

# Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee

## January 27, 2009 AGENDA

**1:15 PM – 2:45 PM**

Sonoma County Transportation Authority  
Large Conference Room, 490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206  
Santa Rosa, California 95401

### ITEM

1. Introductions
2. Approval of Minutes, November 4, 2008– **DISCUSSION / ACTION\***
3. Approval of Agenda – **DISCUSSION / ACTION**
4. Public Comment
5. CBPAC Election of Officers for 2009 – **DISCUSSION / ACTION\***
6. Roundtable Members Reports – **INFORMATION**
7. Staff Reports:
  - 7.1. TDA3 & TFCA Quarterly Status Report – **INFORMATION\***
  - 7.2. Programming Update – **INFORMATION\***
  - 7.3. *Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan* Status – **INFORMATION**
  - 7.4. Caltrans Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) – **INFORMATION/DISCUSSION\***
  - 7.5. Bicyclist & Pedestrian Counting Methodology – **INFORMATION/DISCUSSION\***  
Chris Barney's report post MTC meeting on January 20th
  - 7.6. *Lower Russian River Community Based Transportation Plan*– **INFORMATION\***
  - 7.7. *Regional Bicycle Plan* Review & Comments\* –**DISCUSSION/ACTION\***
  - 7.8. Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition "Clinic" – **INFORMATION\***
8. Other Business / Comments / Announcements
9. Adjourn – **ACTION**

\*Materials attached.

---

The next **SCTA** meeting will be held December February 9, 2009

The next **CBPAC** meeting will be held March 24, 2009

Copies of the full Agenda Packet are available at [www.sctainfo.org](http://www.sctainfo.org)

DISABLED ACCOMMODATION: If you have a disability that requires the agenda materials to be in an alternate format or that requires an interpreter or other person to assist you while attending this meeting, please contact SCTA at least 72 hours prior to the meeting to ensure arrangements for accommodation.

SB 343 DOCUMENTS RELATED TO OPEN SESSION AGENDAS: Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the **CBPAC** after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Sonoma County Transportation Authority office at 490 Mendocino Ave., Suite 206, during normal business hours.

Pagers, cellular telephones and all other communication devices should be turned off during the committee meeting to avoid electrical interference with the sound recording system.

Board of Directors

Mike Kerns, Chair, Sonoma County ♦ Lisa Schaffner, V. Chair, Healdsburg

♦ Valerie Brown, Sonoma County ♦ Stanley Cohen, Sonoma ♦ Pat Gilardi, Cotati ♦ Mike Harris, Petaluma ♦ Paul Kelley, Sonoma County ♦  
♦ Jake Mackenzie, Rohnert Park ♦ Sarah Glade-Gurney, Sebastopol ♦ Carol Russell, Cloverdale ♦ Sam Salmon, Windsor ♦ John Sawyer, Santa Rosa ♦

**COUNTYWIDE BICYCLE & PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING  
 MINUTES  
 November 4, 2008**

**ATTENDEES**

Dadko, Beth	County of Sonoma Dept. of Health Services
Duiven, Scott	City of Petaluma
Eunice, Janice	Citizen
Favila, Fabian	City of Santa Rosa
Helfrich, Gary	Sonoma County PRMD
Perez, Alejandro	Town of Windsor
Schmitz, Steven	Sonoma County Transit
Tacata, Eydie	City of Rohnert Park

SCTA staff present: Lynne March, Chris Barney, Nina Donofrio

Chair Steven Schmitz called the meeting to order at 1:34 p.m.

**ITEM**

**1. Introductions**

Round table introduction were made.

**2. Approval of Minutes, September 23, 2008– DISCUSSION / ACTION\***

Chair Schmitz moved for approval of the minutes of the meeting of September 23, 2008 with one correction to be made to the spelling of Alejandro Perez’s name. Ms. Atkins seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Lynne March announced that Susan Kelly would be the representative to the Committee for the City of Sebastopol, and that Mindy Berrett was no longer with the City of Sebastopol. She also announced that Scott Duiven will now represent the City of Petaluma on the Committee.

**3. Approval of Agenda – DISCUSSION / ACTION**

Chair Schmitz moved for approval of the agenda as submitted. Frank Favila seconded the motion. It carried unanimously.

The next SCTA meeting was corrected to be November 10, 2008

**4. Public Comment**

Janice Eunice asked who she would write to about the use of chip seal surfacing on roads, and the inherent danger this presents to bicyclists. Chair Schmitz suggested she write to the Director of the County Transportation and Public Works Department, and copy the Board of Supervisors with her complaint.

Ms. March invited Committee members to take supplies of Amtrak rail schedules and transit schedules the SCTA has recently received for distribution to the public.

Beth Dadko of Sonoma County Department of Health Services reported that her agency has been granted funding for Phase 1 of a non-infrastructure Safe Routes to School program. It is hoped that this will begin July 1, 2008. She also noted a safety issue for students riding bicycles to Bellevue School, stating that there is a bicycle path behind the school, as well as a creek and a

ditch. She expressed the need for this to be resolved through the Sonoma County Water Agency and Sonoma County Regional Parks. She said they would like to install a foot bridge, which is approximately a \$7,500 project, and are trying to identify funding sources. She asked for suggestions and recommendations.

Chair Schmitz noted that the difficulty with funding these types of projects is that they must be designed for both bicycle and pedestrian use. Bicycle facilities also have to comply with certain standards. He noted that there are sources for funding for pedestrian projects. Discussion ensued regarding the possibility of making this a community group project, checking with Rotary Clubs, and the national partnership Bikes Belong. Ms. Dadko noted that staff has met with the Water Agency.

**5. Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition Report on Initiatives and Programs, including Safe Routes to Schools - INFORMATION**

Christine Culver of the Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition reported that they are beginning to work with Sebastopol on their Safe Routes to School grant, and held a successful Walk 'n Roll to School day, with 33 schools participating. They are now regularly conducting Walking and Rolling Wednesday with Sebastopol schools. Surveys were conducted among parents to address their concerns. The Coalition is also currently working with Kawana Elementary School.

Ms. Culver reported that the Coalition received a small grant through Bikes Belong for a pilot program for 10 schools. They are also getting organized for the Measure M Safe Routes to School project.

Ms. Culver recognized the efforts of Tina Panza as the grant writer for the Department of Health Services \$500,000 grant.

The Coalition has been working for six years to get language included in legislation that requires transportation projects to include bicycles and pedestrians in all projects. Ms. Culver next reported that Caltrans has adopted Complete Streets (Deputy Directive 64). All 12 districts must consider the needs of all travelers with all levels of abilities. An example of the usefulness of this directive is that it can be a tool to enforce the installation of a bicycle lane on Highway 12. It is hoped that this will make Caltrans consider the needs of bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users in transportation projects. This Act will be implemented in 2011.

Ms March noted that this new Deputy Directive (DD-44-R1) supersedes the prior one adopted in 2001. Copies of this document were made available as a supplement to the agenda.

Chair Schmitz noted that this Act will also influence General Plan updates in the County.

Ms. Culver announced that the MTC adopted the draft Regional Transportation Plan investment plan in July, 2008 and that this is now at the environmental review stage. It is hoped that this be passed in February, 2009. This will bring additional funding for the Safe Routes to School program, which will mean more lockers and other bicycle accommodations, fully funding the bicycle regional network, and will be \$1 billion.

SCBC workshops are being planned. They are being conducted in partnership with the SCTA, to take place as follows:

January 20, 2009, Riding in the Rain, which will teach how to bicycle safely in inclement weather.

March 24, 2009, Biking to Work, to address advocating for workplace improvements for bicyclists who commute to work.

May 19, 2009, Haul with Your Bike; which will address hauling groceries, lumber, taking children to school, etc. with your bicycle. Ms. Culver cited the example of Tom Robinson of the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District, who uses his bicycle to take his wife to work and to do grocery shopping.

The workshops will be held at the Dennis Hunter Center at First and D Street across from City Hall; the time is to be determined, but will be after work hours like 5:30 to 8:30. Fliers will be published. They are to be fun sort of "mixers" to build enthusiasm for bicycle use

## **6. Roundtable Members Reports - INFORMATION**

### *Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition:*

Ms. Culver recognized Janice Eunice for receiving a gold resolution from the Board of Supervisors for her volunteer work on the Sonoma County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee.

Ms. Culver announced plans for a bicycle recreation center that will have a palindrome and criteria course, and which will be a place to hold classes that will teach children how to ride their bicycles while keeping safe from traffic.

Other events scheduled include bicycle races at Doyle Park and Community Park, A Place to Play December 6, and at Julliard Park February 14. These events are all associated with the Tour of California bicycle race.

### *City of Rohnert Park:*

Eydie Tacata reported the formation of a small group that began from a core of the Bicycle Advisory Committee ("Get to Know Rohnert Park") and that a small coalition will come out of this.

Ms. Culver added that the Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition has worked similarly with the City of Sebastopol with members of the bicycle coalition, and that they help cities organize similar groups, and try to encourage other entities to do so.

### *City of Santa Rosa:*

Frank Favila reported that workshops for the Santa Rosa Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan have been postponed, to allow time to respond to comments received on the draft.

The City Public Works Department held a study session with the City Council to introduce a bicycle boulevard on Humboldt Boulevard. Staff expects to bring this back to City Council in February.

### *Town of Windsor:*

Alejandro Perez reported that the Town of Windsor Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan comes before the Windsor Town Council November 19. It has been approved by the Planning Commission.

### *City of Sonoma:*

Wendy Atkins announced that the City is looking into becoming a member of the Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition. City Council will look at the first project to come out of the Plan, which is a bicycle path around the Sonoma Plaza. The City received a quote on a proposed valet bicycle parking structure. Application for BTA funding is being considered.

Ms. Atkins reported on the recent Caltrans District 4 Pedestrian Advisory meeting. One of the projects considered was in Sonoma County. There is a possibility that area meetings may take place in the future (e.g. for Sonoma County projects).

Ms. Eunice inquired as to the possibility of a flashing light being installed at the traffic stop at Maxwell Park and expressed her concern for bicyclists' safety at this intersection.

Ms. Atkins replied that a crosswalk is planned for this intersection.

*City of Petaluma:*

Scott Duiven reported that the Petaluma Boulevard North bicycle lanes are completed. Safe Routes to School project is planned for December, and pavement lighting is to be installed at crosswalks for several schools. The City also received a grant for overhead beacons at pedestrian corrals. Overhead flashing lights will be installed at Washington Avenue, which is the only major street crossing. Grants are being submitted for the Petaluma River Trail projects.

*Sonoma County Permits and Resource Management Department:*

Gary Helfrich reported that the General Plan is completed. There is now urgency to get bicycle lanes installed. The Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan completion has been made a high priority..

**7. Staff Reports: - INFORMATION/DISCUSSION**

7.1. TFCA & TDA3 Quarterly Status Report\*

Ms. March presented a list of projects under the TFCA and TDA3 program showing their expenditure status. She reported that all projects that had been due to expire in 2008 have had activity. An extension for one project for the Cotati Multimodal Facility has been requested. The list includes 2008/09 cycle projects.

7.2. Update on Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan adoptions\*

Ms. March reported that five of the eight participating entities have adopted Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plans. The City of Cotati had their plan on the Council agenda; it was rescheduled for December 10. The Town of Windsor's plan is scheduled for November 19<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. March announced that it is projected that November 14<sup>th</sup> the MTC comment period will open up for the Regional Bicycle Plan. This will mainly consist of verifying that all on the facilities designated as regional routes are shown as such on MTC's Regional Bicycle map.

7.3. 2009 Meeting Schedule\*

Ms. March presented the proposed committee meeting schedule for 2009, noting that this will be in place unless changes are needed, in which case the committee would be notified in advance.

7.4. January Election of Officers\*

Ms. March announced the upcoming election of officers to take place in January. There is one candidate for Chair so far; Wendy Atkins. There are no candidates for Vice Chair. Members were asked to consider volunteering to serve in these capacities.

7.5. Follow-up on Bicycle/Ped Plan's Recommendations for Bike Counts

Ms. March noted that the plans being adopted all contain recommendations for count locations. When the scoping of the countywide plan was underway, obtaining better data emerged as a need. Because the amount of funding to conduct the plan was limited, it was compromised to make count location recommendations but not the actual counts. Also at that time Christine Culver stated perhaps the SCBC could organize volunteers to assist with the counts. That offer remains.

MTC is also interested in seeing consistency in using a count methodology across the region. MTC is recommending use of the 2003 Wilbur Smith report titled "Bicyclist and Pedestrian Data Collection and Analysis Project" Sean Co of MTC is researching possible funding options to assist with the relatively minor costs associated with performing counts. Ms March asked if any of the entities had undertaken recent counts

Mr. Favila reported that Santa Rosa had conducted bicycle counts at 30 intersections as part of their current planning efforts. Mr. Duiven stated Petaluma had also done counts. Both noted that they do manual counts.

Discussion ensued regarding taking both commuter bicycle counts and recreational bicycling counts. The number of count locations in the unincorporated area was also discussed, as there are many.

#### 7.6. Alert for TDA3 and TFCA Calls

Ms. March reminded the Committee to be prepared for these programs. She said the TFCA call for projects will likely go out in December. She also noted that there are new policies to be cognizant of, which will hopefully expedite and streamline the process. Policies will go to the BAAQMD Board November 5 for final approval.

#### 8. Other Business / Comments / Announcements

Ms. Culver announced a meeting on November 12 to form a Sebastopol Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. at the library. This has the support of Sara Gurney of the City Council.

#### 9. Adjourn – **ACTION**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:43 p.m.



---

## Staff Report

To: Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC)  
From: Lynne March, Transportation Planner  
Re: Election of CBPAC Officers for 2009  
Date: January 27, 2009

---

**Issue:** The election of the Chair and Vice Chair of the CBPAC for 2009.

**Background:**

The committee's purpose is to provide technical assistance to the Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA) related to bicycle and pedestrian planning and funding. The CBPAC meetings serve as a forum for the exchange of information about bicyclist and pedestrian issues and to coordinate efforts countywide.

**Officers:** SCTA's Ordinance No.3 requires that a Chair and Vice Chair be elected at the first meeting of the year to lead the CBPAC during the calendar year. Officers must be members of the CBPAC. There are no other requirements or term limits.

**Steven Schmitz** has been Chair during 2008, as well as several years prior. In September he stated his desire to step-down from the Chair position, in which he has served well. **Wendy Atkins** has graciously volunteered to be a candidate for this position. **Fabian Favila** has served as Vice-Chair during 2008.

**Organization:** The officers elected in January are to accept responsibility for conducting the CBPAC meetings, as well as representing the CBPAC before the SCTA Board and at other venues as necessary.

**Meetings:** There are to be approximately six regular meetings of the CBPAC in 2009. Additional meetings may be scheduled if the need arises.

**Membership:** The membership of CBPAC is designated as up to twenty (20) members, based on the ten (10) jurisdictions of Sonoma County (the County and its nine city/town entities). Each jurisdiction may appoint a staff person and citizen representative. Representatives from regional and other agencies are considered ex-officio, non-voting members.

**Voting:** Each member, excluding non-voting members, shall have one vote on any matter to come before the committee for a vote. SCTA, however, urges the CBPAC to reach consensus on issues. If consensus is not reached, a minority opinion report can and should be made at the SCTA Board meeting if the issue is to go to the Board for a decision.

**Action Requested:** CBPAC Members are asked to elect a Chair and Vice Chair of the CBPAC.



## Staff Report

**To:** Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC)  
**From:** Lynne March, Transportation Planner  
**Re:** Project status update for Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) and Transportation Development Act, Article 3 (TDA3)  
**Date:** January 27, 2009

Expenditure status, as of January 9, 2009, of <b>TFCA</b> and <b>TDA3</b> projects <i>not</i> fully expended	
<b>Cloverdale</b>	
<b>TDA 3 Project: Bicycle Lane Striping (07-0010-57)</b>	
Funds Originally Programmed: \$50,000	Funds Expire: 06/30/09
Funds Expended \$0	Funds Remaining \$50,000
<b>TDA 3 Project: Bicycle Lane Striping (09-0010-16)</b>	
Funds Originally Programmed: \$42,000	Funds Expire: 06/30/11
Funds Expended \$0	Funds Remaining \$42,000
<b>Petaluma</b>	
<b>TFCA Project: Transit/Bike Marketing Program (07-SON-04)</b>	
Funds Originally Programmed: \$143,528	Funds Expire: 12/26/09
Funds Expended \$48,930	Funds Remaining: \$94,598
<b>Rohnert Park</b>	
<b>TDA 3 Project: Copeland Creek Multi-Use Path Overlay (09-0010-19)</b>	
Funds Originally Programmed: \$142,000	Funds Expire: 06/30/11
Funds Expended \$100,102	Funds Remaining \$41,898
<b>TDA 3 Project: Copeland Creek Multi-Use Trail (09-0010-20)</b>	
Funds Originally Programmed: \$30,000	Funds Expire: 06/30/11
Funds Expended \$0	Funds Remaining \$30,000

<b>Santa Rosa</b>	
<b>TFCA Project: Student Pass Subsidy (07-SON-03)</b>	
Funds Originally Programmed: \$88,000	Funds Expire: 12/26/09
Funds Expended \$75,168	Funds Remaining \$12,832
<b>TFCA Project: Student Pass Subsidy (08-SON-03) Contract Pending</b>	
Funds Originally Programmed: \$88,000	Funds Expire: 12/19/10
Funds Expended \$0	Funds Remaining \$88,000
<b>TFCA Project: Santa Rosa Free Ride Program (08-SON-04) Contract Pending</b>	
Funds Originally Programmed: \$189,856	Funds Expire: 12/19/10
Funds Expended \$17,609	Funds Remaining \$172,247
<b>TDA 3 Project: Santa Rosa Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan (08-0010-02)</b>	
Funds Originally Programmed: \$248,934	Funds Expire: 06/30/10
Funds Expended \$80,800	Funds Remaining \$168,134
<b>TDA 3 Project: Sonoma Ave. Class II Bike Lanes &amp; Public Education Campaign (09-0010-21)</b>	
Funds Originally Programmed: \$31,500	Funds Expire: 06/30/11
Funds Expended \$6,951	Funds Remaining \$24,549
<b>Sonoma County</b>	
<b>TFCA Project: Transit Marketing Program (07-SON-01)</b>	
Funds Originally Programmed: \$158,609	Funds Expire: 12/26/10
Funds Expended \$46,302	Funds Remaining \$112,307
<b>TFCA Project: Transit Marketing Program (08-SON-02)</b>	
Funds Originally Programmed: \$89,485	Funds Expire: 12/19/10
Funds Expended \$0	Funds Remaining \$89,485
<b>TFCA Project: Cotati Intermodal Facility (06-SON-02)</b>	
Funds Originally Programmed: \$32,000	Funds Expire: Extension Request to 04/16/09
Funds Expended \$22,620	Funds Remaining \$9,380
<b>TFCA Project: Cotati Intermodal Facility (08-SON-01) Contract Executed</b>	
Funds Originally Programmed: \$360,000	Funds Expire: 12/19/10
Funds Expended \$0	Funds Remaining \$360,000

<b>TDA 3 Project: Santa Rosa Creek Trail, Reach F (Son Regional Parks) (08-0010-03)</b>	
Funds Originally Programmed: \$100,000	Funds Expire: 06/30/10
Funds Expended \$0	Funds Remaining \$100,000
<b>TDA 3 Project: Central Sonoma Valley Trail (09-0010-23)</b>	
Funds Originally Programmed: \$50,000	Funds Expire: 06/30/11
Funds Expended \$0	Funds Remaining \$50,000
<b>TDA 3 Project: Share the Road Bicycle Caution Signs (09-0010-24)</b>	
Funds Originally Programmed: \$5,000	Funds Expire: 06/30/11
Funds Expended \$0	Funds Remaining \$5,000
<b>TDA 3 Project: Unincorporated Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Plan (09-0010-25)</b>	
Funds Originally Programmed: \$20,000	Funds Expire: 06/30/11
Funds Expended \$0	Funds Remaining \$20,000
<b>TDA 3 Project: Arnold Drive Multi-Use Pathway (09-0010-22)</b>	
Funds Originally Programmed: \$100,000	Funds Expire: 06/30/11
Funds Expended \$0	Funds Remaining \$100,000
<b>Healdsburg</b>	
<b>TDA 3 Project: Foss Creek Pathway Segment 3 (09-0010-18)</b>	
Funds Originally Programmed: \$110,000	Funds Expire: 06/30/11
Funds Expended \$0	Funds Remaining \$110,000
<b>TDA 3 Project: Healdsburg Ave, Grove St, &amp; Rosewood Drive Class II Bike Lane Re-striping (09-0010-17)</b>	
Funds Originally Programmed: \$18,000	Funds Expire: 06/30/11
Funds Expended \$0	Funds Remaining \$18,000
<b>Windsor</b>	
<b>TFCA Project: Old Redwood Highway Bicycle Lanes (07-SON-05)</b>	
Funds Originally Programmed: \$79,964	Funds Expire: 12/26/09
Funds Expended \$0	Funds Remaining \$79,964
<b>TFCA Project: Town Center Bicycle Lockers (08-SON-05) Contract Executed</b>	
Funds Originally Programmed: \$4,000	Funds Expire: 12/19/10
Funds Expended \$0	Funds Remaining \$4,000

<b>TFCA Project: Mitchell Lane Class II Bicycle Lanes (08-SON-06) Contract Executed</b>	
Funds Originally Programmed: \$10,400	Funds Expire: 12/19/10
Funds Expended \$0	Funds Remaining \$10,400
<b>TDA 3 Project: Pedestrian Signal Indication Enhancement (08-0010-05)</b>	
Funds Originally Programmed: \$41,863	Funds Expire: 06/30/10
Funds Expended \$0	Funds Remaining \$41,863



---

## Staff Report

**To:** Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC)

**From:** Lynne March, Transportation Planner

**Re:** Programming Update

**Date:** January 27, 2009

---

### **TFCA**

The "Call for Projects" has been issued and applications are due February 20. Revenues for projects are estimated to be down about \$115,000 from last year. TFCA funds the ongoing transit marketing programs of Sonoma County Transit and Santa Rosa CityBus. The competitive portion may fund transit, bicycle, pedestrian, arterial management, and other projects, such as vehicle purchases and retrofits ---all of which must demonstrate emission reduction benefits.

Funding Estimate is as follows:

<b>Santa Rosa</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Competitive</b>	<b>Total Allocation</b>
38.14%	25.57%	36.29%	100%
<b>\$239,138</b>	<b>\$160,324</b>	<b>\$227,538</b>	<b>\$627,000</b>

Dissemination of the final fund estimate to potential applicants is awaiting the reporting of calendar year 2008 TFCA interest.

### **TDA3**

The 09/10 "Call for Projects" will be issued after the fund estimate is received. This is projected to be around the third week of January, thus the call is anticipated to be out prior to the 1/27 CBPAC meeting. TDA 3 revenues are expected to be reduced from the levels of the prior several years. This revenue source funds pedestrian and bicycle projects, and planning.

### **LIFELINE**

While the last cycle of Lifeline Transportation Program (LTP) funding was targeted to transit, the program is under evaluation as to what funding sources might be available for future cycles. Many of the region's Community Based Transportation Plans (including Sonoma County's for Roseland and the Lower Russian River) have had bicycle and

pedestrian projects identified as high priorities. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is exploring options to add a funding source to the LTP for such projects. LTP will no longer have JARC as a source; and Prop 1B and STA face uncertainty.

MTC staff indicated Tier I approval was to be requested in early January. Staff is recommending approval of projects as they were approved by the SCTA Board. Sponsors will be notified of approval.

Tier II funding remains uncertain.

## Staff Report

**To:** Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC)

**From:** Lynne March, Transportation Planner

**Re:** Caltrans' Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA)

**Date:** January 27, 2009

---

Issue:

Adoption of the new bicycle & pedestrian plans set the stage for qualifying for BTA funding.

Which entities applied for 09/10 BTA funding?

What is the process to apply?

Information:

Potential applicants should access the Caltrans website at:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/bta/btawebPage.htm>

The site has sample applications, which might be helpful.

---

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.

The governing body of a city or county must adopt the BTP by resolution or certify that it is current and complies with Section 891.2. In the case of Sonoma County, for the plans done as part of the SCTA countywide master plan, each adoption is a "stand alone" for purposes of BTA. Your plan consists of the countywide overview, appendices and individual city/county plan.

The city or county must submit the BTP to the appropriate Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) or Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA). MPO/RTPA approval consists of verifying the plan to be in compliance with Section 891.2 and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Following MPO/RTPA approval, the local agency submits the plan, adopting resolution, and MPO/RTPA letter of approval to the Bicycle Facilities Unit for review to ensure the plan addresses the required elements.

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is Sonoma County's MPO; and RTPA. Sean Co is the contact for this review and approval. Sean can be contacted at: [sco@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:sco@mtc.ca.gov) or (510) 817-5748.

For Caltrans Bicycle Facilities Unit, Ken McGuire is the current contact (David Priebe is no longer with Caltrans). Ken can be reached at [ken\\_mcguire@dot.ca.gov](mailto:ken_mcguire@dot.ca.gov) or (916) 653-2750

BTP adoption establishes eligibility for five consecutive BTA funding cycles. Example: BTPs adopted in 2008 and submitted December 1, 2008; with an application for 2009/2010 BTA funding would establish eligibility for state fiscal years 2009/2010, 2010/2011, 2011/2012, 2012/2013, and 2013/2014. The state fiscal year begins on July 1 and ends on June 30 of the following year.

Bicycle Program staff employ a checklist approach to BTP review, to determine if the plan includes the required elements. The review does not "grade" the information provided in the discussion of the required elements. Each required element should be addressed in the plan, regardless of applicability to the local agency preparing the plan.

---

### Santa Rosa

For 08/09 BTA funding, Santa Rosa was granted \$238,500 for Sonoma Avenue bicycle improvements

---

# Counting walkers, bicyclists not as easy as 1, 2, 3

By **Will Reisman**  
Examiner Staff Writer 12/19/08



The Metropolitan Transportation Commission is looking to standardize how other transit agencies do studies about the number of bicyclists and walkers in the Bay Area. The statistics could impact future policy and planning decisions.

**AP SAN FRANCISCO** – The number of people walking and biking in the Bay Area has always been a speculative matter, with different government and nonprofit agencies offering up various statistics.

As a way to reconcile the discrepancies, Bay Area transportation officials are attempting to devise a universal method to count cyclists and pedestrians — a move that they say could impact future policy and planning decisions.

Agencies including the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency and Alameda County’s Congestion Management Authority have conducted studies on the number of local bicyclists, but often come up with data using different methods, making it difficult to compare statistics, according to John Goodwin, spokesman for the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, which is leading the move toward standardizing such statistics.

“By devising a standard to count walkers and bikers, we can start comparing apples to apples,” said Goodwin. “And by doing that, we can come up with some effective planning decisions that mirror our findings.”

The only regional data for pedestrians and bikers comes from the 2000 census, which reported that just 1.5 percent of all travel trips were done by cyclists, and only 3.3 percent were done by walkers, Goodwin said.

Andy Thornley of the nonprofit San Francisco Bike Coalition, said finding a method to count pedestrians and bicyclists is an important way of holding government officials accountable.

“If taxpayers end up paying for a sidewalk to be widened or a bike lane to be installed, they ought to know if those changes are being taken advantage of,” Thornley said.

The idea is to devise what days of the week, what time of the day, and what personnel — volunteers or paid — would most accurately capture the data, said Thornley, who is working with the MTC on the plan.

Since 2006, the SFMTA has used volunteers to count cyclists each August. Spokesman Judson True said the department is working with the MTC to come up with a streamlined manner to count both bikers and walkers.

Maneesh Champsee, president of the local pedestrian advocacy group Walk SF, said the data could also lead to better protection for walkers at dangerous intersections around the Bay Area.

The MTC hopes to have a uniform counting system in place by next spring. Then comes the difficult part — finding out who should pay for the project, and how.

“Right now the important thing is coming up with a plan,” Thornley said. “And then we can really push to have the program properly funded.”



**METROPOLITAN  
TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION**

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter  
101 Eighth Street  
Oakland, CA 94607-4700  
TEL 510.817.5700  
TDD/TTY 510.817.5769  
FAX 510.817.5848  
E-MAIL [info@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:info@mtc.ca.gov)  
WEB [www.mtc.ca.gov](http://www.mtc.ca.gov)

## *Memorandum*

TO: Regional Bicycle Working Group and Regional  
Pedestrian Committee

DATE: December 8, 2008

FR: Sean Co

W.I.:

RE: Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Counts

### **Attendees:**

Lindsay Arnold - UC Berkeley Traffic Safety Center  
Celia Chung - ACTIA  
Jennifer Donlon – Alta Planning  
Kelsey Finch - SFMTA  
Heath Maddox – SFMTA  
Cristina Olea – SFMTA  
Jason Patton – City of Oakland  
Bob Schneider – UC Berkeley Traffic Safety Center  
Rochelle Wheeler - ACTIA

### **Background**

On November 4, 2008 agency staff listed above met to discuss the possibility of conducting bicycle and pedestrian counts with a uniform methodology that will assist agencies and MTC to gauge bicycle and pedestrian use, mode share and exposure rates.

### **Status of Counts**

Many agencies in the Bay Area conduct bicycle and pedestrian counts, but do so with different methodologies and formats that make it difficult to compare results across cities and counties. The hours of the counts also differ depending upon the agency; some are set hours while others attempt to capture the peak hours. Counts are often collected for traffic impact, planning and other studies, and do not follow the same format as counts that are conducted on a regular basis.

The group discussed goals for a future counting project:

#### Goals

- Standardize counting methods and forms
- Compare counts between areas to show trends at the regional level
- Track changes over time

- Examine how facility improvements affect bicycle and pedestrian use
- Determine exposure rates for crash analysis
- Monitor mode splits
- Input data into travel models

## **Current and Past Efforts**

### **MTC:**

In 2002, MTC undertook a project to identify 50 count locations and provide a standard methodology to conduct the counts. The “Handbook for Bicyclist and Pedestrian Counts” was developed which provided data entry forms and a standard methodology. Additional counts were conducted by MTC in 2003 and 2004.

### **Alameda County:**

The CMA requests that cities in Alameda County conduct voluntary counts every year at the same locations. Counters are advised to use the MTC methodology. UC Berkeley Traffic Safety Center has been counting 50 locations in the county and using a combination of hand counts and automated counters these counts will be extrapolated to 7,500 intersections in the county.

**SFMTA:** San Francisco Municipal Transportation Administration conducts bicycle counts at select locations throughout the city every year. Pedestrian counts are only conducted for 15 minutes at varying locations.

### **Other Cities & Counties:**

Other agencies conduct counts only when needed or required by projects and don’t have a systematic method to compare these counts to monitor changes over time.

## **Next Steps**

Volunteers are requested to participate in a subcommittee to develop a standard protocol for bicycle and pedestrian counts. Meetings can be held after the Regional Bicycle Working Group Meetings. The subcommittee will work to:

1. Clearly articulate the goals for establishing a regional counting program and document the desired uses for count data
2. Establish regional count locations
  - Set regional locations can be used to monitor changes over time
  - MTC selected 50 locations with three years of data, these locations can be updated
  - Local counts can be used to supplement regional locations
3. Create a repository for count data
  - Data can be submitted for ITE/Alta project
  - MTC can gather and submit data
  - Data needs to be accessible with queries for temporal and special component
4. Standardize methodology – forms, count times and peak hour period
  - Variety of count forms exist – MTC, ACTIA/TSC and Alta/ITE
  - Different count times and peak period times
  - Standard methodology agreed to or new methodology adopted

Alta will be revising the ITE data gathering form and setting up a database. The committee should keep Alta informed of its progress so that the ITE product can reflect the needs of local and regional agencies most likely to generate count data.

J:\COMMITTEE\Regional Bicycle Working Group\2008 Meetings\December 18\MTC bike\_ped count.doc

	<b>MTC/WS</b>	<b>ACTIA/TSC</b>	<b>Alta/ITE</b>	<b>ACCMA</b>	<b>Albuquerque</b>	<b>DC</b>	<b>NYMTC</b>
<b>Users Counted</b>	Pedestrians and/or Bicyclists	Pedestrian and Bicycle	Pedestrian and/or Bicycle	Bicycle	Pedestrian and Bicycle	Pedestrian	Pedestrian, Bicycle and In-line skater
<b>Count Frequency</b>	Annual (2002, 2003, 2004, 2005?)	Started in 2008, likely to be Annual	Annual, quarterly is optional (2005, 2006, 2007, 2008)	2002, 2004, 2006, 2008	Rotate intersections on a rolling basis since 2002	Rotate intersections on a rolling basis since 1980s (may do same intersection every 5-10 years)	Annual (2002, 2003, 2004...?)
<b>Count Time of Year</b>	September through October	April through June	Second week of September	April through June	Any time of year	Any time of year	Summer/Fall
<b>Weather Notes</b>	No counting during "weather events" (forecasts were consulted)	All weather OK; adjustment factors calculated from automated counters	All weather OK; adjustment factors to be calculated at future time	No mention of weather	All weather OK, but no adjustment factors calculated	All weather OK, but no adjustment factors calculated	No counts during rain or hot and humid conditions
<b>Count Duration</b>	4 hours total (some are 6 hrs.)	2 hours weekday, 2 hours weekend	4 hours total, 12 hours is optional	3 hours total (generally)	9 hours total	10 hours total	9 hours total
<b>Subperiod Duration</b>	15 minutes	15 minutes	15 minutes	Depends on local agency	15 minutes	15 minutes	Each user is a single record, but they are compiled at 15-minute intervals
<b>Count Period(s)</b>	Tu,W,orTh: 7-9 and 4-6 (added 2-4 near schools)	Tu,W,orTh: 12-2 or 3-5 Sa: 9-11, 12-2, or 3-5	Tu,W,orTh: 7-9 and 4-6 Actual time depends on local agency	Tu,W,orTh: 3-6 (some were 4-6)	Weekdays: 6:45-9:45, 11-2, and 3-6	M,Tu,W,orTh: 7-12 and 1-6	Weekdays: 7-9, 10-2, and 4-7 Weekends: 10-2
<b>Count Site</b>	Intersection	Intersection	Mid-block (trail, bike lane, or sidewalk)	Intersection	Intersection	Intersection	Mid-block (trail, bike lane, or sidewalk)
<b>Pedestrian Count Description</b>	Pedestrians are counted every time they cross a leg of the intersection.	Pedestrians are counted every time they cross a leg of the intersection. Pedestrians within 50 feet of the crosswalk are counted.	Pedestrians are counted every time they pass a specific location on the sidewalk or trail.		Pedestrians are counted when they cross in any of the 4 directions. Pedestrians are not counted if they do not cross the street.	Pedestrians are counted every time they cross a leg of the intersection.	Pedestrians are counted every time they pass a specific location on the sidewalk or trail.
<b>Pedestrian Data Created</b>	Number of pedestrian crossings per intersection leg per 15-minute period	Number of pedestrian crossings per intersection leg per 15-minute period	Number of pedestrians per direction per 15-minute period		Number of pedestrian crossings per direction per 15-minute period	Number of pedestrians crossings per intersection leg per 15-minute period	Number of pedestrians per direction per 15-minute period
<b>Bicycle Count Description</b>	Bicyclists are counted every time they enter the	Bicyclists are counted every time they go straight, turn	Bicyclists are counted every time they pass a specific	Bicyclists are usually counted every time they pass	Bicyclist crossings from any of the 4 directions.		Bicyclists are counted every time they pass a specific

	intersection from a particular intersection leg.	left, or turn right. Bicyclists in the roadway and on the sidewalk are counted.	location on a trail or bike lane (both bike lane directions are counted)	through the intersection (depends on local agency)	Bicyclists are counted on the intersection leg that they enter the intersection from (right-turning bicyclists are not counted)		location on a trail or bike lane (both bike lane directions are counted)
<b>Bicycle Data Created</b>	Number of bicyclists coming from each intersection leg per 15-minute period	Number of bicyclist turning movements (12 possible movements) per 15-minute period	Number of bicyclists per direction (2 directions) per 15-minute period	Number of bicyclists at the intersection per 3-hour period	Number of bicyclists per direction (4 directions) per 15-minute period		Number of bicyclists per direction (2 directions) per 15-minute period
<b>Other Data Collected</b>	Site characteristics (bicycle facilities, nearby transit, schools, and activity centers)	Gender, site characteristics (sidewalk coverage, bicycle facilities, intersection characteristics, traffic information, transit, schools, commercial properties, population & employment density, etc.)	Guidelines suggest that agencies provide descriptions of surrounding land uses and traffic conditions. Some agencies provide this information.				Gender, age (adult/child). Bicyclist helmet use direction, and traffic law compliance. Pedestrian using wheelchair or stroller, walking dog.
<b>Number of Locations</b>	99	50 (20 funded by ACTIA)	More than 60 different agencies?	12	4 to 8 per week, rotated among intersections	100 per year, rotated among intersections	200
<b>Other Notes</b>	Direction of crossing was not counted.	For 3-leg intersections, the 4 <sup>th</sup> "sidewalk" leg is counted as if it were a crossing. Direction of crossing (e.g., north to south or south to north) is also collected				Pedestrians are counted as a part of manual motor vehicle intersection turning counts.	

SF Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Commission/Wilbur Smith (MTC/WS), Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority/UC-Berkeley Traffic Safety Center (ACTIA/TSC), Alta Planning & Design/Institute of Transportation Engineers (Alta/ITE), the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACCMA), City of Albuquerque (Albuquerque), District of Columbia (DC), and New York Metropolitan Transportation Commission (NYMTC). Other examples: were documented in the FHWA Pedestrian and Bicycle Data Collection in US Communities report, [http://www.pedbikeinfo.org/pdf/casestudies/PBIC\\_Data\\_Collection\\_Case\\_Studies.pdf](http://www.pedbikeinfo.org/pdf/casestudies/PBIC_Data_Collection_Case_Studies.pdf)

## Staff Report

**To:** *Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC)*  
**From:** *Lynne March, Transportation Planner*  
**Re:** *The Lower Russian River Community Based Transportation Plan (CBTP)*  
**Date:** *January 27, 2009*

---

### **Background:**

Funded by the **Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)**, and conducted by **SCTA** with assistance from **Matt Stevens** of the Results Group for the outreach component, the **Lower Russian River Community Based Transportation Plan** is focused on addressing the transportation needs of low-income people of the Lower Russian River area. Emphasis has been placed on involving the community in identifying transportation problems, as well as potential solutions.

The public outreach component is nearly complete and has included residents, employers, community-based organizations, transportation and service providers, governmental agencies, and the business community. Outreach has included the administration of a survey, interviews, focus groups, and interaction with a stakeholders committee of residents and service providers. **Steven Schmitz, Christine Culver** and **Steve Ehret** are serving on this body.

The second Stakeholders Committee meeting was held January 15, at which outreach findings were presented, validated, and expanded upon. A methodology to evaluate projects and strategies was presented and revised. "Homework" was assigned to further refine projects and strategies to feed into the "action plan" component of the CBTP.

The third meeting has been set for February 10<sup>th</sup>, at which priorities will be set.

Plan completion and dissemination is anticipated to be February-March; SCTA adoption March/April.

### **CBTP Contents:**

**Chapter One; Introduction Overview** introduced the plan and its purpose, providing background to the origins of the plan and the agencies involved in conducting it.

**Chapter Two: Setting and Conditions** describes existing conditions, including the area's demographics; historical context; geographical and hydrological challenges; existing transit, transportation and other related services; employment, housing, and infrastructure.

**Chapter Three: Outreach Strategy** documents the outreach conducted as an integral part of the planning, including the parties involved and the strategies used to gain public input

**Chapter Four: Potential Solutions** details potential solutions arising from the community-based process, as well as the methodology utilized for their prioritization.

**Chapter Five: Action Plan for Implementation** lays out an action plan for implementation based of which solutions were determined to be the most viable. Potential funding sources and agency implementation responsibilities are delineated.

**Chapter Six: Summary** summarizes the planning effort and provides direction as to the plan's utility.

### **Outreach Findings**

1. Overall, there was a high degree of consistency between the interview/focus group data and the direct contact survey, as well as prior outreach conducted by the Russian River Redevelopment Oversight Committee (RRROC). Participants in each of the data gathering processes identified generally the same gaps and issue areas regarding transportation.
2. Many residents (especially seniors and low-income families) struggle to meet the challenges of life with severely constrained resources. As a result, they often are on the edge of running out of resources to pay for gas, keep their cars adequately maintained, or pay for bus fare when a car is not an option. Caring for a family, utilizing government and health services while living in a geographically isolated community makes these challenges even more difficult from a transportation perspective.
3. Bus service does not adequately serve seniors, shift-workers, low-income individuals and families in the study area. Transit-related improvements that were suggested include:
  - More Express service to Santa Rosa.
  - More service to Sebastopol.
  - Later evening & earlier morning service.
  - 30 minute headways.
  - Expand routes: Armstrong Woods Road, Cazadero Highway, secondary roads
  - Smaller bus/jitney/vans.

- A “wait protocol” for child drop offs.
- Stops near childcare.
- Bus fare voucher.
- Deviated fixed route.
- More Saturday & Sunday service.
- Bus shelters & seats.
- More bus bike racks.
- Change policy re large packages on bus.
- Survey local employers to set bus schedules.
- Senior education program.
- Expand paratransit service boundaries.

**4. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities need significant improvements:**

- **Increase shoulder widths on 116.**
- **Bike lanes on 116.**
- **Bike lanes on River Rd.**
- **Bike lanes on Armstrong Wood Road.**
- **Bike lanes elsewhere.**
- **Bike share program.**
- **Secure bicycle parking.**
- **Build trail system all along river.**
- **Dutch Bill trail.**
- **Add sidewalks in high traffic locations.**
- **Repair sidewalks.**
- **Crosswalks at transit stop locations.**
- **Crosswalk timing.**

5. Hitchhiking is a common mode of transportation. Idea: an organized “casual car pool” program established where riders and drivers are prescreened, then given an easy to read (from a distance) card and a central place to connect.

6. Traffic safety is an issue:

- a. Many respondents stated that people drive too fast along Armstrong Woods Road endangering school aged children walking to school
- b. River Rd/Highway 116 is the main corridor through the study area and is another route where people routinely drive too fast



---

## Staff Report

**To: Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC)**

**From: Lynne March, Transportation Planner**

**Re: MTC's Regional Bicycle Plan Review & Update**

**Date: January 27, 2009**

---

### **Background:**

The comment period for the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC's) update of their *Regional Bicycle Plan* ends January 30, 2009.

Using the recently adopted city bicycle & pedestrian plans and with the assistance of city/county staff, SCTA has compiled the attached list of existing and proposed projects for inclusion in the Regional Bicycle Plan. This list represents a significant updating of how the regional network is to be defined in Sonoma County. The mapping and listing of projects in the draft plan under review was based on outdated information.

Inclusion of the projects in MTC's plan is important for purposes of funding. Certain funding sources require inclusion to qualify for funding.

### **Action Requested:**

**The CBPAC representative from each jurisdiction (all 9 cities and the County) are asked to review this list and communicate the need for any corrections to SCTA staff (Lynne March) no later than January 28<sup>th</sup>.**

This list, with any corrections received by January 28, 2009, will be submitted to MTC by January 30<sup>th</sup> as Sonoma County's update.

SCTA has not yet received the list for **Santa Rosa**.

**SINCERE THANKS TO ALL WHO PARTICIPATED IN CREATING THIS NEW LIST!**

Draft:

**SONOMA COUNTY'S EXISTING AND PROPOSED PROJECTS ON THE SF BAY AREA REGIONAL NETWORK**

Name	Begin	End	Class	Length	SF BAY AREA REGIONAL ROUTE	Cost	Plan	Existing or Proposed	Notes
NWP Trail	McCray Road	S Cloverdale City limits	I	3.93	Yes	\$2,158,772	Cloverdale	Proposed	
NWP Trail	Cotati City Limits	Cotati City Limits	I	0.4	Yes	\$235,189	Cotati	Proposed	
Commerce	Old Redwood Hwy	Rohnert Park/Cotati City	II	0.1	Yes	\$7,500	Cotati	Proposed	
Old Redwood Hwy	Gravenstein	La Plaza	II	0.8	Yes	\$57,483	Cotati	Proposed	
Old Redwood Hwy	Charles	Eucalyptus	II	0.6	Yes	\$45,953	Cotati	Proposed	
Old Redwood Hwy	La Plaza	Charles	III	0.1	Yes	\$1,307	Cotati	Proposed	
East Cotati Ave at RR	Santero Way	Windmill Farms Drive	II	0.1	Yes	\$225,000	Cotati	Proposed	
NWP trail-- Northern/Central Rohnert Park Segment	Rohnert Park City Limits	Cotati City Limits	I	2.46	Yes	\$1,350,524	Rohnert Park	Proposed	
NWP Trail--Southern Segment	Cotati City Limits	Rohnert Park City Limits (E Railroad Ave)	I	1.06	Yes	\$583,874	Rohnert Park	Proposed	
Trail to Crane Creek Regional Park	Petaluma Hill Road	Crane Creek Regional Pa	I	1.6	Yes	\$711,270	Rohnert Park	Proposed	
Bike/Pedestrian Crossing Improvements at NWP railroad	Southwest Blvd, Copeland Ck, Rohnert Park Expressway, Golf Course Drive		I/II	-	Yes	\$550,000	Rohnert Park	Proposed	
Bike/Pedestrian Crossing Improvements at NWP railroad	Laguna de Santa Rosa Extension Trail		I/II	-	Yes	\$600,000	Rohnert Park	Proposed	

Bridge Crossing - Copeland Creek Trail West @ Laguna de Santa Rosa	Rohnert Park City Limits (western edge)	Laguna de Santa Rosa Trail (eastern terminus)	I	0.1	Yes	\$300,000	Rohnert Park	Proposed	
Eddie Lane	High School Road	Johnson Street	I	0.34	Yes		Sebastopol	Existing	
Joe Rodota Trail	Petaluma Avenue	Sebastopol City Limits	I	0.24	Yes		Sebastopol	Existing	County facility
Railroad Forest Path	Sebastopol Ave	Joe Rodota Trail	I	0.22	Yes		Sebastopol	Existing	
West County Regional Trail	Sebastopol City Limits	High School Road	I	0.34	Yes		Sebastopol	Existing	County facility
Jewell Ave	Meadowlark Drive	Lynch Road	I	0.09	Yes		Sebastopol	Existing	
North Main St	Analy Ave	Healdsburg Ave	II	0.14	Yes	\$10,247	Sebastopol	Proposed	
Gravenstein Hwy S (SR 116)	Petaluma Ave/S Main St	Cooper Road	II	0.56	Yes	\$42,003	Sebastopol	Proposed	
Gravenstein Hwy N (SR 116)	Sebastopol City Limits	Covert Lane	II	0.52	Yes	\$38,829	Sebastopol	Proposed	
Bodega Ave	City Limits	Ragle Road	II	0.3	Yes	\$21,045	Sebastopol	Proposed	
Morris St.	Laguna Park Way	Sebastopol Avenue	II	0.17	Yes	\$12,380	Sebastopol	Proposed	
Morris St.	Johnson Street	Laguna Park Way	II	0.27	Yes	\$19,919	Sebastopol	Proposed	
Bodega Ave	Ragle Road	Main St	II	1.11	Yes	\$84,770	Sebastopol	Proposed	
Healdsburg Ave (SR 116)	Covert Lane	N Main Street	II	0.64	Yes	\$47,863	Sebastopol	Proposed	
McKinley St (SR 116)	N Main St	Petaluma Ave	II	0.08	Yes	\$6,290	Sebastopol	Proposed	
N Main St/S Main St (SR 116)	Healdsburg Ave	Gravenstein Hwy S	II	0.81	Yes	\$60,902	Sebastopol	Proposed	
Petaluma Ave (SR 116)	McKinley St	South Main St	II	0.64	Yes	\$47,886	Sebastopol	Proposed	
Sebastopol Ave (SR 12)	Main St	Morris St	II	0.29	Yes	\$21,739	Sebastopol	Proposed	
Sonoma-Schellville Trail	Lovall Valley Road	Sonoma Schellville Trail	I	0.09	Yes	\$48,029	Sonoma	Proposed	
Broadway	Highway 12	Naoa Road	II	1.12	Yes	\$84,153	Sonoma	Proposed	
Highway 12	Verano Avenue	West Napa Street	II	0.64	Yes	\$48,321	Sonoma	Proposed	
Highway 12	Highway 12	The Plaza	II	1.04	Yes	\$78,048	Sonoma	Proposed	

NWP Trail	North of Wilson Ranch Soccer Park	North of Shiloh Road	I	0.69	Yes		Windsor	Existing	
NWP Trail	Windsor River Road	Joshua Drive	I	0.65	Yes		Windsor	Existing	
NWP Trail	North of Shiloh Road	Windsor City Limits	I	0.8	Yes	\$440,886	Windsor	Proposed	
NWP Trail	Windsor City Limits	Windsor River Road	I	1.59	Yes	\$872,713	Windsor	Proposed	
NWP Trail	End of Existing Class I	End of Existing Class I	I	0.26	Yes	\$142,083	Windsor	Proposed	
Sonoma - Schellville Trail (SCBT - VII)	Sonoma City Limits	Dale Ave.	I	4.79	Yes	\$ 1,914,720	County	Proposed	Trail/Pathway
West County Trail Extension	Pajaro Lane	Forestville Youth Park	I	0.67	Yes	\$ 266,680	County	Proposed	Trail/Pathway
Colgan Creek Trail Extension	Todd Rd.	Laguna de Santa Rosa Tr	I	1.79	Yes	\$ 717,108	County	Proposed	Trail/Pathway
SMART Rail Trail (NWP)	Sonoma/Marin County L	Petaluma City Limits	I	3.67	Yes	\$ 1,469,840	County	Proposed	Trail/Pathway
SMART Rail Trail (NWP)	Petaluma City Limits	Cotati City Limits	I	2.91	Yes	\$ 1,163,260	County	Proposed	Trail/Pathway
SMART Rail Trail (NWP)	Rohnert Park City Limits	Santa Rosa City Limits	I	2.24	Yes	\$ 897,484	County	Proposed	Trail/Pathway
SMART Rail Trail (NWP)	Santa Rosa City Limits	Windsor Town Limits	I	2.97	Yes	\$ 1,188,956	County	Proposed	Trail/Pathway
SMART Rail Trail (NWP)	Windsor Town Limits	Healdsburg City Limits	I	2.05	Yes	\$ 820,764	County	Proposed	Trail/Pathway
SMART Rail Trail (NCRA) *	Healdsburg City Limits	Cloverdale City Limits	I	13.20	Yes	\$ 5,281,828	County	Proposed	Trail/Pathway
SMART Rail Trail (NCRA) *	Cloverdale City Limits	McCray Rd.	I	0.36	Yes	\$ 142,385	County	Proposed	Trail/Pathway
Santa Rosa Creek Trail Extension	Santa Rosa City Limits	Guerneville Rd.	I	3.30	Yes	\$ 1,321,572	County	Proposed	Trail/Pathway
Laguna de Santa Rosa Trail (LSRT - P23, P29, P30, P31, P34) *	Todd Rd.	Joe Rodota Trail	I	2.18	Yes	\$ 870,800	County	Proposed	Trail/Pathway
Copeland Creek Trail *	Rohnert Park City Limits	Crane Creek Park	I	1.81	Yes	\$ 722,423	County	Proposed	Trail/Pathway
Petaluma - Novato Trail (Hwy. 101) *	Petaluma City Limits	Sonoma/Marin County L	I	2.91	Yes	\$ 1,165,364	County	Proposed	Trail/Pathway

Sonoma County Bay Trail (SCBT - VI-Ramal Rd.) *	Dale Ave.	Sonoma/Napa County Li	I	4.02	Yes	\$ 1,609,688	County	Proposed	Trail/Pathway
Sonoma County Bay Trail (SCBT - V-Hudeman Slough) *	Ramal Rd.	Skagg's Island Rd.	I	2.10	Yes	\$ 841,160	County	Proposed	Trail/Pathway
Sonoma County Bay Trail (SCBT - IV-Skagg's Island Rd.) *	Hudeman Slough	Sonoma/Napa County Li	I	3.91	Yes	\$ 1,565,800	County	Proposed	Trail/Pathway
Sonoma County Bay Trail (SCBT - I-Port Sonoma Trail) *	NWP/SMART Railroad R	Sonoma/Marin County L	I	0.49	Yes	\$ 195,880	County	Proposed	Trail/Pathway
Petaluma River Trail (Petaluma) *	Petaluma City Limits (Co	Petaluma City Limits (Go	I	0.36	Yes	\$ 143,989	County	Proposed	Trail/Pathway
Laguna de Santa Rosa Trail (LSRT - P10) *	Rohnert Park City Limits	Stony Point Rd.	I	0.57	Yes	\$ 227,338	County	Proposed	Trail/Pathway
Laguna de Santa Rosa Trail (LSRT - P15) *	Stony Point Rd.	Wastewater Treatment	I	1.92	Yes	\$ 767,244	County	Proposed	Trail/Pathway
Laguna de Santa Rosa Trail (LSRT - P20) *	Wastewater Treatment	Todd Rd.	I	1.39	Yes	\$ 554,160	County	Proposed	Trail/Pathway
Laguna de Santa Rosa Trail Extension	Santa Rosa Creek Trail	Riverfront Park (Eastside	I	5.61	Yes	\$ 2,242,605	County	Proposed	Trail/Pathway
Dutch Bill Creek Trail	Highway 116	Graton Rd.	I	5.46	Yes	\$ 2,184,536	County	Proposed	Trail/Pathway
Petaluma - Sebastopol Trail *	Petaluma City Limits	Sebastopol City Limits	I	11.19	Yes	\$ 4,477,520	County	Proposed	Trail/Pathway
North Cloverdale Blvd.	McCray Rd.	Highway 128	II	0.99	Yes	\$ 24,633	County	Proposed	Cloverdale
Geyserville Avenue - Asti Road	Canyon Rd.	Weidersheim Rd.	II	3.72	Yes	\$ 93,073	County	Proposed	Cloverdale
Dutcher Creek Road	Cloverdale City Limits	Dry Creek Rd.	II	5.27	Yes	\$ 131,872	County	Proposed	Cloverdale
Valley Ford Road *	Highway I	Bodega Ave. - Petaluma	II	10.39	Yes	\$ 259,685	County	Proposed	Petaluma
Adobe Road	Lynch Rd.	Highway 116	II	3.26	Yes	\$ 81,394	County	Proposed	Petaluma
Bodega Avenue - Petaluma	Petaluma City Limits	King Rd.	II	3.59	Yes	\$ 89,663	County	Proposed	Petaluma

Bodega Avenue - Petaluma	Middle Two Rock Rd.	Valley Ford Rd.	II	1.69	Yes	\$ 42,163	County	Proposed	Petaluma
Lakeville Highway (SCBT)	Highway 116	Highway 37	II	6.98	Yes	\$ 174,436	County	Proposed	Petaluma
River Road	Highway 101	Scenic - Martinelli Rd.	II	9.84	Yes	\$ 245,876	County	Proposed	River/Coast
River Road	Westside Rd.	Highway 116	II	5.28	Yes	\$ 132,066	County	Proposed	River/Coast
Mirabel Road	Lois Lane	Trenton Rd.	II	0.28	Yes	\$ 7,077	County	Proposed	River/Coast
Occidental Road	Atascadero Creek	Sanford Rd.	II	2.20	Yes	\$ 55,028	County	Proposed	River/Coast
Petaluma Hill Road	Santa Rosa City Limits	Adobe Road	II	8.31	Yes	\$ 207,747	County	Proposed	Rohnert Park/Cotati
East Cotati Avenue *	Rohnert Park City Limits	Petaluma Hill Rd.	II	0.51	Yes	\$ 12,760	County	Proposed	Rohnert Park/Cotati
Old Redwood Highway (North)	Cotati City Limits	Petaluma City Limits	II	3.26	Yes	\$ 81,583	County	Proposed	Rohnert Park/Cotati
Rohnert Park Expressway (West)	Rohnert Park City Limits	Stony Point Rd.	II	0.58	Yes	\$ 14,533	County	Proposed	Rohnert Park/Cotati
Snyder Lane	Rohnert Park City Limits	Petaluma Hill Rd.	II	0.68	Yes	\$ 17,003	County	Proposed	Rohnert Park/Cotati
Old Redwood Highway	Santa Rosa City Limits	Windsor Town Limits	II	3.83	Yes	\$ 95,787	County	Proposed	Santa Rosa
Stony Point Road	Santa Rosa City Limits	Petaluma City Limits	II	10.11	Yes	\$ 252,828	County	Proposed	Santa Rosa
Guerneville Road	Santa Rosa City Limits	Highway 116	II	5.33	Yes	\$ 133,303	County	Proposed	Santa Rosa
Airport Blvd.	Highway 101 Overpass	Highway 101 Overpass	II	0.30	Yes	\$ 7,496	County	Proposed	Santa Rosa
Fulton Road	Highway 101 Overpass	Highway 101 Overpass	II	0.27	Yes	\$ 6,838	County	Proposed	Santa Rosa
Laguna Road - Old Trenton Road	Guerneville Rd.	Vine Hill Rd.	II	1.31	Yes	\$ 32,817	County	Proposed	Santa Rosa
Santa Rosa Avenue	Robert's Lake Rd.	Santa Rosa City Limits	II	1.98	Yes	\$ 49,443	County	Proposed	Santa Rosa
Mill Station Road *	Ragle Road	Highway 116	II	0.26	Yes	\$ 6,593	County	Proposed	Sebastopol
High School Road	Sebastopol City Limits	Occidental Rd.	II	1.26	Yes	\$ 31,568	County	Proposed	Sebastopol
Bodega Highway	Jonive Rd.	Bohemian Hwy.	II	0.69	Yes	\$ 17,353	County	Proposed	Sebastopol
Lone Pine Road	Blucher Creek	Bloomfield Rd.	II	1.26	Yes	\$ 31,560	County	Proposed	Sebastopol
Valley Ford - Freestone Road *	Highway 1	Bodega Hwy.	II	10.39	Yes	\$ 259,685	County	Proposed	Sebastopol
Arnold Drive	Gibson St.	Highway 12	II	0.47	Yes	\$ 11,872	County	Proposed	Sonoma Valley

Arnold Drive (SCBT)	Highway 116	Petaluma Ave.	II	2.85	Yes	\$ 71,274	County	Proposed	Sonoma Valley
Leveroni Road - Napa Road (SCBT)	Arnold Dr.	Highway 12	II	6.05	Yes	\$ 151,364	County	Proposed	Sonoma Valley
Highway 37 (SCBT - I, II, III, IV) *	Sonoma/Napa County Li	Sonoma/Marin County L	II	6.42	Yes	\$ 160,566	County	Proposed	State Highway
Highway 116 - North	Cotati City Limits	Stony Point Rd.	II	0.65	Yes	\$ 16,371	County	Proposed	State Highway
Highway 116 - North	Sebastopol City Limits	Green Valley Rd.	II	2.78	Yes	\$ 69,428	County	Proposed	State Highway
Highway 116 - North	Armstrong Woods Rd.	Foothill Dr.	II	4.63	Yes	\$ 115,797	County	Proposed	State Highway
Highway 116 - North	Duncan Rd.	Moscow Rd.	II	2.90	Yes	\$ 72,380	County	Proposed	State Highway
Highway 116 - South (SCBT)	Arnold Dr.	Highway 121	II	1.60	Yes	\$ 39,958	County	Proposed	State Highway
Highway 12	Santa Rosa City Limits	Kunde Winery Rd.	II	2.52	Yes	\$ 62,923	County	Proposed	State Highway
Highway 12	Agua Caliente Rd.	Sonoma City Limits	II	1.74	Yes	\$ 43,462	County	Proposed	State Highway
Highway 1	Slaughter House Rd.	Doran Beach Rd.	II	7.23	Yes	\$ 180,745	County	Proposed	State Highway
Highway 121 (SCBT) *	Highway 37	Bisso Rd.	II	3.24	Yes	\$ 80,940	County	Proposed	State Highway
Highway 121 (SCBT) *	Napa Rd.	Sonoma/Napa County Li	II	0.94	Yes	\$ 23,588	County	Proposed	State Highway
Highway 1	Sonoma/Marin County L	Valley Ford Rd.	II	1.52	Yes	\$ 37,928	County	Proposed	State Highway
Skylane Blvd. *	Airport Blvd.	Windsor Town Limits	II	0.52	Yes	\$ 13,070	County	Proposed	Windsor
Geyserville Avenue - Asti Road	Lytton Springs Rd.	Canyon Rd.	II (S)	5.02	Yes	\$ 3,764,625	County	Proposed	Cloverdale
Geyserville Avenue - Asti Road	Weidersheim Rd.	Airport Rd.	II (S)	2.74	Yes	\$ 2,055,525	County	Proposed	Cloverdale
Healdsburg Avenue - Lytton Springs Road	Healdsburg City Limits	Geyserville Ave.	II (S)	1.16	Yes	\$ 868,350	County	Proposed	Healdsburg

Dry Creek Road	Healdsburg City Limits	Dry Creek Rd.	II (S)	10.07	Yes	\$ 7,551,525	County	Proposed	Healdsburg
Eastside Road	Old Redwood Hwy.	Trenton - Healdsburg Rd	II (S)	5.18	Yes	\$ 3,883,950	County	Proposed	Healdsburg
Alexander Valley Rd.	Healdsburg Ave.	Highway 128	II (S)	3.83	Yes	\$ 2,874,120	County	Proposed	Healdsburg
Adobe Road	Old Redwood Hwy.	Lynch Rd.	II (S)	2.99	Yes	\$ 2,242,425	County	Proposed	Petaluma
				0.24					
East Washington Street	Adobe Rd.	Petaluma City Limits	II (S)		Yes	\$ 182,364	County	Proposed	Petaluma
Roblar Road	Valley Ford Rd.	Stony Point Rd.	II (S)	6.50	Yes	\$ 4,871,723	County	Proposed	Petaluma
Bodega Avenue - Petaluma				2.08					
	King Rd.	Middle Two Rock Rd.	II (S)		Yes	\$ 1,556,550	County	Proposed	Petaluma
River Road	Scenic - Martinelli Rd.	Westside Rd.	II (S)	0.93	Yes	\$ 698,873	County	Proposed	River/Coast
Mirabel Road	Highway 116	Lois Lane	II (S)	0.87	Yes	\$ 651,260	County	Proposed	River/Coast
Mirabel Road	Trenton Rd.	River Rd.	II (S)	0.22	Yes	\$ 165,176	County	Proposed	River/Coast
Occidental Road	Sanford Rd.	Santa Rosa City Limits	II (S)	3.06	Yes	\$ 2,292,600	County	Proposed	River/Coast
Graton Road	Dyer Ave.	Highway 116	II (S)	1.03	Yes	\$ 771,450	County	Proposed	River/Coast
Graton Road	Bohemian Hwy.	Acreage Lane	II (S)	0.59	Yes	\$ 446,081	County	Proposed	River/Coast
				1.25					Rohnert
West Sierra Avenue	Cotati City Limits	Stony Point Rd.	II (S)		Yes	\$ 937,590	County	Proposed	Park/Cotati
Laguna Road - Old Trenton Road				1.39					
	Vine Hill Rd.	River Rd.	II (S)		Yes	\$ 1,041,390	County	Proposed	Santa Rosa
Mark West Springs - Porter Creek Road				9.72					
	Highway 101	Petrified Forest Rd.	II (S)		Yes	\$ 7,287,668	County	Proposed	Santa Rosa
Petrified Forest Road	Porter Creek Rd.	Sonoma/Napa County Li	II (S)	2.37	Yes	\$ 1,774,028	County	Proposed	Santa Rosa
Ragle Road *	Sebastopol City Limits	Mill Station Rd.	II (S)	0.41	Yes	\$ 309,099	County	Proposed	Sebastopol
Bodega Highway	Sebastopol City Limits	Jonive Rd.	II (S)	3.46	Yes	\$ 2,598,075	County	Proposed	Sebastopol
Bodega Highway	Bohemian Hwy.	Valley Ford - Freestone	II (S)	1.30	Yes	\$ 976,125	County	Proposed	Sebastopol
Pleasant Hill Road	Bloomfield Rd.	Elphick Rd.	II (S)	2.16	Yes	\$ 1,617,420	County	Proposed	Sebastopol
Water Trough Road	Elphick Rd.	Bodega Hwy.	II (S)	1.71	Yes	\$ 1,279,335	County	Proposed	Sebastopol
Lone Pine Road	Highway 116	Blucher Creek	II (S)	0.30	Yes	\$ 223,060	County	Proposed	Sebastopol
				3.47					
Arnold Drive	Country Club Dr.	Chauvet Rd.	II (S)		Yes	\$ 2,600,288	County	Proposed	Sonoma Valley
				0.62					
Petaluma Avenue	Arnold Dr.	Riverside Dr.	II (S)		Yes	\$ 465,075	County	Proposed	Sonoma Valley
				2.08					
Bennett Valley Road	Santa Rosa City Limits	Grange Rd.	II (S)		Yes	\$ 1,559,723	County	Proposed	Sonoma Valley

Warm Springs Road	Bennett Valley Rd.	Arnold Dr.	II (S)	2.40	Yes	\$ 1,798,882	County	Proposed	Sonoma Valley
Warm Springs Road	Highway 12	Bennett Valley Rd.	II (S)	2.73	Yes	\$ 2,044,598	County	Proposed	Sonoma Valley
Highway 121 (SCBT) *	Bisso Rd.	Napa Rd.	II (S)	7.45	Yes	\$ 5,585,250	County	Proposed	State Highway
Highway 116 - North	Stony Point Rd.	Gilchrist Rd.	II (S)	1.18	Yes	\$ 882,968	County	Proposed	State Highway
Highway 116 - North	Gilchrist Rd.	Sebastopol City Limits	II (S)	4.53	Yes	\$ 3,393,938	County	Proposed	State Highway
Highway 116 - North	Green Valley Rd.	Armstrong Woods Rd.	II (S)	9.67	Yes	\$ 7,249,905	County	Proposed	State Highway
Highway 116 - North	Foothill Dr.	Duncan Rd.	II (S)	0.59	Yes	\$ 443,762	County	Proposed	State Highway
Highway 116 - North	Moscow Rd.	Highway 1	II (S)	3.71	Yes	\$ 2,784,308	County	Proposed	State Highway
Highway 116 - South (SCBT)	Lakeville Hwy.	Arnold Dr.	II (S)	5.56	Yes	\$ 4,170,638	County	Proposed	State Highway
Highway 12	Kunde Winery Rd.	Agua Caliente Rd.	II (S)	6.93	Yes	\$ 5,193,893	County	Proposed	State Highway
Highway 1	Valley Ford Rd.	Slaughter House Rd.	II (S)	1.49	Yes	\$ 1,119,000	County	Proposed	State Highway
Highway 1	Doran Beach Rd.	Highway 116	II (S)	11.04	Yes	\$ 8,278,350	County	Proposed	State Highway
Highway 128 *	Chalk Hill Rd.	Sonoma/Napa County Li	II (S)	9.22	Yes	\$ 6,912,338	County	Proposed	State Highway
Trenton Road - Healdsburg Road	River Rd.	Eastside Rd.	II (S)	1.32	Yes	\$ 988,748	County	Proposed	Windsor
Eastside Road	Trenton - Healdsburg Rd	Wholer Rd.	III	1.15	Yes	\$ 5,740	County	Proposed	Healdsburg
Reclamation Road	Highway 37	NWP Railroad Right-of-W	III	0.47	Yes	\$ 2,327	County	Proposed	Petaluma
Bohemian Highway - Main Street	Highway 116	Morelli Lane	III	5.23	Yes	\$ 26,151	County	Proposed	River/Coast
Bohemian Highway - Main Street	Occidental - Camp Meek	Bodega Hwy.	III	4.06	Yes	\$ 20,293	County	Proposed	River/Coast
Green Hill Road	Graton Rd.	Occidental Rd.	III	0.89	Yes	\$ 4,432	County	Proposed	River/Coast

Occidental Road	Green Hill Rd.	Atascadero Creek	III	1.70	Yes	\$ 8,523	County	Proposed	River/Coast
Graton Road	Acreage Lane	Dyer Ave.	III	4.43	Yes	\$ 22,142	County	Proposed	River/Coast
Occidental Road - Camp Meeker Road *	Morelli Lane	Bohemian Hwy.	III	1.26	Yes	\$ 6,291	County	Proposed	River/Coast
Penngrove - Main Street *	Adobe Road	Old Redwood Hwy.	III	0.48	Yes	\$ 2,393	County	Proposed	Rohnert Park/Cotati
Crane Canyon Road	Alta Monte Dr.	Petaluma Hill Rd.	III	1.53	Yes	\$ 7,665	County	Proposed	Rohnert Park/Cotati
Wallace Road - Reibli Road	Mark West Springs Rd.	Santa Rosa City Limits	III	3.80	Yes	\$ 19,011	County	Proposed	Santa Rosa
Arnold Drive	Chauvet Rd.	Gibson St.	III	0.80	Yes	\$ 3,989	County	Proposed	Sonoma Valley
Skagg's Island Road (SCBT - VI)	Ramal Rd.	Sonoma/Napa County Li	III	5.29	Yes	\$ 26,452	County	Proposed	Sonoma Valley
Dale Avenue (SCBT - VI) *	Burndale Rd.	Ramal Rd.	III	0.49	Yes	\$ 2,442	County	Proposed	Sonoma Valley
Bennett Valley Road	Grange Rd.	Warm Springs Rd.	III	5.42	Yes	\$ 27,101	County	Proposed	Sonoma Valley
Highway I	Meyer's Grade Rd.	Kruse Ranch Rd.	III	16.12	Yes	\$ 80,600	County	Proposed	State Highway
Chalk Hill Road	Pleasant Ave.	Highway 128	III	8.18	Yes	\$ 40,921	County	Proposed	Windsor
Mark West Station Road *	Trenton - Healdsburg Rd	Slusser Rd. - Windsor Rd	III	2.22	Yes	\$ 11,086	County	Proposed	Windsor
Slusser Road - Windsor Road *	River Rd.	Windsor Town Limits	III	3.40	Yes	\$ 16,977	County	Proposed	Windsor
Grange Road	Bennett Valley Rd.	Alta Monte Dr.	III	2.10	Yes	\$ 797,841	County	Proposed	Rohnert Park/Cotati
Highway I	Highway 116	Meyer's Grade Rd.	III	6.05	Yes	\$ 2,359,500	County	Proposed	State Highway
Highway I	Kruse Ranch Rd.	Gualala River Bridge	III	15.47	Yes	\$ 6,033,729	County	Proposed	State Highway
Cloverdale River Trail	McCray Road	1st Street	I	1.2	Yes		County	Existing	
Joe Rodota Trail	Dutton Avenue	Stony Point Road	I	0.88	Yes		County	Existing	
Joe Rodota Trail	Sebastopol Road	Sebastopol City Limits	I	3.03	Yes		County	Existing	
Joe Rodota Trail	Du Franc Avenue	Hwy. 116	I	0.75	Yes		County	Existing	

West County Trail	Mill Station Road	Occidental Road	I	1.67	Yes		County	Existing	
West County Trail	Occidental Road	Grey Street	I	0.73	Yes		County	Existing	
West County Trail	Graton Road	Green Valley Road	I	162.00%	Yes		County	Existing	
West County Trail	Green Valley Road	Ross Station Road	I	1.21	Yes		County	Existing	
West County Trail	Ross Branch Road	Pajaro Lane	I	0.92	Yes		County	Existing	
Arnold Drive	Country Club Drive	Petaluma Avenue	II	1.71	Yes		County	Existing	
Asti Road	Santana Road	Porterfield Creek	II	0.45	Yes		County	Existing	
Asti Road	Hwy. 101 Overpass	Airport Road	II	0.62	Yes		County	Existing	
Fulton Road	Old Redwood Highway	Hwy. 101 Overpass	II	0.53	Yes		County	Existing	
Fulton Road	Hwy. 101 Overpass	Santa Rosa City Limits	II	2.06	Yes		County	Existing	
Old Redwood Highway	Healdsburg City Limits	Windsor City Limits	II	2.34	Yes		County	Existing	
Riverside Drive	Petaluma Avenue	Hwy. 12	II	0.05	Yes		County	Existing	
Petaluma Blvd. North	Gossage Avenue	Bailey Avenue	II	1.06	Yes		County	Existing	
Occidental Rd. (West County Trail)	Highway 116	Peterson Road	III	0.87	Yes		County	Existing	
Grey St. (West County Trail)	Railroad Street	Bowen Street	III	0.02	Yes		County	Existing	
Bowen St. (West County Trail)	Grey Street	Graton Road	III	0.24	Yes		County	Existing	
Green Valley Rd. (West County Trail)	Ross Road	Atascadero Creek	III	0.15	Yes		County	Existing	
Ross Station Rd. (West County Trail)	Ross Station Road	Ross Branch Road	III	0.06	Yes		County	Existing	
NWP Trail	Northern UGB Limit	Southern UGB Limit	I	5.68	Yes		Petaluma	Proposed	
Petaluma River Trail	Petaluma Blvd. North	Denman Phase I	I	0.52	Yes		Petaluma	Proposed	
Petaluma River Trail	Denman Phase I	Corona Road	I	0.25	Yes		Petaluma	Existing	
Petaluma River Trail	Corona Road	Factory Outlets	I	0.55	Yes		Petaluma	Proposed	
Petaluma River Trail	Factory Outlets	Factory Outlets	I	0.34	Yes		Petaluma	Existing	
Petaluma River Trail	Factory Outlets	Lynch Creek	I	1.10	Yes		Petaluma	Proposed	
Petaluma River Trail	Lynch Creek	Lakeville Street	I	0.60	Yes		Petaluma	Existing	
Petaluma River Trail	Lakeville Street	E. Washington Street	I	0.37	Yes		Petaluma	Proposed	
Petaluma River Trail	E. Washington Street	C Street	I	0.24	Yes		Petaluma	Existing	
Petaluma River Trail	C Street	NWP Trail at Petaluma f	I	1.47	Yes		Petaluma	Proposed	
Petaluma River Trail	Petaluma Marina	Shollenberger Park	I	1.97	Yes		Petaluma	Existing	

Petaluma River Trail	Shollenberger Park	Southern City Limit	I	1.77	Yes		Petaluma	Proposed	
Frates Road	Eastern City Limit	Ely Road	II	0.71	Yes		Petaluma	Proposed	
Frates Road	Ely Road	Lakeville Highway	II	0.44	Yes		Petaluma	Existing	
Lakeville Highway	Southern City Limit	East D Street	II	2.85	Yes		Petaluma	Proposed	
Lakeville Street	East D Street	East Washigton Street	II	0.14	Yes		Petaluma	Existing	
East Washington St	Lakeville Street	Howard Street	III	0.62	Yes		Petaluma	Proposed	
Bodega Avenue	Howard Street	Webster Street	III	0.42	Yes		Petaluma	Proposed	
Bodega Avenue	Webster Street	Western City Limit	II	0.33	Yes		Petaluma	Existing	
Bodega Avenue	Western City Limit	Western UGB Limit	II	0.14	Yes		Petaluma	Proposed	
Stony Point Road	Northern UGB Limit	Petaluma Blvd. North	II	0.84	Yes		Petaluma	Proposed	
Old Redwood Highway	Eastern UGB Limit	Willow Brook Creek Crossing	II	0.31	Yes		Petaluma	Proposed	
Old Redwood Highway	Willow Brook Creek	North McDowell Blvd.	II	0.27	Yes		Petaluma	Existing	
Old Redwood Highway	North McDowell Blvd.	101 Interchange	II	0.25	Yes		Petaluma	Proposed	
Petaluma Boulevard	101 Interchange	Bailey Avenue	II	0.36	Yes		Petaluma	Proposed	
Petaluma Boulevard	Bailey Avenue	Shasta Avenue	II	2.00	Yes		Petaluma	Existing	
Petaluma Boulevard	Shasta Avenue	Lakeville Street	II	0.41	Yes		Petaluma	Proposed	
Petaluma Boulevard	Lakeville Street	D Street	III	0.71	Yes		Petaluma	Proposed	
Petaluma Boulevard	D Street	Southern UGB Limit	II	1.88	Yes		Petaluma	Proposed	
Vine/Grove Street	Norton Slough	Mill Street	I	0.43	Yes		Healdsburg	Existing	
Grove Street	Healdsburg Avenue	Grove Street Curve	II	0.58	Yes		Healdsburg	Existing	
Old Redwood Hwy.	Vets. Memorial Beach	City Limits	II	0.76	Yes		Healdsburg	Existing	
Healdsburg Avenue	Parkland Farms Blvd.	March Avenue	III	0.82	Yes		Healdsburg	Existing	
Foss Creek Pathway Segment 3	Healdsburg Railroad Depot	Front Street	I	0.14	Yes	\$490,000	Healdsburg	Proposed	
Foss Creek Pathway Segment 4	Mill St./ Healdsburg Ave. intersection	Healdsburg Railroad Dep	I	0.18	Yes	\$450,000	Healdsburg	Proposed	
Foss Creek Pathway Segment 5	W. Grant Street	Grove Street (Norton Sl	I	0.16	Yes	\$490,000	Healdsburg	Proposed	
Foss Creek Pathway Segment 6	Skate Park	W. Grant Street	I	0.6	Yes	\$1,830,000	Healdsburg	Proposed	
Foss Creek Pathway Pathway Segment 7	Dry Creek Road	Skate Park	I	0.22	Yes	\$1,010,000	Healdsburg	Proposed	
Foss Creek Pathway Pathway Segment 8	Grove St. & Healdsburg Ave.	Dry Creek Road	I	0.59	Yes	\$1,680,000	Healdsburg	Proposed	

Foss Creek Pathway Pathway Segment 9	Healdsburg Ave. (Future fire sub-station)	Grove St. & Healdsburg	I	0.71	Yes	\$3,270,000	Healdsburg	Proposed	
Foss Creek Pathway Pathway Segment 9A	Healdsburg Ave./Parkland Farms Blvd. Intersection	Grove St./ Healdsburg A	I	0.19	Yes	\$570,000	Healdsburg	Proposed	
Foss Creek Pathway Pathway Segment 10	Northern city limits	Healdsburg Ave. (Future	I	0.24	Yes	\$570,000	Healdsburg	Proposed	
Healdsburg Avenue	North city limits	Parkland Farms Boulevard	II	0.75	Yes	\$56,250	Healdsburg	Proposed	
Healdsburg Avenue Bridge over Russian River	East bridge approach at vicinity of access into Veterans Memorial Beach	West bridge approach at	II	0.09	Yes	n/a	Healdsburg	Proposed	
Dry Creek Road	Highway 101	Grove Street	III	0.13	Yes	\$1,945	Healdsburg	Proposed	
Warning and Way- finding Sign Program	Citywide	n/a	n/a		Yes	\$6,500	Healdsburg	Proposed	
Bicycle Parking Program	Citywide	n/a	n/a		Yes	\$5,000	Healdsburg	Proposed	

# SCBC BIKE COMMUTE CLINICS



Are you a fair-weather bike commuter? Would you bike to work if only your workplace were more bike-friendly? Think you can't bike to work because you need your car to go to meetings and run errands? Wish you could transform it all?

## You can!

This is a three-part series on how to make bike commuting work for you. Each clinic will feature experienced bike commuters sharing tips, answering questions, and allowing for group discussion. Then, you'll have time to just mix and chat with other attendees. It'll be informative AND fun!

Here's the schedule (all Tuesdays at 6:30 p.m.)

- **January 27th – Singin' in the Rain**  
Learn to stay dry, safe, and visible riding around on those wet days. You CAN be impervious to the rain!
- **March 24th – Your Bicycle-Friendly Workplace**  
Learn how to get your employer to create a bicycle friendly workplace, and how to keep commuting by bike in the meantime.
- **May 19th – Who needs a car to haul that \_\_\_?**  
Learn to use your bike for errands on the way to and from work, and how to get to work meetings by bike – carrying everything you need.

RSVP Sandra at 707-545-0153 or SandraL@BikeSonoma.org.

Note: These clinics are FREE of charge.

Location: Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition office, 655 1<sup>st</sup> Street, Santa Rosa. [www.BikeSonoma.org](http://www.BikeSonoma.org)

Sponsored by:

