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Executive Summary

The Caltrans District 3, Complete Streets Implementation Plan (D3-CSIP) is a comprehensive plan that identifies a vision and framework for complete streets improvements on the State Highway that facilitates livable communities. It identifies key policies, standards and guidance, and projects needed to create complete street applications within District 3 on the State Highway System (SHS). The document provides high level guidance and recommendations on how District 3 and our stakeholders can work together in the region to achieve a vision where the state highway can serve both the local community and the greater traveling public. The document also includes a list of recommended SHS segments in the District where complete streets is most easily achieved. It includes the following sections:

BACKGROUND
Legislative mandates and policies in this document mandate the planning, programming, designing, operating, and maintaining complete streets. Developing complete streets will require the collaboration of Caltrans and our stakeholders.

STANDARDS AND GUIDANCE
Caltrans uses several standards and guidance that incorporate complete street elements. These standards and guidance provide flexibility while maintaining the safety and integrity of the state’s transportation system. The engineer is empowered to exercise sound judgment in applying standards in the design of multimodal transportation projects. This includes state highways that also function as main streets, as they can improve multimodal travel and contribute to livable communities.

RECOMMENDED COMPLETE STREETS
Priority is given to ensuring consistency with city or county general plans, complete street plans, bicycle plans, pedestrian plans, active transportation plans, and safe routes to school plans, unless the local proposal is inconsistent with the allowable use of the SHS, because of safety considerations, environmental conditions, Right-of-Way (ROW) limitations, financial conditions, maintenance considerations, or other factors. See Table ES-1 and Figure 1 for the 69 recommended SHS segments, which support the District’s vision for complete streets.

District 3 recommends the proceeding 69 SHS complete street segments to be included in future fiscally constrained planning documents, such as Transportation Concept Reports (TCRs), Corridor System Management Plans (CSMPs), and corridor studies. These segments are intended for future prioritization and inclusion in fiscally constrained planning documents. Caltrans will use these documents to form the basis for capital improvements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>State Route</th>
<th>ID Number</th>
<th>Recommended Complete Street Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JT</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Chico Nord Avenue Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Class II, ADA ramps, and crosswalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>Class II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Streetscape Design Plan for Highway 99, Gridley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1, 3</td>
<td>Class II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Class II, sidewalks, ADA ramps, crosswalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>Class II, sidewalks, and ADA ramps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>City of Colusa Market Street/SR-20 &amp; 45 Complete Street Concept Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Class II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Class II, Diamond Springs and El Dorado Area Mobility and Livable Community Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Class I, Class II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Class II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Class II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Class III, ADA ramps, curbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1-2, 4-8</td>
<td>Class III, multi-use shoulders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Class II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Class II, pedestrian/bicycle tunnel, sidewalks, and ADA ramps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Class II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>Class III, multi-use shoulders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Class II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Class I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>American River Crossing Alternatives Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1, 3-7</td>
<td>Share the Road, multi-use shoulders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Share the Road, widen shoulders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Share the Road, multi-use shoulders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Class II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collaborative Highway 99 Streetscape Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Meyers Area Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
District 3 Recommended Complete Street Facilities
Caltrans Mission Statement

Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated, and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability.

Introduction

Purpose and Need
In line with our mission, the purpose of District 3 Complete Streets Implementation Plan (D3-CSIP) is to create the District’s first comprehensive plan that identifies a vision and framework for complete streets improvements on the State Highway System (SHS) that facilitates livable communities.

Vision Statement for Complete Streets in District 3

Caltrans District 3, and regional and local partners will coordinate and collaborate to plan, design, operate, and maintain complete streets on the State Highway System. These complete streets will serve both the local community and the greater traveling public.

The D3-CSIP provides information regarding the policies and guidance for complete street applications on the SHS in District 3, along with recommendations and guidance to further develop complete streets to facilitate livable communities. This plan also includes a list of recommended SHS segments in the District where complete streets is most easily achieved.

This planning effort builds upon previous planning studies and products that identified a need to develop a comprehensive system of complete streets improvements on the SHS within District 3. One major product is the Caltrans District 3, State Highway Bicycle Facility Plan. The purpose of this plan is to create a vision and framework for bicycle facility improvements on the SHS in District 3. The plan provides information regarding bicycle facilities on the SHS along with recommended changes to improve connectivity and convenience. In addition, District 3 produced the Caltrans District 3, Complete Streets Inventory. The purpose of the inventory is to compile a comprehensive inventory of existing bike and pedestrian facilities on the SHS segments within District 3. It includes post mile segment information, location information, bikeway classification, presence of sidewalks, curb extensions, pedestrian crossings, and number of travel lanes. Each segment includes the Google location map and a street view image.


The D3-CSIP builds upon local agency plans by considering the desires of our local and regional transportation partners. However, in some cases, Caltrans’ recommendations differ, because of safety considerations, environmental conditions, Right-of-Way (ROW) limitations, financial conditions, maintenance considerations, or other factors.

**Background**

In 2008, Caltrans adopted Deputy Directive (DD) 64-R1—Complete Streets—Integrating the Transportation System. This directive advances the strategic goal of considering bicyclists, pedestrians, motorists, and transit users in all our projects. With this directive, Caltrans took an important step towards multimodal transportation in California.

A complete street is a transportation facility that is planned, designed, operated, and maintained to provide the safe mobility for all users, including bicyclists, pedestrians, transit vehicles, truckers, and motorists, appropriate to the function and context of the facility. Complete Street concepts apply to all roadways in all contexts, including rural, suburban, and urban areas.

Source: Caltrans, Final Draft Complete Street Implementation Action Plan 2.0., June 2014

By improving conditions for bicycling, walking, and transit, complete streets promote a healthy and active lifestyle. By increasing the number of people biking and walking, complete streets can improve a community’s livability, public health, and economic activity. Complete streets also increases travel options, and enables environmentally, sustainable alternatives to single occupant vehicle trips.

Complete Streets benefit communities of all sizes, especially in small towns in rural areas. Rural towns have more automobile traffic collisions, while urban areas have more pedestrian and bicyclist traffic collisions. Small towns in rural areas have more seniors and low income populations that are less likely to have a car or drive. These groups have limited transportation options. Public transportation and carpooling to reach jobs, groceries, medical appointments, and schools can be a lifeline. Also, children in rural areas are at greater risk of obesity than children in other areas. Providing a safe opportunity for
children to walk and bike to and from school is a key strategy to keep children active and healthy. Creating safe walking, bicycling, and public transportation options for rural residents creates a more livable and accessible community for everyone.

Complete streets also supports the California Complete Streets Act of 2008 (Assembly Bill (AB) 1358), the California Global Warming Solutions Act (AB 32), the California Transportation Plan 2040 (Senate Bill (SB) 391), and regional sustainable communities strategy goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (SB 375).

In addition, according to Caltrans and the National Complete Streets Coalition, incorporating complete streets in early planning and project development phases may result in some complete street projects saving money by avoiding costly and time-consuming re-work that often happens if all modes are not successfully integrated when technical decisions are initially made.

AB 1358 California Complete Streets Act of 2008
This law requires a city or county to identify in their general plan how they will accommodate a balanced, multimodal transportation network that meets the needs of all users of the roadway defined to include motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, children, person with disabilities, seniors, movers of commercial goods, and users of public transportation, in a manner that is suitable to the rural, suburban, or urban context of the general plan.

Local governments are required to include this new provision in their General Plans when they update their Circulation Element.


Developing a complete street requires collaboration throughout Caltrans functional areas and among our stakeholders.

This plan has identified 69 segments where a state highway could be a complete street. This is great opportunity for Caltrans and local agencies to leverage federal and state funding to increase biking and walking while enhancing California cities and towns—one complete street at a time.

With this plan, Caltrans welcomes partnerships with regional and local agencies to plan, deliver, and maintain complete streets on the SHS.
Stakeholder Participation
Caltrans coordinated with various stakeholders throughout the development of the D3-CSIP. Outreach efforts involved internal and external stakeholders, tribes, and local and regional agencies. Stakeholders were contacted for initial input related to their particular specializations, and to verify data sources that were used as well as data accuracy. As the document was finalized, stakeholders were asked to review the document for comments, edits, and consistency with the intent of existing plans, policies, and procedures. Written comments were received and incorporated into the final document. The process of including and working closely with stakeholders adds value to the D3-CSIP, allows for outside input, provides an opportunity for ideas to be reflected in the document, increases credibility, and helps strengthen public support and trust.

Caltrans Policies on Multimodal Transportation
The following policies have set forth Caltrans’ commitment to complete streets.

Director’s Policy 22--Context Sensitive Solutions (DP-22)
This Director’s Policy promotes the integration and balance of transportation needs with the goals of the community. Caltrans will take a collaborative approach with communities and stakeholders in planning, maintaining, and operating the transportation system. This approach includes identifying the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians. Caltrans will also consider and examine the feasibility of funding and maintenance, impact of alternate routes and safety, and any relevant laws, rules, and regulations, and balance transportation needs with goals of the community. For more information, see www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/ocip/tel/dp-22.pdf.

Deputy Directive 64-R1 (DD-64-R1)--Complete Streets--Integrating the Transportation System
This Deputy Directive focuses on accommodating non-motorized travel on state facilities, addressing the safety, access, and mobility needs for all travelers, including bicyclists, pedestrians, transit riders, and motorists. The directive focuses on partnerships between Caltrans and other stakeholders to develop a complete streets network. This goal will be accomplished through multimodal projects that provide a balance of community goals, plans, and values. For more information, see www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/complete_streets/files/dd_64_r1_signed.pdf.

This Policy Directive refers to the process that transportation agencies are using to identify the most effective intersection control treatments to the facility. ICE is largely focused on the possibility of constructing roundabouts instead of signalized intersections. It has replaced Traffic Signal Warrant evaluation. For more information, see www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/signtech/signdel/policy/13-01pdf.
Standards and Guidance on Designing and Implementing Complete Streets

Caltrans uses several standards and guidance documents that incorporate complete street elements.

Caltrans is continually improving its standards and processes to provide flexibility while maintaining the safety and integrity of the state’s transportation system. This commitment is evident in the May 2012 update to the *Highway Design Manual* (HDM) to facilitate the design of complete streets, recognizing that the SHS needs to be multimodal, not just for cars and trucks. The manual can be found at--

www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd/hdm/hdmtoc.htm

Caltrans’ philosophy and flexible approach toward designing multimodal transportation projects on the SHS is reflected in the HDM, Chapter 80. It provides a guide for the engineer to exercise **sound judgment** in applying standards, consistent with the above Project Development philosophy, in the design of projects.

This guidance allows for flexibility in applying design standards and approving design exceptions that take the context of the project location into consideration, which enables the designer to tailor the design, as appropriate, for the specific circumstances while maintaining safety.

To also support the philosophy of flexibility in design, Caltrans recently published *Main Street, California, A Guide for Improving Community Vitality*. This guide emphasizes investments on California highways that function as a local main street and can improve multimodal travel and contribute to livable and sustainable communities. The guide is available at


Caltrans recently endorsed two urban street and bicycle design guides from the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO). These two guides include the *Urban Street Design Guide* and the *Urban Bikeway Design Guide*. For more information, see www.nacto.org. Caltrans also endorsed the Institute of Transportation (ITE)’s *Designing Urban Walkable Throughfares*. Caltrans and stakeholders can reference all three resources when making planning and design decisions on the SHS and local streets and roads. For more information about the ITE, see www.ite.org.

For standards on signs, markings, and traffic control design, refer to the *California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices* at dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/engineering/mutcd/pdf/camutcd2012/Part0.pdf.

Additional standards and guidance on designing and implementing complete streets can be found in appendix A. All documents must be evaluated for consistency with Caltrans policies and guidance. These documents are continuously updated and available at the links above.
Goods Movement, and Complete Streets

Complete streets should also advance the mobility of goods in District 3. Freight movement, in the form of truck deliveries and pick-ups, are integral to providing goods to businesses.

According to the Resources Systems Group (RSG), states, cities, and counties can harmonize goods movement and complete streets by: 1) developing complete street plans that support goods movement in mind, 2) asking freight operators and stakeholders about their needs and what could work for them, and 3) thinking beyond design, through the incorporation of Context Sensitive Design Solutions with DP-22.

With regards to goods movement and roundabouts, there is a need to accommodate the large truck using intersections according to the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP)’s Roundabouts: An Informational Guide. The turning path requirements of a large truck or design vehicle, will dictate the dimensions of a roundabout. If the widths and turning requirements are too tight, it can create difficulties for large trucks. The design vehicle will depend on the approaching roadway types and the surrounding land use. Contact Caltrans to identify the appropriate design vehicle for a given site. AASHTO’s A Policy on Geometric Design on Highways and Streets provides further information at https://bookstore.transportation.org.

District 3 is preparing the Caltrans District 3 Goods Movement Plan (GMP). The purpose of the D3 GMP is to close information gaps, develop a project planning prioritization framework, improve planning integration, and enhance regional coordination. The challenges for the future include providing facilities for efficient and effective goods movement, which are not in conflict with peak period travel and livable communities. More information can be found at http://sites/google.com/site/d03goodsmovement/.

System Planning and Complete Streets

Additional vision and guidance is derived from the District 3’s long range system planning function within the Division of Transportation Planning. The Office of System and Freight Planning produces the District System Management and Development Plan (DSMDP), Transportation Concept Reports (TCRs), and Corridor System Management Plans (CSMPs). Guidance for the development of TCRs was recently updated to enhance the inclusion of complete streets related information.

The DSMDP is a compilation of the District System Management Plan and the Transportation System Development Program. It identifies key policies, programs, and projects including bicycle facilities and complete street facilities to support our mission. TCRs are long-range planning document for a highway. The purpose of the TCR is to determine how a state highway will be improved and managed.
over a 20 year period to maintain a minimum acceptable level of service. CSMPs are 10 year comprehensive, integrated management plans for all travel modes, including bicycle and pedestrian facilities in a congested SHS corridor that analyze travel conditions, and propose how to maximize the existing infrastructure by coordinating proven Intelligent Transportation System and operational methods and technologies.

District 3 System and Freight Planning collaborates with local jurisdictions, transit providers, tribal governments, and regional agencies on updates to DSMDP, TCRs, and CSMPs to better align mutual long-range planning goals for the corridor.

**Smart Mobility 2010: A Call to Action for the Next Decade**

The Smart Mobility Framework (SMF) is a new approach to integrate transportation and land use. Smart Mobility Framework is a policy and action framework. It responds to the transportation needs of people and businesses, the mandate to address climate change, and the commitment to a transportation system that advances social equity and environmental justice. For more information, see www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/smf_files/SMF_handbook_062210.pdf

The SMF introduces the SMF Place Types as a tool to create a context for transportation investment and opportunity to obtain Smart Mobility benefits. The place types are a tool for the general classification of towns, cities, and larger areas. In District 3, we have identified six SMF Place Types for complete streets: 1) urban centers, 2) close-in compact communities, 3) compact communities, 4) suburban communities, 5) rural and agricultural lands, and 6) protected lands. See below for examples and descriptions of these place type communities.
**Urban Centers**

These areas are highly dense, mixed use places with well connected streets. These areas, in general, have many jobs per household, transit service is very frequent, and pedestrians find it easy to walk around. A local example would be Downtown Sacramento on I-5.
**Close-in Compact Communities**

These areas are near urban areas. They are mostly comprised of housing with mixed commercial centers. The arterial corridors form the backbone of the transportation system. Transit is available to connect areas, but mostly for commute trips only. A local example would be Downtown Chico on State Route 99.
Compact Communities
These areas are compact, and have many historical buildings. There is a strong presence of community design elements in the community. A local example would be Downtown Colusa on State Route 20.

Suburban Communities
These areas separate housing, jobs, retail, and services, making walking, transit, and driving difficult. Also, streets are not connected, and there is limited transit service and lots of parking. A local example would be in Yuba City on State Route 20.
**Rural and Agricultural Lands**

These areas are widely spaced towns separated by farms, vineyards, orchards, and grazing lands. A local example would be Grimes on State Route 45.

**Protected Lands**

These areas are rural compact towns, and are located in lands protected for open space or natural resource. The focus of these towns is tourism and recreation. A local example would be Tahoe City on State Route 28.
Main Street, California

Caltrans can best demonstrate our commitment to DD-64-R1 on SHS segments that function as main streets through communities. These locations are ideal for Caltrans to demonstrate complete street concepts which enhance the multimodal street network. In cities and counties throughout District 3, state highways move people and goods through the region and to local destinations. Certain sections of the state highway run through communities, and also serve as both thoroughfares and main streets. These main street highways provide local access for a community while serving regional mobility needs.

Incorporating principles of livability and sustainability into main street projects can help balance the need for an efficient multimodal transportation facility with local needs. Specific main street roadway features can improve livability, such as, the addition of bicycle lanes, wide sidewalks, transit shelters, and attractive street trees and landscaping. In keeping with DD 64-R1, and the recently updated HDM, incorporating complete street concepts into main streets is essential to providing comfortable access for all.

Appropriate roadway design is critical to creating favorable travel conditions for bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit riders. It must feel comfortable to bike, walk, and take transit. It is also essential that access be provided to enhance the mobility for travelers with disabilities, ensuring that the facility is accessible to all. Caltrans Design Information Bulletin (DIB) 82 provides current guidance on compliance with federal and state laws regarding pedestrian accessibility. The Caltrans HDM also discusses ADA design requirements. Main street designs must accommodate the size and maneuverability of transit vehicles. Transit shelters and facilities must be located to provide efficient pedestrian access to the facility and not obstruct pedestrians not using public transit. Transit design standards can be found in the HDM and the AASHTO publications: A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets and Guide for Geometric Design of Transit Facilities on Highways and Streets. For more information, see http://bookstore/transportation/org.

Caltrans provides extensive guidance and standards for the SHS in the HDM. The HDM allows for flexibility in applying design standards that take the context of the project into consideration, enabling the local or regional partner to tailor the design as appropriate to the site. Sometimes, this results in a design exception process. In other cases, if the community’s desires are outside what is allowed within the HDM, it may be appropriate for the community to accept ownership of all or a portion of the SHS main street through the legislative relinquishment process. A relinquishment is a conveyance of all rights, titles and interests of a state highway, or portion thereof, to a county or city. The relinquishment of facilities—roadway, sidewalks—allows local agencies to assume the administration, planning, design, construction, maintenance, and operation of that facility. For more information about relinquishment of Caltrans right of way, see chapters 13 and 25 of the Caltrans Project Development Procedures Manual and chapter 6 of the Caltrans Right of Way Manual.
For more information on Main Streets, see Caltrans’ Main Street, California: Guide for Improving Community and Transportation Vitality at www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/mainstreet.

**Intersection Control Evaluation**

An Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) process should be done to identify the most effective intersection control treatment appropriate to a facility. ICE is a process whereby a balanced approach is taken to examine the addition, expansion, or control of major intersections. See Caltrans Traffic Operations Policy Directive 13-02: Intersection Control Evaluation. www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/signtech/signdel/policy/13-01pdf.

**Complete Intersections**

It is important that motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists be able to see one another approaching, and to not have their sight distance blocked by parked vehicles, trees, and transit vehicles at intersections. The following guiding principles summarize common considerations. These principles should be used to guide the development of pedestrian and bicycle accommodations in project scoping, planning, and design phases at intersections:

**Observe**—Watch how the intersection is being used. How do bicyclists, pedestrians, transit users, and motorists currently use the intersection? Intersection designs should encourage legal movements, according to the California Vehicle Code.

**Pedestrians and Bicyclists Will Be There**—Expect pedestrians and bicyclists to travel anywhere it is legal. They will use the facility, regardless of perceived safety concerns.

**Maintain and Improve**—When improving an intersection, do not remove existing non-motorized facilities or reduce safety or mobility for pedestrians and bicyclists. Instead, improve existing facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists.

**Tee it up**—Bring intersections to a 90-degree angle. This forces motorists to make slower turns at intersections.

**One Decision at a Time**—Design intersections so motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists only need to make one decision at a time.

**Slow it Down**—Where appropriate, use treatments that reduce speed of motorists at intersections while maintaining operational efficiency.

**Shorten Crossing**—Reducing crossing distance reduces the time it takes for pedestrians and bicyclists to cross, resulting in less exposure to crashes.
Improve Visibility—Ensure visibility of pedestrians and bicyclists by providing ample sight distance at crosswalks, lighting, weaving, merging, and crossing areas. Install appropriate pedestrian and bicyclist markings, signage, and signals.

Clarify the Right-of-Way—Use design treatments clarify to pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists who have the right-of-way.

Keep it Direct—Design pedestrian and bicycle paths to be as direct as possible, and as safe as possible.

Light at Night—Install lighting at pedestrian and bicycle crossing, weaving and merging areas, and along shared use paths.

Access for All—Design facilities so that pedestrians and bicyclists of all abilities, ages, and skills can use them with ease. Pedestrian facilities must be reconstructed to meet or exceed ADA requirements.

Complete Interchanges
Pedestrians and bicyclists often must cross freeway ramps at interchanges, unless prohibited. Even when pedestrians and bicyclists are allowed, interchanges are not always the most comfortable places to walk or bike. According to Caltrans’s Complete Intersections guide, the best interchange design for pedestrians and bicyclists are those where the ramps intersect the crossroad at a 90-degree angle, and where the intersection is controlled by a roundabout, stop sign, or signal. This intersection design causes motorists to slow down before turning, increasing the likelihood that they will see and yield to pedestrians and bicyclists. While we did not address specific interchanges in this document, there are interchange locations in District 3 where pedestrian and bicycle accessibility can be improved.

Recommended Complete Streets List and Methodology

The D3-CSIP includes a list of 69 recommended SHS segments, which support the District’s vision for complete streets based on the following criteria and delineated in Table 1: Recommended Complete Street Facilities and maps in Figures 2-13.

Priority is given to ensuring consistency with city or county general plans, complete street plans, bicycle plans, pedestrian plans, active transportation plans, and safe routes to school plans, unless the local proposal is inconsistent with the allowable use of the SHS, because of safety considerations, environmental conditions, ROW limitations, financial conditions, maintenance considerations, or other factors.

1) Complete streets investments yield the highest Smart Mobility benefits can be achieved.
2) Complete streets elements are diverse and multimodal. The context of the facility best determines the appropriate complete street elements.
3) Some complete streets elements require maintenance agreements between Caltrans and local agencies.
4) Some complete streets elements are appropriate after an ICE process has been completed to identify the most effective intersection control appropriate to the SHS.

District 3 recommends 69 SHS complete street segments to be included in future fiscally constrained planning documents, such as TCRs, CSMPs, and corridor studies. This list is intended for future prioritization and inclusion in fiscally constrained planning documents. Caltrans will use these documents to form the basis for capital improvements.

These 69 SHS facilities have the potential to support complete streets on the SHS. This comprehensive list has been compiled to better understand the future of complete streets and to evaluate future additional needs from Caltrans and our partners.

Three typical bikeway classifications are used frequently in the project listing, and identified as Class I, Class II, or Class III bicycle facility. Each class of bikeways should not be construed that one is better than the other, because each class of bikeway has its appropriate application. The three bikeway designations are described and illustrated in Appendix B and in Figure 14. In addition to bikeways, there are non-designated facilities on the SHS that include Share the Road designation. A Share the Road facility differs from a Class III bicycle facility in that the Share the Road facility is not officially designated as a bike route, but bicyclists may still use the facility.

**Share the Road Disclaimer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most bicycle travel now occurs on streets and highways without bicycle designations. In many cases, streets and highway segments are adequate for safe and efficient bicycle travel. Signing and pavement markings for bicycle travel may be unnecessary.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Share the Road designation in this document has been used for all state highways where bicycles are not prohibited, and where bike lanes or bike routes are not proposed, or do not exist. This does not mean Share the Road warning signs should be placed on all conventional highways that have no other bicycle designation. Share warning signs are used only where paved shoulders are narrow, and there are sufficient traffic and bicyclist volumes to cause safety concerns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Complete streets projects vary in Smart Mobility Place Type and existing complete street features. Smart Mobility Place Types range from urban centers to protected lands. Most refer to planning documents, such as complete streets plans, bicycle plans, and TCRs. Many feature Share the Road facilities, and do not include sidewalks on both sides of the highway. Other facilities include ADA ramps, crosswalks, underpass, shoulders, and roundabouts, where appropriate.

Where allowable and not constrained by safety or other factors, the local agency can sponsor and pursue the improvement included in their plan through encroachment permits, maintenance agreements, and other means to be determined.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</th>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th>Recommended Complete Street Facility</th>
<th>Existing Bike Facility</th>
<th>Existing Sidewalk</th>
<th>Planning Documents</th>
<th>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BUTTE COUNTY, BUT 32, 6.238/7.11, TCR 6</td>
<td>BUTTE COUNTY, BUT 32, 6.238/7.11, TCR 6</td>
<td><strong>SR-32 (Nord Avenue) from West/East Avenue to West 8th Avenue, Chico</strong></td>
<td>Share the Road facility, Class II facility begins in TCR segment 7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2006 Chico Nord Avenue (SR-32) Corridor Plan (2006 CNACP), 2011 Butte County Bike Plan (2011 BCBP), 2011 SR-32, TCR</td>
<td>Close In Compact Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BUTTE COUNTY, BUT 32, 7.11/R8.367, TCR 7</td>
<td>BUTTE COUNTY, BUT 32, 7.11/R8.367, TCR 7</td>
<td><strong>SR-32 (Nord Avenue) from West 8th Avenue to West 1st Street, Chico</strong></td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2006 CNACP, 2011 BCBP, 2011 SR-32 TCR</td>
<td>Close In Compact Communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Chico Nord Avenue Plan's goals: 1) improve physical street, walking and sidewalks and pedestrian networks, 2) manage the quantity and quality of walking, bicycling (Class II) and transit facilities and services, 3) improve connectivity to isolated neighborhoods, 4) increase the efficiency and safety of intersections, 5) provide a set of mixed-use centers, and 6) create a strong, compelling set of incentives to encourage more sustainable and healthy non-motorized travel.

Table 1: Recommended Complete Street Facilities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</th>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th>Recommended Complete Street Facility</th>
<th>Existing Bike Facility</th>
<th>Existing Sidewalk</th>
<th>Planning Documents</th>
<th>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BUTTE COUNTY, BUT 32, R8.814/9407L , TCR 9</td>
<td>SR-32 (West 8th Street) from Walnut Street to Pine Street, Chico</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility. Add ADA ramps, sidewalks and crosswalks.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2011 BCBP, 2011 SR-32 TCR</td>
<td>Close In Compact Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BUTTE COUNTY, BUT 32, R8.866/R9.406R, TCR 9</td>
<td>SR-32 (West 9th Street) from Walnut Street to Pine Street, Chico</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2011 BCBP, 2011 SR-32 TCR</td>
<td>Close In Compact Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BUTTE COUNTY, BUT 32, R9.406R/10.242R, TCR 10</td>
<td>SR-32 (West 9th Street) from Pine Street to Fir Street, Chico</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2011 BCBP, 2011 SR-32 TCR</td>
<td>Close In Compact Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</td>
<td>Project Location¹</td>
<td>Recommended Complete Street Facility²</td>
<td>Existing Bike Facility</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Planning Documents³</td>
<td>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BUT 32, 10.242R/12.406, TCR 11</td>
<td>SR-32 from Fir Street to Yosemite Drive, Chico</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2011 BCBP, 2011 SR-32 TCR</td>
<td>Close In Compact Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BUT 99, R3.968/4.556, TCR 15</td>
<td>SR-99 from Cherry Street to Ford Avenue, Gridley</td>
<td>Within Gridley city limits, consider a road diet, class II bicycle facility, on-street parking, planting strips, street trees, central landscaped median, traffic calming, shorter pedestrian crossings, roundabouts, pedestrian and disability accessible design improvements, and streetscape improvements.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2002 Gridley Highway 99 Streetscape Final Report, 2010 SR-99 TCR</td>
<td>Suburban Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID#</td>
<td>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</td>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Recommended Complete Street Facility</td>
<td>Existing Bike Facility</td>
<td>Planning Documents</td>
<td>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTTE COUNTY</td>
<td>BUT 162, 15.805/17.14, TCR 8</td>
<td>SR-162 (Oro Dam Rd.) from SR-70 to Lincoln Street, Oroville</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2011 BCBP, 2011 SR-162 TCR</td>
<td>Suburban Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BUT 162, 17.14/17.826, TCR 8</td>
<td>SR-162 (Oro Dam Blvd.) from Lincoln Street to Medical Center Drive, Oroville</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility. Add sidewalks and ADA ramps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTTE COUNTY</td>
<td>BUT 162, 17.826/17.940, TCR 8</td>
<td>SR-162 (Oro Dam Rd.) from Medical Center Street to Executive Parkway, Oroville</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility. Add sidewalks and ADA ramps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2011 BCBP, 2030 City of Oroville General Plan, 2010 Draft City of Oroville Bicycle Transportation Plan, 2011 SR-162 TCR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2011 BCBP, 2011 SR-162 TCR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class II bicycle facility.!!!Add sidewalks and ADA ramps.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</th>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th>Recommended Complete Street Facility</th>
<th>Existing Bike Facility</th>
<th>Existing Sidewalk</th>
<th>Planning Documents</th>
<th>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BUTTE COUNTY BUT 162, 17.940/18.457, TCR 8</td>
<td>SR 162 (Olive Highway) from Executive Parkway to Foothill Blvd., Oroville</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility. Add sidewalks and ADA ramps.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2011 BCBP; 2011 SR-162 TCR</td>
<td>Suburban Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</td>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Recommended Complete Street Facility</td>
<td>Existing Bike Facility</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Planning Documents</td>
<td>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>COL 20, 31.08/31.84, TCR 3</td>
<td>SR-20/SR-45, from 10th Street to Bridge Street, Colusa</td>
<td>The city of Colusa Market Street/SR-20 &amp; SR-45 Complete Streets Concept Plan’s goals include: 1) improve the overall safety and usability of the Market Street/SR-20 &amp; SR-45 corridor for pedestrians; 2) enhance connectivity along the corridor for all modes of travel; 3) calm automobile traffic; and 4) preserve and enhance Colusa’s small town character and identity.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2012 Colusa County Bicycle Plan--Draft (2012 CCBP--Draft), 2010 City of Colusa Market Street/SR 20/45 Complete Streets Concept Plan (2010 CCMS), 2013 SR-20 TCR</td>
<td>Compact Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>COL 45, 12.408/12.839, TCR 2</td>
<td>SR-45 (2nd Street) from E Leven Street to 5th Street, Main Street, Grimes</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2012 CCBP--Draft, 2009 SR-45 TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</td>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Recommended Complete Street Facility</td>
<td>Existing Bike Facility</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Planning Documents</td>
<td>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ED 49, 10.074/11.859, TCR 3</td>
<td>SR-49, from El Dorado Diamond Springs, El Dorado</td>
<td>The purpose of the Diamond Springs and El Dorado Area Mobility and Livable Community Plan is to provide the communities of Diamond Springs and El Dorado with a menu of options from which they can make informed decisions about transportation infrastructure improvements that will help shape the future of their community. Complete Street features could include shoulders, enhanced shoulders, Class I bike facilities, Class II bike facilities, Class III facilities, detached sidewalks, attached sidewalks, medians, enhanced intersections, and organized parking.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Diamond Springs and El Dorado Area Mobility and Livable Community Plan, February 18, 2014, El Dorado County Bicycle Transportation Plan Update 2010 (EDCBTP 2010)</td>
<td>Compact Communities and Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ED 49, 14.59/15.058, TCR 6</td>
<td>SR-49, from Sacramento Street to Spring Street, Placerville</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>EDCBTP 2010, 2000 SR-49 TCR</td>
<td>Compact Communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Complete Street features could include shoulders, enhanced shoulders, Class I bike facilities, Class II bike facilities, Class III facilities, detached sidewalks, attached sidewalks, medians, enhanced intersections, and organized parking.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</th>
<th>Project Location¹</th>
<th>Recommended Complete Street Facility²</th>
<th>Existing Bike Facility</th>
<th>Existing Sidewalk</th>
<th>Planning Documents³</th>
<th>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type⁴</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ED 49, 34.465/34.865, TCR 7</td>
<td>SR-193 (Coloma Road) from Georgetown Road to St. Florian Court, Cool</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility. Class I bicycle facility proposed from Cave Valley Road to SR-193. Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCBTP 2010, 2000 SR-49, TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</td>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Recommended Complete Street Facility¹</td>
<td>Existing Bike Facility</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Planning Documents³</td>
<td>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GLE 32, RO 211/459, TCR 1</td>
<td>SR-32 (Newville Road/Walker Street) from 9th Street to A Street, Orland</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2009/2010 Glenn County Regional Transportation Plan (2009/2010 GCRTP), 2011 SR-32 TCR</td>
<td>Compact Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLE 32, 0.537/1.036, TCR 2</td>
<td>SR-32 (East Walker Street) from East Street to Papst Avenue, Orland</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2009/2010 GCRTP, 2011 SR-32 TCR</td>
<td>Suburban Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GLENN COUNTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>GLE 32, 9.609/10.178, TCR 4</td>
<td>SR-32 (6th Street) from Canal Street &amp; 6th Street to Sacramento Avenue, Hamilton City</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility.</td>
<td>Share the Road bicycle facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2009/2010 GCRTP, 2011 SR-32 TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GLE 45, 22.677/23.208, TCR 4</td>
<td>SR-45 (Canal Street) from 1st Street to 6th Street, Hamilton City</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2009/2010 GCRTP, 2009 SR-45 TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^1]: Location information.
[^2]: Recommended facility.
[^3]: Planning documents related to the project.
[^4]: Land use type related to the project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</th>
<th>Project Location¹</th>
<th>Recommended Complete Street Facility²</th>
<th>Existing Bike Facility</th>
<th>Existing Sidewalk</th>
<th>Planning Documents³</th>
<th>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type⁴</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GLE 162, 66.144/67.108, TCR 3</td>
<td>SR-162 (Biggs-Willows Road) from North Merrill Avenue Intersection to 1st Street, Willows</td>
<td>Class III bicycle facility from Villa Avenue to Tehama Street. Install ADA ramps and improve curbs.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2009/2010 GCRTP, 2011 SR-162 TCR</td>
<td>Suburban Communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Location coordinate may be subject to change. ² Bicycle facility may be combined with a sidewalk. ³ Planning documents may be subject to change. ⁴ Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type may be subject to change.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</th>
<th>Project Location¹</th>
<th>Recommended Complete Street Facility²</th>
<th>Existing Bike Facility</th>
<th>Existing Sidewalk</th>
<th>Planning Documents³</th>
<th>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type⁴</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NEV 49, 0.000/2.194, TCR 9</td>
<td>SR 49 from Placer/Nevada County Line to Wolf Road/Combie Road, Grass Valley</td>
<td>Class III bicycle facility with multi-use shoulders from the Placer/Nevada County Line to Wolf/Combie Road in the community of Lake of the Pines.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2013 Nevada County Bicycle Master Plan (NCBMP), 2000 SR-49 TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NEV 49, 2.194/8.092, TCR 9</td>
<td>SR 49 from Wolf/Combie Road to Auburn Road, Grass Valley</td>
<td>Class III bicycle facility with multi-use shoulders from the Wolf/Combie Road to Auburn Road near the community of Lake of the Pines.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2013 NCBMP, 2000 SR-49 TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</td>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Recommended Complete Street Facility</td>
<td>Existing Bike Facility</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Planning Documents</td>
<td>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NEV 49, 10.332/12.893, TCR 9</td>
<td>SR 49 from Allison Ranch Road to Crestview Drive, Grass Valley</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2013 NCBMP, 2000 SR-49 TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NEV 49, 15.199/17.135, TCR 10</td>
<td>SR 49 from the Nevada City Limit to Old Downieville Highway, Nevada City</td>
<td>Class III bicycle facility with multi-use shoulders from the Nevada City Limit to Old Downieville Highway near Nevada City.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2013 NCBMP, 2000 SR-49 TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</td>
<td>Project Location¹</td>
<td>Recommended Complete Street Facility²</td>
<td>Existing Bike Facility</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Planning Documents³</td>
<td>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NEVADA COUNTY, NEV 49, 17.135/17.537, TCR 10</td>
<td>SR 49 from Old Downieville Highway to Newtown Road, Nevada City</td>
<td>Class III bicycle facility with multi-use shoulders from Old Downieville Highway to Newtown Road near Nevada City.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2013 NCBMP, 2000 SR-49 TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NEVADA COUNTY, NEV 49, 17.537/R25.683, TCRs 10-11</td>
<td>SR 49 from Newtown Road to Tyler Foote Crossing, Nevada City</td>
<td>Class III bicycle facility with multi-use shoulders from Newtown Road to Tyler Foote Crossing near Nevada City.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2013 NCBMP, 2000 SR-49 TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</td>
<td>Project Location(^1)</td>
<td>Recommended Complete Street Facility(^2)</td>
<td>Existing Bike Facility</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Planning Documents(^3)</td>
<td>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type(^4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NEVADA COUNTY NEV 49, R25.683/27.5 14, TCR 11</td>
<td>SR 49 from Tyler Foote Crossing to Pleasant Valley Road, Nevada City</td>
<td>Class III bicycle facility with multi-use shoulders from Tyler Foote Crossing to Pleasant Valley Road.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2013 NCBMP, 2000 SR-49 TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>NEVADA COUNTY NEV 49, 27.514/30.01 1, TCR 11</td>
<td>SR 49 from Pleasant Valley Road to Oak Tree Road, Nevada City</td>
<td>Class III bicycle facility with multi-use shoulders from Pleasant Valley Road to Oak Street Road.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2013 NCBMP, 2000 SR-49 TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</td>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Recommended Complete Street Facility ²</td>
<td>Existing Bike Facility</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Planning Documents ³</td>
<td>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type ⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NEV 89, 0.005/14.193, TCR 6</td>
<td>SR-89 (River Road) from Roundabout near Interstate 80 to West River Street, Truckee</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility on SR-89 from Interstate 80 to West River Street. Pedestrian/bicycle tunnel at the Donner Creek Underpass (mousehole). Add sidewalks and ADA ramps.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2013 NCBMP, 2001 Placer County Regional Bikeway Plan (2001 PCRBP), 2012 SR-89 TCR</td>
<td>Protected Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NEV 174, 1.125/4.622, TCR 3</td>
<td>SR-174 (Colfax Avenue) from Lower Colfax Road to You Bet Road, Grass Valley</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2013 NCBMP, 2010 SR-174 TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</td>
<td>Project Location¹</td>
<td>Recommended Complete Street Facility²</td>
<td>Existing Bike Facility</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Planning Documents³</td>
<td>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NEV 174, 4.622/6.799, TCR 3</td>
<td>SR 174 from You Bet Road to Brunswick Road, Grass Valley</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2013 NCBMP, 2010 SR-174 TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NEV 174, 6.799/R8.235 , TCR 3</td>
<td>SR 174 from Brunswick Road to Rattlesnake Road, Grass Valley</td>
<td>Class III bicycle facility with multi-use shoulders on SR-174 from Brunswick Road to Rattlesnake Road.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2013 NCBMP, 2010 SR-174 TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</td>
<td>Project Location¹</td>
<td>Recommended Complete Street Facility²</td>
<td>Existing Bike Facility</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Planning Documents³</td>
<td>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NEVADA COUNTY</td>
<td>NEV 174, 9.351/10.218, TCR 4</td>
<td>SR 174 from Mercury Drive to South Auburn Street (End of Route), Grass Valley</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2013 NCBMP, 2010 SR-174 TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands. Close in Compact Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</td>
<td>Project Location¹</td>
<td>Recommended Complete Street Facility²</td>
<td>Existing Bike Facility</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Planning Documents³</td>
<td>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLA 49, 2.526/11.373, TCRs 8-9</td>
<td>SR-49 from Lincoln Way to Nevada &amp; Placer County Line, Auburn</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility.</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2001 PCRBP, 2000 SR-49 TCR</td>
<td>Suburban Communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### District 3 2014 Complete Streets Implementation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</th>
<th>Project Location¹</th>
<th>Recommended Complete Street Facility²</th>
<th>Existing Bike Facility</th>
<th>Existing Sidewalk</th>
<th>Planning Documents³</th>
<th>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type⁴</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SAC 160, 4.58/4.693, TCR 2</td>
<td>SR-160 (River Road) from A Street to 2nd Street, Isleton</td>
<td>Class I bike facility, Isleton-Shore Lakes Trail, Multi-use Path, Delta Trail.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2013 Sacramento County Bicycle Master Plan (2011 SCBMP), 2010 SR-160 TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SAC 1-5, 24.63/25.31, TCR 7</td>
<td>I-5 from Richards Boulevard to Garden Highway, Sacramento</td>
<td>The American River Crossing Alternatives Study came up with eight recommendations to add bicycle and pedestrian access connecting South Natomas and Downtown Sacramento. Three preferred recommendations include: 1) add bike and pedestrian access (Class I) on the west side of I-5 bridge over the American River; 2) piggyback on the Sacramento Regional Transit's planned bridge to serve the Green Line light rail extension to the airport; and 3) elevate Northgate Boulevard and replace the SR-160 bridges over the American River, adding additional bike and pedestrian access.</td>
<td>Share the Road bicycle when Discovery Park is flooded.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2013 Summary Report, Draft American River Crossing, Alternatives Study. 2013 Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Master Plan, (2013 SACOG RBPTMP), 2010 TCR, I-5.</td>
<td>Urban Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</td>
<td>Project Location¹</td>
<td>Recommended Complete Street Facility²</td>
<td>Existing Bike Facility</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Planning Documents³</td>
<td>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SIE 49, 0.000/16.725, TCR 13</td>
<td>SR 49 from the Yuba/Sierra County Line to Nevada Street in Downieville</td>
<td>Share the Road facility with multi-use shoulders from the Yuba/Sierra County Line to Nevada Street in Downieville.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2012 Sierra County Bicycle Master Plan (2012 SCBMP), 2000 SR-49 TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands, Close in Compact Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SIE 49, 16.725/16.967, TCR 13</td>
<td>SR 49 from Nevada Street to Belle Street, Downieville</td>
<td>Share the Road facility. Widen shoulders where appropriate.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2012 SCBMP, 2000 SR-49 TCR</td>
<td>Close In Compact Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</td>
<td>Project Location¹</td>
<td>Recommended Complete Street Facility²</td>
<td>Existing Bike Facility</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Planning Documents³</td>
<td>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SIE 49, 16.967/R34.307, TCR 13</td>
<td>SR 49 from Belle Street in Downieville to Gold Lake Highway (Co Road S620)</td>
<td>Share the Road facility with multi-use shoulders from Belle Street in Downieville to Gold Lake Highway (Co Road S620) in the community of Bassetts Station.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2012 SCBMP, 2000 SR-49 TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SIE 49, R34.307/47.440, TCR 13</td>
<td>SR 49 from Gold Lake Highway (Co Road S620) to SR 49/89 Junction</td>
<td>Share the Road facility with multi-use shoulders from Gold Lake Highway (Co Road S620) between the communities of Bassetts Station and Sattley.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2012 SCBMP, 2000 SR-49 TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</td>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Recommended Complete Street Facility</td>
<td>Existing Bike Facility</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Planning Documents</td>
<td>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SIE 49, 47.52/58.472, TCR 14</td>
<td>SR 49 from Battelle Street to Genasci Road, Sierra County</td>
<td>Share the Road facility with multi-use shoulders from Battelle Street to Genasci Road between the communities of Sierraville and Loyalton.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2012 SCBMP, 2000 SR-49 TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SIE 49, 58.472/64.047, TCR 14</td>
<td>SR 49 (Main Street) from Genasci Road to the Plumas/Sierra County Line, Loyalton</td>
<td>Share the Road facility from Genasci Road to Hill Street and from Alleghany Street to the Plumas/Sierra County Line, Class II bicycle facility from Hill Street to Alleghany Street. Widen shoulders where feasible.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2012 SCBMP, 2000 SR-49 TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</td>
<td>Project Location¹</td>
<td>Recommended Complete Street Facility²</td>
<td>Existing Bike Facility</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Planning Documents ₪</td>
<td>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SIE 49, 47.52 to SIE 89, 19.081, TCR 8</td>
<td>SR 49 from Battelle Street to Westside Road, SR 89, Sierraville</td>
<td>Share the Road facility with multi-use shoulders from Battelle Street to Westside Road between the communities of Sierraville and Sattley.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2012 SCBMP, 2012 SR-89 TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SIE 89, 19.081/19.958, TCR 8</td>
<td>SR 89 from Westside Road to SR 49/89 Junction</td>
<td>Share the Road facility with multi-use shoulders from Westside Road to the SR 49/89 Junction near the community of Sattley.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2012 SCBMP, 2012 SR-89 TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SIE 89, 19.958/23.07, TCR 8</td>
<td>SR 89 from SR 49/89 Junction to Calpine Road</td>
<td>Share the Road facility with multi-use shoulders from SR 49/89 Junction to Calpine Road, near the community of Calpine.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2012 SCBMP; 2012 SR-89 TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Project Location: The location of the project as described in the table.
² Recommended Complete Street Facility: A detailed description of the recommended complete street facility.
³ Existing Bike Facility: Information about the existing bike facility.
⁴ Existing Sidewalk: Information about the existing sidewalk.
⁵ Planning Documents: Documentation related to the project.
⁶ Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type: Classification of the place type according to Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</th>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th>Recommended Complete Street Facility</th>
<th>Existing Bike Facility</th>
<th>Existing Sidewalk</th>
<th>Planning Documents</th>
<th>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SIERRA COUNTY SIE 89, 23.07/29.584 TCR 8</td>
<td>SR-89 from Calpine Road to Sierra &amp; Plumas County Line</td>
<td>Share the Road facility with multi-use shoulders from Calpine Road to the Sierra/Plumas County Line.</td>
<td>Share the Road bicycle facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2012 SCBMP, 2012 SR-89 TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</td>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Recommended Complete Street Facility</td>
<td>Existing Bike Facility</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Planning Documents</td>
<td>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SUT 20, R14.85/17.049, TCRs 7-8</td>
<td>SR-20 (Colusa Avenue) from Tharp Road to Sutter/Yuba County Line, Yuba City</td>
<td>Class II bike facility.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2012 Sutter County Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Plan (2012 SCPBTP), 2011 Yuba City Master Bicycle Plan (2011 YCMBP), 2013 SR-20 TCR, City of Yuba City’s 2009 Highway 20 Revitalization Strategy. 2013 SACOG Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian and Trails Master Plans (2013 SACOG RBPTMP)</td>
<td>Suburban Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</td>
<td>Project Location¹</td>
<td>Recommended Complete Street Facility²</td>
<td>Existing Bike Facility</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Planning Documents³</td>
<td>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1    | SUTTER COUNTY  
SUT 99, 38.39/42.13, TCR 13  
SR-99 from Paseo Avenue to Riviera Street, Live Oak |  
The purpose of the Collaborative Highway 99 Streetscape Master Plan was to establish conceptual guidance along Highway 99 within the city of Live Oak as the community grows, and include recommendations to enhance aesthetics, safety, multimodal accessibility, and quality of life for residents and visitors. |  
Share the Road facility | No |  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</th>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th>Recommended Complete Street Facility</th>
<th>Existing Bike Facility</th>
<th>Existing Sidewalk</th>
<th>Planning Documents</th>
<th>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TAHOE BASIN TAH (PLA) 28, 9.344/10.049 TCR 2</td>
<td>SR-28 (North Lake Blvd) from North Shore Blvd &amp; SR-267 to Fox Road, Kings Beach</td>
<td>The Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project is to convert the existing four-lane highway to one lane in each direction with a center turn lane and provide class II bicycle facilities, sidewalks, and limited on-street seasonal parking. The project will also accommodate future transit needs, and convert two existing intersections into roundabouts.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2010 Lake Tahoe Regional Bicycle Pedestrian Plan (2010 LTRBPP), Placer County Department of Public Works, Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project, 2012 SR-28 TCR</td>
<td>Protected Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</td>
<td>Project Location(^1)</td>
<td>Recommended Complete Street Facility(^2)</td>
<td>Existing Bike Facility</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Planning Documents(^3)</td>
<td>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type(^4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TAHOE BASIN TAH (ED) 50, 70.021/71.47, TCR 17</td>
<td>US-50 from Town Center area, which includes Meyers Community Center District and portions of Upper Truckee Residential/Tourism District, Meyers</td>
<td>The Meyers Area Plan serves as the comprehensive land use and zoning plan for the community of Meyers consistent with the Lake Tahoe Regional Plan and the El Dorado County General Plan. In the plan's transportation and circulation vision, the transportation system will be redeveloped within Meyers to achieve complete streets, reduce reliance on the private automobile, improve circulation, and provide opportunities to experience Meyers as a pedestrian or cyclist.</td>
<td>Class I bicycle facility parallel to US-50</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2013 Meyers Area Plan, Public Review Draft, 2010 LTRBPP, 2010 SR-50 TCR</td>
<td>Protected Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</td>
<td>Project Location¹</td>
<td>Recommended Complete Street Facility²</td>
<td>Existing Bike Facility</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Planning Documents³</td>
<td>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TAH (ED) 89, 8.57/11.772, TCR 2-3</td>
<td>US-50/SR-89 to Visitor Center Blvd, South Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility.</td>
<td>Class I bicycle facility parallel to SR-89 from 15th Street to Visitor Center Blvd.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2010 LTRBPP, 2012 SR-89 TCR</td>
<td>Protected Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TAH (ED) 50, 75.446/78.887, TCR 18</td>
<td>US-50 from Emerald Bay Road (SR-89) to Fairway Drive, South Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility.</td>
<td>Parallel local facility varies from Class I to Class III.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2010 LTRBPP, 2010 SR-50 TCR</td>
<td>Protected Lands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Project Location: This column lists the project locations for each segment.

² Recommended Complete Street Facility: This column describes the recommended complete street facilities for each segment.

³ Existing Bike Facility: This column indicates the existing bike facilities for each segment.

⁴ Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type: This column specifies the Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework place type for each segment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</th>
<th>Project Location(^1)</th>
<th>Recommended Complete Street Facility(^2)</th>
<th>Existing Bike Facility</th>
<th>Existing Sidewalk</th>
<th>Planning Documents(^3)</th>
<th>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type(^4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TAHOE BASIN TAH (PLA) 89, 0.00/21.579, TCRs 4-5</td>
<td>SR-89 (El Dorado County Line) to West River Street, Truckee</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility.</td>
<td>Class I bicycle facilities, El Dorado County line to Homewood, Tahoe Pines to Pineland, and Sunnyside to Nevada Border.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2010 LTRBPP, 2012 SR-89 TCR</td>
<td>Protected Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</td>
<td>Project Location¹</td>
<td>Recommended Complete Street Facility²</td>
<td>Existing Bike Facility</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Planning Documents³</td>
<td>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TAH (PLA) 28, 0.19/1.0, TCR 1</td>
<td>SR-28 (North Lake Blvd) Macinaw Road to the east end of community, Tahoe City</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility.</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility, Class I bicycle facility parallel to SR-28 along Common Beach area</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2010 LTRBPP, 2012 SR-28 TCR</td>
<td>Protected Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</td>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Recommended Complete Street Facility</td>
<td>Existing Bike Facility</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Planning Documents</td>
<td>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TAHOE BASIN TAH (PLA) 89, 8.45, TCR 4</td>
<td>SR-89 (West Lake Blvd) and SR-28 Intersection, Tahoe City</td>
<td>The Tahoe Transportation District is currently analyzing project alternatives to increase multimodal crossing and accessibility at and around the Truckee River Bridge, including emergency access to the West Shore. Alternatives include a realignment of SR-89.</td>
<td>Class I bicycle facility parallel to highways.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2010 LTRBPP, Tahoe Transportation District, SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project, 2012 SR-89 TCR</td>
<td>Protected Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</td>
<td>Project Location¹</td>
<td>Recommended Complete Street Facility²</td>
<td>Existing Bike Facility</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Planning Documents³</td>
<td>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>YOL 16, 27.54/28.83, TCR 4</td>
<td>SR-16 (Woodland Avenue) from Orleans Street to 1/3 mile east of County Road 86A, Esparto</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility, sidewalks, pedestrian bridge (not on state highway), turn lanes, medians, crosswalks, parallel parking, curb extensions, lighting, gateway signs, textured concrete, and refuge islands.</td>
<td>Yes. Transit Shelters.</td>
<td></td>
<td>County of Yolo Bicycle Transportation Plan 2013 (CYBTP 2013), 2013 SACOG RBPTMP, 2012 SR-16 TCR, Traffic Calming Project, Capay and Esparto, County of Yolo, 6/30/2014</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ID # | County, Route, PM, TCR Segment | Project Location | Recommended Complete Street Facility | Existing Bike Facility | Existing Sidewalk | Planning Documents | Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>YOL 16, R40.684/R41.556, TCR 7</td>
<td>SR-16 (Pedrick Road/County Road 98) from West Main Street to West Kentucky Avenue, Woodland</td>
<td>Class II bike facility. Add sidewalks.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>County of Yolo Bicycle Transportation Plan 2013 (CYBTP 2013), 2013 SACOG RBPTMP, 2012 SR-16 TCR</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>YOL 45,0/0.071, TCR 1</td>
<td>SR-45 (4th Street) from Locust Street to Oaks Grove Avenue, Knights Landing</td>
<td>Share the Road facility.</td>
<td>Share the Road bicycle facility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CYBTP 2013, 2013 SACOG RBPTMP, 2009 SR-45 TCR</td>
<td>Compact Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</td>
<td>Project Location¹</td>
<td>Recommended Complete Street Facility²</td>
<td>Existing Bike Facility</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Planning Documents³</td>
<td>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOLO COUNTY</td>
<td>YOL 128, 8.769/9.83, TCR 2</td>
<td>SR-128 (East Grant Avenue) from Railroad Avenue to I-505, Winters</td>
<td>The Grant Avenue/SR-128/Russell Blvd plan is to 1) improve the overall safety and usability of the Grand Avenue/SR-128 corridor for pedestrians and bicyclists; 2) reduce the number of travel lanes where possible; 3) enhance the connectivity along the corridor for all modes of travel; 4) calm automobile travel along the corridor; 5) preserve and enhance Winter’s small town character and identity; and 6) develop one community-supported conceptual plan for the corridor. The plan actually goes to past I-505 to El Rio Villa, which is on a local county road.</td>
<td>Class II Bicycle facility, except for a portion on the west side of Russell Blvd/Interstate 505 Intersection.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2010 City of Winters Grant Avenue/SR-128 Russell Blvd., Complete Streets Concept Plan, 2002 Winters Bikeway Master Plan (2002 WBMP), City of Winters Grant Avenue SR-28 and West Main Street Intersection Improvements, Railroad Improvements, Walnut Avenue Roundabout, Grant Avenue SR-128 and West Main Street Intersection Improvements, SACOG RPP, 2010 SR-128 TCR, 2013 SACOG RBPTMP</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Project Location refers to the specific location of the project. ² Recommended Complete Street Facility details the specific improvements planned. ³ Planning Documents include relevant plans and reports. ⁴ Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type categorizes the location based on land use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</th>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th>Recommended Complete Street Facility</th>
<th>Existing Bike Facility</th>
<th>Existing Sidewalk</th>
<th>Planning Documents</th>
<th>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>YUB 20, 1.489/R2.013, TCR 11</td>
<td>SR-20 (12th Street) from B Street to Buchanan Street, Marysville</td>
<td>The purpose of the Pedestrian Safety, Mobility &amp; Context Improvement Study is to prepare recommendations to improve pedestrian connections and walkability across and along State Route 70 and State Route 20 (SR-70/20).</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2013 SACOG RBPTMP, 2013 SR-20 TCR, 2008 Pedestrian, Safety, Mobility &amp; Context Improvement Study (2008 PSMCIS)</td>
<td>Compact Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>YUB 20, 0.001/1.485, TCRs 10 and 11</td>
<td>SR-20 from Yuba/Sutter County Border to 12th Street/B Street, Marysville</td>
<td>Same as above.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2013 SACOG RBPTMP, 2013 SR-20 TCR, mvforward.org, 2008 PSMCIS</td>
<td>Compact Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>YUB 65, 1.21/1.718, TCR 4</td>
<td>SR-65 (D Street) from 1st Street to Evergreen Avenue, Wheatland</td>
<td>Class II bicycle facility</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2012 Yuba County Bikeway Master Plan (2012 YCBMP)</td>
<td>Rural and Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</td>
<td>Project Location¹</td>
<td>Recommended Complete Street Facility²</td>
<td>Existing Bike Facility</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Planning Documents³</td>
<td>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>YUB 70, 13.607/14.7, TCR 4-6</td>
<td>SR-70 (Yuba River Bridge) from North Beale Road to 9th and B Street, Marysville</td>
<td>The purpose of the Pedestrian Safety, Mobility &amp; Context Improvement Study is to prepare recommendations to improve pedestrian connections and walkability across and along State Route 70 and State Route 20 (SR-70/20). Share the Road facility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2013 SACOG RBPTMP, 2009 SR-70 TCR, mvforward.org, 2008 PSMCIS</td>
<td>Compact Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>YUB 70, 14.7, YUB 20, 1.488</td>
<td>SR-70 (E-Street) from 9th/B Street to 12th/B Street, Break in Route, Marysville</td>
<td>Same as above. Share the Road facility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2013 SACOG RBPTMP, 2008 PSMCIS, 2009 SR-70 TCR, mvforward.org.</td>
<td>Compact Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>County, Route, PM, TCR Segment</td>
<td>Project Location¹</td>
<td>Recommended Complete Street Facility²</td>
<td>Existing Bike Facility</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Planning Documents³</td>
<td>Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Type⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>YUB 20, 14.888, YUB 70, 15.319, TCR 7</td>
<td>SR-70 (B Street) from 12th Street to East 24th Street, Marysville</td>
<td>The purpose of the Pedestrian Safety, Mobility &amp; Context Improvement Study is to prepare recommendations to improve pedestrian connections and walkability across and along State Route 70 and State Route 20 (SR-70/20). Accommodate bicycle and pedestrian travel.</td>
<td>Share the Road facility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2013 SACOG RBPTMP, 2008 PS MCIS, 2009 SR-70 TCR, mvforward.org</td>
<td>Compact Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes:

1. This category gives a physical description of the beginning and ending points of the post mile segment.
2. This category shows the complete street facility improvements recommended by Caltrans and local stakeholders for that segment of the SHS.
3. Planning documents are local and Caltrans planning documents that contains plans for the facility.
4. This category shows the Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework Place Types in which the segment is located.
Figure 4: Recommended Complete Street Facilities, El Dorado County

Figure 5: Recommended Complete Street Facilities, Glenn County
Figure 6: Recommended Complete Street Facilities, Nevada County

Figure 7: Recommended Complete Street Facilities, Placer County
Figure 8: Recommended Complete Street Facilities, Sacramento County
Figure 9: Recommended Complete Street Facilities: Sierra County

Figure 10: Recommended Complete Street Facilities, Sutter County
Figure 11: Recommended Complete Street Facilities: Tahoe Basin
Figure 12: Recommended Complete Street Facilities: Yolo County

Figure 13: Recommended Complete Street Facilities: Yuba County
**Action Plan**

The District and its partners may take the following actions to plan, program, develop, operate, and maintain the recommended complete street improvements on the SHS:

**Planning**

Caltrans and local agencies do considerable planning before project development occurs. A transportation need is identified, either as a structural or operating deficiency of the existing transportation system or as a response to a planned land use change. The identification of this need may result in a minor or major project to the SHS. If a major project on the SHS is needed, Caltrans or a regional agency must perform studies to compare potential transportation investments before deciding what to build.

Federal, state, regional, local agencies, private, community-based organizations, and the general public work together to identify future transportation needs and to plan for how those needs can and will be met. This is transportation planning. Transportation planning is long-range (20+years) and area-wide.

The goal of transportation planning is to prepare and provide mobility for all travelers in a fiscally and environmentally responsible manner. In addition, transportation planning examines and considers several factors, such as: the environment, social-economic conditions, finances, political, climate, land use, equity, and community goals. All modes of transportation are considered, and all affected stakeholders are involved. It is ongoing, and not a single completed action.

Every five years, Caltrans updates the California Transportation Plan (CTP), which has a minimum 20-year planning horizon. The CTP, developed over several years with widespread stakeholder participation, articulates a vision for a statewide transportation system that complements regional transportation plans and land use goals. This long-range transportation plan is designed to meet California’s future mobility needs and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

As part of the planning process, Caltrans sets a 20-25-year vision for each state highway and evaluates existing and future operating conditions on the SHS. Caltrans also recommends improvements to system operations. Goals, policies, and findings are documented in DSMPs, TCRs, or CSMPs.

The above System Planning process identifies a variety of projects to address deficiencies on the transportation system. The bridge between the needed system improvements and the actual programming (funding) of these projects is the Project Initiation Document (PID). The PID provides information regarding the scope, schedule, and cost of the proposed improvements.
Caltrans Planning Grant Program

For regional and local agencies interested in pursuing complete street planning studies with Caltrans, funding is available for an on-call consultant to enhance public engagement and outreach efforts. The goal of the Caltrans Public Participation and Engagement Program is to translate complex planning and design issues into language and graphics that people can understand. These outreach efforts engage all stakeholders, especially underserved populations. This approach means that more people are aware of the transportation projects in their community and are more likely to stay actively involved in the process. Examples of past complete street plans using this program include the City of Winters Grant Avenue/SR-128/Russell Boulevard, and the City of Colusa Market Street/SR-20 & 45 Complete Streets Concept plans.

| Caltrans, Division of Transportation Planning, Office of Community Planning administers the Public Participation Engagement program. For more information about these grant programs, see www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/index.html |

Programming

Programming is the process by which specific funds for a project are identified. Projects may be listed in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) or the State Highway Operational and Protection Program (SHOPP). STIP projects focus on increasing capacity, while SHOPP projects focus on improving or maintaining existing facilities. By State law, Caltrans must program SHOPP funds first, then STIP funds. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) approves all projects to be included in the STIP and SHOPP.

Regional Transportation Planning agencies are responsible to nominate and program 75-percent of STIP funds to projects in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). Caltrans nominates and programs the remaining 25-percent of the funds to projects through the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP).

Projects may also be funded by local funds, sales tax, developer fees, or private funds. All projects involving the SHS are required to follow the Caltrans Project Development Process.
Project Development
The project development process spans the period of time from feasibility studies until the completion of construction. The project development process is tied to legal requirements of environmental laws and regulations. This process melds engineering requirements with Caltrans management approval steps with the environmental process. All Caltrans projects are subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Projects that require federal approval, access to a highway, or use federal funding are subject to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Most documents are prepared to fulfill requirements of both laws.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Project and Program Funding

Active Transportation Program--Caltrans
Senate Bill 99 and Assembly Bill 101 created the Active Transportation Program (ATP) to encourage active transportation, such as biking and walking, in California. The ATP consolidates several federal and state programs: 1) the Transportation Enhancements Program, 2) Recreational Trails Program, 3) Safe Routes to Schools, and 4) the Bicycle Transportation Account Program into a single program. The six goals of the ATP are:

1) Increase the proportion of trips by biking and walking;
2) Increase the safety and mobility of non-motorized users;
3) Advance the efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals;
4) Enhance public health, including the reduction of childhood obesity;
5) Ensure that disadvantaged communities fully share in the benefits of the program
6) Provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of active transportation users.

Caltrans, Division of Local Assistance, Office of Active Transportation and Special Programs administers the ATP for small urban and rural regions of the State. For more information, see www.dot.ca.gov/hq/lcalPrograms/atp/index.html

Active Transportation Program—Metropolitan Planning Organizations with Populations Over 200,000
A separate call for applications is budgeted for Metropolitan Planning Organizations with large urbanized areas are responsible for overseeing a competitive project selection process. This call includes those projects not considered by the Caltrans Active Transportation program.
In District 3, Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) provides funds to support walking and biking throughout El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties. The program provides facilities and programs for walking and biking in cities and towns and between them in the region. Projects and programs must support Blueprint Preferred Scenario and planning principles. Projects must be derived from SACOG’s Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian and Trails Master Plan.

For capital projects, federal funds may be used for construction, preliminary engineering, including environmental work and design and right-of-way. For non-capital projects and programs, funds may be used for bicycle and pedestrian planning, education, information, and marketing efforts. For more information, see www.sacog.org/regionalfunding/fundingprograms_bikeped-overview.cfm

Placer County and the El Dorado Transportation Commission have separate selection and funding processes for the ATP. Butte County of Governments and the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization may make recommendations or provide input regarding projects within their boundaries for ATP funding.

Agreements
Agreements may include freeway agreements, relinquishments agreements, cooperative agreements, and maintenance agreements. These agreements are required by law to document the exchange of resources between agencies, agency responsibilities, and the effects a project may have on a community.

Every project will require maintenance over its lifetime. Because planning and design decisions about roadways and roadside features and materials impact maintenance needs, Caltrans maintenance managers must be included early in the project development phase.
Summary of Actions

Planning Actions

• Caltrans and local agencies will maintain proactive communication and collaborative complete street planning.

• Caltrans will consult local planning documents when updating this plan to coordinate complete street improvements.

• Caltrans will place complete street plans from Table 1 into Transportation Concept Reports, Corridor System Management Plans, and other System Planning documents when updated.

• Caltrans will place a high priority on developing PIDs to program recommended complete street projects on the SHS where the state highway is part of a multimodal complete street network.

Programming Actions

• Caltrans will work with local agencies in developing regional transportation plans and on projects on the SHS.

• Caltrans will develop PIDs for major SHS improvements and will include, whenever possible, recommended complete street improvements from this plan during their development.

• Caltrans will include complete streets plans identified in this plan early in the project development process.

Project Development Actions

• Caltrans will maintain the complete street scope through the environmental, project delivery, and construction phases.

• Caltrans will give high priority to overlaying the entire traveled way and paved shoulders, where feasible, when implementing new highway construction and major maintenance projects at locations on the SHS where this plan recommends complete street improvements.

• Caltrans roadway rehabilitation projects will be scoped to take into consideration recommended complete street improvements in this plan.

Agreements Actions

• Caltrans cooperative maintenance agreements with local agencies will be executed to cooperate in a project or share its costs.

• Caltrans freeway and controlled access highway agreements with local agencies will be executed before Caltrans is allowed to close a city street or county road as a result of construction.

• Caltrans relinquishment agreements with local agencies will be executed when a project results in Caltrans transferring a portion of the SHS to a local agency.

• Caltrans maintenance agreements with local agencies will be executed whenever possible to provide acceptable levels of maintenance for complete street facilities on State highways.
• Caltrans and local agencies may look at adding parking restrictions or back-in parking to improve bicycle safety by reducing obstructions and door collisions, and signage to notify drivers of bicyclists and bicycle facilities as part of operational improvements to facilitate safe bicycling.

Future Updates

Because the transportation system is continually changing, occasional updates will be necessary to assess progress and identify new planning opportunities. In order to keep the D3-CSIP up to date, it is anticipated that this document will be updated every two years. Table 1, Recommended Complete Street Project List will be updated as changes to the system are made. Figures 2 -- 13, which identify the recommended complete street facilities within each county, will be updated regularly as local and regional complete street plans are developed or updated, which identify segments of the SHS, and as resources become available.

For more information, please contact:
Caltrans—District 3
Division of Planning and Local Assistance
Office of System and Freight Planning
703 B Street
Marysville, CA 95901
(530) 634-7616 (office)
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Appendix A: Guidance on Designing and Implementing Complete Streets

- The California Street Design: Part 1—Complete Streets http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/publicroads/10julauog/03.cfm
- Going on a Road Diet (http://www.fhwa.dot.ca.gov/publications/publicroads/11septoct/05.cfm)
- Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), Designing Urban Walkable Throughfares, http://www.ite.org.
- Local manuals or street design manuals
- *Vehicle Code Section 21960* – This section of the Vehicle Code allows Caltrans to prohibit pedestrian use of freeways and expressways, which prohibition comes into effect when signs are placed on the facility.  http://www.dmv.ca.gov/pubs/vctop/d11/vc21960.htm, and *Streets and Highways Code 890.4* – This section of the Streets and Highways Code defines bikeway classifications on the SHS. http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=shc&group=00001-01000&file=890-894.2
Appendix B: Bikeway Classifications

Class I Bikeway - Bike Path
As identified in the Streets and Highways Code 890.4 (a), a Class I bike path “provide[s] a completely separated right-of-way designated for the exclusive use of bicycles and pedestrians with cross flows by motorists minimized.” The most common applications for Class I bike paths are along rivers, ocean fronts, canals, utility ROW, and abandoned railroad ROW, as well as within school campuses, or within and between parks. There are Class I bike paths parallel to the SHS, but most Class I bike paths are built by local agencies or private organizations, not Caltrans due to the high ROW and capital costs.

Class II Bikeway - Bike Lane
According to Streets and Highways Code 890.4 (b), a Class II bike lane “provide[s] a restricted right-of-way designated for the exclusive or semi exclusive use of bicycles with through travel by motor vehicles or pedestrians prohibited, but with vehicle parking and cross flows by pedestrians and motorists permitted.” Class II bike lanes are encouraged in areas where there is sufficient demand to justify the cost of dedicated ROW for bicycles, and where road geometrics and environmental constraints, including drainage allow. These areas are typically urban areas with activity centers. Caltrans District 3 consults and often partners with local agencies to establish Class II bike lanes.

Class III Bikeway - Bike Route
As defined by Streets and Highways Code 890.4 (c), a Class III bike route “provide[s] a right-of-way designated by signs or permanent markings and shared with pedestrians or motorists.” Class III bike routes are often shared with motor vehicles and are established by placing signs along roadways, and in some instances, a 4-inch white edge stripe separating the traffic lanes from the shoulder. Class III bike routes are often used to provide continuity between Class II bike lanes or to designate preferred routes through high demand corridors. Section 9C.04 of the CA MUTCD states that Class III bike routes are particularly applicable on rural highways and on major arterials in urban areas where there is no vehicle parking.

Non-Designated Bicycle Facilities

Share the Road Facilities
Share the Road facilities are non-classified SHS segments, which have no bikeway designation and are open to bicyclists unless designated as closed to bicyclists. These facilities range from roadway shoulders of varying widths to full sharing of the mainline traffic lane. Non-classified segments are very common in rural areas. To remind drivers of bicycle presence, many non-classified SHS segments have Share the Road signs. A Share the Road facility differs from a Class III facility in that the Share-the-Road facility is not officially designated as a bike route, but bicyclists may still use the facility.

Freeway Shoulders Open to Non-motorized Travel
Although not usually open for non-motorized travel, freeway shoulders can be used by bicyclists if certain criteria regarding the safety and convenience of the freeway, as compared with available alternate roadway routes, are met. Only freeway shoulders that are compatible for bicyclists are permitted for such purposes.
Figure 14: Bikeway Designations

Source: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Appendix C: Links to Local Complete Streets Plans

City of Chico, Chico Nord Avenue (SR 32) Corridor Plan (http://www.bcag.org/Planning/Nord-Ave-Corridor-Plan/index.html)


El Dorado County Transportation Commission, Diamond Springs and El Dorado Area Mobility and Sustainable Community Plan (http://www.edctc.org/3/DS-ED_Vision.htm)

Placer County, Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project (http://www.placer.ca.gov/departments/works/projects/kingsbeach)

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and El Dorado County, Meyers Area Plan (http://www.edcgov.us/Government/Meyers/Meyers_main_info.aspx)


Tahoe Transportation District, SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project (http://tahoetransportation.org/current-capital-projects/sr89-fanny-bridge-community-reviti)

City of Winters, The City of Winters Complete Streets Concept Plan (http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist3/departments/planning/communityplanning1.htm)
Appendix D – Acronyms and Definitions

ADA—The American Disabilities Act (ADA) is a federal act that calls for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities.

ATP—The Alternative Transportation Program (ATP) encourages active transportation in California. The ATP consolidates several federal and state programs, including the Bicycle Transportation Account, the Safe Routes to School programs, and the Transportation Alternative Program.

ATP—An Active Transportation Plan is a plan that documents bicycle and pedestrian facilities, policies, and policies.

CEQA—The California Environmental Protection Act (CEQA) is a statute that requires State and local agencies to identify significant environmental impacts of their actions and to avoid or mitigate those impacts, if feasible.

CSMP—Corridor System Management Plans (CSMP) are 10-year, comprehensive, integrated management plans for all travel modes including bicycle facilities in a congested SHS corridor that analyze traffic conditions. They also propose how to maximize the existing infrastructure by coordinating proven Intelligent Transportation System and operational methods and technologies.

DSMDP—A District System Management and Development Plan (DSMDP) refers to a compilation of the District System Management Plan and the Transportation System Development Plan. This plan identifies key policies, programs, and projects, including bicycle facilities that are needed to maintain, manage, and ultimately, enhance overall mobility.

HDM—The Highway Design Manual refers to California Highway Design Manual (HDM). This manual establishes uniform policies and procedures to carry out the State highway design functions of the California Department of Transportation.

ICE—Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) refers to the process whereby a balanced approach is taken to examine the addition, expansion, or control of major intersections. Intersection control options include roundabouts, reduced access intersections, traffic signals, and median treatments to reduce traffic movements.

MPO—A Metropolitan Planning Organization is an agency that combines the governing bodies of neighboring cities where the combined population exceeds 50,000.

NEPA—The National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) is a federal act that outlines policies to protect the environment. It is intended to help public officials make decisions based on understanding the environmental consequences, and take actions that protect, restore, and enhance the environment.
PID—A Project Initiation Document (PID) is a record of the purpose and need for the project, and the approach that will be taken to meet or reduce structural or operational transportation deficiencies. The most important function of a PID is to establish a project as a viable candidate for Federal, State, regional, and local funds.

RTIP—The Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) is a listing of all arterial highway, public transit, and other transportation improvement projects in a region. A regional agency is responsible for developing a RTIP.

SHOPP—The State Highway Operation Protection Program (SHOPP) is a four-year program of projects. The purpose of the SHOPP is to reduce collisions, restore damaged roadways, preserve bridges, roadways, and roadsides, enhance mobility, and preserve other transportation facilities related to the state highway system.

SHS—The State Highway System (SHS) is comprised of over 15,400 miles of roadway and carries over 185 billion vehicle miles each year. Caltrans has responsibility for operations, maintenance, design, construction, and long-range planning of the SHS.

STIP—The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is a multi-year capital improvement program of transportation projects on and off the State Highway System.

TCR--Transportation Concept Report: A Transportation Concept Report is a 20-to 25-year plan that evaluates existing and future operation conditions and deficiencies on the SHS for a route, and recommends solutions to minimize those deficiencies.
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