


The San Francisco Bay Trail Project

Gap Analysis Study



**A Report on Closing the Gaps in the
500-mile Regional Trail System
Encircling San Francisco Bay**



September 2005



**THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY TRAIL PROJECT
GAP ANALYSIS STUDY**

**A REPORT ON CLOSING THE GAPS IN THE 500-MILE REGIONAL TRAIL SYSTEM ENCIRCLING
SAN FRANCISCO BAY**

**Association of Bay Area Governments
Bay Trail Project**

Prepared by:


**Alta Planning + Design, Inc.
Questa Engineering, Inc.
GreenInfo Network**

AUGUST 2005

Supporting agencies



The Bay Trail Project plans, promotes and advocates for implementation of the Bay Trail network. To carry out this mission, staff coordinates with public and private partners, disseminates information about the Bay Trail, seeks funding and administers planning and construction grants. Construction and maintenance of the Bay Trail is the responsibility of cities, counties, park districts or other property owners. The Bay Trail Project is a nonprofit organization administered by the Association of Bay Area Governments. www.baytrail.org



The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) is the comprehensive regional planning agency for the 9-county San Francisco Bay Area. ABAG's mission is to strengthen cooperation and coordination among local governments. ABAG administers the Bay Trail Project. www.abag.ca.gov



The Coastal Conservancy is a state agency guided by the vision of a beautiful, restored and accessible coastline. It acts with others to preserve, protect and restore the resources of the California coast and the San Francisco Bay. www.coastalconservancy.ca.gov

The San Francisco Bay Trail

Current View



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Bay Trail Board Members

Susan Barnes
Bruce Beyaert
Bill Bliss
Mary Burns
Rosemary Corbin
Dana Cowell
Bob Douglass
Lynn Favaro
Jean Finney, Alternate
Jim Foran
Mark Frederick
Kelly Gibson, Alternate
Dan Hodapp
Minane Jameson
Ellen Johnck
Doug Johnson
Dough Kimsey
David Lewis
Gayle Likens
Bill Long
John Malamut, Alternate
Steven McAdam, Alternate
Jim McGrath
Julia Miller
David Mitchell
Betty Moose, Alternate
Rob Powell
Kerry Jo Ricketts-Ferris
Diane Ross-Leech
Philip Sales
Don Weden
John Woodbury
Del Woods

Bay Trail Steering Committee Members

Rick Parmer
Tom Huening
Julie Bondurant
Joan Cardellino
Leo Dubose
Stana Hearne
Joseph La Clair
Brian Wiese
Cathy Woodbury, Alternate

Bay Trail Advisory Council

Steve Heminger
Liz Figueroa
Kathleen Foote
David Hansen
Bill Lockyer
Ken McKowen
Linda Stonier

Bay Trail Staff Members

Laura Thompson, Project Manager
Maureen Gaffney, Bay Trail Planner
Lee Huo, Bay Trail Planner
Patrycja Bossak, Bay Trail Planner

Consultant Team

Michael Jones, Principal in Charge, Alta
Ian Moore, Project Manager, Alta
Nora De Cuir, Project Planner, Alta
Jeff Peters, Project Engineer, Questa
Margaret Henderson, Project Designer, Questa
Lynn Federico, GreenInfo Network
Amanda Kochanek, GreenInfo Network
Larry Orman, GreenInfo Network

This page intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Executive Summary	- 1 -
2. Why Complete the San Francisco Bay Trail?.....	- 2 -
2.1. Recreation and Shoreline Access	- 2 -
2.2. Transportation	- 2 -
2.3. Environmental Restoration and Education	- 3 -
2.4. Community Health.....	- 4 -
2.5. Equal Access to Open Space.....	- 4 -
2.6. Economic Vitality.....	- 4 -
3. The First 15 Years.....	- 6 -
3.1. Establishment of the Bay Trail Plan and Project	- 6 -
The Bay Trail Project.....	- 6 -
3.2. Completing the Remaining Bay Trail Gaps.....	- 7 -
Local Adoption.....	- 7 -
State Funding and Support	- 7 -
Partnership Building	- 8 -
Increased Public Awareness	- 9 -
Recent Project Successes.....	- 10 -
Land Ownership Challenges.....	- 10 -
Engineering Challenges	- 10 -
4. The Next 15 Years	- 12 -
4.1. Classification and Evaluation Process.....	- 12 -
4.2. Cost Estimate Methodology.....	- 15 -
Trail Construction Unit Costs	- 15 -
Trail Classification in the Cost Estimates	- 15 -
Project Categories.....	- 16 -
4.3. Project Phasing.....	- 17 -
Methodology	- 17 -
Benefit Factors.....	- 18 -
5. Bay Trail Projects by Phase	- 19 -
5.1. Short-Term Projects (Years 1-5).....	- 29 -
Summary of Short-Term Projects.....	- 29 -
Project Example: Short -Term	- 36 -
5.2. Mid-Term Projects (Years 6-10).....	- 38 -
Summary of Mid-Term Projects	- 38 -
Project Example: Mid-Term.....	- 45 -
5.3. Long-Term Projects (Years 11-15)	- 47 -
Summary of Long-Term Projects	- 47 -
Project Example: Long-Term.....	- 51 -
6. Closing the Gaps	- 52 -
Environmental Issues	- 54 -
Planning, Environmental Review and Permitting.....	- 55 -
Roads.....	- 56 -
Best Practices for Feasibility Studies	- 57 -
Institutional Challenges	- 58 -
7. Financial Needs	- 59 -
8. Conclusion.....	- 61 -

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

TABLE 1. EXISTING AND FUTURE ANNUAL USAGE OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY TRAIL-	3 -
TABLE 2. PROJECTED EXPENDITURES BY SAN FRANCISCO BAY TRAIL USERS.....	5 -
TABLE 3. BAY TRAIL FUNDING 1997-2005.....	7 -
TABLE 4. PROJECTED COST OF BAY TRAIL COMPLETION, BY TYPE OF PROJECT.....	16 -
TABLE 5. DESCRIPTION OF PHASING FACTORS.....	17 -
TABLE 6. DESCRIPTION OF BENEFIT FACTORS.....	18 -
TABLE 7. SUMMARY OF SHORT-TERM BAY TRAIL PROJECT COSTS BY COUNTY.....	29 -
TABLE 8. SHORT-TERM PROJECTS BY COUNTY AND BENEFIT RANK.....	30 -
TABLE 9. SUMMARY OF MID-TERM BAY TRAIL PROJECT COSTS BY COUNTY.....	38 -
TABLE 10. MID-TERM PROJECTS BY COUNTY AND BENEFIT RANK.....	39 -
TABLE 11. SUMMARY OF LONG-TERM BAY TRAIL PROJECT COSTS BY COUNTY.....	47 -
TABLE 12. LONG-TERM PROJECTS BY COUNTY AND BENEFIT RANK.....	47 -
TABLE 13. SAN FRANCISCO BAY TRAIL FUNDING AVAILABLE OVER NEXT 15 YEARS.....	60 -
FIGURE 1. EXAMPLE OF COST DETAIL FOR CLASS I TRAIL.....	15 -

MAPS

SAMPLE SEGMENT MAP.....	14 -
SEGMENT MAPS BY COUNTY.....	
SAN FRANCISCO.....	20 -
SAN MATEO.....	21 -
SANTA CLARA.....	22 -
ALAMEDA.....	23 -
CONTRA COSTA.....	24 -
SOLANO.....	25 -
NAPA.....	26 -
SONOMA.....	27 -
MARIN.....	28 -

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: COST ESTIMATE DETAILS
APPENDIX B: TRAIL COST DOCUMENTATION
APPENDIX C: IMPLEMENTATION RANKING
APPENDIX D: SURVEY
APPENDIX E: TRAIL USEAGE ESTIMATE METHODOLOGY

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Bay Trail Project is a nonprofit organization administered by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) that plans, promotes and advocates for the implementation of a continuous 500-mile bicycling and hiking path around San Francisco Bay. When complete, the trail will pass through 47 cities, all nine Bay Area counties, and cross seven toll bridges. To date, slightly more than half the length of the Bay Trail alignment has been developed. In reaching this significant milestone, there is increased interest in overcoming the remaining gaps in the trail system. This report was commissioned by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Bay Trail Project and the California Coastal Conservancy to answer two of the most commonly asked questions regarding the Bay Trail: “When will it be done?” and “How much will it cost?” To this end, the Gap Analysis Study aims to:

- Identify the remaining gaps,
- Classify the gaps by phase, county and benefit ranking,
- Develop cost estimates for individual gap completion using a consistent methodology,
- Identify strategies and actions to overcome gaps,
- Identify long term funding needs, and
- Present an overall cost and timeframe for completion.

In addition to this Gap Analysis Study, another important aspect of this project has been the meticulous cataloguing of each unfinished segment of Bay Trail into a geographic information system (GIS) and an integrated geodatabase. This invaluable tool will allow staff to continuously update important information relating to changes in the status of particular gaps—from incomplete to complete, from unfunded to funded, from proposed Class II to proposed Class I, etc. With the infrastructure set in place by the Gap Analysis team, Bay Trail staff will be able to quickly reference the report, the GIS maps or the geodatabase regarding commonly asked questions such as “How much Bay Trail is left to be constructed in Solano County? How much would that cost? Which projects are ready to construct at this time?” Having this information readily available will assist the Project as it contemplates new and different sources of funding for trail completion.

The majority of easily constructed trail segments within the adopted alignment have been completed and the current challenge is to address the institutional, funding, planning, design, and environmental issues related to the remaining segments. **The research done for this report indicates that the cost to complete the remaining gaps, excluding segments that will be built as part of transportation and private development projects, is \$187,798,000. If adequate funding sources are found, the Bay Trail could be “complete” in 15 years. Bay Trail segments to be constructed as part of transportation and private development projects are excluded from this estimate because these projects will be funded by separate sources.**¹ The body of this report details how Bay Trail Project staff and Alta Planning + Design prepared these costs and timeline estimates. The information contained in this report is intended to aid in the setting of priorities and in defining the costs and timing associated with completing the Bay Trail, but is not intended to represent a feasibility study level of cost estimating.

¹ Please see Chapters 4 and 5 and Appendix A for detailed cost explanation and breakdown.

2. WHY COMPLETE THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY TRAIL?

The San Francisco Bay Trail has proven to be one of the most popular public facilities in the region. The motivation to complete the trail is based on the tangible benefits that people and local agencies see on their completed segments, including:

- recreational and shoreline access;
- transportation;
- environmental restoration and education;
- community health;
- access to and preservation of open space; and,
- economic vitality.

Perhaps most importantly, the Bay Trail binds together the communities of the San Francisco Bay Area. The Trail is accessible within five (5) miles of 54 cities with a combined population of 3.8 million people (57% of the Bay Area population).² Over 75% of the Bay Area population (5.8 million people) lives within 20 miles of the Bay Trail.

2.1. RECREATION AND SHORELINE ACCESS

One of the founding goals of the San Francisco Bay Trail is to enhance access to the Bay shoreline, which has historically been cut-off from many areas due to a variety of public and private actions. The connection between Bay Area communities and the San Francisco Bay had disappeared or was severely impacted by numerous industrial uses, and the perception of wetlands as undesirable 'swamp.' Things have changed dramatically in the past 20 years, due in part to the Bay Trail. For example, communities such as Hercules are developing new neighborhoods oriented towards San Pablo Bay for the first time. "Public access to and along the shoreline of the Bay is an integral component of development and usually consists of pedestrian, bicycle and other non-motorized forms of movement," according to *Shoreline Spaces: Public Access Design Guidelines for the San Francisco Bay* (San Francisco Bay Conservation Development Commission, April 2005).

The Bay Trail has helped many residents and visitors rediscover the Bay, and in some cases, entire communities have discovered the shoreline as a major resource. This has not only resulted in the enhancement of shoreline access, but the expansion of local recreational opportunities. With the growth in recreational activities such as bicycling and walking, coupled with renewed interest in healthy lifestyles, the Bay Trail increasingly serves as a major recreational facility in Bay Area communities.

2.2. TRANSPORTATION

While the Bay Trail is perceived as primarily a recreational facility, in many areas it also serves an important transportation function. For example, weekday Bay Trail users in Tiburon connect to the Ferry for a ride into San Francisco. Transportation trips on the Bay Trail are defined as any trip made by a bicyclist or pedestrian that would have otherwise been made in a private vehicle. This could include, for example, a person who decides to walk or bicycle on a nearby Bay Trail rather than driving to a park. It would also include anybody walking or bicycling to shop or dine, to connect to a bus or ferry, or traveling to school or work.

² 2000 U.S. Census

The Bay Trail is identified as part of the regional network by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Regional Bicycle Plan, a portion of the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area, which establishes the region's 25-year transportation investment plan. Table 1 shows that an estimated 37.9 million annual trips are made on the existing Bay Trail, making it one of the most heavily used recreation and non-motorized transportation corridors in the region. In this way, the Bay Trail is helping to provide alternatives to driving. An explanation of the methodology used to derive usage estimates for this report is contained in Appendix E.

2.3. ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND EDUCATION

Ecological restoration of the San Francisco Bay shoreline and estuaries is a long-term undertaking that will require billions of dollars of public investment. An important part of this restoration effort is careful design of public access in order to provide people with the opportunity to see and appreciate the return of greater numbers of bird, animal and aquatic species to areas where they once teemed. The Bay Trail Project is working closely with many of the wildlife management and other agencies to create these opportunities now and in the future. As a result of these restoration projects, the alignment of the trail may change in order to accommodate the shifting shoreline. Current examples of joint ecological restoration and public access projects in planning stages or under construction include:

- Hamilton Wetlands Restoration will include 2.66 miles of new Bay Trail that will connect to an existing 5 miles of Bay Trail to the south at Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District and McInnis Park in San Rafael
- The Bel Marin Keys Unit V restoration project will create approximately one mile of new Bay Trail



San Francisco Bay Trail, Ravenswood, San Mateo County
Image Credit: San Francisco Bay Trail Project

**Table 1:
 Existing and Future Annual Usage of the
 San Francisco Bay Trail**

	Existing	Future
Alameda	11,977,267	19,962,112
Contra Costa	2,295,897	5,101,993
Marin	1,668,584	3,337,169
Napa	83,472	1,669,450
San Francisco	10,768,934	15,384,192
San Mateo	6,120,909	10,201,515
Santa Clara	3,801,137	10,860,392
Solano	1,109,135	2,772,837
Sonoma	67,563	1,351,251
Total	37,892,899	70,640,911

- The Sonoma Baylands restoration will result in approximately .75 miles of new Bay Trail, and is currently under construction
- The Sears Point restoration will include approximately 2.4 miles of new Bay Trail, including a visitor center and interpretive displays addressing the topic of wetland restoration. The Sears Point project will directly connect with Sonoma Baylands, together creating over 5 miles of new Bay Trail where the previous alignment had been inland and on-street
- The South Bay Salt Ponds encompasses planning and development of new public access to 15,100 acres of former salt ponds in South San Francisco Bay.

The Bay Trail also provides direct, experiential educational opportunities in the bay environment, focusing on ecological restoration, land use planning, Bay Area history and many other aspects of San Francisco Bay ecology, history and culture. The accessible nature of multi-use trail environments allows trail users to view restoration efforts first-hand. The ability to experience the restoration may engender further support for Bay Trail completion efforts as residents become personally invested in the well being of the Bay.

Because the Bay Trail is located near environmentally sensitive areas, the Bay Trail Project and partner agencies have undertaken a major study to begin to assess potential wildlife impacts associated with public access to these areas. *The San Francisco Bay Trail Wildlife & Public Access Study*, funded by The Bay Trail Project, BCDC and other sponsors, is a benchmark study in this field. After two years of research, preliminary findings of this study suggest there is no clear connection between the abundance and diversity of shore birds and waterfowl using mudflat foraging habitat adjacent to the Bay Trail and levels of trail use. Research on this issue will continue, and lessons learned relating to the design and operation of the Bay Trail will be incorporated into existing and future projects as appropriate.

2.4. COMMUNITY HEALTH

Studies by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and other organizations increasingly point to the sedentary lifestyle of Americans as a primary reason for the epidemic of obesity. The Bay Trail provides an important resource for Bay Area residents to start and maintain an active lifestyle, especially in our dense central cities. The Bay Trail is unique in that it is close to residential neighborhoods, employment centers, schools and parks, is generally level, and provides an aesthetic experience for users. All of these elements make the Bay Trail an important tool to encourage Bay Area residents to exercise on a regular basis. While difficult to quantify, it is known that increased activity results in lower short and long term medical costs.

2.5. EQUAL ACCESS TO OPEN SPACE

As the Bay Area region continues to gain population, efforts are being made to acquire and preserve open space, with notable success in areas like Marin, Sonoma, Alameda, and other counties. This trend continues through efforts of well-established privately funded land trusts in San Mateo, Napa and other counties.

However, residents of many older Bay Area cities continue to have limited access to regional open spaces that are often located in the hills and more remote coastal areas. As an example, in his analysis of equity of access to open space, Daniel Press concludes that open space in Santa Clara County is primarily concentrated in the “hilly, wooded west side of the valley [with] many of the wealthiest and whitest communities.” He observes that Santa Clara County’s poorest residents are often far from any “parks or other open spaces larger than playing fields.”³

Completion of the Bay Trail system holds tremendous opportunity to knit together underutilized Bay shore park facilities, improve access through connector trails, and provide access to communities residing close to the Bay, yet historically cut off from this resource by private land ownership, industrial activity, and transportation infrastructure.

2.6. ECONOMIC VITALITY

Trails and bikeways are not normally considered an economic factor in the San Francisco Bay Area. However, several facts point to the Bay Trail playing a significant undocumented role in supporting the Bay Area economy. First, Bay Trail segments around the region are often some of the most heavily used

³ Daniel Press, *Saving Open Space* (University of California Press, Berkeley, 2002) 133.

recreational facilities – on par with national and regional parks – and play an important role in the tourism economy.

Second, the Bay Trail links numerous major regional destinations. For example, the Embarcadero in San Francisco links Fisherman’s Wharf, Pier 39, the Ferry Building, the San Francisco Giant’s Ball Park, and many other waterfront activity areas. Third, even assuming a very low expenditure per Bay Trail trip, the Bay Trail generates an estimated \$190 million per year (see Table 2) for businesses near the trail.⁴ Finally, the Bay Area’s economic vitality is directly linked to its ability to attract and retain high quality workers. The Bay Trail is one of the key components that make the Bay Area ‘livable’ with one of the highest concentrations of outdoor recreational opportunities in the country.

**Table 2: Projected Expenditures by San Francisco Bay Trail Users
July 2005**

	Annual Expenditures
Alameda	\$59,886,335
Contra Costa	\$11,479,484
Marin	\$8,342,922
Napa	\$417,362
San Francisco	\$53,844,672
San Mateo	\$30,604,545
Santa Clara	\$19,005,685
Solano	\$5,545,674
Sonoma	\$337,813
Total	\$189,464,493

⁴ It is estimated that Bay Trail users spend an average of \$5 per visit on supplies, food, fuel, lodging, and other items. Estimates of expenditures are based on several studies of average expenditures by trail users. The single most important source for the expenditure data is the Appalachian Trail in 2000 (Use and Users of the Appalachian Trail: A Source Book). Other sources include the International Mountain Bicycling Association (IMBA), Association of Bicycle and Pedestrian Professionals (Bicycle and Pedestrian National Clearinghouse), and the Office of Business, Economic Development, and Tourism (DBED&T). Expenditure data from these sources has been customized to reflect conditions in the San Francisco Bay Area and on the Bay Trail. Nationally, average daily expenditures for day hikers is \$10, mountain bicyclists \$20, and bird watchers is \$10. Given the proximity of the Bay Trail to neighborhoods and the number of shorter trips, we have estimated \$5/visit rather than the higher \$10+ amounts. While many shorter trips on the Bay Trail by nearby residents may not generate significant expenditures, other sections of the Bay Trail heavily used by regional, national, and international visitors would generate substantially more than \$5/day.

3. THE FIRST 15 YEARS

3.1. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BAY TRAIL PLAN AND PROJECT

In 1987, then-State Senator Bill Lockyer created a vision for a "Ring Around the Bay," a hiking and bicycling trail that would encircle the shoreline of San Francisco and San Pablo Bays. To fulfill his vision, Senator Lockyer authored Senate Bill 100 (SB 100) that was passed into California law in 1987 with the endorsement of the entire Bay Area legislative delegation. SB 100 authorized the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) to "develop and adopt a plan ... for a continuous recreational corridor which will extend around the perimeter of San Francisco and San Pablo Bays."



San Francisco Bay Trail, Coyote Hills Regional Park, Alameda County
Image Credit: Ron Horii

SB 100 outlined that the plan would include a specific bicycling and hiking trail alignment; connections to parks and other recreational facilities; links to existing and proposed public transportation facilities; an implementation and funding program for the trail; and provisions for implementing the trail without adversely affecting the natural environment of the Bay. This plan became known as the Bay Trail Plan.

The Bay Trail Plan was developed over a two-year period by an ABAG advisory committee that included representatives from a broad range of interests, including Federal, State, regional and local government agencies, environmental and recreational organizations and private landowners. In July 1989, the Bay Trail Plan along with its policies, proposed trail alignment, and implementation and financing strategies was adopted by the ABAG Executive Board. The policies in the Bay Trail Plan focus on trail alignment, trail design, environmental protection, transportation access and an implementation program to guide the selection and design of future trail routes.

Since its inception, the Bay Trail Plan has enjoyed widespread support in the Bay Area. The Plan continues to guide the development of the Bay Trail today.

The Bay Trail Project

To implement the Bay Trail Plan and its provisions, the San Francisco Bay Trail Project (Bay Trail Project) was created in 1990 as a nonprofit organization administered by ABAG. The mission of the Bay Trail Project is to plan, promote, and advocate for the implementation of the Bay Trail. To carry out its mission, the Bay Trail Project administers grant funds for trail planning, design and construction; participates in local and regional planning efforts by encouraging consistency with the adopted Bay Trail Plan; educates the public and decision-makers about the merits and benefits of the Bay Trail; produces maps and other materials to publicize the Bay Trail; and disseminates information about the progress of its development.

Today, the Bay Trail Project is staffed by four full-time employees. It is governed by a 43-member volunteer board of directors representing a broad range of interests and a steering committee that meets regularly to guide project direction. The Bay Trail Project continues to strive towards the vision of a continuous "Ring Around the Bay" through its Bay Trail grants, government and community partnerships, public outreach and planning efforts such as the Bay Trail Gap Analysis Study.

3.2. COMPLETING THE REMAINING BAY TRAIL GAPS

When the concept of the Bay Trail was developed in the late 1980s, there were approximately 180 miles of shoreline trail in use by the public. Since then, close to 100 more miles have been completed. Along the way, the Bay Trail Project and its partners have achieved: (1) greater than fifty percent completion of the total planned system; (2) increased local adoption of the Bay Trail concept through General Plans and other planning documents; (3) state funding for the Project; (4) agency and organizational partnerships; and, (5) increased public awareness and use of the trail.

A combination of forces including increased funding, recent emphasis on bay restoration, and the need for increased access to the shoreline, is moving the Bay Trail forward with increasing momentum. Of the 500 planned Bay Trail miles, 270 miles are now open to the public. The map located at the end of the report provides an overview of the completed Bay Trail.

As can be seen on the overview map at the beginning of the report ("Current View"), much of the Bay Trail development in the past has been in San Francisco, San Mateo, Alameda, Contra Costa, and Marin Counties. Physical and environmental constraints in the North Bay have limited Bay Trail development in Sonoma and Napa Counties, however, upcoming projects such as the Sonoma Baylands, Sears Point Restoration, Napa Sonoma Marsh and Wetlands Edge Trail in American Canyon are representative of increasing progress toward Bay Trail implementation in the North Bay.

Local Adoption

In 1990, the initial task of the Bay Trail Project was to conduct outreach and gather support from local agencies and the public for completion of the trail. Over time, this successful early project work resulted in official support from the majority of shoreline communities. The nine counties and 47 cities have officially recognized the Bay Trail by adopting the alignment in local plans or passing resolutions in support of the concept. This in turn has resulted in local agencies requiring easements for and construction of the Bay Trail when new developments occur, and has focused implementation efforts on closing Bay Trail gaps.

State Funding and Support

The California State Legislature has also been very supportive of the project. In 1997, the Bay Trail Project received its first grant from the state general fund in the amount of \$200,000. Since then, the project has received four more appropriations totaling \$15 million (\$1 million, \$2.5 million, \$7.5 million from Proposition 12 and \$3.8 million from Proposition 40) in the form of general fund dollars or from statewide park bonds. Bay Trail staff serves as the administrative lead for allocation of grants to local jurisdictions and the grants are matched with other sources of funding. Bay Trail has worked closely with the State Coastal Conservancy to award grants under the two most recent appropriations. The Bay Trail grant program has awarded over 70 planning and construction grants to communities in all nine counties. These projects have resulted in over 35 miles of trail construction, new shoreline destination areas, interpretive signs, trail amenities as well detailed planning analysis for over 95 miles, a crucial first step

**Table 3: Bay Trail Funding
1997-2005**

Source	Amount
State Legislature	\$200,000
State Legislature	\$1,000,000
State Legislature	\$2,500,000
Proposition 12	\$7,500,000
Proposition 40	\$3,800,000
Total	\$15,000,000

for trail construction. Table 4 illustrates specific funding allocations to the Bay Trail Project since its inception.

Partnership Building

The Bay Trail Project has built an extensive network of agency and organizational partnerships. The Bay Trail Project is a small organization with a small budget in the context of a major metropolitan region of large geographic scope. The broad working relationships maintained by Bay Trail staff expand the effectiveness of the organization, leveraging their existing administrative funding to create a much larger group of Bay Trail advocates within the public, private and nonprofit sectors. These partnerships have been instrumental in bringing about many of the ideas and strategies leading to trail development in areas of complex property ownership, land use, environmental regulatory jurisdiction and public interest. A exhaustive list of Bay Trail Project partner relationships is too long to include in this study, but the core group of federal, State, regional, local and advocacy organizations is presented here to provide evidence of the breadth of these associations:

Federal

- National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
 - San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge, San Pablo Bay National Wildlife Refuge

State

- California Legislators
- State Coastal Conservancy
- San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)
- California Department of Parks and Recreation (California State Parks)
 - The Bay Trail spine passes through three state parks: China Camp State Park, Benicia State Recreation Area, Candlestick Point State Recreation Area
- California Department of Transportation (CalTrans)
- California Department of Fish & Game

Regional

- Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)
- San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District
- East Bay Regional Park District
- Marin County Open Space District
- Mid-Peninsula Regional Open Space District
- Bay Area Open Space Council

Local

- Nine counties
- County Congestion Management Agencies and Transportation Authorities

- Forty-seven cities
- Parks and Recreation, Public Works, Planning Departments, Water Districts, Land Trusts, Ports
- Local Elected Officials
- Flood Control Districts

Advocacy Organizations

- Trail Organizations
- Bicycle Coalitions
- Land Use Organizations
- Pedestrian Advocates
- Environmental Organizations
- Open Space Groups

Private Land Ownership Development

Increased Public Awareness

Media Coverage

Since its inception in 1990, the Bay Trail Project has gained public awareness, in part through increased media coverage of the project. In 2003, both the San Francisco Chronicle and the Bay Area CBS affiliate, KPIX, produced features on the Bay Trail. The Chronicle series, entitled "Bay Trail Adventure" recounted the experience of Chronicle reporters and photographers on a month long trek around the Bay, on bike or foot along the existing Bay Trail segments and by boat, transit or car across the gaps. The series covered the origins of the Bay Trail, the construction process, and the remaining gaps in the Trail. The Chronicle coverage of the Bay Trail provided an overview of the scale of the project, noting that the trail:

- Connects all nine Bay Area counties;
- Links 10 ferry terminals;
- Links 47 cities or towns; and,
- Links 130 parks or wildlife preserves encompassing 57,000 acres of open space.

The series highlighted the educational opportunities along the Bay Trail, particularly for school children. Detailed profiles of existing trail segments also reviewed the specific issues associated with them,

BAY TRAIL ADVENTURE
The Shoreline At Your Feet
Long plagued by budget shortages and, after 15 years, still only half finished, the Bay Trail nevertheless is creating what amounts to an unofficial national park -- right in the midst of the nation's fifth-biggest urban area.

STORY | PHOTOS

Chronicle / Lance Iversen

Buy Photos
Prints for Purchase
The remarkable around-the-bay, shoreline tour in pictures available for display in your home.

Buy Photos
The shoreline at your feet 400 years ago, the dream is still much a work in progress... story | photos | mpeg-4 video

On the way - Larkspur to SF
A famous tourist mecca and commute route, but full of surprises. story | photos | mpeg-4 video

Down the Peninsula...
At Pier 39, it's sea lions. In San Mateo, it's feral cats. story | photos | mpeg-4 video

South Bay refuge
Here, experts are attempting one of the nation's biggest estuary restoration projects. story | photos | mpeg-4 video

East Bay to the Bay Bridge
Cannon Slough: The lungs of East Oakland are a tailgate party paradise. story | photos | mpeg-4 video

N. East Bay to Albany Bull
Stunning views, cool breezes and anything-goes art at the Albany Bull. story | photos

Tolay Creek & Dickson Ranch
One of the prettiest, quietest sections of the Bay Trail, home to the last farmer on the bay. story | photos

BAY TRAIL MAPS

Entire Map View | Download PDF

1 Marin-SF View | Download PDF

2 Millbrae-San Carlos View | Download PDF

3 South Bay View | Download PDF

4 Oakland View | Download PDF

5 Berkeley View | Download PDF

6 Sonoma Baylands View | Download PDF

BAY TRAIL RESOURCES

Getting There, Access Tips, Wildlife Guides

Check Weather

Check Traffic

SFGate Travel

SFGate Outdoors

Official maps and links:
Bay Trail Project
www.baytrail.org
(510) 464-7900

A joint project with:
San Francisco Openair

San Francisco Chronicle Web-Based Bay Trail Guide
Image Credit: www.sfgate.com

including conflicts between dog walkers and bird watchers in the East Bay. This invaluable public information is now maintained on the San Francisco Chronicle website, www.sfgate.com.

Recent Project Successes

Specific project examples illustrate best the significant accomplishment of the Bay Trail Project over its 15 year history. The projects presented below encapsulate the many challenges that present themselves when developing new public access to the San Francisco Bay shoreline. The myriad of land ownership negotiations, engineering, and coordination challenges make construction of each Bay Trail segment unique. The following projects illustrate recent accomplishments and successful responses to the challenges of urban trail development.

Land Ownership Challenges

Sunnyvale Baylands Park - Lockheed Reach

The Bay Trail in Sunnyvale illustrates the importance of partnerships in constructing trail on private land. In cooperation with Cargill Salt and Lockheed Martin, the City of Sunnyvale opened one mile of new Bay Trail along an existing levee in June 2001. Formal license agreements with the two property owners enabled the city to take down fences and open this segment of trail to the public. The project extends 2.7 miles of Bay Trail in Sunnyvale Baylands Park for recreation and provides new access to Lockheed property for employees.



The Bay Trail in Sunnyvale provides direct access to Sunnyvale Baylands Park and the Lockheed office complex near Moffett Field.

Image Credit: San Francisco Bay Trail Project

Damon Slough Bridge, Oakland

After many years of negotiation for use of an abandoned railroad right-of-way, in October 2004 the East Bay Regional Park District completed a long-standing gap in the Bay Trail with the retrofit of the Damon Slough railroad bridge. This short but critical gap links existing Bay Trail to the north in Martin Luther King, Jr. Regional Shoreline with trail to the south along Arrowhead Marsh resulting in over 5 continuous miles of shoreline trail. This segment also provides access to a new job center in the Oakland Airport area. Acquisition of the property was made possible through collaboration and license agreements with the Port of Oakland and the City of Oakland.



The Damon Slough railroad bridge is a key link in the Martin Luther King, Jr. Regional Shoreline trail system.

Image Credit: San Francisco Bay Trail Project

Engineering Challenges

Bridgeway Bike Lanes, Sausalito

In September 2003, the City of Sausalito celebrated the completion of two miles of bike lanes on Bridgeway Avenue through downtown Sausalito. The bike lanes extend from Princess Street to the northern city limits along a popular segment of the Bay Trail. The striped bike lanes separate motor vehicles from bicycle traffic and improve safety along this busy corridor, which has been estimated by the Golden Gate Bridge District to accommodate as many as 5,000 bicyclists per day. In order to complete this project, the center median was narrowed to accommodate 5-foot striped bike lanes and improved sidewalks.



The Bridgeway bicycle lanes in Sausalito filled a critical gap in one of the most highly used on-street segments of the Bay Trail.

Alfred Zampa Memorial Bridge

The recently completed 12-foot wide bicycle and pedestrian path on the west side of the new Alfred Zampa Memorial Bridge provides an important Bay Trail link for recreation and an option for alternative commuting between Solano and Contra Costa counties. Prior to construction, bicyclists and pedestrians were required to take a bus shuttle service across the Strait.

Benicia State Recreation Area

In September 2003, California State Parks constructed 2 new miles of trail in Benicia State Recreation Area along the edge of the park's western hills offering expansive views of the Strait. The path is ADA accessible and required careful placement on steep slopes to avoid erosion and destabilization. A wider alternative bicycle path was also constructed inland from the shoreline.



The Alfred Zampa Memorial Bridge pathway spans the Carquinez Strait.

Image Credit: San Francisco Bay Trail Project



The Benicia State Recreation Area trail offers expansive views of the Carquinez Strait.

Image Credit: San Francisco Bay Trail Project

4. THE NEXT 15 YEARS

This chapter provides an overview of the methodology used to develop the required information for this report, such as identification of gaps, assignment of project categories, development of cost estimating tools, and development of a phasing chart. The objective is to provide regional and local agencies with guidance on those segments that can be completed in the short, mid, and long term, and the cost to complete those segments.

4.1. CLASSIFICATION AND EVALUATION PROCESS

The trail segments analyzed in this study are based on the alignment identified in the Bay Trail Plan. However, since the Plan was adopted, the alignment has changed and will continue to shift in response to new opportunities to meet the goals of placing the Bay Trail as close to the shoreline as possible. The data collected for this Gap Analysis Study will be used as a tool to implement the goals identified in the Bay Trail Plan.

As background for this report, The Bay Trail Project initiated a GIS-based mapping effort with Green Info Network (GIN) to identify and number Bay Trail gap segments. A series of maps (see sample map on following page) were produced showing each gap with a related segment number. Over 300 gaps were initially identified, and Bay Trail staff was able to provide detailed information for over half of those gaps. For those gaps that the Bay Trail staff had minimal information for, a questionnaire and high-quality map showing the relevant segment was sent to the appropriate jurisdiction. The response rate was high—approximately 80%. The questionnaires asked what type of obstacles to implementation existed for each gap—private land ownership, habitat concerns, funding, security, safety, liability, and other factors affecting project design, funding and implementation (A transcript of survey questions is included in this document as **Appendix D**).

The photographs depict some examples of the types of obstacles to implementation that this study refers to: physical and financial constraints, land use constraints, and security, safety and liability constraints.

The services of a trail planning and engineering team (Alta Planning + Design and Questa Engineering) were enlisted to review the survey responses, develop accurate and consistent cost estimates, and prioritize segments. The Bay Trail segments were numbered in the following series sequence, by county.

- San Francisco = 1000
- San Mateo = 2000
- Santa Clara = 3000
- Alameda = 4000
- Contra Costa = 5000
- Solano = 6000
- Napa = 7000
- Sonoma = 8000
- Marin = 9000


The segments are numbered sequentially starting at the Golden Gate Bridge and moving southward around the south end of the San Francisco Bay, up the East Bay shoreline, around the North Bay (Carquinez Straights, San Pablo Bay), and south again through Marin to the Golden Gate Bridge. The definition of an individual segment was




Segment 8014 in Sonoma County fell into the land use constraints category as a security or operational restriction.

Image Credit: The San Francisco Bay Trail Project

based upon several factors, including jurisdictional boundaries. The objective was to ensure that each segment could be planned, designed, funded, and constructed as a stand-alone project. In some cases, segments could be combined as appropriate by a local agency. The division of gaps into shorter segments based on these and other factors has greatly contributed to the accuracy of the cost estimates and prioritization that forms the basis of the 5, 10 and 15 year implementation plans presented below.



Segment 5080 on Carquinez Scenic Drive in Contra Costa County is a good example of a physical and financial constraint. The slope failure shown here is a physical constraint, while the funds required to fix it represent a financial constraint.
Image Credit: The San Francisco Bay Trail Project




Segment 3029 is another example of a land use constraint involving security and operational issues, as well as safety and liability concerns.
Image Credit: The San Francisco Bay Trail Project



SAN FRANCISCO BAY TRAIL

San Francisco County



- Completed Trail Segment
- Proposed Trail Segment
- Segment Break
- County Line

4.2. COST ESTIMATE METHODOLOGY

Developing accurate planning-level cost estimates for the remaining Bay Trail gaps is an important and challenging task. Cost estimates are typically developed as part of preliminary engineering and feasibility studies, and can involve numerous complex issues that can be difficult to ascertain. Estimates for the cost of implementation of trail sections were based on the Gap Analysis team’s knowledge of trail and bikeway planning and engineering, knowledge of the specific gaps, limited site visits, and review of the corridors using high-resolution aerial photography to determine what type of trail construction would be needed (i.e., boardwalk, simple asphalt path, bridge, bike lanes, etc.). These estimates and their related per foot cost assumptions can be found in **Appendix A**. It is important to note that the costs in this report were not estimated to the level of detail as would be found in a feasibility study. They are meant to be used as a preliminary planning-level estimate only.

The cost estimating methodology can be broken down into two parts: (1) development and application of trail construction unit costs to each gap segment; and, (2) sorting of the gap segments into appropriate categories based on the likely source of funding and project sponsor.

Trail Construction Unit Costs

First, unit costs for all constituent elements of trail construction were developed and applied to the gap segments. These unit costs were developed using the current best available knowledge of costs for specific building materials, construction strategies, and design and permitting costs. Complete documentation and sourcing for these costs is provided in **Appendix B**.

Trail Classification in the Cost Estimates

The San Francisco Bay Trail system is intended to be a multi-use pathway separate from vehicle traffic to the greatest extent feasible. As such, the cost estimates reflect this Bay Trail Plan goal. Wherever feasible, based on the analysis completed for this report, cost estimates reflect development of a multi-use pathway separate from streets, roadways and highways. Other gap segments that do not provide right-of-way or other environmental characteristics suitable to development of a multi-use path have cost estimates based on bicycle lanes, sidewalks, or signed bicycle routes. This detail is reflected in the cost estimating spreadsheets included in **Appendix C**. An example of cost estimate detail for a Class I Multi-Use Trail is shown in Figure 1. Gap segments were divided into appropriate project categories based on the likely source of funding.

Figure 1: Example of Cost Detail for Class I Trail

Construction Type	Construction Type General Requirements	Construction Components	Cost per Lineal Foot	Typical Section
Trail – Level Paved Surface	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Existing path, roadway or levee location requiring minor leveling/grading 2. Aggregate Base and Paving for 12' trail width 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Earthwork b. Asphalt pavement with Aggregate Base 12 ft. wide c. Pavement striping d. Traffic Sign e. Wayfinding Sign 	\$63.86	<p>The diagram shows a cross-section of a trail. At the top, a horizontal line indicates a width of 10' - 12'. Below this, a paved surface is shown with two 2' wide shoulders on either side. Below the paved surface is an aggregate base, and below that is an existing unpaved surface. Labels include 'Paved', 'Gravel Shoulder', 'Aggregate Base as required', and 'Existing Unpaved Surface var. width'.</p>

Project Categories

Each of the Bay Trail gaps was assigned a project category, according to responsibility for implementation, and eligibility for public funding. Table 4 below shows the total cost associated with each project category. The Project Categories include:

Planned Projects

Planned projects include those projects typically constructed with public funding. Lead agencies typically include cities, counties, park districts, and other agencies. Projects require the funding shown in this report, including design, regulatory review and construction. Cost estimates for projects with completed design or regulatory review are calculated appropriately.



This segment of the San Francisco Bay Trail in Marin County illustrates the separated multi-use trail standard given priority in all cost estimating for this analysis.

Image Credit San Francisco Bay Trail Project

Greenway, Promenade or Park Projects

Greenway, promenade or park projects incorporate a Bay Trail alignment as a portion of a large-scale project including greater landscape, park fixture or other urban amenities than a typical Bay Trail project. The Bay Trail component (trail facility) of larger estimated project budget is assumed to be 20% of total project cost.

Private Land Ownership Development Project

This category includes projects assumed to be a condition of development, either by the local jurisdiction or by the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission's (BCDC) regulatory permitting process which requires shoreline public access. Such projects are not typically funded by the ABAG Bay Trail Project and are presented as a separate cost category. The timing of these projects is also dependent on the timing of the overall development project.

Transportation Capital Project

These project costs are assumed to be incorporated in Caltrans or other transportation agency budgets as a non-motorized project share providing for bicycle and pedestrian access within a highway or other transportation corridor. Such projects are not typically funded by the ABAG Bay Trail Project and are presented as a separate cost category. The timing of these projects is also dependent on the timing of the overall transportation project.

Table 4: Projected Cost of Bay Trail Completion, by Type of Project

PROJECT TYPE	COST
Planned	\$175,000,000
Greenway Promenade or Park	\$13,000,000
Private Land Ownership Development	\$11,000,000
Transportation Capital	\$ 349,000,000
TOTAL	\$ 548,000,000

4.3. PROJECT PHASING

Understanding how remaining Bay Trail projects are likely to be sequenced over the next 15 years is crucial to the Bay Trail Project for staffing and funding needs. A phasing chart has been developed that breaks all of the remaining gaps into three (3) categories:

- Short-Term (1-5 years)
- Mid-Term (6-10 years) and,
- Long-Term (11-15 years).

Gaps were assigned to these three phasing categories based on assumptions about land ownership, engineering complexity, funding, sensitive habitats, and existing support for the Bay Trail at that location. These phasing criteria were identified because of their degree of influence on each potential project’s timeline. The more obstacles, challenges, and higher cost, the more likely it was to fall into a later phase. The phasing chart identifies the *likely* sequencing of projects and funding needs over the next 15 years. In reality, many other factors influence how and when projects are moved through the planning, design, and construction process. Given this, the phasing chart represents an educated guess as to how projects will be developed in the region, and not a specific priority by which the Bay Trail project will score funding applications.

The purpose of evaluating and organizing Bay Trail gaps by phase is to identify future Bay Trail staffing and funding needs, and to help ensure that adequate resources are available over time to complete the Bay Trail. In order to understand how those needs will unfold over time, Bay Trail gaps were evaluated and sorted, and are presented here in short- (1-5 years), mid- (6-10 years), and long- (11-15 years) term groups of projects.

Methodology

The evaluation process used a combination of factors to identify the likely timing of projects over the next 15 years, as described below in Table 5. Further phasing details are provided in **Appendix C**.

Table 5: Description of Phasing Factors

Phasing Factors	DESCRIPTION OF PHASING FACTORS
Support in Local Plans (0-3 points)	Projects that have the support of local agencies are more likely to be implemented sooner than those that do not. Segments receive between 0 and 3 points, depending on level of support.
Degree of environmental impact/regulatory context (1-4 points)	Projects that have a potentially high impact on the local environment will take longer to implement due to the need to conduct CEQA/NEPA studies and obtain local permits and approvals. Segments receive between 1 and 4 points, with more points awarded to projects with a lesser degree of impact.
Status of property control/ownership (1-4 points)	Projects that require the purchase of easements or property are expected to take longer to implement than those that already have right-of-way secured. Segments receive between 1 and 4 points, with more points awarded to segments with property ownership amenable to trail alignment.
Preliminary design/needs identified (1-4 points)	Projects that have preliminary engineering and feasibility issues resolved will be completed sooner than projects that do not. Segments receive between 1 and 4 points, with more points awarded to segments further along in the preliminary design and engineering process.
Cost (0-13 points)	The higher the project cost, the more complex and time consuming the project will be to fund, plan, design, and construct. Segments receive between 0 and 13 points, with more points awarded to segments with a low average cost per foot and significant overall benefit.

Benefit Factors

Within each phasing category for each county, projects are listed according to their benefit score. The benefit score relates to factors that reflect a combination of Bay Trail goals (such as enhancing the shoreline experience) and projects that will benefit the most people possible (multi-use trails and creating longer, functional segments). Table 6 below presents the three benefit criteria.

Table 6: Description of Benefit Factors

Benefit Factors	DESCRIPTION OF BENEFIT FACTORS
Distance of Continuity (1-6 points)	Gap closure that creates the greatest amount of continuous miles of Bay Trail receives highest points. New segments closing gaps between existing longer segments receive highest points, 5 to 6 points. New segments closing gaps between existing shorter segments, receives 3 to 4 points. New segment that adds distance at one end of existing segment without closing gap, receives 1 to 3 points.
Trail classification (I, II, III) (2-4 points)	Feasible Class I segment receives highest points (4), Class II receives up to (3) points if no feasible Class I exists, and Class III receives a maximum of (2) points if adequate lane width exists.
Shoreline experience/Proximity to Bay (1-3 points)	Segments providing trail users with the greatest opportunity for shoreline exposure and experience receive greatest points (3).

5. BAY TRAIL PROJECTS BY PHASE

This chapter presents an implementation strategy to complete the San Francisco Bay Trail by 2020. Remaining gaps are identified and grouped according to expected phasing: Short-Term (1-5 years), Mid-Term (6-10 years) and Long-Term (11-15 years). Each phase identifies an estimated cost for projects that require funding exclusive of private development and major transportation projects. A review of typical implementation obstacles is provided, along with case studies of selected gap projects and recommended actions and strategies for local agencies to employ to complete gaps in their communities. The following maps present the existing and future San Francisco Bay Trail segments along with the segment numbers for all remaining gaps. Some gaps that are funded or currently under construction are shown on the maps but not included in the cost estimate sheets.



SAN FRANCISCO BAY TRAIL

San Francisco County

Marin County



San Mateo County



— Completed Trail Segment — Proposed Trail Segment ○ Segment Break — County Line





SAN FRANCISCO BAY TRAIL

San Mateo County



— Completed Trail Segment
 — Proposed Trail Segment
 ● Segment Break
 --- County Line



Santa Clara County



SAN FRANCISCO BAY TRAIL

Santa Clara County




— Completed Trail Segment
 — Proposed Trail Segment
 ○ Segment Break
 — County Line



SAN FRANCISCO BAY TRAIL



Alameda County





SAN FRANCISCO BAY TRAIL


Contra Costa County





SAN FRANCISCO BAY TRAIL

Solano County





SAN FRANCISCO BAY TRAIL

Napa County



Solano County

- Completed Trail Segment
- Proposed Trail Segment
- Segment Break
- County Line






SAN FRANCISCO BAY TRAIL

Sonoma County



- Completed Trail Segment
- Proposed Trail Segment
- Segment Break
- County Line



SAN FRANCISCO BAY TRAIL

Marin County



— Completed Trail Segment
 — Proposed Trail Segment
 ● Segment Break
 — County Line



5.1. SHORT-TERM PROJECTS (YEARS 1-5)

The Short-Term (Years 1-5) projects consist of gaps that are expected to be funded and completed within the next five years due to a combination of project readiness, feasibility, cost and benefit. Since local project sponsors lead all projects, the actual timeline may differ from that being shown. In many cases these projects have completed feasibility studies prior to initiation of this report and the needs of the projects are well known. The implementation requirements for these projects range from the need for construction financing alone to a need for detailed feasibility analysis and design.

Summary of Short-Term Projects

A summary of short-term project costs by county is shown in Table 7. As can be seen in the table, Alameda County has the greatest number of miles of short term projects to be completed. Although Contra Costa County has fewer miles of proposed trail to complete, the cost for these projects is significantly higher. A detailed breakdown by county, sorted by segment number, is presented in Table 8 on the following page.

Table 7:

Summary of Short Term Bay Trail Project Costs by County⁵

County	Miles	Total Project Cost
San Francisco	2.29	\$1,762,000
San Mateo	2.23	\$2,094,000
Santa Clara	3.90	\$1,374,000
Alameda	14.81	\$8,588,000
Contra Costa	12.57	\$21,788,000
Solano	9.14	\$1,485,000
Napa	6.90	\$1,772,000
Sonoma	9.88	\$2,624,000
Marin	9.19	\$2,527,000
Total Short Term Project Costs		\$44,194,000

⁵ Excludes private development and transportation projects.

Table 8: Short-Term Projects by County and Benefit Rank

SHORT-TERM PROJECTS							
Gap Segment Number	Jurisdiction	Location	Project Category	Gap Segment Length (Feet)	Project Type (Class)	Cost of Construction, Design, and Permitting	Benefit Rank
SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY							
1001.0	San Francisco	Marine Dr, between Golden Gate Bridge and Long Ave (Fort Point National Historic Site)	planned	1900.5	2	\$24,065	8
1006.0	San Francisco	Long Ave between the Bay and Lincoln Ave	planned	1178.9	2	\$61,981	10
1008.0	San Francisco	Lincoln Ave between Battery East parking lot and Long Ave	planned	880.3	2	\$46,282	7
1020.0	San Francisco	Cargo Way between Illinois Street Bridge and Heron's Head Park	planned	3902.4	1	\$730,968	10
1026.0	San Francisco	Candlestick Point State Recreation Area, Yosemite Slough	planned	4206	1	\$898,633	8
SAN MATEO COUNTY							
2005.0	South San Francisco	Southern boundary of Sierra Point	private development	1833.2	1	\$179,608	11
2049.0	Burlingame	Fisherman's Park	planned	447	1	\$35,693	10
2056.0	San Mateo	Coyote Point Park	planned	1007.6	1	\$188,736	5
2057.0	Burlingame	Beach Road between Airport Blvd and slough	planned	1009.2	1	\$466,661	10
2058.0	San Mateo	Coyote Point Park	planned	670.2	1	\$53,515	7
2059.0	San Mateo	Coyote Point Park	planned	858.7	1	\$160,845	5
2060.0	San Mateo	Coyote Point Park	planned	748.7	1	\$59,784	9
2061.0	San Mateo	Coyote Point Park	planned	1064.7	1	\$199,432	5
2062.0	San Mateo	Coyote Point Park	planned	1655.6	1	\$132,200	5
2063.0	San Mateo	Coyote Point Park	planned	667.8	1	\$53,324	7
2091.0	Menlo Park	University Ave between Bayfront Hwy and railroad tracks	planned	1863.1	1	\$300,000	8
2096.0	East Palo Alto	PG+E parcel	planned	1804.3	1	\$443,504	9
SANTA CLARA COUNTY							
3014.0	San Jose	Los Esteros Rd from Spreckles Ave to Zanker Rd	planned	9431.1	1	\$453,697	4
3017.0	San Jose	Spreckles between Los Esteros Rd and State St	planned	1636.8	1	\$324,538	7
3021.0	San Jose	Between Zanker Rd and Coyote Creek	planned	3786.3	1	\$290,152	7
3025.0	San Jose	Gold St between Alviso County Park and State St	planned	2252.3	2	\$29,661	6
3028.0	San Jose	West edge of Coyote Creek between Hwy 237 and Zanker Rd	planned	3460.9	1	\$276,266	5

SHORT-TERM PROJECTS							
Gap Segment Number	Jurisdiction	Location	Project Category	Gap Segment Length (Feet)	Project Type (Class)	Cost of Construction, Design, and Permitting	Benefit Rank
ALAMEDA COUNTY							
4008.0	Fremont	Boyce from Stevenson to Auto Mall	planned	6118.4	1	\$20,573	7
4022.0	Fremont	Paseo Padre between Jarvis and Ardenwood Blvd	planned	11880	3	\$25,097	7
4028.0	Union City	Union City Blvd from Smith St to Alameda Creek Trail	planned	12988.8	3	\$27,439	7
4046.0	San Leandro	Neptune Dr from Oyster Bay Regional Shoreline to Marina Blvd	planned	3220.8	2	\$10,830	3
4049.0	San Leandro	San Leandro Slough crossing	planned	897.6	1	\$2,188,000	13
4063.0	Alameda	Fernside between Encinal Ave and Washington St	greenway/promenade/park	1108.8	1	\$88,510	9
4078.0	Oakland	Oakland Waterfront Pathway-Alameda Ave.	greenway/promenade/park	792	1	\$60,475	10
4080.0	Alameda	Buena Vista between Grand and Fruitvale Bridge	greenway/promenade/park	7708.8	1	\$16,249	8
4084.0	Alameda	Paden School	greenway/promenade/park	739.2	1	\$72,553	8
4085.0	Alameda	4th St between Ballena Blvd and Central	planned	792	2	\$10,029	4
4090.0	Alameda	Central Ave between Main St and Crown Dr	planned	2956.8	2	\$37,440	8
4091.0	Alameda	Main St access to Alameda Park	planned	1584	1	\$126,482	7
4100.0	Alameda	Alameda Beltline between Grand and Sherman	greenway/promenade/park	2798.4	1	\$7,722	10
4104.0	Oakland	Oakland Waterfront Pathway - Cryer Site	greenway/promenade/park	528	1	\$265,638	9
4105.0	Alameda	Alameda Beltline between California and Constitution Way	greenway/promenade/park	4276.8	1	\$834,086	5
4106.0	Alameda	Alameda Beltline between Webster St and Constitution Way	greenway/promenade/park	475.2	1	\$38,313	5
4107.0	Oakland	Oakland Waterfront Pathway - Skateboard Park	greenway/promenade/park	844.8	1	\$182,053	11
4108.0	Alameda	Atlantic Blvd between Main St and Webster St	greenway/promenade/park	4329.6	1	\$468,345	9
4116.0	Oakland	Oakland Waterfront Pathway - Brooklyn Basin	greenway/promenade/park	1267.2	1	\$534,568	12
4120.0	Alameda	Main St from linear park to Alameda Ferry Terminal	planned	1108.8	1	\$88,538	9
4151.0	Berkeley	Berkeley Marina South of Shorebird Park	planned	897.6	1	\$314,083	9
4152.0	Berkeley	Berkeley Marina along Seawall Dr between Southern tip to University Ave	planned	844.8	1	\$295,608	8
4155.0	Berkeley	Berkeley Marina along Seawall Dr from northern tip to University Ave	planned	1636.8	1	\$572,740	8

SHORT-TERM PROJECTS

Gap Segment Number	Jurisdiction	Location	Project Category	Gap Segment Length (Feet)	Project Type (Class)	Cost of Construction, Design, and Permitting	Benefit Rank
4156.0	Berkeley	Berkeley Marina along University between Marina Dr and Horseshoe Park	planned	1214.4	1	\$424,936	8
4157.0	Berkeley	Berkley Marina inlet from Horseshoe Park to northern tip	planned	950.4	1	\$332,559	8
4158.0	Berkeley	Berkeley Marina to University Ave frontage Rd	planned	1742.4	1	\$609,691	10
4159.0	Berkeley	Berkeley Marina Eastern edge	planned	2164.8	1	\$757,495	10
4166.0	Albany	Buchanan St to Albany Bulb	planned	2323.2	1	\$178,087	10
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY							
5006.0	Richmond	Pt Richmond Shores	private development	3275	1	\$251,048	13
5008.0	Richmond	Ford Assembly Plant	greenway/promenade/park	1108.8	1	\$552,220	10
5012.0	Richmond	Shipyards 3	planned	7128	1	\$750,352	8
5012.1	Richmond	Seacliff Marina Development	private development	1378.3	1	\$132,415	10
5017.0	Richmond	Hall Ave between Harbor Way and Marina Way	planned	1108.8	1	\$221,705	9
5022.0	Richmond	Harbor Way, from Wright Ave to Ford Assembly Plant	private development	3907.2	1	\$817,994	7
5030.0	Richmond	Tewksbury between Garrard and Marine	planned	3854.4	2	\$412,382	7
5031.0	Richmond	From Marine/Tewksbury to Long Wharf	planned	2376	1	\$4,140,000	4
5032.0	Richmond	Between Long Wharf to Toll Plaza	planned	1267.2	1	\$4,140,000	8
5036.0	Richmond	Pt San Pablo Peninsula between bridge toll plaza to Point Molate Beach	planned	6652.8	1	\$925,417	8
5038.0	Richmond	Pt San Pablo Peninsula between Point Molate Beach and Pt Molate	private development	1425.6	1	\$148,886	8
5043.0	Richmond	West County Wastewater Treatment Plant	planned	1056	1	\$224,900	8
5045.0	Richmond	West County Wastewater Treatment Plant - along ponds	planned	1689.6	1	\$224,900	8
5048.0	Richmond	West County Wastewater Treatment Plant - along southern edge of San Pablo Creek	planned	1425.6	1	\$224,900	8
5049.0	Richmond	West County Wastewater Treatment Plant	planned	1478.4	1	\$224,900	8
5052.0	Richmond	Goodrick Ave from Richmond Pkwy to Rheem Creek	planned	1689.6	1	\$444,084	7
5053.0	Richmond	Spur trail to EBRPD spit from Rheem Creek	planned	3443.8	1	\$846,500	8
5053.1	Richmond	Freethy Blvd along edge of gun club	private development	2702.5	1	\$375,925	8
5054.0	Richmond	Between Rheem Creek and Giant Marsh	planned	5280	1	\$2,146,744	8
5058.0	Richmond	Pt. Pinole to Atlas connection	planned	2827.6	1	\$577,074	6

SHORT-TERM PROJECTS							
Gap Segment Number	Jurisdiction	Location	Project Category	Gap Segment Length (Feet)	Project Type (Class)	Cost of Construction, Design, and Permitting	Benefit Rank
5059.0	Richmond	Bruener Marsh Segment	planned	11675.9	1	\$1,980,161	8
5060.0	Richmond	Pt. Pinole to Pt. Wilson along railroad corridor	planned	3069.2	1	\$670,949	8
5078.2	Martinez	Railroad corridor between Nejedly Staging area and Berrellssa St	planned	1571.5	1	\$235,458	6
5076.0	Martinez	Approach to Nejedly along Carquinez Scenic Dr, Talbart St and Escobar St	planned	3612.4	3	\$7,541	4
5081.2	Hercules	Biorad	planned	2117.7	1	\$396,619	12
5086.0	Rodeo	Lone Tree Point Regional Shoreline	planned	2564.2	1	\$543,354	7
5098.0	Richmond	Canal Boulevard Gap	planned	465	1	\$171,347	8
SOLANO COUNTY							
6006.0	Benicia	5th St between H St to Military East	planned	1692.5	1	\$36,144	5
6006.1	Benicia	5th St between Marina and H St	planned	1130.4	1	\$32,034	6
6007.0	Benicia	private self storage facility at 7th St/L St intersection	planned	808.6	1	\$159,905	5
6008.0	Benicia	Park Rd between bridge approach and Jefferson	planned	1162.6	1	\$147,605	7
6008.1	Benicia	Park Rd to Jefferson	planned	413.3	1	\$41,793	5
6008.2	Benicia	Jefferson St between Park Rd and Military East	planned	543.8	1	\$8,864	5
6008.3	Benicia	Military East between Jefferson and 7th St	planned	765.9	1	\$5,673	5
6008.4	Benicia	Military East between 5th St and 7th St	planned	1563.9	1	\$32,471	5
6014.0	Vallejo	Dirt road west of Glen Cove Waterfront Park	planned	924.9	1	\$23,818	6
6015.1	Vallejo	Eastern edge of Elliot Cove	planned	1029.7	1	\$46,509	10
6015.2	Vallejo	West of Marina Estates	planned	300.5	1	\$32,738	7
6015.3	Vallejo	Stairs at foot of Stinson St	planned	78.8	1	\$30,030	7
6015.4	Vallejo	Between Stinson St and Timber Cove	planned	532.2	1	\$36,628	7
6015.5	Vallejo	Between Timber Cove and Clearview	planned	629.9	1	\$41,460	6
6015.6	Vallejo	West of Clearview	planned	238.4	1	\$17,171	6
6015.7	Vallejo	West of Clearview	planned	640.4	1	\$17,315	6
6015.8	Vallejo	Approach to Bayside Terrace	planned	373.9	1	\$26,448	6
6015.9	Vallejo	Trail turn at Bayside Terrace	planned	177.9	1	\$7,565	5
6016.2	Vallejo	Regatta Dr and around Glen Cove Pkwy	planned	4772.4	1	\$49,721	3
6023.0	Vallejo	Sonoma Blvd between Sandy Beach Rd and Chestnut St	planned	5432.2	1	\$69,136	5
6023.1	Vallejo	Sonoma Blvd between Chestnut St and Curtola Pkwy	planned	3589.3	1	\$4,793	5

SHORT-TERM PROJECTS

Gap Segment Number	Jurisdiction	Location	Project Category	Gap Segment Length (Feet)	Project Type (Class)	Cost of Construction, Design, and Permitting	Benefit Rank
6023.2	Vallejo	Curtola Pkwy between shoreline trail and Sonoma Blvd	planned	1129.4	1	\$143,351	6
6031.0	Vallejo	Sonoma Blvd from Marine World Pkwy to Meadows Dr	planned	3431.8	1	\$121,587	5
6032.0	Vallejo	Marine World Pky, along Broadway St to Ventana Dr	planned	7037.4	1	\$286,511	5
6034.0	Vallejo	Meadows between Hwy 29 and Broadway	planned	746.7	1	\$52,718	5
6035.0	Vallejo	Meadows Drive from Azalea Ct to Sonoma Blvd	planned	3921.4	1	\$5,849	5
6036.0	Vallejo	Meadows Drive from Catalina Way to Azalea Ct	planned	3821.3	1	\$5,399	5
6037.0	Vallejo	Catalina Way between Meadows Dr and county boundary	planned	1364.9	1	\$2,158	8
NAPA COUNTY							
7004.0	Vallejo	Along county boundary from Catalina to north of Dutch Flat Rd.	planned	740.1	1	\$82,186	7
7005.0	Vallejo	Along county boundary from Mini Dr to Jack London Dr	planned	1642.8	1	\$118,978	5
7013.0	American Canyon	Mezzetta Ct between Wetlands Edge Trail and Green Island Rd	planned	2223.4	2	\$29,222	3
7014.0	American Canyon	Green Island Road from Mezzetta Ct. to Hwy 29	planned	5515.2	1	\$350,990	6
7017.0	Napa County	Las Amigas between Cuttings Wharf and Duhig	planned	13328.6	2	\$575,426	4
7026.0	Napa	Approach to Maxwell Bridge on Imola, along Napa-Vallejo Highway to Streblov	planned	5790.9	2	\$73,182	6
7026.2	Napa	Kaiser Rd bewteen Hwy 29 and Industrial	planned	1658.5	2	\$2,799	4
7026.3	Napa	Corporate Dr between Kaiser and Hwy 29	planned	5558.2	2	\$539,677	3
SONOMA COUNTY							
8002.0	Sonoma County	8th St RR right-of-way between Hwy 121 and Imperial Dr	planned	1830.4	1	\$71,500	7
8005.0	Sonoma County	Ramal Rd between Napa County boundary and existing trail	planned	10250	2	\$34,209	4
8005.2	Sonoma County	Dale Ave between Ramal and Burndale	planned	2714	3	\$6,500	2
8005.3	Sonoma County	Burndale between Dale and Hwy 121	planned	2100	3	\$6,500	2
8006.3	Sonoma County	Sonoma Valley Water Agency between Ramal and Hudeman Slough	planned	4796.7	1	\$39,000	6
8007.1	Sonoma County	North Skaggs Island Rd Bridge	planned	472.6	3	\$6,500	4

SHORT-TERM PROJECTS							
Gap Segment Number	Jurisdiction	Location	Project Category	Gap Segment Length (Feet)	Project Type (Class)	Cost of Construction, Design, and Permitting	Benefit Rank
8009.0	Sonoma County	South Skaggs Island Rd Bridge	planned	1356.2	3	\$6,500	3
8010.2	Sonoma County	Skaggs Island Rd between bridge and Hwy 37	planned	2840.2	1	\$65,000	7
8012.3	Sonoma County	Hwy 37 between Tolay Creek and Hwy 121	planned	3291.5	1	\$1,306,500	9
8011.2	Sonoma County	Sonoma Creek Bridge (on Hwy 37)	planned	1143.3	1	\$13,000	5
8012.4	Sonoma County	Port Sonoma Trail connection to Hwy 37	planned	124.8	1	\$55,250	5
8012.5	Sonoma County	Port Sonoma Trail	planned	632.3	1	\$13,000	5
8013.0	Sonoma County	Vallejo Sanitation District between Hwy 37 and Tolay Creek Trail	planned	16702.3	1	\$734,500	9
8018.0	Sonoma County	Port Sonoma Trail connection to Sonoma Baylands	planned	3908.73	2	\$265,907	4
MARIN COUNTY							
9035.0	San Rafael	Point San Pedro from Bayview Dr to Riviera	planned	6324.2	3	\$12,885	6
9036.0	San Rafael	Point San Pedro between Summit Ave and Bayview Dr	planned	4074.7	3	\$8,317	2
9037.0	San Rafael	Point San Pedro between east end of Marina Blvd and Summit Ave	planned	2929	3	\$5,968	2
9038.1	San Rafael	4th Street downtown San Rafael	planned	3483.4	3	\$19,041	1
9039.0	San Rafael	2nd Street downtown San Rafael	planned	3202.8	3	\$6,773	1
9041.0	San Rafael	Around Pickleweed Park	planned	2690.6	1	\$329,714	10
9102.0	Sausalito	Bridgeway between Richardson to Princess	planned	1980.5	3	\$4,200	7
9069.0	Corte Madera	Paradise Dr between Teaberry Ln and Paradise Beach Park	planned	1182.6	2	\$260,000	2
9070.0	Corte Madera	Paradise Dr between Paradise Beach Park and Westward Dr	planned	2438.6	3	\$5,200	2
9071.0	Corte Madera	Paradise Dr between Westward Dr and Prince Royal	planned	1812.7	1	\$353,139	5
9072.0	Corte Madera	Paradise Dr between Prince Royal and San Clemente	planned	2241.5	1	\$792,916	7
9074.0	Tiburon	Trestle Glen Boulevard	planned	355868	2	\$427,042	7
9080.0	Tiburon	Greenwood Beach Rd between city boundary and Blackies Pasture	planned	2378.8	1	\$189,906	6
9083.0	Mill Valley	Shelter Bay Ave west between Hamilton Dr and the bay	planned	1085.8	3	\$2,864	8

SHORT-TERM PROJECTS							
Gap Segment Number	Jurisdiction	Location	Project Category	Gap Segment Length (Feet)	Project Type (Class)	Cost of Construction, Design, and Permitting	Benefit Rank
9086.0	Strawberry	Strawberry Dr between Harbor Cove Way to Weatherly Dr	planned	4699.6	3	\$9,838	4
9089.0	Strawberry	East of Hwy 101 from Hwy 101 overpass to De Silva Dr	planned	386.6	2	\$26,422	7
9090.0	Mill Valley	Connection between Bothin Marsh trail and Hwy 101 overpass	planned	528.5	1	\$64,761	9
9093.0	Strawberry	Weatherly Dr to Strawberry Dr	planned	1659.1	3	\$3,495	6
9103.0	Sausalito	Second Street between Bridgeway and city boundary	planned	2171.5	3	\$4,583	3

Project Example: Short -Term

Point Pinole to Point Wilson, Richmond: Segment 5060

This segment will connect the Point Pinole Regional Park to Point Wilson in Richmond along San Pablo Bay, helping to connect to existing and planned Bay Trail segments. This proposed trail corridor is located along a steeply sloped section of shoreline within the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way and passes close to wetland areas.

This gap is a good example of a segment that has numerous obstacles, including environmental, railroad, easement, and other issues, but is moving steadily toward completion due to the resources and commitment of the project sponsor, the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD).

The EBRPD has already completed preliminary engineering and a biological assessment that identified a series of issues associated with constructing trail in a restricted area near an active railroad. It outlined the community need for closing this gap to provide a safe connection between a nearby residential area and school to the Point Pinole Regional Shoreline Park staging area. It provided specific design and management techniques to overcome concerns about wetland impacts, safety, security, and other issues, while providing a functional pathway.

Historically, communities in this area turned their back on the San Pablo Bay shoreline. With portions of the Bay Trail already constructed and in use further to the East in Pinole and Hercules, and new developments being oriented towards the Bay, the shoreline is coming alive. The Pt. Pinole-Pt. Wilson segment and others in the area are the tangible evidence of a change in how local communities in the area are finally recognizing the Bay as a resource and asset.

The importance of having an agency like the EBRPD committed to developing the Bay Trail with strong financial, political, legal, technical, and other resources goes beyond the obvious efforts such as sponsoring preliminary engineering studies. When the Southern Pacific Railroad was purchased by the Union Pacific Railroad in the mid-1990s, the EBRPD led an effort to secure public access to the shoreline that was almost entirely owned by the railroad. Without this agreement, the Bay Trail would have had little chance of being located near the water along this part of the San Pablo Bay shoreline.

Lessons learned:

- An effective implementing agency with resources, motivation, and experience in developing trails is a key ingredient to overcoming gaps in the Bay Trail.

-
- Many communities in the Bay Area have not historically been oriented toward the water due to a variety of reasons (industry, pollution, and barriers such as active railroads). Having a strong vision of how the shoreline can become a major local resource is critical to building political and public support.
 - Preliminary engineering and environmental studies are an important first step to resolving complex issues, and to initiating project momentum.
 - Having specialized expertise in areas such as rails-with-trails, trail impacts on wetlands, trail design in constrained corridors, and related areas is key to overcoming major physical and operational issues.

5.2. MID-TERM PROJECTS (YEARS 6-10)

The Mid-Term (Years 6-10) projects consist of gap segments with more implementation constraints than short term projects, and that are expected to be funded and completed within the next 6-10 years. Since local project sponsors lead all projects, the actual timeline may differ from that being shown. In many cases these projects have not completed feasibility studies, and the needs of the projects are not well known.

Summary of Mid-Term Projects

A summary of mid-term project costs by county is shown in Table 9. As can be seen in the table, Alameda County has the greatest number of mid-term project miles yet to complete, at the greatest cost. A detailed breakdown by county, sorted by segment number, is presented in Table 10 on the following page.



San Francisco Bay Trail, Sierra Point, San Mateo County
Image Credit: San Francisco Bay Trail Project

Table 9:

Summary of Mid Term Bay Trail Project Costs by County⁶

County	Miles	Total Project Cost
San Francisco	4.91	\$1,846,246
San Mateo	7.04	\$3,827,374
Santa Clara	8.89	\$11,216,503
Alameda	23.95	\$17,820,646
Contra Costa	19.88	\$6,800,251
Solano	2.56	\$2,337,000
Napa	22.38	\$9,584,000
Sonoma	24.62	\$14,039,000
Marin	20.45	\$13,165,000
Total Mid Term Project Costs		\$80,636,020

⁶ Excludes private development and transportation projects.

Table 10: Mid-Term Projects by County and Benefit Rank

MID-TERM PROJECTS							
Gap Segment Number	Jurisdiction	Location	Project Category	Gap Segment Length (Feet)	Project Type (Class)	Cost of Construction, Design, and Permitting	Benefit Rank
SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY							
1002.0	San Francisco	Embarcadero between Taylor and Powell	planned	2795.3	2	\$182,957	5
1005.0	San Francisco	Jefferson St, between Taylor St and west of Hyde St	planned	1795.7	2	\$117,506	10
1024.0	San Francisco	Third St between Cargo Way and Ingalls St	planned	9668.1	3	\$64,776	4
1025.0	San Francisco	Private boat launch	planned	1093.1	1	\$223,244	8
1028.0	San Francisco	Carroll Ave between Ingalls and Candlestick Point State Recreation Area	planned	5382	2	\$68,150	2
1029.0	San Francisco	Candlestick Point State Recreation Area	planned	3934.3	1	\$833,678	9
1032.0	San Francisco	Alana Way from Harney to County Line	planned	1280.8	1	\$355,934	6
SAN MATEO COUNTY							
2000.0	Brisbane	Alana Way between County border and Beatty St	planned	450	1	\$35,964	11
2001.0	Brisbane	Between Alana Way and Brisbane Lagoon	private development	6584	1	\$645,067	9
2010.0	South San Francisco	Genentech between San Bruno Pt and existing trail	private development	2868.7	1	\$1,153,438	11
2012.0	South San Francisco	Between Haskins and Michelle Ct	private development	838.2	1	\$85,408	10
2019.0	South San Francisco	Airport Blvd between Utah and North Access Rd	planned	1486.7	2	\$97,286	4
2020.0	South San Francisco	North Access Road	planned	1478.6	1	\$77,737	5
2022.0	South San Francisco	Airport Blvd between North Access Road and city border	planned	1210.9	2	\$79,238	3
2025.0	San Bruno	San Bruno Ave. between Hwy 101 and Huntington	planned	1940.1	2	\$126,955	3
2027.0	San Bruno	Huntington Ave between San Bruno Ave and city border	planned	7469.7	2	\$94,585	3
2028.0	San Bruno	Between Cupid Row and San Juan Ave	planned	5477.7	2	\$69,361	3
2029.0	Millbrae	San Antonio Ave between city border and Hermosa Ave	transportation	3832.7	1	\$486,336	3
2030.0	Millbrae	Between Santa Helena Ave and Hermosa Ave	planned	2292.2	2	\$29,025	3

MID-TERM PROJECTS							
Gap Segment Number	Jurisdiction	Location	Project Category	Gap Segment Length (Feet)	Project Type (Class)	Cost of Construction, Design, and Permitting	Benefit Rank
2034.0	Millbrae	East of Cuardo and North of Nadina to Hemlock Ave	planned	653.4	1	\$43,749	4
2035.0	Millbrae	Millbrae Avenue overcrossing of Hwy 101	transportation	2755.2	1	\$1,186,148	7
2036.0	Millbrae	BART right-of-way between Hermosa and Millbrae Ave	transportation	3738.6	1	\$486,336	3
2041.0	Burlingame	Between Fisherman's Park and slough	private development	963.9	1	\$180,551	8
2083.0	Redwood City	Levee between Whipple and Bair Island Road	planned	2466.7	1	\$189,087	9
2085.0	Redwood City	Bair Island Road	planned	1541.8	1	\$326,707	8
2089.0	Redwood City	Cargill Levee between Seaport Blvd and Bayfront Park	planned	10724.1	1	\$2,657,677	12
SANTA CLARA COUNTY							
3004.0	San Jose	N. McCarthy Boulevard Bridge	planned	1225.3	2	\$15,485	5
3011.0	San Jose	Alviso/San Jose; Pond A-18	planned	16380.4	1	\$3,558,699	7
3020.0	San Jose	Shoreline alignment north of State St from Catherine St to Spreckles Ave	planned	4277	1	\$833,070	6
3021.1	San Jose	Zanker Rd between Hwy 237 trail	planned	2406.2	1	\$192,135	7
3023.0	San Jose	State St between Gold and Spreckles	planned	3578.3	2	\$234,155	3
3027.0	Mountain View	Moffett Field, West Edge Maintenance Buildings, Site 25	planned	1930.4	1	\$781,305	7
3029.0	Mountain View	Moffett Field, Perimeter Road	planned	4464.7	1	\$998,139	10
3033.0	San Jose	Between Hwy 237 to intersection of Gold and Taylor St.	planned	8365.2	1	\$4,290,000	10
3034.0	San Jose	Gold St between Hwy 237 pathway and State St	planned	4287	1	\$313,515	7
ALAMEDA COUNTY							
4000.0	Fremont	Connection to Newby loop	private development	481.2	1	\$910,647	4
4001.0	Fremont	Between Dixon Landing and Fremont Blvd	private development	3631.9	1	\$290,007	7
4003.0	Fremont	Cushing Pkwy and Fremont Blvd to Landing Rd	planned	5967.7	2	\$75,417	5
4005.0	Fremont	Pacific Common development	private development	14166.6	1	\$1,131,203	5
4007.0	Fremont	Newark PG+E substation	planned	2632.1	1	\$210,173	5
4012.0	Newark	Central Ave between railroad and Willow St	planned	5808	2	\$76,486	3
4013.0	Newark	Willow St between Thornton and Central	planned	3590.4	2	\$47,282	3
4015.0	Newark	Thornton between Marshlands and Willow	greenway/promenade/park	3854.4	2	\$50,759	3

MID-TERM PROJECTS							
Gap Segment Number	Jurisdiction	Location	Project Category	Gap Segment Length (Feet)	Project Type (Class)	Cost of Construction, Design, and Permitting	Benefit Rank
4016.0	Newark	Thornton between Willow and Cherry	planned	6019.2	2	\$76,218	4
4029.0	Hayward	Alameda Creek spur	planned	23390.4	1	\$2,166,559	9
4034.0	Hayward	On-street alignment around Eden Landing	planned	14216.3	2	\$47,802	5
4044.0	San Leandro	Neptune Dr between Marina Blvd and Fairway Dr	planned	2217.6	2	\$28,080	6
4045.0	San Leandro	San Leandro Marina	planned	2640	1	\$210,804	8
4053.0	Oakland	Doolittle Dr between Airport Dr and existing trail	planned	6758.4	2	\$918,804	10
4062.0	Alameda	Elsie Roemer Bird Sanctuary	planned	2798.4	1	\$524,175	13
4069.0	Oakland	Oakland Waterfront Pathway - Gallagar & Burke Aggregate	greenway/promenade/park	739.2	1	\$500,000	12
4071.0	Oakland	Oakland Waterfront Pathway - High Street Bridge float	greenway/promenade/park	81.3	1	\$365,879	6
4072.0	Alameda	Ballena Blvd south from Tideway Dr	planned	3537.6	1	\$232,087	7
4075.0	Oakland	Oakland Waterfront Pathway - Mini Storage Site	greenway/promenade/park	897.6	1	\$330,732	8
4077.0	Oakland	Oakland Waterfront Pathway - U.S. Audio	greenway/promenade/park	475.2	1	\$465,510	8
4081.0	Oakland	Oakland Waterfront Pathway - Fruitvale Bridge float	greenway/promenade/park	95.4	1	\$284,506	7
4082.0	Oakland	Oakland Waterfront Pathway - Lancaster to Fruitvale Bridge	greenway/promenade/park	316.8	1	\$39,064	9
4083.0	Oakland	Oakland Waterfront Pathway - Lancaster Street Park	greenway/promenade/park	83.6	1	\$1,059,020	8
4086.0	Oakland	Oakland Waterfront Pathway - Women's Museum Board	greenway/promenade/park	413.7	1	\$156,834	8
4087.0	Oakland	Oakland Waterfront Pathway - Derby Street Park	greenway/promenade/park	78.4	1	\$202,035	8
4092.0	Oakland	Oakland Waterfront Pathway - Pier 29 Restaurant	greenway/promenade/park	114.2	1	\$141,677	8
4093.0	Oakland	Oakland Waterfront Pathway - Park Street Bridge float	greenway/promenade/park	99.3	1	\$377,800	8
4094.0	Oakland	Oakland Waterfront Pathway - Lonestar Plant	greenway/promenade/park	950.4	1	\$1,011,656	8
4096.0	Oakland	Oakland Waterfront Pathway - ConAgra Site	greenway/promenade/park	739.2	1	\$587,499	9
4117.0	Alameda	Marina Village Parkway between Webster Tube and Shoreline Park	planned	2217.6	2	\$145,114	7
4118.0	Oakland	Oakland Waterfront Pathway - Oyster Reef Restaurant	greenway/promenade/park	297.7	1	\$226,552	9

MID-TERM PROJECTS

Gap Segment Number	Jurisdiction	Location	Project Category	Gap Segment Length (Feet)	Project Type (Class)	Cost of Construction, Design, and Permitting	Benefit Rank
4122.0	Oakland	Oakland Waterfront Pathway - Oak to Ninth	greenway/promenade/park	5596.8	1	\$2,400,000	8
4125.0	Oakland	Oakland Waterfront Pathway - Estuary Park	greenway/promenade/park	2798.4	1	\$1,803,981	10
4126.0	Alameda/Oakland	Webster Tube	planned	2323.2	1	\$7,499	9
4132.0	Oakland	Middle Harbor Rd between shoreline park and 3rd St	planned	11510.4	2	\$1,408,459	8
4142.0	Oakland	Maritime St	planned	12302.4	2	\$1,630,818	8
4143.0	Oakland	Mandela Pkwy under highway to Shellmound	planned	897.6	2	\$11,366	8
4146.0	Emeryville	Powell St between Frontage Rd and Shellmound St	transportation	1214.4	2	\$79,467	8
4147.0	Emeryville	Along Frontage between Powell and existing trail	transportation	844.8	1	\$311,298	8
4163.0	Berkeley	Shoreline between Gilman and Golden Gate Fields	private development	2006.4	1	\$153,803	10
4164.0	Albany	Golden Gate Fields between parking lot and Albany Bulb	private development	3326.4	1	\$254,989	10

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

5055.0	Martinez	Franklin Canyon between Dutra Rd and Alhambra Ave	planned	5415.5	3	\$10,983	7
5057.0	Contra Costa County	San Pablo Ave between Richmond Pky and Del Monte Dr	planned	6523.3	3	\$13,780	2
5062.0	Pinole	San Pablo Ave between Del Monte Dr and city boundary	planned	9316.7	2	\$117,740	2
5072.0	Crockett	McEwan and Franklin Canyon from Carquinez Scenic Dr to Dutra Rd	planned	26391.3	3	\$55,752	2
5080.0	Contra Costa County	Carquinez Scenic Dr from Nejedly Staging Area	planned	8852.1	1	\$3,840,000	7
5085.0	Rodeo	Parker Ave between San Pablo Ave and 7th St	planned	4592.8	3	\$113,040	2
5088.0	Contra Costa County	San Pablo Ave between Parker Ave and A St	planned	7927.8	2	\$539,526	3
5089.0	Port Costa	Canyon Lake Dr from Carquinez Scenic Dr to bay	planned	2466.3	3	\$5,210	2
5090.0	Crockett	Carquinez Scenic Dr from Winslow to McEwan	planned	12298.6	3	\$25,981	2
5092.0	Contra Costa County	Carquinez Strait Regional Shoreline Park along shoreline	planned	5016.6	1	\$1,969,778	8
5093.0	Crockett	San Pablo Ave from A St to Vista Del Rio	planned	4043.3	3	\$27,090	2

MID-TERM PROJECTS							
Gap Segment Number	Jurisdiction	Location	Project Category	Gap Segment Length (Feet)	Project Type (Class)	Cost of Construction, Design, and Permitting	Benefit Rank
5095.0	Crockett	Southern approach to Zampa Bridge along Dowrelio Dr	planned	4418	3	\$29,601	4
5096.0	Crockett	Downtown Crockett between bridge approach and Carquinez Scenic Dr	planned	7726.9	3	\$51,770	3
SOLANO COUNTY							
6016.0	Vallejo	Glen Cove Waterfront Park	planned	1880	1	\$61,833	10
6016.1	Vallejo	Glen Cove Waterfront Park	planned	980	1	\$23,818	7
6019.0	Vallejo	Maritime Academy Drive to Morrow Cove	planned	3191.5	1	\$38,719	4
6020.0	Vallejo	Vallejo Bluff Trail	planned	4478.9	1	\$1,650,307	5
6033.0	Vallejo	Sonoma Blvd from Meadows Dr to county boundary	planned	3001.3	1	\$562,106	5
NAPA COUNTY							
7006.0	American Canyon	Hwy 29 between American Canyon Rd and Mini Dr	planned	3756.2	1	\$703,489	6
7007.0	American Canyon	Broadway St between county boundary and American Canyon Rd	planned	3802.8	2	\$48,058	3
7012.0	American Canyon	Hwy 29 between American Canyon Rd and Green Island Rd	planned	14312.5	1	\$2,680,552	5
7013.1	American Canyon	Wetlands Edge Trail between Mezzetta Ct and Eucalyptus Dr	planned	4529.5	1	\$533,275	6
7015.0	Napa County	Devlin Rd between Airport Blvd and Hwy 12	planned	10507.6	2	\$330,336	3
7015.1	Napa County	Devlin Rd between Airport Blvd and Green Island Rd	planned	11265.1	2	\$255,705	4
7019.0	Napa	Connection between Cuttings Wharf Rd and Stanley Ln	planned	5455.8	3	\$11,389	3
7021.0	Napa County	Duhig between county boundary and Hwy 12	planned	15647.6	2	\$197,747	3
7021.1	Napa County	Sonoma-Napa Hwy from Old Sonoma Rd to Cuttings Wharf Rd	planned	5340.6	2	\$67,492	4
7022.0	Napa	Stanley Ln between Hwy 12 and Napa River	planned	10739.8	1	\$994,473	5
7025.0	Napa	Golden Gate Dr between city boundary and Hwy 29	planned	6344	2	\$414,977	3
7027.0	Napa County	Old Sonoma Rd between Duhig and Congress Valley	planned	15010.1	1	\$2,811,204	5
7029.0	Napa	Golden Gate Dr between city boundary and Imola	planned	3114.4	2	\$203,721	3
7031.0	Napa	West of Hwy 29 between Old Sonoma Rd and Imola	planned	2310.3	2	\$29,196	3
7031.1	Napa	Imola between Jefferson	planned	1743.8	2	\$22,037	4

MID-TERM PROJECTS							
Gap Segment Number	Jurisdiction	Location	Project Category	Gap Segment Length (Feet)	Project Type (Class)	Cost of Construction, Design, and Permitting	Benefit Rank
		and Hwy 29					
7032.0	Napa	Old Sonoma Rd between Congress Valley and Hwy 29	planned	4290.2	2	\$280,633	4
SONOMA COUNTY							
8001.0	Sonoma County	Hwy 121 (Arnold Rd) between Leveroni and Hwy 12	planned	16115.2	2	\$1,096,300	4
8002.1	Sonoma County	8th St RR right-of-way between Napa Rd and Hwy 121	planned	8033.7	1	\$1,332,500	6
8003.1	Sonoma County	Hwy 121 between Arnold Dr and 8th St	planned	3253.7	1	\$3,250,000	5
8003.2	Sonoma County	Hwy 121 from Burndale Rd to East of 8th St	planned	1706.5	1	\$1,300,000	6
8004.0	Sonoma County	Stage Gulch Rd between Lakeville Hwy and Arnold Dr	planned	29340.4	2	\$1,996,001	4
8005.1	Sonoma County	Ramal Rd north of Hudeman Slough	planned	3898.2	3	\$13,000	3
8005.8	Sonoma County	Ramal Rd south of Dale St	planned	6968.5	3	\$1,040,000	3
8006.0	Sonoma County	Skaggs Island Rd between bridge and Ramal	planned	7454.6	2	\$94,208	5
8006.2	Sonoma County	Levee trail north of Hudeman Slough boat launch	planned	4230.1	1	\$240,500	7
8008.0	Sonoma County	Lakeville Hwy between Hwy 37 and Stage Gulch Rd	planned	36754.6	2	\$2,500,381	4
8010.1	Sonoma County	West End Duck Club south levee	planned	7515.9	1	\$331,500	7
8011.1	Sonoma County	South of Hwy 37 along edge of residential area near Tolay Creek	planned	707	1	\$845,000	6
MARIN COUNTY							
9002.0	Novato	Hwy 37 between Hwy 101 and Petaluma River	planned	16851.8	3	\$457,042	3
9003.0	Novato	Railroad corridor between Hwy 101 and the Petaluma River	planned	17141.7	1	\$3,338,864	6
9005.0	Novato	Bel Marin Keys between Pacheco Pond and Hamilton Dr	planned	3636	1	\$398,269	9
9009.0	Novato	Railroad corridor between Bolling Dr and Bel Marin Keys Blvd	planned	13038	1	\$3,473,889	5
9030.0	San Rafael	Civic Center Dr between North San Pedro and McInnis Pkwy	planned	3335.7	1	\$625,055	5
9032.0	San Rafael	Cantera Way between Point San Pedro Rd and McNeers Beach	planned	5308.8	1	\$423,858	9
9038.0	San Rafael	3rd Street downtown San	planned	6948.3	3	\$14,578	1

MID-TERM PROJECTS							
Gap Segment Number	Jurisdiction	Location	Project Category	Gap Segment Length (Feet)	Project Type (Class)	Cost of Construction, Design, and Permitting	Benefit Rank
		Rafael					
9040.0	San Rafael	Grand Ave between 2nd and 3rd St	planned	581.3	2	\$7,426	3
9042.0	San Rafael	Point San Pedro from west Marina Blvd to east end of Marina Blvd	planned	1305.5	3	\$2,681	4
9043.2	San Rafael	Canal St between Grand and Pickleweed Park	planned	7598.6	2	\$516,977	1
9044.0	San Rafael	Point San Pedro from Embarcadero Way to Marina Blvd	planned	1341.5	3	\$2,871	2
9049.0	San Rafael	Shoreline Park - Canalways	planned	1621.4	1	\$198,716	13
9055.0	San Rafael	Shoreline Park - gun club segment	planned	1325.5	1	\$129,873	10
9062.0	Marin County	Sir Francis Drake Blvd between Andersen Dr and Remillard Park	planned	3182.1	1	\$825,103	11
9064.0	Corte Madera	Along railroad right-of-way between Redwood Hwy and proposed Corte Madera Creek crossing	planned	2272.1	2	\$756,000	10
9065.0	Larkspur	Redwood Hwy between existing path and Rich St	planned	1306.2	2	\$209,328	7
9075.0	Tiburon	Greenwood Beach Rd from Blackfield to Barbaree	planned	1648	2	\$20,908	6
9079.0	Strawberry	Harbor Cove Way between Strawberry Dr and the bay	planned	735.3	1	\$58,737	7
9092.0	Marin County	Seminary Dr from Ricardo Rd to Strawberry Dr	planned	7079.7	1	\$1,164,643	9
9095.0	Tiburon	Paradise Dr from Mar West St to Agreste	planned	2616.2	3	\$5,503	7
9104.0	Marin County	Ft. Baker Rd between South Alexander and turn in road	planned	3674.3	1	\$255,596	5
9105.0	Marin County	Ft. Baker Rd between turn in road and Ft Baker	planned	2430.1	1	\$75,348	5
9107.0	Marin County	Fort Baker shoreline trail	planned	1637.2	1	\$130,750	10
9108.0	Marin County	Ft Baker between Golden Gate Bridge and shoreline path	planned	1385.3	2	\$72,710	8

Project Example: Mid-Term

Wetlands Edge Bay Trail, American Canyon: Segment 7013.1

A significant portion of the proposed Bay Trail alignment in the North Bay follows major streets and highways. The Bay Trail Project is actively seeking options for safer alternative alignments for bicyclists and pedestrians on facilities located off street and separated from traffic.

An example of this effort is the Wetlands Edge Trail in American Canyon. Located west of Highway 29, the rapidly-growing city of American Canyon has required construction of a 12-foot wide paved trail along the edge of the Napa River wetlands as a condition of residential development. This opened up an opportunity to move the proposed Bay Trail alignment off Highway 29 and locate it west to provide a safer and more enjoyable trail experience.



Wetlands Edge Trail, American Canyon
Image Credit: San Francisco Bay Trail Project

One section of this trail, however, still remains incomplete. The proposed trail alignment along the edge of a grove of Eucalyptus trees requires the crossing of several channels. The engineering and environmental permitting requirements to cross and pass near potential wetland areas associated with the North Slough are significant. The trail alignment is also adjacent to a paintball game facility and screening or buffering will need to be considered to ensure safe trail passage. The northern section of the trail would need to come within close proximity to the city's sewage treatment plant, and buffer options in this area would also need to be explored. A conceptual plan for this new Bay Trail alignment has been completed by the City. The next step is completion of a wetlands delineation and analysis to provide solutions to these challenging questions.

The Wetlands Edge Trail will provide city residents with a direct connection between the residential areas of the city and its industrial area to the north. It will also provide a safe bicycle and pedestrian option located off Highway 29 in an area where people can enjoy the open space and marshlands at the edge of the Napa River.

Lessons learned:

- Obstacles such as the need for new bridges, combined with potential environmental impacts, location of the trail next to potentially incompatible uses such as a sewage treatment plant and a privately owned recreational facility, can slow or stop progress on completing a Bay Trail segment.
- Many of these obstacles are the result of unique situations where the impacts on trail users and the environment is unknown. Being able to provide examples of how issues were resolved in similar settings will be helpful in overcoming these concerns, and in finding the right technical solution for each situation.

5.3. LONG-TERM PROJECTS (YEARS 11-15)

The Long-Term (Years 11-15) project category consists of gaps with significant implementation issues, often major cost, and include most of the toll bridge projects in the Bay Area. Since local project sponsors lead all projects, the actual timeline may differ from that being shown. In many cases these projects have not completed feasibility studies, and the specific needs of the projects are not well known.

Summary of Long-Term Projects

A summary of long-term project costs by county is shown in Table 11. As can be seen in the table, Marin County has the greatest number of long-term projects. A detailed breakdown by county, sorted by segment number, is presented in Table 12 below.

Table 11:

Summary of Long Term Bay Trail Project Costs by County⁷

County	Miles	Total Project Cost
San Francisco	.06	\$ 703,136
San Mateo	4.88	\$8,014,900
Santa Clara	2.69	\$6,872,928
Alameda	6.44	\$13,030,944
Contra Costa	5.69	\$6,022,768
Solano	0	0
Napa	3.86	\$1,554,356
Sonoma	10.28	\$6,286,445
Marin	20.78	\$21,687,869
Total Long Term Project Costs		\$63,470,210

Table 12: Long-Term Projects by County and Benefit Rank

LONG-TERM PROJECTS							
Gap Segment Number	Jurisdiction	Location	Project Category	Gap Segment Length (Feet)	Project Type (Class)	Cost of Construction, Design, and Permitting	Benefit Rank
SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY							
1009.0	San Francisco	Bay Bridge west span	transportation	15327.2	1	\$192,000,000	7
1013.0	San Francisco	Third Street Bridge over Mission Creek	planned	320.3	2	\$703,136	3
1027.0	San Francisco	Hunter's Point Naval Shipyard	private development	23272.8	1	\$1,858,333	8

⁷ Excludes private development and transportation projects.

LONG-TERM PROJECTS							
Gap Segment Number	Jurisdiction	Location	Project Category	Gap Segment Length (Feet)	Project Type (Class)	Cost of Construction, Design, and Permitting	Benefit Rank
SAN MATEO COUNTY							
2018.0	South San Francisco	Edge of San Bruno sewage treatment plant	planned	1928.6	1	\$412,055	12
2023.0	South San Francisco	Alignment under highway overcrossing between Airport Blvd and San Bruno Ave	planned	2675.5	1	\$313,803	5
2024.0	San Bruno	Airport Blvd and San Bruno Blvd	planned	3127.2	1	\$249,639	5
2026.0	San Bruno	East side of residential between San Bruno Ave and Huntington	planned	3770.6	1	\$421,171	5
2031.0	Millbrae	Along Hemlock Ave from Nadina to Spruce	planned	2406.6	1	\$235,787	5
2038.0	San Mateo	San Mateo-Hayward Bridge	transportation	22620.4	3	\$49,657,252	9
2039.0	Burlingame	Behind hotel complex	private development	519.9	1	\$165,858	10
2040.0	Burlingame	Behind hotel complex	private development	499	1	\$97,208	8
2042.0	Burlingame	Between Anza Lagoon and slough	private development	875.6	1	\$67,120	7
2047.0	Burlingame	Behind hotel between Airport Blvd and Anza Lagoon	private development	625.3	1	\$53,925	9
2048.0	Burlingame	Behind hotel complex north of slough	private development	326.2	1	\$119,060	9
2051.0	Burlingame	Along channel north of Fisherman's Park	private development	426	1	\$79,795	10
2079.0	San Carlos	San Carlos Airport	planned	4465.1	1	\$2,544,444	13
2087.0	Redwood City	Redwood Creek crossing between Bair Island Road and Blomquist	planned	2455	1	\$1,049,379	7
2088.0	Redwood City	Blomquist between Maple and Seaport Blvd	planned	1929.7	2	\$24,435	4
2092.0	Menlo Park	Railroad alignment between University Ave and Ravenswood Open Space Preserve	planned	3024.7	1	\$2,764,188	8
SANTA CLARA COUNTY							
3000.1	San Jose	Newby Island Loop	private development	19237.4	1	\$1,946,945	8
3024.0	Mountain View	Moffett Field, Runway	planned	3727.9	1	\$1,508,821	5
3026.0	Mountain View	Moffett Field, Jaegel Slough	planned	2095.5	1	\$848,127	7
3031.0	Mountain View	Moffett Field, Magnetic Bldgs.	planned	1835.4	1	\$742,855	5
3035.0	San Jose	Between Sunnyvale trail and Gold Street Bridge	planned	6558.9	1	\$3,335,000	8
ALAMEDA COUNTY							
4006.0	Fremont	Railroad alignment between Cushing and Auto Mall Pkwy	planned	18532.8	1	\$7,102,269	5

LONG-TERM PROJECTS							
Gap Segment Number	Jurisdiction	Location	Project Category	Gap Segment Length (Feet)	Project Type (Class)	Cost of Construction, Design, and Permitting	Benefit Rank
4011.0	Newark	Railroad alignment between Thornton Ave and Stevenson Blvd	planned	15470.4	1	\$5,928,675	6
4032.0	Hayward	San Mateo-Hayward Bridge	transportation	19008	1	\$41,727,160	7
4057.0	Oakland	Doolittle between Harbor Bay Pkwy and existing trail	transportation	3273.6	1	\$1,206,281	11
4089.0	Oakland	Oakland Waterfront Pathway - Waterfront Lofts Project	private development	950.4	1	\$350,211	8
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY							
5034.0	Richmond	Richmond-San Rafael Bridge	transportation	8870.4	1	\$19,472,675	5
5040.0	Richmond	Pt San Pablo Peninsula between Pt Molate and Terminal 4	planned	8078.4	1	\$843,688	8
5046.0	Richmond	Pt San Pablo Peninsula through Terminal 4 to Yacht Club	planned	5280	1	\$718,362	8
5067.0	Pinole	San Pablo Bay Regional Shoreline between existing Pt Wilson trail and Bayfront Park Treatment Plant	planned	2655.5	1	\$610,237	12
5083.0	Contra Costa County	Carquinez Scenic Dr. to Northern Regional Shoreline Park	planned	8985.2	1	\$3,840,000	7
5087.0	Port Costa	Carquinez Scenic Dr from Northern Regional Shoreline Park to Reservoir St	planned	5020.7	3	\$10,481	2
SOLANO COUNTY							
NO LONG-TERM PROJECTS							
NAPA COUNTY							
7008.0	American Canyon	Wetlands Edge Trail between Kensington Way and Kimberly Dr	planned	120	1	\$270,636	8
7011.0	American Canyon	Union Pacific Railroad from Green Island Rd to American Canyon Rd	planned	12311.1	2	\$805,300	3
7023.0	Napa	Slough to Kennedy Park	planned	7936.7	1	\$1,231,720	4
7026.1	Napa	Napa-Vallejo Hwy between Streblov Dr and Kaiser Rd	transportation	4497.9	3	\$52,000	6
SONOMA COUNTY							
8000.0	Sonoma County	Leveroni Rd between Hwy 121 and 8th St East	planned	15779.2	2	\$1,073,445	4
8007.0	Sonoma County	Skaggs Island trail levee	planned	30498.1	1	\$2,606,500	7
8012.1	Sonoma County	Hwy 37 connection to Petaluma River Bridge	transportation	1238.1	1	\$2,436,732	2
8014.1	Sonoma County	Railroad alignment between Reclamation Road and residential area adjacent to Hwy 37	planned	8008.5	1	\$2,606,500	6

LONG-TERM PROJECTS							
Gap Segment Number	Jurisdiction	Location	Project Category	Gap Segment Length (Feet)	Project Type (Class)	Cost of Construction, Design, and Permitting	Benefit Rank
MARIN COUNTY							
9000.0	Marin County	Highway 37 Bike Ped Bridge over Petaluma River	transportation	834.5	1	\$1,831,905	3
9001.0	Marin County	Railroad Bridge over Petaluma River	transportation	811.7	1	\$1,781,854	4
9011.0	Novato	Hamilton southern levee gap	planned	961.4	1	\$236,666	11
9013.0	Novato	Connection through Las Gallinas property	planned	5374.2	1	\$2,410,014	11
9015.0	Novato	Railroad corridor from North Ave to Bolling Dr	planned	9558.2	1	\$4,416,820	5
9022.0	San Rafael	Railroad corridor from end of McInnis Pkwy to North Ave	planned	6008.7	1	\$3,119,753	6
9023.0	Marin County	North San Pedro Road between Miwok Meadows and La Pasada	planned	10176.9	1	\$1,170,776	6
9024.0	San Rafael	Redwood Hwy between McInnis and Smith Ranch Rd	planned	7769	2	\$528,782	4
9027.0	Marin County	North San Pedro Rd from China Camp State Park to Biscayne Dr	planned	12790	1	\$1,434,565	6
9034.0	San Rafael	Marina Quarry	planned	8790.2	1	\$701,810	7
9043.0	San Rafael	Beach Park between Grand and edge of park	planned	1004.7	1	\$104,953	5
9043.1	San Rafael	Beach Park between edge of park and Francisco Blvd	private development	1988.7	1	\$207,670	5
9057.0	San Rafael	Sir Francis Drake Blvd approach to Richmond-San Rafael Bridge	transportation	5308.8	1	\$7,234,460	7
9058.0	Larkspur	crossing over Sir Francis Drake Blvd to Calpark Tunnel	planned	151	1	\$297,324	7
9061.0	Larkspur	Corte Madera Creek crossing	planned	1229.5	1	\$4,320,216	9
9063.0	Marin County	San Quentin State Prison between Main and Sir Francis Drake Blvd	planned	6635.4	1	\$529,750	10
9063.1	Marin County	San Quentin State Prison along Main St Richmond-San Rafael Bridge	planned	1754.4	1	\$200,513	5
9066.0	San Rafael	Richmond-San Rafael Bridge	transportation	12769.1	1	\$28,030,894	5
9067.0	Corte Madera	Along edge of Corte Madera Ecological Reserve	planned	4099.3	1	\$445,471	10
9073.0	Tiburon	Paradise Dr between Trestle Glen and Corte Madera boundary	planned	9528.9	3	\$504,604	3
9082.0	Marin County	Paradise Dr between Trestle Glen and Tiburon boundary	planned	23905.8	3	\$1,265,850	3

Project Example: Long-Term

Bayfront to Ravenswood Preserve, Menlo Park: Segment 2092

A short but important gap in the Bay Trail spans the boundaries of Menlo Park and East Palo Alto in the South Bay and contains a diverse array of land uses and infrastructure, resulting in significant challenges for gap closure. When complete, this 0.5-mile section will ultimately provide an important connection between the Dumbarton Bridge bicycle and pedestrian pathway and the Ravenswood Open Space District.

Multiple stakeholders are involved in decisions related to this trail gap, including the City of Menlo Park, the City of East Palo Alto, the County of San Mateo, the San Francisco Water Department, Samtrans, the Peninsula Joint Powers Board and the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District. The site is adjacent to a residential area, existing wetlands, a railroad spur (currently inactive but reserved for future use), above-ground Hetch-Hetchy pipes that supply water to the San Francisco Bay Area, a former salt pond planned for restoration and a former sportsmen's gun club currently undergoing an extensive cleanup process.



San Francisco Bay Trail
Image Credit: San Francisco
Bay Trail Project

With plans for a future Caltrain rail extension across the bay in this area and a proposal to construct a double track system on the existing levee, a section of the proposed trail would likely be an elevated boardwalk structure. The wetland habitat issues and costs associated with this alignment have not been explored in depth. The alignment would also require crossing a wetland area to connect the existing trail at Ravenswood Open Space Preserve. Also factored into the decision is the timing for a proposed wetland restoration and lead cleanup on the north side of the project area.

This area represents an extremely complicated shoreline with multi-layered decision requirements.

Lessons learned:

- Future plans for improvements in a planned Bay Trail corridor, such as future double-tracking of the rail line in this segment, must be incorporated into the planning process. Where necessary, interim and short-term solutions may be needed until these improvements are more clearly defined. In those cases, long-term Bay Trail alignments may be constructed as part of those improvement projects.
- Including all relevant agencies in the planning process is critical, as is a strong lead agency willing to take on the responsibilities and effort of resolving complex right-of-way issues.
- Developing a feasibility study that anticipates issues such as easement acquisition, liability, maintenance, and safety concerns, the cost and impacts of boardwalks and other structures, will help to resolve these issues in advance of final design.



6. CLOSING THE GAPS

This section reviews the types of physical and institutional obstacles that local agencies are likely to face in completing the remaining Bay Trail segments, and provides strategies that local agencies may use to overcome these obstacles. In reviewing the remaining gaps, the diversity of locations is striking. However, they all share a common thread. First, the majority of the highly aesthetic, available and accessible segments have been constructed. Second, what remains are often the locations that are less attractive, often with major constraints, or in remote and isolated areas. Note that in many cases a Bay Trail gap may have more than one of the issues cited below.

Numerous Bay Trail gaps have some type of right-of-way issue that is hindering construction of the project. This may take one or more of the following forms:

- Privately-owned land with existing development (easement needed)
- Privately-owned undeveloped land (easement needed through permitting and zoning)
- Publicly-owned land (by multiple agencies)
- Publicly-owned land (incompatible uses)

Privately Owned Land: Existing Development

Privately owned land with existing development represents one of the greatest obstacles to Bay Trail development, because the owners have little or no incentive to provide public access, the land is often very expensive, and property owners wish to retain their privacy. A good example of this condition can be seen in Burlingame along Airport Boulevard where the Bay Trail is slated to be on hotel and business park shoreline property. Public agencies may be faced with several difficult options: (a) offering payment for an easement, zoning incentives and/or other inducements to the owner, (b) offering a well-conceived plan to address their concerns about privacy, security, liability, (c) waiting until the property changes hands, (d) waiting until the property owner wishes to upgrade, expand, or conduct any improvements that will require a permit approval from BCDC which will likely require public access.

Privately Owned Land: Undeveloped

It is typically easier to obtain an easement on privately owned undeveloped land for the Bay Trail because (a) the Bay Trail alignment is likely part of the local agency General Plan and therefore dedication is required as part of any development, and (b) access would be required if within BCDC's jurisdiction. The location, configuration, access, and other aspects of the easement may need to be negotiated with the property owner. A good example of this is the proposed Bay Trail along the shoreline of Point San Pablo Peninsula in Richmond, where the trail would be developed as part of a future development project in the area.

Publicly Owned Land: Multiple Agencies

Publicly owned parcels typically offer the least complicated process to obtain easements for the Bay Trail. In some areas, the complexity of land ownership titles, and/or possible conflicts with agency goals and policies may hinder the proposed project. Fort Baker in Marin County illustrates this condition where numerous agencies (Caltrans, Golden Gate Bridge District, Marin County, National Park Service, Sausalito) all have an interest and sometimes conflicting expectations and needs. Various agencies may have different ideas regarding the alignment and design of the Bay Trail, or the planned segment may conflict with future plans. In all of these cases, a well-conceived master plan and feasibility study should resolve most if not all of these conflicts.

Publicly Owned Land: Incompatible Uses

Publicly owned parcels with possible incompatible uses, such as a sewage treatment plant, airports, or sanitary landfills, can potentially be resolved through a comprehensive master plan and feasibility process. Good examples of this include a waste water treatment plant in Richmond, a trail segment along the shoreline at the Port of Richmond and the San Carlos Airport in San Mateo County. Trails have been developed in virtually every type of setting in the United States, and there will almost always be an alignment, design, or management practice that addresses the concerns of the relevant agencies.

Negotiation of right-of-way for public shoreline access generally requires a clearly defined plan for trail location, features, and means of controlling and managing access. Development of such a plan requires direct contact and collaborative agreement with the property owner and managers. All of this requires dedicated resources. The Bay Trail Project has been effective in addressing this need in recent years through grants to cities, counties and parks agencies. These agencies through their own staff and consultants can dedicate the necessary time to identifying the exact design parameters and management agreements that make implementation of a new trail segment agreeable to all parties. Without resources to complete this careful planning work, the majority of remaining gaps in the Bay Trail system will not be implemented.

What the Bay Trail Project Can Do:

- **Provide funding for technical assistance**
- **Provide model easement agreements**
- **Facilitate communication between agencies**
- **Provide 'best practices' and case studies**

What Local Agencies Can Do:

- **Conduct a master plan and feasibility study process**
- **Adopt the Bay Trail alignment in the General Plan**
- **Require easements/improvements as part of project approval process**

Physical Constraints

One of the most common obstacles on the Bay Trail are physical constraints, ranging from steep topography to tunnels and bridges, that do not allow for development of a multi-use trail without experiencing major engineering, cost, and environmental impacts. This is especially true in places like Marin, Contra Costa, and Solano Counties where the Bay Trail is planned along rugged terrain. While each location is different and requires its own solution, the typical constraints can be classified into the following categories:

- Steep Terrain Adjacent to Existing Road
- Steep Terrain in Undeveloped Area
- Bridge, Tunnel or Highway

Steep Terrain Adjacent to Existing Road

Where the Bay Trail is identified along an existing roadway corridor in an area with steep terrain (such as Paradise Drive in Tiburon), the physical, environmental, and right-of-way obstacles may be so great compared to what is already a serviceable facility for some Bay Trail users (in this case bicyclists), the lead agency may focus more on signage and minor improvements such as turn outs and minimal shoulders rather than attempting to provide a Class I path. A feasibility study, if needed, will be able to evaluate the trade-offs between need, benefit, cost, and impacts in this type of corridor.

Steep Terrain in Undeveloped Area

Where the Bay Trail is proposed in steep topography, but there is no active paved road (such as Carquinez Straight Regional Shoreline in Martinez and Contra Costa County), the cost of providing a Class I facility might be considered if (a) there is no viable paved facility through the corridor, and (b) there will be a higher demand for a facility that is located away from a roadway for aesthetic reasons.

Bridge, Tunnel or Highway

Bridges, tunnels, and highways represent major physical barriers to the Bay Trail, for which there may or may not be plans to provide adequate Bay Trail improvements. Examples of these constraints include the Alameda Tubes (Webster/Posey Tubes), Petaluma River Bridge (SR 37), Powell Street Under Crossing in Emeryville, and the I-580 crossing in Richmond. While it may be possible to facilitate Bay Trail improvements in these types of locations by funding the trail portion of the project, it is more likely that the Bay Trail portion will only be constructed when the facility is replaced or upgraded in the future (such as the East Span of the Bay Bridge)—unless there is sufficient demand to warrant the investment.

What the Bay Trail Project Can Do:

- **Provide funding for technical assistance**
- **Provide best practices and case studies to agencies showing how other agencies have overcome similar problems**
- **Provide a technical resource library and experts as needed**
- **Help ensure major transportation projects include the Bay Trail**
- **Accept roadways as the Bay Trail alignment in some locations**

What Local Agencies Can Do:

- **Pursue funding and improvements for roadway projects**
- **Ensure that the Bay Trail is included in transportation projects**
- **Provide alternative routes around major gaps**
- **Pursue Class I paths where no roads exist**

Environmental Issues

Some gaps in the Bay Trail system are located near environmentally sensitive areas. The Bay Trail is trying to understand and add to the body of information about the potential impacts of trail use on birds through sponsorship of the *Wildlife and Public Access Study*. Three existing Bay Trail sites and three additional nearby control sites are under investigation. All six study sites are located adjacent to mudflat foraging habitat, a typical habitat along the Bay Trail. Research on this issue will continue, and lessons learned relating to the design and operation of the Bay Trail will be incorporated into existing and future projects as appropriate.

Planning, Environmental Review and Permitting

To implement construction of Bay Trail segments located near environmentally sensitive areas, it is important to engage in a thorough, well-planned process in order to be able to proceed efficiently through the required environmental review and permitting process. Below is a suggested list of steps that should be incorporated into such a process.

- Fatal Flaw Analysis:** A key first step in any Bay Trail feasibility analysis is the determination of whether there is an environmental 'fatal flaw' with a specific alignment or design. While most potential environmental impacts can be mitigated or avoided, some either cannot be mitigated or the mitigation is so expensive as to impact the viability of the alternative.
- Pre-Mitigation:** If at all possible, the environmental assessment and preliminary design work should be completed by experienced professionals, who can then try and 'pre-mitigate' potential environment impacts in the planning and design process. This will simplify the planning process, minimize environmental impacts, and expedite the permitting and approval process.
- TAC:** Include all relevant permitting agencies on a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) in order to find out early in the process what may or may not be acceptable to their agencies.
- CEQA/NEPA:** Depending on the source of the money and requirements of the lead agency, CEQA and/or NEPA requirements may need to be met in an assessment or full environmental impact report (EIR) or environmental impact statement (EIS). Much of the information needed for either of these efforts, such as the analysis of alternatives, should be developed in a feasibility study/master plan.
- Engineering:** Many environmental impacts can be reduced or eliminated through innovative design, engineering, and construction techniques. For example, new bridge decking materials have been developed that allow light to go through the structure, minimizing shading. New pier installation techniques minimize impacts to wetlands.
- Management Plan:** Completing a management plan for the trail can help eliminate or reduce the perceived impacts of a new trail. For example, the management plan may recommend limitations or prohibitions on dogs, closing the trail during breeding season, or posting signs to keep people out of habitat areas.
- Permitting:** Permitting can be a lengthy process even if all of the procedures are followed properly. Enlisting the help of experts knowledgeable about all agency permitting requirements can greatly facilitate this process.
- Restoration:** Work with stakeholders to identify environmental opportunities such as: joint-funded public access and restoration efforts; securing habitat mitigation funds through trail projects; and, identification of strategies for habitat improvement through the trail planning and design process.

What the Bay Trail Project Can Do:

- **Provide best practices and case studies to agencies showing how other agencies have overcome similar problems**
- **Provide a technical resource library and experts as needed**
- **Utilize findings in the *Wildlife and Public Access Study***

What Local Agencies Can Do:

- **Consider fatal environmental flaws and pre-mitigate environmental impacts in the feasibility/master plan process**
- **Include permitting agencies on TACs**
- **Utilize innovative engineering and management practices to minimize impacts**
- **Include restoration and education efforts as part of projects when possible**

Roads

A significant number of remaining Bay Trail segments are located on roadways, such as East Sir Francis Drake Boulevard in Larkspur, Highway 37 in Sonoma County, 3rd Street in San Francisco, and Maritime Avenue in Oakland. Most people do not think of roadways when they think of the Bay Trail, and it is a Bay Trail goal to provide a Class I path whenever possible. Where the Bay Trail is located on a roadway, its functional use is substantially different than where it exists as a trail. The number of users will be usually be much smaller, most of the users will be more experienced bicyclists, and the route will serve more of a connector function than as a destination. All on-road Bay Trail segments should include (a) Bay Trail signs and stencils, and (b) standard bicycle and pedestrian advisory and warning signs.

The following recommendations may help agencies understand how they can make their on-road segments of the Bay Trail function as efficiently as possible.

Highways: Bay Trail segments on highways, such as Highway 37 in Sonoma County, have two basic options. First, exploration of alternate locations for a pathway or bikeway should be conducted. If demand is sufficient and space available, a parallel pathway within the highway corridor may be feasible, assuming there are no major obstacles such as bridges. If the highway is a limited access freeway, bicyclists and pedestrians are typically prohibited by law in most locations, and an alternate route should be identified. If bicycles are allowed on the highway, a determination should be made whether to encourage people to use the route given traffic volumes and speeds, or simply to leave the segment usable for more experienced bicyclists but not promoted in maps and signs.

City Streets: Bay Trail segments on city streets, such as 3rd Street in San Francisco and Powell Street in Emeryville, should be programmed to provide (a) sidewalks and (b) bike lanes whenever possible. Where bike lanes are not possible, Class III bike routes, wide curb lanes and traffic calming measures should be implemented.

Rural Roads: A significant number of Bay Trail segments are located on rural-type roads, such as paradise Drive in Tiburon and Duhig Road in Napa County. Rural roads are typically

two-lane roads with no curb or shoulder, low traffic volumes, and low to high speeds. Where traffic volumes are less than 1,000 ADT (average daily traffic), all that may be needed are signs. Where traffic volumes are higher than this, it would be prudent to add at least three (3) foot wide shoulders (possibly by narrowing the travel lanes) and/or turn outs where possible.

What the Bay Trail Project Can Do:

- **Provide best practices and case studies to agencies showing how other agencies have overcome similar problems**
- **Provide a technical resource library and experts as needed**
- **Work with local public works departments to find the appropriate solution**
- **Work with Caltrans to post Bay Trail signs**

What Local Agencies Can Do:

- **Implement the appropriate type of solution for each roadway type, including sidewalks and bike lanes**
- **Utilize innovative engineering and management practices**
- **Include Bay Trail improvements as roadways are expanded or rehabilitated**

Best Practices for Feasibility Studies

Most of the recommendations on how to overcome constraints in this report mention the importance of conducting a feasibility study, sometimes also known as a master or corridor plan, and preliminary engineering. While The Bay Trail Project already provides guidance to local agencies on the elements that should be included in a feasibility study, a recommended 'best practice' is presented below.

Conducting a Feasibility Study

Also known as a preliminary engineering study, this is a critical step for almost all bikeway and trail gap projects. Feasibility studies are important for several reasons. Feasibility studies:

- Allow local agencies and the public an opportunity to provide input
- Evaluate multiple alignment and design options
- Include an understanding of user needs and patterns
- Consider connectivity, access, safety, and other elements
- Help develop more accurate cost estimates

Many trail and bikeway projects that have received funding for final design may have been conceived completely differently had they gone through a feasibility study process. Basic elements of a feasibility study include:

- Goals and Policies:** A summary of the goals and policies for the project, how they relate to existing local policies, and how they can be used as evaluation criteria and design objectives.
- Existing Conditions:** A summary of existing trails and bikeways, activity centers, destinations, land use zoning, traffic volumes and speeds, collision patterns, right-of-way ownership, plans and policies, and environmental issues.
- Needs Analysis:** A summary of user needs and patterns, input from the public and local agencies typically through a public workshop and/or surveys, and estimates of future demand.
- Alternatives Analysis:** An evaluation of each alternative using criteria based on the adopted goals and policies, plus factors such as cost, demand, right-of-way availability, and other issues.
- Preferred Alignment:** A preferred alignment and design is selected and shown in maps, sections, and plans. Normally, base mapping is done on available aerial photos.
- Design Standards:** Design standards on all trail elements are shown, including sections and plans that conform to relevant published sources. Details of the project such as crossings, bridges, and other features may be developed in concept-level detail. Items such as signing and striping, drainage, landscaping, trailheads, and other support features may also be developed.
- Cost and Phasing:** Cost estimates are developed based on the plans and designs, and broken down by item and segment. As needed, the project phasing over time is shown along with priorities for implementation.
- Management Plan:** A summary of how the pathway will be operated and maintained, including safety, security, liability, emergency response, and other topics are addressed.

Feasibility studies typically cost about 3-5% of the total project cost, or roughly 20-35% of the total design cost. Feasibility studies provide important information needed by public agencies on costs, required right-of-way, permits and approvals, alignment location, and other items. With the completion of a feasibility study, public agencies stand a much greater chance of receiving competitive funding for final design and construction as well.

Institutional Challenges

Bay Trail staff should continue working to elevate the priority of the Bay Trail in these communities through outreach, participation in local waterfront planning processes and by providing funding opportunities. Some local agencies do not have the staff, resources, and/or interest to pursue the completion of Bay Trail segments in their jurisdiction. Often, the segment is simply a low priority when compared to other local projects, may lack a strong project proponent, and may have multiple constraints.

7. FINANCIAL NEEDS

While many Bay Trail projects identified in this report will be completed as part of planned transportation (bridge and roadway) projects and as part of development projects, most remaining segments will need to be funded by public agencies. Table 13 shows how the \$187,798,000 in projected costs for these segments may be partially paid for by existing funding sources, in addition to estimating the funding shortfall. Aside from the existing Bay Trail grant program (which has \$3.8 million remaining), much of the funding is expected to come from local sources such as TDA Article III moneys.

A conservative approach is used in this table to project the likely amount of these sources that will be used on Bay Trail projects, since the Bay Trail represents only one small part of the bicycle, pedestrian, and trail needs in any community. For example, 10% of the available TDA Article III funds over the next 15 years are projected to be used on Bay Trail segments (and only those segments that are paved and provide a transportation benefit), and 10% of the estimated \$50 million available from county sales tax measures for bicycle and pedestrian projects.

Regional sources available for bicycle and pedestrian projects such as Bridge Toll funds, Safe Routes to Transit, and other sources including Clean Air funds, are projected to total \$50 million over the next 15 years of which 15% could be used on the Bay Trail.

State sources available for bicycle and pedestrian projects such as the Bicycle Transportation Account, Safe Routes to Schools, Office of Traffic Safety, and other sources is expected to total \$31 million over the next 15 years, of which 20% could be used on the Bay Trail.

Federal sources from the newly approved SAFETEA-LU legislation includes numerous sources, some of which could be used on the Bay Trail. For estimating purposes, the amounts assume two (2) authorizations (which typically run 6 years). The Bay Trail could potentially receive 10% of the Bay Area allocation for Transportation, Community, & System Preservation, 10% from the Recreational Trails allocation, 10% from the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality program, 5% from the safe Routes to School program, 5% from the Transportation Enhancements program, and 20% from Congressional earmarks such as the \$25 million Model Community grant awarded to Marin County.

Based on these assumptions, there will be a shortfall of \$116,626,000 to complete the Bay Trail, averaging about \$7.8 million per year. A dedicated source of funding on the state or regional level for the Bay Trail is instrumental in assuring that the system is completed in a 15-year timeframe.

Table 13: San Francisco Bay Trail Estimate of Funding Needs

Projected Costs⁸	
Total	\$187,798,000
Potential Bay Trail Funding Sources⁹	
Bay Trail Funding ¹⁰	\$3,800,000
Local Sources ¹¹	
TDA Article III	\$19,830,000
Sales Tax Measures	\$5,000,000
Regional Sources ¹²	\$7,500,000
State Sources ¹³	\$3,100,000
Federal Sources ¹⁴	
TCSP ¹⁵	\$1,425,600
Recreational Trails ¹⁶	\$580,800
CMAQ ¹⁷	\$2,270,400
Safe Routes to School ¹⁸	\$1,615,680
Transportation Enhancements ¹⁹	\$4,290,000
Earmarks/Model Cities ²⁰	\$21,760,000
Total	\$71,172,480
Surplus/(Shortfall)	\$(116,626,000)
Average annual (15 years)	\$(7,775,000)

⁸ Excludes Bay Trail projects to be constructed as part of transportation and development projects.

⁹ Excludes Bay Trail projects to be constructed as part of transportation and development projects.

¹⁰ Remaining Bay Trail funding available as of 2005.

¹¹ Assumes 10% of TDA moneys over next 15 years (from MTC Regional Bicycle Plan) and 10 % of county sales tax measure moneys for bikeways/trails (estimated at \$50 million).

¹² Assumes 15% of regional funding sources including Bridge Tolls, Safe Routes to Transit, and other sources (totalling \$50 million) used on Bay Trail.

¹³ Assumes 10% of state funding in Bay Area from Bicycle Transportation Account, Safe Routes to School, Office of Traffic Safety and other sources.

¹⁴ Federal funding from SAFETEA-LU estimated based on state and Bay Area share; assumes two authorizations over the next 15 years.

¹⁵ Transportation, Community and System Preservation Program, 10% of Bay Area share.

¹⁶ Recreational Trails program, 10% of Bay Area share.

¹⁷ Congestion and Mitigation and Air Quality Program, 10% of Bay Area share.

¹⁸ Safe Routes to School Program, 5% Bay Area share.

¹⁹ Transportation Enhancements, 5% Bay Area share.

²⁰ Congressional earmarks, Model Cities Program, 20% Bay Area share.

8. CONCLUSION

The San Francisco Bay Trail is an integral part of what makes the Bay Area livable. With a growing population and worsening traffic congestion, the need and demand for places to walk or bicycle has never been greater. The importance of the Bay Trail as a recreation and transportation facility is clear: every day thousands of people use the trail either to access transit, get to work, or simply exercise.

While the Bay Trail may include many miles of trail in isolated wetland areas, it also serves as a major transportation corridor for commuters in other areas. For example, Bay Trail segments in San Mateo County directly serve numerous high tech employers, while segments in Marin and Alameda link directly to ferries and transit. As congestion increases and multi-modal options expand, the Bay Trail is expected to serve an even greater transportation role in the Bay Area.

Healthy lifestyles and environmental protection are some of the top priorities of Bay Area residents, and the Bay Trail is instrumental in helping to achieve these goals. Easily accessible by the vast majority of residents, the Bay Trail offers a car-free environment for recreational use. Bay Trail projects also help educate people on environmental issues, helping to build support for further restoration and protection efforts. Bay Trail projects are often accompanied by environmental improvements as well.

Restoration of and access to the San Francisco Bay and its wetlands has enjoyed widespread public support since the 1960s, expressed through passage of laws and funding programs. The Bay Trail is an important element of this effort, helping to increase access, views, and understanding of eco-systems.

This Gap Analysis Study will be an important tool for Bay Trail project and local agency staff to focus efforts on completing the remaining gaps. More accurate cost estimates developed for each remaining segment will help identify funding needs and phasing of implementation. Much of the cost to complete the Bay Trail will be born by on-going transportation and development projects.

This study clearly identifies the remaining \$187,798,000 in costs needed to complete the Bay Trail within 15 years. In order to meet this goal, new and increased public and private funding will be required. This will involve the approval of a dedicated regional and/or state funding source for the Bay Trail that will help match funds generated from existing sources. This dedicated source of funds will leverage millions of dollars in other funds, and help achieve the vision of a completed 500-mile long Bay Trail.

APPENDIX A: COST ESTIMATE DETAILS

The San Francisco Bay Trail Project Gap Analysis Study
San Francisco County Cost Summary

Planned Projects	Construction, Design and Permitting Cost	\$6,145,579
	County Gap Length in Miles	11.3
Greenway, Promenade or Park Project	Construction, Design and Permitting Cost	\$0
	Gap Length in Miles	0.0
Private Land Ownership Development Project	Construction, Design and Permitting Cost	\$0
	Gap Length in Miles	0.0
Transportation Capital Project	Construction, Design and Permitting Cost	\$192,024,065
	Gap Length in Miles	3.3
County Total	Construction, Design and Permitting Cost	\$198,169,644
	Gap Length in Miles	14.6

NOTES:

Cost Classifications: See Appendix B for supporting information for all cost per lineal foot categories used in this cost estimate table. Explanation, sourcing and documentation for all Class I, II, III and other trail construction, design, and environmental review costs are presented. Explanation for A, B, C, and X level of implementation cost is also included in Appendix B.

County Identification: Summary tables are provided for each of the nine Bay Area Counties following the Regional Cost Summary. Series are as follows: 1000=San Francisco County, 2000=San Mateo County, 3000=Santa Clara County, 4000=Alameda County, 5000=Contra Costa County, 6000=Solano County, 7000=Napa County, 8000=Sonoma County, 9000=Marin County.

Project Category Legend

1	Planned Project: Planned projects include those projects typically funded with public money. Lead agencies typically include cities, counties, park districts, and other land management agencies. Projects require the funding shown herein, including design, regulatory review and construction. Cost estimates for projects with either design or regulatory review completed are calculated appropriately.
2	Greenway, Promenade or Park Project: Greenway, promenade or park projects that incorporate a Bay Trail alignment as a portion of a larger-scale project. The Bay Trail component (trail facility) of larger estimated project budget assumed to be 20% of total project cost.
3	Private Land Ownership Development Project: The Bay Trail project cost assumed to be condition of development or subject to the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) regulatory permitting process, requiring shoreline public access. Such projects are not typically funded by the ABAG Bay Trail Project and are presented as a separate cost category.
4	Transportation Capital Project: The Bay Trail project cost assumed to be incorporated in Caltrans or other agency transportation capital investment as a non-motorized project share providing for bicycle and pedestrian access with a State Highway corridor. Such projects are not typically funded by the ABAG Bay Trail Project and are presented as a separate cost category.

Project Category	Gap Segment Number	Gap Segment Length (ft.)	Construction Cost	Construction, Design & Permitting	Class 1				Class 2				Class 3				Bridge		Boardwalk		Fencing and Barrier					Trail Furnishing		Design Cost				Environmental and Permitting					
					A	B	C	X	A	B	C	X	A	B	C	X	A	B	A	B	A	B	C	D	No Fence	% Basis	% Basis	2%	20%	A	B	C	25%				
					LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF										
4	1001.0	1900.5	\$19,252	\$24,065						10.11	52.33	108.74	2.67		1.67	5.34	51.31																				
1	1002.0	2795.3	\$146,366	\$182,957								2795.3																									
1	1005.0	1795.7	\$94,005	\$117,506								1795.7																									
1	1006.0	1178.9	\$49,585	\$61,981								1178.9																									
1	1008.0	880.3	\$37,025	\$46,282								880.3																									
4	1009.0	15327.2	\$160,000,000	\$192,000,000																																	
1	1013.0	320.3	\$484,921	\$703,136															320.3																		\$121,230
1	1020.0	3902.4	\$584,775	\$730,968																																	
1	1024.0	9668.1	\$51,821	\$64,776											9668.1																						
1	1025.0	1093.1	\$171,726	\$223,244																																	\$17,173
1	1026.0	4206	\$691,256	\$898,633																																	\$69,126
1	1027.0	23272.8	\$1,486,666	\$1,858,333																																	\$74,333
1	1028.0	5382	\$54,520	\$68,150								5382																									\$2,726
1	1029.0	3934.3	\$666,943	\$833,678																																	\$33,347
1	1032.0	1280.8	\$284,747	\$355,934																																	\$14,237

Project Category Legend

1	Planned Project: Planned projects include those projects typically funded by with public money. Lead agencies typically include cities, counties, park districts, and other land management agencies. Projects require the funding shown herein, including design, regulatory review and construction. Cost estimates for projects with either design or regulatory review completed are calculated appropriately.
2	Greenway, Promenade or Park Project: Greenway, promenade or park projects that incorporate a Bay Trail alignment as a portion of a larger-scale project. The Bay Trail component (trail facility) of larger estimated project budget assumed to be 20% of total project cost.
3	Private Land Ownership Development Project: The Bay Trail project cost assumed to be condition of development or subject to the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) regulatory permitting process, requiring shoreline public access. Such projects are not typically funded by the ABAG Bay Trail Project and are presented as a separate cost category.
4	Transportation Capital Project: The Bay Trail project cost assumed to be incorporated in Caltrans or other agency transportation capital investment as a non-motorized project share providing for bicycle and pedestrian access with a State Highway corridor. Such projects are not typically funded by the ABAG Bay Trail Project and are presented as a separate cost category.

Project Category	Gap Segment Number	Gap Segment Length (ft.)	Construction Cost	Construction, Design & Permitting	Class 1				Class 2				Class 3				Bridge		Boardwalk		Fencing and Barrier					Trail Furnishing	Design Cost	Environmental and Permitting					
					A	B	C	X	A	B	C	X	A	B	C	X	A	B	A	B	A	B	C	D	No Fence			% Basis	% Basis	A	B	C	
					LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF			LF	2%	20%	5%	10%	25%
					\$ 63.86	\$ 149.83	\$ 294.77	\$ 2.67	\$ 10.11	\$ 52.33	\$ 108.74	\$ 2.67	\$ 1.67	\$ 5.34	\$ 51.31	\$ 827.94	\$ 1,513.94	\$ 927.34	\$ 19.67	\$ 14.50	\$ 29.95	\$ 49.62	\$ -	2%		\$89,937	\$22,484						
1	6033.0	3001.3	\$449,685	\$562,106																													
1	6034.0	746.7	\$42,175	\$52,718																						\$8,435	\$2,109						
1	6035.0	3921.4	\$4,679	\$5,849																						\$936	\$234						
1	6036.0	3821.3	\$4,319	\$5,399																						\$864	\$216						
1	6037.0	1364.9	\$1,727	\$2,158																						\$345	\$86						

Project Category Legend

1	Planned Project: Planned projects include those projects typically funded with public money. Lead agencies typically include cities, counties, park districts, and other land management agencies. Projects require the funding shown herein, including design, regulatory review and construction. Cost estimates for projects with either design or regulatory review completed are calculated appropriately.
2	Greenway, Promenade or Park Project: Greenway, promenade or park projects that incorporate a Bay Trail alignment as a portion of a larger-scale project. The Bay Trail component (trail facility) of larger estimated project budget assumed to be 20% of total project cost.
3	Private Land Ownership Development Project: The Bay Trail project cost assumed to be condition of development or subject to the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) regulatory permitting process, requiring shoreline public access. Such projects are not typically funded by the ABAG Bay Trail Project and are presented as a separate cost category.
4	Transportation Capital Project: The Bay Trail project cost assumed to be incorporated in Caltrans or other agency transportation capital investment as a non-motorized project share providing for bicycle and pedestrian access with a State Highway corridor. Such projects are not typically funded by the ABAG Bay Trail Project and are presented as a separate cost category.

Project Category	Gap Segment Number	Gap Segment Length (ft.)	Construction Cost	Construction, Design & Permitting	Class 1				Class 2				Class 3			Bridge		Boardwalk	Fencing and Barrier					Trail Furnishing	Design Cost		Environmental and Permitting				
					A	B	C	X	A	B	C	X	A	B	C	A	B	A	B	C	D	No Fence	% Basis	% Basis	A	B	C				
					LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	LF	2%	20%	5%	10%	25%				
1	8010.2	2840.2	\$50,000	\$65,000																						\$10,000		\$5,000			
1	8011.1	707	\$650,000	\$845,000																						\$130,000		\$65,000			
1	8011.2	1143.3	\$10,000	\$13,000																						\$2,000		\$1,000			
4	8012.1	1238.1	\$1,874,409	\$2,436,732													1238.1									\$374,882		\$187,441			
1	8012.3	3291.5	\$1,005,000	\$1,306,500																						\$201,000		\$100,500			
1	8012.4	124.8	\$42,500	\$55,250																						\$8,500		\$4,250			
1	8012.5	632.3	\$10,000	\$13,000																						\$2,000		\$1,000			
1	8013.0	16702.3	\$565,000	\$734,500																						\$113,000		\$56,500			
1	8014.1	8008.5	\$2,005,000	\$2,606,500																						\$401,000		\$200,500			
1	8018.0	3908.73	\$204,544	\$265,907								3908.73														\$40,909		\$20,454			

APPENDIX B: TRAIL COST DOCUMENTATION

Appendix B: Trail Cost Documentation

Facility Type	Rating	Construction Type	Construction Type General Requirements	Construction Components	Cost per Linear Foot	Typical Section
Class I Multi-Use Trail	A	Trail – Level Paved Surface	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Existing path, roadway or levee location requiring minor leveling/grading Aggregate Base and Paving for 12' trail width 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Earthwork Asphalt pavement with Aggregate Base 12 ft. wide Pavement striping Traffic Sign Wayfinding Sign 	\$63.86	
Class I Multi-Use Trail	B	Trail – Moderate Hillside Location or Other Moderate Engineering Challenge for Implementation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Grading to create trail bench w/ minor cut/fill Aggregate Base and Paving for 12' trail width Drainage as required. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Earthwork Engineered Fill Asphalt pavement with Aggregate Base 12 ft. wide pavement striping 24" or less retaining wall Traffic Sign Wayfinding Sign 	\$149.83	
Class I Multi-Use Trail	C	Trail – Difficult Hillside Location or Other Complex Engineering Challenge for Implementation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Grading to create trail bench w/ substantial cut and/or cut/fill Retaining walls, structure, or piles required Aggregate Base and Paving for 12' trail width Drainage as required. <p>NOTES: Structural solutions cost minimum \$50 per Sq. Ft. It is assumed that for any given segment, no greater than 50% of the total length classified as "C" will require structural solutions.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Earthwork Engineered Fill Asphalt pavement with Aggregate Base 12 ft. wide Pavement striping 4 ft. Engineered retaining wall Traffic Sign Wayfinding Sign 	\$294.77	
Class I Multi-Use Trail	X	Existing multi-use trail requiring minimal improvement to upgrade to regional trail	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Bay Trail identifying signage 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> signage installation trail inspection 	\$2.67	N/A
Trail Bridge	A	Bridge- Prefabricated Structure Pedestrian/Bicycle Load Only	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Abutment engineering/construction Transport of structure to site Bridge structure securing and surfacing 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Earthwork Concrete bridge abutments/piers Preconstructed clearspan bridge, pedestrian rating Bridge Engineering design Traffic Sign Wayfinding Sign 	\$827.94	

Appendix B: Trail Cost Documentation

Facility Type	Rating	Construction Type	Construction Type General Requirements	Construction Components	Cost per Lineal Foot	Typical Section
Trail Bridge	B	Bridge – Prefabricated Structure Light Vehicle/Maintenance Load	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abutment engineering/ construction 2. Transport of structure to site 3. Bridge structure securing and surfacing 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Earthwork b. Concrete bridge abutments/piers c. Preconstructed clearspan bridge, vehicle load rating d. Bridge Engineering design e. Traffic Sign f. Wayfinding Sign 	\$1513.94	<p>MODEL: T2-SQ</p>
Trail Boardwalk	A	10 ft. wide Boardwalk-Structure Pedestrian/Bicycle Load Only	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Boardwalk abutment engineering/ construction 2. Pile engineering and construction 3. Decking securing and surfacing 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. 10 ft. wide Boardwalk b. Drilled piles or piers c. Traffic Sign d. Wayfinding Sign 	\$927.34	<p>10' - 12'</p> <p>Light Vehicle Load Surface</p> <p>42" Rail</p> <p>Structural Deck for Light Vehicle Load</p> <p>Concrete/ Structural Pile</p>
Class II Bicycle Lane	A	Vehicle travel lane narrowing through re-striping of existing roadway surface to accommodate Caltrans minimum or greater width Class II bicycle lanes, applicable to urban or suburban streets or outlying roadways with existing paved shoulder.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Existing stripe grinding/ removal 2. Lane striping both sides of roadway 3. Pavement markers (bike lane symbol and turn arrows as req'd) 4. Signage 5. Does not account for parking stall removal or replacement in urban or suburban setting. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Pavement striping b. Asphalt surface treatment existing road surface c. Pavement marking and lane signage d. Traffic Sign e. Wayfinding Sign 	\$10.11	<p>Example with Curb/Gutter</p> <p>Example without Curb/Gutter</p> <p>New 150 MM Solid White Stripe</p> <p>0.9 M min.</p> <p>Edge of Pavement</p> <p>1.5 M min. Bike Lane</p> <p>Motor Vehicle Lanes Restriped as Required</p> <p>1.2 M min. Bike Lane</p> <p>Two-Lane or Multi-Lane Highways</p>




Appendix B: Trail Cost Documentation

Facility Type	Rating	Construction Type	Construction Type General Requirements	Construction Components	Cost per Lineal Foot	Typical Section
Class II Bicycle Lane	B	Roadway widening of shoulder edge to create additional roadway width sufficient to accommodate Class II bicycle lanes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Roadway shoulder paving both sides of roadway, 4' minimum on each side of roadway assumed Lane striping both sides of roadway to create shoulder bicycle lane Pavement markers (bike lane symbol and turn arrows as req'd) Signage 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Asphalt pavement with Aggregate Base, 8 ft. wide Asphalt surface treatment existing road surface Pavement striping Pavement marking and lane signage Traffic Sign Wayfinding Sign 	\$52.33	
Class II Bicycle Lane	C	Roadway widening including drainage channel fill, retaining wall, or other structural to obtain additional width for Class II bicycle lanes.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Drainage or retaining wall construction as required. See NOTE. Roadway shoulder paving both sides of roadway, 4' minimum on each side of roadway assumed Lane striping both sides of roadway to create shoulder bicycle lane Pavement markers (bike lane symbol and turn arrows as req'd) Striping both shoulders <p>NOTE: Structural roadway accommodations cost minimum of \$50 per Sq. Ft. It is assumed that no more than 50% of given project distance defined as "C" will require structural treatment at the roadway edge.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Earthwork Asphalt pavement with Aggregate Base, 8 ft. wide Asphalt surface treatment Engineered fill Retaining wall up to 24" Pavement striping Pavement marking and lane signage Traffic Sign Wayfinding Sign 	\$108.74	
Class II Bicycle Lane	X	Existing multi-use trail requiring minimal improvement to upgrade to regional trail	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Bay Trail identifying signage 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> signage installation trail inspection 	\$2.67	N/A

Appendix B: Trail Cost Documentation

Facility Type	Rating	Construction Type	Construction Type General Requirements	Construction Components	Cost per Lineal Foot	Typical Section
Class III Bicycle Route	A	Caltrans Class III Signage Minimum	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ID placement and install Class III Route signage 	a. Traffic signs	\$2.67	
Class III Bicycle Route	B	Bicycle Wayfinding Signage (e.g. San Francisco, Marin)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ID placement, content and install bicycle wayfinding signage with key destinations and distance 2. ID placement and install Bay Trail signage 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Traffic Sign b. Wayfinding Sign 	\$5.34	
Class III Bicycle Route	C	Sliver fill on rural roadway with topographic or other constraints to create periodic bicycle pull outs, uphill shoulder segments, or other bicycle safety improvement strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Roadway structural treatment for short distances 2. Shoulder widening for short distances 3. ID placement, content and install bicycle wayfinding signage with key destinations and distance 4. ID placement and install Bay Trail signage 5. Stencil roadway with Shared Use Pavement Arrow <p>NOTE: Structural roadway accommodations cost minimum of \$50 per Sq. Ft. It is assumed that no more than 50% of given project distance defined as "C" will require structural treatment at the roadway edge.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Asphalt pavement with Aggregate Base, 8 ft. wide b. Asphalt Surface treatment c. Pavement striping or marking d. Lane/Route Stenciling e. Traffic Sign f. Wayfinding Sign 	\$51.31	

Appendix B: Trail Cost Documentation

Facility Type	Rating	Construction Type	Construction Type General Requirements	Construction Components	Cost per Lineal Foot	Typical Section
Fencing	A	Habitat Protective Fencing	1. 4' wood post and grid wire construction	a. Construct 4 ft. wood and wire fence b. Emergency gate every 100 ft.	\$19.67	
Fencing	B	Roadway Barrier/Separator	1. 3' bollard/post and cable	a. Construct 3 ft. bollard and cable fence	\$14.50	
Fencing	C	Security Fencing	1. 6' Min. cyclone/ chainlink fencing 2. Support posts and gate as required	a. Construct 6 ft. chain link fence b. Emergency Access Gate every 1000 ft.	\$29.95	
Trail Furnishings and Landscaping	A	Bench Trash Receptacle Bicycle Rack Picnic table Landscaping Irrigation Erosion Control	1. Install site furnishings	a. Furnish and install site furnishings	2% of Project Base Cost	N/A
Design Cost	A	Engineering design for all facilities associated with subject segment	1. 20% of total project cost of facilities	a. Engineering design b. Construction management and observation	20% project construction budget	N/A
Environmental Cost	A	Low Sensitivity - Environmental review and permitting/clearances for	1. 5% of total project cost for Checklist/IS	a. CEQA Initial Study Checklist	5% project construction budget	N/A

Appendix B: Trail Cost Documentation

Facility Type	Rating	Construction Type	Construction Type General Requirements	Construction Components	Cost per Lineal Foot	Typical Section
Environmental Cost	B	Moderate Sensitivity - Environmental review and permitting/clearances	<u>2.</u> 10% of total project cost for IS/MND or focused EIR	a. CEQA Initial Study Checklist b. Focused analysis of some issues c. Permitting assistance d. Mitigated Negative Declaration/Focused EIR completion	10% project construction budget	N/A
Environmental Cost	C	High Sensitivity - Environmental review and permitting/clearances	<u>3.</u> 15% of total project cost of facilities for complete EIR	a. CEQA Initial Study Checklist b. Focused analysis of major issues c. Agency coordination d. Complex permitting issues e. Mitigation and Monitoring Program f. Post Construction observation/monitoring	25% project construction budget	N/A

NOTES:

1. Project costs were calculated based on existing project studies, Mean's Construction Costs, CalTrans data, Ace, Bay Trail Feasibility studies, and recent trail installation projects. For lump sum items, a percentage cost was assigned relative to total project cost. Other cost items are based on an average of current costs for each construction component for the type of trail to be built. Individual project components such as structural walls, access ramps, concrete sidewalks and stairs, bank stabilization, wetland mitigation, culvert and drainage systems, urban design elements, lighting, play components, artwork and other unique project items are not included in this estimate and would be identified on an individual basis.
2. For cost determination using cost estimating handbooks and databases, engineers did not use average cost, but estimated probable cost based on geographic variables and Bay area construction experience.
3. Cost database references used: *RS Means Site Work and Landscape Cost Data 2005*, 24th annual edition; *Architects Contractors Engineers Guide to Construction Costs, 2004 Edition, Volume 35*; and <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/esc/oe/awards/2004CCDB/2004ccdb.pdf> (State of California, Business, Transportation, and Housing Division, Department of Transportation Contract Cost Data 2004).
4. Bay Trail costs are based on average of costs of projects identified in Bay Trail Feasibility Studies.

APPENDIX C: IMPLEMENTATION RANKING

OVERALL CRITERIA	SUB-CRITERION	POINTS	DEFINITION OF IMPLEMENTATION PRIORITY RANKING CRITERIA
Critical Bay Trail Link		13	
	Distance of Continuity	6	<p>Gap closure that creates the greatest amount of continuous miles of Bay Trail receives highest points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New segments closing gaps between existing longer segments receive highest points from 5 to 6 points. • New segments closing gaps between existing shorter segments or establishing new Bay Trail in an undeveloped geographic region of the Bay Trail system receives 3 to 4 points. • New segment that adds distance at one end of existing segment without closing gap, receives 1 to 3 points.
	Trail classification (I, II, III)	4	<p>Priority given to completing all Class I segments prior to competitive funds spent on Class II and III.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuous Class I segment receives up to 4 points; • Gap segments with mixed Class I and Class II opportunities receives 4 points; • Class II receives up to 2 points if no feasible Class I exists, and, • Class III receives a maximum of 1 point if adequate lane width exists.
	Shoreline experience/Proximity to Bay	3	<p>Segments providing trail users with the greatest opportunity for shoreline exposure and experience receive greatest points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Segment providing an trail experience adjacent to shoreline with appealing natural or urban views receives 3 points; • Segment providing views of shoreline or Bay environment but no direct, adjacent experience receives 1 to 2 points • Segment that does not provide shoreline experience or views receives no points under this criterion.
Regional Need/Connections		2	
	Support in local general or master plans	2	<p>Segments already supported by local general or master plans, or by existing agency plans (such as BCDC plans for shoreline access), will rank more favorably.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Segments with known plan support receive 1 to 2 points, depending on force of document; legislatively approved documents receive greater points. • Segments with no known adopted plan support receive no points under this criterion.

Project Readiness	12	
Degree of environmental impact/regulatory context	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highest points awarded to projects that have certified, completed environmental review, and have permits completed and/or identified with preliminary agency consultations completed receive 4 points. • Projects with limited permitting requirements and environmental review in process with limited environmental consequences receive 3 points. • Projects with substantial permitting and environmental review requirements but with clear beneficial mitigation opportunities receive 2 points • Projects with substantial permitting and environmental review requirements and high cost or offsite mitigation only receive 1 point.
Status of property control/ownership	4	<p>Segments with property ownership or control that has been previously identified as amenable to Bay Trail alignment and construction across the property shall be given preferential ranking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Segments located on publicly owned land designated for recreational access such as park, open space, etc. or and publicly owned easement on private land receives 4 points • Segments located on publicly owned land designated for wildlife habitat or other protected purpose receives 3 points if balancing of management goals is required • Segments located on private property with identified but not publicly-owned easement receives 2 points • Segments on known restricted private or public lands where feasibility of access is unknown but believed possible receive 1 point.
Preliminary design/needs identified	4	<p>Overall construction type is identified and documented as feasible from an engineering and cost standpoint for the subject area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feasibility study documented construction strategy and documented costs receives 4 points • Feasibility study documented construction type with no cost estimates receives 3 points • Assumed ease of construction/ feasible construction type receives 2 points • Assumed difficulty of construction including engineering and potential unknown construction obstacles receives 1 point.
Cost	13	
Cost effectiveness of project	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects with low average cost per lineal foot and significant overall benefit receive highest points, 10 to 13. • Projects with mid-level average cost per lineal foot or high cost and significant overall benefit receive medium points, 6 to 9. • Projects with mid-level average cost per lineal and fewer defined project benefits, receives lower points, 3 to 5. • Projects with high average cost per lineal foot and fewer defined project benefits, receives lowest points, 0 to 2.
TOTAL POINTS	40	

The San Francisco Bay Trail Project Gap Analysis Study

San Francisco County Implementation Ranking

NOTES: Implementation criteria definitions are provided on page one of this appendix. See Appendix A for cost estimate details and project category definitions.

Point Range								TOTAL	RANK	Project Category	Gap Segment Number	Gap Segment Length (ft.)	Construction Cost	Construction, Design & Permitting	Cost per Mile Construction, Design &
6	4	3	2	4	4	4	13	40							
Criteria															
Distance of Continuity	Trail Classification (L/I/J)	Shoreline Experience	Support in Local Plan	Degree of Environmental Impact / Regulatory Context	Status of Property Control / Ownership	Preliminary Design Identifies	Cost Effectiveness								
3	2	3	2	3	4	4	10	31	3	4	1001.0	1900.5	\$19,252	\$24,063	\$66,858
3	2	0	1	2	3	2	10	23	7	1	1002.0	2795.3	\$146,366	\$182,957	\$345,585
6	2	2	2	3	4	1	10	30	3	1	1005.0	1795.7	\$94,005	\$117,506	\$345,510
5	3	2	2	3	4	4	12	35	1	1	1006.0	1178.9	\$49,585	\$61,981	\$277,596
4	3	0	2	3	4	4	12	32	2	1	1008.0	880.3	\$37,025	\$46,282	\$277,596
3	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	13	13	4	1009.0	15327.2	\$160,000,000	\$192,000,000	\$66,141,239
2	1	0	1	2	1	1	2	10	14	1	1013.0	320.3	\$484,921	\$703,136	\$11,590,878
4	3	3	1	3	3	2	8	27	5	1	1020.0	3902.4	\$584,775	\$730,968	\$989,010
0	1	3	2	3	2	1	4	16	11	1	1024.0	9668.1	\$51,821	\$64,776	\$35,376
3	4	1	1	2	2	1	7	21	8	4	1025.0	1093.1	\$171,726	\$223,244	\$1,078,334
1	4	3	2	3	3	3	6	25	5	1	1026.0	4206	\$691,256	\$898,633	\$1,128,098
3	4	1	1	1	1	1	8	20	9	3	1027.0	23272.8	\$1,486,666	\$1,858,333	\$421,608
0	2	0	1	3	2	1	7	16	11	1	1028.0	5382	\$54,320	\$68,150	\$66,858
2	4	3	2	3	3	3	4	24	6	1	1029.0	3934.3	\$666,943	\$833,678	\$1,118,832
2	4	0	1	3	2	1	5	18	10	1	1032.0	1280.8	\$284,747	\$355,934	\$1,467,312

The San Francisco Bay Trail Project Gap Analysis Study San Mateo County Implementation Ranking

NOTES: Implementation criteria definitions are provided on page one of this appendix. See Appendix A for cost estimate details and project category definitions.

Point Range										TOTAL	RANK	Project Category	Gap Segment Number	Gap Segment Length (ft.)	Construction Cost	Construction, Design & Permitting	Cost per Mile Construction, Design & Permitting	
6	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	13	40									
Criteria																		
Distance of Community	Trail Classification (L, H, J)	Shoreline Experience	Support in Local Plans	Degree of Environmental Impact/Regulatory Context	Status of Property Control/Ownership	Preliminary Design Identified	Cost Effectiveness											
5	4	2	2	3	4	2	6	28	1	1	2000.0	450.4	\$28,772	\$35,964	\$421,608			
4	4	1	1	2	1	1	8	22	17	3	2001.0	658.4	\$516,054	\$645,067	\$517,308			
5	3	3	1	2	1	1	8	24	13	3	2005.0	1833.2	\$143,686	\$179,608	\$517,308			
4	4	3	2	2	2	2	4	23	16	3	2010.0	2868.7	\$887,260	\$1,153,438	\$2,122,967			
4	3	3	1	2	1	1	7	22	17	3	2012.0	838.2	\$65,698	\$85,408	\$538,000			
5	4	3	1	1	2	1	2	19	22	1	2018.0	1928.6	\$316,965	\$412,055	\$1,128,098			
2	2	0	1	2	2	2	3	14	39	1	2019.0	1486.7	\$77,829	\$97,286	\$345,510			
1	2	2	1	2	2	2	3	15	36	1	2020.0	1478.6	\$62,190	\$77,737	\$277,596			
1	2	0	1	2	2	2	3	13	45	1	2022.0	1210.9	\$63,391	\$79,238	\$345,510			
1	4	0	1	1	2	1	5	15	36	1	2023.0	2675.5	\$251,042	\$313,803	\$619,278			
1	4	0	1	1	1	1	8	17	27	1	2024.0	3127.2	\$199,711	\$249,639	\$421,493			
1	2	0	1	1	2	2	9	18	25	1	2025.0	1940.1	\$101,564	\$126,955	\$345,510			
1	4	0	1	1	1	1	5	14	39	1	2026.0	3770.6	\$336,937	\$421,171	\$589,769			
1	2	0	1	2	2	1	5	14	39	1	2027.0	7469.7	\$75,668	\$94,585	\$66,858			
1	2	0	1	2	2	1	5	14	39	1	2028.0	5477.7	\$55,489	\$69,361	\$66,858			
1	2	0	2	2	3	3	4	17	27	4	2029.0	3832.7	\$405,280	\$486,336	\$669,986			
1	2	0	1	2	2	1	5	14	39	1	2030.0	2292.2	\$23,220	\$29,025	\$66,858			
1	4	0	1	1	1	1	7	16	32	1	2031.0	2406.6	\$188,629	\$235,787	\$517,308			
1	3	0	1	1	1	2	10	19	22	1	2034.0	653.4	\$33,653	\$43,749	\$353,530			
3	4	0	1	3	3	2	1	17	27	4	2035.0	2755.2	\$948,918	\$1,186,148	\$2,273,106			
1	2	0	2	3	3	3	2	16	32	4	2036.0	3738.6	\$405,280	\$486,336	\$686,849			
3	4	2	1	2	1	1	1	15	36	4	2038.0	22620.4	\$34,246,381	\$49,657,252	\$11,590,878			
3	4	3	1	2	1	1	2	17	27	3	2039.0	519.9	\$127,583	\$165,858	\$1,684,425			
1	4	3	1	2	1	1	3	16	32	3	2040.0	499	\$74,775	\$97,208	\$1,028,570			
1	4	3	1	2	1	1	8	21	20	3	2041.0	963.9	\$144,440	\$180,551	\$989,010			
1	3	3	1	2	1	1	5	17	27	3	2042.0	875.6	\$55,933	\$67,120	\$404,744			
4	2	3	1	2	1	1	5	19	22	3	2047.0	625.3	\$39,944	\$53,925	\$455,337			

Appendix C: Implementation Ranking

San Mateo County

Point Range										TOTAL	RANK
6	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	13	40		
Criteria											
Distance of Continuity	Trail Classification (L,LL,LLI)	Shoreline Experience	Support in Local Plans	Degree of Environmental Impact/Regulatory Context	Status of Property Control/Ownership	Preliminary Design Identified	Cost Effectiveness				
2	4	3	1	1	1	1	1	14	39		
3	4	3	2	2	4	3	9	30	4		
3	4	3	1	2	1	1	3	18	25		
1	4	0	2	2	4	4	7	24	13		
5	4	1	1	2	4	3	7	27	9		
1	4	2	2	3	4	4	12	32	2		
1	4	0	2	3	4	4	12	30	4		
2	4	3	2	3	4	4	12	34	1		
1	4	0	2	3	4	4	10	28	8		
1	4	0	2	3	4	4	12	30	4		
3	4	0	2	3	4	4	12	32	2		
6	4	3	0	3	3	4	3	26	10		
2	4	3	1	1	2	4	5	22	17		
1	4	3	1	3	2	2	5	21	20		
1	4	2	0	2	2	1	4	16	32		
2	2	0	0	2	2	1	4	13	45		
5	4	3	1	1	2	1	7	24	13		
3	3	2	2	3	4	4	8	29	7		
2	4	2	2	3	4	4	4	25	12		
3	4	2	2	2	3	4	6	26	10		
Project Category	Gap Segment Number	Gap Segment Length (ft.)	Construction Cost	Construction, Design & Permitting	Cost per Mile Construction, Design & Permitting						
3	2048.0	326.2	\$95,248	\$119,060	\$1,927,153						
1	2049.0	447	\$28,554	\$35,693	\$421,608						
3	2051.0	426	\$63,836	\$79,795	\$989,010						
1	2056.0	1007.6	\$150,989	\$188,736	\$989,010						
1	2057.0	1009.2	\$373,329	\$466,661	\$2,441,507						
1	2058.0	670.2	\$42,812	\$53,515	\$421,608						
1	2059.0	858.7	\$128,676	\$160,845	\$989,010						
1	2060.0	748.7	\$47,827	\$59,784	\$421,608						
1	2061.0	1064.7	\$159,545	\$199,432	\$989,010						
1	2062.0	1655.6	\$105,760	\$132,200	\$421,608						
1	2063.0	667.8	\$42,659	\$53,324	\$421,608						
1	2079.0	4465.1	\$1,754,789	\$2,544,444	\$3,008,816						
1	2083.0	2466.7	\$157,573	\$189,087	\$404,744						
1	2085.0	1541.8	\$261,366	\$326,707	\$1,118,832						
1	2087.0	2455	\$723,709	\$1,049,379	\$2,256,912						
1	2088.0	1929.7	\$19,548	\$24,435	\$66,858						
1	2089.0	10724.1	\$1,832,881	\$2,657,677	\$1,308,505						
1	2091.0	1863.1	\$250,000	\$300,000	\$850,196						
1	2092.0	3024.7	\$2,303,490	\$2,764,188	\$4,825,243						
1	2096.0	1804.3	\$305,865	\$443,504	\$1,297,845						

The San Francisco Bay Trail Project Gap Analysis Study Santa Clara County Implementation Ranking

NOTES: Implementation criteria definitions are provided on page one of this appendix. See Appendix A for cost estimate details and project category definitions.

Point Range								TOTAL	RANK
6	4	3	2	4	4	4	13	40	
Criteria									
Distance of Continuity	Trail Classification (TLM)	Shoreline Experience	Support in Local Plan	Degree of Environmental Impact/ Regulatory Context	Status of Property Control Ownership	Preliminary Design Identified	Cost Effectiveness		
1	4	3	1	1	1	1	5	17	13
3	2	0	1	3	3	2	7	21	10
1	4	2	1	2	2	2	5	19	12
1	3	0	2	3	3	4	8	24	4
1	4	2	2	3	3	4	5	24	4
1	4	1	2	2	2	4	5	21	10
3	4	0	2	2	3	4	7	25	3
3	4	0	1	3	3	1	8	23	7
1	2	0	1	3	3	1	4	15	16
1	4	0	2	2	2	2	1	14	18
3	2	1	2	3	3	4	10	28	1
1	4	2	2	2	2	2	1	16	14
3	4	0	2	2	2	2	1	16	14
1	4	0	2	3	3	4	10	27	2
3	4	3	2	2	2	2	6	24	4
1	4	0	2	2	1	2	1	13	19
5	4	1	2	3	3	4	1	23	7
2	4	1	2	1	3	4	6	23	7
5	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	15	16

Project Category	Gap Segment Number	Gap Segment Length (ft.)	Construction Cost	Construction, Design & Permitting	Cost per Mile Construction, Design & Permitting
	3	3000.1	19237.4	\$1,557,556	\$1,946,945
	1	3004.0	1225.3	\$12,388	\$15,485
	1	3011.0	16380.4	\$2,454,275	\$3,558,699
	1	3014.0	9431.1	\$348,998	\$453,697
	1	3017.0	1636.8	\$249,645	\$324,538
	1	3020.0	4277	\$640,823	\$833,070
	1	3021.0	3786.3	\$241,793	\$290,152
	1	3021.1	2406.2	\$153,708	\$192,135
	1	3023.0	3578.3	\$187,324	\$234,155
	1	3024.0	3727.9	\$1,207,057	\$1,508,821
	1	3025.0	2252.3	\$22,816	\$29,661
	1	3026.0	2095.5	\$678,502	\$848,127
	1	3027.0	1930.4	\$625,044	\$781,305
	1	3028.0	3460.9	\$221,013	\$276,266
	1	3029.0	4464.7	\$798,512	\$998,139
	1	3031.0	1835.4	\$594,284	\$742,855
	1	3033.0	8365.2	\$3,300,000	\$4,290,000
	1	3034.0	4287	\$241,165	\$313,515
	1	3035.0	6558.9	\$2,300,000	\$3,335,000

The San Francisco Bay Trail Project Gap Analysis Study Alameda County Implementation Ranking

NOTES: Implementation criteria definitions are provided on page one of this appendix. See Appendix A for cost estimate details and project category definitions.

Point Range								TOTAL	RANK	Project Category	Gap Segment Number	Gap Segment Length (ft.)	Construction Cost	Construction, Design & Permitting	Cost per Mile Construction, Design & Permitting
6	4	3	2	4	4	4	13	40							
Criteria															
Distance of Continuity	Trail Classification (L/U)	Shoreline Experience	Support in Local Plans	Degree of Environmental Impact/Regulatory Context	Status of Property Control/Ownership	Preliminary Design Identified	Cost Effectiveness								
1	3	0	2	3	2	2	2	15	69	3	4000.0	481.2	\$728,518	\$910,647	\$9,992,136
3	3	1	2	3	2	2	5	21	53	3	4001.0	3631.9	\$232,006	\$290,007	\$421,608
3	2	0	1	2	3	2	6	19	61	1	4003.0	5967.7	\$60,333	\$75,417	\$66,726
1	4	0	1	3	2	2	5	18	64	3	4005.0	14166.6	\$904,962	\$1,131,203	\$421,608
1	4	0	1	1	2	1	4	14	70	1	4006.0	18532.8	\$5,463,284	\$7,102,269	\$2,023,439
1	4	0	1	2	2	1	7	18	64	1	4007.0	2632.1	\$168,139	\$210,173	\$421,608
3	4	0	1	2	4	2	11	27	17	1	4008.0	6118.4	\$16,458	\$20,573	\$17,754
1	4	1	1	1	1	2	2	13	71	1	4011.0	15470.4	\$4,560,519	\$5,928,675	\$2,023,439
1	2	0	1	1	1	2	5	13	71	1	4012.0	5808	\$58,835	\$76,486	\$69,532
1	2	0	1	1	1	2	5	13	71	1	4013.0	3590.4	\$36,371	\$47,282	\$69,532
1	2	0	1	2	3	2	5	16	68	1	4015.0	3854.4	\$39,045	\$50,759	\$69,532
2	2	0	1	2	3	2	5	17	66	1	4016.0	6019.2	\$60,974	\$76,218	\$66,858
6	1	0	1	3	4	3	13	31	5	1	4022.0	11880	\$20,077	\$25,097	\$11,154
6	1	0	1	1	4	2	13	28	13	1	4028.0	12988.8	\$21,951	\$27,439	\$11,154
3	4	2	2	2	3	2	5	23	36	1	4029.0	23390.4	\$1,494,179	\$2,166,559	\$489,065
3	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	13	71	4	4032.0	19008	\$28,777,352	\$41,727,160	\$11,590,878
3	2	0	1	2	3	2	10	23	36	1	4034.0	14216.3	\$38,242	\$47,802	\$17,754
3	2	1	1	2	3	3	8	23	36	1	4044.0	2217.6	\$22,464	\$28,080	\$66,858
1	4	3	1	2	3	3	6	23	36	1	4045.0	2640	\$168,643	\$210,804	\$421,608
1	2	0	1	2	4	3	9	22	47	1	4046.0	3220.8	\$8,664	\$10,830	\$17,754
6	4	3	2	4	3	4	13	39	1	1	4049.0	897.6	\$2,188,000	\$2,188,000	\$12,870,588
5	3	2	1	2	1	1	8	23	36	4	4053.0	6758.4	\$735,044	\$918,804	\$717,816
5	3	3	1	2	1	1	6	22	47	4	4057.0	3273.6	\$965,025	\$1,206,281	\$1,945,614
6	4	3	1	2	2	2	12	32	4	1	4062.0	2798.4	\$419,340	\$524,175	\$989,010
6	3	0	1	2	3	4	7	26	22	2	4063.0	1108.8	\$70,808	\$88,510	\$421,476
5	4	3	2	2	3	4	4	27	17	2	4069.0	739.2	\$400,000	\$500,000	\$3,571,429

Appendix C: Implementation Ranking

Alameda County

Point Range										TOTAL	RANK
6	4	3	2	4	4	4	13	40			
Criteria											
Distance of Continuity	Trail Classification (I,II,III)	Shoreline Experience	Support in Local Plans	Degree of Environmental Impact/Regulatory Context	Status of Property Control/Ownership	Preliminary Design Identified	Cost Effectiveness				
2	4	0	2	2	3	4	2	19	61		
1	3	3	1	3	3	2	8	24	30		
1	4	3	2	2	2	4	3	21	53		
1	4	3	2	1	3	4	5	23	36		
3	4	3	2	2	3	4	6	27	17		
5	3	0	2	2	3	4	10	29	9		
2	4	1	2	2	3	4	1	19	61		
2	4	3	2	2	3	4	3	23	36		
1	4	3	2	2	3	4	1	20	56		
1	4	3	1	3	3	4	5	24	30		
1	2	1	1	3	3	2	10	23	36		
1	4	3	2	2	3	4	4	23	36		
1	4	3	2	2	3	4	1	20	56		
1	4	3	1	2	2	2	2	17	66		
6	2	0	2	3	4	3	13	33	2		
2	4	1	2	3	4	3	5	24	30		
1	4	3	2	2	3	4	3	22	47		
1	4	3	2	2	3	4	1	20	56		
1	4	3	2	2	3	4	2	21	53		
2	4	3	2	2	3	4	4	24	30		
6	4	0	2	2	3	4	12	33	2		
2	4	3	2	3	3	4	3	24	30		
1	4	0	2	3	4	4	4	22	47		
1	4	0	2	3	4	4	4	22	47		
4	4	3	2	3	3	4	3	26	22		
5	4	0	2	2	4	4	5	26	22		
5	4	3	2	3	3	4	5	29	9		
3	4	0	1	3	4	2	6	23	36		
2	4	3	2	2	3	4	2	22	47		
5	4	0	1	3	4	1	9	27	17		

Project Category	Gap Segment Number	Gap Segment Length (ft.)	Construction Cost	Construction, Design & Permitting	Cost per Mile Construction, Design & Permitting	
	2	4071.0	81.3	\$292,703	\$365,879	\$23,761,867
	1	4072.0	3537.6	\$185,669	\$232,087	\$346,398
	2	4075.0	897.6	\$264,586	\$330,732	\$1,945,482
	2	4077.0	475.2	\$372,408	\$465,510	\$5,172,333
	2	4078.0	792	\$48,380	\$60,475	\$403,167
	2	4080.0	7708.8	\$12,999	\$16,249	\$11,129
	2	4081.0	95.4	\$284,506	\$284,506	\$15,746,266
	2	4082.0	316.8	\$31,251	\$39,064	\$651,058
	2	4083.0	83.6	\$847,216	\$1,059,020	\$66,885,474
	2	4084.0	739.2	\$58,042	\$72,553	\$518,232
	1	4085.0	792	\$8,023	\$10,029	\$66,858
	2	4086.0	413.7	\$125,467	\$156,834	\$2,001,646
	2	4087.0	78.4	\$161,628	\$202,035	\$13,606,456
	3	4089.0	950.4	\$280,168	\$350,211	\$1,945,614
	1	4090.0	2956.8	\$29,952	\$37,440	\$66,858
	1	4091.0	1584	\$101,186	\$126,482	\$421,608
	2	4092.0	114.2	\$113,341	\$141,677	\$6,550,379
	2	4093.0	99.3	\$302,240	\$377,800	\$20,088,459
	2	4094.0	950.4	\$809,325	\$1,011,656	\$5,620,310
	2	4096.0	739.2	\$469,999	\$587,499	\$4,196,421
	2	4100.0	2798.4	\$6,178	\$7,722	\$14,570
	2	4104.0	528	\$221,365	\$265,638	\$2,656,382
	2	4105.0	4276.8	\$667,269	\$834,086	\$1,029,736
	2	4106.0	475.2	\$30,650	\$38,313	\$425,694
	2	4107.0	844.8	\$151,711	\$182,053	\$1,137,833
	2	4108.0	4329.6	\$374,676	\$468,345	\$571,152
	2	4116.0	1267.2	\$445,473	\$534,568	\$2,227,366
	1	4117.0	2217.6	\$116,091	\$145,114	\$345,510
	2	4118.0	297.7	\$226,552	\$226,552	\$4,018,117
	1	4120.0	1108.8	\$70,830	\$88,538	\$421,608

Point Range								TOTAL	RANK
6	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	13	40
Criteria									
Distance of Continuity	Trail Classification (L,I,U)	Shoreline Experience	Support in Local Plans	Degree of Environmental Impact/Regulatory Context	Status of Property Control/Ownership	Preliminary Design Identified	Cost Effectiveness		
1	4	3	2	2	3	4	4	23	36
3	4	3	2	2	3	4	3	24	30
3	4	2	1	1	2	1	12	26	22
6	2	0	1	1	2	1	12	25	26
6	2	0	1	1	2	1	12	25	26
6	2	0	1	2	2	1	13	27	17
5	3	0	1	2	1	1	7	20	56
5	3	0	1	2	2	1	6	20	56
2	4	3	2	3	4	4	7	29	9
1	4	3	2	3	4	4	7	28	13
1	4	3	2	3	4	4	7	28	13
1	4	3	2	3	4	4	7	28	13
1	4	3	3	3	4	4	7	29	9
3	4	3	2	3	4	4	7	30	7
3	4	3	2	3	4	4	7	30	7
3	4	3	2	2	1	2	8	25	26
3	4	3	2	2	1	2	8	25	26
3	4	3	2	3	4	2	10	31	5

Project Category	Gap Segment Number	Gap Segment Length (ft.)	Construction Cost	Construction, Design & Permitting	Cost per Mile Construction, Design & Permitting	
	2	4122.0	5596.8	\$2,000,000	\$2,400,000	\$2,264,151
	2	4125.0	2798.4	\$1,503,317	\$1,803,981	\$3,403,737
	1	4126.0	2323.2	\$6,249	\$7,499	\$17,044
	1	4132.0	11510.4	\$1,173,715	\$1,408,459	\$646,082
	1	4142.0	12302.4	\$1,254,476	\$1,630,818	\$699,922
	1	4143.0	897.6	\$9,093	\$11,366	\$66,858
	4	4146.0	1214.4	\$63,574	\$79,467	\$345,510
	4	4147.0	844.8	\$249,039	\$311,298	\$1,945,614
	1	4151.0	897.6	\$261,736	\$314,083	\$1,847,548
	1	4152.0	844.8	\$246,340	\$295,608	\$1,847,548
	1	4155.0	1636.8	\$477,283	\$572,740	\$1,847,548
	1	4156.0	1214.4	\$354,113	\$424,936	\$1,847,548
	1	4157.0	950.4	\$277,132	\$332,559	\$1,847,548
	1	4158.0	1742.4	\$508,076	\$609,691	\$1,847,548
	1	4159.0	2164.8	\$631,246	\$757,495	\$1,847,548
	3	4163.0	2006.4	\$128,169	\$153,803	\$404,744
	3	4164.0	3326.4	\$212,490	\$254,989	\$404,744
	1	4166.0	2323.2	\$148,406	\$178,087	\$404,744

**The San Francisco Bay Trail Project Gap Analysis Study
Contra Costa County Implementation Ranking**

NOTES: Implementation criteria definitions are provided on page one of this appendix. See Appendix A for cost estimate details and project category definitions.

Criteria										Project Category	Gap Segment Number	Gap Segment Length (ft.)	Construction Cost	Construction, Design & Permitting	Cost per Mile Construction, Design & Permitting	
Point Range	6	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	13	TOTAL	RANK					
Distance of Continuity	6	4	3	1	2	2	1	8	27	4	3	5006.0	3275	\$209,207	\$251,048	\$404,744
Trail Qualification (LULU)	3	2	3	1	1	2	2	1	15	37	2	5008.0	1108.8	\$424,785	\$552,220	\$2,629,619
Shoreline Exposure	3	4	1	2	2	3	4	9	28	2	1	5012.0	7128	\$714,621	\$750,352	\$555,816
Support to Local Plans	3	4	3	2	2	3	4	9	30	1	3	5012.1	1378.3	\$126,110	\$151,331	\$579,720
Degree of Environmental Impact/Regulatory Context	3	4	0	1	1	2	1	8	20	20	1	5017.0	1108.8	\$177,364	\$221,705	\$1,055,736
Status of Property Control/Ownership	3	4	0	1	1	2	1	7	19	25	3	5022.0	4367	\$654,395	\$817,994	\$989,010
Preliminary Design Identifies	3	4	0	2	2	2	2	5	20	20	1	5030.0	3854.4	\$317,217	\$412,382	\$564,907
Cost Effectiveness	1	3	0	2	2	2	1	1	12	42	1	5031.0	2376	\$3,450,000	\$4,140,000	\$9,200,000
	2	3	3	2	2	2	1	1	16	31	1	5032.0	1267.2	\$3,450,000	\$4,140,000	\$17,250,000
	1	2	2	1	0	1	1	1	9	45	4	5034.0	8870.4	\$13,429,431	\$19,472,675	\$11,590,878
	1	2	3	1	2	2	1	8	20	20	1	5036.0	6652.8	\$740,334	\$925,417	\$734,458
	1	2	3	1	2	2	1	9	21	15	3	5038.0	1425.6	\$119,109	\$148,886	\$551,430
	1	2	3	1	2	2	1	9	21	15	1	5040.0	8078.4	\$674,950	\$843,688	\$551,430
	3	4	1	1	2	2	3	5	21	15	1	5043.0	1056	\$173,000	\$224,900	\$1,124,500
	1	4	1	2	2	2	4	7	23	8	1	5045.0	1689.6	\$173,000	\$224,900	\$702,813
	1	4	3	1	3	1	2	7	22	12	1	5046.0	5280	\$495,422	\$718,362	\$718,362
	3	4	2	2	2	2	2	9	26	5	1	5048.0	1425.6	\$173,000	\$224,900	\$832,963
	1	4	3	1	2	2	4	6	23	8	1	5049.0	1478.4	\$173,000	\$224,900	\$1,478
	3	1	0	1	3	2	2	3	15	37	1	5052.0	1689.6	\$341,603	\$444,084	\$1,387,764
	1	4	3	1	2	1	2	4	18	27	1	5053.0	3443.8	\$583,793	\$846,500	\$1,297,845
	3	4	1	1	2	1	1	7	20	20	3	5053.1	2702.5	\$289,173	\$375,925	\$734,463
	1	4	0	1	1	1	2	2	12	42	1	5054.0	5280	\$1,480,513	\$2,146,744	\$2,146,744
	3	4	0	1	3	3	1	8	23	8	1	5055.0	5415.5	\$9,152	\$10,983	\$10,708
	1	1	0	1	3	3	1	6	16	31	1	5057.0	6523.3	\$11,024	\$13,780	\$11,154
	3	3	0	1	3	4	2	8	24	7	1	5058.0	2827.6	\$443,903	\$577,074	\$1,077,575
	1	4	0	2	2	2	4	7	22	12	1	5059.0	11675.9	\$1,650,134	\$1,980,161	\$895,456
	1	4	3	2	2	2	4	7	25	6	1	5060.0	3069.2	\$559,124	\$670,949	\$1,154,245
	1	1	0	1	3	3	1	8	18	27	1	5062.0	9316.7	\$94,192	\$117,740	\$66,726
	5	4	3	2	0	1	1	5	21	15	1	5067.0	2655.5	\$469,413	\$610,237	\$1,213,349
	1	1	0	1	3	3	1	6	16	31	1	5072.0	26391.3	\$44,601	\$55,752	\$11,154

Point Range										TOTAL	RANK
6	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	13	40		
Criteria											
Distance of Continuity											
Trail Classification (U/L)											
Shoreline Experience											
Support in local Plan											
Degree of Environmental Impact/ Regulatory Context											
Status of Property Control/ Ownership											
Preliminary Design Identifiable											
Cost Effectiveness											
3	1	0	2	3	4	2	6	21	15		
2	4	0	2	4	4	4	7	27	4		
1	4	2	2	3	4	2	2	20	20		
5	4	3	2	3	4	3	4	28	2		
1	4	2	1	2	3	2	4	19	25		
1	1	0	1	3	3	2	2	13	41		
1	4	2	2	3	4	2	5	23	8		
1	1	0	0	3	3	2	6	16	31		
1	2	0	1	3	4	1	3	15	37		
1	1	0	1	3	4	1	6	17	29		
1	1	0	1	3	4	1	6	17	29		
1	4	3	2	2	4	2	4	22	12		
1	1	0	1	3	4	2	3	15	37		
2	1	1	1	3	4	1	3	16	31		
2	1	0	1	3	4	2	3	16	31		

Project Category	Gap Segment Number	Gap Segment Length (ft.)	Construction Cost	Construction, Design & Permitting	Cost per Mile Construction, Design & Permitting
1	5076.0	3612.4	\$6,033	\$7,541	\$11,022
1	5078.2	1571.5	\$235,458	\$235,458	\$791,102
1	5080.0	8852.1	\$3,200,000	\$3,840,000	\$2,290,440
1	5081.2	2117.7	\$317,295	\$396,619	\$988,878
1	5083.0	8985.2	\$3,200,000	\$3,840,000	\$2,256,511
1	5085.0	4592.8	\$90,432	\$113,040	\$129,954
1	5086.0	2564.2	\$434,683	\$543,354	\$1,118,832
1	5087.0	5020.7	\$8,385	\$10,481	\$11,022
1	5088.0	7927.8	\$415,020	\$539,526	\$359,330
1	5089.0	2466.3	\$4,168	\$5,210	\$11,154
1	5090.0	12298.6	\$20,785	\$25,981	\$11,154
1	5092.0	5016.6	\$1,515,214	\$1,969,778	\$2,073,203
1	5093.0	4043.3	\$21,672	\$27,090	\$35,376
1	5095.0	4418	\$23,680	\$29,601	\$35,376
1	5096.0	7726.9	\$41,416	\$51,770	\$35,376

The San Francisco Bay Trail Project Gap Analysis Study
Solano County Implementation Ranking

NOTES: Implementation criteria definitions are provided on page one of this appendix. See Appendix A for cost estimate details and project category definitions.

Point Range									TOTAL	RANK	Project Category	Gap Segment Number	Gap Segment Length (ft.)	Construction Cost	Construction, Design & Permitting	Cost per Mile Construction, Design & Permitting
6	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	13	40							
Criteria																
Distance of Continuity		Trail Construction (L,I,II)		Shoreline Experience		Support in Local Plans		Degree of Environmental Impact/ Regulatory Context		Status of Property Control/ Ownership		Preliminary Design Identified		Cost Effectiveness		
1	4	0	2	3	4	4	4	6	24	24	1	6006.0	1692.5	\$28,915	\$36,144	\$112,756
2	4	0	2	3	4	4	4	10	29	4	1	6006.1	1130.4	\$25,627	\$32,034	\$149,627
1	4	0	2	3	4	4	4	3	21	30	1	6007.0	808.6	\$127,924	\$159,905	\$1,044,148
3	4	0	2	3	4	4	4	9	29	4	1	6008.0	1162.6	\$118,084	\$147,605	\$670,355
1	4	0	2	3	4	4	4	6	24	24	1	6008.1	413.3	\$33,434	\$41,793	\$533,909
1	4	0	2	3	4	4	4	11	29	4	1	6008.2	543.8	\$7,091	\$8,864	\$86,062
1	4	0	2	3	4	4	4	11	29	4	1	6008.3	765.9	\$4,538	\$5,673	\$39,105
1	4	0	2	3	4	4	4	8	26	16	1	6008.4	1563.9	\$25,977	\$32,471	\$109,629
1	4	1	2	3	4	4	4	8	27	11	1	6014.0	924.9	\$19,054	\$23,818	\$135,968
3	4	3	2	3	4	4	4	10	33	2	1	6015.1	1029.7	\$37,207	\$46,509	\$238,483
1	4	2	2	3	4	4	4	7	27	11	1	6015.2	300.5	\$26,190	\$32,738	\$575,221
1	4	2	2	3	4	4	4	2	22	29	1	6015.3	78.8	\$24,024	\$30,030	\$2,012,162
1	4	2	2	3	4	4	4	5	25	19	1	6015.4	532.2	\$29,302	\$36,628	\$363,384
1	4	1	2	3	4	4	4	5	24	24	1	6015.5	629.9	\$33,168	\$41,460	\$347,529
1	4	1	2	3	4	4	4	5	24	24	1	6015.6	238.4	\$13,737	\$17,171	\$380,303
1	4	1	2	3	4	4	4	9	28	9	1	6015.7	640.4	\$13,852	\$17,315	\$142,760
1	4	1	2	3	4	4	4	6	25	19	1	6015.8	373.9	\$21,158	\$26,448	\$373,476
1	4	0	2	3	4	4	4	7	25	19	1	6015.9	177.9	\$6,032	\$7,565	\$224,526
3	4	3	2	3	4	4	4	11	34	1	1	6016.0	1880	\$49,466	\$61,833	\$173,657
1	4	2	2	3	4	4	4	7	27	11	1	6016.1	980	\$19,054	\$23,818	\$128,323
1	2	0	2	3	4	4	4	8	24	24	1	6016.2	4772.4	\$39,777	\$49,721	\$55,010
2	2	0	0	2	2	3	10	21	30	30	1	6019.0	3191.5	\$32,266	\$38,719	\$64,057
1	4	0	2	2	4	3	4	20	32	32	1	6020.0	4478.9	\$1,320,245	\$1,650,307	\$1,945,482
1	4	0	2	3	4	4	10	28	9	9	1	6023.0	5432.2	\$57,613	\$69,136	\$67,199

Point Range								TOTAL	RANK
6	4	3	2	4	4	4	13	40	
Criteria									
				Degree of Environmental Impact / Regulatory Context	Status of Property Control / Ownership	Preliminary Design Identified	Cost Effectiveness		
				Support in Local Plans					
				Shoreline Experience					
				Trail Classification (L,LL,HL)					
				Distance of Continuity					
1	4	0	2	3	4	4	13	31	3
2	4	0	2	3	4	4	8	27	11
1	4	0	2	3	4	4	7	25	19
1	4	0	2	3	4	4	9	27	11
1	4	0	0	2	4	3	3	17	33
1	4	0	2	3	3	4	8	25	19
1	4	0	2	3	3	4	9	26	16
1	4	0	2	3	3	4	9	26	16
1	4	3	2	3	3	4	9	29	4

Project Category	Gap Segment Number	Gap Segment Length (ft.)	Construction Cost	Construction, Design & Permitting	Cost per Mile Construction, Design & Permitting
1	6023.1	3589.3	\$3,994	\$4,793	\$7,050
1	6023.2	1129.4	\$119,459	\$143,351	\$670,172
1	6031.0	3431.8	\$97,270	\$121,587	\$187,069
1	6032.0	7037.4	\$229,209	\$286,511	\$214,963
1	6033.0	3001.3	\$449,685	\$562,106	\$988,876
1	6034.0	746.7	\$42,173	\$52,718	\$372,777
1	6035.0	3921.4	\$4,679	\$5,849	\$7,876
1	6036.0	3821.3	\$4,319	\$5,399	\$7,460
1	6037.0	1364.9	\$1,727	\$2,158	\$8,350

The San Francisco Bay Trail Project Gap Analysis Study Napa County Implementation Ranking

NOTES: Implementation criteria definitions are provided on page one of this appendix. See Appendix A for cost estimate details and project category definitions.

Point Range								TOTAL	RANK
6	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	13	40
Criteria									
Distance of Continuity	Trail Classification (L,I,J)	Shoreline Experience	Support in Local Plans	Degree of Environmental Impact/Regulatory Context	Status of Property Control/Ownership	Preliminary Design Identified	Cost Effectiveness		
1	4	2	2	3	3	4	10	29	1
1	4	0	2	3	3	4	12	29	1
2	4	0	0	3	1	2	6	18	16
1	2	0	1	3	3	2	8	20	11
3	4	1	1	3	1	2	2	17	21
1	2	0	0	3	1	1	2	10	28
1	4	0	0	3	2	1	6	17	21
1	2	0	0	2	3	3	9	20	11
2	4	0	0	2	3	3	7	21	8
2	4	0	1	3	2	3	10	25	3
1	2	0	1	3	3	2	4	16	26
1	2	1	1	3	2	1	7	18	5
2	2	0	1	3	3	1	5	17	21
2	1	0	1	3	1	1	13	22	6
1	2	0	1	3	3	1	9	20	11
2	2	0	1	3	3	1	9	21	8
1	4	0	1	0	3	1	8	18	16
2	2	0	2	3	4	2	8	23	4

Project Category	Gap Segment Number	Gap Segment Length (ft.)	Construction Cost	Construction, Design & Permitting	Cost per Mile Construction, Design & Permitting	
	1	7004.0	740.1	\$65,749	\$82,186	\$586,329
	1	7005.0	1642.8	\$95,183	\$118,978	\$382,400
	1	7006.0	3756.2	\$562,791	\$703,489	\$988,878
	1	7007.0	3802.8	\$38,446	\$48,058	\$66,726
	1	7008.0	120	\$216,509	\$270,636	\$1,726
	1	7011.0	12311.1	\$644,240	\$805,300	\$345,378
	1	7012.0	14312.5	\$2,144,442	\$2,680,552	\$988,878
	1	7013.0	2223.4	\$22,479	\$29,222	\$69,395
	1	7013.1	4529.5	\$410,211	\$533,275	\$621,634
	1	7014.0	5515.2	\$350,990	\$350,990	\$336,022
	1	7015.0	21909.5	\$330,336	\$330,336	\$79,608
	1	7015.1	11265.12	\$255,705	\$255,705	\$119,850
	1	7017.0	13328.6	\$460,341	\$575,426	\$227,949
	1	7019.0	5455.8	\$9,111	\$11,389	\$11,022
	1	7021.0	15647.6	\$158,197	\$197,747	\$66,726
	1	7021.1	5340.6	\$53,993	\$67,492	\$66,726
	1	7022.0	10739.8	\$685,844	\$994,473	\$488,912
	1	7023.0	7936.7	\$1,231,720	\$1,231,720	\$819,419

Appendix C: Implementation Ranking

Napa County

Point Range								TOTAL	RANK
6	4	3	2	4	4	4	13	40	
Criteria									
Distance of Continuity	Trail Classification (1,1,1)	Shoreline Experience	Support in Local Plans	Degree of Environmental Impact/Regulatory Context	Status of Property Control/Ownership	Preliminary Design Identified	Cost Effectiveness		
1	2	0	1	3	4	1	5	17	21
4	2	0	2	3	4	2		17	21
2	4	0	2	1	1	2	4	16	26
2	2	0	2	3	4	2	8	23	4
1	2	0	2	3	4	2	8	22	6
1	4	0	1	3	4	2	6	21	8
1	2	0	1	3	4	2	5	18	16
1	2	0	1	3	4	2	5	18	16
2	2	0	1	3	4	2	5	19	15
2	2	0	1	3	4	2	6	20	11

Project Category	Gap Segment Number	Gap Segment Length (ft.)	Construction Cost	Construction, Design & Permitting	Cost per Mile Construction, Design & Permitting	
	1	7025.0	6344	\$331,982	\$414,977	\$345,378
	1	7026.0	5790.9	\$58,546	\$73,182	\$66,726
	4	7026.1	4497.9	\$52,000	\$52,000	\$61,042
	1	7026.2	1658.5	\$2,799	\$2,799	\$8,911
	1	7026.3	5558.2	\$14,840	\$539,677	\$512,665
	1	7027.0	15010.1	\$2,248,963	\$2,811,204	\$988,878
	1	7029.0	3114.4	\$162,977	\$203,721	\$345,378
	1	7031.0	2310.3	\$23,357	\$29,196	\$66,726
	1	7031.1	1743.8	\$17,630	\$22,037	\$66,726
	1	7032.0	4290.2	\$224,506	\$280,633	\$345,378

The San Francisco Bay Trail Project Gap Analysis Study Sonoma County Implementation Ranking

NOTES: Implementation criteria definitions are provided on page one of this appendix. See Appendix A for cost estimate details and project category definitions.

Point Range								TOTAL	RANK	Project Category	Gap Segment Number	Gap Segment Length (ft.)	Construction Cost	Construction, Design & Permitting	Cost per Mile Construction, Design & Permitting
6	4	3	2	4	4	4	13	40							
Criteria															
Distance of Continuity	Trail Classification (I,II,III)	Shoreline Experience	Support in Local Plans	Degree of Environmental Impact/ Regulatory Context	Status of Property Control/ Ownership	Preliminary Design Identified	Cost Effectiveness								
1	2	1	1	3	3	2	2	15	7	1	8000.0	15779.22	\$3,189,927	\$4,146,905	\$1,387,626
1	2	1	1	3	4	2	2	16	6	1	8001.0	16115.19	\$3,257,847	\$4,235,201	\$1,387,626
3	4	0	2	2	1	3	12	27	2	1	8002.0	1830.4	\$55,000	\$71,500	\$206,250
2	4	0	2	2	1	1	8	20	17	1	8002.1	8033.7	\$1,025,000	\$1,332,500	\$875,761
1	4	0	2	2	1	2	6	18	23	1	8003.1	3253.7	\$2,500,000	\$3,250,000	\$5,273,996
2	4	0	2	2	1	2	5	18	23	1	8003.2	1706.5	\$1,000,000	\$1,300,000	\$4,022,268
1	2	1	1	3	4	2	5	19	2	1	8004.0	29340.44	\$1,535,385	\$1,996,001	\$359,193
2	2	0	1	4	4	1	12	26	3	1	8005.0	10250	\$27,368	\$34,209	\$17,622
2	1	0	2	2	0	1	12	20	17	1	8005.1	3898.2	\$10,000	\$13,000	\$17,608
1	1	0	2	2	4	2	10	22	12	1	8005.2	2714	\$5,000	\$6,500	\$12,646
1	1	0	2	3	4	2	9	22	12	1	8005.3	2100	\$5,000	\$6,500	\$16,343
1	2	0	2	2	1	2	5	15	27	1	8005.8	6968.5	\$800,000	\$1,040,000	\$788,003
1	4	0	1	3	4	2	6	21	15	1	8006.0	7454.6	\$75,366	\$94,208	\$66,726
2	4	1	2	2	1	4	8	24	7	1	8006.2	4230.1	\$185,000	\$240,500	\$300,191
1	4	1	2	2	4	4	8	26	3	1	8006.3	4796.7	\$30,000	\$39,000	\$42,930
1	4	2	2	2	3	4	6	24	7	1	8007.0	30498.1	\$2,005,000	\$2,606,500	\$451,252
1	1	2	2	2	4	4	4	20	17	1	8007.1	472.6	\$5,000	\$6,500	\$72,620
1	2	1	1	3	4	2	5	19	2	1	8008.0	36754.63	\$1,923,370	\$2,500,381	\$359,193
1	1	1	2	2	4	4	7	22	12	1	8009.0	1356.2	\$5,000	\$6,500	\$25,306
1	4	2	2	2	1	4	8	24	7	1	8010.1	7515.9	\$255,000	\$331,500	\$232,882

Appendix C: Implementation Ranking

Sonoma County

Point Range									TOTAL	RANK
6	4	3	2	4	4	4	13	40		
Criteria										
Distance of Continuity	Trail Classification (I,II,III)	Shoreline Experience	Support in Local Plans	Degree of Environmental Impact/Regulatory Context	Status of Property Control/Ownership	Preliminary Design Identified	Cost Effectiveness			
1	4	2	2	2	1	4	9	25	6	
1	2	3	2	2	0	4	1	15	27	
1	4	0	2	2	4	4	7	24	7	
1	1	0	1	1	2	1	1	8	30	
3	4	2	2	3	1	4	7	26	3	
1	4	0	2	3	2	4	2	18	23	
1	4	0	2	3	3	4	7	24	7	
3	4	2	2	3	1	4	12	31	1	
2	4	0	2	3	3	4	3	21	15	
1	2	1	1	3	4	2	5	19	2	

Project Category	Gap Segment Number	Gap Segment Length (ft.)	Construction Cost	Construction, Design & Permitting	Cost per Mile Construction, Design & Permitting
1	8010.2	2840.2	\$50,000	\$65,000	\$120,837
1	8011.1	707	\$650,000	\$845,000	\$6,310,608
1	8011.2	1143.3	\$10,000	\$13,000	\$60,037
4	8012.1	1238.1	\$1,874,409	\$2,436,732	\$10,391,684
1	8012.3	3291.5	\$1,005,000	\$1,306,500	\$2,095,798
1	8012.4	124.8	\$42,500	\$55,250	\$2,337,500
1	8012.5	632.3	\$10,000	\$13,000	\$108,556
1	8013.0	16702.3	\$565,000	\$734,500	\$232,193
1	8014.1	8008.5	\$2,005,000	\$2,606,500	\$1,718,464
1	8018.0	3908.73	\$204,544	\$265,907	\$359,193

The San Francisco Bay Trail Project Gap Analysis Study Marin County Implementation Ranking

NOTES: Implementation criteria definitions are provided on page one of this appendix. See Appendix A for cost estimate details and project category definitions.

Point Range								TOTAL	RANK	Project Category	Gap Segment Number	Gap Segment Length (ft.)	Construction Cost	Construction, Design & Permitting	Cost per Mile Construction, Design & Permitting
6	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	13	40						
Criteria															
Distance of Continuity	Trail Classification (1,11,11)	Shoreline Experience	Support in Local Plans	Degree of Environmental Impact/	Status of Property Control/ Ownership	Preliminary Design Identified	Cost Effectiveness								
0	1	2	1	4	4	1	1	14	53	4	9000.0	834.5	\$1,831,905	\$1,831,905	\$11,590,725
0	4	0	0	2	1	1	1	9	62	4	9001.0	811.7	\$1,228,865	\$1,781,854	\$11,590,725
2	1	0	1	2	1	1	8	16	45	1	9002.0	16851.8	\$380,869	\$457,042	\$143,200
2	4	0	1	2	1	1	8	19	35	1	9003.0	17141.7	\$2,568,357	\$3,338,864	\$1,028,440
4	4	1	2	1	1	1	10	24	16	1	9005.0	3636	\$331,891	\$398,269	\$578,344
0	4	1	2	2	1	1	5	16	45	1	9009.0	13038	\$2,672,222	\$3,473,889	\$1,406,821
5	4	2	2	2	2	2	12	31	3	1	9011.0	961.4	\$163,218	\$236,666	\$1,299,769
5	4	2	2	2	2	2	12	31	3	1	9013.0	5374.2	\$1,662,079	\$2,410,014	\$2,367,771
0	4	1	2	1	1	1	4	14	53	1	9015.0	9558.2	\$3,397,554	\$4,416,820	\$2,439,875
1	4	1	2	1	1	1	4	15	49	1	9022.0	6008.7	\$2,399,810	\$3,119,753	\$2,741,408
1	2	1	0	1	2	1	4	12	58	1	9024.0	7769	\$406,755	\$528,782	\$359,373
0	4	2	0	2	3	1	4	16	45	1	9027.0	12790	\$1,103,512	\$1,434,565	\$592,221
1	4	0	0	2	3	2	3	15	49	1	9030.0	3335.7	\$500,044	\$625,055	\$989,384
3	4	2	0	2	3	2	6	22	23	1	9032.0	5308.8	\$339,087	\$423,858	\$421,559
3	1	3	1	2	2	1	4	17	44	1	9034.0	8790.2	\$561,448	\$701,810	\$421,556
3	1	2	1	3	4	3	5	22	23	1	9035.0	6324.2	\$10,737	\$12,885	\$10,757
0	1	1	1	3	4	3	5	18	40	1	9036.0	4074.7	\$6,931	\$8,317	\$10,778
0	1	1	1	3	4	3	5	18	40	1	9037.0	2929	\$4,973	\$5,968	\$10,757
0	1	0	1	2	3	3	5	15	49	1	9038.0	6948.3	\$11,662	\$14,578	\$11,078
0	1	0	1	2	3	3	8	18	40	1	9038.1	3483.4	\$15,233	\$19,041	\$28,861
0	1	0	1	2	3	3	10	20	29	1	9039.0	3202.8	\$5,418	\$6,773	\$11,166
0	2	1	0	2	2	2	10	19	35	1	9040.0	581.3	\$5,941	\$7,426	\$67,453

Appendix C: Implementation Ranking

Marin County

Point Range								TOTAL	RANK	Project Category	Gap Segment Number	Gap Segment Length (ft.)	Construction Cost	Construction, Design & Permitting	Cost per Mile Construction, Design & Permitting
6	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	13	40						
Criteria															
Distance of Continuity	Trail Classification (I,II,III)	Shoreline Experience	Support in Local Plans	Degree of Environmental Impact	Status of Property Control/ Ownership	Preliminary Design Identified	Cost Effectiveness								
3	4	3	1	4	2	2	9	28	6	1	9041.0	2690.6	\$263,771	\$329,714	\$647,027
0	3	1	1	3	3	3	5	19	35	1	9042.0	1305.5	\$2,234	\$2,681	\$10,842
0	4	1	0	1	1	2	6	15	49	3	9043.1	1988.7	\$166,136	\$207,670	\$551,365
0	1	0	1	2	3	1	5	13	56	1	9043.2	7598.6	\$397,675	\$516,977	\$359,229
0	1	1	0	2	3	3	10	20	29	1	9044.0	1341.5	\$2,392	\$2,871	\$11,299
6	4	3	0	2	1	2	9	27	9	1	9049.0	1621.4	\$158,973	\$198,716	\$647,107
3	4	3	2	2	1	2	8	25	14	1	9055.0	1325.5	\$103,899	\$129,873	\$517,337
3	4	0	1	2	1	1	1	13	56	4	9057.0	5308.8	\$4,989,283	\$7,234,460	\$7,195,213
3	4	0	2	1	2	1	1	14	53	1	9058.0	151	\$228,711	\$297,324	\$10,396,511
3	4	2	2	2	1	1	1	16	45	1	9061.0	1229.5	\$3,600,180	\$4,320,216	\$18,552,859
6	4	1	1	2	2	2	10	28	6	1	9062.0	3182.1	\$634,694	\$825,103	\$1,369,078
3	4	3	1	3	2	2	6	24	16	1	9063.0	6635.4	\$423,800	\$529,750	\$421,539
0	3	2	0	3	1	2	7	18	40	1	9063.1	1754.4	\$154,241	\$200,513	\$603,459
3	4	3	2	2	2	2	5	23	20	1	9064.0	2272.1	\$630,000	\$756,000	\$1,756,824
5	2	0	1	2	2	2	6	20	29	1	9065.0	1306.2	\$161,022	\$209,328	\$846,158
0	4	0	1	2	1	1	1	10	60	4	9066.0	12769.1	\$19,331,651	\$28,030,894	\$11,590,725
3	4	3	2	2	3	3	12	32	1	1	9067.0	4099.3	\$342,670	\$445,471	\$573,778
0	0	2	2	3	4	4	6	21	26	1	9069.0	1182.6	\$200,000	\$260,000	\$1,160,832
0	0	2	2	3	4	4	6	21	26	1	9070.0	2438.6	\$4,000	\$5,200	\$11,259
0	4	1	2	2	4	4	3	20	29	1	9071.0	1812.7	\$271,646	\$353,139	\$1,028,618
3	4	0	2	2	4	4	7	26	12	1	9072.0	2241.5	\$660,763	\$792,916	\$1,867,765
2	1	0	1	1	1	1	5	12	58	1	9073.0	9528.9	\$388,157	\$504,604	\$279,603
2	4	1	2	2	4	4	8	27	9	1	9074.0	3270	\$427,042	\$427,042	\$689,536
3	2	1	2	2	2	2	5	19	35	1	9075.0	1648	\$16,727	\$20,908	\$66,988
2	3	2	2	3	3	2	4	21	26	1	9079.0	735.3	\$46,989	\$58,737	\$421,772
3	1	2	2	3	4	3	4	22	23	1	9080.0	2378.8	\$151,925	\$189,906	\$421,517

Appendix C: Implementation Ranking

Marin County

Point Range								TOTAL	RANK
6	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	13	40
Criteria									
Distance of Continuity	Trail Classification (I,II,III)	Shoreline Experience	Support in Local Plans	Environmental Impact/Degree of	Status of Property Control/Ownership	Preliminary Design Identified	Cost Effectiveness		
0	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	10	60
5	1	2	1	4	3	3	11	30	5
0	2	2	1	4	4	3	10	26	12
4	2	1	1	3	3	3	7	24	16
4	4	1	1	3	4	4	6	27	9
3	4	2	1	3	3	2	5	23	20
3	1	2	1	3	3	3	12	28	6
3	1	3	0	2	1	1	12	23	20
3	1	3	2	3	4	4	12	32	1
0	1	2	1	3	4	3	10	24	16
0	3	2	1	2	2	2	7	19	35
0	3	2	1	2	2	2	8	20	29
3	4	3	1	3	3	2	6	25	14
3	2	3	1	3	2	3	3	20	29

Project Category	Gap Segment Number	Gap Segment Length (ft.)	Construction Cost	Construction, Design & Permitting	Cost per Mile Construction, Design & Permitting
1	9082.0	23905.8	\$973,731	\$1,265,850	\$279,584
1	9083.0	1085.8	\$2,291	\$2,864	\$13,928
1	9086.0	4699.6	\$7,870	\$9,838	\$11,052
1	9089.0	386.6	\$20,325	\$26,422	\$360,862
1	9090.0	528.5	\$51,809	\$64,761	\$646,998
1	9092.0	7079.7	\$931,715	\$1,164,643	\$868,584
1	9093.0	1659.1	\$2,912	\$3,495	\$11,122
1	9095.0	2616.2	\$4,402	\$5,503	\$11,106
1	9102.0	1980.5	\$3,360	\$4,200	\$11,196
1	9103.0	2171.5	\$3,666	\$4,583	\$11,142
1	9104.0	3674.3	\$204,477	\$255,596	\$367,293
1	9105.0	2430.1	\$60,278	\$75,348	\$163,711
1	9107.0	1637.2	\$104,600	\$130,750	\$421,672
1	9108.0	1385.3	\$58,168	\$72,710	\$277,130

APPENDIX D: SURVEY



BAY TRAIL GAP SURVEY

For Map Segment ID #: 1

1. Please fill out one of these survey forms for each Bay Trail Gap segment shown in the attached map(s). The gaps are numbered on the map and in this survey – please be sure to match them in your responses.
2. We prefer that you respond to this survey online—see below for web address.
3. If you cannot use the online web site, please fill out each survey form by hand and return it in the enclosed envelope.
4. If you have any questions, please contact: Maureen Gaffney at 510.464.7909 or MaureenG@abag.ca.gov

Thanks for your help!

To complete this survey(s) online go to:

<http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=59504847661>

Important: Fill out one questionnaire for each individual numbered and highlighted segment on the enclosed map(s). The ID is shown above and on the inside of this questionnaire.

BAY TRAIL GAP ANALYSIS QUESTIONNAIRE

Thank you for taking the time to provide this information to us. Please call Maureen Gaffney at 510.464.7909 if you have questions. Please return the completed form(s) in the enclosed addressed envelope by February 25, 2005. If you are not the appropriate contact, please forward to the relevant person in your agency.

Agency Name:

Contact Name: Phone Number:

E-mail Address: Segment ID:

Segment
Length (miles):

Identify the proposed type of trail segment (select one):

- Bike lanes and sidewalk Signed bike route and sidewalks Separated Path Unknown

If the trail segment corridor will have more than one of the above characteristics, please separate into distinct segments and show new segment boundaries on the map.

Is the trail segment accurately represented on the attached map? Yes No

If not, please show the correct alignment on the map and describe changes below:

1. Is the trail segment included in a planning document?

(i.e. general plan, specific plan, bicycle-pedestrian master plan, trail plan, feasibility study, etc.)

Yes No

If yes, please list document title, year adopted or current status:

<i>Document Title:</i>	<i>Year Adopted:</i>	<i>Current Status:</i>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

2. Are cost estimates available for trail design and construction of this segment?

Yes No

If yes, please provide any available cost estimates:

	<i>Cost:</i>	<i>Year Estimated:</i>	<i>Source:</i>
Total Cost:	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Acquisition:	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Design:	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Environmental Review:	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Trail Construction:	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Other:	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

3. Has any funding been programmed or secured for this segment?

Yes No

Funding:

<i>Amount:</i>	<i>Schedule:</i>	<i>Source:</i>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

4. Is the trail segment (or any portion thereof) part of any PROPOSED project or development?

(if more than one development project is proposed along the segment, please list on the front page and indicate project locations and associated trail segments on the map.)

Yes No Estimated Segment Completion date:

Project Name:

Staff Contact Name: Phone Number:

Brief Description of Project:

5. Identify known obstacles to completing the trail segment by checking all relevant box(es):

A) Physical Constraints:

Slope Traffic Hazard Adjacent incompatible land use Railroad Crossing
Highway Condo Narrow right-of way Subject to flooding Other

Description:

B) Environmental Setting:

Wetland Habitat Sensitive species are present Bridge needed Boardwalk needed
Existing soil contamination Other

Description:

C) Land Use Constraints:

Located on private property Maintenance entity not identified Security or operational
restrictions Safety/liability concerns Other

Description:

D) Planning:

Not identified in local plans Dependent on development proposal Alternative
government is preferred Other

Description:

E) Political Setting:

Not supported by community Not a priority for the jurisdiction Other

Description:

F) Finances:

Funding for land acquisition required Environmental review or permitting not funded
Planning, design, or construction not funded Matching funds unavailable
Maintenance funds unavailable Other

Description:

G) Identify support for the segment (legislative, local groups, etc.):

6. Given the above obstacles along this segment, is there an alternative feasible alignment that could be constructed avoiding the identified obstacles?

 Yes No

If yes, please describe and show new alignment on the map:

7. Is there an opportunity for an improved Bay Trail alignment in this area?
(i.e. should the alignment be moved closer to the shoreline, can it be separated from traffic, is there a more direct continuous route, etc.)

 Yes No

If yes, please describe and show new alignment on the map:

Notes

APPENDIX E: TRAIL USAGE METHODOLOGY

Trail Usage Methodology

The Trail Demand Model created by Alta Planning + Design is an attempt to provide a systematic approach to estimating potential trail usage for new and developing trail systems in a variety of locations. The model builds on published data and provides several methods of 'factoring' demand to reflect local knowledge and conditions. Where possible, the model is calibrated to actual counts so that its accuracy can be improved. The table below shows the inputs used to develop demand estimates by County for the Bay Trail.

TRAIL USAGE ESTIMATING TOOL	SF ENTER HERE	MARIN	COCO	SOL	SON	SMAT	ALA	SCLARA	NAPA
1. Quality of Completed Pathway /1 1 = poor 2 = fair 3 = good 4 = excellent	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
2. Area climate 1 = heavy and extended rain-snow 2 = some rain/snow 3 = limited rain only 4 = very mild	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
3. Population of towns/cities directly served b (round to 1,000s) Percent of county population	776 100%	171 69%	260 27%	142 36%	68 15%	514 73%	1027.5 71%	558.5 33%	86 69%
4. Population of other towns/cities within 20 m (round to 1,000s)	200	63	640	133	161	193	169	820	1
5. Annual tourist person visits to area (round to 1,000s)	15000 13500	1742 1393.6	2952 1476	1978 989	4458 891.6	10125 9112.5	7026 6323.4	8915 1783	2627 525.4
Proximity factor	0.9	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.2	0.9	0.9	0.2	0.2
ESTIMATED ANNUAL USAGE	15,384,192	3,337,169	5,101,993	2,772,837	1,351,251	10,201,515	19,962,112	10,860,392	1,669,450

Notes:

/1 Poor = at least two of these three items: less than 1 mile in length, poor access, or unattractive environment

Fair = at least two of these five items: over 1 mile in length, reasonable access, serves major destinations, serves major transit center, neutral or attractive environment

Good = at least three of these five items: over 2 miles in length, good access, serves a major destination(s), serves major transit center, attractive environment

Excellent = at least four of these five items: over 2 miles in length, good access, serves a major destination(s), serves major transit center, attractive environment

/3 Enter 1 if local population 1,000 or less

/4 Exclude town/city directly served by trail

/5 Contact State or Local Tourism Department

Factors that influence trail use, from quality of the completed trail system, area climate, base population directly served by the trail, regional population within 20 miles or less of the trail, and annual tourists are collected and entered into the model. A proximity factor is then assigned to the visitor figures, which reflects the fact that visitors are more likely to use the Bay Trail where it is located very close to other visitor destinations, hotels, etc. Calculations are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{Population directly served by trail (rounded to 000s):} \quad \times 10,000 \\
 & \quad (+) \\
 & \text{Regional population within 20 miles (rounded to 000s):} \quad \times 48 \\
 & \quad (+) \\
 & \text{Visitors (rounded to 000s, factored by proximity factor):} \quad \times 18 \\
 & \quad (\times) \\
 & \text{(Quality and Climate score} \times .24) \\
 & \quad = \\
 & \text{Future (build-out) Usage Estimate}
 \end{aligned}$$

To derive the existing usage figure, the future figure is factored by the percentage the Bay Trail is complete in each county. For example, the future build-out usage figure for Sonoma County is 1,351,251. Since the Bay Trail is only 5% complete in Sonoma County, this figure is factored to 67,563 annual users to reflect existing usage.