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1. Plan Description

This section of the Bicycle Transportation Plan contains the information necessary for decision makers and citizens to understand its scope, intent, and impacts. Those seeking specific detail regarding Plan projects, policies, and development, may refer to sections 2, 3, and 4, respectively.

Purpose

The purpose of this Plan is to provide a blueprint for the development of a comprehensive bicycling system that facilitates bicycle transportation by community members, from children to seniors, both within the city of Atascadero, and to and from neighboring cities. The Plan also aims at enhancing opportunities for recreational bicycling, with the dual goals of encouraging recreational cycling by residents and making Atascadero an attractive destination for tourists.

Adoption of the Bicycle Transportation Plan demonstrates that the City of Atascadero is committed to bicycle transportation and will make the City eligible for various federal, state and regional grants in connection cycling related projects. Beyond that, adoption of this Plan will be an important first step in establishing Atascadero as a Bicycle Friendly Community and obtaining recognition as a place where bicyclists are welcome and safe on the roads.

*The Bicycle Transportation Plan is not a spending initiative or program of projects.* Plan approval does not require the City of Atascadero to develop or fund projects or policies included in the Plan.

Background

The growing interest in bicycle riding throughout the United States is evident almost everywhere. Local and national efforts such as new bike specific development plans, bicycle infrastructure, encouragement activities, Safe Routes to Schools program, and the emergence of powerful regional bike organizations indicate a transition in Americans’ attitude towards cycling for transportation and recreation. The City of Atascadero is well aware of this phenomenon and, by this Plan, is continuing the process of positioning itself to participate in it and to take advantage of Atascadero’s unique suitability for bicycling.

The Bicycle Transportation Plan has been created through the diligent efforts of the Atascadero Parks and Recreation Commission, the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments, the San Luis Obispo County Bicycle Coalition and citizens interested in improving the bicycling environment in Atascadero. Without the sustained efforts of the involved organizations and citizens, this Plan could not have been developed (section 4).
Atascadero stands poised to make major gains in increasing bicycle use, thanks to several factors:

First, Atascadero already has many attributes of a bicycle-friendly community. These include being a smaller sized community with a mild climate and diverse topography, as well as having a population interested in health, environment, and livable neighborhoods. Also, recreational bicycling in and around Atascadero is already popular, which has significantly increased local bicycle ridership and the population’s interest in expanding it further.

Second, there is a history of good cycling and bikeway planning in neighboring cities and in San Luis Obispo County. Increasing support from the surrounding community is evidenced by the approval of bicycle master plans on the County level and in the cities of San Luis Obispo, Pismo Beach, and Paso Robles. Bicycle master plans are also currently in development in every jurisdiction in San Luis Obispo County. As more residents cycle for recreation, more commute by bicycle as well. Consequently, more community members than ever are advocating for improved bicycling conditions throughout the County. In Atascadero, and other communities in the County, residents are expressing a desire for more miles of safe bicycle lanes, bicycle boulevards, marked bike routes and off-street paths, along with more bicycle parking, and improved maintenance of existing facilities—all for the purpose of minimizing dangers for cyclists and encouraging more bicycle riding.

Third, there is a political consensus favoring the encouragement of bicycling, which translates in availability of considerable funding opportunities available for bicycle transportation improvements. This is true on the state level, thanks to the 1994 California Bicycle Transportation Act, the establishment of the state Bicycle Transportation Account in 1997, the 2002 Blueprint for Bicycling and Walking, Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program (EEM), recent SB 375 legislation, and the 2007 Complete Streets Act. The Complete Streets Act of 2007 (AB 1358) codified policy that all streets be designed to accommodate all users, including motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, children, seniors, individuals with disabilities, and users of public transportation. When people have more transportation options, the overall capacity of the transportation network increases, and air quality is improved by the reduction of motor vehicles. By encouraging good planning for all modes of travel, roads are safer and more convenient places for users who choose to walk, ride a bike, or take transit.

Federal funding opportunities are also available, by reason of the following:

- 1990 Clean Air Act,
- 1991 Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA),
- 1991 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program,
• 1993 Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) Recreational Trails Program (RTP),
• 1998 Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA21),
• 2005 Safe Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: a Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU),

All of the laws and programs mentioned above call for renewed commitment to bicycle travel. Already, these laws and programs are delivering over a billion dollars in bicycle, trail and pedestrian projects nationwide, and thousands of miles in new bicycle lanes, sidewalks, multi-use trails and other non-motorized enhancements.

Eligibility for state and federal active transportation grant programs depends on having an approved Bicycle Transportation Plan. For example: As a result of not having an adopted bike plan, the City of Atascadero had previously been ineligible for any of the $7.2 million allocated annually by the State of California’s Bicycle Transportation Account, while neighboring cities with bike plans received funds to provide improvements to their infrastructure. From the Bicycle Transportation Account alone, $64.8 million in funds have been allocated to cities throughout California since 2001. Most street improvement projects funded by SLOCOG either are conditional subject to proposed bicycle and pedestrian improvements or candidate projects are more competitive if they include bicycle and pedestrian improvements.

Advantages

Growing demand for cycling facilities, maintaining its unique small-town rural character, the importance of promoting energy-efficient, non-polluting forms of transportation and establishing Atascadero as a destination for active, outdoor-oriented tourists are four important reasons for adopting a Bicycle Transportation Plan. Additionally, encouraging bicycling and walking as transportation will help obviate increasing motor vehicle traffic problems in Atascadero.

This Bicycle Plan can additionally enhance the enjoyment and quality of life for the residents of Atascadero. Since walking and bicycling are some of the most popular forms of recreational activity in the United States (with 84% walking and 46% of Americans bicycling for pleasure), it can be extrapolated that at least 21,000 residents in Atascadero will occasionally walk, and close to 11,500 will bicycle, purely for pleasure.

Last, but certainly not least, is the matter of safety. Improving safety for cyclists is the single most effective way to encourage people to use bicycles for transportation and recreation. Addressing concerns about safety through physical and program improvements is another major advantage of the Atascadero Bicycle Transportation Plan. It has been proven that providing bike lanes also improves road safety, reducing traffic speeds and providing an increase margin of safety for motorists.
Recommendations

There are two distinct types of recommendations in the Plan: Infrastructure (section 2) and Policies (section 3). Infrastructure improvements such as new bikeways or walkways are broken down between short/mid-term (1 to 5 years) and long-term (5 to 15 years). These projects are designed and packaged to be feasible and competitive for external funding sources. Policy recommendations include safety education programs, tourism marketing and guidelines for maintenance and upgrades.

Implementing recommendations from the Plan will help establish Atascadero as a model community for bicycling and walking in the region, State and United States. The public has cited concerns about safety, livability, and traffic congestion of our towns and cities as the primary impetus to implement a Plan. Along with adult commuters and recreational riders, two other groups have been identified as important beneficiaries of the Plan: senior citizens and school children.

2. Infrastructure

The intention of a projects section of the plan is to provide an inventory of current bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure throughout Atascadero and propose specific new projects that, when completed, will facilitate active transportation and recreation. All future physical projects included in the Plan are broken into two primary categories: short-term (1 to 5 years) and long-term (5 to 15 years).

The majority of physical projects proposed in the Plan will fall into one of three major categories of bicycle infrastructure. Each has its pros and cons, addresses the concerns of different demographics, and will promote biking in a different manner. Additional improvements to bicycle parking are also included in the projects section of the Plan.

Class I. Variously called a bike path or multi-use trail. Provides for bicycle travel on a paved right of way completely separated from any street or highway.

Class II. Referred to as a bike lane. Provides a striped and stenciled lane outside the motor vehicle lanes for one-way bike travel along a street or highway.

Class III. Referred to as a bike route. Provides for shared use by bicycles with motor vehicles or pedestrians and is identified only by bike route signs along roadways.
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Existing Infrastructure

Atascadero has already shown certain leadership in encouraging healthy active transportation choices. Infrastructure projects such as share-the-road signs, bike lanes, multi-use paths, and sidewalks exist in various locations throughout the City with special attention paid to providing safe routes to schools, destinations, and the downtown area (as indicated in Figure 3). Most projects have been funded through grants from the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments: Transportation Enhancements program, Safe Routes to School program. Completed projects are listed in the table and figure below (Table 1, Figure 1).

Table 1
Existing Infrastructure and Associated Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Type of Improvement</th>
<th>Approx.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De Anza Trail</td>
<td>Along the Salinas River &amp; Railroad</td>
<td>north eastern Atascadero</td>
<td>Class I Bikeway &amp; Multi-Use Trail</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Prior to 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Green Trail</td>
<td>Chalk Mountain Golf Course</td>
<td>Loop</td>
<td>Class I Bikeway &amp; Multi-Use Trail</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Prior to 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Real</td>
<td>southern city limit</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Road</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lane Segment</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Prior to 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Real</td>
<td>San Diego Road</td>
<td>State Highway 41</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lane Segment</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Prior to 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Real</td>
<td>San Jacinto Avenue</td>
<td>San Anselmo Avenue</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lane Segment</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Prior to 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Way</td>
<td>Olmeda Avenue / Downtown</td>
<td>Railroad south of San Jacinto</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lane</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Prior to 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capistrano Avenue</td>
<td>Union Pacific Railroad</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lane Segment</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Prior to 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Bridge</td>
<td>North ECR</td>
<td>North ECR</td>
<td>Constructed New Bridge</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graves Creek Bridge</td>
<td>North Ferrocarril</td>
<td>North Ferrocarril</td>
<td>Constructed New Bridge</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Real</td>
<td>San Diego Road</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Road</td>
<td>New Bike Lanes</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$ 550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Ave Bridge</td>
<td>East Mall</td>
<td>Capistrano</td>
<td>Constructed New Bridge with Bike Lanes and signage.</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$ 4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Way</td>
<td>Entrada</td>
<td>Via Road</td>
<td>Added Class II Bike Lane Striping and Signage</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$ 600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Way</td>
<td>Palma North</td>
<td>Palma South</td>
<td>Added Class II Bike Lane Striping and Signage</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Real</td>
<td>Rosario</td>
<td>State Route 41</td>
<td>Added Class II Bike Lane</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Andres Road</td>
<td>Navajo Road</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Added Class II Bike Lane Striping</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Road</td>
<td>US 101</td>
<td>Atascadero</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lane Striping, Widened Shoulder, Signage.</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$ 550,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Costs are in thousands of dollars.
Table 1.1
Existing Bicycle Parking and Changing Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Building / Use Type</th>
<th>Type of Bicycle Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunken gardens</td>
<td>Public Park</td>
<td>Bike Racks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoo</td>
<td>Public Facility</td>
<td>Bike Racks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Way</td>
<td>Street / Intersection</td>
<td>Bike Racks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paloma Creek Park</td>
<td>Public Park and Sports Fields</td>
<td>Bike Racks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilion</td>
<td>Public Facility</td>
<td>Bike Racks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Park</td>
<td>Public Park</td>
<td>Bike Racks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvord Field</td>
<td>Public Sports Fields</td>
<td>Bike Racks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atascadero Library</td>
<td>Public Facility</td>
<td>Bike Racks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hall</td>
<td>Public Facility</td>
<td>Bike Racks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Benito Elementary</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Bike Racks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Rd Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atascadero Junior High</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Bike Racks, Restrooms &amp; Showers, Changing Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atascadero High School</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Bike Racks, Restrooms &amp; Showers, Changing Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalk Mountain Community School</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Bike Racks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Rio Continuation School</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Bike Racks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colony Park Community Center</td>
<td>Public Facility</td>
<td>Bike Racks, Restrooms, Changing Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Park and Ride</td>
<td>park and ride lot</td>
<td>Bike Lockers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(next to the freeway at Curbaril)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara Park And Ride.</td>
<td>park and ride lot</td>
<td>Bike Lockers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rite Aid</td>
<td>Retail Shopping</td>
<td>Bike Racks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tastee Freeze</td>
<td>Restaurant / Fast Food</td>
<td>Bike Racks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack in the Box</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl’s Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-man</td>
<td>Retail (Bike Shop)</td>
<td>Bike Racks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colony Square</td>
<td>Movie Theater &amp; Retail / Restaurant</td>
<td>Bike Racks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy Fitness</td>
<td>Private Gym</td>
<td>Bike Racks, Restrooms &amp; Showers, Changing Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champions</td>
<td>Private Gym</td>
<td>Bike Racks, Restrooms &amp; Showers, Changing Facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Improvements

Infrastructure projects that would increase safety and access for transportation and recreational bicycle use are outlined in this subsection. Proposed improvements have been identified through community feedback at public workshops, via email and direct communication. Additional feedback from City Staff has helped identify gaps in current infrastructure and ensure that improvements are aligned with Atascadero community values and development priorities.

Short-term, 1 to 5 years (Table 2.1), and Long-term, 5 to 15 years (Table 2.2), timelines break all projects in two major categories of priority. Short-term projects are those of high priority, which could be pursued immediately, and are likely to receive grant funding. Long-term projects are often associated with community expansion, future improvements to bikeway connectivity, and often require greater regional funding coordination.

Streets and Highways Code Section 831.2 requires project prioritization for bike projects. All projects have been ranked, but ranking does not strictly dictate the order of construction.
### Table 2.1, 2.2
Proposed Infrastructure and Associated Costs

#### Table 2.1 Proposed Short-term Improvements and Associated Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Caltrans Classification</th>
<th>Approximate Length (mi)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Route 41 Striping and Signage*</td>
<td>Western City Limits</td>
<td>Eastern City Limits</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>$200-612,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Real Class II Bike Lane Gap Closure Projects</td>
<td>Northern City Limits</td>
<td>Southern City Limits</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>$2-700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated Bike Route Signage/Striping</td>
<td>Beginning of Bike Routes</td>
<td>End of Bike Routes</td>
<td>Class I-III</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>$200-1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of El Camino Real</td>
<td>El Camino Real</td>
<td>City Limits North</td>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School Projects</td>
<td>Collectors/Arterials</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Class I-III</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Will require Caltrans Approval

#### Table 2.2 Proposed Long-term Improvements and Associated Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Caltrans Classification</th>
<th>Approx. Length (mi)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atascadero Creek</td>
<td>UP RR/Sycamore Rd.</td>
<td>San Gabriel Road</td>
<td>Unclassified Multi-Use</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>$357,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadium Park Connector</td>
<td>Atascadero Creek</td>
<td>Stadium Park</td>
<td>Combined Class I &amp; Unclassified Multi-Use</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>173,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atascadero Lake Trail</td>
<td>Atascadero Lake</td>
<td>Atascadero Lake (loop)</td>
<td>Combined Class I &amp; Unclassified Multi-Use</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>$71,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atascadero Road</td>
<td>State Route 41</td>
<td>Santa Rosa Road</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>$262,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbaril ROW – (Multi Use non-vehicular Bridge over Salinas River)</td>
<td>Sycamore</td>
<td>Rocky Canyon Road</td>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1-15</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Road</td>
<td>Traffic Way</td>
<td>Capistrano</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-15</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Union Railroad (RWT)</td>
<td>San Jacinto Avenue</td>
<td>City Limits</td>
<td>Combined Class I &amp; Unclassified Multi-Use</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1-15</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Union Railroad (RWT)</td>
<td>De Anza Trail Loop</td>
<td>Curbaril Avenue</td>
<td>Combined Class I &amp; Unclassified Multi-Use</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1-15</td>
<td>$680,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School Projects (Continuation of Projects)</td>
<td>Collectors/Arterials</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Class I-III</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>1-15</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuesta Ridge Trail Connection</td>
<td>State Route 41 / Eagle Ranch</td>
<td>Cerro Alto Campground &amp; Cuesta Ridge Trail</td>
<td>Unclassified Multi-Use</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Ranch Trail Connection</td>
<td>San Rafael Road</td>
<td>Atascadero Road &amp; Cuesta Ridge trail connection</td>
<td>To be determined through Specific Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Ranch / 101 Connection</td>
<td>Eagle Ranch &amp; Atascadero Road</td>
<td>Highway 101 underpass</td>
<td>To be determined through Specific Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rita Creek Bridge</td>
<td>El Camino</td>
<td>City Limits</td>
<td>To be determined through Specific Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Existing and Proposed Facilities with Bicycle Parking, Changing Facilities & Transit
3. Policies

The overall goal of the Bicycle Transportation Plan is to make bicycling a safe and convenient alternative to driving. The policies listed below will ensure that the City continue to:

- Increase safety and livability
- Reduce bicyclist accidents
- Mitigate traffic and parking congestion
- Facilitate affordable mobility
- Attract tourists
- Encourage healthy transportation choices.

Specifically, each policy will provide the City with a blueprint to aid in the development of a comprehensive bicycle system that facilitates active transportation by community members, from children to seniors, both within the city of Atascadero, and to and from neighboring cities.

New Development Policies

P1: The City shall update the Engineering Standard Specification to include bikeway improvement standards for streets and Class I pathways including surface materials, signage and striping.

P2: New development projects that construct, reconstruct, or reconfigure existing roadways shall provide bikeways as prioritized and illustrated on the Figure 1, wherever feasible.

P3: Whenever new development is adjacent to a school, community center, or commercial center, development should include Class I pathways to the center/school/facility.

P4: The City should take full advantage of current regional, State, and Federal bicycle and pedestrian grant funding programs for bikeway projects.

P5: The Municipal Code shall be updated to require bike racks for short term and long term bicycle parking for all commercial and multifamily residential uses with a parking ratio consistent with the California Green Building Code.

P6: Parking lots, park and ride lots, and transit centers should, when feasible, provide bicycle parking for commuters. The City should work with SLOCOG and RTA to identify funds for bicycle parking.

P7: The City shall work with local schools to establish enough bike parking to
accommodate at least 10% of the student/staff population.

P8: All future annexations shall be consistent with this plan. Review of Bicycle/Pedestrian opportunities should be considered in City review of annexation areas.

P9: The Bike Plan shall be consulted when assembling and updating the Capital Improvement program.

P10: The City should eliminate gaps in bicycle routes and prioritize route continuity.

P11: Local bikeway and trail projects should be coordinated with regional projects whenever possible.

P12: The City shall seek funding and coordinate with other agencies, such as SLOCOG, San Luis Obispo County and Caltrans, to establish a bicycle route connection from Atascadero to Templeton along the Salinas River.

P13: The City should encourage new development to include facilities for changing and storing clothes and equipment to encourage bicycle commuting.

P14: Enhance bicycle access and travel within the Downtown with bike lanes, paths and parking facilities.

P15: Bike lanes should not end abruptly at property boundaries. New bike lanes should transition to connect to existing improvements and existing bike routes when possible.

P16: Bicycle routes and trails on the Eagle Ranch property will be planned and identified in the Specific Plan for the future annexation. Eagle Ranch trails should provide connections to existing and proposed City and County trails, consistent with the Circulation Element and the Bikeway and Trails diagram in the Atascadero General Plan.

Maintenance

P17: All Class I, II, and III bikeways shall be constructed and maintained according to guidelines described in Appendix 6 including pavement, sign, striping and stencil upkeep, channelization at intersections that have left or right-turn lanes crossing Class II bikeways, bicycle detection systems at signals, bicycle friendly drainage grates and more.

P18: The City should ensure street sweeping maintenance is extended to include bike lanes, such that bike facilities are maintained along with the travel lanes. Bicycle
and pedestrian pathways should be maintained as part of the City row maintenance efforts.
- The City should encourage local cycling and service groups to aid in maintenance or bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
- An "adopt a trail/lane" program could be implemented to provide recognition for all maintenance related community service efforts.
- If necessary, trail maintenance programs administration may be contracted to a local organization or bicycle advocacy group.

Education and Safety

P19: The City shall install directional signage to assist community members in their effort to find streets with bicycle facilities or identify locations where there is a change in the type of facility (e.g. where a Class I ends at an intersection and a Class II start on the other side, signage shall indicate to user what courses of action are available to them).

P20: The City should consider the establishment of a Rack for Plaques program where community members donate funds for the purchase of specific bike parking racks in designated locations in exchange for special recognition on those racks to assist in meeting bike parking requirements.

P21: All community events where over 500 attendees are expected should provide bike parking for at least 10% of the expected turnout.
- Temporary bike parking can typically be contracted to an outside organization. Ex: Bike Valet services may be hired the San Luis Obispo County Bicycle Coalition (SLOCBC) at a minimal cost to the event organizers.

P22: The City shall work with SLO Regional Rideshare to provide Transportation Choices Programs to City employees.

P23: The City should encourage safer cycling through Bicycle Education Workshops. The SLOCBC currently teaches a two part series of workshops to teach adults safe bicycle riding, provides one hour lunchtime sessions to businesses, schools and more. The School District shall be encouraged to provide bike and pedestrian safety programs at schools within City limits. The City may participate in bike rodeos or assemblies, organized walk/bike to school day events, and Safe Routes to School Activates. Collaboration with SLO Regional Rideshare, SLOCOG Safe Routes to School, SLOCBC, PTA and other organizations should be conducted to locate additional grant funding and volunteer support.

P24: The City should require Bicycle Confidence Workshops (offered by SLOCBC) or another equivalent program, to all people ticketed for bicycling illegally.
P25: The City should promote proper cycling to tourists by providing safe cycling information on the Conference and Visitors Bureau website and at the Chamber of Commerce Building downtown.

P26: The City may work collaboratively with others to support events and programs (ex: SLO Bike Club, The Wellness Community, USA Cycling, Amgen Tour of California, American Hiking Society National Trail day) promoting biking, walking, bicycle racing, and bicycle tourism in Atascadero.

Plan Updates

P27: The Bicycle Transportation Plan shall be updated every five years.

- A stakeholder group shall be established to assist City staff with the effort of updating Plan content and facilitating public input.

P28: Plan update should maximize coordination between local and regional municipalities, community organizations and the general public to include and evaluate all issues of mutual concern.

P29: The City Public Works department shall regularly monitor bicycle related accident levels, and seek a significant reduction on a per capita basis over the next twenty years.

P30: The Atascadero Bicycle Transportation Plan shall be consistent with regional plans such as the Regional Transportation Plan (2005), and local plans such as County Bikeways Plan prepared by the San Luis County Engineering Department (2005).

P31: Eagle Ranch trails and bike routes which are identified in the project Specific Plan should be incorporated into the Bicycle Transportation Plan after Eagle Ranch is annexed into City limits.

4. Plan Development

Atascadero's Bicycle Transportation Plan has been developed during spring and summer of 2010 under the guidance of the Atascadero Parks and Recreation Commission, assisted by the Public Works department, Community Development department, and local citizens interested in increasing active transportation opportunities in Atascadero.

Outreach
A stakeholder group of local citizens have worked to update Atascadero’s 2000 Bicycle Transportation plan with the goal of having the improved plan approved by the end of 2010. Special guidance regarding potential political hurdles, cycling encouragement programs, and infrastructure ideas has been provided by the San Luis Obispo County Bicycle Coalition.

In May of 2010 the Parks and Recreation Commission, with assistance from the SLO County Bicycle Coalition, conducted a public workshop to better understand current demand for a Bike Plan, discuss its potential benefits, and receive input regarding specific projects and policies Atascadero residents care about most. Over 20 participants were present at the public workshop. After the workshop, the stakeholder group began moving forward with updating the content of the plan and integrating ideas for improved bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.

A public hearing conducted on September 28th at a joint meeting of the Atascadero City Council and the Parks and Recreation Commission provided additional opportunities for public feedback before the completion of a Final Draft of the Atascadero Bicycle Transportation Plan.

**Relationships to Other Plans**

As an Element of the General Plan, the Bicycle Transportation Plan has the comprehensive scope and jurisdictional authority required to coordinate and guide the provision of all bicycle related programs, projects and facilities affecting the City of Atascadero. While many current planning efforts provide recommendations regarding one element or aspect of the bicycle networks; the task of the Atascadero Bicycle Transportation Plan is to ensure consistency between all of these blueprints, while attending to planning for areas of the City not already targeted by other studies. The studies or planning efforts listed below have been reviewed and consulted, studied for consistency, and where appropriate, folded into Atascadero’s Bicycle Transportation Plan:

*City of Atascadero General Plan (2002)*

The 2002 update of the General Plan addresses the planning and design of bicycle facilities in Atascadero. It makes specific recommendations meant to improve cycling conditions throughout Atascadero. Recommendations include: (a) a comprehensive network of on and off road bike routes to encourage the use of bikes for commute, recreational and other trips, (b) provide trailheads to improve access to the Salinas River and historic De Anza Trail.

*San Luis Obispo County Bikeways Plan (2005)*
The San Luis Obispo County Bikeways Plan provides the blueprint for developing a bikeway system that includes both on and off street facilities as well as support facilities and programs throughout the unincorporated County. The Plan compliments bikeway plans prepared by other jurisdictions by identifying key connections to existing or planned bikeway facilities in these jurisdictions.

San Luis Obispo County Regional Transportation Plan (2010)

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) developed by the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG) outlines the vision for transportation in SLO County through the year 2030. Various goals in the RTP include bicycle and pedestrian improvements and direct communities to: create and maintain a comprehensive interconnected, inter-county bikeway, trail and pedestrian system; pursue plans to develop multi-use and Class I bikeways along appropriate coastal frontages, and other major recreational areas using utility, rail, and roadway Rights-of-Way and abandoned railroad right-of-way throughout the region; encourage the development of Class I Bikeways that travel through or connect to scenic areas or other recreation destinations; encourage the development of boardwalks, recreation and multi use trails, which travel through or connect scenic areas or other destinations to promote walking and equestrian travel where appropriate; and encourage new development proposals to include bike racks, lockers, showers, Bike and Ride stops and safe interconnected pedestrian paths.

San Luis Obispo County Clean Air Plan (2001)

The SLO County Air Pollution Control District's Clean Air Plan recommends several methods and options to reduce air pollution associated with vehicle miles traveled such as: Voluntary Commute Options Program, City Transit Improvements, Regional Transit, Bicycling and Bikeway Enhancements, and Park and Ride Lots.
Appendices

Appendix 1: BTA requirements
To be eligible for Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) funds, a city or county must prepare and adopt a Bicycle Transportation Plan (BTP) that addresses items A-K in Streets and Highways Code Section 891.2. Below is the list of requirements, along with the page number on which the requirement is met.

Requirement and Location
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 (p. 29).

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 (p. 21, 22, 23, 24).

C. A map and description of existing and proposed bikeways (p. 8, 12).

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 (p. 9, 13).

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 (p. 9, 13).

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, lockers, restrooms, and shower facilities near bicycle parking facilities (p. 9, 13).

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 (p. 30, 42).

H. A description of the extent of citizen and community involvement in development of the plan, including, but not limited to, letters of support (p. 17).

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 (p. 18).

J. A description of the projects proposed in the plan and a listing of their priorities for implementation (p. 11).

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 (p. 8, 11).
### Table 3
List of Community Destinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Benito Elementary</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Rd Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalk Mountain Community School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Rio Continuation School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atascadero Junior High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atascadero High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Padres National Forest</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Mountain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalk Mtn Golf Course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heilmann Grove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atascadero Lake Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadium Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paloma Creek Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heilmann Grove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heilmann Regional Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colony Park Community Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atascadero Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vons &amp; Rite Aid Center</td>
<td>Grocery Drug Store Retail</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albertson's Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food-4-Less Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer's Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-Mart Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adobe Plaza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Retail / Restaurants</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colony Square Movie Theater &amp; Mixed Use</td>
<td>Retail/ Restaurant Office &amp; Residential</td>
<td>Under Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Ranch Mixed Use Development</td>
<td>Future Hotel, Tourist Commercial, Residential</td>
<td>Planning App. in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walmart &amp; The Annex</td>
<td>Future Retail</td>
<td>Planning App. in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Oaks</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Front Mixed Use</td>
<td>Retail/ Restaurant Business Park &amp; Residential</td>
<td>CUP Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Inn</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield Inn</td>
<td>Future Hotel</td>
<td>CUP Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Office Complex</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moresco Plaza</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Depot Center</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>Phase I constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dove Creek Commercial</td>
<td>Future Retail</td>
<td>CUP Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3
City of Atascadero Land Use Diagram
Figure 4
City of Atascadero Zoning Diagram
Appendix 3: Funding Sources

**Federal**

*Transportation Enhancement Activities (TE)*
- Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP-TE)
- Regional Improvement Program (STIP-TE)

Transportation Enhancement (TE) activities are federally funded community-based projects to expand travel choices and enhance transportation experiences by improving cultural, historic, aesthetic and environmental aspects of transportation infrastructure. The Transportation Enhancements program was created in 1991 by Congress to offset negative effects of highway construction projects fragmenting communities and eliminating open space. SAFETEA-LU significantly increased funds dedicated to the program through 2009. An increase is assumed with next transportation bill.

The program is managed by state transportation agencies and programmed by SLOCOG. States must set aside ten percent of its Surface Transportation Program funds for use on TE activities. SLOCOG typically programs 5%-10% of its regular STIP shares for transportation enhancement projects as well. TE projects are considered federal-aid reimbursement activities, meaning sponsors receive funding after expenditures have been made. In most cases, the federal government pays 80% of the project cost, and the project sponsor is responsible for the remaining 20%. Current regulations permit other federal funds and in-kind contributions as match. The TE funding program is directed to community-based activities, such as bicycle facilities, historic preservation, land acquisition, environmental mitigation, corridor enhancements, and scenic protection. This revenue stream is allocated to the region on a formula basis.

*Project Eligibility:* Federal Transportation Enhancement funds are for transportation related capital improvement projects enhancing quality-of-life, in or around transportation facilities. Projects must exceed normal transportation projects and required mitigation, and the project must be directly related to surface transportation systems. The projects should have a quality-of-life benefit with the greatest benefit to the greatest number of people. Projects must be within the following twelve categories:

1. Provision of facilities for pedestrians and bicycles
2. Provision of safety and educational activities for pedestrians and bicyclists
3. Acquisition of scenic easements and scenic/historic sites
4. Scenic or historic highway programs (including tourist and welcome centers)
5. Landscaping and other scenic beautification
6. Historic preservation
7. Rehab of historic transportation facilities (including historic railroad facilities)
8. Preservation of abandoned railway corridor (including conversion/ use for ped/bike trails)
9. Control and removal of outdoor advertising
10. Archaeological planning and research
11. Environmental mitigation to address water pollution due to highway runoff and reduce vehicle-caused wildlife mortality while maintaining habitat connectivity
12. Establishment of transportation museums

The federal criteria have been used exclusively since the California Transportation Commission (CTC) abolished the State Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA) Program in 2002. For the State’s share, districts are encouraged to add enhancements to regular transportation projects rather than create stand-alone transportation enhancement projects. Administered through SLOCOG, competitive funding is programmed during biennial STIP Programming.
Safe Routes to School Program (SRTS)
The Safe Routes to School Program (SRTS) is to increase the number of children in grades K-8 walking or biking to school by removing the barriers that currently prevent them from doing so. Barriers include lack of infrastructure or inadequate infrastructure that poses a safety hazard, or lack of outreach programs that promote walking/bicycling through education and encouragement for children, parents, and the community.

Project Eligibility: Eligible projects fall under the category of infrastructure (capital improvements), or non-infrastructure (education, encouragement, enforcement). Infrastructure projects must be located within a two-mile radius of a grade school or middle school. Eligible applicants include state, local and regional agencies. Non-profit organizations, federally recognized Native American Tribes, school districts, hospitals and public health departments can partner with state, local and regional agencies as their responsible applicants. Administered through Caltrans Local Assistance Competitive Federal funding cycle complete. Future funding cycle structure unknown. Additional information found at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/saferoutes/saferoutes.htm

Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)
This new Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), under SAFETEA-LU, replaces the Hazard Elimination Safety Program (HES). The new program provides a transition period that allows States to fund projects that were eligible under the old HES Program until such time that an annual 5 Percent Report, describing no less than 5 percent of public roadway locations with the most severe safety needs, and a Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) have been developed and implemented by the State. The intent of HSIP is to significantly reduce public roadway fatalities and serious injuries. The emphasis will be at locations that are data and strategically driven.

Project Eligibility: For a project to be eligible for HSIP funds, the project must be on any public road, publicly owned bicycle, pedestrian pathway, or trail. Projects must identify a specific safety problem that can be corrected or be improved substantially. Administered through Caltrans Local Assistance. See http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/hsip.htm

Recreational Trails
The Recreational Trails Program (RTP) provides funds annually for recreational trails and trails-related projects. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) administer the RTP. The Department's Office of Grants and Local Services administer non-motorized projects and the Department's Office of Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division administers motorized projects. See http://www.parks.ca.gov/default.asp?page_id=24324

State

State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)
These funds are not historically used for bicycle specific improvements, except in the case of STIP TE - regional & local projects only (see Fed TE information above) STIP funding is used for major highway and regionally significant projects that can include bicycle improvements.

Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)
These funds are not historically used for bicycle specific improvements, except in the case of ITIP-TE projects. These funds are for Transportation Enhancements of Statewide significance such as the De Anza Trail, Atascadero-Templeton Connector, etc.

Transportation Development Act (TDA)
Approved by the Legislature in 1971, the Mills-Alquist-Deddeh Act or SB 325 created the Transportation
Development Act (TDA). This law provides funding for transit and non-transit purposes complying with Regional Transportation Plans. TDA established the Local Transportation Fund (LTF), and the State Transit Assistance (STA) Fund. Providing public need as are satisfied the LTF can be used for local streets and roads, construction and maintenance. The STA funding can only be used for transportation planning and mass transportation purposes. Project Eligibility: TDA funds a wide variety of transportation programs, including planning and program activities, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, community transit services, public transportation, and bus and rail projects.

**State Gas Tax Subventions**
Also known as Highway User Tax Act (HUTA) subventions, Counties currently receive 3.23-cents of the 18-cents gas tax, equal to approximately $500 million annually. These funds are used at the jurisdictions’ discretion for transportation projects, including bike facilities. Current state budget deliberations include proposals that defer the local share of Highway User Tax Act (HUTA, also known as Gas Tax) in FY 2009-10 and FY 2010-11.

**Bicycle Transportation Account (formerly BLA)**
The Bicycle Transportation Account Program (BTA) provides State funds for city and county projects that improve safety and convenience for bicycle commuters. The Bicycle Facilities Unit (BFU) in the Division of Local Assistance and the District Local Assistance Engineers (DLAE) administer the BTA Program.

**Program Eligibility:** Cities and counties are eligible to apply for BTA funds. To be eligible for BTA funds, a city or county must prepare and adopt a Bicycle Transportation Plan that complies with Streets and Highways Code Section 891.2 and has been approved by the appropriate Regional Transportation Planning Agency and Caltrans. Project Categories BTA projects may include but are not limited to, the following:
- New bikeways serving major transportation corridors
- New bikeways removing travel barriers to potential bicycle commuting
- Secure bicycle parking at employment centers, park-and-ride lots, rail and transit terminals, and ferry docks and landings
- Bicycle-carrying facilities on public transit vehicles
- Installation of traffic control devices to improve the safety and efficiency of bicycle travel
- Elimination of hazardous conditions on existing bikeways
- Planning
- Improvement and maintenance of bikeways competitive funding cycle announced in October. Additional information found at: [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/bta/btawebPage.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/bta/btawebPage.htm)

**Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program (EEM)**
The Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation program was established by the Legislature in 1989. It offers a total of $10 million each year for grants to local, state, and federal governmental agencies and to nonprofit organizations for projects to mitigate the environmental impacts caused by new or modified state transportation facilities.

Eligible projects must be directly or indirectly related to the environmental impact of the modification of an existing transportation facility or construction of a new transportation facility. Projects funded under this program must provide environmental enhancement and mitigation over and above what is otherwise called for under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In funding the program, an attempt is made to maintain a 40/60 North/South split between California’s 45 northern and 13 southern counties. Caltrans administers the approved grant agreements, and grants are awarded in three categories:
- **Highway Landscape and Urban Forestry** -- Projects designed improve air quality through the planting of trees and other suitable plants.
• Resource Lands -- Projects for the acquisition, restoration, or enhancement of watersheds, wildlife habitat, wetlands, forests, or other natural areas.
• Roadside Recreational -- Projects for the acquisition and/or development of roadside recreational opportunities.

Additional information at: http://resources.ca.gov/eem/

**Petroleum Violation Escrow Account**
Grant opportunities from this fund are available through the Bicycle Facilities Unit (BFU) of Caltrans in the form of BTA grants.

**Office of Traffic Safety Grants (OTS)**
Competitive Grants issued by the Office of Traffic Safety on a regional/local level. Search for Local grant information on the website at: http://www.ots.ca.gov/Grants/default.asp

**Safe Routes to School Program (SR2S)**
Assembly Bill (AB) 1475 (Soto – 1999) called for Caltrans to establish and administer a program to fund bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure improvements for children in grades K-12 using federal transportation funds. Senate Bill (SB) 10 was later enacted to extend the sunset date of the program from January 1, 2002 to January 1, 2005. Subsequently SB1087 was signed by Governor Schwarzenegger to extend the program for three more years. In 2007, AB 57 was enacted which eliminated dedicated funding and required that funds compete against other safety programs in the annual State Budget process. Project Eligibility: To be eligible for SR2S funds, the project must be located on any state highway or on any local road. Projects must correct an identified safety hazard or problem on a route that students use for trips to and from school. Up to 10 percent of the project’s cost can fund a non-infrastructure component that supports the infrastructure project. Only cities and counties are eligible to compete for funds. Competitive funding cycle completed. Status of next funding cycle is unknown. Additional information at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/saferoutes/saferoutes.htm

**Local/Regional**

**Traffic Mitigation/Impact Fees**
These one-time fees may be imposed on new developments to pay for fair-share improvements and facilities required to serve it or otherwise reduce the impacts of new developments in a community on a regional level. While a number of jurisdictions actively collect local impact fees, to date, regional traffic impact fees have not been pursued within the San Luis Obispo region. General Funds Jurisdictions can use General funds for bikeway improvements as outlined in their Capital Improvement Program.

**Sales Tax Increase**
*Local Option Sales tax:* This can be used to improve bikeways, this is up to the Jurisdiction to decide to do, promote, and prioritize funds from. San Luis Obispo, Pismo Beach, Grover Beach, and Morro Bay passed Local Option Sales tax measures in 2006.

*Regional Option Sales tax:* Throughout California, more and more regions have turned to a more stable funding, locally-derived, source for transportation projects. Nineteen counties (representing 85% of the population) have passed voter measures to increase the local sales tax, most typically, by 0.5%. In 07/08, over $4.5B was generated for transportation purposes in these regions. Currently, these measures require a 2/3rd majority vote and the funding may only be used for projects and programs in the approved Expenditure Plan. A similar measure in the San Luis Obispo region would generate $20M-$25M
per year. While many of the remaining counties continue to actively and aggressively pursue a regional option sales tax, the San Luis Obispo region has not yet made any progress. The 2010 RTP recommends moving forward with investigating supplemental funding.

**Fuel Tax Increase**

A Fuel Tax increase can be implemented at a regional level and provide local funding opportunities. Washoe County in Nevada recently approved a 2-3 Cent fuel tax increase to be implemented in January 2009.

**California Clean Air Act (CCAA)- Implementation Funds (AB2766)**

The San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) has implemented a vehicle registration surcharge to fund various programs necessary to implement the provisions of the California Clean Air Act of 1988. These funds may be used for the funding of transportation projects and planning activities with air quality benefits, such as travel demand management, transit, and land use planning. The San Luis Obispo County APCD directs the use of those funds according to its adopted Clean Air Plan.

**Appendix 4: Bicycle and Pedestrian Commuter Estimates**

The number of cyclists and pedestrians commuting to work in Atascadero as cited in this plan are based on US Census Data from 1990 (Summary Tape File 3: STF3) and 2000 (Summary File 3: SF3).

Due to the unavailability of more detailed information the City of Atascadero plans to coordinate with local government and non-profit organizations to aid with additional research regarding local transportation choices. A report regarding transportation choices and barriers to cycling and walking will be utilized in the update of the Bicycle Transportation Plan in 2015.

**Table 4**

Means of Transportation to Work for Workers 16 years and older:

Each number indicates the total number of people using each form of transportation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Commuters</th>
<th>Car, Truck, Van</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Walk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>11411</td>
<td>10415</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>12056</td>
<td>11169</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change in Bicycling and Walking from 1990 to 2000:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Total Commuters</th>
<th>Car, Truck, Van</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Walk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990-2000</td>
<td>+ 645</td>
<td>+ 754</td>
<td>- 38</td>
<td>- 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ 5.6%</td>
<td>+ 1.3%</td>
<td>- 0.3%</td>
<td>- 0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: Bicycle Related Crash Statistics

Figure 5
Bike Collision Map
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Appendix 6: Bicycle Facilities

Definitions of Class Types
The following class types are consistent with Highway Design Manual specifications:

Class I:
Bikeways that provide a completely separated right-of-way designated for the exclusive use of bicycles and pedestrians with cross-flows by motorists minimized. Requirements are 8 feet wide with a minimum 2 feet graded on each side making a minimum of 12-foot wide area. See Figure 7 below.

Figure 6
Class I Bikeway Specification

Class II:
Bikeways that provide a restricted right-of-way designed for the exclusive or semi-exclusive use of bicycles with through travel by motor vehicles or pedestrians prohibited but with vehicle parking and cross-flows of pedestrians and motorists permitted. These are lanes striped for bicycles on streets or highways and are intended for one-way bicycle travel. Lanes provide an indication to motorists of possibility of cyclists and definition for cyclists of where to ride. These lanes provide continuity between other bicycle infrastructures. The HDM requires a minimum of 5 feet where parking stalls are marked. On a street with no gutter the bike lane should be at least 4 feet and 5 feet with a 2-foot gutter per HDM. See Figure 8 below.
Figure 7
Class II Bikeway Specifications

(1) MARKED PARKING

Vertical Curb

"12' Min.
Motor Vehicle Lanes

Roller Curb

"13' Min.
Motor Vehicle Lanes

* 13' is recommended where there is substantial parking or turnover of parked cars is high (e.g., commercial areas).

(2) PARKING PERMITTED WITHOUT MARKED PARKING OR STALL

3' Min.

5' Min.
Motor Vehicle Lanes

Bike Lane

4' Min.
Motor Vehicle Lanes

Bike Lane

(With Gutter)

(Without Gutter)

(3) PARKING PROHIBITED

(4) TYPICAL ROADWAY IN OUTLYING AREAS
PARKING RESTRICTED

Note: For pavement marking guidance, see the MUTCD and California Supplement Section 90-64.
Class III:
Bikeways that provide a right-of-way designated by bike route signs along roadways and are shared with pedestrians or motorists. These are usually preferred routes due to advantages over other routes such as high traffic or poor road surface. Sidewalks are not recommended for Class III bikeways. Signage options shown in Figure 9 include:

**Figure 8**
Class III Bikeway Signage Specifications

Bicycle Boulevard:
A roadway shared with automobiles and bicycles similar to Class III although through traffic preference is given to bicyclists. Example might be pilings at cross streets that allow bicycle traffic to flow while automobile traffic is diverted.

Sharrows:
As noted in Figure 10, a sharrow represents a roadway shared with automobiles where there is insufficient width for a striped bike lane. SHARROWS, also known as shared lane markings, are on-street legends that reinforce the existing rules of the road. They are not separate bike lanes; a motorist can still drive over the sharrows. Motorists should expect to see and share the lane with bicyclists. Sharrows indicate to bicyclists the best place to ride in the lane sharrows are typically used in locations where the roadway width is not adequate to provide dedicated bike facilities or on downhill lanes where bicyclists might travel similar speed as motor vehicles.
Figure 9
Sharrow Symbols

Bike Loop Detector:
A Bike Detector tells the signal when a motor vehicle or bicycle is waiting for the light to turn green. Bike-specific pavement markings indicate where to position the front wheel in order to change the signal.
**Channelization:**
Involves how the bicycle is routed through an intersection. Because California Vehicle Code considers bicycles “vehicles” the safest way for a bicyclist to behave in traffic is similarly to a vehicle. Because of this, markings on the road, as shown in Figures 11-13 direct bicyclists into the proper lane position best for creating visibility and safety for traffic.
Figures 11, 12, 13
Examples of Channelization

(1) RIGHT-TURN-ONLY LANE

(2) PARKING AREA BECOMES RIGHT-TURN-ONLY LANE

(3) OPTIONAL DOUBLE RIGHT-TURN-ONLY LANE

(4) RIGHT LANE BECOMES RIGHT-TURN-ONLY LANE

Note: For bicycle lane markings, see the MUTCD and California Supplement. Section 9C.04.
Bike Boxes
A bike box is another way to provide safety for cyclists at intersections. It provides bicyclists with additional space at the front of cars queued up at an intersection.

Figure 14
Bike Box

Appendix 7: Bike Parking Programs

Short Term Bike Parking:
Short-term parking includes racks on sidewalks, in parking lots, and at special events. Below are examples of racks. A “racks with plaques” program can be used to increase public bike parking at minimal cost to the City.

Figure 15
Peak Rack
Figure 16
U-rack (This rack type is NOT recommended)

Long Term Bike Parking:
Long-term parking includes bike lockers (on public or private property) and bike cages (private property only, such as work sites). Other long-term bike amenities include showers, changing rooms, and/or indoor bike parking. These services can be provided by an employer or can be a private enterprise such as Bike Station, a company that provides services and parking for a fee. See examples of long term parking below in diagram/photo 5-12.

Figure 17
Bike Lockers & Cages
Figure 18

Bike Valet Parking

The Bike Valet is a volunteer run bike parking service provided by the SLO County Bicycle Coalition aimed at making it easier for people to pedal to community events, it works just like a coat check. Upon arrival, each rider is given a claim check tag matching the number allocated to their bike. Their bike is carefully parked in the secure lot for the duration of the event. When they wish to retrieve their bike they simply hand our volunteers their claim check tag and the bike is returned with ease.

With over 15,000 bikes parked the Coalition's volunteers are experts at protecting your bikes. If you forget to pick it up we will lock it to a bike rack, sign feature, or in our storage space with a standard bicycle cable lock and may be subject to a storage fee.
Appendix 8: Bicycle Safety Workshops

The SLO County Bicycle Coalition has a variety of workshops designed to meet the needs of all types of community members.

**STREET SKILLS WORKSHOP**
In this workshop you will learn how to take on the road with confidence. Learn simple yet innovative techniques to ride safely, get noticed, and gain the respect of motorists. Find out the typical scenarios that usually lead to a crash and how to avoid them. Learn about your legal rights on a bike. We'll then take it on the road where you'll get to put your new techniques to immediate use, such as how to negotiate an intersection and how to take charge around all of those cars. We guarantee that after you leave this workshop you'll feel more empowered about taking on traffic. Workshop duration: 4.5 hours

**RIDE RIGHT WORKSHOP**
Get more in-depth training on bicycling in traffic. Learn how a simple thing like lane positioning can make a big difference in how you are treated in auto traffic. Beyond that, we'll show you basic road mechanics like how to change a flat, adjust your brakes, and even adjust your gears. Workshop duration: 5 hours

**BROWN BAG SEMINAR**
Interested in having a presentation on bicycling at your place of business, club, or community group? Our one-hour seminar is a great way to introduce bicycling to your friends or colleagues.