian safety stings and speed radar trailers.

- **Engineering**: Signing, striping, and infrastructure improvements are put in place to create clearly delineated walking and cycling routes to schools.

San Leandro has applied for and received two SR2S grants, which have been used to fund programs and lighted crosswalks in two locations. Additionally, the City has developed walking maps for all its elementary schools that indicate the suggested route that children should use to travel between home and school. Currently, the public schools in San Leandro offer a variety of SR2S programs. James Madison Elementary, Roosevelt Elementary, and Washington Elementary schools are participating in the Alameda County Safe Routes to School Program. Their programs through this effort include:

- **James Madison Elementary** – Wacky Walking Wednesdays every Wednesday of the month
- **Roosevelt Elementary** – Walking School Buses
- **Washington Elementary** – Walk and Roll to School Day on May 5, 2010

The effectiveness of SR2S programs and projects in San Leandro could be enhanced if future SR2S grants and projects were coordinated to achieve a strategic vision. Thus, it is recommended that San Leandro develop a Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan with measurable goals and milestones. Guidance for this Strategic Plan could come from a Safe Routes to School Steering
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Committee, which could be composed of City and school district staff, parents, nonprofit organizations such as Cycles of Change and the East Bay Bicycle Coalition, and other related stakeholders.

Safe Routes to Transit

Safe Routes to Transit (SR2T), although similar in name, has a narrower focus than its sister Safe Routes to School program. SR2T provides funding for City CarShare programs and infrastructure projects that facilitate walking and cycling access to transit. Because SR2T is funded by Regional Measure 2 funds ($1 increase in Bay Area bridge tolls to fund transit improvements), projects must have a “bridge nexus” to be eligible. A project must contribute to reduced congestion on a state-owned Bay Area toll bridge by facilitating walking or bicycling to City CarShare pods or regional transit services, which are defined as services that operate between counties. Additionally, the transit service associated with a proposed access improvement project must connect with, cross, or provide the same geographic connection as a state-owned Bay Area toll bridge, or provide direct feeder service into to a regional transit service.

The City of San Leandro, in partnership with BART, has been awarded two competitive grants for pedestrian and bicycle station access improvement projects. These projects included the Bay Fair BART Station Area Improvement Plan (2007) and Downtown San Leandro BART Pedestrian and Bicycle Access Project (2009). As transit access improvement needs arise, the City should continue to pursue SR2T funds through partnerships with BART and other transbay transit operators such as AC Transit.

Security

The San Francisco Bay Trail is currently patrolled by the East Bay Regional Park District Volunteer Trail Safety Patrol; however, additional enforcement on multi-use paths should be provided by the San Leandro Police Department. Existing vehicle statutes relating to bicycle operations and pedestrian violations will be enforced through the Police Department’s normal operations. No additional manpower or equipment is anticipated.

In general, multi-use pathway undercrossings—although none are proposed in San Leandro—require special attention because they can be perceived as unsafe areas, particularly after dark. Any undercrossing over 50 feet in length should be lighted, and all approaches to the undercrossing should provide the user a clear view all the way through the undercrossing. Undercrossings should be designed to avoid areas off the path where people can loiter.

The Police Department may have to be provided with special vehicles (such as trail bikes) for patrolling paths. It is estimated that one hour of additional police manpower is required for every 5 miles of pathway. As discussed in the
Enforcement section below, the San Leandro Police Department already has one bicycle officer.

**Enforcement**

Protecting bicycle and pedestrian rights-of-way and enforcing traffic laws is an important component of bicycle and pedestrian safety; furthermore, proper enforcement fits cohesively into a management strategy that balances the needs of all road users. The City of San Leandro has five traffic officers. This staff is responsible for traffic enforcement and collision investigation; however, no officers are specifically assigned to bicycle or pedestrian safety.

The San Leandro Police Department is responsible for patrols around schools, and enforcement is specifically targeted during pick-up and drop-off periods. The Police Department also has one bicycle officer on its force working Wednesday through Sunday to patrol the Plaza area and the surroundings in Downtown. The Police Department has two radar speed trailers that can be placed by request on a resident’s street for speeding abatement.

In the past, the City has conducted pedestrian sting operations, in which police target motorists who violate the right-of-way of pedestrians crossing the street—especially motorists who do not stop for pedestrians when cars in adjacent lanes have done so.

The City might consider expanding its enforcement toolbox to continue the following strategies or implement the recommendations below.

**Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program:** Continue this City-sponsored community-based program to define traffic calming needs and specific bicycling and walking issues in the neighborhoods. It is recommended that this program be expanded to include the bikeway network, particularly as applied to Class III bike routes, and pedestrian improvement areas defined in the Plan as priority locations to be included in the Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program.

**Traffic officer Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Training:** Traffic officers should receive training specifically focused on bicycle and pedestrian safety and enforcement principles. San Leandro should collaborate with surrounding jurisdictions and the Alameda County Sheriff’s Office and share resources as practical. If funding allows, San Leandro should consider appointing a bicycle and pedestrian traffic safety specialist.

**Additional sting operations:** These operations could employ a decoy undercover officer who attempts to cross the street in the crosswalk. The City might find such stings to be even more effective by involving the media and distributing educational materials in addition to or in place of citations. Stings could also be applied to other road users, such as bicyclists, who might be stopped for wrong-way riding, failure to obey traffic controls, or lack of required
safety equipment (helmets for minors or use of lights at night). As with motorists, cyclist stings could be informational in nature or carry a fine. In a partnership between law enforcement and local bicycle stores, informational materials given to offenders could also include coupons for discounts on helmets, lights, and other bicycle equipment.

Enhanced police enforcement: In areas of high pedestrian and bicycle traffic or high bicycle and pedestrian collision rates, the City should consider deploying a stronger police presence. As necessary, the Police Department may consider assigning more police to traffic control and issuing citations for traffic violations more frequently. Enhanced police enforcement should be used in conjunction with sting operations and walking audits to focus on improving locations most dangerous for bicyclists and pedestrians. Before such a program is implemented, police officers need education on how best to approach an offender and what violations should be targeted for enforcement.

Adoption of a bicycle traffic violation fine structure: Since 1994, with the passage of AB 669, cities have had the discretion to reduce fines for infractions of the vehicle code incurred by bicyclists. It has been found in cities throughout California that a reduced fine structure has stimulated enforcement of bicycle violations.

Bicycle diversion training: With this program, a cyclist that has been given a ticket for illegal (unsafe) riding must attend safety training in lieu of paying a fine or appearing in court. This is often accompanied by a media campaign to inform residents that bicycling offenders will be cited. This program could be expanded to include pedestrians and motorists.
Chapter 6: Implementation

Implementation of the proposed bicycle and pedestrian programs described in the previous section will require funding from local, state, and federal sources and coordination with multiple agencies both within and outside the City. To facilitate implementation efforts, this section presents the project prioritization methodologies, summary of past expenditures, and conceptual cost estimates. At the conclusion of this section, funding and implementation strategies are described.

Project Prioritization

The proposed bikeway projects and pedestrian improvements, when fully implemented, will provide a comprehensive system for the City of San Leandro. Recognizing that there are limited financial resources that can be devoted to these projects, it is necessary to establish a system for ranking or prioritizing the improvements that can provide the most effective use of available funds. The criteria used for setting priorities differ somewhat for bicycle and pedestrian projects. Both are described below along with the resulting list of projects sorted by priority.

Bikeway Project Prioritization

Project Definition

As previously discussed, the bikeway network was divided into segments. The specific improvements needed to implement the bikeway segments will vary based upon the roadway characteristics, particularly roadway width and traffic volumes and speeds, to provide the most appropriate and effective facility for bicyclists and motorists. The specific improvements recommended for each segment are shown in the ‘Proposed Class’ column in Table 5 and are described in more detail in Appendix B. In general, these improvements include:

- **Class I bike path**
  - Paving and signage. Acquisition of right-of-way, fencing, lighting and amenities such as water fountains, benches, and restrooms may also be part of the Class I bike path installation.

- **Class II bike lanes**
  - Stripping, signage and pavement markings where no other roadway modifications are needed.
  - Stripping, signage and pavement markings where roadway restriping and/or lane narrowing is needed.
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- Striping, signage and pavement markings where removal of travel lane, parking or center two-way left-turn lane is needed.
- Engineering study is recommended to determine what roadway modifications are necessary to implement bike lanes.

- **Class III bike route**
  - Signage only.
  - Signage and sharrows.
  - Engineering study is recommended to determine what roadway modifications are necessary to implement a bike route and/or if bike lanes can be provided.

These segments were then combined by bikeway and improvement type into a set of projects for implementation. The proposed projects are described by roadway segment, length, existing and proposed bikeway classification, conceptual cost, and total priority scoring in Table 5.

**Prioritization Methodology**

The methodology used to prioritize projects was updated from the previous plan based upon input from City staff, the BPAC and current practices and conditions. Each bikeway project was evaluated with a total of 27 possible points based upon the five categories discussed below. The bikeway project prioritization sheet is included in Appendix D.

- **Connection to Activity Centers** (total of 6 points) – Projects which provide access to local and regional activity centers such as schools, major employment centers or Downtown, major shopping centers, libraries and parks or recreational facilities. Because of the City’s focus on school safety, an extra point was given to projects that provide access to schools.

- **Safety** (total of 4 points) – Projects which address a safety concern such as high number of collisions or busy arterial street. Because of the City’s focus on safety, this category was weighted to provide additional points for projects that meet these safety criteria.

- **Connectivity** (total of 7 points) – Projects which improve connectivity for bicyclists by eliminating an existing barrier or hazard, bridging a gap in an existing bikeway, connecting to an existing or proposed facility, located on or connects to a bikeway in an adjacent jurisdiction or to the regional or county network, or provides a connection through the city.

- **Transit Access** (total of 3 points) – Projects which connect to a BART station, high capacity bus line, future BRT service or local bus route.

- **Funding & Implementation** (total of 7 points) – Projects which do not require significant additional planning or study or extensive modifications to implement; projects which are part of a recognized current or future project or can be implemented without coordination with agencies outside the City;
projects that would be competitive for alternative funding sources; and projects that have community support.

The projects were grouped into three implementation categories based upon the resultant project scoring. The three categories are defined as follows:

**Phase I (Short-Term Projects):** Projects that received the highest relative scores. These projects have the highest priority for implementation and are targeted for completion within five years.

**Phase II (Medium-Term Projects):** Projects that received moderate relative scores. These projects are included in the second group of projects considered for implementation and are targeted for completion within 10 years.

**Phase III (Long-Term Projects):** Projects that received the lowest relative scores and the lowest priority for implementation. Although the projects in this group scored low, they are part of a plan that, when fully developed, forms a comprehensive bikeway system. These projects are targeted for completion within 10-20 years.

The prioritized projects, listed from High to Low, are shown in Table 6, below.
Table 5: Recommended Bikeway Projects

| Project | Bikeway       | Project Name                      | Segment | Roadway            | From               | To                  | Existing Class | Proposed Class | Length (miles) | Total Priority Points | Conceptual Cost |
|---------|---------------|-----------------------------------|---------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| CW-1    | Spot Improvements | Citywide                        | n/a     | n/a                | n/a                | 21 $50,000          |                |                 |                 |                        |                |                       |
| 5-1     | 5 Bay Trail    | Bay Trail                        | d       | Neptune Dr/ Marina Blvd | Fairway Dr        | 0 1 0.6 10 $450,000 |                |                 |                 |                        |                |                       |
| 5-2     | 5 Marina Park Trail | Marina Park Trail                | e       | Fairway Dr         | Estudillo Canal    | 0 1 0.5 11 $337,500 |                |                 |                 |                        |                |                       |
| 5-3     | 5 Mulford Point Pathway | Mulford Point Pathway          | g       | Bay Trail (segment d) | End of Mulford Point | 0 1 0.5 4 $390,000 |                |                 |                 |                        |                |                       |
| 5-4     | 5 Small Boat Lagoon Loop | Small Boat Lagoon Loop          | h       | Bay Trail (segment d) | End of breakwater  | 0 1 1.0 4 $750,000 |                |                 |                 |                        |                |                       |
| 9-1     | 9 Monarch Bay Dr | Monarch Bay Dr                   | a       | Marina Blvd        | Fairway Dr         | 0 2 (SSP) 0.4 11 $16,800 |                |                 |                 |                        |                |                       |
| 15-1    | 15 Doolittle Dr | Doolittle Dr                      | b       | Davis St           | Marina Blvd        | 0 2 (study) 0.9 12 $70,400 |                |                 |                 |                        |                |                       |
|         |               |                                   | c       | Marina Blvd        | Fairway Dr         | 0 2 (study) 0.4     |                |                 |                 |                        |                |                       |
| 17-1    | 17 Timothy Dr-Westgate Pkwy | Timothy Dr | a       | Davis St           | Westgate Pkwy      | 0 3 (SS) 0.1 9 $2,400 |                |                 |                 |                        |                |                       |
|         |               |                                   | b       | Timothy Dr         | South Walmart Driveway | 0 3 (SS) 0.2       |                |                 |                 |                        |                |                       |
| 17-2    | 17 Merced St   | Merced St                        | d       | Williams St        | Marina Blvd        | 0 2 (study) 0.3 10 $20,800 |                |                 |                 |                        |                |                       |
|         |               |                                   | e       | Marina Bl          | Republic Ave       | 0 2 (study) 0.2     |                |                 |                 |                        |                |                       |
|         |               |                                   | f       | Republic Ave       | Fairway Dr         | 0 2 (study) 0.2     |                |                 |                 |                        |                |                       |
|         |               |                                   | g       | Fairway Dr         | Burroughs Ave      | 0 2 (study) 0.4     |                |                 |                 |                        |                |                       |
| 21-1    | 21 Alvarado St | Alvarado St                      | a       | San Leandro Creek  | Davis St           | 0 3 (S) 0.3 9 $2,320 |                |                 |                 |                        |                |                       |
|         |               |                                   | b       | Davis St           | W Estudillo Ave    | 0 3 (SS) 0.1 1 $1,600 |                |                 |                 |                        |                |                       |
| 21-2    | 21 Alvarado St | Alvarado St                      | d       | Thornton St        | Marina Blvd        | 0 3 (SS) 0.3 11 $6,600 |                |                 |                 |                        |                |                       |
|         |               |                                   | f       | Aladdin Ave/W 137th Ave | Teagarden St     | 0 2 (study) 0.3 11 $20,800 |                |                 |                 |                        |                |                       |

a For a detailed description of the existing and proposed bicycle network by segment, see Appendix B.

b (S) = Signage only for bicycle route.

(SS) = Signage and sharrows for bicycle route.

(SSP) = Signage, striping and pavement markings for a bicycle lane.

(res) = Signage, striping and pavement markings for a bicycle lane where roadway restriping and/or lane narrowing is needed.

(rem) = Signage, striping and pavement markings for a bicycle lane where removal of travel lane, parking or center two-way left-turn lane is needed.

(study) = Additional engineering study is needed for bike lanes or bike route.
Table 5: Recommended Bikeway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Bikeway</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing Class</th>
<th>Proposed Class</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Total Priority Points</th>
<th>Conceptual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Alvarado St-Portola Dr-Monterey Blvd</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>Alvarado St</td>
<td>Fremont St</td>
<td>Portola Dr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (S)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>Portola Dr</td>
<td>Alvarado St</td>
<td>Monterey Blvd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (S)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
<td>Monterey Blvd</td>
<td>Portola Dr</td>
<td>Washington Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (S)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$6,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Norton St-Andover St</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Norton St</td>
<td>Manor Park</td>
<td>Burkhart Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (S)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Andover St</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Lewelling Blvd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (S)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Dowling Blvd-Maple Ct</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Dowling Blvd</td>
<td>MacArthur Blvd</td>
<td>Bancroft Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (S)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$5,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Dowling Blvd</td>
<td>Bancroft Ave</td>
<td>Dutton Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (S)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$2,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Maple Ct</td>
<td>Dutton Ave</td>
<td>Oakes Blvd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (S)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>San Leandro Blvd</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>San Leandro Blvd</td>
<td>Broadmoor Blvd (Oakland city limits)</td>
<td>San Leandro Creek</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (res)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$44,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>San Leandro Blvd-136th Ave</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>San Leandro Blvd</td>
<td>Washington Ave</td>
<td>East 14th St</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (SSP)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$15,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d</td>
<td>136th Ave</td>
<td>East 14th St</td>
<td>Bancroft Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (S)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e</td>
<td>136th Ave</td>
<td>East 14th St</td>
<td>School St</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (S)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$2,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Oakes Blvd-Peralta Ave</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Oakes Blvd</td>
<td>Superior Ave</td>
<td>East 14th St</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (S)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$7,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Peralta Ave</td>
<td>East 14th St</td>
<td>future East Bay Greenway</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (S)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>East Bay Greenway</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>East Bay Greenway</td>
<td>Oakland city limits</td>
<td>eastern city limits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$2,617,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Lake Chabot Rd-Estudillo Ave</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Lake Chabot Rd</td>
<td>eastern city limits</td>
<td>Estudillo Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (SS)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$12,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Estudillo Ave</td>
<td>Sylvan Circle</td>
<td>MacArthur Blvd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (SS)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Davis St</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>Davis St</td>
<td>East 14th St</td>
<td>San Leandro Blvd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (study)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$22,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Davis St</td>
<td>San Leandro Blvd</td>
<td>Alvarado St</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (study)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a For a detailed description of the existing and proposed bicycle network by segment, see Appendix B.
(S) = Signage only for bicycle route.
(SS) = Signage and sharrows for bicycle route.
(SSP) = Signage, striping and pavement markings for a bicycle lane.
(res) = Signage, striping and pavement markings for a bicycle lane where roadway restriping and/or lane narrowing is needed.
(rem) = Signage, striping and pavement markings for a bicycle lane where removal of travel lane, parking or center two-way left-turn lane is needed.
(study) = Additional engineering study is needed for bike lanes or bike route.

c Right-of-way costs are not included in the conceptual cost estimates.
For a detailed description of the existing and proposed bicycle network by segment, see Appendix B.

(S) = Signage only for bicycle route.  
(SS) = Signage and sharrows for bicycle route.  
(SSP) = Signage, striping and pavement markings for a bicycle lane.  
(res) = Signage, striping and pavement markings for a bicycle lane where roadway restriping and/or lane narrowing is needed.  
(rem) = Signage, striping and pavement markings for a bicycle lane where removal of travel lane, parking or center two-way left-turn lane is needed.  
(study) = Additional engineering study is needed for bike lanes or bike route.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Bikeway</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Total Priority Points</th>
<th>Conceptual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Davis St</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Frederick Rd/Gilmore Dr/Westgate Pkwy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (study)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>h</td>
<td>Westgate Pkwy/Doolittle Dr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (study)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>Doolittle Dr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (SS)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$32,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Washington Ave</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Washington Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (SS)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Washington Ave</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Washington Ave/San Leandro Blvd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$292,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Washington Ave</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Washington Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (res)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$13,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d</td>
<td>Washington Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (study)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$13,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Washington Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (study)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$20,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Washington Ave</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Washington Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (study)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$56,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (SS)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (study)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$46,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (SS)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>52,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Juana Ave</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Juana Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (SS)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$9,360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Hesperian Blvd</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>Hesperian Blvd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (study)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$43,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Sybil Ave-Castro St-Williams St</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Sybil Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (SS)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$14,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Castro St</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (SS)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Washington Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (SS)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$10,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5: Recommended Bikeway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Bikeway</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing Class</th>
<th>Proposed Class</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Priority Points</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45-1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>MacArthur Blvd-Superior Ave</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>MacArthur Blvd</td>
<td>Durant Ave (Oakland city limits)</td>
<td>Superior Ave</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 (SSP)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Superior Ave</td>
<td>MacArthur Blvd</td>
<td>Dowling Blvd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (S)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Superior Ave</td>
<td>Oakes Blvd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (S)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Grand Ave-Evergreen Ave-School St-Russ Ave-Wake Ave-Halsey Ave-Lark St</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Grand Ave</td>
<td>Joaquin Ave/MacArthur Blvd</td>
<td>Sybil Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (SS)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Evergreen Ave</td>
<td>Sybil St</td>
<td>School St</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (S)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
<td>School St</td>
<td>Evergreen St</td>
<td>Russ Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (S)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$3,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>h</td>
<td>Russ Ave</td>
<td>School St</td>
<td>Wake Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (S)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>Wake Ave</td>
<td>Russ Ave</td>
<td>Halsey Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (S)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
<td>Halsey Ave</td>
<td>Wake Ave</td>
<td>Lark St</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (S)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>k</td>
<td>Lark St</td>
<td>Halsey Ave</td>
<td>150th Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (S)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>143rd Ave</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>143rd Ave</td>
<td>East 14th St</td>
<td>Washington Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (S)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$4,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Foothill Blvd</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Foothill Blvd</td>
<td>Durant Ave</td>
<td>MacArthur Blvd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (res)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$28,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>150th Ave</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>150th Ave</td>
<td>Freedom Ave (eastern city limits)</td>
<td>Hesperian Blvd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (SS)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$8,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58-1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Manor Blvd</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Manor Blvd</td>
<td>Norton St</td>
<td>Wicks Blvd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (SS)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Fairmont Dr-Halcyon Dr</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Fairmont Dr</td>
<td>East 14th St (eastern city limits)</td>
<td>Hesperian Blvd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (study)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Halcyon Dr</td>
<td>BART tracks/future East Bay Greenway</td>
<td>Washington Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (study)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$32,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**
- For a detailed description of the existing and proposed bicycle network by segment, see Appendix B.
- **(S)** = Signage only for bicycle route.
- **(SS)** = Signage and sharrows for bicycle route.
- **(SSP)** = Signage, striping and pavement markings for a bicycle lane.
- **(res)** = Signage, striping and pavement markings for a bicycle lane where roadway restriping and/or lane narrowing is needed.
- **(rem)** = Signage, striping and pavement markings for a bicycle lane where removal of travel lane, parking or center two-way left-turn lane is needed.
- **(study)** = Additional engineering study is needed for bike lanes or bike route.
- Right-of-way costs are not included in the conceptual cost estimates.
## Chapter 6: IMPLEMENTATION

For a detailed description of the existing and proposed bicycle network by segment, see Appendix B.

(S) = Signage only for bicycle route.
(SS) = Signage and sharrows for bicycle route.
(SSP) = Signage, striping and pavement markings for a bicycle lane.
(res) = Signage, striping and pavement markings for a bicycle lane where roadway restriping and/or lane narrowing is needed.
(rem) = Signage, striping and pavement markings for a bicycle lane where removal of travel lane, parking or center two-way left-turn lane is needed.
(study) = Additional engineering study is needed for bike lanes or bike route.

### Table 5: Recommended Bikeway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Bikeway</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing Class</th>
<th>Proposed Class</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Total Priority Points</th>
<th>Conceptual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60-2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Floresta Blvd-Farnsworth St</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Floresta Blvd</td>
<td>Fremont Ave</td>
<td>Monterey Blvd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (SS)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Floresta Blvd/Farnsworth St</td>
<td>Monterey Blvd</td>
<td>Corvallis St</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (SS)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Farnsworth St</td>
<td>Corvallis St</td>
<td>Vining Dr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (SS)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64-1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Fargo Ave</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Fargo Ave</td>
<td>Washington Ave</td>
<td>Farnsworth St</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (S)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$5,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Estudillo Canal trail</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Estudillo Canal trail</td>
<td>Farnsworth St</td>
<td>Bay (Bay Trail)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$1,432,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Burkhart Ave</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Burkhart Ave</td>
<td>Norton St</td>
<td>Wicks Blvd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (S)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$6,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Lewelling Blvd/Bayfront Dr</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Lewelling Blvd</td>
<td>Hesperian Blvd (eastern city limits)</td>
<td>Washington Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (SS)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Lewelling Blvd</td>
<td>Washington Ave</td>
<td>Sedgeman St</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 (res)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Bayfront Dr</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Bayfront Dr</td>
<td>west of RR tracks/Lewelling Blvd</td>
<td>Harbor Wy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (S)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Activity Centers</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>Transit Access</td>
<td>Funding &amp; Implementation</td>
<td>Total Points</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW-1</td>
<td>Spot Improvements</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW-2</td>
<td>City Bicycle Rack Program</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-2</td>
<td>Davis Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-1</td>
<td>East Bay Greenway</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-1</td>
<td>Washington Ave</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-1</td>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-1</td>
<td>Juana Ave</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-1</td>
<td>Lewelling Blvd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-1</td>
<td>Fairmont Dr-Halcyon Dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-2</td>
<td>Floresta Blvd-Farnsworth St</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-1</td>
<td>Doolittle Dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-3</td>
<td>Davis St</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>Marina Park Trail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-1</td>
<td>Monarch Bay Dr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-2</td>
<td>Alvarado St</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-1</td>
<td>Dowling Blvd-Maple Ct</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-1</td>
<td>San Leandro Blvd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-2</td>
<td>Washington Ave</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64-1</td>
<td>Fargo Ave</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>Bay Trail-Neptune to Fairway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-2</td>
<td>Merced St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-4</td>
<td>Washington Ave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-1</td>
<td>Sybil Ave-Castro St-Williams St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58-1</td>
<td>Manor Blvd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-1</td>
<td>Timothy Dr-Westgate Pkwy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-1</td>
<td>Alvarado St</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-3</td>
<td>Alvarado St-Portola Dr-Monterey Blvd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-2</td>
<td>San Leandro Blvd-136th Ave</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>Lake Chabot Rd-Estudillo Ave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-3</td>
<td>Washington Ave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-1</td>
<td>Estudillo Canal trail</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-2</td>
<td>Bayfront Dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-1</td>
<td>Hesperian Blvd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-1</td>
<td>143rd Ave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-1</td>
<td>Oakes Blvd-Peralta Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-1</td>
<td>MacArthur Blvd-Superior Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-2</td>
<td>Grand Ave-Evergreen Ave-School St-Russ Ave-Wake Ave-Halsey Ave-Lark St</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-1</td>
<td>Norton St-Andover St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-1</td>
<td>Foothill Blvd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-1</td>
<td>Burkhart Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-3</td>
<td>Mulford Point Pathway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-4</td>
<td>Small Boat Lagoon Loop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-1</td>
<td>150th Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pedestrian Project Prioritization

Project Definition
The recommended pedestrian projects are organized based upon the Pedestrian Improvement Area or Key Pedestrian Location within which they are located. The proposed projects are summarized in Table 7 below. The table outlines important information for future implementation, including agencies and key stakeholders who will be instrumental for partnerships and project coordination, additional actions and studies that need to be performed before implementation, a range of construction cost estimates, a total priority scoring, and potential funding opportunities.

Prioritization Methodology
The methodology used to prioritize the recommended pedestrian projects was created based upon the previous Plan’s prioritization of bikeway projects. This methodology was tailored specifically to address pedestrian network issues, and was revised based upon input from City staff and the BPAC. Each of the pedestrian projects was evaluated based upon the five categories listed below using the Pedestrian Prioritization Sheet which is included in Appendix D. Each project could receive up to a total of 24 points.

- **Accessibility** (Total of 3 points) – This category ranks how accessibility would be improved by the project. Points are awarded for improvements that create accessibility in previously inaccessible areas, remedy city-wide barriers to pedestrian connectivity, and that go above and beyond the minimum requirements.

- **Safety** (Total of 5 Points) - This category ranks how pedestrian safety would be improved by the project. Points are awarded to projects that are located adjacent to schools, within an area with a high pedestrian collision rate, and include design features to increase pedestrian safety. Because of the City’s focus on safety, this category was weighted to provide additional points for projects that meet these safety criteria.

- **Connectivity** (Total of 7 points) - This category ranks how the project would improve connectivity. Points are awarded to projects that are located near schools, major employment centers, major shopping centers, libraries, parks and recreation facilities, and major transit routes. Because of the City's focus on school safety, an extra point was given to projects that provide access to schools.

- **Walkability** (Total of 2 Points) - This category ranks how the project would improve the pedestrian environment and walkability. Points were awarded if the project would include pedestrian amenities or gathering places that encourage walking.
- **Funding & Implementation** (Total of 7 points) - This category ranks projects based upon their potential to acquire funding and to be easily implemented. Points were awarded to projects that could be implemented without further study, would not require coordination with agencies outside the city, or would not require extensive modifications for implementation. Points were also awarded if the project was supported in other plans or projects, had extensive community support, and was eligible for outside funding sources.

The projects were grouped into three implementation categories based upon the resultant project scoring. The three categories are defined as follows:

**Phase I (Short-Term Projects):** Projects that received the highest relative scores. These projects have the highest priority for implementation and are targeted for completion within five years.

**Phase II (Medium-Term Projects):** Projects that received moderate relative scores. These projects are included in the second group of projects considered for implementation and are targeted for completion within 10 years.

**Phase III (Long-Term Projects):** Projects that received the lowest relative scores and the lowest priority for implementation. These projects are targeted for completion within 10-20 years.

The prioritized projects, listed from High to Low, are shown in Table 8 below.
**Table 7: Pedestrian Improvements and Prioritization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Coordination &amp; Partnership</th>
<th>Future Actions/Study</th>
<th>Construction Cost Estimate*</th>
<th>Priority Phasing^</th>
<th>Potential Funding~</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENT AREAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-1 San Leandro Marina</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1.a Improve Monarch Bay Drive Sidewalks and Crosswalks</td>
<td>Parks Department</td>
<td>Further Design</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>Measure B Pass-Through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Measure 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1.b Create a Pedestrian Crossing at the Intersection of Monarch Bay Drive and Neptune Drive</td>
<td>Sight Line Distance Analysis</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>Measure B Pass-Through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SR2S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1.c Improve the Sidewalks and Curb-Ramps of the Residential Neighborhood</td>
<td>Local Residents</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>Measure B Pass-Through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SR2S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-2 Westgate Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2.a Implement Safety and Circulation Improvements in the Westgate Center Parking Lot</td>
<td>Westgate Center</td>
<td>Further Design</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>Private Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2.b Improve the Pedestrian Crossing at the Intersection of Timothy Drive and Davis Street</td>
<td>Further Design</td>
<td>Further Traffic Analysis</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>Measure B Pass-Through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SR2T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-3 Kaiser Development Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3.a Improve Sidewalks</td>
<td>Kaiser</td>
<td>Further Design</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>Measure B Pass-Through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3.b Kaiser Site Design Recommendations</td>
<td>Kaiser</td>
<td>Further Design Review</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>Kaiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-4 Manor Boulevard/Washington Avenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4.a Replace the Rolled Curbs along Manor Boulevard</td>
<td>Local Residents/Businesses</td>
<td>Further Design</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>Measure B Pass-Through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SR2S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4.b Create More Pedestrian Crosswalks on Manor Boulevard</td>
<td>Perform a Crosswalk suitability analysis</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>Measure B Pass-Through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SR2S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4.c Implement Pedestrian Streetscape Improvements along Washington Avenue</td>
<td>Further Design Development</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>Measure B Pass-Through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Measure 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4.d Create More Pedestrian Crosswalks along Washington Avenue</td>
<td>Perform a Crosswalk suitability analysis</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>Measure B Pass-Through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Measure 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4.e Create Safe Pedestrian Crosswalks at the Intersection of Washington Avenue and Halcyon Drive and Lewelling Boulevard</td>
<td>Further Traffic Analysis</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>Measure B Pass-Through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4.f Create Safe Pedestrian Connection at the Washington Avenue Tunnel under the Railroad Tracks</td>
<td>East Bay Greenway</td>
<td>Further Design and Coordination</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>CBTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Measure 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Minimal = > $10,000, Low = $10,000 – $40,000, Medium = $40,000 – $100,000, High = > $100,000

^ Priority Scoring = Phase I/Short-Term (10+ pts) – completion within 5 years, Phase II/ Medium-Term (6-8pts) – completion within 10 years, Phase III/ Long-Term (0-5pts) completion within 15-20 years

~ Potential Funding= General Fund (GF), Measure B Bicycle and Pedestrian Funds, (Measure B), Transportation Development Act Funds (TDA), Caltrans Community Based Transportation Planning Grant Program (CBTP), Safe Routes to Schools (SR2S), Safe Routes to Transit (SR2T)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Coordination &amp; Partnership</th>
<th>Future Actions/Study</th>
<th>Construction Cost Estimate*</th>
<th>Priority Phasing^</th>
<th>Potential Funding*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-4.g Improve the I-880 Pedestrian Overpass</td>
<td>• Caltrans</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>• Phase III</td>
<td>• Measure B Pass-Through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5 The Downtown San Leandro BART Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5.a Redesign West Juana Avenue</td>
<td>• Construction Document Development</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>• Phase I</td>
<td>• SR2S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5.b Implement the San Leandro Boulevard BART Pedestrian Interface Plan (Draft form)</td>
<td>• AC Transit • BART • Further Design Development • Coordination with AC Transit &amp; BART</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>• Phase I</td>
<td>• SR2T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5.c Improve the Sidewalks and Curb Ramps in the Residential Neighborhoods</td>
<td>• Local Residents • Perform an analysis to identify curb ramps needing updating</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>• Phase III</td>
<td>• Measure B Pass-Through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5.d Incorporate Streetscape Improvements and Public Space Additions into Future TOD Developments</td>
<td>• Private Developers • Review and coordination with future development plans</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>• Phase II</td>
<td>• Potential Development Impact Fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5.e Safety and Accessibility Improvements at Railroad Crossings</td>
<td>• California Public Utilities Commission • Union Pacific Railroad • Review safety best practices at RR crossings</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>• Phase I</td>
<td>• SR2T • TDA • Measure 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-6 East 14th Street Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-6.a Consolidate and Redesign Driveway Ramps to Improve Safety and Accessibility</td>
<td>• Local Business Owners • Caltrans • Perform an analysis of exiting driveway ramps</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>• Phase III</td>
<td>• Measure B Pass-Through • Measure B • TDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-6.b Reconfigure Crosswalks at Uncontrolled Intersections</td>
<td>• Caltrans</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>• Phase III</td>
<td>• Measure B Pass-Through • SR2S (some locations) • Measure B Pass-Through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-6.c Reconfigure Median between Broadmoor Boulevard and Durant Avenue to Include Pedestrian Refuge</td>
<td>• Caltrans</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>• Phase II</td>
<td>• Measure B Pass-Through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-6.d Implement the Streetscape Improvements Recommended in the East 14th Street South Area Development Strategy</td>
<td>• Caltrans • Further Design Development of Streetscape Recommendations • Traffic Analysis</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>• Phase I</td>
<td>• CBTP • Potential Development Impact Fees • SR2T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-7 Bancroft Avenue/Dutton Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-7.a Redesign the Dutton Avenue/Bancroft Avenue Intersection.</td>
<td>• Adjacent Business owners • Further Design Development</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>• Phase I</td>
<td>• Measure B Pass-Through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-7.b Improve the Safety of the Bancroft Avenue and 136th Avenue intersection for Students.</td>
<td>• San Leandro School District • Further Design Development</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>• Phase I</td>
<td>• Measure B Pass-Through • SR2S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-7.c Create More Crosswalks along Bancroft Avenue between Dutton Avenue and Callan Avenue</td>
<td>• Further Analysis</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>• Phase I</td>
<td>• SRC2S • Measure B Pass-Through • TDA • Measure 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Minimal = < $10,000, Low = $10,000 – $40,000, Medium = $40,000 – $100,000, High = >$100,000
^ Priority Scoring = Phase I/Short-Term (10+ pts) – completion within 5 years, Phase II/Medium-Term (6-9pts) – completion within 10 years, Phase III/ Long-Term (0-5pts) completion within 15-20 years
* Potential Funding= General Fund (GF), Measure B Bicycle and Pedestrian Funds, (Measure B), Transportation Development Act Funds (TDA), Caltrans Community Based Transportation Planning Grant Program (CBTP), Safe Routes to Schools (SR2S), Safe Routes to Transit (SR2T)
## Table 7: Pedestrian Improvements and Prioritization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Coordination &amp; Partnership</th>
<th>Future Actions/Study</th>
<th>Construction Cost Estimate*</th>
<th>Priority Phasing^</th>
<th>Potential Funding~</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-8</strong> The Bay Fair BART Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-8.a Improve the Streetscape along Hesperian Boulevard</td>
<td></td>
<td>Further Design</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>SR2T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-8.b Implement the Bay Fair BART Station Area Improvement Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>• BART</td>
<td>Construction Document Development</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• AC Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Measure B Pass-Through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Bayfair Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-9</strong> MacArthur Boulevard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-9.a Implement Sidewalk and Curb Ramp Improvements on MacArthur Boulevard between Lewis Avenue and Dutton Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perform an analysis to identify curb ramps needing updating</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>Measure B Pass-Through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-9.b Implement Traffic Calming at the Freeway On- and Off-ramps</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Caltrans</td>
<td>Further Design Development</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Phase III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Further Traffic Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-9.c Continue upgrading the sidewalks between Lewis Avenue and Durant Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Adjacent business owners</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>Measure B Pass-Through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-10</strong> Estudillo Ave - I-580 Underpass to Anthony Chabot Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-10.a Create a Safe Pedestrian Connection from the City of San Leandro to Anthony Chabot Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Local Residents</td>
<td>Further Design</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Further Traffic Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-10.b Improve Wayfinding to the Entrance of Anthony Chabot Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dovetail with other wayfinding programs</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Phase III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> KEY PEDESTRIAN LOCATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-1 Garfield Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td>• San Leandro School District</td>
<td>Further Design</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Phase I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-2 Davis Street/I-880</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Caltrans</td>
<td>Further Design</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Phase III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-3 Cherry Grove Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Further Design</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Phase I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Measure B Pass-Through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-4 Woodrow Wilson Elementary School/John Muir Middle School</td>
<td></td>
<td>• San Leandro School District</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>SR25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-5 Wicks Boulevard at the Marina Community Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Community Center</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>Measure B Pass-Through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-6 Bonaire Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>SR25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Measure B Pass-Through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-7 Pacific Community Recreation Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>SR25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Measure B Pass-Through</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* Minimal = > $10,000, Low = $10,000 – $40,000, Medium = $40,000 – $100,000, High = > $100,000

^ Priority Scoring: Phase I (Short-Term (0-2 yrs) – completion within 3 years, Phase II/ Medium-Term (3-8yrs) completion within 10 years, Phase III/ Long-Term (8+ yrs) completion within 15-20 years

~ Potential Funding: General Fund (GF), Measure B Bicycle and Pedestrian Funds, (Measure B), Transportation Development Act Funds (TDA), Caltrans Community Based Transportation Planning Grant Program (CBTP), Safe Routes to Schools (SR2S), Safe Routes to Transit (SR2T)
Table 7: Pedestrian Improvements and Prioritization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Coordination &amp; Partnership</th>
<th>Future Actions/Study</th>
<th>Construction Cost Estimate*</th>
<th>Priority Phasing^</th>
<th>Potential Funding~</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-8 Washington Elementary School</td>
<td>San Leandro School District</td>
<td>Further Traffic Analysis</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>SR25, Measure B Pass-Through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-9 Corvallis Elementary School</td>
<td>San Leandro School District</td>
<td>Further Traffic Analysis</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>SR25, Measure B Pass-Through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-10 Floresta Boulevard/Monterey Boulevard</td>
<td>Further Design, Further Traffic Analysis</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>SR25, Measure B Pass-Through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-11 San Leandro Boulevard/Washington Avenue Intersection</td>
<td>Further Design, Further Traffic Analysis</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>SR25, Measure B Pass-Through, SR2T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-12 McKinley Elementary School</td>
<td>San Leandro School District</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>SR25, Measure B Pass-Through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-13 Bancroft Middle School</td>
<td>San Leandro Police Department</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>SR27, Measure B Pass-Through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-14 East 14th Street/San Leandro Boulevard Intersection</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Further Design, Further Traffic Analysis</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>SR25, Measure B Pass-Through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-16 Washington Avenue/Lewelling Boulevard Intersection</td>
<td>Further Design, Further Traffic Analysis</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>Measure B Pass-Through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-17 Grand Avenue/Joaquin Avenue Intersection</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>Measure B Pass-Through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-19 150th Avenue/Hesperian Boulevard/Bancroft Intersection</td>
<td>Alameda County, Caltrans</td>
<td>Further Design</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>Measure B Pass-Through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-20 Hesperian Boulevard/ Lewelling Boulevard Intersection</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>Measure B Pass-Through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Minimal = > $10,000, Low = $10,000 – $40,000, Medium = $40,000 – $100,000, High = >$100,000
^ Priority Scoring = Phase I/Short-Term (10+ pts) – completion within 5 years, Phase II/Medium-Term (6-9pts) – completion within 10 years, Phase III/Long-Term (0-5pts) completion within 15-20 years
~ Potential Funding= General Fund (GF), Measure B Bicycle and Pedestrian Funds (Measure B), Transportation Development Act Funds (TDA), Caltrans Community Based Transportation Planning Grant Program (CBTP), Safe Routes to Schools (SR2S), Safe Routes to Transit (SR2T)
# Table 8: Prioritized List of Pedestrian Improvement Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Connectivity</th>
<th>Walkability</th>
<th>Funding &amp; Implementation</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-5.b</td>
<td>Implement the San Leandro Boulevard BART Pedestrian Interface Plan (Draft form)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5.a</td>
<td>Redesign West Juana Avenue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-6.d</td>
<td>Implement the Streetscape Improvements Recommended in the East 14th Street South Area Development Strategy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5.e</td>
<td>Safety and Accessibility Improvements at Railroad Crossings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-7.a</td>
<td>Redesign the Dutton Avenue/Bancroft Avenue Intersection.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-7.b</td>
<td>Improve the Safety of the Bancroft Avenue and 136th Avenue intersection for Students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4.a</td>
<td>Replace the Rolled Curbds along Manor Boulevard</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4.b</td>
<td>Create More Pedestrian Crosswalks on Manor Boulevard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4.f</td>
<td>Create Safe Pedestrian Connection at the Washington Avenue Tunnel under the Railroad Tracks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-7.c</td>
<td>Create more crosswalks along Bancroft Avenue between Dutton Avenue and Callan Avenue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>Garfield Elementary School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-15</td>
<td>136th Avenue/Bancroft Avenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-12</td>
<td>McKinley Elementary School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-18</td>
<td>Jefferson Elementary School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1.b</td>
<td>Create a Pedestrian Crossing at the Intersection of Monarch Bay Drive and Neptune Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4.c</td>
<td>Implement Pedestrian Streetscape Improvements along Washington Avenue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1.c</td>
<td>Improve the Sidewalks and Curb Ramps of the Residential Neighborhood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-3</td>
<td>Cherry Grove Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-6</td>
<td>Bonaire Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-9</td>
<td>Corvallis Elementary School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2.b</td>
<td>Improve the Pedestrian Crossing at the Intersection of Timothy Drive and Davis Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4.d</td>
<td>Create More Pedestrian Crosswalks along Washington Avenue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8: Prioritized List of Pedestrian Improvement Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Connectivity</th>
<th>Walkability</th>
<th>Funding &amp; Implementation</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-8.a</td>
<td>Improve the Streetscape along Hesperian Boulevard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-8.c</td>
<td>Hesperian Boulevard/Bayfair Drive and Hesperian Boulevard/Fairmount Drive Intersection.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-4</td>
<td>Woodrow Wilson Elementary School/John Muir Middle School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-10</td>
<td>Floresta Boulevard/Monterey Boulevard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-13</td>
<td>Bancroft Middle School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5.d</td>
<td>Incorporate Streetscape Improvements and Public Space Additions into Future TOD Developments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-10.a</td>
<td>Create a Safe Pedestrian Connection from the City of San Leandro to Anthony Chabot Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4.e</td>
<td>Create Safe Pedestrian Crosswalks at the Intersection of Washington Avenue and Halcyon Drive and Lewelling Boulevard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-19</td>
<td>150th Avenue/Hesperian Boulevard/Bancroft Intersection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-20</td>
<td>Hesperian Boulevard/Lewelling Boulevard Intersection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2.a</td>
<td>Implement Safety and Circulation Improvements in the Westgate Center Parking Lot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3.a</td>
<td>Improve Sidewalks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-6.c</td>
<td>Reconfigure Median between Broadmoor Boulevard and Durant Avenue to Include Pedestrian Refuge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-8.b</td>
<td>Implement the Bay Fair BART Station Area Improvement Plan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-8</td>
<td>Washington Elementary School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-14</td>
<td>East 14th Street/San Leandro Boulevard Intersection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1.a</td>
<td>Improve Monarch Bay Drive Sidewalks and Crosswalks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3.b</td>
<td>Kaiser Site Design Recommendation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4.g</td>
<td>Improve the I-880 Pedestrian Overpass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-9.c</td>
<td>Continue upgrading the sidewalks between Lewis Avenue and Durant Avenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>Davis Street/I-880</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-5</td>
<td>Wicks Boulevard at the Marina Community Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-7</td>
<td>Pacific Community Recreation Complex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 8: Prioritized List of Pedestrian Improvement Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Connectivity</th>
<th>Walkability</th>
<th>Funding &amp; Implementation</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-6.a</td>
<td>Consolidate and Redesign Driveway Ramps to Improve Safety and Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.9.a</td>
<td>Implement Sidewalk and Curb Ramp Improvements on MacArthur Boulevard between Lewis Avenue and Dutton Avenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.9.b</td>
<td>Implement Traffic Calming at the Freeway On- and Off-ramps</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.10.b</td>
<td>Improve Wayfinding to the Entrance of Anthony Chabot Park</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.5.c</td>
<td>Improve the Sidewalks and Curb Ramps in the Residential Neighborhoods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.6.b</td>
<td>Improve Crosswalks at Uncontrolled Intersections</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.11</td>
<td>San Leandro Boulevard/Washington Avenue Intersection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.16</td>
<td>Washington Avenue/Lewelling Boulevard Intersection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.17</td>
<td>Grand Avenue/Joaquin Avenue Intersection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bicycle and Pedestrian Project Coordination

While pedestrians and bicyclists have very different needs for mobility, there are many improvements that can benefit both modes. For example, traffic calming measures that will slow traffic speeds or new traffic signals with video detection will improve both the bicycle and pedestrian environments. However, there are other instances where bicycle or pedestrian improvements can be at cross purposes to the other. For example, widening sidewalks or adding center medians for better pedestrian circulation can also reduce the road space available to implement bike lanes or wide curb lanes.

Consequently, it is important to approach the design and implementation of bicycle and pedestrian projects with an eye on how these improvements can be coordinated to benefit both bicyclists and pedestrian as well as provide for a balanced transportation system for all modes.

As shown in Figure 14, there are many bicycle and pedestrian projects in this Plan that overlap geographically. These areas of overlap provide excellent opportunities to coordinate project design and implementation to ensure that the improvements complement each other. A coordinated bicycle and pedestrian project will also be more attractive to potential funding sources. Key overlapping projects include:

- Removal of free-right turn lanes (citywide)
- Traffic calming projects to slow traffic speeds (citywide)
- Neptune Drive/Monarch Bay Drive/Marina Boulevard intersection
- Access to Westgate Center
- West Juana Avenue to Downtown San Leandro BART Station
- Washington Avenue, particularly for an at-grade railroad crossing over the existing tunnel
- Connection on Estudillo Avenue to Anthony Chabot Park
- East 14th Street
Figure 14: Overlay of Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects
High Priority Projects

High Priority projects are those that should receive the greatest attention for implementation over the next five years. These projects were selected with the following considerations:

1. Projects that rank highest (Phase I) in the bicycle and/or pedestrian prioritization.
2. Projects that can benefit both bicyclists and pedestrians.
3. Projects that have the potential for being implemented in the short-term (i.e. are ready for implementation, funding sources have been identified or secured, or are part of other projects/development that can partially or fully fund these improvements).

The High Priority projects are listed in Table 9. It should be noted that this list is based upon project and funding criteria available at this time and may be adjusted if the City’s priorities or revenues change in future years. In addition, this list does not preclude lower priority projects from being implemented if the opportunity arises.

The High Priority projects are categorized by three funding sources:
1) Committed Measure B Pass-Through Funds and Transportation Development Act (TDA) Funds for Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects, 2) Other Measure B Pass-Through Funds for Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects, and 3) Competitive Grants. A detailed description of potential competitive funding sources available to the City can be found in Appendix F.

---

4 Projects that the City has made a commitment to implement each year.
## Table 9: High Priority Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects – 5-Year Expenditure Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Limits/Location</th>
<th>Estimated Cost(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>CW-2</td>
<td>City Bike Rack Program</td>
<td>citywide program</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped</td>
<td>B-5.b</td>
<td>San Leandro Blvd BART Pedestrian Interface Plan (matching funds)</td>
<td>at Downtown San Leandro BART Station and surroundings</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped</td>
<td>B-5.a</td>
<td>West Juana Ave redesign (matching funds)</td>
<td>at Downtown San Leandro BART Station and surroundings</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Limits/Location</th>
<th>Estimated Cost(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>B-8</td>
<td>Hesperian Blvd Railroad Crossing improvements (matching funds)</td>
<td>Hesperian Blvd/Niles Subdivision railroad crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>CW-1</td>
<td>Spot Improvements</td>
<td>citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>34-1</td>
<td>Juana Avenue bike route</td>
<td>Grand Ave to San Leandro Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>60-1</td>
<td>Fairmont Dr-Halcyon Dr bike lanes</td>
<td>East 14th St to Washington Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>60-2</td>
<td>Floresta -Farnsworth bike route</td>
<td>Fremont Ave to Vining Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>58-1</td>
<td>Manor Blvd bike route</td>
<td>Norton St to Wicks Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped</td>
<td>B-7.a</td>
<td>Dutton Ave/Bancroft Ave Intersection</td>
<td>Dutton Ave/Bancroft Ave Intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped</td>
<td>B-7.c</td>
<td>Bancroft Ave crosswalks</td>
<td>various locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped</td>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>Garfield Elem. School access</td>
<td>Marina Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped</td>
<td>C-12</td>
<td>McKinley Elem. School access</td>
<td>East 14th St and Bancroft Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped</td>
<td>C-3</td>
<td>Cherry Grove Park access</td>
<td>Leonard Dr and Williams St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped</td>
<td>C-6</td>
<td>Bonaire Park access</td>
<td>Juniper St midblock crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>30-2</td>
<td>Davis St bike lanes</td>
<td>East 14th St to Alvarado St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>33-1</td>
<td>East 14th Street Bike corridor feasibility study</td>
<td>north to south city limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East 14th Street bike route</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>70-1</td>
<td>Lewelling Blvd bike lanes/route</td>
<td>east city limits to Sedgeman St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>Estudillo Ave bike route</td>
<td>east city limits to MacArthur Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped</td>
<td>C-18</td>
<td>Jefferson Elem. School access</td>
<td>Bancroft Ave midblock crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped</td>
<td>C-9</td>
<td>Corvallis Elem. School access</td>
<td>Corvallis St intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped</td>
<td>B-10.a</td>
<td>Pedestrian access to Anthony Chabot Park</td>
<td>MacArthur Blvd to Anthony Chabot Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Past Expenditures

Understanding the City’s investment in the existing bikeway and pedestrian system and what is required to complete and maintain the system is important in developing a funding strategy.

Bikeway Network

With an approximate length of 25 miles, the existing bikeway network represents a substantial investment. Prior to the 2004 Plan, an estimated $270,000 was expended for new or improved bikeway facilities in the City. Since the 2004 Plan, an estimated $21,400 was spent for new bikeway facilities generally as part of overall street improvement projects. In addition, the Bay Trail Slough Bridge was completed this year at a cost of $2.5 million. Projects include:

- Bike lanes on Adams Street from Bigge Street to Doolittle Drive (2008) for an estimated cost of $7,200.
- Bike lanes on Westgate Parkway from the south Wal-Mart driveway to Williams Street (2005) for an estimated cost of $2,200.
- Bike lanes on Floresta Boulevard from Washington Avenue to Fremont Avenue (2006) for an estimated cost of $1,000.
- Bike lanes on Wicks Boulevard from Farallon Drive to Burroughs Avenue (2005) for an estimated cost of $6,600.
- Bike lanes on Washington Avenue from Caliente Drive to Anza Way (2009) for an estimated cost of $4,400.
- Bay Trail Slough Bridge (2010) for a cost of $2.5 million. The bridge was funded through a variety of sources including CMAQ Federal funds, SAFETEA-LU Federal Earmark, Recreational Trail Program for State Trails, Coastal Commission Fund, and ACTIA Bicycle/Pedestrian Program and Measure B Funds.

Pedestrian Improvements

There have been substantial improvements for pedestrians in the years since the 2004 Plan was completed with expenditures of more than $2.3 million. These projects include:

- Handicapped ramp program which installed approximately 200 curb ramps for the five-year period from 2005-2010 for an estimated cost of $500,000.
- Annual Sidewalk Program which installed curb ramps and sidewalks for the five-year period from 2005-2010 for an estimated $622,000.
- Roadway and streetscape projects that included an estimated $1.4 million for curb ramp and sidewalk improvements for Downtown, Springlake Drive,
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• San Leandro Street, Wicks Boulevard, Washington Ave/Estabrook Street intersection, Westgate Parkway, Walnut Drive, MacArthur Boulevard Streetscape, and West Estudillo pedestrian connection.

• Other roadway and improvement projects that included an estimated $227,000 for sidewalk improvements on Doolittle Drive, 150th Avenue/Lark Street intersection, Lewelling Boulevard, Davis Street/East 14th Street intersection, and various railroad grade crossings.

Bikeway Facility Costs

Estimated costs for the construction and maintenance of the recommended bicycle network projects are discussed below.

Construction Costs

Table 10 provides a unit cost summary for the construction of bikeway facilities in the Bay Area based upon recent bikeway construction and adjusted for conditions in San Leandro. These are conceptual cost estimates only and do not include costs for contingencies, design, administrative costs, or right-of-way acquisition. More detailed estimates should be developed following the preliminary engineering stage as individual projects advance towards implementation.

For purposes of this Bicycle Master Plan, conceptual construction costs for the proposed system were based on the following assumptions:

• New Class I facilities would be constructed on generally flat right-of-way with no grade separation and minimal grading needed given the existing topography within the City; cost of right-of-way acquisition is not included.

• New Class II facilities – The range of costs reflects
  o Low range for bike lane striping, signage and pavement markings with minimal roadway improvements.
  o High range for reconfiguration of roadway striping with the addition of bike lanes, signage and pavement markings.

• New Class III facilities – The range of costs reflects
  o Low range for signage only.
  o High range for signage and pavement markings (sharrows).
Table 10: Conceptual Unit Cost Estimates for New Bikeway Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Estimated Cost per Mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II Bike Lane</td>
<td>$40,000 - $80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III Bike Route</td>
<td>$8,000 - $20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of network cost by bikeway classification is presented in Table 11. These costs are based upon the assumptions outlined above.

Table 11: Conceptual Cost Estimate Summary for the San Leandro Bikeway Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bikeway Classification</th>
<th>Proposed Segments (miles)</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>$6,270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II Bike Lane</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>$742,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III Bike Route</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>$290,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spot Improvements</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,353,100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Construction of the on-street Class II and Class III facilities and spot improvements, would require approximately $1 million, which equates to an investment of approximately $50,000 per year over 20 years. Although a portion of the proposed system would be constructed as new development or re-development occurs, a substantial amount of the total cost will rely on public funding. The funding strategy is discussed in the next section.

It is anticipated that construction of Class I facilities would be primarily funded by outside grant sources, with land acquisition costs contributing towards local match requirements. Construction of the proposed Class I bike paths would require an estimated investment of approximately $6.2 million (although actual costs will vary depending on the level of amenities, such as landscaping and...
lighting) and, of course, costs for land acquisition. Much of the Class I bike path construction recommended in this Plan involves upgrades to existing pathways so total cost may be lower than what is quoted here.

**Maintenance Costs**

Multi-use path maintenance includes cleaning, resurfacing, and restriping the asphalt path, repairing bridges and other structures, cleaning the drainage system, removing trash, and maintaining landscaping. While this maintenance effort may not be incrementally major, it does have the potential to develop heavy expenses if it is not done periodically.

For purposes of estimating maintenance expenses for paved pathways, $8,500 per mile per year is assumed based on information received for other similar facilities in California. This cost covers all expenses including labor, supplies, and amortized equipment costs. Tasks include trash removal, sweeping (with a mechanized sweeper), sign replacement/repair, pavement marking replacement, pavement sealing/resurfacing, and structural and drainage inspection. Underbrush and weeds should be removed to maintain a clear pathway.

Sections with narrow widths or other clearance restrictions should be clearly marked. Pathways should be designed to accommodate City maintenance vehicles and emergency vehicles.

Maintenance for Class II bike lanes and Class III bike routes can generally be provided as part of the regular roadway maintenance. Additional costs should be minimal because, in most locations, the roadway surface area to be maintained will be the same with or without bike lanes or routes. For estimating purposes, maintenance costs for Class II and Class III facilities would include:

- **Class II** at $2,000/mile annually for sweeping, sign and stripe/pavement marking maintenance, and minor surface repairs.
- **Class III** at $1,000/mile annually for sweeping, signage maintenance, and minor surface repairs.
Funding Strategy

While the high priority/near-term projects were identified earlier in this section, this does not mean that the remaining projects must wait until these high priority projects are implemented. Rather, due to the variety of ways projects can be funded and constructed, all the projects in this Plan should be considered important. If one of the opportunities discussed below arises that could implement any of these bikeways within the scope of another project, the project should be included. With this understanding, the following options should be considered by the City for fulfilling the funding commitment necessary to complete the proposed bikeway network and pedestrian improvements:

- Use the ‘funding experts’ available at the State, county and regional agencies to keep apprised of upcoming funding opportunities.

- Prepare joint applications with other local and regional agencies for competitive funding programs at the State and federal levels. Joint applications often increase the competitiveness of projects for funding; however, coordination amongst the participating jurisdictions is often challenging. The City should consider acting as the lead agency, with a strong emphasis on coordination between participating jurisdictions to ensure that important projects are implemented as quickly as possible.

- Use existing funding sources as matching funds for State and federal funding.

- Include bikeway and pedestrian projects in local traffic impact fee programs and assessment districts.

- Continue to include proposed bikeways and pedestrian improvements as part of roadways projects involving repaving, widening, overlays, or other improvements. For example, when an arterial or collector is scheduled for repaving, re-evaluate roadway and lane configurations to fit bike lanes wherever possible. If necessary, consider restriping for narrower inside travel lanes or reducing the number of travel lanes. If bike lanes are still not possible, provide wider curb lanes.

There are a variety of potential funding sources including local, State and federal. The City should also take advantage of private contributions in developing the proposed system. This could include a variety of resources such as volunteer labor during construction or monetary donations towards specific improvements. The funding sources considered appropriate for San Leandro are discussed in detail in Appendix F.
Implementation Strategy

This section outlines various implementation actions recommended in support of the bicycle network and pedestrian improvements and to measure success of the bicycle and pedestrian program.

**Staffing and Support**

**Bicycle/Pedestrian Program Coordinator:** Continue to designate existing staff (Transportation Engineer or Planner) to this role to be responsible for plan review, coordination with city and outside agency staff, and overall implementation of the *Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan*.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC):** Establish a permanent BPAC as an on-going advocacy, review, and implementation team and as support for City staff in implementation of the *Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan*.

**Plan Review**

All traffic impact studies, street improvement projects, land use changes and development projects should be routed through appropriate City staff (and the BPAC, if appropriate) to ensure that bikeway projects and pedestrian improvements are implemented, developer impact fees are identified (if applicable), and design guidelines presented in this Plan and the *Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines* are met. The review should also include an assessment of impacts to existing bicycle and pedestrian safety, access, and mobility and strategies to mitigate any impacts.

**Monitoring**

A monitoring plan for implementation of the *Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan* should be put into place as the responsibility of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Program Coordinator. The monitoring plan may include the following activities:

- **Collision Monitoring:** Bicycle and pedestrian related collision data from the Police Department should be evaluated every three to six months and tabulated to show patterns by location and collision type.

- **Funding Monitoring:** The Coordinator should work closely with various funding agencies such as MTC, Alameda County, and Caltrans to keep abreast of funding opportunities and to follow up on applications to ensure maximum success.

- **Operations Monitoring:** In cooperation with the Police Department, the Coordinator should be responsible for directing needed enforcement along bike paths (issues of security, privacy, vandalism, and crime) as well as enforcement of traffic laws affecting bicyclists and pedestrians on city streets.
Maintenance
A regular maintenance program should be developed to maintain bicycle and pedestrian facilities in good usable condition. This program should include:

- Annual review of bicycle facilities to assess the condition and needed repair or replacement of signage, striping, or pavement markings.
- Regular sweeping of on-street and off-street facilities no less than four times a year. Obstructions and potholes should be repaired as soon as possible after being reported.
- A pedestrian and bicycle facility improvement and maintenance log in the Public Works Department where all observed and recorded hazardous conditions are listed and scheduled for repair or replacement. This list would include all grates and railroad crossings that do not meet specific criteria.
- The Coordinator should be responsible for the annual maintenance and operations budget, collaborating with the Public Works Department. The Coordinator should keep track of long term path maintenance, schedule repairs, and respond to calls from the public or staff regarding maintenance needs.

Coordination with Other Agencies
The lines of communication regarding issues affecting bicyclists and pedestrians should be established with other City Departments (Police, Public Works, Community Services, and Recreation), county and regional agencies responsible for funding and implementation of the county/regional bikeway networks, and adjacent communities to ensure that all opportunities for implementation of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan are utilized.

Outreach
The general public and interested parties should be kept apprised of successes and opportunities for bicycling and walking in San Leandro. Some strategies include:

- Bicycle and pedestrian promotional and educational events, such as Bike to Work Day and Walk a Child to School Day.
- Updates to the City’s website on new or renovated facilities.
- A mailing list of organizations and individuals that will support events and efforts by the City to encourage bicycling and walking.
- A volunteer maintenance program where the City organizes regular work parties and provides technical and logistical support. Bikeways may be “adopted” by corporations or clubs and maintained by them in exchange for public acknowledgment.
• A bicycle rack program whereby the City supplies and installs bicycle racks on public property at the request of adjacent business owners and residents.

• A bikeway identity by adopting a unique logo for bikeway signage, brochures, maps, and other materials. The logo would help define the bikeway routes as a cohesive system rather than a series of disconnected routes. The design may be accomplished through a contest involving local schools and bicycle clubs, with a prize awarded to the winner. Directional, informational, and warning signs should conform to the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) unless superseded by City guidelines.

• Use the map of the San Leandro Bikeway Network to promote bicycling and educate bicyclists and motorists on the rules of the road and other safety information. The cost of printing and updating this map could be subsidized by advertising revenues from local bike shops and other retailers. Distribution of the map may include local bike shops, libraries, schools, and major employers as well as an on-line resource for use by business in their promotional outreach programs.

• Brochures for residents, schools and employers addressing opportunities for safe routes to school programs, employer incentive programs for walking and bicycling to work, and tips for bicycling/walking with your children.

• Serve as an example for walking and bicycling by developing City programs for employee incentives, secure and convenient bicycle parking (such as electronic lockers or a bike cage for employees), walking and bicycling events, and adopting walking and bicycling goals for employees and elected officials.
Appendix A: Existing Policy Documents

Local Plans

San Leandro General Plan (2002)
The General Plan is the guiding policy document for all current and future (2015) City land use and development actions. Its Land Use; Transportation; Open Space, Parks, and Conservation; and Historic Preservation and Community Design sections (Chapters 3, 4, 5, and 7, respectively) contain goals, policies, and action items to manage existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities and steer future projects to improve walking and cycling conditions.

City of San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (2004)
This document provided an update of the 1997 Bicycle Master Plan as well as added the new pedestrian element. It included a recommended bikeway network, discussion of safety and education programs, key pedestrian improvement locations, and prioritization methodology for bikeway projects.

City of San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (2004)
This document provided guidance for the design of bicycle and pedestrian facilities based upon state and federal regulations and best practices. It included design recommendations for bikeways, bicycle parking, sidewalks, crossings, and accessible features.

San Leandro Climate Action Plan (2009)
The Climate Action Plan provides local strategies for addressing global climate change. Global temperature shifts, according to leading environmental scientists, are occurring as a result of rising levels of atmospheric greenhouse gases, which result primarily from the combustion of fossil fuels for energy use. The Climate Action Plan provides guidance to restructure local energy consumption, development, and travel patterns as a means of curtailing increases in greenhouse gas emissions.

The Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program Handbook provides a toolkit of traffic calming strategies and defines the criteria for whether or not a neighborhood warrants traffic calming devices, based on traffic volumes and community support. Traffic calming is the use of engineered solutions to reduce vehicle speeds to an appropriate level and to encourage motorists to utilize appropriate through routes across the city, rather than cut through residential neighborhoods.

San Leandro Trails and Bikeways Map (2004)
This brochure presents a geographic representation of the San Leandro citywide bicycle and pedestrian network. It includes all bicycle routes and lanes as well as off-street bicycle/pedestrian trails. The map also displays key destinations that
are accessible from the bicycle/pedestrian network. The reverse side of the brochure includes bicycle safety tips and city/regional contacts for additional cycling information.

**San Leandro Safety Brochures**

These assorted publications provide information, safety tips, and city contacts for additional information on the topics of Adult Bicycle Safety, Child Bicycle Safety, Pedestrian Safety, Motorists Best Practices, the Neighborhood Pace Car Program, and the Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program.

**Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy (2007)**

The Downtown San Leandro TOD Strategy is a set of guidelines for establishing a transit-oriented redevelopment district in the vicinity of Downtown San Leandro and the Downtown San Leandro BART Station. The primary goals of the plan are to increase transit ridership and enhance Downtown San Leandro. The plan emphasizes non-automotive transportation as a primary means of circulation in the downtown area and details numerous strategies for improving walking and cycling conditions, including a downtown bike-friendly zone.


Downtown San Leandro’s Design Guidelines and Principles presents a collection of urban design concepts, building façade treatments, and streetscape improvements intended to make Downtown San Leandro a more inviting, pedestrian-oriented commercial district. The guidelines are intended to govern retrofits of existing buildings as well as new development.

**East 14th Street South Area Development Strategy (2004)**

The East 14th Street South Area Development Strategy is a City planning initiative. The primary intent of the Development Strategy is to revitalize the southern portion of the East 14th Street Corridor by retaining and attracting desirable uses, providing streetscape improvements, and ensuring high-quality, aesthetically appealing new development.

**Central San Leandro BART Revitalization Strategy (2005)**

The Central San Leandro BART Revitalization Strategy is a streetscape design and infill development planning initiative centered on the area surrounding the Downtown San Leandro BART Station. The Strategy focuses on approaches to make the BART Station area more walkable while at the same time encouraging transit-oriented development.

**MacArthur Boulevard Streetscape Study (2001)**

This document developed a streetscape plan for the commercial corridor on MacArthur Blvd extending from the City of Oakland border for approximately 6,000 feet south in San Leandro. The study provided design elements to provide an attractive, pedestrian oriented setting for commercial activity by slowing traffic speeds, enhancing pedestrian safety and improving visibility of fronting businesses.
West Estudillo Historic Downtown Improvement Project – Proposed Improvement Drawings (2003)
These drawings illustrate bulbouts, pavement treatments, planters, benches, bicycle racks, bus shelters, and drinking fountains as well as specialty features such as a history wall, fountain, mission bell, and gateway features for the project area.

Marina Connections Plan (2003)
The Marina Connections Plan is a coordinated redevelopment effort for the San Leandro Marina area. The plan proposes development, streetscape, lighting, signage, and planting standards for the area, which is to be rebranded as the Monarch Bay Resort. A critical component of this plan is the proposed network of continuous, off-street bicycle and pedestrian paths, which will be integrated into the regional Bay Trail.

Bay Fair BART Station Area Improvement Plan (2009)
The Bay Fair BART Station Area Improvement Plan assesses safety, security, and access issues within a half-mile radius of the Bay Fair BART Station, with the goal of making the Bay Fair BART Station Area safe, vibrant, and inviting, and to create direct, attractive, and safe connections for pedestrians and bicyclists. The Plan includes prioritized lists of improvement projects designed to achieve these goals. A primary bicycle project included is to restripe Thornally Drive, Coelho Drive and the station access roads as Class III bicycle routes that include sharrows.

Current San Leandro Projects

Wicks Boulevard Walkway (fall, 2009)
The City will install a new sidewalk on the east side of Wicks Boulevard between Stenzel Park and Burkhart Avenue, replacing an existing gravel path. Wicks Boulevard near the vicinity of the Marina Community Center ranks as one of the roadways most in need of pedestrian and bicycle improvements both in the City's Pedestrian and Bike Master Plan as well as the Sidewalk Gap Program.

East 14th Street Median Project (summer, 2009 – spring, 2010)
The City will install new concrete medians along East 14th Street from 136th Avenue to 145th Avenue along with new landscaping and hardscape, turn lanes, and improved pedestrian access across East 14th Street.

Downtown Pedestrian Upgrades/Closure of West Joaquin (fall, 2008 – spring, 2009)
The City is making pedestrian improvements to San Leandro’s Downtown Plaza including enhanced lighting, new sidewalks, and trees. West Joaquin between East 14th Street and Washington Avenue has been closed to create a pedestrian plaza and gathering space with benches, trees, decorative lights and a fountain.
Bay Trail Slough Bridge (summer, 2009 – spring, 2010)
This project constructed a pedestrian bridge over San Leandro Slough, which closed a critical gap in the Bay Trail by connecting the Oyster Bay Regional Shoreline in San Leandro to an existing trail on Port of Oakland property.

Washington Ave/Estabrook Ave Intersection Improvements (summer 2009)
These intersection improvements are designed to provide safer access for motorists and pedestrians at the intersection of Washington and Estabrook Avenues. The project consists of relocating a utility pole, removing a raised island in the roadway, updating and interconnecting traffic signals, and reconstructing handicapped accessible curb ramps.

Regional Plans

Regional Bicycle Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area (2009)
The MTC Regional Bicycle Plan outlines regional goals and establishes an interconnected bicycle network for the greater San Francisco Bay Area. The Plan emphasizes bicycle connections to transit and includes a compendium of best practice bicycle treatments for on-street facilities, transit accommodation, and bicycle parking. Regional bicycle routes are corridors that traverse multiple local roadways or trails with the intent of creating continuous, long-distance bicycle routes. Regional bicycle corridors within San Leandro include Davis Street/Estudillo Avenue/Lake Chabot Road, Bancroft Avenue/Hesperian Boulevard/Fairmount Drive, Doolittle Drive/Farallon Drive/Wicks Boulevard, Lewelling Boulevard, and the San Leandro component of the Bay Trail.

Bay Trail Plan (1989)
The San Francisco Bay Trail Project is administered and funded by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). The San Francisco Bay Trail Plan is the guiding vision for a regional recreational corridor that, when complete, will encircle San Francisco and San Pablo Bays with a continuous 400-mile network of bicycling and hiking trails. It will connect the shoreline of all nine Bay Area counties, link 47 cities, and cross the major toll bridges in the region. To date, approximately 240 miles of the alignment have been completed. The main component of the Bay Trail, the "spine trail," parallels the shoreline through San Leandro and traverses the Oyster Bay Regional Shoreline and San Leandro Marina areas; additional spur trails extend to inland neighborhoods.

Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan (2006)
The Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan presents a network of cross-county bike routes. The Plan includes goals and objectives targeted at integrating cycling with key destinations and other travel modes, promoting safety and awareness of bicycle transportation, improving existing high-usage bicycle corridors, and identifying new bike routes. Alameda countywide bicycle routes are corridors that traverse multiple local roadways or trails with the intent of creating continuous, long-distance bicycle routes. Alameda countywide bicycle routes
within San Leandro include Davis Street/Estudillo Avenue/Lake Chabot Road, Bancroft Avenue/Hesperian Boulevard/Fairmount Drive, Doolittle Drive/Farallon Drive/Wicks Boulevard, Lewelling Boulevard, and the San Leandro component of the Bay Trail. Of these, the section of the Bay Trail in the San Leandro Marina is considered a high priority corridor.

**Alameda County Bicycle Master Plan for Unincorporated Areas (2007)**

The Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan for Unincorporated Areas includes a parallel set of goals and objectives to those of the main Countywide Bicycle Plan. Whereas the main Countywide Plan focuses on primary bicycle routes and regional connectivity, the Bicycle Plan for Unincorporated Areas presents local bicycle networks and proposed projects for areas not included within incorporated cities, such as the San Lorenzo and Castro Valley areas south and east of San Leandro, respectively. Routes adjacent to and entering into San Leandro from these areas include Farnsworth Street (proposed), Washington Avenue (proposed), Hesperian Boulevard, Lewelling Boulevard (proposed), East 14th Street, Fairmount Drive, Lake Chabot Road, and the San Lorenzo component of the Bay Trail.

**Alameda Countywide Strategic Pedestrian Plan (2006)**

Like the Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan, the Countywide Strategic Pedestrian Plan identifies a vision with goals and objectives that targets and prioritizes pedestrian projects of countywide significance. By improving walking facilities, connectivity, and safety, the Plan aims to increase the volume of walking trips in Alameda County. Downtown San Leandro, East 14th Street, and Bay Fair Mall are identified as areas of countywide pedestrian significance. The Plan also includes a companion piece, the Toolkit for Improving Walkability in Alameda County, which offers strategies to enhance walking and walkability through policy, planning, design standards, education, and programs.

**Alameda County Pedestrian Master Plan for Unincorporated Areas (2006)**

The Alameda County Pedestrian Master Plan for Unincorporated Areas sets forth a vision supported by goals and policies that elevates the importance of walking as part of the planning and development process. The Plan identifies pedestrian improvement projects to assist in developing a pedestrian-friendly environment for all communities in unincorporated Alameda County.

**East Bay Regional Park District Master Plan (1997)**

Master planning efforts by the EBRPD are periodically updated to reflect new circumstances to which the District must respond. The EBRPD has the vision to preserve the heritage of natural and cultural resources, open space, parks and trails for the future and will set aside park areas for enjoyment and healthful recreation for generations to come. The 1997 document is available online along with the map of the updated 2007 master plan. The map should be reviewed for overlap at the Oyster Bay and Lake Chabot parklands and the East Bay Greenway.
**MTC Pedestrian Districts Study (2006)**

MTC’s Pedestrian Districts Study profiles successful pedestrian districts throughout the Bay Area, which the Study finds to be predominately characterized by a mixture of land uses and access to quality public transit. Based on case study examples and corresponding with gradations in land use intensity, the Study develops 10 pedestrian typologies. These typologies give a sense of the types of features that assist in creating successful pedestrian districts serve as useful examples for planning future pedestrian improvements.

**East Bay Greenway Study (2008)**

The East Bay Greenway is a proposal for a bicycle/pedestrian path along the Union Pacific Railroad Oakland Subdivision/BART right-of-way between Oakland and Hayward. The trail, which would run along the west side of existing railroad tracks in San Leandro, would provide a continuous north-south non-motorized corridor through the city and link San Leandro and Bay Fair BART stations.

**UPRR Oakland Subdivision Corridor Improvement Study (2009)**

Like the East Bay Greenway study before it, the UPRR Corridor Improvement Study examines the feasibility of a bicycle/pedestrian path along the Oakland Subdivision; however, the UPRR Corridor Improvement Study extends the study area to include the area between Fruitvale and Union City BART stations.

**City of Oakland Bicycle Master Plan (2007)**

The Oakland Bicycle Master Plan offers a vision for cycling in Oakland in which cycling is safe and integrated with key destinations and other travel modes. The Plan sets forth goals and objectives for fulfilling this vision and includes a network of existing and proposed bicycle routes. Major routes adjacent to and entering into San Leandro from Oakland include Doolittle Drive, San Leandro Street/East Bay Greenway (Union Pacific/BART right-of-way) (proposed), Bancroft Avenue, and MacArthur Boulevard (proposed).

**Oakland Pedestrian Master Plan (2002)**

The Oakland Pedestrian Master Plan promotes pedestrian safety and access to help ensure that Oakland is a safe, convenient, and desirable place to walk. The plan also includes a set of guidelines for the design of new and retrofitted pedestrian facilities. Going beyond many other pedestrian plans, the Oakland Plan also includes a Pedestrian Route Network that highlights priority streets for walking to schools and transit. Included in this network are International Boulevard and MacArthur Boulevard, which tie into the San Leandro pedestrian network.
State Plans

**Caltrans Highway Design Manual (2009)**
The Caltrans Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000: Bikeway Planning and Design, sets the basic minimums for bike lane and trail widths. It also establishes policies for the type and placement of signs.

**California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD 2010)**
The CA MUTCD provides guidelines for all traffic control devices, which include “signs, signals, markings, and other devices used to regulate, warn, or guide traffic, placed on, over, or adjacent to a street, highway, pedestrian facility, or bikeway by authority of a public agency having jurisdiction.” The CA MUTCD offers standard design configurations for the placement of traffic control devices as they relate to bikeways.

**Project Development Procedures Manual (1999)**
The Project Development Procedures Manual, Chapter 31: Non-Motorized Transportation Facilities, defines the means by which local jurisdictions may receive Caltrans approval for State-funded projects. The Project Development Procedures Manual includes information about State grant programs, following the State mandate in the Streets and Highways Code that the State disburse a minimum of $7.2 million annually to bicycle projects as part of the Bicycle Transportation Account.

**Accommodating Non-Motorized Travel Directive (DD 64 2001)**
The Caltrans Accommodating Non-Motorized Travel Directive states that, “The Department fully considers the needs of non-motorized travelers (including pedestrians, bicyclists and persons with disabilities) in all programming, planning, maintenance, construction, operations, and project development activities and products...” and “The Department adopts the best practice concepts in the US DOT Policy Statement on Integrating Bicycling and Walking into Transportation Infrastructure.”

**Caltrans Context Sensitive Solutions (2001+)**
Caltrans has begun to provide departmental policy, guidance, and design examples of “context sensitive solutions”—instances in which deviations from standard design practices are utilized to create transportation facilities in harmony with community, environmental, and quality of life goals while at the same time meeting multimodal transportation needs.

**Main Streets: Flexibility in Design and Operations (2005)**
This Caltrans booklet pertains to state highways that also serve as main streets, such East 14th Street/State Route 185 in San Leandro. It identifies design options appropriate for downtown or streetscaped settings which also assure safe and efficient operations for pedestrians, bicyclists, vehicles, and highway workers.
California Vehicle Code

The California Vehicle Code (CVC) has several sections related to bicycle and pedestrian operation while also granting local jurisdictions leeway to create their own policies. Section 21200 establishes bicyclists’ right to share the road with vehicles, and makes them subject to the same rules and regulations as drivers. This section also defines conditions under which a bicyclist may “take the lane,” as well as instances when drivers are allowed in bike lanes. The CVC includes standard specifications for bicycles, including brakes and reflective devices, as well as general safety guidelines and helmet requirements for riders under 18 years of age. Finally, Sections 3900-3911 create a bicycle licensing program, through which cities, if they choose, may request licensing forms from the State, to be distributed through local bicycle vendors when bicycles are sold. While few California cities currently have bicycle licensing programs, there is a well-established program in Chicago, Illinois. The success of a bicycle licensing program is dependent upon extensive public awareness, achieved through public education campaigns.

California Vehicle Code Section 467 defines a “pedestrian” as any person who is afoot or who is using a means of conveyance propelled by human power other than a bicycle. “Pedestrian” includes any person who is operating a self-propelled wheelchair, invalid tricycle, or motorized quadracycle and, by reason of physical disability, is otherwise unable to move about as a pedestrian, as specified in subdivision. The Vehicle Code also identifies pedestrians’ rights and responsibilities when crossing the street, including where it is legal to cross the street and the amount of “due care” required of pedestrians when entering the roadway. The Code also discusses when motorists must yield to pedestrians and vice versa.

Federal Plans

SAFETEA-LU (2005)

The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) is the guiding federal policy for surface transportation investment. SAFETEA-LU provides dedicated funding for qualifying local highway, highway safety, and public transportation projects and has as its objectives the promotion of safety, multimodal equity, innovative financing mechanisms, congestion relief, mobility & productivity, efficiency, environmental stewardship, and environmental streamlining.


The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities offers planning and design guidance for the development of bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The Guide covers topics ranging from high-level bikeway network planning to specific facility design.
Americans with Disabilities Act (1990)
The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) provides thorough civil liberties protections to individuals with disabilities with regards to employment, State and local government services, access to public accommodations, transportation, and telecommunications.

Title III of the act requires places of public accommodation to be accessible and usable to all people, including those with disabilities. While the letter of the law applies to “public accommodations,” the spirit of the law applies not only to public agencies but to all facilities serving the public, whether they are publicly or privately funded.

Title II of the act requires that all government services, programs, and activities be accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities. However, Title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Section 35.150(a), states that if the public entity can demonstrate that modifications would fundamentally alter the nature of its service, program, or activity, or cause undue financial and administrative burdens, it is not required to make that particular modification.
Appendix B: San Leandro Bikeway Network

The San Leandro bikeway network, including existing and proposed segments, is described below. To manage the planning and implementation of the network, each facility was assigned a bikeway number following the conventions of the federal highway system and as utilized in the Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan. (North-south bikeways assigned odd numbers from west to east and east-west bikeways given an even number from north to south.) For consistency, the San Leandro bikeways were assigned the same number where they overlapped the Alameda County routes. Each bikeway was further divided into segments in order from north to south or east to west to describe the different roadway characteristics and recommended improvements. At completion, the network would include 31 bikeways.

Bikeway 5: Bay Trail-Neptune Drive-Bay Trail

This bikeway is a designated segment of the Bay Trail as well as part of the MTC Regional Bikeway and the Alameda Countywide networks.

a. Oyster Bay Shoreline Trail (Bay Trail) – San Leandro Slough to Neptune Drive (existing)
   This segment is an existing Class I bike path that circles the Oyster Bay Regional Shoreline from Davis Street to Neptune Drive. It includes the new San Leandro Bay Trail Slough Bridge connection to Oakland.

b. Neptune Drive (Bay Trail) – Oyster Bay Regional Shoreline to Williams Street (existing)
   This residential/residential collector street offers an important connection to the Oyster Bay Regional Shoreline (from which trails connect to Oakland via a bridge across San Leandro Slough). It has one travel lane in each direction with on-street parking on both sides of the street. Bike route signage is limited although there is one bike route sign and two Bay Trail signs located on the segment north of Williams Street. Additional bike route and Bay Trail signage is needed. Land uses include light industrial, residential and open space.

c. Neptune Drive (Bay Trail) – Williams Street to Marina Boulevard (existing)
   See description for Segment b above. There are no bike route or Bay Trail signs along this Class III bike route. Bike route and Bay Trail signage is needed on this segment.

d. Bay Trail - Neptune Drive/Marina Boulevard to Fairway Drive (proposed)
   This Class I bike path would circle the Mulford Point parking lot to the west of Monarch Bay Drive and run parallel to Monarch Bay Drive between Pescador Point and Fairway Drive. One short segment (250') of this alignment exists between Neptune Drive and the easternmost parking lot at Mulford Point. There are other existing pathways along portions of this alignment that currently function as sidewalks or
pedestrian pathways. At minimum they would need widening and signage for a Class I bike path.

e. Marina Park Trail (Bay Trail) – Fairway Drive to Estudillo Canal (proposed)
This Class I bike path would follow the shoreline along the edge of Marina Park. There are some portions of unpaved trail that follow this alignment which would need widening, paving and signage, at minimum, for a Class I bike path. The City is currently pursuing development of this segment.

f. Bay Trail – Estudillo Canal to southern city limits (existing)
This is a Class I bike path providing connection south of San Leandro. This segment includes a pedestrian/bicycle bridge of the Estudillo Canal and San Lorenzo Creek.

g. Mulford Point Pathway (Bay Trail) – Bay Trail (Segment d) to end of Mulford Point (proposed)
This Class I bike path would provide access from the main spine of the bay Trail out to Mulford Point. There are some portions of unpaved trail that follow this alignment which would need widening, paving and signage, at minimum, to be considered a Class I bike path.

Small Boat Lagoon Loop (Bay Trail) – Bay Trail (Segment d) to end of Small Boat Lagoon breakwater (proposed)
This Class I bike path would circle the peninsula surrounding the small boat lagoon which currently has several paved and unpaved trails as part of the mile-long par course along the breakwater. The alignment of this segment should keep bicyclists away from users of the par course. A bike path down the center of the breakwater may be preferable to a loop on the perimeter of the breakwater both to avoid the par course and to reduce the length of needed pathway.

Bikeway 9: Monarch Bay Drive

a. Monarch Bay Drive – Marina Boulevard to Fairway Drive (proposed)
This collector street has one travel lane in each direction; on-street parking is not permitted although there are parking bays along the eastern side near Fairway Drive. There are no sidewalks adjacent to the roadway. The posted speed limit is 30 mph. AC Transit route 89 operates along this segment. Proposed bicycle lanes would be accommodated with lane striping.

b. Monarch Bay Drive – Fairway Drive to south terminus (existing)
This access road for Marina Park and Tony Lema Golf Course has one travel lane and Class II bike lanes in each direction with parking on both sides of the street. The bike lanes lack signage and pavement markings. This facility offers an on-street connection between the Class II bike lanes on Fairway Drive to the pedestrian/bike bridge over Estudillo Canal and to the Bay Trail to the south.
Bikeway 15: Doolittle Drive-Farallon Drive

Doolittle Drive, in combination with Farallon Drive, Wicks Boulevard, and Lewelling Boulevard, provides a major north-south connection between Oakland to the north and San Lorenzo to the south. This route is designated on both the MTC Regional Bikeway network and the Alameda Countywide network.

The segments include:

a. Doolittle Drive – Oakland city limits to Davis Street (existing)
   This segment of Doolittle Drive has bike lanes and two travel lanes in each direction with a center two-way left-turn lane along its length through this area with commercial and light industrial development. As would be expected, the street has heavy truck traffic. On-street parking is not permitted. Raised medians are used at some of the intersections. This segment connects to existing bike lanes in Oakland. This segment is also designated as California State Route 61; consequently any modifications would need to be coordinated with Caltrans.

b. Doolittle Drive – Davis Street to Marina Boulevard (proposed)
   This segment has two lanes in each direction with parking on both sides although the parking is not well used. It runs through an area with commercial and light industrial development with heavy truck traffic. There are sidewalks on both sides of the street. The posted speed limit is 40 mph. An engineering study is needed to determine how to accommodate the bike lanes proposed for this segment. Lane narrowing or parking lane removal are options.

c. Doolittle Drive – Marina Boulevard to Fairway Drive (proposed)
   This segment has two travel lanes in each direction with parking permitted on both sides of the street. The arterial has a posted speed limit of 40 mph. The area has predominantly residential development. An engineering study is needed to determine how to accommodate the bike lanes proposed for this segment. Lane narrowing, lane reduction and/or parking removal are options.

d. Doolittle Drive – Fairway Drive to Farallon Drive (existing)
   This segment has one travel lane and bike lanes in each direction with parking on both sides of the street. Land uses are predominantly residential and commercial. The posted speed limit is 40 mph. AC Transit route 89 operates along this segment.

e. Farallon Drive – Doolittle Drive to Wicks Boulevard (existing)
   Farallon Drive provides an east-west connection with one travel lane and bike lanes in each direction, a center two-way left-turn lane, and posted speed limit of 35 mph. On-street parking is not permitted in this commercial and light industrial area. AC Transit route 89 operates along this segment.
Bikeway 17: Timothy Drive-Westgate Parkway-Merced Street-Wicks Boulevard

a. Timothy Drive – Davis Street to Westgate Parkway (proposed)
   This short segment of collector street provides access from Davis Street and the I-880 freeway to the major shopping center located on this corner. This transition segment has two travel lanes in each direction with no on-street parking permitted. Sidewalks are only on the southbound direction. AC Transit route 89 operates along this segment. It is proposed for a bike route with signage and sharrows.

b. Westgate Parkway – Timothy Drive to south WalMart Driveway (proposed)
   Like the previous segment, this roadway serves the WalMart/Home Depot retail center. It has only one travel lane in each direction and no on-street parking. Sidewalks are found on the southbound direction side of Westgate Parkway only. This segment is served by AC Transit route 89. It is proposed for a bike route with signage and sharrows. A bicycle/pedestrian bridge extension of Westgate Parkway to the north was studied to cross the intersection with Davis Street; however, a survey of the adjacent neighborhood indicated little desire for the project.

c. Westgate Parkway – South WalMart driveway to Williams Street (existing)
   This short segment of Westgate Parkway has bike lanes with one travel lane in each direction and no on-street parking through commercial and light industrial development. The Westgate Parkway extension between the Wal-Mart driveway and Williams Street did not open until March 2003; thus, this is a new segment since the 2004 Plan. The posted speed limit is 35 mph on this collector street. AC Transit operates route 89 along this segment.

d. Merced Street – Williams Street to Marina Boulevard (proposed)
   This segment of arterial roadway passes through commercial and light industrial development. It has two travel lanes in each direction and parking on both sides of the street. The roadway is too narrow to accommodate this number of travel lanes with on-street parking. Parked vehicles are effectively in the travel lane limiting the capacity of the roadway. AC Transit routes S and 75 operate along this segment with a posted speed limit of 35 mph. An engineering study is needed to determine how to accommodate the bike lanes proposed for this segment. Removal of one of the travel lanes may be the best option since the 2nd travel lane is currently often unusable anyway because of parking demand.

e. Merced Street – Marina Boulevard to Republic Avenue (proposed)
   This segment of arterial roadway passes through commercial and light industrial development. It is also adjacent to the future site of the Kaiser Hospital. It has two travel lanes in each direction and a center two-way left-turn lane; on-street parking is not permitted. AC Transit routes S and 75 operate along this segment with a posted speed limit of 35 mph.
An engineering study is needed to confirm that the proposed bike lanes can be accommodated.

f. Merced Street – Republic Avenue to Fairway Drive (proposed)
This segment of arterial roadway passes through commercial and light industrial development. It is also adjacent to the future site of the Kaiser Hospital. It has two travel lanes in each direction; on-street parking is not permitted. AC Transit routes S and 75 operate along this segment with a posted speed limit of 35 mph. Kaiser Hospital will install bike lanes on this segment as part of the development.

g. Merced Street/Wicks Boulevard – Fairway Drive to Burroughs Avenue (proposed)
This segment of arterial roadway passes through commercial and light industrial development. It is also adjacent to the future site of the Kaiser Hospital. It has two travel lanes in each direction and a center two-way left-turn lane; on-street parking is not permitted. AC Transit routes S and 75 operate along this segment with a posted speed limit of 35 mph. An engineering study is needed to determine how best to accommodate the proposed bike lanes. The road width varies from 48 to 62 feet through this segment. Some options are to narrow travel lanes or remove travel lanes or the center two-way left-turn lane.

h. Wicks Boulevard – Burroughs Avenue to Farallon Drive (existing)
This arterial street has one travel lane and bike lanes in each direction with a center two-way left-turn lane. On-street parking is permitted. Predominant land uses include commercial and light industrial. The posted speed limit is 40 mph.

i. Wicks Boulevard – Farallon Drive to Seacloud Avenue (existing)
This arterial and residential arterial street has one travel lane and bike lanes in each direction with a center two-way left-turn lane. On-street parking is not permitted along this segment. Predominant land uses include commercial and light industrial. Wicks Boulevard, in combination with Farallon Drive, Doolittle Drive, and Lewelling Boulevard, provides a major north-south connection between Oakland to the north and San Lorenzo to the south. This route is designated on both the MTC Regional Bikeway network and the Alameda Countywide network. AC Transit route 89 operates along this segment. The posted speed limit is 40 mph.

j. Wicks Boulevard – Seacloud Avenue to Burkhart Avenue (existing)
This residential arterial street has one travel lane and bike lanes in each direction with a center two-way left-turn lane. On-street parking is permitted. Predominant land uses include residential development which backs onto Wicks Boulevard with no direct access to the street. Wicks Boulevard, in combination with Farallon Drive, Doolittle Drive, and Lewelling Boulevard, provides a major north-south connection between Oakland to the north and San Lorenzo to the south. This route is designated on both the MTC Regional Bikeway network and the Alameda Countywide network. AC Transit route 89 operates along most of this bikeway. The posted speed limit is 40 mph.
k. Wicks Boulevard – Burkhart Avenue to Lewelling Boulevard (existing)
   This residential arterial street has one travel lane and bike lanes in each
direction with a center two-way left-turn lane. On-street parking is not
permitted. Predominant land uses include residential development
which backs onto Wicks Boulevard with no direct access to the street.
Wicks Boulevard, in combination with Farallon Drive, Doolittle Drive,
and Lewelling Boulevard, provides a major north-south connection
between Oakland to the north and San Lorenzo to the south. This route
is designated on both the MTC Regional Bikeway network and the
Alameda Countywide network. AC Transit route 89 operates along most
of this bikeway. The posted speed limit is 40 mph.

Bikeway 19: Teagarden Street-Fremont Avenue
a. Teagarden Street – Fairway Drive/Aladdin Street to Alvarado Street
   (existing)
   This collector street runs both north-south and east-west with one
travel lane and bike lanes in each direction and parking on both sides of
the street. This area has primarily commercial and light industrial
development with a posted speed limit of 35 mph. This facility connects
to existing bikeways on Fairway Drive/Aladdin Avenue to the north and
Alvarado Street to the east and provides connection to Burrell Field and
Lincoln High School.

b. Fremont Avenue – Alvarado Street to Floresta Avenue (existing)
   This arterial runs both north-south and east-west with one travel lane
and bike lanes in each direction. On-street parking is not permitted.
Commercial and light industrial land uses face this roadway; the back of
residential development is also located on the street. There is a posted
speed limit of 35 mph. This facility connects to existing bikeways on
Alvarado Street to the west and Floresta Boulevard to the south.

Bikeway 21: Alvarado Street-Portola Drive-Monterey Boulevard
a. Alvarado Street – San Leandro Creek to Davis Street (proposed)
   This one block segment of Alvarado Street was added to the bikeway
network since the 2004 Plan to add a connection to the park on San
Leandro Creek and to the future East Bay Greenway. The area has
residential and commercial development as well as vacant land. There is
one travel lane in each direction with parking on both sides of the
street. There are sidewalks on both sides of the street although there
are some missing segments in the southbound direction along the
vacant land. A signed bike route is proposed for this segment.

b. Alvarado Street – Davis Street to West Estudillo Avenue (proposed)
   This very short segment has many turn lanes on the approach to Davis
Street. Although it was proposed for bike lanes in the 2004 lanes, this
may not be feasible given the configuration of the roadway. It is
recommended that this segment be treated with a signed bike route
and sharrows. In addition, narrowing of the travel lanes is
recommended to accommodate wider curb lanes and a through bike
lane at the northbound approach to Davis Street to the left of the right-turn lane.

c. **Alvarado Street – West Estudillo Avenue to Thornton Street (existing)**
   This segment of Alvarado Street is a collector for primarily office and commercial development with some vacant land. It has one travel lane in each direction with bike lanes on both sides of the street. On-street parking is not allowed. Posted speed limit is 35 mph.

d. **Alvarado Street – Thornton Street to Marina Boulevard (proposed)**
   This is a very narrow collector street with a posted speed limit of 35 mph. It runs through commercial, light industrial and residential development with one travel lane in each direction and parking on both sides. It is proposed for a signed bike route with sharrows.

e. **Alvarado Street – Marina Boulevard to Aladdin Avenue/W. 137th Avenue (existing)**
   This segment is an arterial street with surrounding commercial and light industrial land uses. It has one travel lane in each direction and a center two-way left-turn lane. Bike lanes are striped on both sides of the street; on-street parking is not permitted. Posted speed limit is 40 mph.

f. **Alvarado Street – Aladdin Avenue/W. 137th Avenue to Teagarden Street (proposed)**
   This segment is an arterial street located primarily in a light industrial and commercial area. It has two travel lanes in each direction and center two-way left-turn lane; on-street parking is not permitted. The posted speed limit is 40 mph. It was proposed for a bike route in the 2004 Plan but is recommended in this update for bike lanes. An engineering study will be needed to determine how best to accommodate the bike lanes.

g. **Alvarado Street – Teagarden Street to Fremont Avenue (existing)**
   This segment is also located in a commercial and light industrial area. It has two travel lanes in each direction with a center two-way left-turn lane. Like the previous segment, it has no on-street parking and the speed limit is 40 mph. The bikeway facility is a signed Class III bike route.

h. **Alvarado Street – Fremont Avenue to Portola Drive (proposed)**
   A signed bike route is proposed for this short one-block connection through a residential area. The majority of traffic, including truck traffic, found on the northern segments of Alvarado Street will use Fremont Street.

i. **Portola Drive – Alvarado Street to Monterey Boulevard (proposed)**
   A signed bike route is proposed for this short one-block connection through a residential area.

j. **Monterey Boulevard – Portola Drive to Washington Avenue (proposed)**
   A signed bike route is proposed for this residential collector providing access to Washington Avenue and to Monroe Elementary School and Floresta Park.
Bikeway 22: Adams Avenue

a. Adams Avenue – Bigge Street to Doolittle Drive (existing)
   Adams Avenue is an east-west collector passing through commercial and light industrial development. It has one travel lane in each direction with parking and bike lanes on both sides of the street. Posted speed limit is 35 mph. Because of the nature of the land uses, Adams Avenue carries significant truck traffic. This short segment of bikeway (<1/2 mile) was implemented since the 2004 Plan. It connects to existing facilities on Doolittle Drive.

Bikeway 23: Norton Street/Andover St

a. Norton Street – Washington Manor Park to Burkhart Street (proposed)
   This bikeway was added to the 2004 Plan to provide connection in the Manor neighborhood and to Washington Manor Park. A signed bike route is proposed for this residential neighborhood which has one travel lane in each direction and parking on both sides of the street. There are speed humps on Norton Street south of Fargo Avenue.

b. Andover Street – Burkhart Street to Lewelling Boulevard (proposed)
   To avoid a difficult intersection at Lewelling Boulevard, the Norton Street bikeway is routed onto Andover Street for the last block. Andover Street is a residential street with one travel lane in each direction and parking on both sides of the street. A signed bike route is proposed.

Bikeway 24: Dowling Boulevard-Maple Court

a. Dowling Boulevard – MacArthur Boulevard to Bancroft Avenue (proposed)
   This residential street has a posted speed limit of 25 mph and provides access to Roosevelt Elementary School and Roosevelt Playground. It has one travel lane in each direction and parking on both sides of the street. It is proposed for a signed bike route.

b. Dowling Boulevard – Bancroft Avenue to Dutton Avenue (proposed)
   This residential street provides access to Washington Elementary School and McCartney Park. It has one travel lane in each direction and parking on both sides of the street. In the 2004 Plan, it was proposed for bike lanes but only minimum travel lane widths would be feasible. Instead it is proposed for a signed bike route.

c. Maple Court – Dutton Avenue to Oakes Boulevard (proposed)
   This very short and narrow segment of residential street provides access to Washington Elementary School. It has one travel lane in each direction and parking on both sides of the street. In the 2004 Plan, it was proposed for bike lanes but is not wide enough to accommodate this configuration. Instead it is proposed for a signed bike route.
Bikeway 25: San Leandro Boulevard-136th Avenue

San Leandro Boulevard is located on the Alameda County Bikeway Network and connects to proposed bike lanes in Oakland.

a. San Leandro Boulevard – Broadmoor Boulevard (Oakland city limits) to San Leandro Creek (proposed)
   This arterial street has two travel lanes in each direction with parking on both sides of the street. It provides access to Downtown San Leandro and to Siempre Verde Park. To accommodate the proposed bike lanes, it will most likely be necessary to remove parking on one side of the street. Parking on the southbound side of the street is not well used. When completed, this facility will offer a connection to proposed bike lanes in Oakland to the north.

b. San Leandro Boulevard – San Leandro Creek to Washington Avenue (existing)
   This arterial street has bike lanes and two travel lanes in each direction and a raised center median. No on-street parking is allowed. This facility provides access to the Downtown San Leandro BART Station and connection to the many AC Transit routes that stop at the station as well as Downtown, Creekside Plaza offices, and San Leandro Boys and Girls Club. This bikeway is included on the Alameda Countywide network.

c. San Leandro Boulevard – Washington Avenue to East 14th Street (proposed)
   This arterial street has a posted speed limit of 40 mph with two travel lanes in each direction and a raised center median; on-street parking is not permitted. Access is provided to San Leandro Hospital and the new 9th Grade Campus. The curb lane is wide enough to accommodate the proposed bike lanes without reconfiguration of the roadway.

d. 136th Avenue – East 14th Street to Bancroft Avenue (proposed)
   This one-block connection is through a commercial area and provides access to the new 9th Grade Campus. It has one travel lane in each direction with parking permitted in the westbound direction only. It is proposed for a signed bike route.

e. 136th Avenue – Bancroft Avenue to School Street (proposed)
   This segment provides access to several schools (Assumption School, 9th Grade Campus, and San Leandro High School) and serves as a connector to MacArthur Boulevard via School Street, Evergreen Street, and Grand Avenue. It runs through a residential area and has one travel lane in each direction with parking on both sides of the street. It is proposed for a signed bike route.

Bikeway 26: Oakes Boulevard-Peralta Avenue

a. Oakes Boulevard – Superior Avenue to East 14th Street (proposed)
   This residential street has one travel lane in each direction with parking on both sides of the street. It is designated for a signed bike route.

b. Peralta Avenue – East 14th Street to Bancroft Avenue (proposed)
   Like the previous segment, this residential street has one travel lane in
each direction with parking on both sides of the street. It will provide a connection to the future East Bay Greenway and is designated for a signed bike route.

**Bikeway 27: East Bay Greenway**

a. East Bay Greenway – Oakland city limits to eastern city limits (proposed)
   This facility has been studied as part of the East Bay Greenway Concept Plan (2008) and the Union Pacific Railroad Oakland Subdivision Corridor Improvement Study (2009). These studies include on-street, rail-with-trail, and rail-to-trail concepts. The Greenway would be developed in San Leandro in conjunction with multiple county and regional agencies.

**Bikeway 29: Park Street**

a. Park Street - San Leandro Street to San Leandro Boulevard (existing)
   This facility was striped after the 2004 Plan. Although it was not included on the proposed bikeways maps it provides access to Siempre Verde Park and to the residential, commercial and light industrial development in the neighborhood. It has one travel lane and bike lanes in each direction with a center turn lane along the southern section near the park. On-street parking is allowed primarily with parallel parking although there is a short segment of diagonal parking adjacent to the park.

**Bikeway 30: Lake Chabot Road-Estudillo Avenue-Davis Street**

This bikeway provides a major east-west connection through San Leandro. This route is designated on both the MTC Regional Bikeway network and the Alameda Countywide network.

a. Lake Chabot Road – Eastern city limits to Estudillo Avenue (proposed)
   This residential collector street has one travel lane in each direction with no on-street parking. It is not improved with curb and gutter and has a rural character. There are no sidewalks except for small sections on the northbound side of the street. This segment provides a connection to Lake Chabot Park and to bikeways designated in the Alameda Countywide Bike Plan and the Alameda County Bicycle Master Plan for Unincorporated Areas. It is proposed for a signed bike route with sharrows.

b. Estudillo Avenue - Sylvan Circle to MacArthur Boulevard (proposed)
   This residential collector street has one travel lane in each direction; on-street parking is only permitted on the eastbound side of the street for the portion closest to MacArthur Boulevard. It is partly unimproved and has sidewalks only along a small portion of the eastbound direction. This segment provides a connection to the Lake Chabot Park. It has been noted that there are conflicts between cyclists traveling downhill (westbound) at high speeds and motorists turning left (eastbound) to the I-580 on-ramp. It is proposed for a signed bike route with sharrows. Signage or pavement markings are suggested to alert motorists and bicyclists of potential conflicts.
c. **Estudillo Avenue – MacArthur Boulevard to East 14th Street (existing)**  
   This segment of Estudillo Avenue has one travel lane and bike lanes in each direction with parking on both sides of the street. The posted speed limit is 30 mph through this area of residential, commercial and office development. Key destinations include the Bancroft Middle School, St. James Christian School, and San Leandro Main Library. AC Transit route 75 operates along this segment.

d. **Davis Street – East 14th Street to San Leandro Boulevard (proposed)**  
   This arterial roadway has two travel lanes in each direction with a mixture of raised and painted center medians and on-street parking permitted on some sections of this segment. AC Transit routes 1, 89, and 801 operate along this segment which provides access in this commercial and office area and to the Downtown San Leandro BART Station, Downtown San Leandro, and the St. Leander School. An engineering study is needed to determine how best to accommodate the proposed bike lanes on this segment. Removal of on-street parking may be an option. This segment and following segments on Davis Street to Doolittle Drive are designated as California State Route 61; consequently any modifications would need to be coordinated with Caltrans.

e. **Davis Street – San Leandro Boulevard to Alvarado Street (proposed)**  
   This arterial roadway has two travel lanes in each direction and a raised center median; on-street parking is not permitted. AC Transit route 89 operates through this commercial and office area. This segment connects to the Downtown San Leandro BART Station and Downtown San Leandro. An engineering study is needed to determine how to accommodate the proposed bike lanes on this segment.

f. **Davis Street – Alvarado Street to Frederick Road/Gilmore Drive (existing)**  
   This segment of Davis Street is an arterial with bike lanes and two travel lanes in each direction and a raised median of variable width with a posted speed limit of 35 mph. On-street parking is not permitted. Land uses are residential, commercial and office. AC Transit route 89 operates along this segment. In combination with Estudillo and Callan Avenues, Davis Street provides a major east-west connection through San Leandro. This route is designated on both the MTC Regional Bikeway network and the Alameda Countywide network.

g. **Davis Street - Frederick Road/Gilmore Drive to Westgate Parkway (proposed)**  
   This arterial street has two travel lanes in each direction and a raised center median. AC Transit route 89 operates along this segment. Much of the segment is the I-880 overpass but also provides access to the Walmart/Home Depot retail area at Westgate Parkway. Bike lanes are proposed for the overpass as part of the future replacement project. An engineering study is needed to link the new bike lanes on the overpass with the rest of the segment.

h. **Davis Street – Westgate Parkway to Doolittle Drive (proposed)**  
   This arterial street has two travel lanes in each direction with a raised or
painted center median. On-street parking is not permitted in this area with commercial and light industrial development. The primary attractors are the WalMart/Home Depot retail area and Costco. This segment was shown on the 2004 map as having existing bike lanes. However, there is only some limited striping but no signage or pavement markings to indicate the bike lanes. An engineering study is needed to determine how best to accommodate bike lanes through this segment.

i. Davis Street – Doolittle Drive to western terminus (proposed)
This collector street has one travel lane in each direction with parking on some sections of the street. This commercial and light industrial area has a significant volume of truck traffic particularly garbage trucks heading for the Davis Street Recycling and Transfer Station. This segment has a posted speed limit of 35 mph. It provides access to the San Francisco Bay Trail including the new San Leandro Bay Trail Slough Bridge connection to Oakland, and the Oyster Bay Regional Shoreline. A signed bike route with sharrows is proposed for this segment. It is also recommended that additional enforcement of parking regulations be imposed to eliminate double parking and other parking infractions that are a hazard to bicycling.

Bikeway 31: Washington Avenue

a. Washington Avenue – Juana Street to San Leandro Boulevard (proposed)
This segment and the following two segments were added to the network since the 2004 Plan. Washington Avenue offers a good connection between Downtown and areas of San Leandro and adjacent communities to the south. The feasibility of this extension is based upon a new grade crossing of the railroad tracks along the BART line (segment B) on what is the alignment of the future East Bay Greenway. This segment of Washington Avenue is a collector street with one travel lane in each direction with parking on both sides of the street. The bikeway passes through commercial, light industrial and residential development providing access to Downtown, the Downtown Plaza Shopping Center, Pelton Plaza and the Principled Academy School. The road width varies; while it is too narrow to accommodate bike lanes, a wide curb lane could be provided with some restriping for a signed bike route with sharrows.

b. Washington Avenue – San Leandro Boulevard to 139th Avenue (proposed)
This segment entails a Class I bike path for an at-grade crossing of the railroad tracks. Currently, there is no pedestrian or bicycle access through the existing subway under the tracks. This segment would intersect with the proposed East Bay Greenway; it is expected that this at-grade crossing would be included with development of the Greenway when the rail line is converted to the pathway. Adding a bicycle/pedestrian crossing at this location while the rail line is still
active would require approval of the California Public Utilities Commission.

c. Washington Avenue – 139th Avenue to 143rd Avenue (proposed)
This arterial street has two travel lanes in each direction with parking on both sides of the street. AC Transit route 85 operates on this segment through commercial and light industrial development. Narrowing of travel lanes to 11-foot lanes should be adequate to accommodate the proposed bike lanes.

d. Washington Avenue – 143rd Avenue to railroad tracks north of Halcyon Drive (proposed)
This arterial street has two travel lanes in each direction with parking on both sides of the street. AC Transit route 85 operates on this segment through commercial (K-Mart retail area) and light industrial development. Bike lanes are proposed for this segment; an engineering study is needed to determine how best to accommodate the lanes on this segment.

e. Washington Avenue – railroad tracks north of Halcyon Drive to Caliente Drive (proposed)
This arterial street has two travel lanes in each direction and a center two-way left-turn lane; on-street parking is not permitted. AC Transit route 85 operates on this segment through commercial and residential development. Most of this segment is taken up with the many turn lanes at the intersection with Halcyon Drive/Floresta Boulevard. Bike lanes are proposed but an engineering study may be needed to determine how best to accommodate bicycle traffic through this intersection, particularly with the free-right turn lanes in both directions.

f. Washington Avenue – Caliente Drive to Anza Way (existing)
This new segment of bike lanes was striped since the 2004 Plan. It has two travel lanes and bike lanes in each direction with a center two-way left-turn lane. Some on-street parking is permitted. There is primarily residential and commercial development along this arterial with a 35 mph posted speed limit. AC Transit route 85 operates along this segment.

g. Washington Avenue – Anza Way to San Lorenzo Creek (proposed)
This arterial street has two travel lanes in each direction; on-street parking is not permitted. AC Transit routes S and 85 operate on this segment through commercial and residential development. This segment includes an interchange with I-880. Bike lanes are proposed but an engineering study may be needed to determine how best to accommodate bicycle traffic through the interchange. Access to Arroyo High School in San Lorenzo is provided via this segment with connection to the existing bike lanes on Grant Avenue in San Lorenzo.
Bikeway 33: East 14th Street

This facility was added to the bikeway network to provide continuity to proposed networks in Oakland and unincorporated Alameda County. This roadway varies greatly as it passes through the City but generally has 1-2 travel lanes in each direction with parking on both sides of the street. This bikeway passes through commercial, office, and retail development. Some of the key destinations include: Downtown, Durant Marketplace, Pelton Plaza, McKinley Elementary School, 9th Grade Campus, new San Leandro Senior Center, San Leandro Hospital and Bayfair Center. In addition, AC Transit routes 1, 1R, 40, 89, and 801 operate along part or the entire segment. Since the roadway configuration varies greatly, it is recommended that an engineering study be done to determine how best to accommodate the facility. Where possible, narrowing of travel lanes is suggested to provide bike lanes (preferable) or wide curb lanes. East 14th Street is designated as California State Route 185; consequently any modifications would need to be coordinated with Caltrans.

a. East 14th Street – Bristol Avenue (northern city limits) to Broadmoor Boulevard (proposed)
   There is a raised center median and one travel lane in each direction. A signed bike route with sharrows is proposed. Where feasible, bike lanes should be considered.

b. East 14th Street – Broadmoor Boulevard to Toler Avenue (proposed)
   This segment is under study by the City to be striped with bike lanes including 6-foot bike lanes from Broadmoor Boulevard to Georgia Way and 4.5-foot bike lanes from Georgia Way to Toler Avenue. This segment has one travel lane in each direction with a center two-way left-turn lane.

c. East 14th Street – Toler Avenue to southern city limits (proposed)
   The segment varies in width and geometry with 1-2 travel lanes and some sections of center two-way left-turn lane. A signed bike route with sharrows is proposed. Where feasible, bike lanes should be considered.

Bikeway 34: Juana Avenue

a. Juana Avenue – Grand Avenue to San Leandro Boulevard (proposed)
   This residential collector has one travel lane in each direction with parking on both sides of the street. There are some areas with diagonal parking (west section) and others with speed bumps (east section). This bikeway was added to the 2004 Plan to provide connection to the Downtown San Leandro BART Station and an alternative to Estudillo Avenue. AC Transit routes 78, 85, and 89 operate along the western portion nearest the BART station. The street has residential and commercial development and provides access to Downtown, Downtown San Leandro BART Station and Pelton Plaza. A signed bike route is proposed.
Bikeway 35: Bancroft Avenue-Hesperian Boulevard

The Bancroft Avenue/Hesperian Boulevard bikeway provides a major north-south connection between Oakland to the north and San Lorenzo to the south through primarily residential and commercial development. This route is designated on both the MTC Regional Bikeway network and the Alameda Countywide network. The existing segments with a combination of Class II bike lanes and Class III bike routes from north to south include:

a. Bancroft Avenue – Durant Avenue (Oakland city limits) to Blossom Way (existing)
   This segment with bike lanes is located on a residential arterial with one travel lane in each direction, a center two-way left-turn lane and parking on both sides of the street. In the southbound direction at the intersection with Dutton Avenue, the bike lanes are terminated approximately 150 feet before the intersection to accommodate eight diagonal parking spaces. The posted speed limit is 30 mph in this largely residential and commercial area. Key attractors are Bancroft Middle School, McKinley Playground and Elementary School, and San Leandro High School. AC Transit routes 40 and 89 are located on this segment. This segment connects to existing bike lanes in the City of Oakland.

b. Bancroft Avenue – Blossom Way to 136th Avenue (existing)
   This is a signed Class III bike route past San Leandro High School. This residential arterial has one travel lane in each direction. On-street parking is allowed with some restrictions between 8am – 5pm. The posted speed limit is 30 mph. AC Transit routes 40 and 89 are located on this segment.

c. Bancroft Avenue – 136th Avenue to 138th Avenue (existing)
   There are bike lanes striped along this two-block segment of Bancroft adjacent to the new 9th Grade Campus. A portion of the southbound bike lane was removed during construction and needs to be replaced. There is one travel lane in each direction with parking only on the east side of the street. The posted speed limit is 30 mph. AC Transit routes 40 and 89 are located on this segment.

d. Bancroft Avenue – 138th Avenue to 142nd Avenue (existing)
   This segment of Bancroft Avenue has a signed Class III bike route along this residential arterial. There is one travel lane in each direction with parking on both sides of the street. The posted speed limit is 30 mph. AC Transit routes 40 and 89 are located on this segment.

e. Bancroft Avenue – 142nd Avenue to 146th Avenue (existing)
   This segment of Bancroft Avenue has one travel lane and bike lanes in each direction with parking on both sides of the street. Key destinations along this residential arterial include Jefferson Elementary School and Toyon Park. The posted speed limit is 30 mph. AC Transit routes 40 and 89 are located on this segment.

f. Bancroft Avenue – 146th Avenue to East 14th Street/Hesperian Boulevard (existing)
   This segment of Bancroft Avenue has a signed Class III bike route along this arterial. There is one travel lane in each direction with parking on
both sides of the street. The posted speed limit is 30 mph. AC Transit routes 40 and 89 are located on this segment.

g. Hesperian Boulevard - East 14th Street to Springlake Drive (existing)
This segment of the bikeway on Hesperian Boulevard has bike lanes and 2-3 travel lanes in each direction with raised medians along most of its length. On-street parking is allowed in most locations of this arterial located through commercial and residential development. Key destinations include the Bayfair Center and Bay Fair BART Station. The posted speed limit is 40 mph. AC Transit routes 32, 89 and 97 operate along portions of this segment. Hesperian Boulevard from East 14th Street to Halcyon Drive/Fairmont Drive is included on both the MTC Regional Bikeway network and the Alameda Countywide network. The segment from Halcyon Drive/Fairmont Drive to Springlake Drive is part of the Alameda Countywide network only.

h. Hesperian Boulevard – Springlake Drive to San Lorenzo Creek (proposed)
This arterial street has three travel lanes in each direction with a raised center median; on-street parking is not permitted. AC Transit routes 32 and 97 operate through this area of commercial development including interchanges with I-880 and I-238. An engineering study is needed to determine how to accommodate bike lanes on this segment. It should be noted that improvements to this segment of Hesperian Boulevard would require coordination with the County.

Bikeway 40: Sybil Avenue-Castro Street-Williams Street

a. Sybil Avenue – Grand Avenue to East 14th Street (proposed)
This residential collector street has one travel lane in each direction with parking on both sides of the street. It provides access to Downtown and is proposed for a signed bike route with sharrows.

b. Castro Street – East 14th Street to Washington Avenue (proposed)
This one block segment of collector street has one travel lane in each direction with parking on both sides of the street. It provides access to Downtown through a residential neighborhood and is proposed for a signed bike route with sharrows.

c. Williams Street – Washington Avenue to San Leandro Boulevard (proposed)
This collector street has one travel lane in each direction with parking on both sides of the street. It travels through residential development and provides access to Downtown and the Downtown San Leandro BART Station. Bike lanes are proposed with lane narrowing and restriping.

d. Williams Street – San Leandro Boulevard to Neptune Drive (existing)
This east-west collector street has one travel lane and bike lanes in each direction. On-street parking is permitted in some locations particularly east of I-880. Where parking is not available, vehicles are often found parked partially blocking the bike lanes and/or the sidewalk especially near Alvarado Street. This bikeway provides access to the San Leandro
Adult, Woodrow Wilson Elementary and John Muir Middle schools as well as the Bay Trail and Oyster Bay Regional Shoreline. Posted speed limits are from 30-35 mph. AC Transit route 75 operates on Williams Street from San Leandro Boulevard to Merced Street.

Bikeway 45: MacArthur Boulevard-Superior Avenue-Grand Avenue-Evergreen Avenue-School Street-Lark Street

a. MacArthur Boulevard – Durant Avenue to Superior Avenue (proposed)
This arterial street has a signed bike route installed as part of the MacArthur Boulevard Streetscape project. However, additional signage is needed. This bikeway connects to proposed routes on MacArthur and Foothill Boulevards in Oakland. This segment has one travel lane in each direction with parking on both sides of the street. Some of the parking is diagonal. AC Transit routes NX3, NX4 and 75 operate along this segment. Based upon the roadway width, bike lanes could be added.

b. Superior Avenue – MacArthur Boulevard to Dowling Boulevard (proposed)
To avoid the I-580 interchange, this bikeway is directed to Superior Avenue. It is a residential street with one travel lane in each direction and parking on both sides of the street. It is proposed for a signed bike route.

c. Superior Avenue – Dowling Boulevard to Oakes Boulevard (proposed)
This residential street has one travel lane in each direction and parking on both sides of the street. It is proposed for a signed bike route.

d. MacArthur Boulevard – Dowling Boulevard to Joaquin Avenue/Grand Avenue (existing)
This arterial street has signed bike routes between Dowling Boulevard and Estudillo Avenue as part of the MacArthur Boulevard Streetscape project. However, additional signage is needed. The street has one travel lane in each direction with parking on both sides of the street. It has a raised median and a posted speed limit of 35 mph. AC Transit routes 75, NX3, and NX4 operate along the roadway.

e. Grand Avenue - Joaquin Avenue/Grand Avenue to Sybil Avenue (proposed)
This collector street has two travel lanes and parking on only one side of the street (southbound). It has a posted speed limit of 30 mph and carries AC Transit routes NX4 and 75. This is primarily a residential and commercial area. It is proposed for a signed bike route with sharrows.

f. Evergreen Avenue – Sybil Avenue to School Street (proposed)
This segment and the following two segments are additions to the 2004 Plan. This bikeway is located on a residential street with one travel lane in each direction with speed bumps and parking on both sides of the street. It provides access to the San Leandro High School. It is proposed for a signed bike route.

g. School Street – Evergreen Street to Russ Avenue (proposed)
This segment of bikeway is located on a residential street with one travel lane in each direction and parking on both sides of the street. It
provides access to the Assumption School. It is proposed for a signed bike route.

h. Russ Avenue – School Street to Wake Avenue (proposed)
This short segment of bikeway is located on a residential street with one travel lane in each direction and parking on both sides of the street. It is proposed for a signed bike route.

i. Wake Avenue – Russ Avenue to Halsey Avenue (proposed)
This bikeway is located on a residential street with one travel lane in each direction and parking on both sides of the street. It provides a parallel alternative to Bancroft Avenue for a short distance with ultimate connection to 150th Avenue. It is proposed for a signed bike route.

j. Halsey Avenue - Wake Avenue to Lark Street (proposed)
This bikeway is located on a residential street with one travel lane in each direction and parking on both sides of the street. It provides a parallel alternative to Bancroft Avenue for a short distance with ultimate connection to 150th Avenue. It is proposed for a signed bike route.

k. Lark Street – Halsey Avenue to 150th Avenue (proposed)
This bikeway is located on a residential street with one travel lane in each direction with speed bumps and parking on both sides of the street. It completes the connection from MacArthur Boulevard to 150th Avenue providing a low traffic volume alternative to Bancroft Avenue. It is proposed for a signed bike route.

Bikeway 46: 143rd Avenue

a. 143rd Avenue – East 14th Street to Washington Avenue (proposed)
This collector street has one travel lane in each direction with parking on both sides of the street. It is surrounded by residential, commercial and light industrial development and provides connection to Heath Park. The posted speed limit is 30 mph. This segment is proposed as a signed bike route.

Bikeway 47: Foothill Boulevard

a. Foothill Boulevard – Durant Avenue to MacArthur Boulevard (proposed)
This collector street has one travel lane in each direction with parking on one side of the street only (southbound). AC Transit route NX4 operates through this residential and commercial area. This segment was added to the 2004 network to provide a connection to proposed bikeway in Oakland. The proposed bike lanes can be accommodated with striping only but it would be preferable to move the center line to provide more width to the southbound direction.
Bikeway 50: Aladdin Avenue - Fairway Drive

a. Aladdin Avenue – Alvarado Street to Teagarden Street (existing)
   This arterial street has one travel lane and bike lanes in each direction; on-street parking is not permitted. The posted speed limit is 40 mph. This bikeway through commercial, light industrial and office development provides access to Lincoln High School and Burrell Field.

b. Fairway Drive – Teagarden Street to Miller Street (existing)
   This segment of Fairway Drive is primarily the overpass of I-880 although surrounding land uses are commercial, office, parkland and vacant space which is the future site of the Kaiser Hospital. Other attractors along this segment are Lincoln High School and Burrell Field. The roadway has one lane of traffic in each direction with a posted speed limit of 40 mph. On-street parking is not permitted. This segment is currently a signed bike route but it is recommended that sharrows and ‘share the road’ or ‘bikes on roadway’ signs be added to the overpass. In addition, ‘yield to bikes’ signage should be added to the westbound merge for traffic entering Fairway Drive on the west side of the overpass.

c. Fairway Drive – Miller Street to Menlo Street (railroad tracks) (existing)
   This arterial street has one travel lane and bike lanes in each direction; on-street parking is not permitted. The area has commercial and light industrial development. The posted speed limit is 40 mph.

d. Fairway Drive – Menlo Street to Doolittle Drive (existing)
   This arterial street has one travel lane and bike lanes in each direction with parking on both sides of the street. The area has residential and commercial development. The posted speed limit is 30 mph.

e. Fairway Drive – Doolittle Drive to Aurora Drive (existing)
   This residential collector has one travel lane and bike lanes in each direction with parking on both sides of the street. The area is primarily residential and includes the Mulford-Marina Branch Library. The posted speed limit is 30 mph.

f. Fairway Drive – Aurora Drive to Monarch Bay Drive (existing)
   This residential collector has one travel lane and bike lanes in each direction and a raised planted center median; on-street parking is not permitted. Surrounding land uses include residential and parkland. Key attractors include the Mulford-Marina Branch Library, Bay Trail, Marina Park, and Tony Lema Golf Course. The posted speed limit is 30 mph. AC Transit route 89 operates along this segment.

Bikeway 54: 150th Avenue

a. 150th Avenue – Freedom Avenue (eastern city limits) to Hesperian Boulevard (proposed)
   This addition to the 2004 Plan would provide an indirect connection to the Alameda County route on Foothill Boulevard as well as an alternative to Fairmont Drive. It is an arterial street with two travel lanes in each direction and parking on both sides of the street. The area
has residential and commercial development. The posted speed limit is 35 mph. This bikeway is proposed for a signed bike route with sharrows.

**Bikeway 58: Manor Boulevard**

a. Manor Boulevard – Norton Street to Wicks Boulevard (proposed)
   This residential collector street was included in the 2004 Plan but is proposed to be extended east to Norton Street. It has one travel lane in each direction with parking on both sides of the street and posted speed limit of 30 mph. This bikeway provides access through the heart of the Manor neighborhood and connects to the Manor Branch Library, Manor Shopping Center, Manor Square retail, and St. Felicita School. It is proposed as a signed bike routes with sharrows.

**Bikeway 60: Fairmont Drive-Halcyon Drive-Floresta Boulevard-Farnsworth Street**

a. Fairmont Drive – East 14th Street to Hesperian Boulevard (proposed)
   This segment is part of the Alameda County and regional bikeway networks and connects to these networks in the adjacent unincorporated county. The arterial street has 2-3 travel lanes and a raised median; on-street parking is not permitted. The area is primarily commercial with the bikeway providing connection to the Bayfair Center and Bay Fair BART Station. The posted speed limit is 35 mph. AC Transit route 89 operates along this segment. An engineering study is needed to determine how to incorporate the proposed bike lanes.

b. Halcyon Drive – Hesperian Boulevard to BART tracks (existing)
   This short east-west segment of bike lanes is located on a residential arterial with two travel lanes in each direction and no on-street parking. The street has a raised median and a posted speed limit of 40 mph. The area is primarily residential and commercial. AC Transit route 89 operates along this street. Key destinations include the Bayfair Center.

c. Halcyon Drive – BART tracks to Washington Avenue (proposed)
   This residential arterial street has two lanes in each direction with a raised center median; on-street parking is not permitted. The posted speed limit is 40 mph. AC Transit route 89 operates along this segment. An engineering study is needed to determine how best to incorporate the proposed bike lanes although they should fit in the available right-of-way. In addition, the existing mainline tracks are at an acute angle to the roadway. This can pose a hazard to bicyclists. It is recommended that the roadway be widened at the tracks so that the bike lanes can cross the tracks at more of a right angle (similar to what was done on Washington Avenue north of Halcyon Drive).

d. Floresta Boulevard – Washington Avenue to Fremont Avenue (existing)
   This short east-west segment of bike lanes is located on an arterial with two travel lanes in each direction and no on-street parking. The street has a raised median and a posted speed limit of 35 mph. The area is primarily commercial. AC Transit route 89 operates along this street. This facility was built since the 2004 Plan.
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e. Floresta Boulevard – Fremont Avenue to Monterey Boulevard (proposed)
This residential arterial has two travel lanes in each direction with parking on both sides of the street. This street has a posted speed limit of 35 mph in this predominantly residential area. AC Transit route 89 operates on this segment. This bikeway would provide access to Floresta Park and Monroe Elementary School. It is proposed as a signed bike route with sharrows.

f. Floresta Boulevard/Farnsworth Street – Monterey Boulevard to Corvallis Street (proposed)
This residential arterial/collector has two travel lanes in each direction; on-street parking is not permitted. This street has a posted speed limit of 35 mph in this predominantly residential area although it includes an overpass of I-880. AC Transit route 89 operates on this segment. This bikeway would provide access to Corvallis Elementary School. It is proposed as a signed bike route with sharrows.

g. Farnsworth Street – Corvallis Street to Vining Drive (proposed)
This residential collector has one travel lane in each direction with parking on both sides of the street. This street has a posted speed limit of 30 mph in this residential and commercial area. AC Transit routes S, 75, and 89 operate on this segment. This bikeway would provide access to Washington Manor Middle, Manor Branch Library, and Washington Manor retail. It is proposed as a signed bike route with sharrows. Consider removing the free-right turn from eastbound Corvallis Street as part of the bikeway improvements.

Bikeway 62: Springlake Drive

a. Springlake Drive – Hesperian Boulevard to Loch Lane/Creekside Drive (existing)
This east-west collector has one travel lane and bike lanes in each direction with a raised center median. On-street parking is permitted on both sides of the street. The posted speed limit is 35 mph. Most of the residential development fronts on interior roadways; no access is available from Springlake Drive.

b. Springlake Drive – Loch Lane/Creekside Drive to Washington Avenue (existing)
This east-west collector has one travel lane and bike lanes in each direction with a center two-way left-turn lane. On-street parking is not permitted. The posted speed limit is 35 mph. Most of the residential development fronts on interior roadways; no access is available from Springlake Drive. The westbound bike lane on the approach to Washington Avenue is striped beyond the start of the right-turn lane. The bike lane should be ended before the turn lane with a through bike lane added.
Bikeway 64: Fargo Avenue

a. Fargo Avenue – Washington Avenue to Farnsworth Street (proposed)
   This residential collector street has one travel lane in each direction with parking on both sides of the street. It is mostly a residential neighborhood but with some commercial at the major intersections. It provides access to the Chinese Christian School, Washington Manor Middle School, and Greenhouse Marketplace Shopping Center. It is proposed for a signed bike route.

Bikeway 66: Estudillo Canal Trail

a. Estudillo Canal Trail – Farnsworth Street to Bay (proposed)
   This proposed Class I bike path would provide a connection to the Bay Trail, Tony Lema Golf Course and Marina Park. There are, however, some engineering issues, particularly at the crossings of the railroad tracks and Wicks Boulevard. Development of this facility would need to be coordinated with Alameda County Flood Control.

Bikeway 68: Burkhart Avenue

a. Burkhart Avenue – Norton Street to Wicks Boulevard (proposed)
   This residential street bikeway was added to the 2004 network to provide a connection through the neighborhood until the Estudillo Canal Trail could be built. It has one travel lane in each direction with parking on both sides of the street. It is proposed for a signed bike route.

Bikeway 70: Lewelling Boulevard/Bayfront Drive

a. Lewelling Boulevard – Hesperian Boulevard (eastern city limits) to Washington Avenue (proposed)
   This arterial street has two travel lanes in each direction with a center two-way left-turn lane. This bikeway runs through primarily commercial development with some multi-family residential and provides connection to the Greenhouse Marketplace shopping center and the Community Christian School. This segment also provides connection to San Lorenzo High School in San Lorenzo via the Alameda County proposed bike lanes on Lewelling Boulevard east of the San Leandro city limits. The posted speed limit is 35 mph. AC Transit route 75 operates along this segment. A signed bike route with sharrows is proposed for this segment; as part of the bike route installation, this facility would benefit from narrowing travel lanes for wider curb lanes.

b. Lewelling Boulevard – Washington Avenue to Sedgeman Street (existing)
   This residential arterial is a signed Class III bike route with two travel lanes in each direction and on-street parking on both sides of the street. Land uses include residential and commercial development and the Lewelling Playground. The posted speed limit is 35 mph. This segment, in combination with Farallon Drive, Wicks Boulevard, and Doolittle Drive, provides a major north-south connection between Oakland to the
north and San Lorenzo to the south. This route is designated on both the MTC Regional Bikeway network and the Alameda Countywide network. AC Transit routes S and 75 operate along portions of this segment. This segment is proposed for upgrade to bike lanes. Narrowing of the center two-way left-turn lane and inside travel lanes may be necessary.

c. Lewelling Boulevard - Sedgeman Street to Wicks Boulevard (existing)

This residential arterial has bike lanes with two travel lanes in each direction, raised median, and no on-street parking. The posted speed limit is 40 mph. This segment, in combination with Farallon Drive, Wicks Boulevard, and Doolittle Drive, provides a major north-south connection between Oakland to the north and San Lorenzo to the south. This route is designated on both the MTC Regional Bikeway network and the Alameda Countywide network. AC Transit routes S, 75 and 89 operate along portions of this segment. The residential development does not front on Lewelling Boulevard; access to houses is available from internal roadways.

d. Lewelling Boulevard - Wicks Boulevard to west of the railroad tracks at Bayfront Drive (existing)

This short segment of Lewelling Boulevard is a residential street with bike lanes and one travel lane in each direction. Although the bike lanes are striped, there are no posted bike lane signs or pavement markings in the lanes. No on-street parking is permitted. A wide raised median (22 feet) is planted with trees and shrubs.

e. Bayfront Drive – west of railroad tracks to Harbor Way (proposed)

This segment was shown as an existing bike route in the 2004 Plan but there is no signage to designate this facility. This residential street has one travel lane in each direction with parking on the westbound side only. It provides access to the Bay Trail. Bike route signage is needed.
Appendix C: Pedestrian Improvement Areas and Key Pedestrian Locations

The most memorable and sought after pedestrian environments are places where people have the opportunity to slow down, enjoy their surroundings, and observe or interact with other members of their community. To achieve this status, pedestrian facilities need to be designed to exceed the minimum requirements, and include amenities that encourage and promote walking. Walkability is a qualitative measure of the degree to which a pedestrian network encourages walking. Walkability is influenced by all aspects of the built environment; the availability and maintenance of aspects of the pedestrian network, such as sidewalks, crosswalks, curb ramps, and street trees, and the availability of pedestrian amenities such as benches and wayfinding signage.

Throughout this document the term “pedestrian” will be used to include all persons who utilize the sidewalks and crosswalks regardless of their type of mobility. The goal of pedestrian oriented design is to meet the needs of all users, regardless of their age, their destination, or if they walk or roll in a wheelchair.

Pedestrian Improvement Areas

The City of San Leandro and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) have identified Pedestrian Improvement Areas as areas where walkability is critical and should be improved. The Pedestrian Improvement Areas were chosen for a number of reasons, which will be further elaborated upon below, but include proximity to important destinations, provision of connectivity, or potential for future development. A total of ten Pedestrian Improvement Areas are identified as part of this Plan, seven of which were previously identified in the 2004 Plan, and three that are new. The discussion of each Pedestrian Improvement Area summarizes the existing conditions and identified needs. Figure C-1 illustrates the Pedestrian Improvement Areas discussed below.
PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENT AREAS

Figure C-1
1. San Leandro Marina

This Pedestrian Improvement Area includes the area along Monarch Bay Drive adjacent to the Marina as well as the neighborhood around Marina Boulevard and Doolittle Drive. This area is adjacent to the Marina, a major local and regional destination, a residential neighborhood, and an elementary school.

**Recent Improvements**

There have been very few recent pedestrian improvements in this area. The intersection of Marina Boulevard and Neptune Drive has been redesigned with a center median to prevent vehicles from cutting through the neighborhood to the north. This intersection is a key link between the neighborhood and the Marina.

**Needed Improvements**

- **Marina:** Within the Marina it is difficult to identify the difference between the Bay Trail and local waterfront access paths and parking lots. Monarch Bay Drive is a wide street that does not have sidewalks consistently on both sides of the street. Additionally, north of Fairway Drive, there is public parking on the east of Monarch Bay Drive that has no accessible parking spaces and provides no sidewalks, curb ramps, or connections to crosswalks. Along Monarch Bay Drive, south of Fairway Drive, there is parking on the east side of the street that is widely used, however there are no crosswalks across Monarch Bay Drive and as a result pedestrians cross at many locations. Additionally, many of the pathways in and around Marina Park, that sometimes double as sidewalks, are asphalt pathways that have degraded and need to be repaired or replaced because they do not meet ADA requirements.

- **Marina Neighborhood:** The Marina neighborhood has no recent pedestrian improvements. The sidewalks, curb ramps and crosswalks throughout the neighborhood do not meet accessibility requirements. There are few improvements near Garfield Elementary school to improve pedestrian safety.

- **Intersection of Monarch Bay Drive and Neptune Drive:** The intersection has been designed with a median that prevents cars from turning left onto Neptune Drive from Monarch Bay Drive. Unfortunately, this median limits bicycle and pedestrian access to the neighborhood.

2. Westgate Center

The Westgate Center Pedestrian Improvement Area includes the Westgate Shopping Center, the intersections of Timothy Drive and Davis Street, and the area along West Gate Parkway.
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Recent Improvements
There have been no major recent improvements in this Pedestrian Improvement Area.

Needed Improvements

- **Parking Lots**: The Westgate Center parking lots contain limited vegetation or overhead tree canopy for shading of the parking lot. There are minimal safe pedestrian connections through the parking lot, with no sidewalk routes or crosswalks.

- **Connectivity**: The connections to Westgate Center from Davis Street and West Gate Parkway are poor and need safety improvements. Additionally, because Westgate Center is a major destination, there should be better wayfinding signage to guide pedestrians and bicycles to its location.

- **Davis Street Intersection**: This intersection is adjacent to freeway on- and off-ramps, and connects two popular retail destinations across a highly traveled street. Pedestrians are directed to cross Davis Street on the west side of the intersection.

3. **Kaiser Development Area**

This Pedestrian Improvement Area encompasses the location of the future Kaiser Permanente San Leandro Medical Center/Mixed-Use Retail Development Project. The area is bounded by Marina Boulevard to the north, Merced Street to the west, Fairway Drive to the south, and I-880 to the east.

Needed Improvements

- **Sidewalks**: The Future Kaiser Permanente Site is vacant and under construction. There are 5-6 foot wide sidewalks that surround a portion of the site, and other portions along Fairway Drive that have no sidewalks. The existing sidewalks have no landscaping buffer or trees.

4. **Manor Boulevard/Washington Avenue**

This Pedestrian Improvement Area includes the Manor Boulevard corridor from Juniper Street to Washington Avenue and the Washington Avenue corridor from San Leandro Boulevard to Lewelling Boulevard. This Pedestrian Area incorporates an active neighborhood commercial district with significant pedestrian traffic near the intersection of Farnsworth Street.

Recent Improvements

- **Manor Boulevard and Farnsworth Street Intersection**: Recent streetscape improvements at this intersection include new sidewalk paving, pedestrian scaled lighting, updated curb ramps, and landscaping. There is also a new mid-block crossing with pedestrian actuated flashing beacons and an in-pavement lighted crosswalk across Manor Boulevard. Recent sidewalk improvements have been installed in conjunction with the recent
renovation of the Manor Branch Library. The sidewalk improvements are an important addition to the area, however it should be noted that the inclusion of 4-foot by 4-foot tree grates in a 6-foot sidewalk creates accessibility issues. While the tree grates and the remaining 2-foot of sidewalk provide an adequate travel width, it is a less than preferred design because the opening in the tree grates creates potential safety issues for people with visibility impairments.

**Needed Improvements**

- **Manor Boulevard:** Other than the pedestrian improvements at the intersection of Manor Boulevard and Farnsworth Street, there have been few pedestrian improvements along Manor Avenue. East of Farnsworth Street, the distance between crosswalks varies between 650 feet to 1,600 feet, which does not encourage walkability. The sidewalks along Manor Boulevard are approximately 4-feet wide, the minimum width required to meet accessibility standards. Along Manor Boulevard, there are some landscaped strips adjacent to the sidewalk, but in most instances a rolled curb separates the sidewalk from the street. A rolled curb encourages drivers to park their cars partially on the sidewalk; this activity infringes on the width of sidewalk available to pedestrians with the potential for an obstructed path of travel.

- **Washington Avenue:** This section of Washington Avenue is very wide, and vehicles are frequently traveling at high speeds, resulting in an inhospitable pedestrian environment. The sidewalks along Washington Avenue are generally between 6- to 10-feet wide, with no landscape strip to improve the aesthetics or buffer the pedestrian from the fast roadway traffic. There are also very few crosswalks along Washington Avenue, with up to 1,700 feet between crosswalks. Additionally, many of the curb ramps need to be updated to meet ADA requirements.

Washington Avenue is also challenging for pedestrians because it intersects with a number of other major roads. Many of these intersections are designed with channelized right turn lanes with pork-chop islands that allow drivers to make unrestricted right turns. Channelized right turns are dangerous for pedestrians because they direct pedestrians to cross in front of drivers who are not forced to stop before making a right turn.

Just south of San Leandro Boulevard, Washington Avenue travels underground to avoid an at-grade crossing with the Union Pacific Railroad tracks. Pedestrians and bicycles are not allowed to use the tunnel, which limits pedestrian and bicycle connectivity in this area of the City.

Washington Avenue provides one of San Leandro’s few pedestrian connections across I-880, which is very important for pedestrian connectivity. The pedestrian path of travel is a 5-foot sidewalk on the west side of the Washington Avenue/I-880 overpass. This pedestrian route is challenging because there is no buffer separating the pedestrian from the adjacent fast moving traffic.
5. The Downtown San Leandro BART Station

The Downtown San Leandro BART Station Pedestrian Improvement Area is bounded by Davis Street to the north, the railroad tracks to the west, Marina Boulevards and Estabrook Street to the south, and East 14th Street to the east. The area expands at its eastern boundary to include the San Leandro Main Library between Estudillo Avenue and Callan Avenue. This Pedestrian Improvement Area includes much of Downtown San Leandro, the Downtown San Leandro BART Station, a number of employment locations, and areas of future development. The area surrounding the BART station is also identified as a pedestrian district in the City’s General Plan.

Recent Improvements

This Pedestrian Improvement Area has undergone a number of specific pedestrian improvements since the 2004 Plan. As part of the Downtown beautification projects, the San Leandro Retail Plaza has recently undergone pedestrian, parking and landscaping updates that encourage the retail nature of the area by improving the area’s safety, circulation and aesthetics. The project also included the development of a new public plaza between the retail area and East 14th Street with a water feature and seating that provides dining areas for the adjacent restaurants.

West Estudillo Avenue, between San Leandro Avenue and Hays Street, has undergone recent streetscape improvements as part of the San Leandro History Walk project. The History Walk connects to a new esplanade designed as part of the improvements to the San Leandro Plaza and provides an important link between the Downtown San Leandro BART Station and Downtown.

Needed Improvements

The Downtown San Leandro BART Station Pedestrian Improvement Area is large and includes areas that are in need of much improvement. This Improvement Area has a number of opportunity sites that are being planned for redevelopment, and it is likely that pedestrian network improvements will be tied to the new development.

- West Juana Avenue: West Juana Avenue has one lane of traffic in each direction with a mixture of diagonal and parallel parking on either side. The roadway is 55 feet in width from curb-to-curb, which is very wide for a two lane road.

- San Leandro Boulevard BART Pedestrian Interface Plan: The Downtown San Leandro BART Station will undergo a number of future changes. As part of the City of San Leandro’s TOD strategy, the BART parking lot to the east of the station and the vacant area to the west of the station are both slated to become mixed-use TOD developments. The Downtown San Leandro BART Station is to be redesigned to accommodate the southern terminus of AC Transit’s Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) line. As part of the San Leandro Boulevard BART Pedestrian Interface Plan, current planning for San Leandro Boulevard improves the access and connectivity to the BART station.
Presently the sidewalks along the front of the BART station are incomplete and not fully accessible in many locations.

- **Railroad Crossings**: The sidewalks located at the at-grade crossings with the railroad tracks on Williams and Davis streets are not accessible and have been the location of vehicle and pedestrian accidents. Improvements that address the accessibility and safety at these locations are necessary.

- **Residential Neighborhood**: An existing residential neighborhood at the southern portion of the study area will likely not change too drastically in the future. The streets within this neighborhood have one lane in each direction with on street parking. The sidewalks range between 6- to 10-feet, and in some places there is a landscape strip of up to 4-feet in width as a buffer from the street. The sidewalks in the neighborhood are old and not accessible in many locations. The planting of the landscape strip is inconsistent.

  The majority of the intersections are two-way stop controlled intersections, and the striping of crosswalks at the intersections is inconsistent. There are curb ramps at most of the intersections, however many do not meet current ADA requirements and should be upgraded.

6. **East 14th Street Corridor**

The East 14th Street Corridor Pedestrian Improvement Area encompasses the nearly three miles of East 14th Street within the City limits. This Pedestrian Improvement Area serves as a primary local vehicle and transit route, providing access to employment centers, as well as, pedestrian generators such as schools, libraries, and parks. The corridor was identified in the City’s General Plan as a priority for improving pedestrian safety and walkability. Since East 14th Street is a State Route (SR 185), coordination with Caltrans would be necessary for any modifications to the street’s right-of-way.

Historically, East 14th Street was a main regional highway lined with bustling commercial destinations. However, since the implementation of the regional freeway system in the 1960’s, the Corridor’s importance as a regional connector has decreased and many of the commercial strip areas and auto-oriented uses are out of date; much of the corridor suffers from a lack of investment.

The East 14th Street corridor is the backbone of the City of San Leandro’s Downtown and recent Downtown beautification projects have increased the safety and walkability of East 14th Street within the Downtown.

**Recent Improvements**

Recent streetscape improvements along the East 14th Street Corridor in the Downtown include upgraded sidewalks in front of City Hall, new street tree grates, decorative paving, pedestrian furniture, and ADA improvements. The west side of East 14th Street between Davis Street and West Juana Avenue has been improved with decorative paving, pedestrian scaled lighting, landscaping,
pedestrian furniture, wayfinding, and ADA improvements. The streetscape improvements are all of a consistent streetscape palette, which includes similar paving colors and consistent pedestrian lighting and furniture fixtures.

**Needed Improvements**

- **Corridor-wide Improvements:** With the exception of the downtown areas noted above, the East 14th Street Corridor is ripe for improvements to the pedestrian network. Throughout the corridor there are many auto-oriented land uses that have expansive parking areas adjacent to the public realm, which negatively contributes to the pedestrian environment. These uses result in a large number of driveway ramps that are found throughout the corridor. Driveway ramps reduce safety for pedestrians by creating potential conflict points between pedestrians and vehicles.

  Sidewalks are consistent along both sides of East 14th Street and range between 8-14 feet in width. There are a number of mature street trees along the corridor; planted in 4-foot by 4-foot tree pits with metal grates. There is great potential to improve the width and surface of the sidewalk in order to establish a consistent and ADA accessible pathway.

- **North of Downtown:** North of Davis Street, the cross section of East 14th Street is one vehicle travel lane in each direction, a center two-way left-turn lane, and two parking lanes, within the 65-foot curb-to-curb width. The crosswalks in this segment of East 14th Street are spaced between 300 – 400 feet apart, which is an acceptable distance for pedestrians. There are a number of crosswalks located at unsignalized intersections that are faded and could benefit from repainting for improved visibility.

  At the north end of the City on the border with Oakland, East 14th Street transitions to two vehicle travel lanes in each direction with a center landscaped median. The median helps to improve the aesthetics of the area and calm traffic. However the median is not well coordinated with crosswalks and does not help to improve pedestrian safety or connectivity in crossing the street.

- **South of Downtown:** Along the East 14th Street Corridor south of Dolores Avenue, the cross section of East 14th Street includes two vehicle travel lanes in each direction, a center two-way left-turn lane, and on-street parking on both sides within an 80-foot curb-to-curb width. The wide street cross section presents challenges for pedestrians to cross the street within the timing of pedestrian signals; pedestrian crossings are especially difficult at unsignalized intersections.

  Along this portion of the corridor, there are a limited number of crosswalks across East 14th Street with 1,000 – 1,700 feet between crosswalks. This scarcity of crosswalks does not foster pedestrian connectivity especially because the road is so wide that many pedestrians are unlikely to cross at locations without a crosswalk. Additionally, many of these crosswalks are located at unsignalized intersections, and they suffer from poor visibility.
The East 14th Street South Area Development Strategy was prepared in 2004 for the East 14th Corridor south of San Leandro’s Downtown. The primary intent of the Development Strategy was to revitalize the southern portion of the East 14th Street Corridor by attracting desirable uses, providing streetscape improvements and by ensuring that new developments are of the highest quality design. The Strategy identifies extensive streetscape recommendations for changes to East 14th Street including lane reconfiguration, new crosswalk locations, design guidelines for new development, and streetscape improvements. The Strategy envisions streetscape improvements in conjunction with the redevelopment of prime opportunity sites, as catalysts for the economic revitalization of these areas.

7. Bancroft Avenue/Dutton Avenue

This Pedestrian Improvement Area encompasses Dutton Avenue from Breed Avenue to Chetland Road, and Bancroft Avenue from Dowling Boulevard to 138th Avenue. The area includes a small commercial district located at the intersection of Bancroft Avenue and Dutton Avenue that serves residences in the surrounding neighborhood, as well as, an influx of pedestrians during community events. Bancroft Avenue is a major north-south connector within the City that is lined by residential uses and also includes a number of schools.

Recent Improvements

This area has had very few recent pedestrian improvements with the exception of crosswalk improvements in front of Washington Elementary School, Roosevelt Elementary School, Bancroft Middle School, and San Leandro High School. This area includes a few curb ramp improvements that are scattered throughout the corridor.

Needed Improvements

- **Dutton Avenue/Bancroft Avenue Intersection Retail Area**: This intersection is an important vibrant neighborhood retail area with a number of active uses that attracts people from outside of the neighborhood. The sidewalks at this location are between 8-10 feet wide, which limits the potential for sidewalk spillover by adjacent restaurants and businesses. The curb ramps at this busy intersection do not meet accessibility standards and are not built to best practices.

- **9th Grade Campus**: The San Leandro High School is currently expanding and creating a new 9th Grade Campus on the south side of Bancroft Avenue between 136th and 138th Avenues. The new campus will result in a number of students traveling between the two schools during the day.
8. The Bayfair BART Station
This Pedestrian Improvement Area encompasses the BART station, Bayfair Mall, and adjacent areas on Hesperian Boulevard and Fairmount Drive.

Recent Improvements
- **Coehlo Drive**: Recent improvements implemented by Alameda County include new sidewalks, pedestrian scaled lighting and landscaping on Coehlo Drive between East 14th Street and the Bay Fair BART Station.
- **Bayfair Center**: Bayfair Center has recently upgraded aspects of their parking lot to incorporate better pedestrian walkways and improved landscaping.

Needed Improvements
- **Hesperian Boulevard**: Hesperian Boulevard is an important pedestrian connection to Bayfair Center and the Bay Fair BART from the adjacent neighborhoods. Hesperian Boulevard has fairly wide sidewalks but no landscaping or buffer to separate the pedestrian from the fast moving traffic on the street. Additionally, Hesperian Avenue has a paved center median, without any landscaping or pedestrian refuge areas. The wide intersections of Hesperian Boulevard/Bayfair Drive and Hesperian Boulevard/Fairmount Drive are difficult for pedestrians to cross.
- **Bay Fair BART Station**: The Bay Fair BART Station Area Improvement Plan, sponsored by BART in cooperation with the City of San Leandro, was recently completed. Based upon the Plan, BART has applied for and received funding from a Safe Routes to Transit Grant. The grant funding will be used to implement the recommendations from the plan for new pedestrian lighting in and around the BART station, implementing a Class III bike route on Thornally Drive, and upgrading the pedestrian bridge that connects the BART station and Bayfair Center.

9. MacArthur Boulevard
This Pedestrian Improvement Area extends along MacArthur Boulevard from Durant Avenue to Estudillo Avenue. The area incorporates two retail corridor districts and access to and from Interstate I-580. As part of Phase I of the MacArthur Boulevard Improvement Project there have been a number of streetscape improvements along MacArthur Boulevard in the retail areas (between Dutton Avenue and Estudillo Avenue, and between Lewis Avenue and Durant Avenue).

Recent Improvements
The City of San Leandro has plans for the entire improvement area, and has successfully implemented some aspects of the design.
- **MacArthur Boulevard between Dutton Avenue and Estudillo Avenue**: The City has recently implemented streetscape improvements throughout this
sub-area. This sub-area contains small scale, neighborhood retail. The streetscape improvements help to enliven this retail area, and include new decorative sidewalk paving, widened sidewalks, curb extensions, landscaped roadway medians, pedestrian scaled lighting, street trees, reorganized parking, crosswalks, and new pedestrian seating areas. The palette of streetscape improvements is similar to the palette used in the Downtown, helping to visually tie these two areas together.

- **MacArthur Boulevard between Lewis Avenue and Durant Avenue**: There have been a number of focused streetscape improvements implemented along this section of MacArthur Boulevard. The main improvements are at intersections and include new curb ramps, curb extensions, and newly striped crosswalks. Pedestrian-scaled lighting has also been implemented throughout the corridor. Street furniture has been incorporated along the corridor and at bus stops. This section of MacArthur Boulevard also benefits from a fairly consistent planting of mature street trees. The sidewalks along this section of MacArthur have been entirely replaced at intersections where there are new curb extensions or curb ramp improvements; however the sidewalks along the majority of the corridor have only been improved for the first 1-2 feet along the curb.

**Needed Improvements**

- **MacArthur Boulevard between Lewis Avenue and Dutton Avenue**: This sub-area of the Improvement Area includes the on- and off-ramps to I-580, and there have been no recent pedestrian improvements. In comparison to the other two sub-areas along MacArthur Boulevard, this sub-area is not dominated by retail. Instead it contains a mixture of housing types, some retail, and includes two medium-sized churches. There are intersections along this portion of MacArthur that have no curb ramps or striped crosswalks. Cars were observed speeding onto and off of the freeway on- and off-ramps in this area. The freeway off-ramps merge into wide lanes along MacArthur Boulevard, which encourages high speeds. Additionally, there are few visual cues, and/or signage, to alert drivers that they should slow down.

10. **Estudillo Avenue from the I-580 Underpass to Anthony Chabot Park**

This Pedestrian Improvement Area encompasses Estudillo Avenue from the I-580 Underpass to Anthony Chabot Park. Anthony Chabot Park is a major destination for residents of the City of San Leandro. Currently pedestrian access to the park is limited and unsafe.

**Needed Improvements**

- **Sidewalks**: The sidewalks along Estudillo Avenue end shortly east of the I-580 underpass and in some instances there is a minimal shoulder along the road for pedestrian use.
Wayfinding: It is very difficult for pedestrians or drivers to find the entrance to Anthony Chabot Park because it is out of the way and within a neighborhood with much screening vegetation.

Key Pedestrian Locations

Key pedestrian locations are identified as discrete locations that warrant special considerations for pedestrians because they (1) pose potential challenges to pedestrians or (2) are located near significant pedestrian destinations. Since the completion of the 2004 Plan, many improvements have been made at some of the previously identified Key Pedestrian Locations, mainly to locations adjacent to schools. Areas that have been significantly improved were removed from this list for this update. The following are Key Pedestrian Locations that need significant pedestrian and safety improvements. The key pedestrian locations are identified in Figure C-2.

1. **Garfield Elementary School**: There are no major pedestrian improvements to the area surrounding the Garfield Elementary School. There is a yellow high-visibility crosswalk on Marina Boulevard. This area is a Key Pedestrian Location because it experiences a high amount of pedestrian activity, particularly children, to/from the school.

2. **Davis Street/I-880**: The Davis Street crossing of I-880 is dangerous and difficult for pedestrians. There are pedestrian sidewalks on both the north and south side of the overpass; however, there are no crosswalks or pedestrian signals for pedestrians at the on- and off-ramp crossings. A new pedestrian bridge was studied to cross this intersection; however, a survey of the adjacent neighborhood indicated little desire for the project.

3. **Cherry Grove Park**: This area is a Key Pedestrian Location because it experiences a high amount of pedestrian activity from the school and park.

4. **Woodrow Wilson Elementary School/ John Muir Middle School**: The intersection of Williams Street and Joyce Avenue has a yellow high visibility crosswalk across from the entrance to the elementary school with a pedestrian actuated flashing beacon. There is a yellow high visibility mid-block crossing on Williams Street across from the entrance to the middle school.

5. **Wicks Boulevard at the Marina Community Center**: Two new high visibility crosswalks have been installed on Wicks Boulevard connecting the Community Center to Stenzel Park. The southern crosswalk still needs to be improved by creating curb ramps on the western sidewalk and creating a new sidewalk to the east, where presently there is no sidewalk and the pedestrian is led into the driveway where they are in potential conflict with vehicles.
6. **Bonaire Park:** There are no pedestrian improvements at this park entrance. The entrance to Bonaire Park is difficult to see because it is adjacent to the entrance to the Madison Elementary parking lot and residential housing.

7. **Pacific Community Recreation Complex:** There are no pedestrian improvements in the vicinity of the Pacific Community Recreation Complex. The intersection of Teagarden Street and Fairway Drive is a major intersection adjacent to a high school and recreation area, so it experiences high pedestrian volumes.

8. **Washington Elementary School:** A yellow high visibility crosswalk has been installed in front of Washington Elementary School across Dutton Avenue with roadway mounted pedestrian signage, and pedestrian actuated flashing beacons with an in-pavement lighted crosswalk. This crosswalk extends to cross a channelized right turn with a pork-chop island from Dowling Boulevard onto Dutton Avenue. It is potentially dangerous for pedestrians crossing a channelized right turn because motorists are typically concerned with looking over their left shoulder at the traffic they are going to merge into, rather than watching for pedestrians that may be in front of them.

9. **Corvallis Elementary School:** At the intersection of Oberlin Avenue and Corvallis Street there is a new yellow striped crosswalk with roadway and sidewalk mounted pedestrian crossing signs. This intersection experiences high pedestrian use to/from the school.

   The intersection of Farnsworth Street and Corvallis Street needs significant pedestrian safety improvements because Farnsworth Street is a major road located adjacent to an elementary school and there is a channelized right turn with a pork-chop island. It is potentially dangerous for pedestrians crossing a channelized right turn because motorists are typically concerned with looking over their left shoulder at the traffic they are going to merge into, rather than watching for pedestrians that may be in front of them.

10. **Floresta Boulevard/Monterey Boulevard:** This intersection needs pedestrian safety improvements because it is adjacent to a school and park. In addition, the intersection has an existing channelized right turn with a pork-chop island. It is potentially dangerous for pedestrians crossing a channelized right turn because motorists are typically concerned with looking over their left shoulder at the traffic they are going to merge into, rather than watching for pedestrians that may be in front of them. The City should evaluate the feasibility of re-configuring Floresta Boulevard to accommodate Class II bike lanes. The City is seeking a Safe Routes to School Grant to complete a proposed traffic signal project at this intersection.

11. **San Leandro Boulevard/Washington Avenue Intersection:** This wide intersection is difficult for pedestrians to cross and contains two channelized right turns with pork-chop islands. It is potentially dangerous for pedestrians crossing a channelized right turn because motorists are typically concerned with looking over their left shoulder at the traffic they are going to merge into, rather than watching for pedestrians that may be in front of them.
front of them. New Accessible Pedestrian Signals have been recently installed at the intersection to improve the safety of the crossing.

12. McKinley Elementary School: A traffic signal with pedestrian activation is located at the intersection of East 14th Street and Estabrook Street in front of the McKinley Elementary School. The City recently installed an in-pavement lighted crosswalk at the Bancroft Avenue/Blossom Way intersection. This area has high volumes of pedestrians, many of which are children.

13. Bancroft Middle School: The intersections adjacent to Bancroft Middle School have recently been updated although there are concerns that jaywalking and other pedestrian/vehicle violations continue.

14. East 14th Street/San Leandro Boulevard Intersection: No major improvements have been implemented at this intersection, which is wide and difficult for pedestrians to cross.

15. 136th Avenue/Bancroft Avenue: This location will become an extremely important crossing because this is a key location for students traveling between the high school and the 9th Grade Campus. The City is considering a dedicated pedestrian scramble signal phase as part of a new traffic signal project. The City is seeking a Safe Routes to School Grant to complete the project.

16. Washington Avenue/Lewelling Boulevard Intersection: There have been no recent pedestrian improvements to this intersection. This intersection is very wide and contains two channelized right turns with pork-chop islands. It is potentially dangerous for pedestrians crossing a channelized right turn because motorists are typically concerned with looking over their left shoulder at the traffic they are going to merge into, rather than watching for pedestrians that may be in front of them.

17. Grand Avenue/Joaquin Avenue Intersection: A pedestrian refuge has been added across Joaquin Avenue at the intersection of Grand Avenue, but there is no crosswalk striping.

18. Jefferson Elementary School: A new high visibility yellow crosswalk has been implemented as a mid-block crossing on Bancroft Avenue. The crosswalk has roadway and sidewalk mounted pedestrian crossing signs. This area has high volumes of pedestrians, many of which are children.

19. 150th Avenue/Hesperian Boulevard/Bancroft/ East 14th Street Intersection: This wide intersection has not had recent pedestrian improvements and is difficult for pedestrians to cross. This intersection is also adjacent to a number of major retail destinations.

20. Hesperian Boulevard/Lewelling Boulevard intersection: There has been significant recent development near this intersection with expected increases in pedestrian traffic.
Figure C-2: Key Pedestrian Locations
### Appendix D: Project Prioritization Worksheets

#### Bikeway Project Prioritization Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. CONNECTION TO ACTIVITY CENTERS: How is access to key destinations improved by this project? The project will provide access to:</th>
<th>Circle all that apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Schools</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Major employment centers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Major shopping centers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Libraries</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Park or recreational facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. SAFETY: How does the project improve bicycle safety?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The project includes an intersection or roadway segment with a high number of bicycle collisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The project provides an alternative to a busy arterial street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. CONNECTIVITY: How will the project improve connectivity for bicyclists?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The project eliminates an existing barrier or hazard to bicycle access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The project bridges a gap in an existing bikeway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The project connects to an existing bikeway on both ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The project connects to an existing or proposed bikeway on both ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The project is located on or connects to the regional, county or Bay Trail network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The project connects to an existing or proposed bikeway in neighboring jurisdiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. The project is part of a bikeway that passes through the entire city.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. TRANSIT ACCESS: How does the project improve bicycle access to transit?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The project connects to a BART station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The project connects to a existing high capacity bus line or future BRT service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The project connects to a local bus route.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. FUNDING &amp; IMPLEMENTATION: Will the project be reasonably easy to implement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The project can be implemented without extensive additional planning or study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The project does not require extensive modifications to implement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The project can be implemented as part of a defined current or future development or redevelopment project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The project can be implemented without coordination with agencies outside the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The project would be competitive for County, State or federal funding sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The project would be eligible for the Safe-Routes-to-School or Safe-Routes-to-Transit program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. The project has community support (i.e. is already included in city, county, or regional adopted planning documents or has been identified or initiated by community input or request.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL SCORE OUT OF 27 POSSIBLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITIZATION OF PROJECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Phase I Projects (13+ points)** Projects that scored within this category are considered the highest priority for implementation. These projects should receive priority and should be targeted for completion within five years.

**Phase II Projects (11 to 12 points)** Projects that score within this category are considered moderate priority and should be targeted for completion within 10 years.

**Phase III Projects (1 to 10 points)** Projects that score within this category are considered the lowest relative priority and should be targeted for completion within 10 to 20 years.
### Pedestrian Project Prioritization Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. ACCESSIBILITY</th>
<th>Circle All That Apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How is accessibility improved by this project?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project will create accessibility in a location that was previously inaccessible.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project will remove a major barrier/obstacle to accessibility in the citywide Pedestrian Network.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project will include design features that are beyond the minimum required by ADA, i.e. extra wide sidewalks, verbal audible signals.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. SAFETY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How does the project improve pedestrian safety?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project is located at an intersection with a high number of pedestrian collisions.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project is located within 1,500 feet of a school.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project includes additional design features to increase pedestrian safety, i.e. pedestrian refuge islands, bulbouts, pedestrian actuated signals.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. CONNECTIVITY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How will the project improve connectivity? The project is located near a:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Employment Center</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Shopping Center</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park or Recreation Facility</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Transit Route/Stop</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. WALKABILITY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How does the project improve the pedestrian environment and encourage walking?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project includes pedestrian amenities such as seating, lighting and trash receptacles.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project creates plazas, or open spaces that will allow for public gatherings and encourage pedestrian use.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. FUNDING &amp; IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Will the project be reasonably easy to implement?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project can be implemented without extensive additional planning or study.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project does not require extensive modifications to implement.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project can be implemented as part of another development or redevelopment project.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project can be implemented without coordination with agencies outside the City.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project is eligible for County, State or federal funding sources.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project is part of a Safe-Routes-to-School or Safe-Routes-to-Transit program.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project has community support (i.e. is already included in city, county, or regional adopted planning documents or has been identified or initiated by community input or request.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL SCORE OUT OF 24 POSSIBLE**

### PRIORITIZATION OF PROJECTS

**Phase I Projects (10+ points)** Projects that scored within this category are considered the highest priority for implementation. These projects should receive priority and should be targeted for completion within five years.

**Phase II Projects (6 to 9 points)** Projects that score within this category are considered moderate priority and should be targeted for completion within 10 years.

**Phase III Projects (0 to 5 points)** Projects that score within this category are considered the lowest relative priority and should be targeted for completion within 10 to 20 years.
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Appendix E: BTA Compliance Checklist

The Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) provides state funds for city and county projects that improve safety and convenience for bicycle commuters. To be eligible for BTA funds, a city or county must prepare and adopt a Bicycle Transportation Plan (BTP) that complies with Streets and Highways Code Section 891.2 items (a)-(k). The following table identifies the required elements and page references in the San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan which addresses the required items. For a full description of BTA requirements, please contact the Bicycle Facilities Unit of Caltrans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BTA Requirement</th>
<th>Page Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) The estimated number of existing bicycle commuters in the plan area and the estimated increase in the number of bicycle commuters resulting from implementation of the plan.</td>
<td>Page 22; Table 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) A map and description of existing and proposed land use and settlement patterns which shall include, but not be limited to, locations of residential neighborhoods, schools, shopping centers, public buildings, and major employment centers.</td>
<td>Pages 3-10 Figure 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A map and description of existing and proposed bikeways.</td>
<td>Pages 17-40; Figures 8 and 11; Appendix B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A map and description of existing and proposed end-of-trip bicycle parking facilities. These shall include, but not be limited to, parking at schools, shopping centers, public buildings, and major employment centers.</td>
<td>Pages 7, 28, 40; Figure 10, page 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) A map and description of existing and proposed bicycle transport and parking facilities for connections with and use of other transportation modes. These shall include, but not be limited to, parking facilities at transit stops, rail and transit terminals, ferry docks and landings, park and ride lots, and provisions for transporting bicyclists and bicycles on transit or rail vehicles or ferry vessels.</td>
<td>Pages 7, 28, 40; Figures 8, 10, and 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) A map and description of existing and proposed facilities for changing and storing clothes and equipment. These shall include, but not be limited to, locker, restroom, and shower facilities near bicycle parking facilities.</td>
<td>Pages 28, 40; Figure 10, page 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Pages 61-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) A description of the extent of citizen and community involvement in development of the plan, including, but not limited to, letters of support.</td>
<td>Page 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Pages 1-3, 64-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) A description of the projects proposed in the plan and a listing of their priorities for implementation.</td>
<td>Pages 34-40; 73-81; 92-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Pages 96-99, Tables 5, 6, and 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Funding Sources

Federal
The primary source of federal funding for bicycle and pedestrian facilities is SAFETEA-LU, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users. SAFETEA-LU, signed into law in 2005, represents the largest surface transportation investment in our Nation’s history. While SAFETEA-LU expired in September 2009, Congress has approved extensions while working on reauthorization legislation for the next funding bill, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century, or MAP-21. Specific funding programs under SAFETEA-LU include:

Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program (CMAQ): The CMAQ program is a flexible funding source to State and local governments for transportation projects and programs that help meet the requirements of the Clean Air Act within jurisdictions contained in non-attainment areas such as the San Francisco Bay Area. Eligible bicycle and pedestrian projects funded under this program would be projects intended for utilitarian transportation purposes. A 20 percent local or state match is generally required for these funds.

Recreational Trails Program (RTP): Funds are available to develop and maintain recreational trails and trail-related facilities for both non-motorized and motorized recreational trail users. Projects include development of urban trail links, maintenance of existing trails, restoration of trails damaged by use, trail facility development, provision of access for people with disabilities, administrative costs, environmental and safety education programs, acquisition of easements, fee simple title for property, and construction of new trails. These funds are administered by the California State Parks Department. A 20 percent local or state match is generally required for these funds.

Safe Routes to School Program (SRTS): This is a new program provided under SAFETEA-LU and is in addition to the Safe Route to School (SR2S) funding already provided by the State of California. This includes both infrastructure-related and behavioral projects to enable and encourage primary and secondary school children to walk and bicycle to school. Eligible activities include the planning, design, and construction of sidewalk improvements, traffic calming and speed reduction improvements, pedestrian and bicycle crossing improvements, on-street bicycle facilities, off-street bicycle and pedestrian facilities, secure bike parking, and traffic diversion improvements in the vicinity of schools. 10 – 30 percent must be spent on non-infrastructure-related activities such as public awareness campaigns and outreach to press and community leaders, traffic education and enforcement in the vicinity of schools, student sessions on bicycle and pedestrian safety, health, and environment, and training, volunteers, and managers of safe routes to school programs. There are no local match requirements for these funds. These funds are administered by Caltrans in conjunction with the State Safe Routes to School (SR2S) program. The next funding cycle is pending reauthorization of SAFETEA-LU.
Transportation, Community and System Preservation Program (TCSP): The TCSP Program is intended to address the relationships among transportation, community, and system preservation plans and practices and identify private sector-based initiatives to improve those relationships. These funds may be used to carry out eligible projects to integrate transportation, community, and system preservation plans and practices that improve the efficiency of the transportation system, reduce the impacts of transportation on the environment, reduce the need for costly future investments in public infrastructure, provide efficient access to jobs, services and trade centers, and examine community development patterns and strategies to encourage private sector development. A 20 percent local or state match is generally required for these funds.

National Highway System Program (NHS): NHS funds provide for an interconnected system of principal arterial routes. The goal of the program is to afford access to major population centers, international border crossings, and transportation systems, meet national defense requirements, and serve interstate and inter-regional travel. This travel includes access for bicyclists and pedestrians. Facilities must be located and designed pursuant to an overall plan developed by each metropolitan planning organization (MPO) and state, and incorporated into the RTP. Both state and local governments can apply for NHS funds. A 20 percent local or state match is required for these funds.

Transportation Enhancement Program (TE): The TE Program is a 10 percent fund set aside from the STP. Projects must have a direct relationship to the intermodal transportation system through function, proximity, or impact. This program has 12 activities that are eligible for funding. Two enhancement activities are specifically pedestrian and bicycle related: 1) provision of facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians, and 2) preservation of abandoned railway corridors (including the conversion and use thereof for bicycle or pedestrian trails). Local, regional, and state public agencies, special districts, non-profit and private organizations can apply for TE funds. Cities, counties, or transit operators must sponsor and administer the proposed projects. A 20 percent local match is generally required for these funds.

Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP): The HSIP was a new program under SAFETEA-LU to achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads including bicycle and pedestrian pathways or trails. Both capital improvements and programs are eligible. Example projects include intersection safety improvements, pavement and shoulder widening, an improvement for pedestrian or bicyclist safety or safety of the disabled, elimination of hazards at highway-rail crossings, traffic calming features, traffic control or other warning devices, and improvement of highway signage and pavement markings. A 10 percent local match is generally required for these funds.

More information on SAFETEA-LU funding programs can be found at [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/safetela/index.htm](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/safetela/index.htm)
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Transit Enhancement: Transit Enhancement funds can be used for bicycle and pedestrian access to mass transportation, including bus shelters, landscaping and other amenities, bicycle storage facilities, and installation of equipment for transporting bicycles on mass transportation vehicles. Regional transportation planning agencies, state, and local agencies may apply for these funds. A 5 percent local match is required for these funds.
http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/te/te_provision.htm

Community Development Block Grants: The CDBG program provides money for streetscape revitalization, which may be largely comprised of pedestrian improvements. Federal Community Development Block Grant Grantees may use CDBG funds for activities that include (but are not limited to): acquiring real property; building public facilities and improvements, such as streets, sidewalks, and recreational facilities; and planning and administrative expenses, such as costs related to developing a consolidated Plan and managing CDBG funds. In adjacent communities, CDBG funds have also been used to fund crossing guards, called “Safe Walk to School Monitors.”
www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/communitydevelopment/programs/index.cfm

State
The State of California uses both federal sources (such as the Recreational Trails Program) and its own budget to fund pedestrian projects and programs. In some cases, such as Safe Routes to School, Office of Traffic Safety, and Environmental Justice grants, project sponsors apply directly to the State for funding. In others, such as Bay Trail grants, sponsors apply to a regional agency.

The Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA): The BTA is a competitive grant program run by the Caltrans Bicycle Facilities Unit. The projects funded by this program are those that promote or otherwise benefit bicycling for commuting purposes. The fund has grown dramatically in recent years from $360,000 per year to the more than $7 million dollars currently available. To be eligible for BTA funds, the City must have a current (no older than 4 years) Bicycle Transportation Plan (BTP) that discusses items (a) through (k) in Section 891.2 of the Streets and Highways Code as listed in Appendix C. The City must adopt the BTP and additionally get approval from both the MTC and the Caltrans Bicycle Facilities Unit (BFU). Grant applications are generally due late in the fall.
http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/bta/btawebPage.htm

Safe Routes to School (SR2S): California was the first state in the country to legislate a Safe Routes to School program with the enactment of AB 1475 in 1999. Eight years later, in 2007, AB 57 extended the program indefinitely with funding provided from the State Highway Account. The purpose of SR2S is to increase the number of children who walk or bicycle to school by funding projects that remove the barriers that currently prevent them from doing so. Those barriers include lack of infrastructure, unsafe infrastructure, lack of programs that promote walking and bicycling through education and encouragement programs aimed at children, parents, and the community.
Land and Water Conservation Fund: The Land and Water Conservation Fund is a federal program that provides grants for planning, acquiring, and developing outdoor recreation areas and facilities, including trails. The Fund is administered by the California State Parks Department and has been reauthorized until 2015. Cities, counties and districts authorized in these activities are eligible to apply. Applicants must fund the entire project, and will be reimbursed for 50 percent of costs. Property acquired or developed under the program must be retained in perpetuity for public recreational use. The grant process for local agencies is competitive, and forty percent of grants are reserved for Northern California.

Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) Grants: The California Office of Traffic Safety distributes federal funding apportioned to California under the National Highway Safety Act and SAFETEA-LU. Grants are used to establish new traffic safety programs and to expand ongoing programs to address deficiencies in current programs. Bicycle and pedestrian safety are included in the list of traffic safety priority areas including activities such as safety programs, education, enforcement, traffic safety and bicycle rodeos, safety helmet distribution, and court diversion programs for safety helmet violators. Eligible grantees are: governmental agencies, state colleges and state universities, local city and county government agencies, school districts, fire departments, and public emergency services providers. Grant funding cannot replace existing program expenditures, nor can traffic safety funds be used for program maintenance, research, rehabilitation, or construction. Grants are awarded on a competitive basis, and priority is given to agencies with the greatest need. Evaluation criteria to assess need include: potential traffic safety impact, collision statistics and rankings, seriousness of problems, and performance on previous grants.

Environmental Justice (EJ) and Community-Based (CBTP) Transportation Planning Grant Program: These grant programs are administered by the Caltrans-Office of Community Planning. The EJ program funds planning activities that assist low-income, minority, and Native American communities in becoming active participants in transportation planning and project development. The CBTP program funds coordinated transportation and land-use planning projects that encourage community involvement and partnership supporting livable/sustainable community concepts with a transportation or mobility objective. Examples of past funded projects include safe, innovative, and complete pedestrian/bicycle/transit linkage studies or plans, community to school linkage studies or plans, context-sensitive streetscapes or town center studies or plan, and complete streets studies or plans. Grants are available to transit districts, cities, counties, and tribal governments. The grant requires a local match of 10 percent with a five percent in-kind contribution maximum.

California Center for Physical Activity Grant Program: The California Center for Physical Activity runs several programs related to walking and offers small
grants to public health departments. Grants are in the amount of $4,999 dollars or less and are offered intermittently.  
http://www.caphysicalactivity.org/our_projects.html

**Coastal Conservancy Grants Program**: The Coastal Conservancy provides grants to government agencies and non-profit organizations for projects that provide access to the California coast and preserve coastal lands, including trail construction. Funds are available from $10,000 to several million dollars, depending on need and funds available.  
http://scc.ca.gov/category/grants/

**Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation (EEM) Program**: This program was established in 1989 and offers grants to public agencies and non-profit organizations for projects that mitigate the environmental impacts caused by new or modified public transportation facilities. Grants are awarded in the categories of highway landscaping and urban forestry, resource lands, and roadside recreation. Grant applications are accepted annually in the fall of the year.  
http://www.resources.ca.gov/eem/

**Flexible Congestion Relief (FCR) Program**: This program is designed to reduce congestion on major transportation corridors by adding capacity to roadways. These funds can be used for bikeway projects if they are consistent with the RTP and included in the RTIP. There is no local match required for these funds.  
http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/programInformation.htm

**Regional**

Funding for regional pedestrian grant programs comes from a variety of sources, including SAFETEA-LU, the State budget, vehicle registration fees and bridge tolls. Although most regional funds are allocated by regional agencies such as the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), there is some flow to county congestion management agencies, such as the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACCMA), which allocate funds to project sponsors.

**Safe Routes to Transit (SR2T)**: The SR2T program is funded by Regional Measure 2, the $1 bridge toll increase, and is administered by TransForm and the East Bay Bicycle Coalition. SR2T promotes bicycling and walking to transit stations by funding projects and plans that make important feeder trips easier, faster, and safer. SR2T funds may be used for secure bicycle storage at transit stations/stopps/pods, safety enhancements for pedestrian and bicycle station access to transit stations/stopps/pods, removal of pedestrian and bicycle barriers near transit stations, and system-wide transit enhancements to accommodate bicyclists or pedestrians. The next funding cycle is expected in 2011.

**Regional Safe Routes to Schools Program**: Like the national and state funded programs, the regional Safe Routes to Schools Program aims to increase the number of children who walk or bicycle to school by funding projects that remove barriers to such activities. Barriers often include lack of infrastructure,
unsafe facilities that result in uninviting walking and bicycling conditions, and
lack of education and enforcement programs aimed at children, parents and the
community at large. In Alameda County, TransForm manages the program
which includes three elementary schools in San Leandro: James Madison,
Roosevelt, and Washington.

Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC): The Metropolitan
Transportation Commission (MTC) disburses these planning and capital funds
for projects designed to improve pedestrian, bicycle and transit access in
existing town centers and near public transit.
http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/smart_growth/tlc_grants

Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program (TFCA): This grant program is
funded through a $4 surcharge on motor vehicle registration fees generating
approximately $22 million per year in revenues. TFCA funds are available
through two main channels: the Regional Fund and the County Program
Manager Fund. The Regional Fund receives about 60 percent of the TFCA
revenues and is administered directly by the Air District. In Alameda County, the
Program Manager Fund (approximately 40 percent of the TFCA revenues) is
administered by the ACCMA who distributes 70 percent to cities based on
population with the remaining 30 percent available as competitive funds to
transit agencies.
http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Strategic-Incentives/Funding-
Sources/TFCA.aspx

The Bay Trail Project: The Bay Trail Grant program offers competitive grants to
local governments, special districts and qualified nonprofit groups to build or
design new Bay Trail segments. The program is structured to: speed Bay Trail
construction by targeting high-priority, ready to build sections and closing
critical gaps; leverage state dollars with significant matching funds and in-kind
contributions; foster partnership by encouraging cooperative partnerships and
creative design solutions; and employ the California Conservation Corps for
construction, landscaping and maintenance where possible. The amount of
available funding varies, depending on State bonds and grants to the Bay Trail
Project. http://baytrail.abag.ca.gov/

Local
TDA Article 3: Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 funds are
available for transit, bicycle and pedestrian projects in California. According to
the Act, pedestrian and bicycle projects are allocated two percent of the
revenue from a ¼ cent of the general state sales tax, which is dedicated to local
transportation. These funds are collected by the State, returned to each county
based on sales tax revenues, and typically apportioned to areas within the
county based on population. Eligible pedestrian and bicycle projects include:
construction and engineering for capital projects; maintenance of bikeways;
bicycle safety education programs; and development of comprehensive bicycle
or pedestrian facilities plans.
http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/STA-TDA/index.htm
ACTIA Bicycle and Pedestrian Measure B Funding: Measure B is a sales tax measure reauthorized by Alameda County voters in 2000. It allows the collection of a ½ cent sales tax devoted to transportation projects and programs, to be collected from 2002 through 2022 with five percent devoted to bicycle and pedestrian improvements. Of this amount, 75 percent goes directly to Alameda County cities and the County, based on population, as local pass-through (monthly) funding. The other 25 percent is allocated to the Measure B Bicycle and Pedestrian Countywide Discretionary Fund (CDF), which supports planning, projects and programs, including a competitive grant program. [http://www.actia2022.com//app_pages/view/22](http://www.actia2022.com//app_pages/view/22)

New Development or Redevelopment: Future new development and redevelopment projects including new roads, road widening and construction projects are one method of providing pedestrian improvements and bike lanes. To ensure that pedestrian and bicycle improvements are included in these projects, it is important that the review process includes an individual (designated bicycle coordinator) or group (BPAC) to monitor the review process.

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

Impact Fees: Another potential local source of funding are developer impact fees, typically tied to trip generation and traffic impacts as a result of proposed projects. In San Leandro, this fee is called Development Fee for Street Improvements (DFSI). A developer may be required to help mitigate the overall impact of vehicular trips by paying DFSI; the City should consider modifying the Municipal Code to clearly include bicycle and pedestrian improvements in the types of projects eligible to receive DFSI funds.

Open Space District: Local Open Space Districts may float bonds that go to acquiring land or open space easements, which may also provide for some improvements to the local trail and bikeway system.

Non-Traditional Funding Sources

In the search for funding sources, it becomes increasingly necessary to ‘think outside the box’. With the climate change and health benefits afforded by walking and bicycling, there is an even greater opportunity to build partnerships with organizations and non-profits that have a similar interest in improving conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists. Teaming ventures with non-profit organizations will open up sources of private grant and foundation funding that is not open to a public agency.

---

5 As defined in the City of San Leandro Municipal Code, Title 7, Chapter 7-11.
California Conservation Corps (CCC): The program provides emergency assistance and public service conservation work for government agencies and non-profit organizations. Both urban and rural projects are eligible and selected on the basis of environmental and natural resource benefits and on-the-job training opportunities. The CCC would be effective at reducing project costs.

Rails to Trails Conservancy (RTC): The Conservancy assists rails-to-trails conversions through technical assistance, public education, advocacy, negotiations, legislation and regulatory action.

Grant and Foundation Opportunities: Private foundations provide excellent opportunities for funding specific capital projects or single event programs. Generally to qualify for these types of funds, a Bicycle Advisory Committee or established non-profit group acting in its behalf must exist. In general, private foundations are initially established for specific purposes, e.g. children and youth need, promotion of certain professional objectives, educational opportunities, the arts, and community development. An excellent source of information about foundations and their funding potential can be found in the Foundation Directory, available at many public libraries or on-line at www.fconline.fdncenter.org/. Several foundations to consider are:

- Compton Foundation, Inc.
- Nathan Cummings Foundation
- Ottinger Foundation
- REI Corporate Contribution Programs
- Surdna Foundation, Inc.
- Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
- Bikes Belong Coalition

Adopt-A-Trail/Path Programs: Modeled upon the Southern California program of highway maintenance contributions, this program would post signs to indicate which individual or group has contributed to the development, installation or maintenance of a particular bike facility. Trail construction can also be considered by school or civic groups as a year-long project.

Memorial Funds: These programs are advertised as potential donor projects to be funded via ongoing charitable contributions or funds left to a particular project through a will. Most memorial projects include the location of a memorial plaque at a location specific to the improvement or at a scenic vista point.

Revenue-Producing Operations: As part of the development of a trail or bike path, plans can specifically include the location of a revenue-producing operation adjacent to the proposed improvement. For example, bicycle rental/repair facilities, food and drink establishments, and bike storage facilities would be appropriate uses. The on-going lease revenues from these operations could then be used for trail/path maintenance.