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1. Plan Purpose

Consistent with State Law, the City considers the varying ages and abilities of motorists, pedestrians and bicyclists with development of transportation infrastructure. Multiple General Plan/Local Coastal Plan policies provide direction to accommodate a variety of opportunities for pedestrian and bicyclists in the Parks, Recreation and Access, Circulation, Conservation and Open Space, and Land Use elements.

The Pismo Beach Bicycle/Pedestrian Master plan (The Plan) provides the implementation tools for many General Plan/Local Coastal Plan directives. The Plan implementation measures found in section 4 are the actions the City can take to improve pedestrian and bicyclist opportunities in Pismo Beach. Additionally, the Plan includes all the requirements for Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) eligibility (shown in Appendix A) and the necessary information for pedestrian and beach access grant applications and projects. Last, future projects identified in The Plan will be included in the San Luis Obispo Council of Government’s (SLOCOG) long term Regional Transportation Plan, the basis for identifying potentially fundable projects in the next 25 years.
2. Introduction and Background

Bicycling, walking, hiking and running are among the many ways to enjoy Pismo Beach. Additional benefits provided to the residents, commuters, businesses and tourists include the extension of transportation infrastructure’s life and capacity, reductions in the need to drive and park, expanded recreational opportunities, as well increased revenues from visitor extended stays.

Abundant ocean views are found virtually the entire length of the City, a primary benefit for the recreational uses of the City’s many bikeways, trails, and beach access points. The Pismo Beach location at the convergence of the California Coastal Trail and the Juan Batista De Anza Trail provides residents and visitors with unique usage opportunities. For these reasons, the City seeks their preservation and enhancement. As noted in the Pismo Beach General Plan/Local Coastal Plan (GP/LCP), “Bikeways shall be encouraged within the City and adjoining jurisdictions as a complement to Pismo Beach’s visitor and recreation emphasis, to reduce automobile trips and for the convenience of visitors and residents”\(^1\) and multiple directives are provided in the GP/LCP to maximize the use of trail and beach access opportunities throughout the City.

Pismo Beach’s relatively small size and Mediterranean climate make for an ideal place for resident and visitor walking and bicycling. Destination areas include multiple City park facilities, Shell Beach neighborhood commercial and beach access areas, downtown shopping, the beach, and three large shopping areas on the southeast side of the City. The Shell Beach area and downtown are prime bicycling and walking areas as parking is limited. Shopping areas located in the southeasterly portion of the City have large parking lots which with improved bicycling/pedestrian facilities could be beneficial to commuting employees. Figure 1 shows general land use areas in Pismo Beach.

Figure 2 identifies many Pismo Beach destination areas.

\(^1\) Policy C-12
Figure 1: Land Use
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Figure 2: Destinations
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Bicycling in Pismo Beach

Various bicycle facilities accommodate differing types of cyclists. Some cyclists are comfortable riding among cars with no bike lane, while others prefer being completely separated from traffic. The more cyclists that can be accommodated through different types of infrastructure, the more people will choose cycling for recreation and transport. The Plan includes different types of facilities to encourage cycling as a consistent form of transportation by eliminating cycling barriers.

The following Figure 3 shows existing bike facilities (Class I, II, and III bikeways and bike parking). The majority of the existing bike facilities are Class II bike lanes that run along the major arterials of the City. Several Class III bikeways are in the northwestern part of the City and a significant number of Class I pathways pass through shoreline parks.

Class I bike paths are separated from roadways with few road crossings. A Class I example is the Pismo Creek Trail in the eastern portion of the City shown to the right.

Class II bike lanes are designated striped sections of roadway with a bicycle symbol stamp. Most of the City’s bike lanes are Class II and run along Shell Beach Road, Mattie Road, portions of Price, and the entire length of Dolliver Street.

Class III bikeways are unmarked sections of the road that are used by cyclists. These roadways are usually on neighborhood streets, have a lower volume of cars and are too narrow to stripe for a bike lane. Class III bikeways are primarily used to connect Class I and II bikeways.

Figure 4 shows existing Pismo Beach bike parking. Parking facilities identified include bike racks, which are generally considered day-use. Long term parking consists of bike lockers or indoor parking facilities. Types of long and short term bike parking are shown in Appendix 5: Bicycle Facilities.

---

2 Existing Class I bike facilities in Pismo Beach are generally multi-use paths that allow bicyclists.
3 Long term bike parking such as bike lockers and employer-provided indoor parking is assumed not to exist, based on employer survey conducted spring 2009.
Figure 3: Existing Bikeways
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Figure 4: Existing Bike Parking
Walking/Hiking/Running/Beach Access

Pismo Beach has many pedestrian trails, beach access stairways and sidewalks. A system of bluff-top trails link with adjacent hotels along Shell Beach Road and Price Street to provide an extraordinary walking experience for most of the length of Pismo Beach.

Nine beach access stairways are available for public use.

A network of complete sidewalks is an important component of a city's walk-ability. Most streets have 4 foot sidewalks, particularly in newer constructed areas, unless the neighborhood streets are too narrow. However, new development requirements include sidewalks with construction.

The City has created a parks, trails and beach access guide (see appendix 2) for residents and visitors. This guide shows the locations of all parks, trails, and beach access points including bike paths.

Existing pedestrian facilities are shown on Figure 5. Future pedestrian and beach access is shown in Section 5, Figure 8. Appendix 12 also shows future City trail access areas (GP/LCP Figure PR-2)
Education and Outreach

Educating visitors and residents can make the Pismo Beach bicycling and pedestrian experience even more successful. Walking and bicycling education programs can include:

- elementary and middle school programs,
- employer based education programs,
- informational materials at hotels and tourist destinations,
- “share-the-road” campaigns for reducing bike/ped-vehicle conflicts. SLO Regional Rideshare and the San Luis Obispo County Bicycle Coalition have several existing programs that could be incorporated into the City.

The Plan, Section 3, provides multiple educational implementation measures. Appendices 6, 7, and 8 contain examples of implementation and education programs.
3. Plan Creation

This Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan was initiated by the City in fall 2008. Creation of the plan included a website [www.bikewalkpismo.org](http://www.bikewalkpismo.org) with online surveys for residents, visitors, and employers. The City also sent employer surveys to all businesses in the City.

Employer and resident surveys were made available online and publicized through the SLOCBC and Rideshare websites and newsletters. Additionally, the resident survey was made available at a Shell Beach Improvement Group Meeting and the employer survey was mailed to all employers in the City. Copies of both surveys and results are in Appendix 4.

The Plan was advertised and presented at the Pismo Beach Parks, Recreation, and Beautification Commission in March 2009, June 2009 and March 2010, where much input was provided. City Public Works staff provided internal input on satisfaction with existing facilities, near-term capital improvement projects, and future projects.

Survey Results

Among the forty-seven (47) respondents to the employer survey general results show the following:

- The majority of Pismo Beach Employees live in the Five Cities area
- Over half of Pismo Beach employers offer some car parking spaces for employees (27), several offer bike parking (12), and none offer showers or alternate transportation choice incentive programs
- Most of the employers surveyed have sidewalks adjacent to their workplace (39), most are adjacent to public transportation (21), many have bike lanes (16), and few had a separated path for walking or biking (8)
- Half of the employers surveyed wanted additional bike and pedestrian activity around their workplace, half wanted additional car parking spaces

Among the eighteen (18) respondents to the resident survey general results show the following:

- A majority of respondents indicated they usually or always spend time at the beach
- Driving is the most common way that respondents get around Pismo (12), followed by walking (8) and then bicycling (6)
- Walkways (10) and beach access points (10) were the amenities that respondents used most often, followed by bike lanes (9) and trails (7)
- Separated bike trails (6) and walkways (6) were the amenities that residents most want to see more of, followed by bike lanes (5) and sidewalks (5)
Public Meetings

PRBC March 4th, 2008
The first Parks, Recreation and Beautification Committee meeting introducing the planning process to the Parks Commission and sharing information about the bike/ped plan, the website, future meetings and deadlines was held on March 4th, 2008. The meeting was an opportunity for PRBC to provide direction on The Plan’s content, and was attended by four of the five commissioners and three members of the community. Several commissioners expressed interest in having maps and other outreach materials; one commissioner was interested in having the plan address electric vehicles. One member of the public noted several locations where existing facilities could be improved. These comments, where appropriate, were incorporated into The Plan.

PRBC June 4th, 2009
The second meeting held on June 4th, 2009 included a Plan presentation with incorporated input from the prior meeting, survey, and website. Attended by the entire Commission and several members of the public, Commissioners expressed interest in having the plan brought back for additional review. This meeting was also attended by members of the public who were concerned about a pending proposal for a modification to the Class II bike lanes on Shell Beach Road between Vista Del Mar and Cliff. It was determined The Plan completion be put on hold until the City Council made a decision as to whether a Class II bike lane in the Shell Beach village area would remain.

PRBC March 4th, 2010
The third meeting was held on March 4, 2010 where the Commission reviewed The Plan and recommended its approval to the City Council. The meeting was attended by two members of the public, both of whom spoke in favor of The Plan.

City Council Meeting: April 6, 2010
Council provided direction for further plan review.

City Council Public Workshop and Public Hearing June 15, 2010
Council approved Resolution R-2010-039 adopting the Plan.
Relationship to City and other Adopted Plans

General Plan/Local Coastal Plan Principle P-1 *Balanced Transportation* item C notes: The quality of life and economic vitality of Pismo Beach is dependent upon a safe and efficiently operating circulation system providing for pedestrians, bicycles, trucks, automobiles and public transportation. Specific aspects of this system include:
c. Pedestrian and Bicycle – Pedestrian and bicycle paths are important elements of the circulation system and shall receive at least the same emphasis and attention in future planning as facilities designed for the automobile.

The General Plan/Local Coastal Plan further discusses pedestrian and bicycling opportunities throughout the Circulation and Parks and Open space elements. The Pismo Beach Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan is not a part of the City’s General Plan/Local Coastal Plan, however, the GP/LCP policies addressing pedestrian and bicycle opportunities are amplified in this document.

As required in Streets and Highways Code Section 891.2, The Plan must show the relationship to other adopted plans in the region, such as the Regional Transportation Plan, the Clean Air Plan, and other adopted plans. This information is included in Appendix 3: Relationship to Other Adopted plans.

Pismo Beach is adjacent to Arroyo Grande to the southeast and Grover Beach to the southwest. Avila Beach is northeast of the City and the northern border of the City is unincorporated County. The Plan maintains consistency with those jurisdictions’ bikeways at their juncture with the City. Figure 6, below, shows where Arroyo Grande, Grover Beach, Avila Beach and the County have bikeways that cross into the City. Future bike projects that may extend into other jurisdictions can be found in Section 5, Table 2 and Figure 6.
Figure 6: Bikeway Area Connections into Pismo Beach
4. Policies

Plan policies are based on the underlying goal of making Pismo Beach a City where residents and visitors of all ages can safely walk, bicycle, or reach the beach with:

- A well defined network of Class I, II, and III bike facilities including sufficient end-of-trip facilities.
- A complete network of sidewalks and pedestrian walkways including frequent beach access points.
- Residents and visitors access to information about bicycling and walking safely in the City.

New Facilities

BP-1: Planning and development activities that construct, reconstruct, or reconfigure existing roadways shall, to the extent feasible as determined by the City, provide bikeways as shown on Figures 7 and 8.

BP-2: Future Planning projects and right-of-way dedications will take the existing layout and circulation of bicycle facilities into consideration and make appropriate adjustments for facilities identified in the plan.

BP-3: Whenever new development is adjacent to an existing commercial center, school or other community facility, development should include non-motorized pathways to the center/school/facility (Consistent with General Plan/Local Coastal Plan LU-N-12, expand to full City limits).

BP-4: A future update of Municipal code section 17.108.020 (minimum off-street parking requirements) should consider a ratio of one bike rack for every 10 car spaces for commercial uses and 1 bike rack for every two car spaces for multi-family residential uses.

BP-5: All new City parking lots should provide bicycle parking not less than 10% of the number of planned parking spaces.

BP-6: All future annexations will be consistent with this plan. Review of Bicycle/Pedestrian opportunities should be considered in City review of annexation areas.

BP-7: The Bike Plan shall be consulted when assembling and updating the Capital Improvement program.

BP-8: City requirement for all new development in commercial areas of the City to construct 10’ sidewalks from the face of the curb to the back of the sidewalk if the existing sidewalk within the block in which the new sidewalk to be constructed is of the same width. If the existing sidewalk in the block in which the new sidewalk is to be constructed is not of a ten-foot width, then the new sidewalk to be constructed will be
the same width as the existing sidewalk already in place on the block. (PBMC Title 12, streets and sidewalks).

BP-9: The City will require all new development in residential areas to construct 4 ½ foot sidewalks from the base of the curb to the back of the sidewalk and poured integrally, unless the new sidewalk to be so constructed is to be determined by resolution of the City Council upon application by the owner, lessee, or agent desiring to construct the sidewalk, or by the Public Works Director. (PBMC Title 12, streets and sidewalks).

BP-10: The City will require new subdivisions to include 4 ½ foot sidewalks for pedestrian benefit. (PBMC Title 16, subdivision ordinance requirement).

BP-11: The City will encourage techniques to create a pleasant walking experience including concern for views, paving materials, landscape, street furniture and pedestrian scale lighting. (General Plan policy C-13).

BP-12: The City will require all new sidewalk areas to be designed to accommodate the handicapped. (General Plan policy C-13).

BP-13: The City and Caltrans shall study the feasibility of adding a pedestrian crossing of US 101 between the Spyglass and Mattie Road interchanges. (General Plan Policy C-13).

BP-14: The City shall install, or require installment by others through the development of property, sidewalks or footpaths along all collectors or arterial streets that connect with commercial centers, public gathering areas, and schools. (General Plan Policy C-13).

BP-15: The City will require new development to provide street trees; trees will provide shading of pedestrians. (Consistent with PBMC Title 12).

**Maintenance/Upgrades**

BP-16: All Class I, II, and III bikeways shall be constructed in accordance with guides established in Figure C-4 in the Pismo Beach General Plan Circulation Element (shown in Appendix 5).

BP-17: Channelization should be provided at intersections that have left or right-turn lanes crossing Class II bikeways. City shall consider including bike boxes at intersections with high bicycle traffic volumes (shown in Appendix 5).

BP-18: Where feasible as determined by the City, video or in-pavement detection of bicycles shall be installed on roads with bikeways; symbols shall be painted on roadway after re-surfacing or repaving (shown in Appendix 5).
BP-19: If feasible, as determined by the City Engineer, the City shall replace existing drainage grates with new “bike friendly” grates, mounted flush with the street, when major improvements or maintenance involving drainage grates is being performed on that street. Bike friendly grates shall be installed when new streets are built (see Appendix 11).

BP-20: The City shall 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.

BP-21: The City shall request Caltrans referral for City comment for all Caltrans Right-of-Way projects for examination and advisement on pedestrian and bicyclist access and safety pursuant to The Plan.

BP-22: The City will install directional signage for trail users at 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).

BP-23: Long and short-term bicycle parking shall be provided at all park and ride lots and transit centers (City shall work with SLOCOG and RTA to identify funds for bicycle parking). Potential future bike parking locations are shown in Figure 9.

BP-24: City staff shall identify locations where additional long and short-term bike parking may be necessary (e.g. where bikes are locked to trees, street signs, blocking doorways, etc) and:
- May develop a “racks-with-plaques” program to provide for additional bike parking at those locations (SLO City Racks with Plaques program brochure shown in Appendix 6).
- Recommend long-term parking facilities including lockers and showers for new developments

BP-25: The City may install, where feasible, water fountains, trash facilities, benches and restroom facilities along primary pedestrian corridors. (Oak Park Blvd, James Way, Five Cities Drive, Dolliver, Highland, Longview, Mattie Road, Pomeroy, Ventana and Wadsworth) and streets located in the Downtown Commercial K planning area.

BP-26: The City shall require reconstruction of existing development to include improvements to maximize the walking experience of passing pedestrian, including, but not limited to paving materials, landscape, street furniture and pedestrian scale lighting (General Plan policy C-13).
**Education/Outreach/Events**

BP-27: The City shall work with SLO Regional Rideshare to provide Transportation Choices Programs to City employees.

BP-28: Bike valet is a service offered by the San Luis Obispo County Bicycle Coalition (SLOCBC) for $50 per hour with a 50% discount if volunteers are provided by event staff, with a $100 minimum. This service is usually for large City events to reduce car usage and encourage bike travel. The City should consider adding the following text to Municipal Code 12.16.160 Content of Special Event form (see Appendix 7 for Bike Valet brochure):

_N. As a condition of the issuance of a Special Event permit, the applicant may be required to provide bicycle parking. Bicycle parking provision may include “Bike Valet” services provided by SLOCBC or by event volunteers._

BP-29: Bicycle Confidence Workshop: Workshops are a series of classes offered by the SLO Bike Coalition to teach adults safe bicycle riding; a $35 deposit is required for the class. The City may work with the bike coalition to advertise Bicycle Confidence Workshops in Pismo Beach (Bicycle Confidence Brochure in Appendix 8).

BP-30: The City should encourage Lucia Mar School District to provide bike and pedestrian safety programs at schools within City limits. The City may participate in bike rodeos or assemblies and organized walk/bike to school day events.

BP-31: The City may participate in Bicycle Confidence Workshops (offered by SLOCBC) or another equivalent program, to individuals ticketed for bicycling illegally.

BP-32: The City may participate in education programs for motorists on rights/rules of pedestrians and bicyclists.

BP-33: 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.

BP-34: The City will continue its advertisement of the many walking and beach access options within the City by print, on-line advertisement and public access television.

BP-35: The City may assist and provide support for organizations and individuals who wish to use pedestrian facilities for social activity and improvement (example, walking clubs).

BP-36: The City encourages school participation with the SLOCOG Safe Routes to School program. SLO Regional Rideshare (www.rideshare.org) works with schools to offer individualized programs including Parent Surveys; Mini Grants given to promote cycling in the community; Bike Assemblies, a ride of recreational cycling in large groups.
ending with a presentation of bicycle education; and, Bike Rodeo, a bicycle safety training and education for elementary school children.

BP-37: The City encourages Rideshare Employee Incentive Programs. Rideshare offers an employer Transportation Choices Program that helps employers promote bicycling, walking, carpooling, and riding the bus to work. This would reduce the employers’ need for car parking spaces. This program may provide financial incentives or only promotional materials.

BP-38: The City may engage Cal Poly, the San Luis Distance Club, SLO Soles Volkssport and/or other walking/running clubs, SLO County Bicycle Coalition, biking clubs or Regional Rideshare assistance to implement elements of this bicycle/pedestrian plan by doing the following:

- Organizing an outreach campaign for Iwalk International Walk to School day each October or other similar walking programs.
- Coordination of walking programs for varying segments of the population, including, but not limited to children and seniors.
- Seeking and writing grants for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure
- Monitoring success of the implementation procedures identified in this document
- Developing a safety campaign to reduce car/bike conflicts
- Liaising between local schools and Rideshare to provide bike education
- Creating or working with the SLOCBC to provide bike valet at events
- Starting a “racks with plaques” and other promotion programs

BP-39: The City may participate with others to address countywide issues related to bicycle and pedestrian access.

BP-40: The City may provide advertising opportunities through its quarterly recreation guide for walking clubs along City pedestrian trails.

BP-41: The City may work collaboratively with others to support events and programs (examples, American Hiking Society National Trail day, Coastwalk; coastal trail walks) promoting pedestrian/hiking/beach access opportunities.
5. Projects

This section in The Plan identifies all previous expenditures on projects, new projects, residents, elected officials, and staff would like to see constructed. Past expenditures are shown in Table 1. These projects are included in Figures 3, 5, and 6 as part of the existing facilities discussion. Future projects are shown on Table 2 and includes each project title, time frame, user type, and a reference number. The number is associated with figures 7 and 8.

Completed Projects/Expenditures

Pismo Beach has successfully developed a near complete network of pedestrian use parks and walkways along the Pacific Ocean in the Shell Beach area and downtown, primarily through easements and developer fees. The City has also been successful in obtaining Transportation Enhancement and other grants from the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (SLOCOG). See Table 1.

Table 1: Completed Projects Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beachcomber Stairs</td>
<td>Installation of beach access stairway</td>
<td>$442,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista Del Mar Stairs</td>
<td>Replacement of obsolete stairway to the beach</td>
<td>$140,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier Avenue Stairs</td>
<td>Replacement of obsolete stairway to the beach</td>
<td>$134,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmar Stairs</td>
<td>Replacement of obsolete stairway to the beach</td>
<td>$365,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinosaur Caves/4th Street Improvements</td>
<td>Sidewalks and stairways to the beach</td>
<td>$561,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promenade I (end of Ocean View cul-de-sac)</td>
<td>Sidewalks and stairways to the beach</td>
<td>$427,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promenade II (Pier to Stimson)</td>
<td>Elevated pedestrian boardwalk along the ocean</td>
<td>$575,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promenade III (Addie Street parking lot to the end of Grand Avenue)</td>
<td>Elevated pedestrian boardwalk along the ocean, walkway along South Dolliver, trail through State Beach area, elevated boardwalk through ocean dunes</td>
<td>$1,589,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promenade IV</td>
<td>Elevated pedestrian boardwalk along the ocean</td>
<td>$2,088,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promenade IV B</td>
<td>Elevated pedestrian boardwalk along the ocean</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Beach Road bike lanes</td>
<td>Bike lanes on several block segment</td>
<td>$59,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blufftop trails from Indio to end of Ebb Tide</td>
<td>Pedestrian walkway and Class I bike lanes</td>
<td>Funded by development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$7,883,550</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Future Projects/Expenditures**

Future projects were identified through community surveys, fieldwork, and community meetings. Projects include gaps in existing infrastructure or new projects identified as areas of concern. Future projects are arranged into long and short-term sections, noted in Table 2. Long-term projects reflect areas where the City will require bike or pedestrian facilities with future development and/or changes to existing uses. Short-term projects are those the City can pursue now (including those eligible for BTA and other grant funding). Figure 9 shows potential locations for bike parking.

**Prioritizing for implementation**

As required by Streets and Highways Code Section 891.2, projects are ranked by City Public Works staff for readiness to build, importance to the City, fundability, etc. Prioritization is only required for Bike projects. All projects have been ranked, but ranking does not dictate order of construction.
Table 2: Future Projects List
(The projects on this list are referenced on Figures 8 and 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref #</th>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Bike/Ped/Both</th>
<th>Approximate Cost</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pismo Creek Trail</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>$1,891,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>City Wide Class I Multi use Path</td>
<td>0-5 yr some segments</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>$10,031,000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Phase 1 (Terrace to Cliff)</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>$1,023,000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coastal Trail</td>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>$3,425,000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>Phase 1 (Cave Landing Trail)</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>$649,000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>James Way Connector</td>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>$539,000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dolliver/Hwy 1 Bikeway</td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>$345,000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mattie Road Connector</td>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>$625,000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Class II Upgrades: Price Canyon</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>$102,000</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Class II Upgrades: Mattie Road</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Class II Upgrades: Oak Park Boulevard</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bicycle Boulevard</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Inland Arterial Class II</td>
<td>10 + years</td>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>$96,000</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Class III Upgrades</td>
<td>0-5 yrs</td>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>$304,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Promenade V</td>
<td>0-5 some segments</td>
<td>Ped</td>
<td>$11,812,000</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Future Spindrift Park blufftop trail</td>
<td>ownership change</td>
<td>Ped</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Coastal Bridge</td>
<td>5-10, 10+</td>
<td>Ped</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pismo DeAnza Trail</td>
<td>future development/changes</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>$131,000</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Freeway Foothills Trail</td>
<td>future development/changes</td>
<td>Ped</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Coastal Ridge Trail</td>
<td>future development/changes</td>
<td>Ped</td>
<td>$137,000</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Inland Foothills Trail</td>
<td>future development/changes</td>
<td>Ped</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ebb Tide Beach Access 1</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>Ped</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>North Spyglass Beach Access</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>Ped</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ebb Tide Beach Access 2</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>Ped</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7: Proposed Bikeway Projects
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Pismo Beach Proposed Bikeways

1. Piemo Creek/Piemo Canyon Trail
2. City-Wide Multi-Use Trail
3. Coastal Trail
4. James Way Connector
5. Doliver St/Hwy 1 Separated bikeway
6. Matto to Belo Connector
7. Piemo Canyon Class II Upgrades
8. Matlto Road Class II Upgrader
9. Oak Park Boulevard Class II Upgrade
10. Bicycle Boulevard
11. Inland Arterial Class II
12a. El Portal Dr. Class III signs
12b. Indo Drive Class III signs
12c. Coburn Class III signs
12d. Viola Del Mar Class III signs
12e. Windward Class III signs
12f. Racettia Class III signs
12g. Freeway Path lightings
12h. Doliver Class III signage and road rehab
Figure 8: Proposed Pedestrian and Beach Access Projects
Proposed Bikeway Projects

1. Pismo Creek Trail/ Price Canyon Trail
   (See Figure 7, No. 1) The City has begun the Pismo Creek Trail Plan connecting the Pismo Promenade at Addie Street to Price Historic Park (where the Price Canyon trails will begin, as shown in the County Parks and Recreation Element). This pedestrian trail and Class I bike lane project is consistent with several policies in the Land Use, Conservation and Open Space, and Parks, Recreation and Access Elements. This project has the potential to dramatically increase recreational bicycle and pedestrian trips from the northern residential areas of Pismo Beach (Land Use areas N, O, and P from Pismo Beach General Plan Land Use Element). This trail could decrease car trips into the recreational core of Pismo Beach.

   **Future Implications:** When future annexations into Price Canyon are considered and the County completes the Price Canyon Natural Area, this project will serve as a primary way for commuters to get into and through Pismo Beach.

   **Primary User:** Commuter and Recreational, Pedestrian and Bike, all ages.

   **Funding Source:** Transportation Enhancement funds, Bicycle Transportation Account funds, Urban and Regional SHA.

2. City-wide Multi-use Trail
   (See Figure 7, No. 2 and 2a for Phase 1)
   This 6-10 foot multi-use trail for pedestrians and bicyclists would begin at the southwesterly city limits on south Dolliver adjacent to Grover Beach and could link with any future Grover Beach trails to the southwest. The trail would commence up the southeast side of Dolliver Street where it could traverse to the east onto the Pismo Creek Trail. At Ira Lease Park the trail may transition to a Class II bike trail up Dolliver to the Price/Dolliver intersection. At this point the multi-use trail could resume to the City limits at El Portal with potential for extension in the County to the Bob Jones Bike Trail. Currently, Class II bike lanes are striped on Shell Beach Road through the Shell Beach Planning area to the City limits; these would be modified or deleted and replaced by the multi-use trail. This project could include, where necessary, converting Class II lanes to a Class III configuration along Price Street and Shell Beach Road.

   **Future Implications:** The project will increase recreational and vulnerable commuting cyclists traveling on Shell Beach Road. More serious cyclists will still be able to utilize the Class II bike lanes along Mattie Road. Upon leaving the City limits, with interagency cooperation, the trail can connect with the existing Bob Jones City to Sea trail at a terminus and parking lot on Ontario Road. This trail will draw families to the area for recreational rides on weekends.

   **Primary User:** Recreational and Commuter (school children), Pedestrian and Bike, all ages.

   **Funding Source:** Transportation Enhancement funds, Bicycle Transportation Account funds, Safe Routes to School grants, Urban and Regional SHA.
3. Cave Landing Trail
(See Figure 7, No. 3 and 3a for phase 1) This Class I trail that will be a continuation of Bluff Drive Class III and continue past Pirates Cove and Cave Landing to Avila Beach. This project will provide a Coastal Trail connection to Avila Beach, which is the existing terminus of the Bob Jones City to Sea bike path.
**Future Implications:** The American Land Conservancy and the Land Conservancy of SLO County are steadily acquiring scenic property between Montana de Oro State Park and the San Luis Bay Drive in Avila. Eventually residents and visitors of San Luis Obispo County will have a connected network of trails from Los Osos to Avila Beach. The Cave Landing Trail will continue that connection south to Pismo Beach.
**Primary User:** Recreational, Pedestrian, Mountain Bike, all ages
**Funding Source:** Transportation Enhancement, State Parks, Coastal Conservancy.

4. James Way to Frady Lane Class I
(See Figure 7, No. 4) This Class I trail will connect the end of James Way or the neighborhood on the hillside above James Way to Frady Lane or the west side of the Pismo Creek. There are several potential trail alignments for this area and a feasibility study would probably need to be done to address an appropriate location. The project could run adjacent to the railroad until it reaches the Price Canyon Trail or it could cross the Railroad and the Pismo Creek and connect to the Pismo Creek Trail.
**Future Implications:** This recreational trail would serve as another way (aside from the freeway bike path) to travel between west and east sides of Pismo.
**Primary User:** Recreational, Pedestrian, all ages
**Funding Source:** Transportation Enhancement, State Parks.

5. Dolliver Street/ Hwy 1 Separated Bikeway
(See Figure 7, No. 5) Class I or II bikeway on the northeast side of Hwy 1/Dolliver Street which will connect the Grover Beach Class I along the railroad to the Ira Lease Park/entrance to the Pismo Creek Trail.
**Future Implications:** This regionally significant trail would connect a Grover Beach Class I to the Pismo Creek Trail which will connect to the County Price Canyon trails.
**Primary User:** Recreational cyclists, all ages.
**Funding Source:** Transportation Enhancement funds, Bicycle Transportation Account funds, Urban and Regional SHA.
6. Mattie to Bello Class I Connector
(See Figure 7, No. 6) Class I bikeway on the northeast side of Hwy 101 connecting Bello Road at its entrance to Hwy 101 to Mattie Road at the Mattie Road exit.

Future Implications: This regional trail would connect cyclists traveling on Price Canyon Road directly to the Class II on Mattie Road, and would serve as a “frontage road” for cyclists. At a future date, when the Pismo Creek Trail is complete and/or the James Way connector is built, this throughway will link several Pismo Beach bike facilities.

Primary User: Recreational cyclists, all ages.
Funding Source: Transportation Enhancement funds, Bicycle Transportation Account funds, Urban and Regional SHA.

7. Class II Upgrades: Price Canyon
(See Figure 7, No. 7) Class II bikeways on Price Canyon Road within Pismo Beach City limits. The Class II (striped, stamped, and signed) would create safety for cyclists entering the City by way of Price Canyon.

Future Implications: This solution is available in the short term and could decrease bike/car conflicts on Price Canyon Road.

Primary User: Commute and Recreational, Bike, confident cyclists.
Funding Source: Transportation Enhancement funds, Bicycle Transportation Account funds, Urban and Regional SHA.

8. Class II Upgrades: Mattie Road, northeast side
(Figure 7, No. 8) This upgrade would include adding a Class II bike lane to the northeast side of Mattie Road and improving the markings of the existing Class II lane on the southwest side of the road.

Future Implications: With the inclusion of a bike path and removal of bike lane on the parallel route (Shell Beach Road), higher speed cyclists will be encouraged to use Mattie Road and avoid the more impacted Shell Beach route. Striping and marking the bike lane on both sides of the road will make this route safer for cyclists.

Primary user: Commute and recreational, confident cyclists.
Funding Source: Transportation Enhancement funds, Urban and Regional SHA, City General funds.

9. Class II Upgrades: Oak Park Boulevard
(Figure 7, No. 9) This upgrade would include adding a Class II bike lane to Oak Park Boulevard from the northeast City limits to the Grover Beach City limits at Hwy 101.

Future Implications: This solution is available in the short term and could decrease bike/car conflicts on Price Canyon Road.

Primary user: Commute and recreational, confident cyclists,
Funding Source: Transportation Enhancement funds, Urban and Regional SHA, City General funds.
10. Bicycle Boulevard
(See Figure 7, No. 10) A bicycle boulevard along Cypress Street from Hwy 1/Dolliver to Hinds Avenue would offer an alternative to bicycle travel on Hwy 1/Dolliver Street. This route connects Promenade III along Highway 1 to the downtown core without requiring cyclists to ride bikes on the Promenade north of the Addie Street parking lot.

Future Implications: Benefit to cyclists, increase safety to riders in downtown area.

Primary User: Recreational and Commute, Bike.

Funding Source: Transportation Enhancement funds, Bicycle Transportation Account funds, Urban and Regional SHA.

11. Inland Arterial Class II
(See Figure 7, No 11) Construct Class II along with future road connecting Oak Park Boulevard to Price Canyon, north of James Way

Future Implications: Improved safety, create connectivity throughout northeastern side of Pismo Beach.

Primary User: Commute, Recreational, bike moderate to confident users.

Funding Source: Transportation enhancement, City General fund, Urban and Regional State Highway Account funds.

12. Class III Upgrades
(See Figure 7, Nos. 12a-12h)
- Sign existing Class III bikeways on El Portal Drive and Indio Drive (consistent with Circulation and Land Use Elements).
- Sign existing Class III on Windward Avenue and Placentia Avenue (consistent with Circulation Element).
- Create Class III on Vista Del Mar to maintain continuity of bikeways when path and/or road are unavailable along Pacific Ocean.
- Create connected Class III bikeway along Coburn, through Spyglass Park, onto Spyglass Drive. South Dolliver adjacent to Promenade III – upgrade paving to match the street.
- Bike/Pedestrian along Highway 101 – addition of lighting.
- Way-finding/directional signs at critical intersections indicating appropriate cyclist/pedestrian action.

Future Implications: Improved safety, create connectivity throughout Shell Beach along low volume roads.

Primary User: Commute, Recreational, bike moderate to confident users

Funding Source: Transportation enhancement, City General fund, Urban and Regional State Highway Account funds.

Connectors to Arroyo Grande, Grover Beach and San Luis Obispo County out Price Canyon Road and Oak Park (all are shown above, see reference number below).

Improve connections to areas outside the City by adjoining existing bikeways in San Luis Obispo County, Arroyo Grande, and Grover Beach. The following
extensions/projects will provide connections to existing and/or proposed bikeways adjacent to the City.

- **Cave Landing Trail (# 3):** this trail is on County property and is proposed to be a hiking trail to be built in the near term. Long term solutions could include a Class I bikeway that would connect to the existing Class III on Indio Drive, which connects to the Class II on Shell Beach Road.
- **Citywide Multi-use Path Connection to Bob Jones (# 2):** the Citywide Multi-use path shown above could connect to the County’s Bob Jones Trail at or near the Ontario Road staging area, in this scenario, the path would likely travel near the existing (privately owned) campground on Avila Road.
- **Price Canyon Class II (#6):** within City limits of Pismo Beach on Price Canyon Road. This will connect with the planned Class II bike lanes on Price Canyon Road in the County’s Bikeway plan.
- **Price Canyon Trail/Pismo Creek Trail (#1):** The City has built a portion of a Class I bikeway near the Price House in the City Limits. If Pismo Beach expands, this trail will expand to connect with future trails in the Price Canyon Area (trails are identified in the County’s Parks and Recreation Element).
- **Oak Park Boulevard Class II (#8):** Bike lanes along Oak Park Boulevard within City limits to connect with Arroyo Grande’s planned Class II on Oak Park.
- **Dolliver Street/Highway One Bikeway (#5):** Class II or Class I outside of right-of-way of highway connecting to Grover Beach’s future Class I adjacent to the railroad track.

**Future Implications:** Connectivity to adjacent jurisdictions, and continuity of regional bikeways.

**Primary User:** Commute and Recreational, Bike, confident cyclists.

**Funding sources:** Urban and Regional State Highway Account, Transportation Enhancement, Recreational Trails Program (in Coastal or De Anza trail corridors).
Proposed Pedestrian Facilities

13. **Promenade V**
(See Figure 8, #13) This Multi-use path will connect Main Street to Harloe Street parallel to the Pacific Ocean along the bluffs and beach. This would be a continuation of the City’s Pismo Promenade I-IV, which is a very important regional pedestrian/recreational cyclist destination. This project could offer a convenient way to travel from the hotels in the northwest section of the City to the Downtown/Pier area and ultimately to Grover Beach.
**Future Implications:** Continuation of existing regionally significant recreational facility.
**Primary User:** Recreational, Pedestrian, Bike
**Funding Source:** Transportation Enhancement funds, Urban and Regional SHA.

14. **Future Spindrift Park Blufftop Trail**
(See Figure 8, #14) Blufftop Park Trail at APN 010-221-043 in the Spindrift Planning area; dedication by property owner upon development of property in the future (See Figure 12).
**Future Implications:** New beach blufftop trail as a part of the California Coastal Trail.
**Primary User:** Recreational.
**Funding Source:** Future development requirement.

15. **Coastal Bridge**
(See Figure 8, #15) This project is a pedestrian bridge across the barranca between the Shorecliff Lodge and the Lighthouse Suites. This bridge would link the public oceanfront pathways of the two hotels, which to the southwest, leads to a beach access stairway at the Seacrest Hotel.
**Future Implications:** Continuation of the California Coastal Trail, a regionally significant recreational facility.
**Primary User:** Recreational, walking, beach access.
**Funding Source:** Transportation Enhancement funds, Urban and Regional SHA, Coastal Conservancy.

16. **Pismo Juan Batista DeAnza Trail**
(See Figure 8, #16) There is a trail easement at the apex of James Way and the Railroad tracks which wraps around the hillside to the northwest to ultimately link with the Class I bike trail in the Price Historic Park. The trail location appears to mirror the DeAnza trail. The City shall take necessary steps to insure that any developments along Price Canyon, either in the City or in the County, shall include a continuous pedestrian and bicycle and equestrian public trail network along Pismo Creek and bordering Price Historical Park. This trail may be located on both or a single side of Pismo Creek as considered appropriate during specific plan and project reviews. Additionally, the City will explore implementation of a trail extending from James Way to Rancho Pismo Drive, paralleling the railroad right-of-way and Pismo Creek, in the existing public access easements dedicated by Tract 814 in 1982 and Tract 2554 in 2008.
**Future Implications:** While easements are in place, improvement of this trail area has not been achieved. Funding would be required for an “El Camino Real” Historical Marker and an interpretive center about the trail history, to be located in Price Historic Park.
Primary User: Recreational, Pedestrian, Mountain Bike.
Funding Source: Future development funded, Recreational Trails Program grant, Transportation Enhancement, Urban and Regional State Highway Account.

17. Freeway Foothills Trail
(See Figure 8, #17) This proposed trail will start at Wadsworth Avenue and continue north. It would provide connections at the south end of Mattie Road, continue north with several connections into the Pismo Heights area (consistent with the Conservation and Open Space Element), and reconnect with Mattie Road at its northern end. This project would be a Class I paved or decomposed granite trail. The exact location is yet to be determined.
Future Implications: The City could work with SLO County to provide a connection between Mattie and Monte Roads and eventually connect to the future Bob Jones Trail that will travel the west side of Highway 101 to San Luis Bay Drive.
Primary User: Recreational, Pedestrian, Mountain Bike.
Funding Source: Future development funded, hopefully other funds available. Showing Nexus to require only development to fund could be difficult.

18. Coastal Ridge Trail
(See Figure 8, #18) This proposed trail would begin at the top of Pismo Heights and continue at the top of the ridge to the end of the City limits adjoining San Luis Obispo County. Access could also be achieved from the future Foothills Trail to hillside pathways extending up the side of the foothills for any new development area that may be annexed into Pismo Beach from San Luis Obispo County. This project would be a decomposed granite trail; the exact location is yet to be determined.
Future Implications: The City would require development of annexation areas between Mattie Road and Pismo Heights to provide by easement and improve these trail opportunities as a condition of annexation.
Primary User: Recreational, Pedestrian, Mountain Bike.
Funding Source: State parks, annexation funds (County property, county pursue trail).

19. Inland Foothills Trail
(See Figure 8, #19) This proposed trail would begin at the southeasterly City limits with future annexation of the Los Robles Del Mar planning area and continue to Pismo Creek through future areas to be annexed. Currently the property is in the County. The exact trail location would be determined with consideration to the hilly and biologically sensitive environment. Access could be achieved from the ends of Highland, Ventana and Ridge Road in the existing City limits. This project would be a decomposed granite trail and possibly a Class I bike trail, contingent upon the terrain and feasibility of construction. The exact location is yet to be determined.
Future Implications: The City would require development of annexation areas between Oak Park Blvd. and Pismo Creek to provide by easement and improve these trail opportunities as a condition of annexation.
Primary User: Recreational, Pedestrian, Mountain Bike.
Funding Source: State parks, annexation funds. (County property, county pursue trail)
20. Ebb Tide Beach Access 1
(See Figure 8, #20) Beach access at the parcel adjacent to the Cliffs Hotel to the north has been approved and will be constructed by 2012.
Future Implications: New beach access and inclusion in California Coastal Trail.
Primary User: Recreational.
Funding Source: Property owner, stairway construction and public access easement dedication required.

21. North Spyglass Beach Access
(See Figure 8, #22) Beach access at Spyglass Park.
Future Implications: New beach access and inclusion in California Coastal Trail.
Primary User: Recreational.
Funding Source: State grant funding, park development.

22. Ebb Tide Beach Access 2
(See Figure 8, #20) Beach access at the end of 2801 Shell Beach Road if/when development occurs in the future. Private beach access is currently located at the site.
Future Implications: New beach access and inclusion in California Coastal Trail.
Primary User: Recreational.
Funding Source: State grants.

Proposed Bike Parking Facilities

Figure 9 shows where short-term bike parking could be located. Locations were chosen based on proximity to shops, availability (or lack of) car parking, and observed needs. The Pedestrian/Bicycle Plan identifies multiple policies for bike parking facilities.
Figure 10: Full Bicycle Network
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Figure 11: Full Pedestrian Network
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Pismo Beach Existing and Proposed Pedestrian Access
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. If a city plans to use a countywide BTP to establish their eligibility for BTA funds, the countywide BTP must include a discussion of the Items A - K in Streets and Highways Code Section 891.2 for that city. Below is the list of requirements, along with the page number on which the requirement is addressed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement and Location</th>
<th>Requirement Details</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The estimated number of existing bicycle commuters in the plan area and the estimated increase in the number of bicycle commuters resulting from implementation of the plan.</td>
<td>Appendix 9, page A-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>A map and description of existing and proposed land use and settlement patterns which shall include, but not be limited to, locations of residential neighborhoods, schools, shopping centers, public buildings, and major employment centers.</td>
<td>Figures 1 and 2, pages 2-2 and 2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>A map and description of existing and proposed bikeways.</td>
<td>Existing: Map on page 2-5, description page 2-4. Proposed: Map on page 5-4, description pages 5-6 through 5-10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A map and description of existing and proposed end-of-trip bicycle parking facilities. These shall include, but not be limited to, parking at schools, shopping centers, public buildings, and major employment centers.</td>
<td>Existing: Map on page 2-6, description page 2-4. Proposed: Map on page 5-14, description page 5-13, policies BP-4, 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>A map and description of existing and proposed bicycle transport and parking facilities for connections with and use of other transportation modes. These shall include, but not be limited to, parking facilities at transit stops, rail and transit terminals, ferry docks and landings, park and ride lots, and provisions for transporting bicyclists and bicycles on transit or rail vehicles or ferry vessels.</td>
<td>Existing: None. Proposed: Map page 5-14, policy BP-5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Existing: None, description page 2-4. Proposed: description Appendix 5, Map page 5-14, policy BP-24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement and Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A description of bicycle safety and education programs conducted in the area included within the plan, efforts by the law enforcement agency having primary traffic law enforcement responsibility in the area to enforce provisions of the Vehicle Code pertaining to bicycle operation, and the resulting effect on accidents involving bicyclists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of safety and education page 2-9, policies BP-18 through BP-24, appendices 2, 6, 7 and 8; Bicycle accident data/info pages Appendix 9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **H**                    |
| A description of the extent of citizen and community involvement in development of the plan, including, but not limited to, letters of support. |
| Page 3-1 through 3-2, Appendices 4 and 13. |

| **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. |
| Page 3-1 through 3-2, Appendix 3, policies BP-21, 23, and 27-32. |

| **J**                    |
| A description of the project proposed in the plan and a listing of their priorities for implementation. |
| Description page 5-6 through 5-10, priority table page 5-3. |

| **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. |
| Past expenditure table page 5-1, future financial needs table page 5-3, appendix 10 for funding sources. |
Appendix 3: Relationship to Other Plans

Policies

This plan is concurrent with the goals and policies of the Pismo Beach General Plan/Local Coastal Plan and other areas plans, including:

2005 San Luis Obispo County Regional Transportation Plan (Vision 2025)
- NM-1: Create and maintain a comprehensive interconnected, inter-county bikeway, trail and pedestrian system.
- NM-3: 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.
- NM-4: Encourage the development of Class I Bikeways that travel through or connect to scenic areas or other recreation destinations.
- NM-5: 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.
- NM-7: Encourage new development proposals to include bike racks, lockers, showers, Bike and Ride stops and safe interconnected pedestrian paths.

2001 San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District: Clean Air Plan recommends several methods to options to reduce air pollution associated with vehicular travel:
- T-1C: Voluntary Commute Options Program
- T-2A: City Transit Improvements
- T-2B: Regional Transit
- T-3: Bicycling and Bikeway Enhancements
- T-4: Park and Ride Lots

Trail and Path Connections

This plan addresses connectivity with bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the following plans:
- San Luis Obispo County Regional Transportation Plan (Vision 2025) Chapter 5, Non-Motorized Transportation identifies regionally significant pedestrian and bikeways that have segments in the City of Pismo Beach:
  - Railroad Class I Multi-Use Path from SLO City to Oceano
  - Pismo Creek Pedestrian and Bike Trail from Dolliver Street to Price House
  - Pismo Pedestrian Promenade from Pier to Main Street
- San Luis Obispo County Bikeway Plan identifies bikeways adjacent to Pismo in Avila Beach
  - Class II on Avila Beach Drive from Avila Village to Ontario Road (North of Pismo Beach)
  - Class II bikeways on Price Canyon Road, west of Pismo Beach
• San Luis Obispo County Parks and Open Space Element identifies the following trails (with segments in or adjacent to Pismo Beach) within the “San Luis Bay Planning Area”:
  o Price Canyon Natural Area
  o California Coastal Trail
  o Juan Batista De Anza Trail
  o Cave Landing Trail (In Avila Planning Area): connects to Pismo Beach Bluffs Trail within Pismo Beach City Limits
• Arroyo Grande Bikeway Plan identifies the following bikeways that are adjacent to Pismo Beach:
  o Class II Bikeways on James Way from Oak Park (Pismo Beach City limits) to Tally Ho Road
  o Class II Bikeways on Oak Park Boulevard, adjacent to Pismo Beach.
• Grover Beach Circulation Element identifies the following bike/pedestrian facilities:
  o Class II Bikeways on North 4th Street from Pismo Beach City limits to Grand Avenue
  o Class II Bikeways on Grand Avenue
  o Multi-use trail along Railroad from Pismo City limits to Oceano
### Appendix 4: Survey Results

#### Survey Results: Employer Survey n=47

Where do the majority of your employees live?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where employees live</th>
<th>full time</th>
<th>part time</th>
<th>seasonal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pismo Beach</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Cities</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO &amp; SB Counties</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How do your employees get to work?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive alone</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool or Vanpool</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of these services do you offer to your employees?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car parking spaces</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike parking spaces</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showers</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommuting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible work hours</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carpool/bike/walk incentives</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many car/bike parking spaces do you offer your employees/clients?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Car Parking</td>
<td>14.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Bike Parking</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Car Parking</td>
<td>28.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Bike Parking</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of the following do you have adjacent to your workplace?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated bike or walking path</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of these would you like to see more of adjacent to your workplace?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ped activity</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>car parking</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bike parking</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=49
Survey Results: Resident n=18
How often do you do the following in Pismo Beach? (answer always or usually)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>spend time on the beach</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travel to other parts of the county</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shop</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grocery shopping</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ride bikes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surf/kayak</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visit the butterfly grove</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visit the doctor's office</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go to an elementary or middle school</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When getting around Pismo Beach, how often do you do the following? (answer always or usually)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>drive</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walk</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bike</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public transit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motorcycle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skateboard</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When getting around Pismo Beach, how often do you use these amenities? (answer always or usually)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pedestrian walkways</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beach access points</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bike trails</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sidewalks</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bike racks</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of these would you like to see more of in Pismo Beach?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bike trails (separated from roadway)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pedestrian walkways</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sidewalks</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beach access points</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secure bike parking</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public transit</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>car parking</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bike rentals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=15
Appendix 5: 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 diagram 5.2 below.

Diagram 5.2
Class I Bikeway Specification

[Diagram showing Class I Bikeway Specification]

Note: For sign clearances, see MUTCD, Figure 9B-1.

**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 diagrams 5-3.
Diagram 5-3
Class II Bikeway Specifications

(1) MARKED PARKING

* 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) PARKING PROHIBITED

(4) TYPICAL ROADWAY
IN OUTLYING AREAS
PARKING RESTRICTED

Note: For pavement marking guidance, see the
MUTCD and California Supplement, Section 9C.04
**Class III**: Bikeways that provide a right-of-way designated by signs or permanent markings and 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 diagram 5-7 include:

**Diagram 5-7**  
**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 diagram 5-8, 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.
Diagram 5-8
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.

**Diagram 5-9**

**Bike (loop) Detector**

---

**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 diagram 5-10 direct bicyclists into the proper lane position best for creating visibility and safety for traffic.
Diagram 5-10
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.
Examples of Channelization

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.
**Short Term Bike Parking:**

Short term parking includes racks on sidewalks, in parking lots, and at special events. Below in diagram 5-11 are examples of racks. Appendix 6 shows a “racks with plaques” program that can be used to increase public bike parking at minimal cost to the City. Bike valet (special event parking) is shown in Appendix 7.

**Diagram/Photo 5-11**  
**Bike Rack**

![Inverted U-rack](image)

*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.

**Diagram/Photo 5-12**

**Bike Lockers**

![Bike Lockers](image)

**Bicycle Cage:**

![Bike Cage](image)
Bike Station
www.bikestation.com

Bike Station is working to give people clean options.

Bike Station plans, designs, and operates bike-transit centers, enabling bicycling and other alternatives to be an integral part of the transportation system. Our facilities offer secure bicycle parking and related services to make cycling more easier. Work your bike at one of our facilities and you can be assured that your vehicle is secure and covered. If you are a potential bike station project developer, please click here.

Whether you ride your bike to public transportation, to work, or you simply need a safe place to store your bike for the day, BikeStation is available to serve you. It’s simple, convenient and affordable.

Many bike stations offer free parking during their hours of operation, and paid memberships for on-hour access to secure parking. To find more information on what method of parking is more convenient for you, check the page of your local BikeStation.

Bike Station Santa Barbara now open!

Bike Station Santa Barbara offers members secure bicycle parking, 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The facility boasts 76 bicycle racks, a shower and washroom facilities, lockers, tools, work stand, an air compressor and vending machine with bicycle accessories for purchase. Access is limited to members and users can choose from a range of membership options ranging from daily to annual plans. Register today!
Appendix 6: Racks with Plaques Program

The Plaque

The bike parking rack features a finely crafted dedication plaque made of ever-lasting cast bronze. The plaque measures 4 x 6 inches and is made to order with a personalized message from the donor.

For More Information:

PMandevi@slocity.org
www.slocity.org/publicworks/transportation/racks.asp

Street & Park Furniture Donation Program

Improve Your Community by Donating a Bike Rack and Receive Permanent Recognition!

The City of San Luis Obispo is committed to preserving its high quality of life by providing cycling infrastructure to support and encourage bicycle riding.

Public Works Department 781-7590

A unique community improvement program offered by the City of San Luis Obispo Public Works Department. 781-7590

Racks with Plaques™

A bike rack donation program debuting in SLO.

Similar to the “Green Bench” Program, the “Racks with Plaques” program allows SLO Downtown & Parks to receive new bicycle parking racks for free and allows donors to be permanently recognized.

Here is how the program works:
1. A donor volunteers to purchase a rack for the City.
2. A dedication plaque is personalized with a message from the donor.
3. A high-quality, cast bronze plaque is attached to the rack.
4. The rack is installed at a location determined by the City & the donor.

A win-win for all involved:
1. Bicyclists are provided with more, conveniently located, easy to use bicycle parking racks.
2. The City is able to provide new, highly functional and attractive bicycle racks at no cost.
3. The donor helps the City and receives permanent recognition.

2005 Pricings: $1.250 (4-bike rack) - $1.650 (8-bike rack)

Contact: Peggy Mandevile in Public Works 781-7590
PMandevile@slocity.org
www.slocity.org/publicworks/transportation/racks.asp
Appendix 7: Bike Valet Program

What is Bike Valet & how does it work?

The Bike Valet is a volunteer run bike parking service aimed at making it easier for people to pedal to community events. The Valet works just like a coat check. Upon arrival at the valet, 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.

Now, you may be thinking, is my bike safe at the Valet? IT SURE IS - with over 15,000 bikes parked we’re 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. Call 805.547.2055 or email valet@slobikelane.org with questions, comments, or to retrieve you forgotten bike.

San Luis Obispo’s Bicycle Valet History:

The Bike Valet Program was first featured at the Amgen Tour of California SLO Stage in February of 2006. At that event the valet service provided parking for an astounding 265 bikes. After the Tour of California’s inspiring turnout, several bicycle advocates took note and decided to approach the City and Downtown Association with the hope of introducing the weekly Farmer’s Market Bike Valet on the first Thursday in May, coinciding with 2006 National Bike Month Activities. Since then the Bike Valet has parked over 5,000 bikes at various events around the county.

What does the Valet provide?
- A valet manager to assist with setup, breakdown, and operation.
- Bike Racks for convenient bicycle parking.
- High visibility “Bike Parking” signage.
- Tables and chairs.
- Tent cover from rain or sun.

Basic service is offered within the city of San Luis Obispo. Additional charges may apply, depending on the distance from SLO. Our ability to commit to an event depends on the availability of volunteers and other valet commitments.

Past Special Events:
- Amgen Tour of California, 2006 and 2007
- SLO Downtown Criterium Festival, 2006 and 2007
- Jeep King of the Mountain, 2006 and 2007
- The Land Conservancy’s Water Festival
- The Central Coast Adventure Challenge
- The Downtown Association’s Concerts in the Plaza Series

We have the following hourly fee structure for special events in order to recoup operation costs:
- With volunteers provided by the Bicycle Valet Program: $75 per hour
- With volunteers provided by event programmers: 350 per hour
- Bike rack rental: 10 per hour pickup: Delivery - mileage paid.
Appendix 8: Bicycle Confidence Workshops

**Show the Road Who’s Boss**

**Take a Bicycle Confidence Workshop**

- Common causes of crashes and how to avoid them
- Where to ride on the road
- Bicycle riding skills
- Traffic laws that affect bicycling

With confidence, riding can be a safe and enjoyable way to travel.

**WORKSHOP — RIDE RIGHT**

Get more in-depth training on bicycling in traffic. Learn how simple things like hand positioning can make a big difference in how you interact with traffic. Focused on strategies that will empower you to be more efficient and safe on the road.

**WORKSHOP — STREET SKILLS**

In this workshop you will learn how to take on the road with confidence. You’ll explore defensive techniques to help you safely navigate, get noticed, and give the impression of a safe, confident rider. Learn the legal rights on a bike. We’ll then take it to the next level by putting your new techniques to immediate use, such as how to negotiate an intersection and how to take changing around all of the lanes. We guarantee that after you leave this workshop you’ll feel more equipped about riding in traffic.

**BROWN BAG SEMINARS**

A 1-hour presentation on bicycling at your place of business, club, or community group. This one-hour seminar is a great way to introduce bicycling to your friends or colleagues.

**KNOW THE LAW:**

We have a legal right to be on the road and we’re entitled to the tools to maintain safety. In our workshops we break you down to the principles and show you simple techniques that will empower and give you the confidence you need.

**Ride Clear of the DOOR-ZONE!**

“After completing the workshop, I am more aware of potential safety hazards on the road and I feel confident when bicycling around town and to work. It’s well worth your time, whether your one time for cycling or a seasoned rider.”

~ Rachel Groopman
SLO resident
Appendix 9: Current and Future Commuters

Commuters

Table 9.1 shows 2000 Census population for the City of Pismo Beach and county-wide population. Also shown are working resident numbers aged 16 and older. Pismo Beach has a slightly higher percentage of workers over 16 than the county as a whole.

Table 9-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>San Luis Obispo County</th>
<th>Pismo Beach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>246,681</td>
<td>8,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total workers 16 and older</td>
<td>107,807</td>
<td>3,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Census 2000: American Factfinder, summary file 1, detailed tables, P1, and summary file 3, detailed tables P27

The 2000 Census notes 22% of the Pismo Beach working residents live in the City.

Table 9-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of work for workers 16 and older</th>
<th>San Luis Obispo County</th>
<th>Pismo Beach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>107,807</td>
<td>3,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in a place:</td>
<td>88,616</td>
<td>3,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked in place of residence</td>
<td>33,853</td>
<td>866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked outside place of residence</td>
<td>54,763</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent working in place of residence</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not living in a place</td>
<td>19,191</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Census 2000: American Factfinder, summary file 3, detailed tables, P27

Of the 3,866 working residents of Pismo Beach, the majority (75.77%) drive alone to work, followed by carpooling, working from home, and then walking. Compared to the county-wide percentage, the City has more walking commuters and fewer bicycling commuters.
Table 9-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means of Transportation to work for workers 16 and older</th>
<th>SLO County</th>
<th>% total respondents for County</th>
<th>Pismo Beach</th>
<th>% total respondents for Pismo Beach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other means</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>3,984</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>4.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at home</td>
<td>6,028</td>
<td>5.59%</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>7.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpoled</td>
<td>14,513</td>
<td>13.46%</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>9.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drove alone</td>
<td>79,633</td>
<td>73.87%</td>
<td>2,968</td>
<td>76.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents:</td>
<td>107,807</td>
<td>107,807</td>
<td>3,866</td>
<td>3,866</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Census 2000: American Factfinder, summary file 3, detailed tables, P30

Likely non-driving Populations

The above charts reference the commuting population over the age of 16. The pie chart below shows the percentage of population that is under 16 (non-driving) and over 65 (greater potential for non-driving). As shown, 63% of the population of Pismo Beach is between the ages of 16 and 64, while 13% is under 16 and 24% is over 64. Pismo Beach’s percentage of residents over 64 is greater than the county-wide percent and the percentages of residents under the age of 16 and between 16 and 64 are lower than the county-wide percent. This indicates a potential need for the City to focus on programs and facilities for the aging population.

Census 2000: American Factfinder, summary file 3, detailed tables, P8
Future Commuters

No official studies have been conducted in Pismo Beach to determine the barriers to cycling and how they may be reduced with inclusion of additional infrastructure and education campaigns. However, the City of San Luis Obispo, had conducted a survey of existing and future residents which showed that 54% of non-bike commuters would consider bicycling if the City implemented various components of the City bike plan. The population base is somewhat different in San Luis Obispo than in Pismo Beach, nonetheless, this is the most current study completed in the region, and may provide insight for Pismo Beach residents.

The 2009 population estimate for the City of Pismo Beach is 8,660 (May 2009 CA Department of Finance, E-4 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 2001-2009). Table 9-3 estimates all current and future bicycle commuters based on this information. Note that the increase and total bicycle commuters is based on 54% of all non-bicycling commuters being enticed to ride a bike due to bicycle facility improvements. This is recognized to be a higher than likely increase. Note too, that the calculation does not take into account the non-working population of which there is 55% of the total population. At present there is no data on transportation mode split for non-work trips. The City may choose to consider doing a statistically significant resident survey prior to the next update of The Plan, to gather better data.
### Table 9-3

Projected Bicycling Commuters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008 population(^1)</th>
<th>2035 population(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Total Population</strong></td>
<td>8,660</td>
<td>9,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of working population 16 and older (2000 Census)</strong></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>assumed 2008 working pop'n 16 and older</strong></td>
<td>3,897</td>
<td>4,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>percent of working pop'n commuting by bicycle (2000 Census)</strong></td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>percent not commuting by bicycle</strong></td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total number of 16+ commuters who are not commuting by bike</strong></td>
<td>3,273</td>
<td>3,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>percent of population that would consider riding a bike if City Plan was implemented (based on SLO City Survey)</strong></td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential new bike commuters (54% enticed to bicycle)</strong></td>
<td>1,768</td>
<td>1,970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Department of Finance 2009 population projection

\(^2\) San Luis Obispo Council of Governments 2009 Long Range Socio-Economic Projections
**Accidents**

Between 2004 and 2008, 69 bicycle and pedestrian accidents were reported. Of the 69, 43 were involved with a bicycle, and 26 were pedestrian accidents. In general 26% of the accidents the bicyclist was reported at fault. Compared to national and other local statistics, this percent of bicycle at fault is low, indicating that a “coexist” or driver safety campaign may be the most effective choice for reducing collisions. Only 12% of the pedestrian accidents the pedestrian was at fault. The highest occurrence of accidents at a single general location was at 4th Street and Five Cities Drive. Dolliver Street (Highway 1) is another route with a high number of accidents. See Figure 9-1 for accident locations.

**TOTALS**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Fault 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Fault 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 9-1 (Pismo Police Department)**

![Pismo Beach Bicycle Accidents 2003-2008](image)
Appendix 10: Bicycle and Pedestrian Project Funding Sources

Federal

Transportation Enhancement Activities (TE)
- Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP-TE)\(^4\)
- 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. A negligible increase is assumed with future reauthorization of SAFETEA-LU.

The program is managed by state transportation agencies. 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)

\(^4\) Administered by Caltrans on State owned and operated 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 biannual 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. Status of future funding cycle 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](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 RTP is administered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). Non-motorized projects are administered by the Department’s Office of Grants and Local Services and motorized projects are administered by the Department’s Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division.


**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)

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 certain conditions are met, counties with population under 500,000 (according to the 1970 Federal census) may also use the LTF 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 eliminate 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

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.

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 these funds according to its adopted Clean Air Plan.
Appendix 11: Drainage Grates
(FHWA University Council on Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation; FHWA-HRT-05-085)

Drainage Grates
Care must be taken to ensure that drainage grates are bicycle-safe. If not, a bicycle wheel may fall into a slot in the grate, causing the bicyclist to fall. Replacing existing grates with bicycle-safe grates (see A and B in figure 14-14, preferred methods) or welding thin metal straps across the grate perpendicular to the direction of travel (see C in figure 14-14, alternate method) is required. These should be checked periodically to ensure that the straps remain in place.

Figure 14-14. Illustration. Examples of bicycle-safe drainage grates.

Note that grates with bars perpendicular to the roadway must not be placed at curb cuts, as wheelchairs could get caught in the slots. The most effective way to avoid drainage grate problems is to eliminate them entirely with the use of inlets in the curb face (see figure 14-15).

Figure 14-15. Illustration. Example of curb drainage inlet.

If a street-surface grate is required for drainage, care must be taken to ensure that the grate is flush with the road surface. Inlets should be raised after a pavement overlay to be within 6 mm (0.25 in) of the new surface. If this is not possible or practical, the pavement must taper into drainage inlets so they do not cause an abrupt edge at the inlet.
Appendix 12:
Trails Plan from General Plan/Local Coastal Plan Parks Element (PR-2)
Appendix 13: Pismo Beach Sections of the California Coastal Trail
Appendix 14: Letters
SLOCOG, CALTRANS, San Luis Obispo County Bicycle Coalition, and San Luis Obispo Bike Club
City of Pismo Beach
Mayor Reiss and City Council
760 Mattie Road
Pismo Beach CA 93449

August 26, 2009

Dear Mayor Reiss and Council Members:

On behalf of the San Luis Obispo County Bicycle Coalition’s Board and Members, I ask for your approval of the Pismo Beach Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. First and foremost, we would like to thank the City Council, staff, consultants and community for the patience, understanding, and hard work required to complete the plan. Such outstanding leadership indicates that the City Government is deeply committed to making Pismo a safer and more livable community.

You will find that a Bike Master Plan is an extremely valuable asset to your City’s development policy. It provides the guidance necessary to develop Pismo Beach in a manner that directly improves the economic, physical, and environmental health of your community. Specifically, as cycling becomes increasingly popular throughout the Country, the Bike Master Plan will demonstrate to tourists, visitors and residents that your city is the best healthy and active family friendly destination for them.

Our board and staff are committed to strengthening our presence in southern San Luis Obispo County. We are especially enthusiastic to assist in launching various active transportation encouragement activities, workshops and outreach programs. Our wildly successful Bicycle Valet, Bicycle Kitchen, and Bicycle Confidence Programs have already made appearances in South County and connect directly to the safety and encouragement elements of the plan. We strongly encourage your Council to keep the Bike Coalition in mind when looking for entities to assist with administration of these elements.

Finally, with State and County approval your Bike Master Plan will make Pismo Beach eligible for additional infrastructure grant funding. Our past experience on such grants has assisted with accessing millions of dollars in funding for bike projects in throughout San Luis Obispo County. Please know that the Bicycle Coalition is seriously committed to collaboration on bike infrastructure grant applications and will submit letters of support whenever possible.

Thank you very much for all of your time and considerations.

Best Regards,

Dan Rivoire
Executive Director
San Luis Obispo County Bicycle Coalition
March 26, 2010

Honorable Mary Ann Reiss and City Council
City of Pismo Beach
760 Mattie Road
Pismo Beach, CA 93449

RE: Support of the Draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan

Dear Mayor Mary Ann Reiss and Council,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Pismo Beach Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. We at SLOCOG are pleased to support the City’s efforts to establish a Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan as well as pursue the Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) grant opportunities to fund bicycle related improvements.

As the state-designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for San Luis Obispo County, SLOCOG is charged with the responsibility of certifying Bicycle Transportation Plans within the region for compliance with California Streets and Highway Code Section 691.2 and with the current Regional Transportation Plan (Vision 2025). SLOCOG acknowledges The City’s Plan meets and exceeds the eligibility requirements set forth by the State of California. This plan is a comprehensive approach to identifying potential bicycle and pedestrian projects and developing programs to of outreach and education for residents and visitors. The plan builds upon existing policies and programs in the Circulation and other elements of City’s General Plan. Additionally, the projects shown in the plan will complement and expand the network of bicycle and pedestrian facilities available throughout the region. They will provide continual access for through-cyclists on the Pacific Coast Bike Route; as well as providing for recreational cyclists and pedestrians accessing both the Pacific Coast Trail and the De Anza Trail in the San Luis Obispo Region. The variety of projects in the plan will serve as both safe routes for commuters and recreational attractions for residents and visitors.

SLOCOG’s current Regional Transportation Plan (update underway) envisions “an efficient, coordinated, integrated, and balanced transportation system to meet the mobility needs of the San Luis Obispo region utilizing all modes of transportation.” This plan will complement that goal and will form the basis of the bicycle and pedestrian projects in the areas in Pismo Beach.

The City of Pismo Beach should be commended for taking this step toward developing a network of bicycle and pedestrian facilities throughout the City and for proactively seeking new funding sources for the projects. SLOCOG is proud to continue to partner with the City of Pismo Beach in planning and implementing future bicycle and pedestrian related improvements.

Should you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me 781-5754.

Sincerely,

Richard Murphy
Director Programming & Project Delivery
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments

1114 Marsh St., San Luis Obispo, CA 93401 • Tel. (805) 781-4219 • Fax (805) 781-5703
Email: slocog@slocog.org • Internet: http://www.slocog.org

A-38
April 5, 2010

Carolyn Johnson, Planning Manager
City of Pismo Beach
Planning Department
Pismo Beach, CA 93449

Dear Ms. Johnson:

PISMO BEACH BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN MASTER PLAN

Thank you for submitting the above referenced project for our review. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 5, has reviewed the above referenced project and appreciates the opportunity to provide comments. Caltrans views all transportation improvements as opportunities to improve safety, access, and mobility for all travelers in California. We recognize bicycle and pedestrian modes as integral elements of the transportation system and are glad to support projects which promote those modes. An approved and current Bicycle Transportation Plan provides eligibility for State Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) funding and is encouraged when applying for other State funding sources. 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. Bicycle Transportation Plan adoption establishes eligibility for five consecutive BTA funding cycles. More info on the Bicycle Transportation Account can be found at:

http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/IocalPrograms/bta/btawebPage.htm

As the City’s Bikeway and Pedestrian Plan is implemented, some of the specific items to be considered are discussed below:

1. The Plan identifies existing and proposed bicycle facilities within the City’s jurisdiction. Any work within the State right-of-way will require an encroachment permit issued from Caltrans. Detailed information such as complete plans, biological and cultural resource findings, hydraulic studies, environmental reports, traffic studies, etc., may need to be submitted as part of the encroachment permit process.

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
2. Relative to the State right-of-way, adherence to State design standards, environmental laws, and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is required. Careful attention must be given to design standards regarding the separation between bike paths and highways especially those within the clear recovery zone of freeways.

3. Specifically regarding hydrology and drainage, review of future construction plans would determine the need for the extension of existing culverts. Hydraulic analyses of existing culverts crossing State facilities and integrating with a bikeway will be needed to show that a project will not negatively impact culvert function.

4. To the extent possible, the City should consider final alignments that would avoid State right-of-way involvement. Doing so may simplify aspects of the project design and approval process. Related to this, the City should know it will be required to assume responsibility for maintenance for any portion of the Plan facilities which may ultimately be approved within State right-of-way.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide comments. If you have any questions, or need further clarification on items discussed above, I can be reached at (805) 549-3131 or adam.fukushima@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Adam Fukushima
Caltrans District 5
Transportation Planner for Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
March 1, 2010

Jim Thomas, Chair
Parks, Recreation, and Beautification Commission,
City of Pismo Beach
760 Mattie Road
Pismo Beach CA 93449

Re: draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan for April 6, 2010

Dear Commissioners:

This is an easy letter to write. Your draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan is an excellent document. It fully meets the existing and future needs of the bicycling community of Pismo Beach and those who bicycle to and from Pismo Beach on a regular basis. It is wonderful to see yet another city in San Luis Obispo County moving forward to officially embrace and plan for the increasing number of bicyclists that will reside in and visit Pismo Beach. In virtually every community in the country it has been shown for bicycle and pedestrian facilities that “if we build them, they will come.” Wherever improved facilities are provided, users increase dramatically.

One consideration you may want to make is to incorporate language in the plan that allows for the incorporation of new solutions quickly into the cities bike and pedestrian infrastructure as they come along and are tested and approved. An immediate example is the use of painted “bike boxes” at key intersections to more clearly delineate, and make safer, the proper location for bicycles and motorists, so as to prevent right turn accidents.

The San Luis Obispo Bicycle Club looks forward to working with you, in whatever way we can, to implement the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan for Pismo Beach.

Sincerely,

Robert Fuller Davis
President
RESOLUTION NO. R-2010-039

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PISMO BEACH
ADOPTING THE 2010 PISMO BEACH BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN MASTER PLAN

WHEREAS, Since the 1993 adoption of the City's General Plan/Local Coastal Plan, (GP/LCP), Pismo Beach has installed multiple bike lanes, public trails, beach access stairways and promenades, successfully had the City bluff top trails designated as a part of the California Coastal Trail, adopted the Pismo Creek trail plan and constructed a portion of the trail, successfully secured grants for trails, beach access and bike lanes, designed and built pedestrian trails and beach access structures in City parks, approved with requirements for trail opportunities subdivisions, single family homes, and hotels; and

WHEREAS, Residents and visitors maximize the use of these wonderful amenities. GP/LCP policies identify the City's value of non-vehicular transportation for enjoyment of the City's vast natural surroundings. The availability/accessibility of recreational and transportation resources are why so many people enjoy Pismo Beach; and

WHEREAS, While the General Plan/Local Coastal Plan created a strong foundation, the City's vision and efforts are further expanded with a Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. The creation of this Plan is a result of multiple Parks, Recreation and Beautification Commission (PRBC) meetings, resulting in a PRBC recommendation for Council approval to memorialize the City's strong vision for bicycle, pedestrian, and beach access opportunities; and,

WHEREAS, the Pismo Beach Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, will be utilized for future grant funding opportunities; and

WHEREAS, the Pismo Beach Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan qualifies as a CEQA statutory exemption. Pursuant to California Code of Regulations section 15262, the Plan is a study that includes possible future projects which the City has not approved, adopted or funded. Funded projects in the Plan have completed their environmental review; future projects identified in the Plan will be evaluated for potential environmental impacts if and when funding is available and approval is granted.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Pismo Beach hereby adopts the 2010 Pismo Beach Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, with:

1. Plan policy implementation flexibility at the discretion of the Public Works Director.
2. Direction for future consideration of 1993 General Plan/Local Coastal Plan (GP/LCP) policy amendments and corresponding amendments to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, including, but not limited to the Spindrift bluff top walkway and policy language for development of bicycle and pedestrian facilities in future annexation areas.
3. Direction for future evaluation of bicycle parking facilities and programs. Future evaluation would include, but not be limited to consideration of an adopt a rack program, bike valet parking and special events committee requirements for valet parking and Plan policies BP-4 and BP-5 regarding bicycle parking in private development projects and public parking lots.

UPON MOTION OF Councilmember Ehring seconded by Councilmember Waage the foregoing resolution was passed, approved and adopted by the City Council of the City of Pismo Beach this 15th day of June, 2010, by the following roll call vote:

AYES: 5    Councilmembers: Ehring, Waage, Vardas, Higginbotham, Reiss
NOES: 0
ABSENT: 0
ABSTAIN: 0

Approved:  

Mary Ann Reiss  
Mayor

Attest:  

Elaine Ceja, Deputy City Clerk